

Annex

Official Journal
of the
European Communities

No 1-293

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1982-1983 Session
Report of Proceedings
from 10 to 14 January 1983
Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Monday, 10 January 1983	1
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 1 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 4 — Welcome, p. 10 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions (contd), p. 10 — Cyprus, p. 12 — Near East, p. 21 — Annex, p. 28	
Tuesday, 11 January 1983	33
Minutes, p. 34 — Welcome, p. 36 — Near East (contd), p. 36 — Votes, p. 52 — German Presidency, p. 54 — Question Time, p. 85 — Annex, p. 98	
Wednesday, 12 January 1983	107
Oils and fats, p. 107 — Automobile market, p. 119 — Intra-Community trade — Turnover, p. 135 — Question Time (contd), p. 140 — Intra-Community trade — Turnover (contd), p. 155 — Discharge for 1980 — Embargo on agricultural exports, p. 160 — Votes, p. 167 — Annexes, p. 168	
Thursday, 13 January 1983	199
Topical and urgent debate, p. 200 — Political cooperation and security, p. 221 — Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, p. 245 — Conscientious objection, p. 248 — Action against the Council, p. 253 — Dates of next part-sessions, p. 254 — Votes, p. 256 — Conscientious objection (contd), p. 257 — ERDF, p. 260 — Discharge for 1980 — Embargo on agricultural exports (contd), p. 270 — Annex, p. 275	
Friday, 14 January 1983	290
Minutes, p. 290 — Votes, p. 291 — Court of Auditors, p. 292 — Mineral raw materials, p. 293 — Noise from helicopters, p. 300 — <i>Foie gras</i> , p. 301 — Reform of statistics, p. 306 — Adjournment, p. 309 — Annex, p. 310	

NOTE TO READER

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

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

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 10 to 14 January 1983 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 42 of 14. 2. 1983.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 10 JANUARY 1983

Contents

1. Resumption of the session	1	Ewing; Mr Boyes; Mr Andriessen; Mr Enright; Mr Andriessen; Mr Balfé; Mr Andriessen; Mr Patterson; Mr Andriessen . .	10
2. Agenda: Mr Pannella; Mr Fergusson; Mr Patterson; Mr Kirk; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Pannella; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Skovmand; Mr Haagerup; Mr Balfé; Miss Quin; Mr Kirk	2	6. Missing persons in Cyprus — Report (Doc. 1-977/82) by Lady Elles: Lady Elles; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Deschamps; Mr Bournias; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Lady Elles; Mr J. D. Taylor; Mr Adamou; Mr Nyborg; Mr De Goede; Mr Lomas; Mr Pöttering; Mr Battersby; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)	12
3. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament: Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Flanagan; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Notenboom; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Junot; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Bagemann; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Bord; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Lange; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Bagemann; Mr Tugendhat	4	7. Situation in the Middle East — Report (Doc. 1-786/82) by Mr Penders: Mr Penders; Mr Schmid; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Kyrkos	21
4. Welcome	10	Annex	28
5. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament (continuation): Mr Chambeiron; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mrs Ewing; Mr Andriessen; Mrs			

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

2. Agenda

President

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

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 17 December 1982.¹

¹ Approval of the minutes — Membership of committees — Petitions — Motions for resolutions (Rule 49) — Authorization of reports — Referral to committees: see Minutes.

President. — At its meeting of 14 December 1982 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to you.

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

With regard to today's agenda, it is proposed that, pursuant to Rule 7(7) of the Rules of Procedure and at the request of the Committee on the Verification of Credentials, the Sieglerschmidt report on the 'tourniquet' system be put on the agenda for today's sitting after the statement by the Commission on the action taken on the opinions and resolutions of Parliament.

President

This report had been referred back to committee on 7 July 1982.

Mr Pannella (CDI). — (FR) Mr President, I believe you are quoting Rule 7(7). But I do not think that you are entitled to refer to that Rule, the text of which stipulates quite clearly that it could be applied no later than at the beginning of the September part-session. That is clearly stipulated as the latest time. Our rules are rarely as clear as this. That option was not used. The group chairmen therefore made a mistake and I hope that our rules — which are rarely so clear — will be respected.

Moreover Rule 59 does not allow us to consider the Sieglerschmidt report because the working document now before us bears 7 January 1983 as the date on which it was tabled. However, Rule 59 stipulates that the debate and vote cannot be opened on a text unless it was tabled not later than twelve days before the beginning of the part-session and distributed at least twenty-four hours previously.

This document cannot therefore be placed on today's agenda, because it was not officially distributed until 10 o'clock this morning.

Mr President, those are the reasons for which we cannot agree to the decision by the group chairmen.

President. — Mr Pannella, you are partly right. This report should have been on the agenda for our part-session in September, whereas it is now January...

Mr Pannella (CDI). — (FR) Mr President, the Rules of Procedure say *no later than*.

President. — Mr Pannella, that is why I said that this report should have been on our agenda for September. Unfortunately, the committee was not in a position to submit the report before now, and that is why we have had to proceed in this way.

Mr Fergusson (ED). — Mr President, I do feel that this report, which after all originated with me and in which I am mentioned several times, has been sprung on us in the most extraordinary and unusual way. It is possible, though unlikely, that I might not have been here at all, in which case I cannot believe that you would have proceeded with it.

(Applause)

The real point is this. We have only just seen the report. I have only just had it. I have only just read the Legal Affairs Committee's opinion. I doubt if anyone else has. I doubt if most of Parliament has been able to get around to reading this. I wonder particularly how

many of the MEPs here have read the crushing condemnation of the tourniquet that has been produced by the Legal Affairs Committee. Of course if we debate the matter, we shall come to it then. But Members simply have not had time to read it and therefore I think I must ask that it be postponed until February.

Quite apart from what Mr Pannella says, the actual practice of producing something at short notice and requiring it to be voted on and all kinds of amendments to be put forward, if that is possible, means that the whole thing is really being pushed through far too quickly and unfairly quickly, if I may say so.

Could we therefore postpone this matter until the next session?

Mr Patterson (ED). — Mr President, I was about to make much the same point as Mr Pannella, but I would like to make one further point. It has been argued that as this report is — insofar as it is Mr Sieglerschmidt's report — identical to the one originally tabled, the deadline laid down in Rule 59, i.e. distribution 24 hours beforehand, no longer applies.

Could I point out, Mr President, that the specific purpose of referring this report back was to obtain the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee, and this is the first time we have seen the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee. Therefore I do urge you, Mr President, to respect the deadlines laid down in Rule 59. If we cannot put it off until February, then we should at least put it off until tomorrow or the day after. This would at least give us time to read the opinion and table amendments if possible.

President. — Mr Patterson, the House is completely free to decide whether it wants it on the agenda now or prefers to postpone it until February. I think it is very easy to vote on that, and if there is a majority in favour of postponing it, also because of the problems concerning the rules which have been cited by Mr Pannella, we can do so.

Mr Kirk (ED). — (DA) Mr President, I think both Mr Fergusson and Mr Patterson have fully expressed the views of our Group, so we will vote to have it postponed for the reasons both have given here.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Pannella is right, of course, when he says that there was a delay in submitting this report and that it should have been on the agenda for consideration during the September part-session. The reason for the delay, however, is that a certain quarter of the House, with Mr Fergusson himself in the van, demanded an opinion from the Legal Affairs Committee. Now anyone that asks for an opinion from the Legal Affairs Committee will realize that that com-

Sieglerschmidt

mittee is going to give the matter a great deal of very careful thought.

I feel that this whole business — I almost felt like saying this whole unedifying business — could have been disposed of if there had been some agreement between all sides of the House. In view of the procedural objections that have been raised, I too would recommend that consideration of the matter be deferred, unless there are some compelling reasons why we absolutely must decide on it today.

President. — I suggest that we do not consider the Sieglerschmidt report at this part-session but at the next or second next one. This would be more in line with the Rules of Procedure than was the case with the original proposal, which rather took Members by surprise.

Mr Pannella (CDI). — (FR) Mr President, I just wanted to say that you made a statement just now which, I am sorry to say, was even more serious than the attempt made by the group chairmen to violate our rules; you said that the Assembly could decide otherwise. Mr President, it is extremely serious to suggest that a majority in Parliament can override the Rules of Procedure.

No assembly can decide that this resolution will be examined before 18 January. We must therefore hold it over until the February part-session or even later.

President. — Mr Pannella, you interpret my words very freely. The position is as follows. The committee responsible proposed to the enlarged Bureau, that is, in effect, to the political group chairmen, that this report be considered today. They in turn proposed to the House that it be put on the agenda. The House is perfectly entitled to turn down that request for this part-session and to decide instead to consider the report in February, March or indeed at any other time.

I propose therefore that we do not place the Sieglerschmidt report on the agenda at this part-session.

(Parliament agreed to the request that the report be held over to a later part-session — The President read the amendments proposed to Wednesday's and Thursday's agendas)¹

I have received from Mr Skovmand, on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, a request, pursuant to Rule 56, for the withdrawal of Mr Haagerup's report on European political cooperation and European security, which had been entered on the agenda under No 334.

Mr Hammerich (CDI). — (DA) Mr President, there are many different reasons for opposing Mr Haagerup's report — sovereignty reasons and reasons of peace policy — but now we are concerned with the formal reasons for wishing to remove it from the agenda. In our Group there are two sets of reasons. There are some reasons which are internal to the European Parliament, the coarse violations of the Rules of Procedure of which Mr Haagerup is guilty towards the minority. In his rather shotgun eagerness to have a discussion on arms, he simply tramples on the rights of the minority.

The second set of reasons relates to Community law. The Haagerup report is in conflict with the Treaty in what it sets out to do. Its manifest aim is to extend the concept of security to cover defence and military affairs. Even European Political Cooperation has no right or authority to deal with defence or military matters, let alone the European Parliament. None of the institutions of the European Community has the authority to concern itself with the field of defence. It would quite simply require an amendment to the Treaty. We therefore call on all who believe in national sovereignty, the rules of law and détente to reject the report.

Mr Skovmand (CDI). — (DA) Mr President, I support the suggestion that Mr Haagerup's report be dropped, and I do so on grounds of the highly unsatisfactory treatment which the report gives to the minorities on the Political Affairs Committee. It is not only an insult to the minorities on that Committee, it is also an insult to this Assembly. What it seeks to do in fact is to conceal the disagreements, the variance of views, which exist in the Committee thereby making it more difficult for Parliament to reach a decision. I therefore call on all present here to refuse to deal with the matter, so that Mr Haagerup and other rapporteurs will in future draft reports which more accurately reflect the discussions which have taken place.

There are four points which have to be singled out as particularly unsatisfactory. One is that the minority opinion is dealt with summarily by the rapporteur on one page, instead of allowing the minorities themselves to present their views. It is a poor excuse to say that there is not enough space to do that. In a report covering nearly 100 pages, there must be space of more than one page for the minorities. Secondly, their views are, into the bargain, wrongly reported. For example, Mr Capanna has been reported in such a way as to give the impression that he is in favour of the report, which he is not. It says that he regards it as the expression of a contribution to a European society of security, and that is an unfortunate formulation. Thirdly, there is the fact that it entirely omits to mention that three members of the Committee, Mr Balfe, Mr Capanna and Mr Ephremidis, made a joint presentation on the subject of unilateral nuclear disarmament. Fourthly, the minority views are set down at a

¹ See Minutes.

Skovmand

point where they are hardly likely to be noticed, tucked away in the annexes, rather than being tied in with the proposal itself.

For these reasons I urge that the report be dropped.

Mr Haagerup (L). — (DA) Mr President, I am sure that Parliament as a whole is fully aware of the crucial interest my four countrymen from the so-called People's Movement against the EEC have in ensuring that all procedures are punctiliously followed and that Parliament does its work according to the rules. It is therefore all the more disappointing to hear Mrs Hammerich and Mr Skovmand make these statements, which have nothing to do with reality. What is the reality? It is that, in a gesture of kindness and in accordance with Rule 100, paragraph 4, of the Rules of Procedure, I stated my willingness to summarize the main essentials of the minority views.

Mr Skovmand has the gall to talk about a minority. Mr President, I would point out to you that I received two written presentations from Mrs Hammerich and Mr Capanna respectively, and Mrs Hammerich assured me that she did not want to be associated in any way with Mr Capanna's views. Now the fact is that these two people represent one vote in the Committee. I think that Parliament will understand that it would be very difficult for me to say what the minority's opinion is, if two people from the same — admittedly not at all homogenous — political group, namely the Technical Coordination Group, cannot agree on an opinion but present two different ones. In addition there were others who either voted against or abstained.

I can only stress that I naturally did what I could to give a fair résumé of the views put forward in the Committee by those who dissented from the very broad majority who voted for my report. I therefore urge Parliament to reject this proposal to postpone or reject my report.

(Parliament rejected the request and adopted the draft agenda thus amended)

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, under Rule 5, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that a Member of this House was prosecuted in a Member State in the course of his European Parliament duties — namely, collecting the material for a fish-and-chip supper to be enjoyed by parliamentarians. Rule 5(3) states: ... *any Member may request that the proceedings be suspended*. I would like to request that we ask the Member State concerned to suspend the proceedings against Mr Kirk, who I think has had enough publicity out of this case — and anyway I would not like him to have to languish in a British jail, which is not a very fond or nice place to languish in.

So, under Rule 5(3), I request that the proceedings be suspended.

President. — Mr Balfe, for that purpose you should introduce a request, which then has to be sent to the competent committee. For the moment, I do think that you are slightly late.¹

(Laughter)

Miss Quin (S). — On a point of order, Mr President, some little while ago you did allow Mr Kirk to speak on behalf of his group, and I would like to ask whether he was in fact speaking on behalf of his group or if, in view of his irresponsible actions in the North Sea last week, he is now in a group on his own.

President. — Miss Quin, I have had no written communications on any change.

Mr Kirk (ED). — (DA) Mr President, since I have to interpret that as a personal attack — especially the phrase 'irresponsible actions' — I would point out to Mrs Quin from the Socialist Group, and *Labour* member in Great Britain, that our group is called the European Democratic Group. That means that I, as vice-chairman, share in the leadership of the group for as long as we adhere to democratic principles. We continue to do so, and there is no reason whatsoever for Mrs Quin to imply that we are seeking to carry out our political work in the European Parliament in an irresponsible manner.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

4. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament

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

In view of some problems concerning the supplementary budget for 1982, I now call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, I am grateful to you for giving me the floor in order to be able to inform Parliament briefly of what action the Commission envisages taking in the light of the rejection by the European Parliament of the supplementary budget No 1 in 1982.

¹ Speaking time — Deadline for tabling amendments: see Minutes.

² See Annex.

Tugendhat

In considering how best to assume its responsibilities in the situation caused by the rejection of this budget, the Commission starts from the assumption that the European Parliament does not contest the existence of a Community obligation that expenditure through the Community budget of certain specified amounts shall take place to the benefit of certain Member States. A large number of parliamentarians, including you yourself, Mr President, have made statements to this effect. The Commission has, therefore, maintained certain technical preparations on this basis.

In response to the European Parliament's resolutions of 16 December 1982, the Commission will make to Parliament and the Council in the next few weeks a series of proposals.

In the first instance the Commission plans to forward to the budgetary authority proposals for a series of measures to be taken within the framework of common policies which give practical effect to the obligation that expenditure through the Community budget of certain specified amounts shall take place to the Member States. These measures will be incorporated in a supplementary budget for the 1983 financial year and will be accompanied by draft regulations in a revised form different to those submitted with the 1982 supplementary budget. The Commission is prepared, if the budgetary authority so wishes, to respect a timetable which would permit discussion and eventual adoption of the supplementary budget at the February part-session.

In parallel to the preparation of a supplementary 1983 budget, the Commission will present to Parliament and to Council by the end of January a new discussion document in the form of what some member countries call a green paper setting out the Commission's preliminary ideas on the future development of the Community's system of financial resources.

Specific proposals from the Commission in this field will be made in the spring of this year.

To complete this triptych of proposed actions the President of the Commission will outline in his programme speech to the February part-session of Parliament the new initiatives for the development of Community policies which the Commission will seek to launch during the next two years. These new initiatives, Mr President, are designed to ensure that the Commission can fulfil its commitments to undertake a thorough restructuring of the Community budget, to further the adoption of common policies and to improve Community decisions-making processes so that it can be fully prepared not only to tackle with national governments the present economic crisis but also to prepare for further enlargement.

Mr President, that is the essence of my *'suite à donner'* reply informing Parliament of the actions which the Commission is proposing to take, in response to the

decisions taken by Parliament on 16 December last: the supplementary budget, the green paper on own resources and then the central point of the triptych — the President's speech.

It has been drawn to my attention that as a result of discussions in the Bureau this morning, and I understand with your permission and that of the House, it would be convenient for the House if I also take this opportunity to answer the questions tabled by Mr Notenboom, on behalf of the European People's Party, questions which I understand are of interest to the whole House. So, if I have your permission, Mr President, I will proceed to do that.

At the end of November the Commission had to prepare to make substantial payments for the implementation of the 1982 budget and for EAGGF advances for January 1983. Within this context the prospect of having to face before the end of the year the payments resulting from the adoption of a supplementary and amending budget to the benefit of the United Kingdom and Germany had necessarily also to be taken into account.

The fact that the utilization of the appropriations available to the Commission in 1982 turned out to be remarkably high, except, of course, in the EAGGF Guarantee Section where economies were achieved, meant the currency requirements would be many and varied.

As a result, in the first weeks of December 1982 and the first fortnight of January 1983 many payments had to be covered in the various Member States, including those for EAGGF Guarantee.

In order to have available the different currencies required, it was necessary to effect currency transfers. These were made in close liaison with the central banks of the countries concerned, which themselves performed almost all the transfer operations, thus greatly limiting recourse to commercial banks.

For reasons of prudence, in other words to avoid generating any instability in the foreign exchange markets, these operations had to be spread out over time. They were thus begun early in December. These operations included the provision to be made for payment to the United Kingdom. During the first fortnight of December, that is to say before the rejection of the supplementary budget, provision had been made for about half the currency requirements likely to be necessary. During the second fortnight of December only...

Mr Flanagan (DEP). — Mr President, would you kindly ask Members to finish their private conversations? I have not been able to hear what speakers are saying because of the mini-parliament going on here all around me. I asked for the floor five minutes ago. I

Flanagan

apologize to the Commissioner for the fact that I had to interrupt him. I simply could not hear what he was saying.

(The President called the House to order)

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, fortunately this statement is in a language which is familiar both to the honourable Member and myself and copies of it will be available afterwards. I don't think you want me to go back to the beginning.

During the second fortnight of December only two exchange operations were effected — one for 36 million ECU, which was in fact a purchase of drachmae, and the other for 81 million ECU in respect of a purchase of pounds sterling. This latter amount of 81 million ECU should be compared with the total amounts of 1 092 million ECU scheduled for the British measures and 210 million ECU for energy measures in Germany. I might add that the advance for January 1983 paid out in December 1982 for the EAGGF Guarantee Section was 1 518 million ECU of which 129 million ECU went to the United Kingdom and 274 million ECU to Germany. In other areas the payments scheduled for the month of January are provisionally estimated at about 800 million ECU, to which should be added, of course, the February EAGGF Guarantee advances.

I have given all this information, Mr President, so as to illustrate the complexity of the cash problems which the Commission has had to face and the incompleteness of the information on which some of Mr Notenboom's questions seem to have been based. The Commission has throughout been guided by reasons of sound financial management and by the determination to avoid any negative repercussions on the exchange markets. With this in view the Commission has throughout acted on the exchange markets with the greatest of prudence, spreading its operations out as much as possible and avoiding any successive actions in an opposite direction. Thus, after the rejection of the budget, that is to say, during the second fortnight of December, it was only the currencies which were then in a strong position that were sold, and that only within strict limits.

I understand, Mr President, that certain rumours have circulated, even in parliamentary quarters, to the effect that the Commission considered making transfers in order to effect the payments to the United Kingdom and Germany. These rumours are utterly false, and I must say very forthrightly that no such payment will be made before the approval of a budget to that effect. The Commission is preparing, as I have just indicated, the new initiative which Parliament asked for, but no implementation will take place before the approval of a budget by the budgetary authority. This is, of course, something which goes without saying, but I

repeat it loud and clear so as to put an end to any possible misconceptions. In proceeding in the way that it has, the Commission has borne in mind that Parliament has stated that the amounts of the payments to be made in favour of the United Kingdom and Germany are not brought into question by the rejection of the budget, but rather the conditions under which the expenditure should take place. Thus, what has been agreed to be paid to the United Kingdom and Germany will, it is envisaged, still be paid but only later, after the adoption of the necessary budget and according to arrangements which will be decided by the two arms of the budgetary authority within the context of the adoption of that budget. The Commission has followed this interpretation and has not therefore sought to give the impression that the amounts themselves are being called into question.

In the management of its cash resources the Commission had to take account, as I have shown, of all the needs scheduled — not only therefore what was envisaged in the amending budget but the very much larger sums for the EAGGF advances and for the other activities that are normally carried out by the Community. We had to do that even before the rejection of the budget in order to ensure that the monies available were properly distributed over the Commission's account in all Member States. Subsequently, the phasing of payments led to the two operations of limited scope with I have already mentioned, one concerning the purchase of drachma, the other that of pounds sterling.

As regards the United Kingdom and Germany more particularly, the Commission had to choose between two possible lines of action. It could on the one hand have proceeded to sell the excess currencies, that is to say to make massive sales of pounds sterling and Deutschmarks after the rejection of the budget. That would in our view have been a serious error, not only for political and psychological reasons but also because it would have resulted in substantial disturbances in the exchange markets. The Commission therefore chose to follow the alternative course, namely to leave the funds where they were and keep them earmarked for future needs in respect of the United Kingdom and Germany. It thus opened accounts in the name of the Commission — I repeat that, in the name of the Commission — administratively different from the ordinary accounts in the national treasuries of the two countries concerned, where the funds remain at the sole disposal of the Commission. I stress that these were accounts opened in the name of the Commission of which the Commission alone is the master. The Commission and no one else. If I were to translate this operation into budgetary terms I would be inclined to compare it with an entry in Chapter 100; a decision is awaited and that decision is the budget. What we have firmly rejected is the idea of making exchange operations with these amounts. The funds exist in pounds and Deutschmarks

Tugendhat

and we want to keep them in those currencies in accounts under our control.

That brings me, Mr President, to reply to Mr Notenboom's additional questions about exchange operations which took place. Taking the month of December as a whole we bought a total of 336.4 million pounds sterling. It should not be forgotten that the Community budget position of countries such as the United Kingdom and Germany results every month in the Commission selling in the market substantial sums in the currencies of those countries. For the period January to November 1982 as regards the pound sterling, the difference between the number of pounds sterling which had to be sold and the number of those which had to be bought was 683.3 million pounds. That is to say the Commission sold in the first nine months of the year 683 million pounds out of its accounts in London, in other words more than twice the amount which it actually purchased in December.

I would like to conclude, Mr President, by saying that I have ready for Mr Notenboom all the other items of information which he has asked to have. So far as the financial regulation is concerned, the Commission considers that it places no restriction on opening bank accounts either with national treasuries or with banks for the needs of cash management. In fact, the accounts mentioned by Mr Notenboom in his point 2, that is to say those provided for in Article 9 of Regulation 2891/77, are actually used mostly for the entry of own resources. It is thus legitimate for other accounts to be opened. The objective pursued is solely that of sound financial management and I have tried to show that that was indeed the only principle that guided the Commission in its actions.

I should also like to make it clear that the decision to proceed in this way over the handling of these accounts was taken after due deliberation collectively by the Commission itself. The President informed the Eco/Fin Council, which met in Brussels on 17 December, of the Commission's decision. On the same day as you will recall, Mr President, I telephoned you at home telling you what had transpired and arranging for a copy of the President of the Commission's statement to be sent to you. Mr President, I have already made quite a long statement. There are, I can see, already supplementaries. As I made clear in my statement, additional information is available which I will provide for Mr Notenboom.

Mr Notenboom (PPE). — (NL) To begin with I would like to thank all those people who have made possible the answers to the questions tabled by me at such short notice, not least Commissioner Tugendhat for having expounded on them to the House. One has to say that it was a matter which invited questions and, as such, it is exemplary that Parliament receive answers to them. However, apart from those few gifted people who understand everything at once,

most of us mere mortals will tend to see in this matter a somewhat complex issue making it almost impossible to evaluate everything at once, even if one is well versed in the technicalities of own resources. Consequently, Mr President, in order to prevent the debate from focusing exclusively on technicalities, and, with a view to saving time, I shall confine my intervention to asking the Commissioner if he is willing to present the answers he has prepared, plus some additional ones, should he wish, to the written questions tabled by me on 24 December 1982 and distributed somewhat later to the other groups, to a meeting of the Committee on Budgets due to be convened later this week? I have taken up the matter with the president of that committee, colleague Lange, who has given approval for such a meeting this week.

As he has asked for the floor I am quite sure he will confirm that there is sufficient time his week for experts from his committee to scrutinize the details, for I hope it will be clear to the Commission as a whole, and certainly to Commissioner Tugendhat that this House has a duty — and it is not always a pleasure — in particular, those members who are well versed in the intricacies of the own resources, to ask specific questions, even if one does not lend much credence to the curious press reports which sometimes make the rounds. Even where one is confident of having seen through the slant of the press report it can still be the duty of the elected member of Parliament to seek clarifications of the events in question. The very fact that the Commissioner felt it wise not to unleash these considerable sums onto the currency markets but rather to hold on to them, for the immediate future at least, was in itself the result of a political decision by the Commission, meaning that the matter is therefore not exclusively technical, as the implications in the press would have us believe. So you see, I feel it's not such a bad idea after all to ask such questions, nor do I consider it so unusual that the House should receive answers which, strictly speaking; go beyond the curt formula. I am, at any rate, much obliged for this answer and I shall end by asking Commissioner Tugendhat if he is prepared to provide fuller details to the specialists of our budget committees at a meeting within the next few days.

Mr Tugendhat. — Mr President, I can. I can provide the additional information either in written form or by an appearance in front of the committee, whichever the committee prefers.

I would just like to say two other things. I agree with Mr Notenboom about the importance of these questions and I am grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to provide the answers. Though he wrote to me on 24 December, as he knows, I only actually received the letter — thanks to the efficiency of the European postal services — at the end of last week. Therefore this statement has been prepared since and I can of course circulate it, but that is why I have not

Tugendhat

been in a position to circulate something earlier than at this part-session.

Mr Junot (DEP). — (FR) Mr President, I am pleased that, in his statement, the Vice-President of the Commission wished to dispel any misunderstanding over the consequences of rejection by the Assembly of the supplementary budget. I listened carefully to Mr Tugendhat but I must confess that I am not entirely clear what he was saying. There seems to remain confusion as to the dates — regarding what happened before rejection on 15 December and after that date — and as to the fundamental distinction between cash-flow and the budget.

I would therefore like clarification on the following points: As I understand it, the appropriations are already available to the Commission. They have been paid by the Member States and converted into pounds sterling and deutschmarks and are apparently blocked in bank accounts in the treasury of each Member State opened in the name of the Commission. But if the Assembly persists in the position adopted by it on 15 December, what will happen since you, Mr President, are telling us that the Commission alone is entitled to use these funds?

Mr Tugendhat. — Mr President, I will of course give the honourable Member my statement in order to blow away the confusion that he says exists, but let me make this quite clear.

The European Parliament rejected the supplementary budget on 16 December. Therefore the Commission cannot, and would not, make payments to the United Kingdom or Germany that were envisaged in that budget. We have, however, the necessary funds available to do so in pounds and in German marks. If, therefore, the European Parliament passes the supplementary budget which we shall be introducing quite shortly and which will, of course, reflect the wishes stated by Parliament last December, then we shall have the money available and we will make the payments. If, however, the supplementary budget is not passed, we will not make the payments, and I think that ought to be quite clear.

But whether or not budgets are passed and whether or not payments are made, the Commission also has a duty to ensure that there is as little disturbance as possible in the currency market as a result of our transactions. That is something which, of course, is in the interests of all Member States as well as of the Community itself.

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) Mr President, I am still slightly confused, but on a much higher level. I should like to ask the Commissioner two very specific questions in the wake of the telephone call he made to you one evening, indeed night, to which he referred ear-

lier, in order to inform you that these two accounts had been opened. Would the Commissioner agree that such action in itself furnishes the proof that something quite out of the ordinary had taken place? At any rate it cannot be as routine an affair as the Commissioner is now making it out to be for I presume that you, Mr President, do not receive telephone calls in the middle of the night every time a bank account is opened.

To come to my second question — and Commissioner Tugendhat has not yet gone into the matter — I take it as obvious that sums which have been blocked by this House should not be paid out, for no payments may be made without the appropriate budgetary justification. What I would like to know is whether or not the sums involved can be drawn upon by the two Member States in any way whatever, if only through some form of currency combine — naturally with the stipulation to repay the Community, should it prove necessary — alternatively, is there any kind of special agreement surrounding this whole affair? I am thinking in terms of any kind of guarantee, deposit, bond or utilization rights, if only on the currency markets? For this is the heart of the matter. In the absence of parliamentary approval on budgetary matters I shall not tolerate attempts by the Commission to bypass this House and make the sums available.

A disquieting aspect in this whole affair are the persistent echoes — and they are more than rumours — to the effect that Britain and the Federal Republic will be afforded special advantages in relation to these accounts which have been opened by the Commission. My specific question to Commissioner Tugendhat is: Are there any advantages, of whatever nature, which the two Member States in question could benefit from, as regards these two accounts?

Mr Tugendhat. — Mr President, as you will recall, it was not the middle of the night when I called you but I thought rather more at 'drinks time'.

(Laughter)

It was, of course, a very unusual situation that existed on the day after the rejection of the budget by this Parliament. But it was also the day of a meeting of the Finance Ministers in Brussels: the President of Parliament had made a statement of some importance, and the President and myself had participated in a discussion. I was therefore aware of the possibility of misunderstandings arising. In those circumstances, I thought it would perhaps be courteous and also serve to speed the flow of information if I look the rather unusual step of telephoning the President of Parliament at his home. If I had not done so that day, we should have got caught up in the Christmas rush and perhaps some Member of Parliament less courteous than Mr Bangemann might have got up and criticized me for not doing all that I could to make information available to Parliament as quickly as possible. So that is why I did

Tugendhat

that. And I was right, of course: misunderstandings have arisen which it is the purpose of this statement to put right.

Secondly, there is no advantage — and the Committee on Budgets will no doubt be able to probe me further on this matter if it wishes — to the Member States concerned in the fact that we have a separate account for this money. There is an advantage from our point of view, because here is potentially — I say 'potentially' because it remains to be seen whether the budgetary authority passes our next supplementary budget or not — a particular and quite substantial self-contained operation to be carried out, independently of the enormous number of transactions which are taking place all the time. Therefore it is, I think, convenient to have that money clearly identifiable. There is also the fact that it is clearly identifiable and that if the budgetary authority were not to pass the subsequent budget — that goes back to a question which the previous honourable Member asked — then the money would be there and obvious and it would be the money which would in due course, and in an orderly fashion, have to be liquidated and transferred to other purposes.

It seems to me that, in the rather exceptional circumstances that have arisen as a result of the rejection of the budget, there is a great deal to be said for having transparency, and the opening of an additional account is a means for providing transparency.

Mr Bord (DEP). — (FR) Mr President, although this is a particularly complex matter, I think it is essential for Parliament to have the clearest possible information. I am grateful to the Vice-President for the extremely interesting information which he has given to us but I would still like clarification on one further aspect: what is the legal situation regarding these appropriations following the rejection by the European Parliament of the draft supplementary budget and pending closure of the administrative account?

Mr Tugendhat. — Mr President, I can see that there is a good deal of further examination that Parliament will wish to make. But the appropriations which were enshrined in the supplementary budget fell when the supplementary budget fell — they were annulled, finished. I do not know what the technical term in French is, but I hope it is coming over the earphones in the way in which I am putting it — finished. Nonetheless, the currencies continue to exist and Parliament made it clear, or at any rate a great number of parliamentarians made it clear, that their objection had not been to making the payments to the United Kingdom and Germany, their objection had been to the style and manner of those payments. They felt that the Council had not in its decision taken sufficient account of wider Community interests and of the development of policies and, of course, the desire of parliamentarians

to ensure that this should be the last payment of that kind.

But it was made quite clear in the debate, and indeed it has been borne in upon us since, that should we bring forward a second supplementary budget, that it was more likely than not — I repeat more likely than not — that these sums of money would be required in the not too distant future for expenditure under one heading or another in those countries. Therefore we have put the money into separate and identifiable bank accounts that belong to the Commission and to nobody else but the Commission and are entirely under the Commission's control, so that when the budgetary authority passes the next supplementary budget, if it decides to do so, we will be able to spend the money. If of course Parliament does not pass the supplementary budget, that money will not be needed for those purposes.

Mr Lange (S), chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (DE) Mr President, colleagues, as a result of colleague Notenboom's written question to the Commission on the matter of the Commission's treasury operations, the latter has wisely felt obliged to go somewhat further into the events which have caused ripples among the public at large and not a little disquiet among the Members of this House. When this aspect has been dealt with today, I can assure Commissioner Tugendhat that the Committee on Budgets will have an additional opportunity of examining in greater detail all pertinent aspects at its next sitting.

Indeed we have already set a date for a Committee on Budgets meeting to deal with the consequences of the House's rejection of the 1982 supplementary budget (first version). The two Commission regulations which accompanied this supplementary budget are still in abeyance. We shall therefore have to feel our way around regarding the next step and we shall also need some help from you, Commissioner Tugendhat.

Given, however, that a supposed precautionary measure taken by the Commission in opening the two accounts we are now talking about, prior to eventual approval of the repayments envisaged in the supplementary budget, can give rise to such a degree of public disquiet as to cause a belief that the sums in question have already been transferred to special accounts in both countries and have in all probability been made available to the respective authorities then this is all the more reason for an immediate clarification as to whether such sums are, either directly or indirectly at the disposition of the two countries in question as of now. I can only concur with colleague Bangemann in insisting that neither Member State should have access, of whatever kind, to the sums which have been transferred to these two accounts by the Commission. This must be absolutely unambiguous for, Commissioner, the statement you have just made to the House contained a passage which could give

Lange

cause for ambiguity and create the impression that such accounts conferred benefits of one kind or another on the two Member States in question as of now.

I would therefore be most grateful if you could set our minds at ease on that aspect of the matter immediately. As for the rest, we shall be dealing with it at our forthcoming Committee on Budgets meeting.

Mr Tugendhat. — I want to make these salient points absolutely clear. These bank accounts are perfectly ordinary, perfectly normal Commission bank accounts. They are treasury accounts. They are no different in any way whatsoever from other Commission bank accounts. They have been set up for the specific reasons that I outlined earlier, but they are subject to the same rules and they yield precisely the same results as the other accounts which the Commission maintains in the Member States.

I said to Mr Bangemann that I felt that, in the very unusual set of circumstances created as a result of the rejection of the supplementary budget, it was very important that the Commission should do everything possible to ensure that there would be the maximum degree of transparency in our activities. And it is my belief, Mr President, and the belief of the Commission, that this procedure of setting up perfectly normal Commission accounts is the best way of achieving the maximum degree of transparency which, among its other consequences, enables Parliament to monitor as closely as possible the financial activities of the Commission. That is why I was pleased to be able to reply, by this rather unusual procedure, to the question tabled by Mr Notenboom at the earliest possible opportunity in the plenary session — which I have tried to do as fully as possible and, of course, which I stand ready to do in greater detail, if required, in whatever manner the Committee on Budgets thinks most suitable.

Bangemann (L). — On a point of order, Mr President.

President. — Mr Bangemann, I think we decided more or less that a further debate should take place in the Committee on Budgets. You are now turning a question into a point of order.

Mr Bangemann (L). — Do not underestimate my intelligence, Mr President. I do not want to turn a question into a point of order. But I regret that the Commissioner did not answer Mr Lange's question. Could you not ask him, please, to answer once more. Is there any advantage to these countries in opening these bank accounts?

Mr Tugendhat. — The answer, Mr President, is No No No!

4. Welcome

President. — I should like to extend a hearty welcome to the delegation from the Austrian Parliament who have taken their seats in the official gallery.

This is the first time that an Austrian delegation has visited the European Parliament. This is a very good beginning and will, I hope, lead to closer relations between both parties.

(Applause)

5. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament (continuation)

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) Mr President, I have two very short questions to put to the Commission.

I would like to remind them that last December they decided to grant emergency aid of 300 000 ECU to Viet Nam, a decision which I personally welcomed. Can the Commission now tell us how far the procedure for using this aid has progressed and let us know in particular when and how the aid will be made available to the beneficiary? Can we also expect this decision to result in restoration by the Commission of food aid to Viet Nam which was suspended in July 1979?

My second concise question relates to the directive on the information and consultation of workers in undertakings with a complex structure, in particular transnational undertakings. Given that certain trade union organizations thought that the Commission's initial proposal had been largely deprived of its innovative content by the amendments adopted by the European Parliament, has the Commission now consulted the major European unions again and, if so, has it taken account of their reactions in formulating the text which it has submitted to the Council?

Mr President, those are the two brief but precise questions which I wanted to put to the Commission.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, the Commission has already made the sums relating to this aid to Viet Nam available to the relevant United Nations organization — the United Nations Disaster Relief Office — which is charged with carrying through the project. Given the short lapse of time, I regret to have to say that I have no further details.

Andriessen

With regard to the second question the Commission, in the wake of the observations it made in this House on the Motion for a Resolution contained in the Spencer Report on information and consultation of employees, reopened consultations with the social partners with a view to elaborating a definitive text of the amended regulation. It goes without saying that the Parliament will be informed on the contents of that text.

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR*Vice-President*

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Mr President, I would ask the Commission to turn to paragraph 7 of Section C of their document. And as I note that the document is dated 6 January, could I ask them in particular to turn their attention to the phrase 'To avoid suspension of fishing operations with Norway' under the incredible heading 'Kirk report', the most renowned law-breaker in recent years of this Parliament.

Could I ask the Commission how on earth they could have made such a statement on 6 January when the Norwegian Foreign Minister had already announced a ban on all fishing operations by EEC vessels in Norwegian waters, causing terrible hardships to fleets from many countries and in particular to Hull and Grimsby in England and to the North-East fleet in Scotland? How on earth can the Commission come before this Parliament with this kind of statement, which does not seem to have any reality in the light of what we have been reading in the press, when already there are hardships because we have an intransigent Member State, we have no agreement and in addition we now have no access to Norwegian waters? Yet we get this talk in the Kirk report of the suspension of fishing operations in Norwegian waters being avoided. They *have* been suspended, and the hardship is really dreadful.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, it has not yet proved possible to come to a definitive agreement with Norway but we are giving the matter our full attention. I would ask for understanding for the fact that we have been unable to obtain an agreement in such a short space of time. I anticipate rapid progress and the Honourable Member will of course be kept up to date.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — On a point of order, Mr President. The Commissioner has not answered the question at all as to what they are going to do. They

should be taking an aeroplane and going to Norway now to discuss a matter of this importance.

Mr Boyes (S). — I shall be referring, Mr Commissioner, to Directive 81/363 on aid to shipbuilding.

The Commissioner will be aware that I represent the area of Great Britain that has consistently had the highest rate of unemployment and the Commissioner will also be aware that British shipbuilders are currently talking to the trade unions about the possibility of 2 000 further redundancies in the shipbuilding industry.

He may not be aware that a small works in my constituency — a British shipbuilders foundry — is severely at risk, and if that foundry closes, unemployment will be in excess of 30%. And although that is a very high figure, it is by no means the worst in the constituency. Therefore, Mr Commissioner, I am greatly interested in the statement that you are busily preparing and discussing, a general paper on industrial policy on shipbuilding, and I shall be glad if you will give me more specific details of the timetable for the preparation of that paper.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, the problem to which the Honourable Member refers is one that has preoccupied the Commission for some considerable time now, but it must be stated that, although the Commission does its utmost to coordinate the Member States' policies on shipbuilding, by the elaboration of directives, it still remains the prerogative of the individual Member States. The paper or note to which the Honourable Member refers is the result of our long activity in this area. Furthermore such situation papers should be seen as part of the Commission's industry policy for which my fellow Commissioner Davignon is directly responsible rather than that of the Commissioner whose brief, being competition policy, has been entrusted with the supervision of Member State subsidies to shipbuilding. But I am prepared to give an assurance to the Honourable Member that Parliament will be informed, let us say through the relevant committee, on the state of progress in the elaboration of the situation paper in question.

Mr Enright (S). — Item 9, on the Fishing Agreement between the European Community and the People's Republic of Guinea, states in the third paragraph — and I accept that the Commissioner may not know about the technicalities of this, in which case I will accept a later answer — that the Commission favours the establishment of a separate organization but concludes very oddly, in the English version, 'which appears impossible as matters now stand'. Does he not agree that that would appear to be a highly defeatist position and, if the Commission is in favour and does

Enright

agree that the objective is highly desirable, should it be taking this defeatist attitude?

thereby enabling the House to formulate its viewpoints.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, it is perhaps no more than a choice of words. Although the Commission is not defeatist it has come to the realistic conclusion that, as matters stand, the establishment of a separate organization on the lines of that envisaged by both the Honourable Member and the Commission itself is just not possible. The Commission is of course continuing its efforts apace with a view to achieving the most viable policy possible in its discussions with all of the nations concerned. This is why all Community aid agreements to the countries concerned contain clauses which provide for Community participation in the financing of projects with a view to maximizing our information.

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, whilst I accept that the Commissioner cannot carry all information in his head, may I underline the point that was made earlier by Mr Chambeiron and say that there are many people who are looking very carefully at the emergency aid for Viet Nam and are very anxious that this is put into payment. Could I therefore ask him to arrange for the information that was asked for to be communicated to Mr Chambeiron and possibly also to myself before the next part-session, as we should be interested in knowing that this money has gone through?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I shall be only too pleased to provide the Honourable Member before the next sitting with all the available information concerning the date on which the sum involved is to be transferred.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Mr President, I want to come right back again to the beginning — that is, to the Spencer report. In the statement he made in November, it was made very clear by Commissioner Richard that any amended proposal would be forwarded both to the Council and to Parliament, and we took note of that very carefully. I notice that the statement here only refers to the Council. Can we have Mr Andriessen's assurance that it should read 'Council and Parliament', particularly if any departure is made in this text after consultations, either from Parliament's text as adopted or from the undertaking given by Commissioner Richard in November?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I really feel that one should not attribute too much importance to such texts. Right now matters are proceeding in conformity with the undertakings given to the House by Commissioner Richard. Any amended proposals will be forwarded by the Commission to Parliament, for information,

6. Missing persons in Cyprus

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-977/82) by Lady Elles, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the problem of missing persons in Cyprus.

Lady Elles (ED), rapporteur. — As we have seen only too frequently in recent years, wherever there have been hostilities of whatever kind, there will be people who are missing or maybe presumed to have died in conflict for whatever cause or by whatever means.

There may, however, be special circumstances which may lead families to entertain hopes that their missing relatives are still alive or to question the fate which befell them.

The report before the House today concerns the unknown fate of about 1 600 Cypriots who on or after 20 July 1974 were known to be in the hands of the Turkish military authorities and from whom nothing further has been heard. They include, amongst others, those who were visited and listed by the International Committee of the Red Cross or listed by the Turkish-Cypriot radio station BIRAC. The European Commission on Human Rights confirmed, in its evaluation of evidence pursuant to an application in 1974 and 1975 by the Cyprus Government, that a number of persons declared to be missing have been identified as Greek Cypriots taken prisoner by the Turkish army. Further substantiation is contained in the ICRC statement of 11 March 1976 relating to the repatriation of Cypriots from Turkish prisons, which concluded with the comment: 'This statement, however, does not cover the cases of 9 prisoners who have been listed on 28 August 1974 by a delegate of the ICRC and about whom nothing has been heard, nor does it solve the problem of prisoners-of-war whose families believe they can identify them in photographs which have appeared in the press. These cases must now be discussed by the two parties to the conflict who, being in direct contact, no longer require the services of a neutral intermediary'.

But there has been no solution, so that for eight years families of the missing persons have lived balanced on the edge between hope and despair, their hopes sometimes fanned by the unsubstantiated rumour of the sight or sound of a missing relative and still not certain whether their relative is alive or dead. One of the dramatic consequences of this for these families has been the uncertainty concerning legal or personal status. A woman may not know whether she is married or widowed, whether she is entitled to a pension or free to remarry. In the case of property, a piece of land

Elles

owned partly or wholly by a missing person cannot be disposed of, to the obvious detriment of the potential beneficiary. These are but two simple examples of the very human issues facing these families, issues which I hope this Parliament will fairly seek to help bring to a conclusion.

The issue has already been raised at the United Nations and, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions, an inter-communal committee on missing persons, to which I will refer in future as the ICMP, was established to assist in solving the problem. The committee is composed of a member of the Red Cross and a representative from both the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities, with the main task of holding investigations which would lead to knowledge of the fate of these missing persons, all of whom incidentally are listed and known to the International Committee of the Red Cross at Geneva. The ICMP is the one body which could deal adequately, swiftly and effectively with this inter-communal matter, given goodwill and cooperation. This view is held incidentally by Mr Denktash, as is clear from his letter to Mr Rumor, chairman of Parliament's Political Affairs Committee, on 4 October 1982. He says: 'The Turkish Cypriot side is fully convinced that the ultimate solution to the issue of missing persons in Cyprus, which concerns both communities, can be found within the framework of the CMP which was established with the approval of the two sides and the support of the UN'.

It is therefore all the more to be regretted that the ICMP has failed to implement its task due to procedural difficulties. It is strongly urged — and I hope the Parliament will support the resolution fully — that the ICRC and the two representatives get together once more with all possible speed, settle their differences and proceed with the necessary investigations, without which the families will not be satisfied as to the fate of their missing relatives. The ICRC, as the independent representative, is specifically urged to assist in producing suitable and acceptable rules for the committee to carry out its task.

The committee is properly charged with investigating missing persons from both communities, the Turkish Cypriots having also suffered many casualties during the tragic internecine strife which befell the island of Cyprus particularly between the years 1963 and 1967. None of this is disputable. It is believed that about 800 Turkish Cypriots are missing as a result of inter-communal fighting. It has, however, been averred by Mr Denktash in a letter of 14 April 1981 to Madam Simone Veil, who was then President of this Parliament, that the Turkish side has come to accept the bitter fact that the missing Turkish Cypriots must be presumed dead.

One difficulty has been that the Turkish Cypriots have not allowed entry across the 'green line' to Greek Cypriots to conduct investigations. The Cyprus

Government has granted access, confirmed to me personally by Mr Veniamin, Minister of the Interior, so that anyone could come at any time to the Republic of Cyprus and conduct investigations freely. This, I understand, has not been denied by anybody. Indeed, until July 1974 there was complete freedom of movement for all Cypriots throughout the island, and the Turkish Cypriots therefore had full facilities to make whatever investigations they wished to make at the time.

We recognize that the phenomenon of missing persons is worldwide, and the United Nations Commission on Human Rights has established a working group to examine questions concerning forced or involuntary disappearances. This working group has made a most valuable contribution in its proposals as to the handling of cases concerning the fate of missing persons who have disappeared through the actions of governments or their agents. This approach is based on the principles that (1) the quest for knowledge of the fate of a missing person is purely humanitarian — the family has a right to know the fate of its relatives; (2) no attempt is made to attach blame to any individual who may have been connected with the disappearance — governments, after all, have their own internal legislative measures to apply if they so decide; (3) governments are requested as members of the United Nations to supply the necessary information on a confidential basis. In the case of the governments involved in the fate of those missing persons whom we are now considering, the EEC has, after all, association agreements with both countries concerned.

A resolution of the United Nations General Assembly has recently paid tribute to this working group and welcomed the extension of its mandate by the Commissioner on Human Rights.

Your rapporteur recommends this wise approach to the European Parliament and reiterates the view that families have a right to know the fate of their missing relatives, knowing that the passage of time does nothing to heal the void or relieve the ever-eroding anxiety created by uncertainty. The deliberate and voluntary denial of information concerning the fate of persons who have been held by, or have suffered at the hands of, government agents or authorities should not be supported wherever it may occur or by any government. Nor is it in the ultimate interests of any government whatsoever to deny this information.

Parliament should know that the leaders of the four political parties in the Cyprus House of Representatives — Mr Papaioanou (AKEL), Dr Lyssaridis (Socialist), Mr Glavkos Cliridis (Democratic Rally) and Mr Galanos (Democratic Party) — all strongly confirmed to me, as your rapporteur, that (1) they regard the issue as strictly humanitarian, (2) they have no wish to exploit the matter for political purposes, and (3) they do not seek to attach blame to any individual. All they demand — and that is all four par-

Elles

ties representing the broad spectrum of Cypriots in the Republic — is that sufficient information is provided, as a result of properly-conducted investigations, to convince the families of the fate of their missing relatives and that this information should be made available with the minimum of delay.

We therefore, Mr President, are earnestly asking the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to consider this problem with all possible urgency, to take all steps necessary, by diplomatic means if need be, to assist in bringing the matter to a conclusion and to report the results of their endeavours to Parliament by the end of the present presidency in June 1983.

I reiterate that we believe that the ICMP is the proper vehicle to bring an adequate, swift and efficient solution to this problem. The ending of this tragic situation would serve not only to alleviate individual suffering and uncertainty but also to contribute to a better climate for the furtherance of inter-communal talks leading to a relaxation of tensions in the Republic of Cyprus and the eventual removal of all foreign troops from the Republic.

In asking for the support of Parliament in adopting the motion for a resolution, Mr President, I would like to recall to honourable Members that the Political Affairs Committee gave its unanimous approval to this item and no amendments were then tabled, so recording the importance it attaches to this exclusively humanitarian problem and the depth of sympathy it conveys to all those families who have suffered in the last years.

(Applause)

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — *(GR)* There is very little one can add to what Lady Elles has said in her commendably objective and very diligent report on the problem of missing persons in Cyprus. Hundreds of Greek Cypriot families who have had close relatives missing since the tragic events precipitated by the invasion of the northern part of the island by the Turkish expeditionary force in 1974 are still unable to discover the fate of their missing relatives eight whole years after that invasion despite clear evidence indicating that these persons were alive after the cessation of the hostilities which took place in July and August of 1974 — and possibly still are alive.

Of course, the issue of the missing Greek Cypriots is only one factor in the tragedy that befell the people of Cyprus when the island's independence was violated. This tragedy has continued into the present without any let-up, and no one knows how much longer it will go on if the Turkish army of occupation continues to hold on to 38% of the territory of the Cyprus Republic in contravention of UN resolutions on the matter. However, Mr President, I do not believe anyone wishes to enter into a debate here and now on the complex political and international problems of

Cyprus which have remained in abeyance for so many years in a way that very definitely poses an extreme threat to peace in the Mediterranean and the Middle East.

We respect the nature of Lady Elles' mission, and the high-minded endeavour which her report reflects. We respect the declarations by the Cyprus Government and all the political representatives of the Cypriot people that the missing persons issue is a purely humanitarian one and that they do not seek to make political capital out of it. Above all we have respect for the pain and anxiety felt by the families of the missing persons, and therefore I can say emphatically that we too shall stick to the humanitarian aspects of the issue, and in this spirit we shall ask Parliament for a unanimous — if possible — decision.

Dear colleagues, the matter we are discussing has to do with the fate of 1 619 persons whose names are listed on detailed personal files kept by the Cyprus Government together with information proving, or at least indicating, that they were alive when they fell under the authority of the Turkish occupation forces during the events of the summer of 1974. What has become of these persons? Are they dead or alive? Is it after all such a huge problem, such an unattainable goal, for their relatives to be given this information, when this depends on a committee set up on the basis of a UN resolution of April 1981 being allowed to conduct a genuine investigation in the territorial areas of both sides?

I do not wish to go over or enumerate the strenuous efforts made by the Cyprus Government through international organizations, or the series of resolutions passed by the United Nations and the Commission on Human Rights of the Council of Europe on the question of ascertaining the fate of missing persons in Cyprus. These efforts and resolutions have already been referred to in detail in Lady Elles' report, and in connection with this aspect of the report I request you all to concentrate your thoughts and ponder just what reasons the Turkish Cypriot side can have for persistently impeding the implementation of the UN resolutions, and the conducting of an investigation in its territorial area, when for its part the Cyprus Government has repeatedly stated all along that any investigation or quest for information whatsoever concerning missing persons may be conducted by an international committee freely and with guarantees in the whole of the remainder of Cyprus. What is the composition of the committee charged with conducting this investigation? It has three members: a Greek Cypriot, a Turkish Cypriot, and a chairman, Mr Claude Guilloux, who is a member of the International Red Cross. The composition of the committee is acceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side in view of the participation of its representative in the eleven meetings that have so far taken place, but during which, nevertheless, it has constantly sought to raise procedural obstacles. Just recently the issue was again laid before the United

Plaskovitis

Nations General Assembly which, on 18 December 1982, gave virtually unanimous acceptance to the proposals made by the committee on missing persons in Cyprus. The only dissenting parties in the face of this resolution have been the Turkish delegate at the UN and the Turkish Cypriot community. Why? International public opinion quite reasonable expects an explanation. Perhaps the difficulty is due to the presence of the occupation forces in the northern part of Cyprus. Whatever the case, approval by Parliament of Lady Elles' motion for a resolution cannot but have as its chief objective the expression of a demand by the people of the European Community for the committee concerned to be allowed at long last to proceed with its real task, and for all the irrational obstacles which prevent freedom of access to those areas where there are indications that missing persons are living or being held to be lifted. We shall therefore endorse Lady Elles' report and those amendments which positively add to the spirit of the report.

(Applause)

Mr Deschamps (PPE). — *(FR)* On a point of order, Mr President, all the members of this Assembly are entitled to respect, and the officials employed by this Parliament, in particular the interpreters, will be aware of the regard in which I have held them for a long time.

I therefore wish to protest and would ask you, Mr President, to point out to the head of the interpreting service that a remark such as that made by the French booth after the speech by Lady Elles was totally inadmissible in both tone and substance. If you like I will give you more details but I do not wish to do so in public.

President. — We take note of what you have said.

Mr Bournias (PPE). — *(GR)* Mr President, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party and of those of my Greek colleagues who, with me, belong to the New Democracy Party, I wish to inform you right at the outset that we support unreservedly the motion for a resolution tabled by the Political Affairs Committee on missing persons in Cyprus.

The European Communities, and this Parliament in particular, have always shown sensitivity and a sense of purpose in defence of human rights wherever these have been violated. Unfortunately, however, these violations continue to besmirch our civilisation over the whole length and breadth of the five continents. Parliament has dealt in the past with the specific question of the 1 619 missing Greek Cypriots and Greek soldiers. In a resolution adopted on 18 October 1975 it pronounced that the future for peace and development along democratic lines in the area of the eastern Mediterranean would depend on the ending of tension in

Cyprus and of the sufferings of the people of the Cyprus Republic, a country, incidentally, which has an association with the Community. As recital F of the motion for a resolution points out the 10 Member States of the EEC, together with Cyprus and Turkey, are high contracting parties to the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and hence incur all the legal obligations that this entails. It is, thus, nothing short of incredible that the tragedy which began in August 1974 still lingers on, and that neither the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, the European Community and the Council of Europe, nor the investigations carried out over so many years by the International Red Cross, nor even the more systematic endeavours of the working party set up by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, have had any success in discovering the fate of so many innocent people. So, when all is said and done, what is it that hinders the accomplishment of this humanitarian duty? Until when are the families of the victims of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus destined to remain in ignorance concerning the fate of their relatives? How can this tragedy, which has all along evoked the sympathy of world public opinion, have been allowed to lie under a cloak of silence and obfuscation for eight years and more?

As Lady Elles very rightly says in her report, this long delay has resulted not only in psychological and emotional distress, but has also seriously affected the personal circumstances and legal position of many families. Family matters and affairs having to do with the law of inheritance are in total confusion, and this adds to the suffering of the relatives. Wives are neither single nor widowed. Property belonging to those missing cannot be transferred without their signatures or, in the case of death, without proper certification of this fact. With the passing of time — of such a long time — there have been reports that many of those missing are still alive, but no one knows whether they are prisoners or hostages or under sentence of death, and this lack of knowledge makes the suffering of their families unbearable. In keeping with the studious attention she has given to the issue under debate the honourable rapporteur, Lady Elles, has classified those missing persons who, according to reports and official data, are still alive, into six categories. In the explanatory statement contained in the report she says that 'unless speedy and effective investigations are carried out there can be no relief for the mixed feelings of hope and despair being experienced by the relatives of the missing persons'. Lady Elles saw the situation at first hand when she visited Cyprus at the behest of the Political Affairs Committee, and she considers the UN inter-communal committee on missing persons capable of carrying out these investigations. This committee operates solely and exclusively in a humanitarian spirit, and seeks to learn the whereabouts of missing persons if they are being held, and if they are not being held what happened to them after their arrest. The work of this committee is particularly helped by the joint stance adopted by the leaders of the four pol-

Bournias

itical parties in the Cyprus House of Representatives who have impressed Lady Elles by declaring, as she told us just now, that they regard the issue as strictly humanitarian, that they have no wish to exploit the matter for political purposes, and that they do not seek to attach blame to individuals for acts of violence which have taken place. This affirmation by itself lends great weight to Lady Elles' report, because it helps to make a solution possible. I sincerely congratulate her for the trouble she has taken and because she has understood the need to bring an end to this problem. That is why she has requested the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation to report to Parliament on progress made by June 1983.

With regard to paragraph 5, stressing the need for the withdrawal of all foreign armed forces from the Republic of Cyprus, this is self-evidently desirable, which is why it is included in all the UN motions.

Concerning this I remind you of the decision by the Greek Government last February that in the event of such a withdrawal it would undertake to meet the whole cost of United Nations forces.

Mr President and dear colleagues, at this moment I too feel the same way as the Greek Cypriot political leaders. You would be doing me an injustice if you were to think that I am influenced, as a Greek, by the tension in Greco-Turkish relations. At this moment nothing concerns me other than the humanitarian duty which a month ago moved the United Nations General Assembly to adopt unanimously the proposals of the third political committee on missing persons in Cyprus, and to pass a new resolution calling on the competent authorities of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to surmount all procedural obstacles and to bring the matter to a conclusion as quickly as possible. Only Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot side refused to accept this resolution. I am entitled to say — and here I express a personal opinion — that only the guilty would repudiate an investigation conducted for this purpose by investigators of such calibre and honour as those representing the United Nations Organisation.

Fellow Members of the European Parliament, whichever countries you represent and whatever your political persuasions, please help to bring an end to this human drama! Whatever the outcome it will be preferable to the agony of not knowing.

(Applause)

Mrs Baduel Glorioso (COM). — (FR) On a point of order, Mr President, Mr Deschamps criticised the French interpreters; I too was listening to the French interpretation during the presentation of the report which Lady Elles conducted at a fast pace.

It seems to me that we should be apologising to the interpreters who show exceptional skill. I wanted to

stress that point. As to the real substance of the matter, all that the French interpreter said was 'I cannot keep up'.

President. — I don't think it is something what we should have a discussion about at this stage.

Lady Elles (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, I apologize to the French interpreters if they had difficulty with the speed with which I talk. I know that I speak quickly, but I did provide all the interpreters' cabins with a text of my speech in English in order to facilitate their task.

Mr J. D. Taylor (ED). — Mr President, Mr Battersby and myself will not be speaking on behalf of the European Democrats. We will be speaking as individuals because within our group there is a division of approach to the whole subject of missing persons in Cyprus.

I speak as one who has been a regular visitor to that island each year for the past ten years. I was there during the government of President Makarios, which was subsequently overthrown by Greek troops under the junta, and then since 1974 during the division of that island. The whole issue of missing persons is a most sensitive issue in that island and one which I would caution Members of this House to speak about with great care, because their words will be misused and abused by various factions within that island.

I must say, Mr President, that I feel that this report is somewhat one-sided. It is true that in a fleeting phrase the rapporteur, who speaks for her committee and not for the European Democratic Group, stated that there were also missing Turkish Cypriots. The truth is that missing persons in the island of Cyprus are nothing new. People have been missing since the atrocities against the Turkish Cypriot minority in 1963. It has, of course, become a problem common to both communities since the Greek coup against the government of Archbishop Makarios in 1974.

Mr President, the trouble in this debate is that we are going to vote on a motion for a resolution and not actually on the contents of the report. However, some people will use the contents of the report for political purposes back in that island. I know that the contents of that report have already caused great distress and some criticism of this Parliament within that island. It is interesting indeed that tonight out of our 434 Members we have less than 50 present taking an interest in this debate, and of those 50 at least one-third are Members from Greece.

There were two motions to be commented upon, Mrs Pruvot's did not set any time limit at 1974. It gave us a wider brief, and I am sorry that the resolution does not therefore refer to the missing members of the

J. D. Taylor

minority community, the missing Turkish Cypriots. There is an amendment down in the name of some Members from this Group seeking to correct the resolution which I trust the rapporteur will find possible to accept. The rapporteur also said in her speech that there was freedom of movement prior to 1974 in the island. She must not have visited Cyprus prior to 1974, because I can assure her that even under the government of Archbishop Makarios there was not freedom of movement. I can certainly assure her that tonight there is no freedom of movement within the island of Cyprus. Even the leader of our own Cyprus delegation, Mr Herman, was refused admission to northern Cyprus by the Greek Cypriot authorities.

The final point I want to make on the resolution is on the question of the withdrawal of all foreign armed forces. I must make it clear that on the island there are not only Turkish troops but also Greek troops. Both are foreign forces on that island.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the report by Lady Elles and the motion she is proposing on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee concerning missing persons in Cyprus constitute a firm step towards resolving a strictly humanitarian problem. Therefore we would like to believe that the House will approve them unanimously.

This issue, however, is only one facet — the most dramatic perhaps — of the great tragedy of the Cypriot people which has been going on for so many years. As Lady Elles mentions in her report, Cyprus, an independent and sovereign state and a member of the United Nations, is suffering terribly from the consequences of a foreign military occupation which has lasted for many years. For eight and a half years 38% of its territory has been occupied illegally by Turkish forces. On the island itself there are 200 000 refugees, one third of the population of Cyprus, that is. These refugees are forbidden to return to their houses and lands by the occupying forces, and as Lady Elles mentions, the area from which they fled has been colonized by thousands of Turks brought over from the mainland.

Over and beyond the suffering of the Cypriot people, which has exceeded all the bounds of forbearance and endurance, the prolongation of this situation poses immense dangers for peace, not only in the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East but also on a world scale.

If the relevant decisions and resolutions of the United Nations had been implemented the Cyprus tragedy would have been brought to a peaceful and just end years ago. The foreign occupation, the de facto partition of the island, acts of foreign interference and the threat to the future of Cyprus would all have ceased, because these resolutions guarantee the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Cyprus

Republic, and ensure peace in the lives of the Cypriot people, Greeks and Turks alike, without the presence of foreign troops and bases. However, the drama lingers on and the dangers are growing because governments in Ankara have intransigently and provocatively refused to implement the proposals of the United Nations.

It is an open secret that the Turkish occupiers have all along had the support of the US and NATO imperialists, both at the time of their invasion and today. By cultivating the chauvinists in Ankara these circles seek to transform Cyprus into a base and operational lair for their opportunist designs in the Near and Middle East. Without their comprehensive support Turkey would not have dared to mount an armed invasion of Cyprus, nor would it dare now to remain in occupation. 'For the United States and NATO' — wrote the French newspaper 'Aurore' — 'Turkey is a marvellous aircraft carrier moored right up against the Soviet Union. If it were lost to the Atlantic Alliance it would be irreplaceable.' Akin to this objective there are others: the oil of the Persian Gulf, and the large markets offered by the countries of the Middle East. Hence Turkey is a most powerful outpost for the imperialistic monopolies of the US and Western Europe. And this is why the fate of Cyprus has become caught up in the cogs of the imperialist world-domination machine, and why the Cypriot people — Greeks and Turks, who for decades lived together in a brotherly way — have been suffering for eight and a half years.

The question puts itself: can the EEC help towards a just solution of the Cyprus problem? The EEC has the power to exert decisive pressure on Ankara, because Turkey has substantial economic ties with the Community, particularly with certain of its members such as the German Federal Republic and Britain. But the EEC does not wish to exert this pressure. Indeed some EEC spokesmen quite openly use the language of the Turkish occupiers and give multifarious support to the occupation regime in Cyprus. We recall the pronouncements on Cyprus made in this Chamber on 16 of last June by the representative of the Belgian presidency, Mr Keersmaecker, and the statement by the Economics Minister of the German Federal Republic that his country imports citrus fruits from occupied northern Cyprus, thus giving economic support to the occupiers who are selling stolen goods. We recall also the provocative visits made to occupied territory by Euro MPs without informing the lawful government of Cyprus, and which were designed to confer unofficial recognition on the illegal regime set up in northern Cyprus under the foreign occupation.

Mr President, the Cypriot people will continue with their struggle for liberation in the belief that they have the support of all the peoples of the world — and amongst them the Turkish people — and of all men and women of good intention, and there are such people here in this Chamber. We hope they will make

Adamou

their support manifest. With regard to the Communist Party of Greece, Greek Communists and Greek patriots in general, they will continue to support the struggle of the Cypriot people ever more resolutely until justice is fully done.

(Applause)

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — *(DA)* Mr President, I join with Mr Taylor in saying that, while I think the proposal is excellent, the explanatory statement is one-sided. As far as I am aware, about 500 persons have disappeared from the northern part of Cyprus since 1974. I am not saying that only angels live in the northern or in the southern part, but Parliament has always had a reputation for having a certain sense of justice, and I ask that we also show it in the present case. It is quite clear and reasonable that there should be an investigation, but it should proceed under equal conditions for the populations in both parts of Cyprus.

Mr De Goede (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, it is only right that the tragedy of the missing persons in Cyprus should once more come before the House.

The horrendous events which took place on that Mediterranean island around 1974 and, it should be stressed, also in the years prior to that were shocking in themselves. Worse than this, however, and completely unacceptable is the uncertainty surrounding the exact fate of many hundreds of Greek and Turkish Cypriots, thereafter. Many families still have to live with unbearably tense situations with the resultant sociological and legal uncertainty surrounding such matters.

In reading Lady Elles's report one cannot help realizing that bad will, in refusing bilateral exchanges of information among the two communities is contributing to the continuing suffering. I would have to say, both to my Greek colleagues and to others, that it would be wrong to point the accusing finger solely at the Turkish Cypriots and/or Turkish government in Ankara. I have no sympathy for the present Turkish regime and just as little for the Greek intrigues over the island of Cyprus and what they have done in the past. The firmly entrenched prejudices of both countries are rendering all practical solutions unworkable in this conflict which has been going on for decades. The problem of Cyprus, as such, is not one we are discussing today. But I must say that during my visit to the northern part of the island last September I was deeply struck by the continuing suffering of the Turkish Cypriots there. The mass graves containing hundreds of slaughtered innocent victims from newly-born infants to old folk were a great shock to us and a reminder that mutual barbaric cruelty will remain for some considerable time a stumbling block to efforts to reach any kind of solution. In this respect I feel it most regrettable that Lady Elles did not visit

both parts of the island. Let us at least ensure that no one-sided picture emerges from this House on this human tragedy of the missing persons, but rather let us adopt measures which would be mandatory on both sides thereby perhaps slightly alleviating the human suffering and uncertainty.

Lady Elles's report is in this respect, a good approach and we shall vote in favour. We have also decided to vote for the amendments tabled by colleague van Minnen (1 to 4) and Mr Forth (No 6), which represent improvements, in our opinion.

Mr Lomas (S). — Mr President, it is nearly ten years since the brutal invasion of Cyprus by the Turkish army, as a result of which 200 000 Greek Cypriots were made homeless and thousands more either were killed or have disappeared. I fear that the majority of those disappeared people may well already have been murdered by the occupation army, but still we have to try to find out their whereabouts and, if we can, to help those who may still be alive.

I would say to those apologists for the Turkish junta that they should put themselves in the place of the families of the disappeared people and imagine the anguish, the torment, the dying hopes as they turn to the international community for assistance.

Whilst this report deals specifically with the question of the disappeared people, it cannot be separated from the bigger problem of the continued Turkish occupation of Cyprus, because it will not be finally resolved until the Turkish troops return where they belong — to their own country.

(Applause)

I fear, Mr President, not only for the people who are missing but also for those who are still subject to Turkish rule there. When one sees how the Junta treats its own people in Turkey — the mass arrests, the torture, the harassment — one can but fear for anybody who lives anywhere under its rule.

So I hope, Mr President, that we will join today with the United Nations, who have condemned the Junta on the question of disappeared people, and the European Commission on Human Rights, who have done likewise, and adopt this resolution by Lady Elles which, under all the circumstances, is a moderate one. I would have liked it to be a bit tougher, but, to get unanimity in the Political Affairs Committee, we all agreed to support it. Today, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I call on this Parliament to carry this resolution unanimously and align itself with those forces who care and want to do something for the disappeared people in Cyprus.

(Applause)

Mr Pöttering (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, colleagues, this Parliament sees itself as a lawyer in the defence of human rights throughout the world — an attitude for which we are criticized from time to time. I believe we are fully justified in speaking out against human rights violations, be they in the Soviet Union, Afghanistan, Central- or South America or wherever else.

Today the House is turning its attention towards Cyprus, a Mediterranean island and very much part of Europe. The issue is that of human rights and, more specifically of the missing persons in Cyprus. Given such an emotional subject a fair and balanced debate can only take place if we desist from the kind of polemic to which our Communist colleague Adamou has just resorted when referring to a NATO member country. Mr Adamou, you would have been more credible if you had referred to human rights violations in Afghanistan in the same terms as those which you felt it necessary to use in your diatribe against NATO.

(Applause)

We are concerned with the missing persons in Cyprus and we ask plaintively: What has become of them? Are they presumed dead, imprisoned or dead? And we want answers to such questions. Equity behoves us to define 'missing persons' to include all denominations. Nor is any arbitrary cut off period in the history of the island called for. We must ask both what occurred after and before 1975.

On a personal note I would like to say that ten years after the hostilities of the Second World War my own father was still officially listed as missing, nor did he ever return subsequently. I can therefore assure you that I know what it means for a family to live with such uncertainty. When there no longer exists any hope this much should be communicated to the next of kin. This underlines the need for the Committee on Missing Persons to achieve tangible results very quickly with a view to informing the immediate family of such people as to the fate of their next of kin including how and when they met their death, for such details are also relevant.

We welcome the fact that Greece is now a member of the Community and my group has always found the contribution of our Greek colleagues to be exemplary. However, we must not forget that in Turkey we also have a partner. Although not yet a member of the Community Turkey is a full member of NATO and, therefore, of the Western family. We hope and expect that Turkey, like Greece before her, will find its way back to democracy.

Today's debate makes clear that relations between nations in the Western orbit must be rooted in a fundamental commitment to democracy. If such can be guaranteed, then there will be no human suffering and no human rights violations. If this Parliament could

only see the present debate as a mission to militate for democracy in every corner of the world, we would provide a sterling service to human rights and freedom as a whole thereby rendering a service to the presumed dead and those listed as missing on the island of Cyprus.

(Applause)

Mr Battersby (ED). — Mr President, as my colleague John Taylor has said, I am speaking for myself. I would like to say that I personally fully support this balanced, unbiased and humanitarian report by Lady Elles. A lasting solution to the Cyprus problem can only be achieved when, and only when, goodwill and mutual trust exist between the two Cypriot communities. Moreover, the future survival of a truly independent Cyprus depends very much on the development of a Cypriot identity which will enable the inhabitants of that island to live in peace and harmony, which will enable them to confront their common Cypriot problems with mutual understanding and cooperation as a united people.

The 1974 conflict, I understand, cost upwards of 6 000 Greek-Cypriot and 2 000 Turkish-Cypriot lives — which if converted into our own terms proportionately is 800 000 people in Germany or 800 000 people in Italy or 800 000 people in Britain. The 1974 conflict, with the events leading up to it, was a tragic affair which has left many unhealed wounds. This can only be healed by tolerance, trust, human kindness, goodwill, conciliation and understanding. I personally fully support the proposal that the inter-communal committee on missing persons should meet urgently and as quickly as possible, because I believe this is the best and most acceptable and effective body.

I ask also that all parties involved should cooperate to the full, that all Cypriots should put on one side their understandable bitterness and mistrust, which we here should not try in any way to exacerbate or prolong or use for opportunist political ends, and that all parties concerned should do everything possible to determine once and for all what has happened to the missing persons in Cyprus. There has been enough grief, uncertainty and misery, Mr President. We are talking of people — kind, decent, hardworking people with their roots in the soil of Cyprus who want to know what has happened to members of their families. All the people of Cyprus deserve our help and support in this matter, and it is, I consider, our duty to use our influence and to bring our deep concern over the missing persons in Cyprus and their families to the attention of all those involved in the solution of this tragic problem, whatever our political leaning or preference or nationality. I hope Lady Elles's very fair report will be adopted unanimously by the House.

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, Lady Elles has produced an extremely valuable, positive and

Kyrkos

objective report, and I am astonished that a colleague, whom we have come to know as a counsel for the Turkish side, has had the temerity to declare in this Chamber that the report is one-sided. Mr Taylor should ask himself just why the report contains only the views of the Greek Cypriot side. For the simple reason that the Turkish Cypriot side rejected attempts by Lady Elles to establish contact, as she explained to those of us who sit on the Political Affairs Committee.

Another very revealing point comes out in her report. All of the Greeks she spoke to, first among them the Cypriot Minister of the Interior, Mr Veniamin, confirmed to her that the Cyprus Government offers every possible support and encouragement to all those wishing to carry out investigations on the island. But why has not the Turkish side made such a pronouncement? This is the root of the problem. The Turkish side wishes to impede investigations. Lady Elles told us in addition that 'the Turkish side has also suffered casualties'. In years gone by we were the first ones to speak out on this score. However, plenty of time has passed during which investigations could have been carried out, but Mr Denktash brought matters to a close by saying that the missing Turkish Cypriots must be presumed dead. However, we on our part maintain and adduce support for the view that the missing Greek Cypriots are still alive.

Mr Taylor, if your child was missing, and you possessed a photograph of it in some Turkish prison camp, would you venture to mislead the European Parliament as you attempted to do this evening?

With regard to Mr Pöttering's observation — yes, Turkey is a member of the 'Atlantic Alliance'. But, Mr Pöttering, do you know what this member is really called? It is called the invader of Cyprus, the subjugator of Cyprus, and this subjugation must be called by its real name if we wish to uphold the high principles which unite all of us here in this Chamber.

Colleagues, this is not, of course, an occasion for the display of political attachment. I ask you to approve the resolution unanimously, in order to show that on a humanitarian issue at least the views of all sides of this House coincide.

(Applause)

Mr van Minnen (S). — (NL) It is clear that the fate of missing persons is, if anything, more tragic than that of those killed immediately. Even though one would have to say that an outsider would not get such an impression by reviewing the great number of empty seats in the House during this debate. The tragedy of the missing persons is primarily a tragedy of the next of kin who have to live in such cruel uncertainty. But the plight of missing persons is one that must be of immediate concern to all of us, as human rights should be.

Missing persons may be split up into various categories but as soon as we begin to inquire about the fate of these people, it must be undertaken with sympathy, irrespective of everything except the human aspect. Naturally attempts to uncover the fate of someone listed as missing in 1863 have little chance of success. But the case of those listed missing one hundred years later, in 1963, must be undertaken with all our force, for we cannot ignore such a cry of distress. At any rate the same priority must be accorded that person's case as that we apply to someone killed 10 years later, for example.

On the basis of the foregoing examples of classification systems in dealing with humanitarian problems I have tabled a few amendments to Lady Elles's report, which are aimed at strengthening the humanitarian side. On the one hand they attempt to involve the United Nations more closely in the missing persons in Cyprus. On the other hand they attempt to widen the terminology of the report to make it quite clear that the House is equally appalled at the missing persons drama of Turkish and Greek Cypriots alike. In this respect I hope the report will have unanimous support in the House.

Mr Psemazoglou (NI). — (GR) Mr President, Parliament should acknowledge the great importance of the initiative undertaken by the Political Affairs Committee and of Lady Elles' meticulous and commendable report. I hope Lady Elles will permit me to remark on what I presume to be a printing error in her report where it says that the population of Cyprus has been Greek since the 4th century BC. In fact, the population of Cyprus has been Greek since the 14th century BC, since the time of the Mycenaeans, a thousand years earlier than that is.

Mr President, I would like to make three observations. First to say that though the issue is, indisputably, a humanitarian one, it does also have a political aspect. It is politically important for the European Community to be steadfast in its support of human rights, not only because this accords with the feelings and the disposition of our peoples, but also because such a policy is commensurate politically with the prestige and influence of the European Community on the world stage. It is not feasible for Europe, the European Community and the European Parliament, to issue resolutions on what happens in other countries and yet remain apathetic and indifferent about the huge anomaly in Cyprus.

My second observation has to do with what has been said by some of our colleagues and, in particular, by Mr Taylor who I believe has left the Chamber and not stayed to hear the reply to his unfounded allegations. The Cyprus Government has accepted that the cases of the 300 Turkish Cypriots listed as missing since 1974 should be investigated by the Red Cross Committee operating under UN auspices on the same basis

Pesmazoglou

as the cases of missing Greek Cypriots. I can assure Parliament, Mr President, that this remains the position of the Cyprus Government to the present time, and that it is indeed possible for the cases referred to of Turkish Cypriots missing since 1974 to be investigated with the provision of full assistance by the Cyprus Government. By contrast, not only is there an absence of the requisite and prescribed cooperation on the part of the Turkish side in connection with the major issue of the approximately 2 000 missing Greek Cypriots and Greeks listed by name, and about whom specific data exist recording the time and place of their disappearance — and either indications or convincing evidence that they are still alive — but moreover a complete refusal to deal with the issue. How can some of our colleagues fail to take account of this unacceptable attitude, while the Cyprus Government consents to the whole process of investigation into the whereabouts of persons who have been missing since the criminal Turkish attack against Cyprus in 1974?

Mr President, my final observation has to do with the issue in general. As Lady Elles very rightly points out, the issue of missing persons is bound up with the Cyprus problem as a whole and can only be resolved in the context of a final solution of this problem. Mr President, it is unbelievable that various speakers have spoken today without making any reference to the invasion of 1974 which was an attack against an independent state. In a sense it was more than just that, because after the initial invasion, even while discussions were in progress on bringing about a cessation of hostilities and on preliminary moves towards a settlement of the matter, the second phase of the invasion was launched and this increased the amount of Cypriot territory under military occupation from 8% to 38%. Since then this grossly anomalous situation has continued in being along with the great tragedy affecting the Greek Cypriot and Greek families of the missing persons. It is obvious that this situation constitutes a serious threat to peace in the area. I hope, Mr President, that Parliament will give its unanimous approval to the report and motion for a resolution produced by Lady Elles and the Political Affairs Committee.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, the motion for a resolution contained in this report is addressed to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. On behalf of the Commission, however, I want to make it very clear that we are favourably disposed to the humanitarian concerns that have dominated this debate. I have no doubt that our governments will take up the same position when they come to consider the matter.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

7. Situation in the Middle East

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-786/82) by Mr Penders, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the situation in the Middle East.

Mr Penders (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, no sooner had the directly-elected European Parliament taken office than it was almost immediately obliged, by the force of events, to focus attention on the problem-ridden Middle East. Until the advent of direct elections at universal suffrage to the European Parliament in mid-1979 one could discern a clear divergence of viewpoints between the Foreign Ministers of the (then) nine Community Member States meeting in political cooperation (EPC) and of the European Parliament on the question of the Middle East. Whereas the former were acutely aware of the importance of the Palestinian issue in the Middle East context from the early 1970s the European Parliament, on the other hand, continued for quite some time thereafter to pursue a vigorous unqualified pro-Israeli line. I felt it high time that Parliament acted to bridge the gap separating our respective viewpoints, for international political reasons firstly, and secondly for institutional reasons. How can this Parliament's desire for closer involvement in, and understanding of, EPC deliberations on the Middle East, be taken seriously, when our political viewpoints and statements concerning such an intricate issue has tended to remain so primitive compared to those of the Council, Mr President? I need hardly add that this should not be construed as a plea for a consistent conformity of viewpoints between Parliament and Council.

With its report on the situation in the Middle East the Political Affairs Committee has now bridged that gap and I feel justified in stating that the motion for a resolution contained therein is both balanced and realistic. Balanced because it examines carefully and minutely both Israel's security requirements as well as the aspirations of the Palestinian people. Realistic because we have resisted the temptation of opting for a dramatic breakthrough in favour of a step by step approach. While recognizing the ultimate necessity of an all-embracing solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, efforts to resolve the problem in the context of a large international summit conference, analogous to that of the Warsaw Pact member states, held last Wednesday in Prague, are doomed to failure.

Mr President, the option of a step by step approach presupposes in this case a coordination of the Community's Middle East initiative with both the Camp David Agreement and the latest proposals of President Reagan, as stated in the Resolution. But the maintenance of Camp David would have to be conditional upon certain endorsements. It means recognition by the Community that the political and diplomatic initia-

Penders

tive is the prerogative of the United States as the sole real guarantor of Israel's existence and security and this is something I would ask those friends of Israel, who are quite critical of certain aspects of the motion for a resolution, to bear in mind when evaluating my report. Furthermore the motion for a resolution goes a lot further towards endorsing Camp David than anything which has hitherto been elaborated by the EPC ministers, an additional aspect which those friends of Israel should bear in mind.

Coordination of the Community's efforts with those of the United States should also serve to demonstrate to the Arab world and the PLO the futility of attempts to drive a wedge between the United States and Europe — a current favourite pastime of many in the world today, as may be seen in East-West relations. Suffice it to say that the motion for a resolution gives short shrift to such predatory aspirations. Support for the U.S.-sponsored idea of admitting Jordan as a party to the autonomy talks has its counterpart in the condemnation by the Political Affairs Committee of Israel's settlement policy in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank of the river Jordan.

A further point, Mr President, The Political Affairs Committee has been at pains to dissociate itself from any idea that we, (i.e. the Community), were in the process of elaborating an ambitious blueprint for peace in the Middle East or that we would, or indeed could, come up with a grandiose masterplan. Such suggestions are no more than figments of the imagination, concocted by those who would not hesitate to exploit the Community to score points in their own internal political debates. We shall have no part in such manoeuvrings.

I feel that one of the most positive merits of the visit to the region in early 1981 undertaken by the (then) President of the Council of Community Foreign Ministers, Van der Klaauw, was that it demonstrated just how unrealistic such an all-embracing Community-sponsored initiative would be. What contribution can the Community make? It can provide vigorous political and diplomatic back up support in the form of financial assistance, the removal of inequalities, improving the general climate etc. as mentioned in paragraphs 4, 5 and 7 of the motion for a resolution. The most tangible Community contributions would take the form of economic, financial, technical and humanitarian aid as well as the provision of contingents for the peace-keeping forces and observers, as referred to in paragraphs 12 and 13.

Such a peace-keeping force should, in my opinion, operate under the auspices of the United Nations, thereby making optimum use of its possibilities. But this does not imply that such a procedure would be the ideal one to cover all eventualities. A rigid total commitment to U.N. control over all Middle East peace-keeping forces, whatever the circumstances, would inevitably provide the Soviet Union with the oppor-

tunity to use its veto right in the Security Council — something which I intend to preempt.

Mr President, I have taken the somewhat unusual step, as rapporteur of tabling an amendment to my own report. Indeed I had announced my intention of so doing, some time back, to the Political Affairs Committee, and the matter provoked no controversy. It concerns paragraph 7.2. With a view to circumventing the notorious differences of interpretation surrounding Article 1(1) of U.N. Security Council Resolution 242 ('Withdrawal of Israeli forces from territories occupied...'; 'des territoires occupés') my amendment aims to render paragraph 7.2 of the Motion for a Resolution conform to the renowned declaration by the Community's Ministers of Foreign Affairs of 6 November 1973.

The Committee wrestled hard with the whole issue of the PLO. It should be emphasized that the Motion for a Resolution does not — I repeat, does not — consider the PLO to be the sole representative of the Palestinian people. That question can only be decided by the Palestinians themselves. The PLO should rather be seen as an important and inescapable political factor in the context of the Arab-Israeli conflict — something which should be borne in mind by both the signatories to the Fahd plan as signed at the Fez Summit, and by Israel.

Paragraph 9 sets out, in unambiguous terms, the conditions to be fulfilled for a legitimate participation of the PLO at the negotiations. Paragraph 10, for me personally, the most important of all, declares that the heart of the matter is the gradual dismantling of psychological barriers between Israelis and the Palestinian people, including the PLO.

It should be obvious that, in the wake of the events which have taken place in Beirut, the PLO will further increase its diplomatic activity whilst gradually shedding its terrorist activities, a step which we must do our utmost to encourage. As it adopts more of a political posture it will find its counterpart in an enhanced political status.

Paragraph 7.4. of the Motion for a Resolution is couched in a particularly sensitive terminology in referring to the eventual emergence of a Palestinian state. I personally consider it to be no more than the logical consequence of the references to the Palestinian people as contained in the Camp David Agreements. The declaration of the EPC ministers of 20 September 1982 comes very close to this viewpoint in referring to the right of self-determination of the Palestinians 'with everything which that implies'. I personally consider point 14 to be of importance also.

Although the EPC Ministers have never referred to it specifically, it is the logical outcome of efforts to attain an all-embracing solution. There can be no doubting the necessity of a U.N. Security Council fol-

Penders

low-up resolution to Resolution 242, making explicit reference to the State of Israel and the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people.

In closing, Mr President, just a few remarks on the Lebanon. Paragraph eleven outlines an extensive, flexible and comprehensive framework. We must all fervently hope for a successful outcome to the Israel/Lebanon/United States negotiations currently taking place. Here too a step by step approach is called for, rather than trying to achieve all at once. Israel has everything to gain in seeing President Gemayel's efforts to rebuild his war-torn country coming to fruition, and in the establishment of harmonious relations both between the warring factions inside his country as well as with its other Arab neighbours. We must never lose sight of the fact that the Lebanon is an Arab country and very much part of the Arab world. Any short-term Israeli policy objective of forcing President Gemayel to normalize relations between his country and Israel will only serve to delay the withdrawal of Syrian and PLO forces from the Lebanon. I hope I am correct in assuming that Tel Aviv remains committed to achieving such a withdrawal and has not abandoned it in favour of exercising some kind of protectorate mandate in the southern and Christian areas of the Lebanon.

Mr President, I shall follow the debate attentively, at the end of which I hope to be able to return to the podium to make some closing remarks.

Mr Schmid (S). — (DE) Mr President, colleagues, it is not only a laudable but long overdue initiative that the European Parliament should take up the matter of the situation in the Middle East, for we, Europeans, cannot afford to be indifferent to the course of events in that part of the globe. Events taking place there affect us to a certain extent. An additional welcome sign may be seen in the fact that the basis for this debate is a report which is generally recognized as balanced. Should it be adopted by the House as it stands at present, it would be the most advanced document of its kind to emanate from a Community Institution in recent years. As such it is no small tribute to the rapporteur's efforts in elaborating a generally acceptable bipartisan report.

Consequently, I would like to take this opportunity for expressing my appreciation and respect to you colleague Penders. The Socialist Group supports the broad outlines of your motion for a resolution, notwithstanding the tabling by us of several less fundamental amendments whose aim is that of clarifying our position with regard to the compromise worked out in the Political Affairs Committee. I feel sure you will appreciate our reasoning.

Anyone having political discussions in the Middle East will by now be familiar with the widely divergent viewpoints as to a European contribution to a peace

settlement. Most of its Member States would like to envisage a European Community initiative going beyond the Israel-Egypt separate peace treaty worked out at the Camp David Summit in September 1979 and which would, for example, take more account of the Fahd peace plan. Egypt, for its part, naturally hopes for support in gaining acceptance for, and implementation of, its proposals, such as autonomy for the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip and on the West Bank within the framework of the Camp David agreements. Of all the Middle East states in the immediate area Syria alone considers the Community to be a willing tool of the United States and, as such, quite incapable of elaborating its own peace initiative for the region.

Finally, to judge from the declarations of the Israeli foreign minister, Israel considers that any Community-sponsored Middle East initiative can only make a valuable contribution in so far as it supports both Israel and the United States' Middle East policies, at least up to President Reagan's initiative of September 1982. Current developments in the region make it necessary for the Community to decide as to the wisdom, or otherwise, of elaborating its own Middle East policy, given that its rather meagre declarations heretofore, devoid of implementing measures, do not, in my opinion, merit such a denomination.

The Community needs such a policy, for several reasons. With the impending accession to the Community of Spain and Portugal its focal point will have moved in a southerly direction in more ways than one. Future Community policy will increasingly have to take account of other non Community neighbouring states in the immediate Mediterranean basin. The interests of the industrialized states to the North are in reality complementary to those of the sun-soaked states of the South — and let's not forget that solar energy is the energy of the future — and in some ways, even identical. The alternative to our current inward-looking central Europe-oriented policy is a complementary Pact with the countries of the Mediterranean Basin.

Those who, while concurring on the necessity of such a policy, would confine its workings to the economic field, fail to perceive the reality. For the Community has, in addition to the obvious economic reasons, valid security reasons in seeing stability and peace in the Middle East, for the conflict in that region could all too easily spill over and take on wider dimensions. Both superpowers are actively involved in the region. One might say that there exists an almost electric connection between the Middle East conflict and the overall East-West conflict. There exists the very real danger that regional crises in the Middle East could act as a detonator setting off world-wide conflicts from which we shall not be spared. We therefore not only have an interest in stability, detente and peace in central Europe. Of equal importance is the task of ensuring peace at our very doorstep — Southern Europe.

Schmid

I believe furthermore that Europe has a historical responsibility for the situation in the Middle East. The latter is merely a reflection of an abortive European policy in the region in the course of this century. I need only call to mind the fact that Britain pursued a policy of simultaneously granting control over the (then) Turkish-controlled Arab territories to leading Zionists, Arabs and, of course, to itself. At the Conference of San Remo, France presided over the Balkanization of the Middle East. I need hardly add that my country, under the Nazis, was instrumental in causing the massive exodus to Palestine of those European Jews who escaped before or after the holocaust.

That holocaust was not only instrumental in making Israel possible but its political ramifications were so enormous as to make a Jewish state an inevitability, irrespective even of the Zionist movement. Thus the (then) Soviet delegate to the United Nations made a declaration in November 1947 before the Assembly which I would subscribe to even today. He stated that no Western European nation was capable of guaranteeing the defence of the fundamental rights of the Jewish people or of protecting them from the violent acts of the Fascist hangman. This is ample explanation of the need felt by the Jewish people for a State of their own. When one takes account of the suffering endured by them during the Second World War one cannot justifiably deny them this.

The question now arises as to how Europe can best fulfil the obligation incumbent upon it, in the light of the foregoing. We know both superpowers to be active in the region; in conformity with their existing post World War Two division of the world they are currently active along the same lines in this region of the globe. The friendship pact between the Soviet Union and Syria, South Yemen and Libya have less to do with friendship than with utilization rights as ports of call for refuelling by the Soviet Fleet. In similar vein the Middle East visit by Alexander Haig in April 1981 was dictated, not by the problems inherent to the region but primarily by the aim of attaining a strategic anti-Soviet consensus.

It is doubtful whether subordination of the Middle East's interests to those of the wider East-West theatre of conflict really furthers the attainment of stability and detente in that region. Rather the presence there of the superpowers simply reflects the global conflict. By contrast, the basis of a Community presence would be detente and restoration. This is, in my opinion, a very fundamental difference. Our Group is convinced of the need for the Community to elaborate a credible Middle East policy, not bypassing the United States (and on this point I fully agree with colleague Penders) but nevertheless of a more independent character than that which he envisages, as reflected in the motion for a resolution. In addition to the principles outlined by colleague Penders, to which we subscribe, the policy which we foresee would also have to take account of the following aspects.

Firstly, the Community must finally stop talking about a Middle East policy and get down to actually elaborating one. With every six-monthly change of presidency in the Council of Ministers we have heretofore been obliged to witness the sorry spectacle of the president of the Council of Foreign Ministers departing for the Middle East on one of the all too familiar fact-finding missions. In some instances the Community Foreign Ministers visited their counterparts in various Middle East states armed with questionnaires. The latter-named foreign ministers have had enough and who can blame them. Enquiries were carried out as though there were a lack of information rather than policy. If we stubbornly persist along these lines we shall only succeed in holding ourselves up to ridicule. It has to stop!

Secondly, we must clearly announce our policy objectives as well as the bases thereof. As long as the individual Community Member States behave in a vague and incalculable manner, as they have done heretofore they will be greeted with mistrust — and justifiably so — particularly by Israel. The states of the region must know, just as clearly as they do in relation to United States policy, the direction of Community policy, which is manifestly not yet the case.

Thirdly, given the fact that the success of any eventual solution is contingent upon both U.N. approval and a degree of Soviet participation the Community must demonstrate its interest in ensuring the stability of the Middle East in its discussions with both the United States — which should normally be easier among allies — and the Soviet Union.

Fourthly, a stronger Community commitment to the Middle East presupposes a readiness to assume responsibility and guarantees. A start could be made in the area of technical and economic cooperation through the provision of elements for the peace-keeping regiments.

The report under consideration contains important and substantial aspects for a Community Middle East policy. We are of the opinion, however, that the following points are in need of clarification.

Although an important step along the road towards a solution to the Middle East conflict, the Camp David agreements are but one of several steps which must eventually be taken. Its limitations in isolation have already become apparent. By now even the United States has come round to this point of view, for what else could explain the need felt in Washington to elaborate the latest Reagan Initiative of September 1982.

We believe that both the Palestinian and Jewish peoples have an equal right to self-determination, not just theoretically but practically, implying, as it must, the right to their own sovereign state at the end of the negotiating process in the region. The Palestinians must be involved and represented in the negotiating

Schmid

process and those of us who consider the term 'Palestinians' to cover, not just the Arab inhabitants of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip must inevitably conclude that the elected mayors of those areas cannot be considered — at least not solely — to be the true representatives of the Palestinians.

As long as there is no legally recognized representatives of the Palestinian people within a governmental context, the PLO must be considered at present as being the only valid negotiating partner. We would not wish to make a value judgment on the matter but it appears to us to be self-evident, and must, we feel, be recognized as such. A people cannot materially negotiate for themselves but must be represented. History should have brought home to us by now the futility of attempting to choose one's negotiating partners according to one's wishes.

We are opposed to Israel's settlement policy in the occupied territories. Such a policy is cold-blooded annexation. Such an annexation of the West Bank into the State of Israel would inexorably endanger the democratic character of that state or alternatively, its Jewish character, given that such a state would one day be destined to have a majority of Arab inhabitants. Those who wish to avoid such eventualities cannot but be opposed to the settlement policy. If for no other reason than that of protecting the interests of a state with which we have always maintained friendly relations we must protest against its settlement policy.

In closing, may I appeal to all Groups in the House to refrain from diluting through amendments, the essentials of the hard-fought compromise achieved in the Political Affairs Committee, thereby preserving the fundamental declaration of the Penders report.

(Applause from the left side of the House).

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, allow me at the outset to express my disappointment at the fact that the House is so sparsely attended on the occasion of what colleague Schmid has correctly dubbed a critical debate. Perhaps the late hour may provide part of the answer, but, whatever face we may put on it, such an attitude is in stark contrast with the importance of the subject now before us.

No one would deny that the task entrusted to my friend and colleague, Penders, was a daunting one: repeatedly he saw his draft outlines for the motion for a resolution being overtaken by the rapidly-changing course of events in the Middle East. The same must be said of the report now before us, or at least of a number of the crucial tenets underlying both the document and the motion itself as elaborated before the events of June 1982. This must not be construed as a criticism of colleague Penders but rather as a blunt statement of the facts and developments in the present day Middle East.

I have no difficulty in subscribing to a great deal of the more important aspects of the Motion for a Resolution before us. The considerable number of amendments tabled by individual members of my Group attests to the wide divergence of views on this issue. Speaking personally I would have to take issue with a number of points in the Penders report for, as it now stands, in the wake of the recent changes which the region has endured, the much sought-after balance on the one hand now finds its counterpart in ambiguity on the other, thereby rendering necessary the addition of a number of amendments (which I have barely had a chance of reviewing) to the Motion, in an effort to attain equanimity. I would like to believe that such an improved version would meet with all round support in the House.

I would, nevertheless, like to congratulate colleague Penders on the painstaking nature of his report and its underlying belief in the need for a modest and realistic approach as opposed to the grandiose all-embrasive plans and decisions which have emanated from various quarters in Europe and indeed from within this very House in an effort to find a solution to an unprecedented and intractable problem in a region such as the Middle East in which strife has for centuries been endemic. It goes without saying that a modest and restrained approach will continue to be the order of the day as regards future utterances by this House on the Middle East.

Any overall evaluation of the various peace proposals for the Middle East must now, in my opinion, recognize that Israel's invasion of the Lebanon in June 1982 — irrespective of emotional feelings of one or other kind — has fundamentally altered the political and strategic situation of the whole region. As a military factor the PLO has been eliminated in Lebanon and most of the neighbouring states. I cannot deny that I consider it a positive factor that the PLO's military and terrorist posture, which was partly responsible for rendering unworkable any peace initiatives for Lebanon during the past seven years, has now been removed.

For Europeans and Americans — governments and citizens alike — it is no easy task to understand the mentality or developments in a region such as the Middle East, which, for centuries has been characterized by conflict, hate and thoughtlessness, so alien to present-day Europeans. In trying to evolve and gain acceptance for any initiatives concerning the region it behoves the Community to tread warily thereby precluding any unnecessary arousing of sensitivities.

In the Middle East as a whole, the State of Israel is one of the few — indeed perhaps the sole — functioning parliamentary democracies analogous to ours. The fact that its government acceded to an official inquiry in the full glare of publicity following the widespread condemnation of its government and military leadership represents, contrary to many of the neighbouring

Blumenfeld

states of the region, true constitutional democracy in the best sense of the word.

Whatever the Community envisages for the region, prerequisites are balance, a good deal of sympathy, and recognition, born of a thorough familiarity with the historical background, that we are dealing with immensely suspicious people in a region which has been marked by an almost continuous state of hostilities over the centuries.

It is not impossible to envisage a scenario in which one day, in the wake of a definitive, all embracing solution for the region, the right of self-determination of the Palestinian Arabs would be reconciled to those of Israeli Jews throughout what was formerly called Palestine in the historical sense. Although not seeing any real point of departure for a new Community Middle East initiative on the basis of our Venice Declaration of 1980 I nevertheless consider that we could not only support the broad outlines of the Reagan Initiative of last September but could even build on it in the future.

I consider the two most important aspects at work in the region at present to be as follows: under the supervision of the United States, direct negotiations are now taking place between the Lebanon and Israel. This is not only of great significance for the future of the Lebanon as an independent sovereign state but leads us inexorably to the crucial question as to whether or not the Lebanon wants to be an independent sovereign state, free to determine its own destiny or will it continue to allow itself, as it has over the past few decades, to bend to the wishes of its Arab neighbours. It is for the Lebanese negotiators to make this clear at the negotiations with Israel in the course of the next few weeks. Having only returned yesterday from a visit to the Lebanon and Israel I believe that there is every reason for optimism for a good beginning.

The second aspect of importance is, I feel, Jordan. Having been heretofore excluded from the Camp David process, a way must now be found to include it as a party to these talks. Similarly the government of Jordan must elaborate the preconditions which would have to be met for an eventual confederacy between Jordan and a Palestinian State or alternatively a common state embracing the Jordanian and Palestinian people. While I was in Israel, a member of the United States Senate had talks with both Premier Begin and King Hussein. The latter was asked whether he would be prepared to join the Camp David follow-up talks in return for a complete withdrawal of Israeli, Syrian and PLO forces from the Lebanon, and a moratorium on Israeli settlement policy in the West Bank. This U.S. Senate has been informed that King Hussein confirmed his willingness to join the Camp David peace process under the foregoing conditions.

Were this to take place the Community could then make a contribution in the form of political, humani-

tarian, economic and financial aid, thereby ultimately ensuring peace and security for all inhabitants of the region.

Mr de Courcy Ling (ED). — Mr President, as I understand it, this is one of the occasions when we offer advice to the Council, as distinct from our normal legislative role in this Parliament of controlling the proposals of the Commission. Therefore the first advice I would give to the governments of the Member States would be to be unanimous. Let us try to return to the unanimity that was achieved in June 1980 at the time of the Venice Declaration.

However, let us at the same time remember that one of the reasons why the Venice Declaration was not the benevolent influence that it might have been on the situation in the Middle East was that our European diplomacy was defective. I was chairman of Parliament's delegation to the Israeli Knesset from July 1979 to February of 1982, and I witnessed myself on a visit to Israel and in two meetings here in Strasbourg with a delegation from Israel that the Israelis genuinely regarded the Venice Declaration as a destabilizing element. They felt that they had not been adequately consulted. We had failed to explain the declaration to them. So my second bit of advice to the Member States is to be not only cohesive and coherent but also more effective in their diplomacy with both sides.

The third piece of advice I would give to the Member States is not to engage too much in short-term economic considerations but to think of the long-term strategic ones. Let us not, for example, link the Fahd plan with investment in Saudi Arabia or even with commerce with Saudi Arabia.

Of course there is always the problem — the continuing problem and the more acute problem as it is now — of the attitude of the Israeli Government. The more that Israel sees itself as a sacred State, the more difficult this Palestinian problem is to resolve. In the long run I am sure that we must be thinking in terms of the secularization of the State of Israel.

The second half of my argument, Mr President, is that 1983 must, I believe, if Europe is to survive, be the year when the process of arms reduction between the Soviet Union, the United States, France and the United Kingdom begins. I hope the Warsaw Pact countries will understand, in the light of their declaration last week, that we Europeans see arms reduction in the general context of an easing of tension between East and West, and it would be inconceivable if we did not take into account the problem of Soviet provocation in the Middle East in that context. The Member States must have in mind not only the problem of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and Soviet tyranny in Poland but also the influence of the Soviet Union over Syria and over the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, despite his ideological persuasion Mr Penders has made a noteworthy attempt at moderation in framing his thoughts on this subject. However, we shall not be supporting his proposals because, in our opinion, he would have the Community follow the road of American policy with the interests of this policy as its guiding criterion. From this standpoint the rapporteur's motion is a trifle outdated. Mr Penders asks us to declare firm attachment to the Camp David agreement at a time when many interpretations are being placed on this agreement, and when recently President Reagan himself gave an interpretation of it incorporating more positive elements than it contained originally.

In consequence we believe there is a call for an independent European initiative on the massive Middle East problem. In addition to resembling a constantly exploding gunpowder magazine this problem is, at the same time, a test for the Community in its relations with the Third World and the Arab countries. The crucial point concerns the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and to set up a state of their own, and secondly, the recognition of the PLO as the legal representative of the Palestinian people. These two elements constitute the crux of the problem, and in my view, if we wish to be realists, we must give them some form of categorical acceptance. In paragraph 7 Mr Penders lays before us proposals that not even a Byzantine monk could have thought up, and in which the right of the Palestinians to self-determination is both recognized and not recognized. When, following

on the world-wide admiration inspired by its resistance to the Israeli invasion, recognition of the PLO constitutes a given fact, when Arafat is received by the Pope and holds discussions with the world's top leaders, it is rather pointless for us to deliberate about which is the authentic representative of the Palestinian people.

With regard to the argument that the PLO does not recognize the state of Israel I feel that it is no longer feasible for us to be led astray by such artifices, and that with coolness and realism we must put together a European initiative capable of attracting the greatest possible support from all sides.

I inform fellow Members — and here I come to the end of my speech, Mr President — that we shall propose returning to the idea of a conference in which Israel, of course, the PLO, interested states in the Middle East, the United States, the Soviet Union, the European Community and representatives of the non-aligned countries would all take part, because we believe that such a coming together of the two great power blocs — whose rivalry influences the development of all events — with the Third World constitutes the only possible solution to the problems of our time.

President. — We must adjourn our debate on the Penders report until tomorrow.

(The sitting was closed at 8 p.m.)¹

¹ Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX

Commission action on opinions on its proposals delivered by the European Parliament at its November and December 1982 part-sessions

This is an account, as arranged with the Bureau of Parliament, of the action taken by the Commission in respect of amendments proposed at the November and December 1982 part-sessions in the framework of parliamentary consultation, and of disaster aid granted.

A. *Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that the Commission has accepted in whole or in part* (November and December 1982 part-sessions)

1. Report by Mr Spencer: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a directive on the information and consultation of workers in undertakings with complex, particularly transnational, structures

In consequence of the position it adopted with regard to the amendments proposed by Parliament at the October part-session, described by Mr Richard at the November part-session, the Commission has begun consultations with all parties concerned with a view to preparing an amended proposal, which will be sent to the Council as soon as possible.

2. Report by Mr Moreau: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a decision empowering the Commission to contract loans for the NCI with a view to promoting investment within the Community.

- (a) The Commission has accepted the amendments which Parliament proposed at the sitting on 16 December 1982 to the proposal for a Council decision on the continuance of the NCI and the provisional nature of the procedure with regard to inclusion of Community borrowings in the budget. It will be amending its proposal to the Council accordingly under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the EEC Treaty.

- (b) The Commission considers that in doing this it has met the request made in Articles 1 and 2 of Parliament's resolution. Concerning the other suggestions to the Commission, it would draw Parliament's attention to the fact that the extent to which it participates in making loans available is now fully adequate after the changes that have been introduced in relation to NCI II. The Commission would also repeat that it attaches particular importance to the financing of productive investment in small and medium-sized undertakings.

3. Report by Mr Ruffolo: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a directive on the supervision of credit institutions on a consolidated basis

Before the end of February the Commission will state its views on Mr Tugendhat's proposal concerning the action to be taken on Parliament's requests, some of which will be accepted. The Commission will inform Parliament and send the Council of Ministers an amended proposal.

4. Report by Mr Tolman: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a directive amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 72/461/EEC with regard to certain measures relating to foot-and-mouth disease, Aujeszky's disease and swine vesicular disease

The Commission has taken note of the amendments proposed to its proposal amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 72/461/EEC with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, swine vesicular disease and Aujeszky's disease. At its meeting on 21 December 1982 the Council adopted a directive extending the exemptions for certain Member States until 31 December 1983. It asked the Commission then to send it a report before that date on the repercussions of

Community rules on trade with outside countries, together with fresh proposals. In preparing the proposals the Commission will take the parliamentary resolution into account.

5. Report by Mr Notenboom: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on:
 - (i) the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (COM(82)412 final) for a regulation (EEC, Euratom, ECSC) amending and extending Regulation (EEC, Euratom, ECSC) No 2892/77 implementing in respect of own resources accruing from value added tax the Decision of 21 April 1970 on the replacement of financial contributions from Member States by the Communities' own resources,
 - (ii) the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (COM(82)316 final) for a regulation (ECSC, EEC, Euratom) amending Regulation (EEC, Euratom, ECSC) No 2891/77 on the replacement of financial contributions from Member States by the Communities' own resources

As it indicated during the debate on 17 December, the Commission will be amending its proposals revising those two regulations in the light of the amendments proposed by Parliament.

B. *Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that the Commission has not felt able to accept*

1. Report by Mr Beumer: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a directive amending Directive 72/464/EEC on taxes other than turnover taxes which affect the consumption of manufactured tobacco

Although the Commission has not felt able to accept the proposed amendments to its proposal, it will take a decision as soon as possible, on the basis of a proposal from Mr Tugendhat, on the action to be taken on the requests set out in the resolution and will inform Parliament accordingly.
2. Report by Mrs Desouches: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a directive amending Directive 81/363/EEC on aid to shipbuilding
 - (a) At its meeting on 21 December 1982 the Council decided that Directive 81/363/EEC should be extended for two years.
 - (b) Although the Commission has not felt able to accept the proposed amendments to its decision, it will bear Parliament's desiderata in mind when preparing and discussing the general paper on industrial policy on shipbuilding.

C. *Commission proposals in respect of which the European Parliament delivered favourable opinions or did not request formal amendment (November and December 1982 part-sessions)*

1. Report by Mrs Carettoni Romagnoli: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a decision laying down general guidelines for 1983 with regard to financial and technical assistance for developing countries

The Commission is pleased that this resolution has been adopted, supporting the guidelines it proposed. It will take the observations made by Parliament in the resolution fully into account.
2. Report by Mr Ruffolo: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the Commission proposal concerning the adoption of the annual report on the economic situation in the Community and laying down economic policy guidelines for 1983

At its third review of the economic situation in the Community, carried out in pursuance of the 'convergence' Decision of 18 February 1974, the Council

of Ministers of Economic and Financial Affairs adopted on 17 December 1982 the decision embodying the annual report on the economic situation in the Community and laying down economic policy guidelines for 1983 on which Parliament had delivered its opinion in the above resolution.

The Commission will keep Parliament informed about any new economic policy proposals it makes to the Council, whether as part of the periodic reviews of the economic situation pursuant to the 'convergence' Decision or on any other suitable occasion. In this way it recently told Parliament, in the President of the Commission's statement to it on 15 December 1982, how the European Council, meeting on 3 and 4 December 1982, wanted to see the Commission's proposals (contained in two communications, on the economic and social situation and on investment) followed up with regard to economic policy action to improve the Community's economic situation.

3. Report by Mr Seefeld: Resolution on the parliamentary consultation procedure on the Commission proposal for a regulation amending Regulations (EEC) Nos 3164/76 and 2964/79 on the Community quota for the carriage of goods by road between Member States

At its meeting on 16 December the Council adopted only part of the Commission proposal, namely that aimed at making the arrangements for converting part of Community authorizations into short-term authorizations permanent. The conversion ceiling was raised from 10 to 15%.

Unfortunately the Council felt it could not endorse any increase in the present quota, in spite of the fact that our proposal was extremely moderate. After this setback the Commission is accelerating its efforts to arrive as quickly as may be at a method for adjusting the quota which will be as widely acceptable as possible within the Community.

4. Report by Mr Papantoniou: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the 11th report of the Commission of the European Communities on competition policy

The Commission gave its general views on the resolution at the debate during the December 1982 part-session. As regards a certain number of points, in particular those relating to questions of procedure and economic studies in given fields, the Commission refers Members to the 12th report which, as usual, will be presented to Parliament during the first quarter of 1983.

5. Report by Mr Veronesi: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a decision concerning a preparatory phase for a Community research and development programme in the field of information technologies

Following Council approval of the decision on the pilot stage of ESPRIT on 21 December 1982, the Commission set to work on this forthwith. Further preparatory work is under way on the main programme, going into the aims, priorities, resources to be made available and other points mentioned in Parliament's resolution in greater detail. Parliament will be consulted on all essential parts of the main programme as they are worked out.

6. Report by Mr Schmid: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the Commission proposal for a decision on a five-year research and development programme on applied metrology and reference materials, non-nuclear indirect project, 1983-87.

On 15 December 1982 the Commission agreed an amendment to the proposal for a five-year research and development programme on applied metrology and reference materials (Decision H/4611/82);

the amendment was submitted by the Commission to the Council under Article 149 (2) EEC on 20 December as Doc. COM(82) 871 final;

the Council by decision of 21 December 1982 adopted an EEC R. & D. programme on applied metrology and reference materials for 1983-87, to a

great extent incorporating the amendment to Article 4 of the initial Commission proposal.

7. Report by Mr Kirk: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC No 765/82 laying down for 1982 certain fish stocks conservation and management measures applicable to vessels flying the Norwegian flag

With respect to the remark mentioned in para 2 of the Resolution, the Commission would point out that Parliament gave its opinion on the Regulation instituting definitive arrangements for Norwegian vessels on 12 March 1982. The amendment in the proposed Regulation here referred to merely increases the herring and pout quotas. To avoid suspension of fishing operations when the initial quotas were used up the Council on 4 October approved interim arrangements.

8. Report by Mr d'Ormesson: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a regulation concluding the agreement between the Government of the Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea and the European Economic Community on fishing off the Guinea coast
9. Report by Mr Enright: Resolution closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a regulation concluding the agreement between the Government of the Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea and the European Economic Community on fishing off the Guinea coast

The Commission will be submitting a report on the implementation of the South-East Atlantic fishery agreements, embodying in particular the points listed in para 3 of the Resolution, as soon as details are to hand of the first two years for which the agreements with Senegal and Guinea-Bissau have been in force. From then on it will report regularly on the implementation of the fishery agreements with the countries in the area.

There is already an FAO East Central Atlantic Fisheries Committee responsible for studying fish stocks management and conservation measures. As this is an FAO body, the Commission can only attend its proceedings in an observer capacity.

The Commission favours the establishment of a separate organization of which it could be a full member: this, however, would necessitate the agreement and financial participation of the coastal States, which appears impossible as matters now stand.

In order to develop a science cooperation policy with the African countries involved, the Community has undertaken in all its agreements with them to part-finance scientific programmes aimed at securing better knowledge of their fishery resources.

D. *Disaster aid provided since the last part-Session*

I. *Emergency aid within the Community*

Denmark	500 000 Ecus for Greenland (severe weather)
France	1 500 000 Ecus for flood victims in south-west
Italy	250 000 Ecus for flood victims in Tuscany
	250 000 Ecus for flood victims in Emilia Romagna

II. *Emergency aid to third countries*

a. *Financial aid*

10 000 000 Ecus for South-East Asia refugees
10 000 000 Ecus for Afghan refugees in Pakistan
5 000 000 Ecus for refugees and displaced persons in Angola

10 000 000 Ecus for refugees and displaced persons in Central America

1 050 000 Ecus for Poland

80 000 Ecus for Spain

1 000 000 Ecus for Yemen (earthquake victims)

300 000 Ecus for Vietnam (victims of Typhoon Nancy)

300 000 Ecus for Mali (drought victims)

75 000 Ecus for Lesotho

b. Food aid

350 tonnes sugar for Sri Lanka

1 500 tonnes beans for Nicaragua

150 tonnes beans	}	for Ugandan refugees in Sudan
+ 150 tonnes vegetable oil		

400 tonnes milk	}	for displaced persons in El Salvador
+ 100 tonnes butteroil		
+ 500 tonnes beans		

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 11 JANUARY 1983

Contents

1. *Approval of the minutes:*
Mr Pannella; Mr Balfe; Mr von der Vring;
Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Bom-
bard; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Sieglerschmidt . . . 34
2. *Welcome* 36
3. *Situation in the Middle East (Doc. 1-786/82)*
(continuation):
Mrs T. Nielsen; Mr Junot; Mr Capanna; Mrs
Charzat; Mr Gontikas; Mr Price; Mr Gal-
luzzi; Mr Nordmann; Mrs Ewing; Mr Alexi-
adis; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mr d'Ormesson;
Mr Prag; Mr Martin; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mrs
Dury; Mr Normanton; Lord O'Hagan; Mr
Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Penders; Mr
Schmid 36
4. *Votes:*
Lady Elles; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Kyrkos; Mr
Gerokostopoulos; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr De
Goede; Mr Forth; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr von
der Vring; Mr Blumenfeld; Lord O'Hagan;
Mr von der Vring; Mr J. B. Nielsen 52
5. *German Presidency (Statement by the Coun-
cil):*
Mr Genscher (Council); Mr Arndt; Mr
Rumor; Lady Elles; Mr Spinelli; Mr Bange-
mann; Mr Lalor; Mr Bøgh; Mr De Goede;
Mr J. Moreau; Mr Klepsch; Mr Møller; Mr
Martin; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Vandemeule-
broucke; Mr Romualdi; Mr Petersen; Mr
Goppel; Mr de Ferranti; Mr Alavanos; Mr
Jurgens; Mr Blaney; Lady Elles; Mr Pesma-
zoglou; Mr Moreland; Mr Croux; Mr Kyr-
kos; Mr Irmer; Mrs Spaak; Mr Genscher . . . 54
6. *Question Time (Doc. 1-1094/82)* 85
 - *Question to the Council:*
Question No 57 by Mr M. Martin:
Taxes on wine:
Mr Genscher (Council); Mr Martin; Mr
Genscher; Mr Martin 85
 - *Question No 58 by Mr Pranchère:*
Long-term multiannual agricultural sup-
ply agreement:
Mr Genscher; Mrs Le Roux; Mr
Genscher; Mr Chambeiron; Mr
Genscher; Mr Welsh; Mr Genscher; Miss
Hooper; Mr Genscher 85
 - *Question No 59 by Mr Konrad Schön:*
Intensified border controls at internal
Community borders:
Mr Genscher; Mr Konrad Schön; Mr
Genscher; Mr Habsburg; Mr Genscher;
Mr Rogalla; Mr Genscher; Mr Anto-
niozzi; Mr Genscher; Mr van Minnen;
Mr Genscher; Mr von Wogau; Mr
Genscher; Mrs von Alemann; Mr
Genscher; Mr Enright; Mr Genscher; Mr
Seligman; Mr Genscher 86
 - *Question No 60 by Mrs Squarcialupi:*
The Council's absence from the joint
debate of 11 and 12 October in Stras-
bourg on the problems relating to unem-
ployment:
Mr Genscher; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr
Genscher; Mr Boyes; Mr Genscher; Mr
Marshall; Mr Genscher; Mr van Min-
nen; Mr Genscher 88
 - *Question No 61 by Mr Lalor: EEC aid
for Belfast housing:*
Mr Genscher; Mr Lalor; Mr Genscher;
Mr J. D. Taylor; Mr Genscher 89
 - *Question No 62 by Mr Flanagan:*
Dumping of wastes at sea, and Question
No 63 by Mrs Weber: Transport of 2
tonnes of toxic waste (dioxin) from Sev-
eso (Italy) to another European country:
Mr Genscher; Mrs Weber; Mr Genscher;
Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Genscher; Mr
Seligman; Mr Rogers; Mr Genscher; Mr
Didò; Mr Genscher; Mr Sherlock; Mr
Genscher; Mr Maher; Mr Genscher; Mrs
Le Roux; Mr Genscher; Mrs Wiczor-
rek-Zeul; Mr Genscher; Mrs Wiczor-
rek-Zeul; Mr Genscher 90
 - *Question No 64 by Mr Habsburg:*
Yugoslav border controls:
Mr Genscher; Mr Habsburg; Mr
Genscher 92
 - *Questions to the Ministers of Foreign
Affairs:*

- Question No 86 by Mrs Lizin: Discovery of mass graves in Argentina:
Mr Genscher (Foreign Affairs Ministers);
Mrs Lizin; Mr Genscher; Mr van Minnen;
Mr Genscher; Mr Marshall; Mr Genscher;
Mr Boyes; Mr Genscher; Mr Hord; Mr Genscher 92
- Question No 87 by Mrs Boserup: Foreign Ministers' cooperation with the Commission within the EPC framework:
Mr Genscher; Mr Boserup; Mr Genscher;
Mr Cousté; Mr Genscher; Mr Alavanos;
Mr Genscher; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Genscher 94
- Question No 88 by Mr Berkhower: French arms supplies to Argentina:
Mr Genscher; Mr Berkhower; Mr Genscher;
Mr Howell; Mr Genscher; Mr Marshall; Mr Genscher 95
- Question No 91 by Mr Didò: Measures to combat international terrorist connections:
Mr Genscher; Mr Didò; Mr Genscher;
Mr van Minnen; Mr Genscher; Mr Alavanos;
Mr Genscher; Mr Habsburg; Mr Genscher 96

Annex:

Mr Papafstratiou; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Battersby; Mr Kallias; Mr Marshall; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Gerokostopoulos; Mr Forth; Mr Nyborg; Mr Cottrell; Mr J. D. Taylor; Mr Hord; Mrs Veil; Mr Galluzzi; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr De Goede; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Israël; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Marshall; Mr Prag; Mr Schmid; Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul 98

PRESIDENT: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

1. Approval of the minutes

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

Are there any objections?

Mr Pannella (CDI). — (FR) Mr President, referring to the inclusion of the report by Mr Sieglerschmidt, page 3 of the Italian version of the minutes reads:

The President proposed that the report should be held over to the next part-session.

I am absolutely certain that he did not say to the next part-session but to a forthcoming part-session.

The minutes continue: *Parliament agreed to this proposal.*

Mr President, I am quite certain that the President proposed that this report should be held over to a forthcoming part-session and not specifically to our next session.

President. — Mr Pannella, I assume that there must be a mistake in the translation or in the final version. You are right and the Bureau accepts your observation. The text should read: 'to a subsequent part-session'. The sense you have must, therefore, be accordingly adapted; Mr Vinci has taken due note.

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, yesterday afternoon I had my attention drawn to an incident in the rue René Cassin, which runs along the canal. I have a picture to substantiate what I am about to say which is that there is a vehicle there with the Luxembourg registration number UW 637 occupied by two members of the staff of this Parliament and plugged into the electricity supply of this Parliament through a first floor window looking out over the rue René Cassin. I would submit, Mr President, that it is highly irregular for the electricity of this building to be plugged into a private caravan where, among other things, a dinner party was taking place at 8 o'clock last night.

I would ask if you could look into this matter with a view to assuring that if our staff must camp, they at least use their own electricity.

President. — I suggest that we look into your allegation and give you an answer later.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, the agenda for this part-session forms part of yesterday's minutes. The draft and this version again omit to point out that the voting on any objections to the urgency of

von der Vring

items must, of course, take place at 3 p.m. on Wednesday.

Perhaps you could record this as a technical addition rather than an amendment to the minutes so that it is not forgotten and we are able to vote.

President. — Mr von der Vring, I have here a French version of the agenda and this voting is included. A clear announcement will therefore be made that the urgency votes will take place at 3 p.m. as you have requested.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President, at 6.15 yesterday evening not one of the 96 amendments to the report on the situation in the Middle East was available. I have not yet checked this morning, but I should like to ask you whether it is appropriate or even feasible for Parliament to vote on these 96 amendments at 12 o'clock today when they may not have been available in all the languages until this morning or even later.

Mrs Scrivener (L). — (FR) I wish to inform you that the amendments to the Penders report are not yet available in French.

President. — Mrs Scrivener, I shall just check to see whether the amendments have still not been distributed in French. I have been assured that everything is all right, but I shall check once again.

Mr Bombard (S). — (FR) Mr President, may I point out to Mrs Scrivener that the amendments are now available in French.

President. — I now come to the points raised by Mr Sieglerschmidt and Mrs Scrivener. Ladies and gentlemen, it was decided — and this is a rule — that amendments to reports, including on this occasion those by Lady Elles and Mr Penders, must be submitted at the latest by Friday noon. A start can then be made on all the work of translation and printing the amendments. You will appreciate, as a result, that a number of amendments in all languages were available only yesterday evening; work went on all through the night and this morning all the amendments are available in all the languages. I repeat 'this morning'. The vote will take place at 12 noon today, if my memory serves me right. You will appreciate that a number of technical difficulties would arise if we set the deadline at Friday noon — that is the latest possible moment for us, for our services — and it may happen, if there is a large number of amendments, that everything is not yet clear on Monday afternoon. We ask you therefore to excuse us. We shall do our best to see that everything is sorted out in good time.

I now therefore ask Parliament, Mr Sieglerschmidt included, to bear with the technical difficulties and not to insist upon these important reports being further delayed, to allow the vote to go through as decided yesterday on the adoption of the agenda. Can I take it that we have no more agenda amendments?

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, with all due respect for your decision, it seems to me that, with over 90 amendments only reaching us this morning, a vote at 12 o'clock is completely out of the question. Why cannot the vote on this important report and the important amendments to it be postponed until this evening or tomorrow morning? I see no reason why this should not be possible. If you insist on the vote on Mr Penders' important report being taken at noon today, you will have chaos on your hands. I must warn you of that. Some of these amendments need to be looked at really very closely. The groups must also have another opportunity to discuss them.

President. — I have every sympathy with Mr Blumenfeld's observation but, ladies and gentlemen, I must point out a problem here. If we have to vote whenever a Member asks for the agenda to be amended, where for instance amendments have been submitted late, we could then have a majority that certainly takes a decision changing the whole agenda. Two months ago that happened three times in a single part-session, with the result that at one point the President of the Council asked himself what he was doing there.

I ask you very emphatically to make as little use as possible of your right to amend the agenda once it has been fixed by Monday noon. At any rate, I shall not take it upon myself to provoke a further vote. But at 12 noon, when the debate is due to begin, you may ask whether we vote or not, and then the President may put the matter to the vote. Please remember that at this moment important groups are assembled elsewhere. I should therefore prefer not to allow the vote on a request for certain reports to be put to the vote at some other time to be taken by a chamber which is not yet sufficiently full. But you can always make this request at 12 noon today.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President, it is not that certain Members are more or less arbitrarily requesting a change to the Rules of Procedure. This situation could have been foreseen by the Secretariat, because if you have 96 amendments on a Friday evening, you must know that they cannot be voted on at 12 noon the following Tuesday.

President. — Agreed, Mr Sieglerschmidt, I was not being personal in any way. You know me well enough

President

to appreciate how much I respect your observations. I will not settle the matter right away. The question is: Are we going to vote at 12 noon today? I would ask the Members of the various groups to be punctual since the decision to be taken is an important one. In any case I would ask you not to amend the agenda.

(Parliament approved the minutes)

2. Welcome

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, it is my great pleasure to welcome representatives of the Latin American and the Andes Parliaments who have taken their seats in the Official Gallery.

This delegation is led by Brazilian Senator Nelson Carneiro (Brazil), President of the Latin-American Parliament, and Mr Raul Baca Carbo (Ecuador), President of the Andean Parliament.

They have come to Strasbourg to take part in the first meeting of the Joint Committee of the European Community/Latin America Six inter-parliamentary Conference, which will be held in Brussels in the coming months.

Once again I extend to them a cordial welcome and offer my best wishes for the success of the forthcoming conference, which we see as being of great significance for good relations between our two continents.¹

3. Situation in the Middle East (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report by Mr Penders on the situation in the Middle East (Doc. 1-786/82)²

(Applause)

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* Mr President, we know from experience that differing views come to the fore in Parliament when we discuss this question. This is something we have seen several times. I should therefore like to say, as spokesman for the Liberal Group, that we feel that the Penders report has arrived at a good and sensibly balanced view. I say this although I am well aware that some finer points may still arise on which not all may be agreed. Some may consider these to be minor points, some may think them major ones.

But the Liberal Group members of the Political Affairs Committee participated in the working out of this proposal and worked to produce a result which was as evenly balanced as we feel it to be necessary on such a sensitive question. It does not mean that we agree on all points. We have therefore tabled some amendments to improve the report still further.

As regards the situation in the Middle East, we must concede that the Ten — whether it be each Member State independently or the Ten as a Community — cannot resolve the situation in the Middle East. We were reminded of that as recently as last Friday, when President Gemayel of Lebanon said that the reconstruction of Lebanon depended first and foremost on the action of the United States. In December last year we had a debate here in Parliament on the initiative of my colleague from the Liberal Group, Mr Donnez, as a result of which we asked the Member States to support France and Italy in the peace-keeping force in Lebanon. What we asked in the resolution was that more Community aid should be made available to the Lebanese and Palestinian victims of the conflict. We must be quite honest, and it is no use cherishing false hopes, for we know full well that, in spite of our endeavours, the peace which we all want in the Middle East will not be re-established with the efforts we make here alone.

I think it is important to make clear that it is up to the countries of the Middle East in the first instance and to the peoples who live there, the peoples who carry the responsibility, to create the real, genuine and lasting peace. But the United States plays a vital role here, partly because the USA is a major power and partly because of the USA's special relationship with Israel. But even the United States could not alone have achieved the peace agreements we got between Egypt and Israel, if it had not been for the imagination, courage and realism shown by President Sadat in the negotiations with Begin. For us it was a stirring experience two years back to listen to President Sadat here in Parliament.

As I have said, the Liberal Group has tabled some amendments designed to improve the report still further, but one of the reasons why we feel that there is something very important in this report is that it lays such clear emphasis on the value of the Camp David agreements. One may of course take the view that the Camp David agreements do not go far enough, but they must form the basis on which further negotiations are to take place, and we feel that it is very important for us Europeans to speak with one voice. The way to peace and justice for the Palestinians, the way to security for all the States in the region and the way to the protection of Europe's legitimate economic interests and cultural concerns in the Middle East lies only through negotiations. These negotiations must not be aimed solely at securing a ceasefire, they must have the clear objective of establishing normal relations between Israel and its neighbours. It would therefore

¹ Membership of Committees — Topical and urgent debate (Announcement): See Minutes.

² See previous day's Debates.

Nielsen

be particularly unwise for those in Parliament who call themselves true friends of the Arabs and, in particular, the Palestinians, to seek to support the Palestinians in their misguided policies. For up to now the PLO has not shown any wish for genuine negotiations or a willingness to renounce its declared aims, which emerge very clearly in the PLO Convention.

As recently as a few days ago, King Hussein of Jordan and PLO leader Yasser Arafat discussed the possibility of a joint acceptance of President Reagan's proposal of September last year, and once again Arafat repeated his intention to continue waging war against Israel. If Arafat, who purports to represent a group of the population in this area of the Middle East, really thinks that peace must be achieved, he must understand that there is only one way, and that is through negotiation. All that has to do with war must be completely set aside, and that must be said absolutely clearly and unequivocally.

Declarations of support from certain Europeans for the PLO's wrong-headed policies not only make things difficult for the more moderate but also make the situation as a whole far more dangerous. We have seen it, because people who really wanted to make a personal contribution to bringing about peace, sadly, have been murdered. We have a number of examples going back to the time around 1951, when King Hussein's grandfather was murdered. We saw it in 1981, when Sadat was murdered. This reminds us how dangerous it can still be to become personally involved in bringing about peace in the Middle East.

It is therefore important for us in the democratic countries of Western Europe to do what we can to encourage peaceful dialogues, peaceful negotiations, in order to achieve peace and to have done with the insane murders such as have taken place. I will close by saying, as chairman of the Israel delegation: there are few democratic countries in the world. In the Middle East there is only one, Israel. We in the European Parliament also represent a European, democratically elected institution; that is why it is so important that we in the democratic countries and institutions continue to have a dialogue. That is why we in the Liberal Group have the whole time worked so hard to maintain the link with the Israeli parliament, because it is the only way we can express the attitudes we have. We must keep the dialogue going, we must have discussions with democratically elected representatives. We are therefore glad, Mr President, that in a month's time we shall be meeting representatives of the Israeli parliament in order to present our views and to listen to the views obtaining over there. It is through dialogue that we shall make progress. That is the way we can make our contribution to peace in the Middle East.

Mr Junot (DEP). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for fifty years the Middle East has been

one of the most intensive focal points of agitation in the world. Situated at the junction between Europe and Asia, between the Mediterranean world and the Persian Gulf, between west and east, this region, which is held sacred by three of the world's main religions is close to energy sources that are essential to the modern economy and the cradle of related peoples who are separated by their faith; for these and other reasons it has been the scene of internal conflicts and is watched over closely by the great powers.

The tragic and bitter struggle between the Arabs and the Jews has brought constant bloodshed to Palestine and, for the past ten years, has led the unfortunate and peaceful country of Lebanon into the same conflict. The European Community which was established by a treaty whose preamble requires its members to do everything in their power to safeguard peace and freedom, cannot stand aside from the fate of the Middle East to which it is linked by so many historical, spiritual, cultural and economic ties. Scarcely a part-session of this Assembly goes by without us being called upon in one way or another to give our attention to this major problem for world peace and the defence of human rights.

The report which Mr Penders has tabled today on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee is being discussed at a time when the signs of civil war are again making their appearance in Lebanon: confrontation between Christians and Druze elements, installation of new Syrian rockets of Soviet origin in the Beeka, assassinations in Tripoli. The members of the PLO who have not moved out of the country are profiting from these events to resume their attacks on the Israeli troops. The infernal circle seems on the point of beginning again. The only way of putting an end to this terrible recrudescence of violence is to continue the negotiations between Israel and Lebanon under American guidance.

As is quite rightly pointed out in the Penders' report these negotiations should lead in the first place to the evacuation of Lebanese territory by all the foreign forces — Syrian, Palestinian and Israeli — and secondly to the complete restoration of Lebanese sovereignty whose territory must no longer be used as a base for aggression against Israel. The process of peace embarked upon in Camp David must be continued relentlessly. Very promising results have been obtained through the Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty. The Hebrew State is now at peace with the largest country of the Arab world. Any European initiative must follow the Camp David line and take account of the existence of the Reagan plan founded on the two following principles: respect for the political sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States in the region, leading to their mutual recognition set down in a formal treaty guaranteed by the United Nations Security Council; self-determination for the Palestinian people under a procedure compatible with the fundamental right of Israel to exist — an elementary

Junot

right which the PLO is unfortunately still refusing to recognize.

The Palestinian problem became pressing when the domination of the Ottoman empire ended and the British mandate was established over this territory in 1922. In fact there are two Palestinian States: Jewish Palestine and Arab Palestine. Arab Palestine has found its constitutional form in the Kingdom of Jordan. King Hussein who wrote in 1967 that the PLO was nothing more than a political movement of socialist origin set up to foment trouble in royalist Jordan and submit all Palestinians to its authority, finally waged a war on them in the autumn of 1970 to expel the members of the PLO from his territory. At that time Yasser Arafat and his friends settled in Lebanon and turned that peaceful country into the base for launching their permanent hostile activities on Israel. The agreement signed in Camp David between Israel and Egypt gave reason to hope that the Arab world would accept the basis of peaceful coexistence with Israel. But, under pressure from the PLO, that did not happen and the troubles only continued. The angered Israelis pursued the assailants on Lebanese territory and joined the Syrians in occupying that country.

The most important task now is to ensure that all foreign troops evacuate the Lebanese territory and that its territorial integrity and independence are guaranteed by an international force in which the Community countries should take part. Once this first aim has been achieved and peace and freedom have been restored to unhappy Lebanon, we shall still have the eternal problem of the coexistence of Israel and the Arab countries and of guaranteeing frontiers which, with the sole exception of that formed by the river Jordan, are all artificial. Only negotiations conducted under the joint authority of the United States and western Europe have any prospect of leading to a settlement which will ensure the existence and security of Israel and provide a homeland for all Palestinians. How can we fail to understand the persistent anxiety of the people of Israel who see that whenever a step seems to be on the point of being taken towards an understanding and peaceful settlement, whenever the moderate Arab leaders seem to be moving towards negotiation, a fresh drama occurs like the assassination of President Sadat or more recently that of President Bechir Gemayel. Once again in the past few days when fresh hope for effective negotiation capable of bringing about the resurgence of an independent, peaceful Lebanon had arisen, attacks and aggression have redoubled in intensity.

Europe must unite its efforts with those of America to contribute to a negotiated agreement on Lebanon and also for Israel and the Palestinians. The task is enormous and the difficulties innumerable, but the stake is so great that our efforts must never be slackened. We are ready to vote in favour of most of the ideas contained in the motion for a resolution by Mr Penders. However, to remove any ambiguity concerning the

PLO, we should like to see a more precise and tighter wording of paragraphs 9 and 10 of the motion for a resolution; that wording could however still be very close to the present text. With that aim in mind our group proposes the replacement of these two paragraphs by the following single sentence: 'The European Parliament considers it vital for Israel and the people of Palestine who have the right to decide for themselves by whom they are to be represented, to open negotiations and embark upon a process of mutual acceptance and recognition; the PLO cannot be recognized, however, as a legitimate participant in the negotiations until all the paragraphs in its charters explicitly or implicitly advocating the destruction of Israel have been officially deleted'.

(Applause)

Mr Capanna (CDI). — *(IT)* Mr President, Mr Penders may well have made an effort to be objective, but in politics facts are what counts, not efforts or intentions.

This draft resolution is disturbing in the context of the complex situation in the Middle East: it is illogical, and above all it does not reflect a genuine desire for peace. I will take one example: in the Political Affairs Committee both the rapporteur and the centre-right majority stubbornly refused to allow the UN General Assembly's resolutions on the Middle East to be mentioned together with those adopted by the UN Security Council.

Mr President, I believe you will agree with me that for this Parliament to pick and choose among the UN resolutions on the Middle East is a very strange proceeding. Such an attitude is factitious; to tell the truth, Arafat was more fair-minded when he signed the document submitted to him by the American delegate Mc Closkey, for he referred to all the UN resolutions on the Middle East and not to only a few, as did Mr Penders.

From its birth in 1948 to the present, the State of Israel has ignored some 170 UN resolutions — this is an undeniable historical fact. If the UN is the only forum of international law, which at present appears to be the case, then it follows that Israel is violating the law of the international Community.

In the complex and dangerous situation in the Middle East, Europe can play a vital role as an active force for peace. Europe can do much, whether in connection with the Reagan plan or in the light of the Arab plan drawn up at the most recent summit in Fez.

Yesterday all members of Parliament received a statement from the PLO office in Brussels which focuses on precisely this point: the need for Europe, and this Parliament in particular, to provide active and intelligent mediation in the context of both the Reagan and

Capanna

the Arab plans. I will say more: why does not Europe provide facilities for direct negotiations between Israel and the PLO, preferably here in Strasbourg? This would have a great moral and political significance, and it would naturally include the participation of the United States, the Soviet Union, and the countries of the Arab League.

We are now to discover whether the majority of this Parliament is made up of allies of President Reagan or of true partisans of peace.

In paragraph 7, the Penders resolution mentions the possible creation of a Palestinian State. We cannot make peace on the basis of possibilities, however — only on the basis of certainties. The Penders resolution is a classic example of the use of a double standard. The Palestinians are not the ones who are creating danger and tension in the Middle East; it is the enemies of the Palestinians who are doing this, preventing them from enjoying their legitimate right of self-determination and continually endangering the peace in the Middle East, in the Mediterranean area, and throughout the world.

Mr President, I have already declared in this Parliament that we must oppose all forms of anti-Semitism, whether directed against the Jews or against the Palestinians, who are also a Semitic people. As it now stands, the Penders resolution is anti-Semitic precisely because it gives no concrete recognition of the Palestinians' right to determine their own destiny and to create their own autonomous State.

The few amendments I have presented represent the wisdom which Europe and this Parliament must employ in dealing with the situation in the Middle East. If these amendments are not approved, I have no choice but to vote against the Penders resolution.

Mrs Charzat (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as I see it, the State of Israel, the Arab States and the people of Palestine are all victims of the past, victims of the terrible history of our century in which racism and colonialism have intermingled. That is why the Israeli-Arab conflict is not a conventional conflict but one between two rights: the right of Israel to security and to the means of existence, and the right of the Palestinian people to cease being treated as refugees and instead to be seen as the people which are entitled to a homeland, to a State on the West Bank and in Gaza.

The use of force has done nothing to promote the coexistence of these two rights in the Middle-East since the Israeli-Arab war of 1948. A dialogue between the parties to the conflict is vital to usher in an era of peace.

The European Parliament can contribute to this through the remarkable report by Mr Penders. The

first overture for peace came from the Arab world in 1977. The latest Fez Summit which came after major initiatives from the Arab world for peace, proves that the Arab States are ready for a dialogue and ready for total peace. In the case of Israel, the Camp David agreements, the Israeli-Egyptian Treaty and the return of Sinai to Egypt underline the fact that a dialogue can be opened. Today in Israel and in the Arab States, pressure from the masses is stronger than ever in favour of a policy of development, independence and peace. We must therefore view the problems of the Middle East in terms other than those of the cold war.

The motion for a resolution by Mr Penders which I fully support lays emphasis on three main aspects of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Firstly, fresh negotiations for peace between Israel and the Palestinians are imperative. Secondly, territorial extension, annexation and the creation of new settlements are unacceptable in international law. Israel will not obtain the security to which it is entitled through the use of force and the creation of a *fait accompli*. The solution lies in the right of nations to live in peace, and in security within safe and recognized frontiers.

Bearing in mind that absolute principle I must now mention Lebanon. France and the European Council condemned the Israeli aggression last June and July on a nation whose independence, integrity, unity and sovereignty are sacred. All foreign forces must be withdrawn from Lebanon including the Israeli forces. Lebanon has been the martyr of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

As regards the Golan Heights, Israel has not only occupied Syrian territory, but decided to annex it as an integral part of its own territory. The people of Syria who look back on a glorious past cannot accept that *fait accompli*. The overall peace settlement must include the return of the Golan Heights to Syria.

Thirdly, the settlements on the West Bank and in Gaza, the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, are awaiting a definitive statute. However, according to Resolution 242 and under the terms of the Camp David agreement, the occupied territories do not fall under the sovereignty or permanent control of Israel. The policy of settlement pursued by Israel is based on the concept of annexation. However, neither the terrible war fought last summer against the PLO in Lebanon nor the unjust administrative policy pursued against the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, succeeded in eliminating the unanimous aspiration of the Palestinians to a State and a homeland on their own territory on the West Bank and in Gaza.

Two fundamental points in the Penders report must be clarified. The first is that the Palestinian people whose legitimate rights were recognized by Camp David and in President Reagan's speech last September, must be given full autonomy.

Charzat

As President Mitterrand pointed out in the Knesset, the Palestinians have the right to decide their own destiny. Free elections in the West Bank and in Gaza must lead to self-determination and independence. As President Mitterrand pointed out the Arab inhabitants of the West Bank must have a homeland because no one can be asked to renounce his identity and rightful place. Why should we be hypocritical or incomplete on this point?

The second point — peace negotiations leading either to a federation or to a confederation between Jordan and the Palestinians — implies that the Palestinians must be given a place at the negotiating table. It is well known that a very large majority of Palestinians in the West Bank and in Gaza would favour a Jordan/Palestine federation. That aim presupposes that the PLO will make a clear choice between the political and military options. Contrary to the latest declarations by the President of the PLO in Algeria, suggesting that the PLO should step up its military opposition, I am convinced that only an evolution in the PLO towards mutual recognition is capable of opening a serious dialogue for peace. In that respect the Franco-Egyptian resolution constitutes a pendant to Resolution 242. It confirms the national rights of the people of Palestine — who are more than a disparate grouping of refugees to be represented in peace negotiations. It calls for mutual and simultaneous recognition of all the parties involved.

By endorsing the Franco-Egyptian resolution, the European Parliament, through the motion for a resolution contained in the Penders report, can exert strong pressure on the UN Security Council and contribute to the progress of the peace negotiations.

Let us hope that the Palestinian people will at long last make their voice heard in diplomatic peace negotiations. Let us hope that coexistence will be established between the State of Israel and the future Palestinian State. Those are my aspirations for the European Parliament.

Mr Gontikas (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, I wish to congratulate our colleague, Mr Penders, on his work which is, however, so endowed with historical detail that it is doubtful if it is suitable for a brief debate. Moreover, in many aspects, the conclusions of the report, which are based on certain given political and military facts, have been overtaken by events. The historical part of the report is so copious that the reader is frequently cast into doubt about the utility of what is proposed in the draft resolution. Mr Penders has tried to maintain an impartial stance and to reconcile the differing points of view that exist on the issue of the Middle East. However, I fear that in attempting to do thus he loses his feel for balance and is carried astray by a more general climate of pro-Arab opinion hence creating the impression that his report carries a clear political bias against Israel. I am afraid that, in this res-

pect — given that it will form the basis on which the Council will develop its Middle East policy during the new presidency — the report is deficient and does not accurately reflect the political will of the majority in this Parliament. In my opinion, Mr President, this political will, which does, in fact, etch out Community policy, can be summarized as supporting the following points which, regrettably, are not mentioned in the report.

First: the formulation and implementation of a joint Community policy on the Middle East.

Second: the treatment of all States in that area on an equal basis.

Third: strict adherence to the Camp David agreements and to any eventual outcome of talks which have begun between Lebanon and Israel.

Fourth: recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

Fifth: recognition of the need to establish, and provide safeguards for, a Palestinian State.

Sixth: a declaration by the Community that it refuses to accept any intervention whatsoever in this area by the Soviet Union.

Seventh: recognition of Israel's right to protect and defend its territorial integrity.

I believe, Mr President, that the points I have just mentioned, or some of them at least, should have been included in paragraph 12 of the draft resolution. But the chief criterion, which the rapporteur omits to stress, is that any decision whatsoever taken by the Council must be unanimous. This is necessary if there is to be any hope of shaping a Community policy on the Middle East.

I agree absolutely with what the report says concerning Israel's withdrawal from occupied territories, but I cannot help reflecting, Mr President, on the short-sightedness of the report in failing to recognize that military intervention by Israel was preceded by events and actions of such a nature as to make the establishment of this presence necessary for Israel's survival. As such this intervention differed from the brutal invasion of Cyprus by Attila, and the Turkish occupation of part of the island, about which our rapporteur saw fit to say nothing, despite the fact that Cyprus belongs to the same geographical area and has an association with the Community.

I do not believe there is anyone in this Chamber who disagrees with the concept of a Palestinian State.

The Palestinians have every right to a piece of land where they can raise their children, practise their religion and die peacefully.

Gontikas

However, good faith demands also that the Palestinians recognize Israel's right to survival. Consequently, Mr President, every declaration to the contrary, such as that contained in the Palestine Liberation Organization's Charter calling explicitly for the destruction of the State of Israel, finds me personally in opposition. For this reason, beyond doubt, the Palestinians themselves must decide freely if they really agree with what the Palestine Liberation Organization has done so far. I consider this to be an essential prerequisite to any further attempt at finding a peaceful solution. In this sense paragraph 10 of the draft resolution contradicts paragraph 9, and I for one disagree with the way it is drafted. Finally, I disagree with what the rapporteur says in paragraph 14 of the resolution. The adoption of an *ad hoc* resolution on Israel will, while complicating matters, in no way help towards a peaceful solution. It will complicate matters because other countries, which have already achieved distinction in the field of violent expansionism, will remain unsanctioned, and instead of themselves being in the dock they will enjoy the privileged position of prosecutor.

Our efforts, Mr President, should not extend to having yet another unenforceable resolution by the Security Council or the UN General Assembly.

But we must try to devise a solution which, if accepted, will ensure the greatest possible stabilization of peace for the population of that area.

Finally, I am in agreement with all the sentiments expressed in the resolution concerning peace, coexistence and economic aid. However, in noting the developments in this area over the last five years I must dwell on two points.

Firstly, on the fact that in the Middle East at present Europe is engaged in a struggle on four fronts: political, cultural, economic and religious. In this struggle its natural allies are neither the atheists nor the Muslims. Let us not forget, colleagues, that what binds different peoples most closely together is not oil but the sacrifice of blood. And over the years Europe has shed a lot of its blood in this area in order to leave the way free for others to dispute its possession at the present time.

Secondly, there can be no successful peaceful solution without an American guarantee. In view of this it would be a mistake if, forgetting the Camp David agreement, we aspired after Utopian solutions or embarked on other kinds of plan. Unfortunately, Mr President, history teaches that it is the victor who sets the price of peace.

The rapporteur neglected to tell us who the victor is in the Middle East. This too is a sign of the times. But in the thoughts of all men there can be nothing other than justification for the struggle of an independent State which for years now has been fighting an unde-

clared war against terrorism, violence and the backwardness of the East.

(Applause)

Mr Price (ED). — Mr President, since the original conflict ended in 1949 there have been four further wars between Israel and its Arab neighbours — that is one every seven years. I ask the question: how much longer does all this have to go on? How many more thousands of lives have to be lost before ultimately there is a settlement?

All parties see important issues of principle at stake. If we look at the history of the world we know that many lives have been lost down the centuries for points of principle — very important points of principle. But in most of those cases in the end many of those principles have been found to be a lot less important, a lot less essential than they seem to be at the outset. Unfortunately, that recognition usually comes after far too many lives have been lost.

The relationship between Europe and the Middle East is close and important. It is an economic relationship as well as a political one. So it is not possible for us to stand aside and the parties will not let us do so. I believe we have a role to play. Part of the help which we can give is to apply pressure on both of them, mainly through the attitude that we express towards the conflict in the area. I think there are three important things which we should be saying.

The first is that there must be talks; no excuses — talk! If we want to get a peaceful solution, that by definition means there must be agreement and you cannot get agreement unless all the relevant parties are talking to each other. So talks are fundamental and that is why I welcome paragraph 10 of this resolution which 'considers it essential for Israel and the Palestinian people, including the PLO, to hold talks with each other and to initiate a process leading to mutual acceptance and recognition'.

The second thing that we should be saying is that there should be no preconditions in those talks because otherwise the parties will simply never get to the conference table. For that reason I would oppose paragraph 9 in the text that we have before us which seeks to include as a precondition that the PLO remove from its charter all paragraphs calling explicitly or implicitly for the destruction of Israel.

The deletion of words in a charter amounts to a precondition which is fruitless because we know that the governing body of the PLO have indicated that they are prepared to enter into talks which would end with the recognition of Israel — we know that, they have made it clear. So talk of doing it in a particular *form* by the removal of words in a charter is a quite unnecessary precondition and we should remove that from our resolution.

Price

The third element, I believe, should be the emphasis on self-determination, which I find in paragraph 7, the fourth part of it, which talks about self-determination for the Palestinian people. I believe that that is an important principle, both in terms of the principle of democracy, which we in the European Community subscribe to, and also on the basis of realism because, if any solution is to stick, it must represent the views of the people of the area and what they are prepared to accept.

So for those reasons I believe that the important principles are capable of being expressed in our resolution. What that approach means is in my view even-handedness. It means that the Arabs, and the Palestinians in particular, must recognize that Israel exists and that its existence is permanent. The point is simple and much progress has been made in getting it accepted.

On the other hand, the Israelis must recognize that the PLO is the only credible existing body able to represent the Palestinian people.

Jordan will have an important part to play, I have no doubt, in an eventual political solution. But it cannot be the sole negotiator for the Palestinians and it has rejected that role being thrust upon it. So talks between the PLO and Israel, I believe, are essential. I recognize that this is a very sensitive issue for Israel and highly emotive because of the association of the PLO with terrorism.

But this objection is quite unrealistic. First, if we just look at history round the world in general we know that people who have led terrorist bodies have ultimately gained recognition. Indeed, we can look to the Middle East and see as a prime example that Begin himself has gained the Nobel Peace Prize. What could be more of a reversal of fortune than that? So the fact is that those who lead terrorist movements in the end are very often accepted.

The second thing is that in the light of the invasion of Lebanon by Israel, it surely cannot be seriously suggested that Israel is more peaceful in its methods than the PLO.

And, finally, what other option has the PLO than to involve itself in terrorism? There is no real alternative realistic option.

So, Mr President, I would sum up by saying: this is a relatively small territory but it has got to be big enough for both the peoples who aspire to it. The sooner they move to negotiation the sooner we will get the peaceful settlement that we all desire.

Mr Galuzzi (COM). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this debate on Mr Penders' resolution comes at a crucial moment for the Middle East. It comes at a time when Beirut is cut off, despite the

commitments made by the government in Tel Aviv and the negotiations for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon, and this factor is prejudicial to a true and peaceful solution of the whole Middle East problem. At Tripoli in the north fighting has been going on for ten days: the massacres and the destruction, which seemed to be only a tragic memory, have once again become a hideous reality.

It is said that these clashes are the product of religious and factional conflicts. In reality, they reflect the opposing interests and strategies of the forces involved, and they demonstrate the continued existence of a will to settle problems not by peaceful negotiations but rather by the use of force. This is a dangerous situation, Mr President, one which jeopardizes peace for this region and for the world; it weakens the foundations of any possible settlement.

The causes of this situation, as maintained by Parliament and stated in the Penders resolution, are comprehensive, but they are primarily represented by what has been called the 'double refusal': that is, the refusal of both Israelis and Palestinians to extend mutual recognition to their respective realities, to acknowledge the existence of Israel and the existence of the Palestinian people and their right to a homeland.

We do not agree with this balanced and general allocation of blame, not because we are unaware of the errors and the responsibilities of the Arab nations and peoples, but because we believe that Israel is still more culpable, due to its acts of aggression and to the horrible massacres for which it is politically and morally responsible, atrocities which aroused democratic public opinion around the world and within the Israeli democracy itself.

Israel is thus the source of the strategy which aims at a peace attained by force, based on tanks and bombers.

We do not agree with this allocation of blame because it is impossible to consider the Palestinian people as protagonists, with the State of Israel, in a peace process. The Palestinian people are politically and militarily represented by the PLO, which is now recognized by 119 countries and which constitutes Israel's true and only interlocutor.

If this reality is ignored, efforts to work out a peaceful negotiated solution will be undermined, and a rupture, followed by more intensive fighting, will be the result. The central problem remains that of mutual recognition on the part of Israel and the PLO.

This problem can only be solved gradually, through a series of political choices paving the way for the attainment of this objective. The first step in this process can only be made by Israel, which must respect the conditions imposed upon it by the UN and public opinion around the world and within Israel itself. It must withdraw its troops from Lebanon and from the

Galuzzi

occupied territories, abandon the policy of creating settlements on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and demonstrate its readiness to examine a peace plan.

This is what must be done now, and it is to this end that we must direct our efforts, not arguing over the validity of the Camp David agreements, whose limitations have been recognized by the Americans themselves, but with the understanding that we have reached a new phase which demands bold new initiatives. Our efforts should not be mere gestures; rather they should goad the Community into taking decisive and independent action to bring about a political settlement involving all the parties concerned; a political settlement based on the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. This recognition should constitute the key to the solution of the problem, legitimate in itself, of the security of the State of Israel, as is acknowledged in the Reagan plan as well.

Two years ago, in Venice, the Council of Ministers took a step in the right direction. Subsequently the impulse died under the pressure exerted by Kissinger and the fear of upsetting the plans and the strategic balance favoured by the Americans.

This impulse could be reborn today; changes in the situation and in American policy, the new positions delineated in respect of the PLO make it possible, provided that the will to take up an independent position exists. Despite its numerous and sometimes glaring contradictions, we perceive this will in Mr Penders' report.

We hope that this overall political approach will be expressed in the definitive wording of the resolution, and that it will be supported by the majority of this Parliament.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

Mr Nordmann (L). — (FR) Mr President, I think that the report now before use poses to a far greater degree than most other documents, the problem of the extent to which the European Parliament can make a contribution to such a complex and involved problem as the Middle Eastern conflict.

I am afraid that the wish to satisfy or at least to give moral satisfaction to the greatest possible number of participants in the conflict is liable to confuse or at the very least will not help significantly to clarify that conflict which we unfortunately lack the power to resolve. We shall not succeed in clarifying the most passionate issue of the century by merely juxtaposing complex, disparate and often contradictory facts. We must on the contrary indicate our preferences and make a choice.

Leaving aside the explanatory statement in this report, I think that we must lay emphasis on a fundamental

cleavage which underlies this conflict: the gulf between those who want coexistence between the Jews and the Arabs and those who reject the principle of that coexistence. Last month in Paris the PLO representatives stated: 'We shall never recognize Israel.' More recently, Arafat reaffirmed the perpetuity of the military option. Neither the Fahd Plan nor the Fez Summit have really changed the refusal by the Arab countries apart from Egypt, to accept Israel's right to exist and, let us not forget, that refusal forms the basis of the Middle East conflict. We cannot pursue opposing aims; we cannot proclaim the right of Israel to exist while at the same time giving a semblance of international honour to those very forces which are seeking to destroy Israel.

The security of the Jewish State is important to us because of the responsibility which Europeans bear towards a people who escaped from the holocaust. But we are particularly attached to Israel because it is the only, I repeat the only, democratic State in the Middle East and the latest events are there to underline that fact with vigour and eloquence. To be effective, the security of Israel must be founded on a tangible base which naturally excludes an outright return to the armistice lines which prevailed until 1967 and were highly insecure, as experience amply confirmed.

The Israelis have proved their readiness to accept great sacrifices including territorial sacrifices, in return for recognition and peace. The success of the Camp David agreements is there to show that for the first time in history the military victors made a material sacrifice in the cause of peace. The courageous response by President Sadat to the various initiatives taken by successive governments in Jerusalem, the Camp David agreements and the Washington Treaty would have warranted more positive support from Europe. These initiatives showed that there is only one path to peace; the path of mutual recognition and direct dialogue. What we must do today is to prolong the results of the Camp David agreements and extend them to the other countries in the Middle East. We must surely hope that the negotiations which have recently been opened between Israel and Lebanon will emerge rapidly on a peace settlement, and a formal treaty given that no territorial dispute divides the two countries.

The problem of the Palestinian Arabs must be approached in the same spirit; this problem can only be solved through a direct dialogue between the parties involved, a direct dialogue between the Jewish Palestinian State and the Arab Palestinian State. We are only too prone to forget one fact which seriously distorts the issue — the fact that an independent and sovereign Palestinian Arab State already exists in the shape of Jordan — as several speakers have already emphasized; today Jordan shares with Israel the territory of Palestine which used to be entrusted to a British mandate. I must draw your attention to the fact that one major shortcoming in the report by Mr Penders is its failure to mention Jordan a single time.

Nordmann

Given that a Palestinian Arab State already exists next to Israel, the creation of a further Palestinian State might be felt by some observers — and we can easily understand their point of view — to be at the cost of Israel and not alongside Israel. A direct dialogue must therefore be opened rapidly between the two Palestinian States, between Israel and Jordan. Europe would be pursuing a worthy cause if it facilitated and favoured that dialogue; but it must refrain from giving moral lessons which often merely hide its interest in oil supplies. It must also avoid an attempt at false symmetry based on a misguided complex of Solomon.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Mr President, I congratulate Mr Penders on all his work and on his sincerity, but like many speakers I have a few points of dispute with the report.

First of all, I must make it clear I cannot go along with the rapporteur in his insertion of the Venice declaration as a useful contribution. I think it has to some extent destroyed the issue, because it suggested that the PLO should be a party to negotiations quite clearly at a time when they were pledged that the State of Israel should be destroyed.

I cannot go along at all with Mr Price's rather extraordinary question to this Chamber: what alternative is there to terrorism? In a world where it seems that everyone has to be kind to the PLO, I think it must be stated that they are the people who taught the world international terrorism, and for that no one can admire their contribution to mankind. It is very odd, is it not, that the very Arab States that financed the PLO were on the whole so reluctant to take them in after the recent expulsion from Lebanon. If they admire them so much, would you not have thought that they would have been clamouring to help their heroes?

Recently, I visited Lebanon in common with many members of this Chamber. I met Bashir Gemayel, and the family that has been in feud with him, and had an opportunity to hear at first hand from eye-witnesses of towns and villages in Lebanon that were destroyed, of children killed by their thousands, but the world was strangely silent: apparently it is alright if the PLO does it but it is very different if anyone else commits acts of bloodletting. There are no shades in bloodletting, but it does seem that a certain degree of hypocrisy has come into the media, and sometimes to this House too in its pronouncements, where the PLO is concerned. In the north of Israel there have been constant invasions, and again villages have been destroyed and children killed there. The Lebanese I met certainly wanted to be rid of the PLO first and foremost and of the Syrians next — and I dare say of the Israelis as well.

We should all be looking for a solution to this, because then we might see the emergence of another democratic State to join the one that is already there — Israel. I agree very much with the remarks of the

last speaker — without rehearsing them — and I think that the omission of Jordan from this report is another matter on which I must take issue.

(Applause)

Mr Alexiadis (NI). — (GR) Mr President and colleagues, although the report by Mr Penders on the situation in the Middle East is very thoroughgoing it could be said that it deals with the matter in a narrow and schematic sort of way by confining the whole problem within the bounds of the Arab-Israel conflict and ignoring several other potentially explosive issues which are equally as dangerous as this, if not more so. It disregards the conflict between Iran and Iraq, the prolonged occupation of the territory of the Cyprus Republic by foreign forces and the enforced refugee status of 200 000 of its inhabitants, the genocidal slaughter suffered by the Armenian people which remains unforgotten to the present day, and the genocide of the Kurdish people currently in progress. Judicial circles in Ankara revealed some days ago that the government Commissioner of the military tribunal at Digiarbekir, which is trying 375 members of the Kurdish Labour Party on charges connected with the struggle for autonomy, is seeking the death penalty for 186 of those charged. This is the fifth trial of Kurds with Turkish citizenship since September 1980, when military rule was imposed — or rather declared openly — in Turkey, and since then more than 2 500 Kurds have been tried or are awaiting trial by the military tribunals at Digiarbekir and Erzerum on charges connected with the struggle for autonomy.

It is obviously in the interest of the European Ten to work for a settlement in the Middle East, and the European Parliament is capable of and should point out a complete series of steps and a plan of action covering all the crucial problems of the area. The creation of a Palestinian homeland would, of course, be first among these steps, together with, however, recognition by the Arab world of Israel's right to exist. Only thus can an end be brought to this quarrel between first cousins, the descendants of Shem, which is so unremitting precisely because it is between people of the same kin. The persistence of the Palestine Liberation Organization in sticking to its original extreme position, and much more so any chance resumption of former terrorist activity, not only impedes — and in the latter case would impede — a solution to the problem, but also serves to alienate champions of the Palestinian cause who are motivated by the sympathy which it is natural for men who are free to feel towards a people struggling for national independence. The provocative actions of the Israelis in recent years and their harsh measures against the people in the occupied Arab territories have led many people to the belief that all the blame lies with them. However, an unbiased examination of the issue obliges us to accept that the other side also bears responsibility. If only the Balfour declaration had not been made, and the

Alexiadis

persecution of the Jews in Nazi-held Europe, which made it necessary for the fugitives to seek a national home of their own, had not occurred. But what is done cannot be undone. Nevertheless, when in 1947 the United Nations General Assembly decided on the division of Palestine into Jewish and Arab sectors, with mutual cooperation between the two in the economic sphere, and on the internationalization of Jerusalem — which is a holy city for Christians, Jews and Muslims — Israel accepted the plan. The Arab States, however, rejected the plan and launched their armed forces against the newly-constituted State. Contrary to all expectation they were defeated, but did not hesitate to renew their military efforts in three succeeding wars which worsened the problem and raised hatred to a high pitch. It would be pointless for us to deny that the two super powers played a significant part in this ruinous process. In their efforts to secure positions of geopolitical dominance it was impossible for them to ignore the Middle East with its tremendous strategic potential and inexhaustible supplies of energy. Thus, since 1960, the Middle East has been one of the chief areas of American-Soviet confrontation. After the crisis in 1956 President Nasser turned to the Soviet Union for assistance, while the United States became the principal guarantor of Israel's independence. Later on, with the Camp David agreements, the United States succeeded in breaking down the front of Arab unity and in bringing Egypt and Israel peacefully together for the first time. But the Soviet Union has not remained idle. It has signed friendship treaties with Iraq, Syria, Libya and the People's Republic of Yemen. It has great influence in Damascus and maintains an abundant flow of arms, so much so as to give rise to the suspicion that, all other things apart, the Middle East areas has been selected as a testing ground for new weapons, as happened in Spain in the run-up to the Second World War and later in Vietnam.

By duly noting all these historical factors and in condemning intransigence and threats to peace from whatever side they come the European Parliament is making an important contribution to international *détente* and acting in the best common interest of the people of the Middle East.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have nothing to add to the generally positive assessment which Gerhard Schmid and Mrs Charzat have given of the Penders report. I believe that on the whole this report represents a step forward. But on behalf of my group I should like to criticize two fundamental points, for which the rapporteur is certainly not to blame, but which stem from decisions taken in the Political Affairs Committee.

The first concerns the excessive importance attached to the Camp David agreement on the one hand and the inadequate importance attached to the Fahd Plan or Fez Charter on the other, which results in some

imbalance. My group has consequently tabled two amendments.

Why can the Camp David agreement — as the report claims — not form the basis? The Camp David agreement is already practically non-existent, as paragraph 3 of the Penders report predicts. It was originally designed to divide the Arabs, but they refused to be divided. Nor did Jordan negotiate on this basis, and the submission of the Reagan plan is surely a virtual admission of the failure of the Camp David agreement. Israel has also broken the agreement on several occasions by launching a massive settlement programme on the West Bank.

Why then, with the USA in fact turning its back on the Camp David agreement, should we continue to make symbolic gestures of support? The role the USA has played in the Middle East has been — to put it politely — extremely unsatisfactory. It has repeatedly given military and other support to a country — Israel — whose armies have marched into Lebanon, which has bombarded Beirut and whose troops were responsible for the massacres in Sabra and Chatilla. We Europeans should make it clearer to the USA than we have done in the past that we expect it to adopt a balanced, responsible and more progressive position on the settlement of the conflict. But we shall not succeed in this if we do not spell out the mistakes the US Government has made.

The second aspect of the Penders report we should like to influence and change with amendments is the evaluation of the Fahd Plan or the later Fez Charter, although it is not so called in the report. The report says that it includes useful elements. I feel, however, that the Fahd Plan and also the Fez Charter include what we would like to see referred to as important new elements. Can it not be regarded as an important element that the Arab countries should for the first time implicitly recognize Israel's right to exist and refer to the UN Security Council's guarantee for all the countries in the region? We should make a point of stating this clearly in the report. We surely do not want to say less than the Ten have already said on their joint declaration.

To Members who have perhaps read more about the PLO than they have learned through actual discussions I should like to say that here again there has been an interesting process of change, which is reflected, for example, in adjustments to various articles of the covenant. That too should be noted. We should not cling to old positions.

This brings me to another point, the question of how the PLO is to be appraised. I do realize that in his report Mr Penders refers to the basic role of the PLO, and as far as I know, this is the first time this has been done. But why is a clearer reference not made to the PLO's right to represent the Palestinian people? Why do some Members pretend that the PLO is a group

Wieczorek-Zeul

that should be overlooked in negotiations? The Palestinian National Council is the body which represents Palestinians in the present circumstances, spread as they are among various countries. As my colleague Gerhard Schmid asked yesterday, are we supposed to negotiate with the Palestinian mayors? We need a representative group which takes its place in negotiations. That is why the Socialist Group has called both for the removal of all prior conditions from paragraph 9, as Mr Price has said, and for a clear reference to be made to the PLO's right to represent the Palestinian people.

We have also tabled an amendment to paragraph 10, which says that Israel and the Palestinian people, including the PLO, should hold talks with each other. I realize this is in the nature of a compromise, but how much longer do we intend to make do with compromises in these matters? When are we at last going to make a clear statement on this? *Who* is going to negotiate? People cannot negotiate. The Israeli Government and the body which represents the Palestinian people, the Palestine Liberation Organization, can negotiate. Let us say so in so many words, let us say that there should be talks between the Israeli Government and the PLO and that this must result in a process of mutual recognition and peaceful coexistence.

How many people have lost their lives in this region in the last few years, in the last few months? What else has to happen before we make a contribution with a clear and trail-blazing report to a peaceful solution to the situation in the Middle East? We have delayed too long. We have not spoken up clearly enough. We have been too faint-hearted. Unless progress is made, the line so far adopted by Yassir Arafat that a peaceful solution should be found will be doomed to failure. That would mean terrorism and war.

(Applause)

Mr d'Ormesson (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, the search for a peaceful solution in the Middle East requires a desire for peace which must be inseparable from a determination to implement the instruments necessary to safeguard that peace. In the Middle East we are clearly reluctant to take all the necessary steps; we still seem content to await solutions proposed by others or to confound them with our criticisms and condemnation.

Are we acting as the champions of human rights by behaving in this way? Let us remember the words of Montesquieu in the preamble to the 'Spirit of the Law': 'The republic, that is to say the government of the people by the people, requires a facet which is not to be found in a monarchy or in a despotic State: the facet of virtue'.

In this particular instance I can see no virtue in calling upon others to restore peace without helping them to

achieve that aim. We it was that took the decision to set up the State of Israel. Since then the Jewish people have suffered terribly under Hitler and Stalin.

Are we to forget that Molotov met Adolf Hitler in December 1940 to put the unsuccessful request that the Soviet Union be given a free hand in the Middle East?

We cannot lose sight of the fact either that Brezhnev aimed at gaining control over the sources of energy on which the West depend — and we have no reason to suppose that his successor will not pursue the same policy.

Whatever legitimate interest may be inspired in us by the suffering of the Palestinian people — who have been up-rooted by events, decimated by war, attacked in their dignity and rights and subjected finally, through our weakness, to the influence of the PLO which they have been obliged to serve — we cannot lose sight of the fact that since 1975 the PLO has been a war machine armed by the Soviet Union and by its principal go-between, Colonel Kadhafi. Before the Israeli offensive, West-Beirut had become the centre for an organized plan to bring the 10 452 square kilometres of Lebanese territory into the Soviet orbit this year. Following the occupation of South-Yemen and of Afghanistan, the pincers would have closed a little more tightly on our lines of communication.

However, following the election of Bechir Gemayel on 23 September last we were inspired by a wild hope. The charisma of this young leader of the Lebanese resistance gave us reason to hope for the restoration of unity and independence of his country, for the creation of an area of peace in which Christians and Moslems could unite their efforts to seek with the Israelis the conditions for peace; still more than this, we hoped for a resumption of peace negotiations between Egypt, Israel and the whole Arab world. I had the privilege to be acquainted with Bechir Gemayel and I know that he believed that the European Community and the United States would help him to restore the territorial and political integrity of his country. With his dynamic spirit, he hoped to bring his full weight to bear in favour of the resumption of the Camp David agreements. His tragic encounter with death on the very evening of his triumph and the massacres in Sabra and Chatilah seem to have called into question once again the prospects for peace in this infinitely small territory which carries a great and noble culture, a brilliant history and is the sole example of a shared Moslem and Christian society. It is our duty to help bring about the rebirth of that hope.

This report should therefore, first and foremost, set on record our desire to increase the size of the UN forces stationed in Lebanon to 30 000 men as requested by President Amin Gemayel in order to ensure control of the Lebanese frontiers, the evacuation of foreign troops and the disarming of the gangs which create

d'Ormesson

violence and insecurity in the country. This we must do if our aim is peace. The restoration of peace in Lebanon would be the first step towards peace in the neighbouring territories and would imply stronger links between Europe and the Middle East; by promoting this cause we can show the world that our Community is equal to its responsibilities and progressing towards its own unity and that even if the old documents have given place to new procedures, Europe is still there to protect the freedom of others.

(Applause)

Mr Prag (ED). — Mr President, by and large I think the Penders report tries very hard to be fair and genuinely seeks a balance. But on certain points I am not sure that Mr Penders has managed to achieve that balance, and that is perhaps because of the closeness and vividness of events in Lebanon. That emphasis on Lebanon is shown particularly in paragraph 11, which I may say I fully support. Lebanon must be free and independent, sovereign and unoccupied by any foreign troops. That means that there should be no Israeli troops, nor Syrians, nor PLO. Furthermore, the Community must indeed help in the reconstruction of Lebanon, and I am glad to note that my own country has agreed to send a contribution to the peace-keeping forces there.

I would like to add at this moment that it is no use sending peace-keeping forces for a couple of weeks. The United States and the Community countries must surely bear part of the responsibility for the massacres in the Sabra and Chatila camps. It was folly to withdraw the peace-keeping forces before all foreign occupying troops had been withdrawn from Lebanon and effective Lebanese sovereignty had been restored.

But these recent events must also be placed in the perspective of thirty-four years of hostility by the Arab States to Israel. That is the reason, Mr President, for my Amendment No 2 and my proposal for a new recital 1a. One cannot accept on its own recital J which effectively places all the blame on Israel. My Amendment No 1 tries to redress this imbalance by stating the simple clear fact that there would have been no Lebanon invasion nor the long series of Arab/Israeli wars if the Arab States had ever shown statesmanship and reasonableness over the last thirty-four years. Peace — genuine peace — could have come to the Middle East at any time in those thirty-four years if the Arab States had really wanted it, and if the intransigence and the total inflexibility which they showed had been replaced by a willingness to talk. They refused not only to make peace with Israel — they are still at war with Israel except for Egypt and Lebanon — but even to recognize Israel or talk to Israelis if one excludes the courageous and far-sighted President Sadat. That is why I hope Mr Penders may accept my Amendment No 2, which redresses the balance by inserting an additional recital.

My third amendment — which is to paragraph 7.4. — would replace the words: 'the option of a possible Palestinian State' by 'an area of genuine autonomy for the Palestinian Arabs'. Now that seems to me to be pure practicality, Mr President. As Mr Nordmann said, there is already one Palestinian Arab State — Jordan — and a West Bank Arab State, however people may feel emotionally, is just not a starter. Such a State could only exist in confederation with Jordan or even possibly with Israel. It could not exist as an independent entity virtually surrounded by Israel.

In my Amendment No 4, I believe the reference to the PLO is unfortunate. I would like to see in paragraph 10 a commitment to the legitimate representatives of the Arab people of Palestine. That would make us non-committal with regard to the PLO without excluding it, and it would avoid our appearing to support terrorism.

The Middle East, Mr President, is crying out for peace and that requires a readiness to talk and negotiate and to compromise on both sides. If the Arab States and Israel were to work together, what splendid new prospects could be opened up! Some may think that a dream, but who in 1945 would have thought that seven years later those apparently hereditary enemies — France and Germany — would be reconciled in the first European Community? In that total reversal of the hatred of centuries in Europe, is there not an example for the Middle East and perhaps even a gleam of hope?

(Applause)

Mr M. Martin (COM). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report by Mr Penders falls in directly with American policy and Camp David. But we have now seen just where attempts to establish a *pax americana* in the Middle East lead.

Total American support for Israel has resulted in the worst exactions and the most horrible crimes. The bombardment of Beirut, the massacres in Sabra and Chatilah, vast destruction, thousands of victims and thousands of maltreated prisoners. We can now see that a genuine process of progress towards peace has not begun. Israel has conquered many territories in Golan, East Jerusalem and Lebanon. The occupied territories are being colonized in a way which spares neither land nor the people nor yet their fundamental freedoms since it is well known that repression, imprisonment and even torturing of prisoners are common practice there.

To propose, as the Penders report does, a European initiative following in the footsteps of Camp David which has been a manifest failure can in no way contribute to a solution to bring about a real peace. Of course the Ten must play a positive role. They can contribute, through political cooperation, to the

Martin

implementation of the UN resolutions, in particular those which call for the withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon and the occupied territories.

The Ten should use their weight to persuade Israel to negotiate, to support the efforts at peace and dialogue which have now been initiated in particular through the Franco-Egyptian initiative and to support the results of the Fez Summit and the PLO proposals. But, quite obviously, nothing positive can be initiated without respect for certain principles, first and foremost the respect for the national rights of the Palestinian people and the right of that people to establish an independent State. That is not a possible future right, as the report would have it, but an indisputable historic right. For their part, the French Communists and Allied Members will continue to demand recognition of that right just as it must be recognized for the other peoples of the region. This is the only way in which dialogue and peace will win the day over violence and war.

Finally, it must be recalled that all the events of last summer and the demonstrations in the occupied territories — only yesterday yet again in Naplouse — have confirmed, if there was any need for confirmation, that Yasser Arafat's Palestinian Liberation Organization is the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. That is another reality which must be recognized if we really want a peace settlement in the Middle East.

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — (FR) Mr President, I am always rather surprised by the one-sided way in which facts are often presented and when I listen to Mr Martin I feel somewhat uneasy because he presented a one-sided view of events and his own interpretation of history. I do not say that he is entirely wrong and I do not say that Israel is in no way responsible; of course Israel must bear its responsibility. But I do not think Israel is the only country to have a responsibility.

Mr Martin, you are a Frenchman. To the best of my knowledge the Israelis had nothing whatever to do with the assassination of Mr Louis Delamare, your ambassador in Lebanon. I believe that a different State and a different power were responsible for the fact that Mr Delamare is no longer with us today. There are some things which we should not forget.

Having said that, ladies and gentlemen, we are now discussing the Penders report; I believe that it contains a reasonable and measured list of proposals; I hope Mr Penders will bear with me if I say that it is inspired less by genius than by diligence, balance and hard work. As it stands it really is not bad — it is a considerable achievement. This report also reflects European aspirations but it bears witness to the limits and impotence of Europe. We find an analysis, suggestions and proposals but we are unfortunately unable to reach a decision and when I look at this Assembly I feel bound to

realize that the fact that we ourselves are unable to shape events is reflected in the many empty seats in this chamber; generally one finds that places where things are happening are crowded. That brings me, through the Penders report, to a point which I consider fundamental for the definition and implementation of a European policy.

Paragraph 12(1) of the Penders report draws attention to the need for a multi-national, international force to implement resolutions in favour of peace, security and order on the spot. Ladies and gentlemen, Lebanon has asked my own country, Belgium, to make its contribution to the multi-national force; so far there has been no practical response except a vague response of principle. Why? For two reasons: firstly, because our treasury is empty but above all because our own State is in crisis. I am afraid that in the case of Belgium the financial argument is an alibi — an alibi to avoid any real commitment. I remember the attitude of some who not so long ago proclaimed 'not one franc, not a single man for the Congo'. So why should we send money or men to Lebanon where our interests are not directly at stake and where no Belgians are established? I understand that attitude. It is possible to explain any attitude: good, bad or indifferent. But allow me to say that this attitude is bad not only for Belgium but for Europe as a whole because there is an evident contradiction between our constant repetition and reaffirmation of our desire for European integration and our evasion of the very first stage in integration which is that of cooperation.

Mr President, I am less ambitious. We shall see about integration but cooperation is essential. It is essential right now and not the day after tomorrow. It is only if we cooperate that we shall be able to think of possible integration. If the desire to cooperate is lacking, integration — I am sorry to say this — is bound to be an illusion. Let us cooperate right now. The Penders report has given me an opportunity to make this observation not in connection with the Middle East but through the Middle East in connection with the very essence and implementation of European policy as a whole.

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) Mr President, even if we speak in terms of international responsibilities, I think that any serious debate about the Middle East conflict must necessarily begin by criticizing the Israeli Government. Of course we can show understanding for the encirclement of the Hebrew State; but however closely we look at the depths of Jewish history including and perhaps above all that of the genocide, the fact remains that in the continuing crisis in this part of the world which regularly bursts out in murderous explosions, Israeli policy bears a heavy responsibility. There is no need for a lengthy demonstration: it is sufficient to think of the invasion of Lebanon and the constant policy of the Begin government of establishing settlements on the West Bank together with the repression pursued by that government.

Dury

Any improvement in the present situation and progress towards *détente* and later towards peace must inevitably involve recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to a State of their own: that seems self-evident to me, a necessity which other speakers have already emphasized. In the same spirit of realism and attachment to democracy I would like now to address a brief appeal to those men and women who, under extremely difficult conditions, are working in Israel itself in favour of an Israel-Arab *rapprochement* and thus in favour of peace.

They are doing so under difficult conditions in a country which is still at war and has been suffering for many years under the impact of a complex of encirclement. There is a strong temptation to turn the rule of unanimity, the principle of the sacred union, into a categorical imperative of political conscience. And yet the world has witnessed with admiration the moral revolt of hundred of thousands of Israelis who, considering the war in Lebanon to be unnecessary to such an extent as to be criminal, did not hesitate to proclaim their beliefs at a time when the guns were still firing. How many soldiers and officers could be numbered among their ranks?

While it is true that this protest could not readily find expression in the institutional world and at the level of the political forces, it was nonetheless a source of admiration and a cause for hope, or at least it would have been if the movement which assumed such spectacular form after the Sabra and Chatilah massacres last September, received the encouragement which it merits from outside.

We must take up a political position in favour of the aims of this well-organized movement in support of peace. When the supporters of that movement cry out their rejection of the aggressive practices of Mr Begin and Mr Sharon, we will not help to strengthen its impact if we adopt a complacent attitude to the Israeli Government. When that movement expresses its disgust at the daily annexation of land in the West Bank through the creation of new settlements we shall not help the Israeli democrats and pacifists if we close our eyes to these dangerous events. On the contrary, if we express our reprobation of the annexationist and repressive practices of the Begin government and if we multiply our criticism of those policies, we shall bring comfort to all those men and women who are sounding the alarm in Israel today because, for all of them, the stake is double as they are repeating with increasing indignation and anxiety.

The first stake at issue is of course to put an end to the injustice suffered by the people of Lebanon and Palestine and the misfortune which that injustice brings in its train. But there is a second issue: the need to save Israel from the evils which beset it and which stem from the continuation of a tension that may lead to new confrontation and to a deterioration of democracy in Israel.

A leading Israeli daily, 'Haretz', recently wrote that violence is becoming an accepted norm in Israeli society. That impression is widely held among all democrats and pacifists in Israel. We must not cease our efforts to understand the problems confronting all the parties in this conflict. But let us be quite clear about one thing: the attachment which some of us feel for the Israeli people can only be expressed effectively if we echo the efforts now being made by the bravest and healthiest forces among the Israeli people. To echo them means in practical terms to condemn and put a brake on the annexation and creation of settlements in the occupied territories. Condemnation perhaps also involves sanctions against the Israeli State. We must favour the dialogue between the Israelis and Palestinians and recognize the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and to a State of their own.

The best citizens of Israel, the bravest and most lucid spirits, understand this. The best friends of Israel must also understand this fact and, with them, all those who wish for reconciliation at the earliest possible date between the Palestinians and Israelis.

IN THE CHAIR: MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

Mr Normanton (ED). — Mr President, may I at the outset, in this brief contribution, declare my political conviction that there can and will be no prospect of peace in the Middle East until Israel and Egypt — two of the major participants in the conflicts, certainly historically — are accepted by the European Community as two of the growing number of States which make up the European Community. In other words, I firmly believe it is the creation of an environment involving these two interests, a political environment where one can talk in a parliamentary forum like this, that can replace fighting on a world stage which brings into conflict States which have no interest whatsoever in resolving the conflict but only in extending their own involvement. And the reason for my belief lies, quite frankly, in the fact that the Jewish people, around the world in general and in the State of Israel in particular, have so much more in common with what we believe in — what we call our Western civilization. Indeed, our heritage as Europeans has been enormously enriched by the Jewish participation to a degree which we take too much for granted and which we should be very foolish to ignore when searching for a solution to the Arab-Israel conflict.

The Penders report is good in parts and particularly in its reference to the importance which is attached to the development of the Camp David agreement. Here should lie the key to the policy of the Community, to

Normanton

exploit the common ground which has been so painfully established by two of the major conflicting parties and make it work. When I say make it work I am thinking of the promotion of trade between these two elements of the agreement. Until trade is effectively flowing and rapidly increasing between Egypt and Israel so long will we fall far short of what we have to achieve.

The Community should replace in my opinion the United States of America as the provider of an international police force to keep the peace in sensitive spots between the opposing military forces peripheral to Israel. For far too long Europe as a whole has abdicated to our friends the Americans responsibilities which are, and rightly should be, ours to exercise. It is our failure to grasp this which is no mean factor behind the perpetuation of the Arab/Israeli conflict.

Lastly, Mr President, I must say that the Penders report, so far as it goes and subject to the approval by the House of a number of amendments which have been tabled, will receive my support but I repeat: subject to the acceptance by the House of a number of important amendments.

Lord O'Hagan (ED). — Mr President, on this subject of all subjects there are many shades of opinion and differences of point of view between Members of this House, between groups and within groups. But whatever the variety and the scope of these attitudes and the nature of the gap between them there is no comparison between their number and the number of graves marked and unmarked in the Middle East. If anything that we do here or say here in this Parliament contributes by one small step towards a resolution of the problem, then we will have helped. I believe that the European Community cannot escape its political responsibility in this field. We must add our voice and our actions to those of others who are trying to secure a lasting and just settlement in that troubled part of the world.

Now my group, Mr President, and I am speaking on behalf of my group, has not formally tabled amendments as a group because we would like to pay tribute to the work of Mr Penders. We feel that he has taken on a difficult task and he has carried it out with great patience and with considerable skill. We accept the broad thrust of his resolution. Individual members of our group have individual views which they are of course free to express as to the particular balance between one part of the resolution and another and they have introduced amendments, but in general I hope this Parliament will support the broad thrust of Mr Pender's report. It gives us a measured, careful and considered view of the Community's role in this part of the world and I hope that we will vote it through with an overwhelming majority. I conclude, Mr President, that we should all be grateful to Mr Penders for the considerable work that he has done on our behalf in drawing up this report.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, I should like to begin by expressing my thanks and respect to Mr Penders, whose report has rightly found general approval throughout the debate because of the extensive information it contains and the balanced way in which it is presented. Even after this debate has ended, much of what is to be found in this report will give us food for thought.

For many years and in many different ways the Community has demonstrated its interest in a lasting, just and global peace settlement in the Middle East. Efforts have also been made on numerous occasions to contribute to such a settlement, and they are continuing. These efforts have been and will be based on the declaration of the European Council in Venice, much quoted during this debate, and the essential principles confirmed in that declaration of the recognition of the right of all countries in the region, including Israel, to existence and security and the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

There can be no doubt that solving the political problems which have been discussed yesterday and today is of decisive importance, but in these discussions we should not overlook the importance of economic development, and I would refer in this context to paragraph 12 of the resolution and points 55 and 56 of the report, which call on the Community to provide economic, financial and technical assistance for all the countries in this area, which have suffered so much. I believe that here we have real, practical instruments we can use. We have treaties with the countries of this region. I am convinced that this region has great potential which should enable it to turn areas that are still desert into a flourishing landscape. There is certainly room in this region for everyone of good will prepared to live in peace with his neighbour if we contribute to the development of the potential that exists there. I believe we have only just begun to do what can be done.

I would remind you that in November 1973 Willy Brandt, then Federal German Chancellor and now a Member of this House, referred in connection with the war then a few weeks old to Europe's obligation and duty to help to make this area stable. But what he emphasized above all else was that Europe must not be tight-fisted when contributing to the future development of this region with material aid. I consider it important for us to take these passages of the resolution just as seriously as the political statements we make. A Member of the House said a few minutes ago that the opportunities we have are limited. That may be true. But the debate has shown that we consider it our duty to do everything within these limits which may contribute to positive developments in this region.

Mr Penders (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I greatly appreciate having this opportunity of winding up the debate by commenting briefly on some

Penders

of the salient points raised by the various speakers. Firstly let me say that I feel it incumbent upon me, at the end of an in-depth debate which occupied part of the House's proceedings yesterday and has been carried over to today, to thank all the Members who took part in it, and that embraces the criticisms of one sort or another which were voiced against my approach to the problem. It was only to be expected that such a report and motion for a resolution would not find favour with everyone. Hence my desire to briefly recapitulate the thoughts which guided me in drawing up this report.

As I have already stated, my primary aim was that of making up the discrepancy which separated Parliament's official stance on the Middle East especially throughout the years prior to direct elections, from that of the Community ministers of foreign affairs. Although it is by no means the goal of the directly-elected Parliament to rubber-stamp the decisions of the foreign ministers, I can think of no other subject on which there existed such a yawning gap between statements emanating from this House on the one hand, and the official Community policy statements which resulted from exhaustive Council negotiations, on the other. I hope the House will appreciate what I took to be my primary duty i.e. bridging that gap, and no matter how one looks at the motion for a resolution contained in the report, it would have to be said that the Political Affairs Committee has achieved its first goal. In elaborating the report I have been at pains to arrive at a definitive comprehensive document which would do justice to the often contradictory and reluctant aspirations and political demands. Mr President, any such document would have to be dynamic in nature. It cannot be a sort of fossil for storing information; such is not the business of politics. Consequently, although I followed with much interest the speech made by Mr Nordmann I am forced to conclude that his political approach to the problem can only lead to a fossilization, an immobilization of this Parliament, and that is unacceptable. A policy document must be dynamic in nature and bear a political stamp.

It also means that one cannot proceed in a slipshod or shallow manner. Hence my reluctance to comply with the wishes of my colleague Mr Capanna to include in my report all of the United Nations resolutions on the Middle East. Many of the latter are of a sloppy and shallow nature and contribute nothing in the way of clarification. Hence the reason for my decision not to include them. I need hardly remind the House of the need to tread warily in our efforts to gain all-round acceptance for our document.

I freely admit that the whole tone of the paragraphs in the motion for a resolution which deal with contacts between the State of Israel and the Palestinian people, including the PLO, reveals the pains taken to achieve a cautious approach. This should be borne in mind both by the friends of Israel who have been somewhat

sceptical about the paragraphs in question and by those who have worked hard to further the Euro-Arab dialogue and who are most probably disappointed that the wording of the paragraphs does not go far enough. I look upon the formula chosen as offering the best chance of all-round support in the House, thereby edging Parliament's official Middle East policy a step further. It is of course all too easy to launch great initiatives, to the accompaniment of fanfares but if such measures fail to gain majority support then we inevitably find the whole process stalled. This practical objective also dictated my cautious approach to the eventual option of a Palestinian state. The subject is a very delicate one, for although one cannot exclude the possibility of such a state, I am not yet prepared to give it unqualified approval, given the present unstable, potentially explosive situation. Nevertheless the subject must be broached, albeit with great care.

Generally speaking I approached this whole debate in the hope that Members from all sides of the House would endeavour to make a constructive and cooperative contribution to an issue so fraught with difficulty. I am pleased to say, that, with one notable exception, such has been the case. Parliamentary debates on issues as complex as this should be open and critical. But unless such criticism is constructive Parliament will not advance any further and indeed it will be construed by the public at large, the Council and the Community foreign ministers as a step backwards.

If you will allow me, Mr President, I would like to make a somewhat personal point. Various speakers have more or less upbraided me by effectively saying: 'Rapporteur, don't you realize that there is only one true democracy in the Middle East and that is the State of Israel? The other Middle East states cannot be described as such'. It goes without saying that I am not unaware of the fact that criticism of the government is possible within Israel as in all democracies, something I find laudable. However, we would be found wanting in our democratic obligations were we, in praising the democratic characteristics of one Middle East state, to neglect the rights of the Palestinian people. One of the most valuable achievements of the Community foreign ministers over the past ten years has been that of defining, and awakening interest in, the plight of the Palestinian people. That democracy is a thorny subject is something I would not care to deny. This year, just a few weeks hence, we shall be calling to mind the arrival of Hitler as political leader of Germany, and as such we would do well to remind ourselves just how extraordinarily fragile and exacting democracy can be. I feel it incumbent upon me to express my admiration for Israel's commitment to democracy in a hostile environment. However, against this it must be said that we would be remiss in our democratic duties if we did not attempt to do justice to the Palestinian people.

In closing, Mr President, just a few words concerning the amendments. As rapporteur my hands are, quite naturally, tied. I am, after all, speaking on behalf of

Penders

the Political Affairs Committee. I have personally gone over all 96 amendments with a fine-tooth comb, using in a majority of cases the sole criterion of whether it lay strictly within the brief I received from the Political Affairs Committee. I may not go beyond the terms of that brief. For those amendments which deal with the situation which has arisen since the voting in the Political Affairs Committee and today, 11 January 1983, I have fortunately been able to draw those terms somewhat wider. In this respect I was happy to be able to accept the amendment tabled by our colleague Ms Charzat dealing with the Franco-Egyptian draft resolution before the United Nations, which has been labelled useful by the Community foreign ministers. Such amendments can be accepted without any difficulty, while I am regrettably forced to reject others.

Paragraphs 9 and 10 of the motion for a resolution has, not surprisingly, caused quite a stir in the House. The Group of European Progressive Democrats has sought to render them somewhat clearer by rephrasing the terminology. I have given that a lot of careful consideration, Mr President, at the end of which I decided against upsetting the delicate balance which has been struck in those paragraphs, which must be seen as forming a whole, just as the motion for a resolution itself.

Mr President, I have reached the end of my intervention. All criticisms and comments, whether positive or negative, have been voiced. It only remains now for Parliament to determine the course it wishes to embark upon and I can only hope that it will be one which will edge the Community a little closer towards considering, and assisting in the search for, a solution to the disputes of the Middle East.

(Applause)

Mr Schmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President, the Council's representative was not present during this important debate on the Middle East. Was the Council not invited? Could you please explain to the House why a foreign policy debate of such importance has taken place in the absence of the appropriate President of the Council.

President. — The Bureau has dealt with this matter. The President-in-Office of the Council informed us that he would remain at our disposal today from 3 p.m. and all day Thursday. Since, however, there are further items on the agenda that might interest the President-of the Council, we have chosen this course.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.25 a.m. and resumed at 12 noon)

4. Votes¹

LADY ELLES REPORT (Doc. 1-977/82 'Cyprus')

Lady Elles (ED), rapporteur. — May I say, Mr President, with regard to all the amendments to this resolution, that during the Political Affairs Committee discussion no amendments were tabled by any Member, although of course they had the opportunity and right to do so. It was, as I understood it, the clear intention of the Political Affairs Committee, who voted unanimously on the draft resolution, that it should go through as it stands. Of course Members are free to vote as they like, but I must state as rapporteur of the committee that the amendments that are proposed were not discussed in the Political Affairs Committee and I am therefore not able to give the opinion of the committee on any of these amendments from 1 to 10. I think that this is the fairest and most balanced way to approach this subject.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — (GR) Mr President, in deference to the report by Lady Elles, for whom I have the highest regard, I wish to announce that, in order to speed up voting and to facilitate acceptance of the report in its entirety, I will withdraw the amendments I have tabled if all the other amendments are withdrawn as well.

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, I agree with the view expressed by Mr Plaskovitis and I withdraw my amendment also.

Paragraph 1 — Amendment No 9

Mr Gerokostopoulos (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, if I understood correctly Mr Plaskovitis said he would withdraw his amendments on the condition that all the other amendments are withdrawn as well. But since the other amendments have not been withdrawn I think that the amendments tabled by Mr Plaskovitis should be voted upon.

President. — Mr Gerokostopoulos, actually I should not have called you. Only Mr Plaskovitis could say that. However, he does not seem to share your opinion.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — (GR) Mr President, really what I said was that I would withdraw my amendments if everyone else were to withdraw theirs as well so that we could go straight ahead with voting on a very objective and satisfactory report. Of course, since the others have not withdrawn their amendments mine

¹ See Annex.

Plaskovitis

ought to be voted on as well. But never mind, Mr President. I withdraw my amendments without the others having withdrawn theirs, and I ask Parliament to respect this.

Paragraph 3 — Amendments Nos 5, 10 and 4

President. — On paragraph 3, three amendments were tabled but I understand from Mr Kyrkos and Mr Plaskovitis that they have been withdrawn. So there only remains Amendment No 4 by Mr Van Minnen, which the rapporteur is against.

Mr De Goede (NI). — (NL) Mr President, I have heard you say on a number of occasions that the rapporteur is opposed to an amendment, but this is incorrect. Lady Elles has herself stated that no amendments were dealt with by the Political Affairs Committee and that, as rapporteur of that committee, she felt the fairest and most balanced approach to these amendments would be to refrain from commenting on them. She has thus a neutral standpoint on the matter and I would be much obliged if you would so inform the House.

President. — I should have said rather that the rapporteur cannot approve this amendment.

Before the vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole.

Mr Forth (ED). — Could you explain whether the roll-call vote has been requested by a political group or by the appropriate number of people, Mr President? That isn't clear.

President. — The roll-call vote was requested by the Socialist Group.

After the vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole.

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — (FR) Mr President, I am sorry but I cannot find my voting card. If the Rules of Procedure allow this I hope you will count me as having voted in favour. Thank you.

President. — It will be recorded in the Minutes.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, once the result of a vote has been ascertained, you should not allow it to be changed. Otherwise, where a vote is very close, we could be in a real mess.

President. — Mr von der Vring, I did not touch it up. I merely said that we would note Mr Beyer de Ryke's

statement in the Minutes. The outcome of the vote will not be affected.

PENDERS REPORT (Doc. 1-786/82 'Middle East')

President. — The next item is the vote on the report by Mr Penders. Vice-President Vandewiele promised this morning that this would be the time when we decided whether there should be a vote.

A number of Members wanted the vote to be deferred because the amendments took so long to come. On the other hand, the amendments were available in all languages and the deadlines are set by decisions of the enlarged Bureau. As you know, our translation service works at high pressure. However, where there are so many translations to be done in so short a time, delays can occur. This will need to be sorted out by the Bureau.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, you have anticipated a number of the arguments I put forward earlier this morning.

I request once again the postponement of the vote on the Penders report on the following grounds: firstly, contrary to what you have just said, Mr President, the amendments were not available to Parliament in all the languages until early this morning. There is an enormous number of amendments, and many of us have not had an opportunity to discuss them among ourselves, let alone in our political groups.

Secondly, this is a very important report, and the House should first consider in what form some of the amendments really deserve a large majority. The result will depend on sheer chance if we decide on 96 amendments today. We have another 28 minutes, and I would ask that, even though you have discussed the matter in the various groups, you depart from the set procedure and take account of the political significance of the amendments that have been tabled to Mr Penders' major report by all the groups.

Lord O'Hagan (ED). — Mr President. I believe in this Parliament and I believe that this debate that we have had is possibly of some use and I believe we should continue our work. This group has tried very hard to evolve a whip taking account of all the different views within it, which are as divergent as any other group in the Parliament. All those who are concerned about this subject seriously will have studied the amendments in different languages, if not in our own. I do not believe that we will be doing justice to the seriousness of the subject of or to the public image of this

O'Hagan

Parliament if we delay voting on these amendments, and I hope we will vote now.

(Parliament rejected the request)

(After the vote on all the amendments)

Mr von der Vring (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, for practical reasons I wish to propose that the explanations of vote be heard now and that the final vote be deferred until 3 p.m.

President. — Mr von der Vring, that is a very unkind thing to ask of the poor President.

(Laughter)

So far, 14 Members have wanted to give explanations of vote, more may follow. I would therefore ask you to make your statement in writing.

(Applause)

Mr Brøndlund Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* On a point of order, Mr President, I should like to ask the President to repeat whether it was the Technical Coordination Group which asked for a roll-call vote. I find it interesting, for this group derives much of its strength from a few Danish Members, who are against Parliament taking up any position at all. I should therefore like an indication of who asked for this roll-call vote.

President. — I would point out that Mr Capanna put his name to it as Acting Chairman of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.25 p.m. and resumed at 3.15 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

President

5. German Presidency (Statement by the Council)

President. — The next item is the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the programme of the German presidency for the next six months.

Mr Genscher, you have often visited us and you are always welcome.

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, almost exactly 25 years ago, on 1 January 1958, the Treaties of Rome entered into force. It was 25 years ago that a President of the Council first appeared before the European Parliament. That was the committed European, the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs Larock. At the constituent meeting here in Strasbourg, he said to the Members of Parliament, who were then 142 in number: 'Complete integration is the aim we are striving for and to which the Treaties of Rome will lead us. At this new stage of the proceedings, our countries are looking to this House to provide decisive initiatives, which must be transmitted to the European public.'

It is with this long-term aim in view that the Federal Republic of Germany is taking over the Presidency of the Community. It will endeavour to bring the Community further along the road towards European unification.

Europe is developing and taking shape in its own way. I do not know how often it has been said that the European Community and its ultimate political goal, European union, are finished and done with; and yet the story of the past years is a story of European progress.

When the Federal Republic of Germany took over the Presidency in 1978, the aim was to conclude the accession negotiations with Greece. Today, Greece is a member of the European Community. Then, we were trying to start negotiations with Portugal and to create the preconditions for negotiations with Spain. Negotiations with both countries have now reached a very advanced stage, and I have no doubt that the next German Presidency will be able to speak on behalf of 12 Member States.

On 4 July 1978, I announced to you that the Member States had agreed to direct elections to the European Parliament. A year later, the elections took place. In the meantime, the political forces in Europe have been organized across state frontiers. Today, we are preparing for the second direct elections to the European Parliament.

Neither economic crises nor political and military threats to our system should let us forget that European union is a historical process which has made considerable progress. More depends on the success of this process than European living standards. Our basic political system — democracy, legality and our pluralistic society — is at stake; our scope for action in world politics, our independence, are at issue. It will depend on us whether the European model is followed throughout the world, whether a non-hegemonic fusion of equal free states, or other, less desirable forms of organizing international co-operation carry the day.

We therefore have a duty to history, and to the generations to come, to put aside petty national quarrels.

Genscher

We must unremittably struggle to overcome the problems which no threaten the Community — and with the Community its political future: European union. It is our job to ensure that the idea of European union does not fade from the public consciousness. Here the European Parliament has a special rôle to play.

It was these considerations which in 1981 led Mr Colombo and myself to take a joint initiative on European union, which has become known as the European Act. Under the German Presidency we will leave no stone unturned in our efforts to bring the initiative to a successful conclusion.

On 14 October last year, Mr Colombo and I reported to you on the progress of discussions on the European Act. In response to a request from your Political Affairs Committee, I agreed that in future I would regularly report to this House on the progress of discussions. I do not want to anticipate that report today.

In addition to the European Act, the Council of Ministers will continue its discussions on two Commission proposals: (1) on improving the conciliation procedure between Council and Parliament; and (2) increasing the Parliament's rôle in the Community's external agreements.

The Community's activities must be democratically legitimate and controlled by Parliament. That is the electoral mandate which this House received through the direct elections.

In the coming year, we have the second direct elections before us. It is time to set the date for the elections, since the parties, candidates and electoral bodies should be aware of the situation in good time. I will shortly suggest an election date to the Council; the Council will then start consultations with the European Parliament. I share the concern of this House as to whether it will still be possible to adopt the Decision on uniform electoral procedure — as you proposed on 10 March 1982 — in time for the direct elections in 1984. Your Presidency and the ten Foreign Ministers will discuss the question on 24 January.

Voting for the European Parliament is also giving a vote for European politics. Let us therefore consider the new elections as a stimulus for a European policy that the people will understand and support, and let us act accordingly. The European Parliament is the only parliamentary forum where questions of common concern to Europeans are discussed from the European, and not from the national, point of view. It is therefore for you, ladies and gentlemen, to define these interests. It is your duty to be and to remain the motive power of Europe's unification endeavours, resisting all centrifugal tendencies with all the authority of a directly-elected parliament. National governments, and national parliaments too, should not regard the European Parliament as a rival, but as a

partner with whom they should co-operate in complete trust.

Today's debate opens the dialogue between the Council and the Parliament in this half of 1983. The matters on which the German Presidency will concentrate arise from the major problems facing us. There are four main tasks which we must tackle resolutely within the Community framework:

1. The fight against unemployment has top priority. There are more than 11 million people, nearly 10% of the working population, unemployed in the Community today. Young people under 25 represent 40% of the unemployed. If we want to maintain even existing employment levels, we must create 1 million new jobs a year in the next few years. Even in the 'Golden 60s' we only managed to create 260 000 jobs a year in Europe. This shows the enormity of the task before us.

Of course employment policy is primarily a matter for the Member States, but the Community must prove that it can make an important contribution to this basic problem. The people of Europe, and particularly our young people, must see that the European Community is able to do something for their lives and their future prospects, that it is not a failure in this respect. The European Council has set the target: every young person must be found a training place or a practical apprenticeship. This is where the Social Fund must be used effectively. With more than 1 700 million ECU in commitment appropriations, it now enables the Community to follow a constructive labour-market policy.

We must also use education and vocational training policy to conquer youth unemployment. A joint meeting of the Ministers of Labour and Education should deal with the problems of the transition of young people from school to working life, and elaborate pilot schemes for preparing young people more adequately for the world of work. We need an effective common vocational training policy for the 80s.

In the long run, we can only create secure employment if we again succeed in achieving strong and *lasting growth*. In this endeavour it is the small and medium-sized undertakings we need above all. You, ladies and gentlemen, have declared 1983 the 'Year of Small and Medium-Sized Undertakings' — and you were right to do so. Of all European undertakings, 95% are small and medium-sized undertakings; 30 million people, more than half the total labour force, are employed in them. Small and medium-sized undertakings train more than 60% of our young people. Small and medium-sized undertakings are the chief agents of technical progress: of the 60 basic inventions of this century, 48, that is, 80%, came from small and medium-sized undertakings.

In Europe today, we need an active policy to support small businesses, to open opportunities for the drive, the wealth of inventiveness and the ability to innovate

Genscher

which exists in small and medium-sized enterprises. Particularly in a period of great structural change, the many small and medium-sized undertakings have a key rôle to play. With their personal responsibility, their readiness to take risks and show initiative, their high degree of adaptability and training capacity, the varied goods and services they have to offer, their wealth of ideas and creativity, they make a decisive contribution to economic growth and technical progress, to creating and preserving employment and to the structural change we so much need. In Europe, we must create the basic political and economic conditions which will enable the dynamic forces in our economies to develop freely.

Only in this way shall we achieve the fundamental improvement in the general economic situation in Europe which we are all seeking. The prospects are not bad, the outlook for a gradual economic recovery has become more favourable; but let us not deceive ourselves. It will need great efforts and common sacrifices to turn this prospect into reality. The sceptics must not be proved right. Europe must demonstrate that it has the strength and the staying-power to achieve the upswing.

2. The Community's decisive contribution in this matter is to maintain and expand the common internal market. This is our second pressing task. Today it is more than ever important to preserve and liberate the forces for growth in the free exchange of goods within the Community. The internal market is in serious danger from a protectionism that appears in many different guises.

(Applause)

Non-tariff restrictions and subsidies which distort competition have shown a spectacular increase, and the German Presidency will make every effort to ward off these dangers to the internal market.

Still more, however, is needed: we must not only preserve the common market, we must expand it. There are still border controls and formalities which hinder free trade within the Community. The cost of the time spent on customs clearance for EC goods traffic is estimated at 36-37 thousand million German marks a year. A consignment going from Holland to Naples with a travelling time of 26 hours takes roughly an additional 10 hours for customs clearance at borders.

(Applause)

It was not quite clear whether the applause was meant for this state of affairs or for the criticism of it. I trust it was meant for the criticism.

(Applause)

Now it is clear!

(Laughter)

We shall do what we can to promote a Council decision on measures to simplify border formalities between Member States on roads, railways and inland waterways.

The common transport policy is closely connected with the expansion of the internal market. It is important to find a new direction for the Community's plans of transport policy.

We have no chance of coming out of the recession if we compartmentalize our markets. Protection against one another is not going to create employment.

Free world trade is also vitally important to the Community. The European Community is by far the largest importer and exporter in the world. In Europe, every fifth job demands an external trade.

We Europeans know better than anyone that trade barriers cost jobs. No other region relies so heavily on the maintenance of free trade as ours. It is in our own interests to remain on the side of free world trade.

(Applause)

3. Our third priority is to complete the Community's enlargement towards the South through the simultaneous accession of Portugal and Spain. The Community and its Member States are politically committed to this contribution to the stabilization of democracy in the Iberian peninsula.

(Applause)

We must keep our word. The European Council has set the pace and the direction for negotiations with the two countries and for adjusting the *acquis communautaire*. In practical terms, this means that we must not concentrate on the accession negotiations alone; we must concentrate at the same time on the necessary preparatory measures in the common agricultural policy. This is particularly true of Mediterranean agricultural products. It is essential that we work out solutions which, while conforming to the free market as far as possible, limit the danger of overproduction and guarantee that the enlargement in general can still be financed. There is one thing of which there can be no doubt: in a time of inevitable reductions in national budgets, the Community must also show that it is capable of using its revenue economically.

4. We are further required to take resolute action on the budget. The 1983 budget entered into force on time. The improved budget procedure has stood the test: together, by strict economy, we have created more scope for structurally effective expenditure, particularly in the fields of labour-market and regional policy. We should now bring the budgetary compensation for the United Kingdom and the related reduction for Germany to a successful conclusion.

Genscher

In the near future the Commission will be submitting more extensive proposals for reforming the Community's system of own resources; the Presidency will start consultations at once. Experience has shown, however, that it will not be possible to solve such a complex problem within a year. It took from 1962 to 1970 to establish the system of the Community's own resources, and it will require great efforts on the part of all the Community Institutions and the Member States to reform it. But this task cannot be shirked; we must tackle it with determination.

Ladies and gentlemen, in addition to these four priorities, our Presidency has other important tasks.

I shall mention first of all the need for increased co-ordination of economic, monetary and financial policy. In this connection, we must make careful use of the financial instruments available to the Community. In Copenhagen, the European Council approved a comprehensive strategy and asked the Council of Ministers to take decisions by the end of March. Commission proposals have been submitted and the Council's discussions have begun.

This House is expecting the Community to provide more loans, particularly to the less prosperous countries. The Community's true credit instrument is the European Investment Bank. Since its capital was doubled in 1981, it has had, and still has, considerable scope for giving credit. The 'New Instrument', the Community loan, will have to play an ancillary role in promoting investment. This House delivered its Opinion on the new Commission proposal in December. On this, too, the Council will take a decision before the end of March.

The Community's most important instrument of structural policy, the Regional Fund, has now reached an amount of over 2 thousand million ECU in commitment appropriations, not least thanks to the decisions of this House. In this half-year, it is again due for reform. The main aim of our reform will be to concentrate its resources. We can only talk about a meaningful reform of the Regional Fund if its resources are concentrated on the really disadvantaged regions.

The European Monetary System has proved itself in difficult times. The relatively high exchange-rate stability between the EMS currencies is not least due to the discipline which the system imposes on each of its members. The close co-operation between monetary authorities must now be increased still further and the system strengthened by a policy of stability in the Member States. I am thinking here not only of interest-rate policy, but also of consolidating national budgets in order to achieve the convergence in economic policies which will in turn make it possible to extend the Monetary System.

There are again difficult decisions to be taken on steel. It is agreed that the structural crisis in the European

steel industry cannot be overcome without further drastic reductions in capacity. At the same time, it is essential that we remove subsidies which distort competition.

(Applause)

We see this as one of the Community's particularly important tasks in the months to come.

Structural adjustment is also needed in the fields of energy, research and innovation. The European Council in Copenhagen laid great stress on this; the European Parliament has also called for it repeatedly.

We must not relax our efforts to save energy and replace oil. The Community's multiannual programme for demonstration projects to promote alternative energies has shown its worth. The common energy policy calls for progress in co-ordination among the Member States. In future, more stress should be laid on coal policy than has been done until now.

Environmental protection is an important task for the German Presidency. Nobody denies the need for a common environmental policy, and there is a large measure of agreement among the Member States on the goals to be pursued.

The most important things are to keep air and water pure and to ensure ecological compatibility. We must find practical, feasible regulations which permit environmental protection and harmonious economic development in all Member States.

Despite its undisputed successes, the common agricultural policy, too, points in this direction and this house has also been increasingly critical in its reaction. The common agricultural policy is about to reach the limits of what we can finance: for this reason expenditure on the CAP must not grow any faster than the Community's own income.

Since 1979, it has been possible to reduce the percentage of agricultural expenditure from 74% to 62%. This is a considerable achievement, but we shall only be able to continue this success if we can restore market equilibrium for the main surplus products. Pre-conditions for this are a cautious pricing policy and an extension of producers' co-responsibility.

The foundations of the common agricultural policy must be preserved. It has guaranteed us supplies of high-quality food and shielded us from many disturbances on the world markets. It remains a fundamental element in holding the Community together.

In March, we must take the annual decisions on agricultural prices and related measures for 1983. I realize that it will be a difficult year: we are faced with good harvests and large stocks, both inside and outside the Community. World market prices are tending to fall.

Genscher

On the other hand, farmers' incomes have again improved in the past year. The Presidency will make every effort to ensure that the price decisions are taken in good time, in accordance with the Treaties.

Despite considerable efforts on the part of the Commission and many Member States, in 1982 we did not succeed in adopting rules for a common fisheries policy. This is regrettable, particularly as it has not only dealt a blow to the conservation of our common fish stocks, but also obstructed negotiations with third countries. Fishing will now have to be continued according to national regulations agreed with the Commission. The Presidency is assuming that the Member States will abide by these regulations and avoid disputes with one another. In close co-operation with the Commission, it will continue its efforts to find a solution which everyone can support.

This morning, the Council Presidency had a further talk here, at the seat of the European Parliament, with the President-in-Office of the Commission and the Danish Minister of Foreign Affairs, in which all questions connected with the removal of differences of opinion concerning a common fisheries policy were discussed at length. These talks are being continued, and other Member States are, of course, being kept in touch. This is not a renegotiation: nobody can, or will, untie the package that was so carefully tied up on 21 December 1982; but we do want, through further clarifications, to prepare for and, I hope, bring about the overall agreement that is required.

The Council Presidency, the Commission and the Danish Government have the firm desire to reach a final settlement in the Fisheries Council on 24 and 25 January 1983.

For years the European public has been distressed at the annual killing of baby seals in Canada. The European Parliament appealed to the Council on 11 March 1982 to decide on a ban on imports of babyseal pelts. The Canadian Government is aware of the seriousness of this matter and has offered to negotiate with the European Community. The Environment Council decided on 18 December 1982 to accept this offer. At the same time, it called upon the Member States to take all appropriate legally feasible measures to stop the import of babyseal pelts into the Community. The Council will look at this question again before the start of the hunting season and decide whether the negotiations with Canada have produced a satisfactory outcome. If this is not the case, the Presidency advocates an immediate import ban on babyseal pelts before the start of the hunting season.

I appeal to all those concerned to face up to their responsibility for the animal world; a humane society means dealing humanely with animals too.

The Community is a valued and acknowledged international negotiating partner. In recent years, its inter-

national image has constantly improved. Today, we Europeans can build on a substantial nucleus of common European positions.

European political co-operation and the Community's external relations are now much more closely aligned on each other than they were only a few years ago. With its common external economic policy, the Community is making an important contribution towards stabilizing the world economy.

European political co-operation has become the central feature of the external policy of the Member States of the European Community. Today, the Ten co-ordinate their views regularly on all important questions of international affairs. At conferences and in the United Nations, we aim to speak increasingly with a single voice. These efforts, which unfortunately are without setbacks, will be continued with determination under the German Presidency. At a time of growing tension and uncertainty throughout the world, the need for coherent and united action on the part of the Member States and the Community in international matters is greater than ever.

Only in close collaboration with our friends and allies throughout the world, but particularly with the USA, shall we be able to meet the great economic and political challenges of our time. A strong and united Europe which defends its own interests in a firm and constructive alliance is a valuable and reliable partner to the US too.

A number of problems which previously plagued Europe-United States relations have now been resolved or taken in hand:

The difficulties connected with the steel problem and the natural gas pipeline sanctions have been overcome. We have reached agreement on the conclusion that trade with the Eastern bloc, conducted in an economically reasonable manner, without preferential treatment, on the basis of strictly balanced security interests, can exercise a stabilizing influence on East-West relations.

Talks between a US Government delegation and the Commission on agricultural trade problems have initiated a search for mutually acceptable, pragmatic solutions. In the process even the Americans have acknowledged that the basic principles of the common agricultural policy were not at issue, as they form an essential pillar in the Community edifice.

The desire of both parties to work out solutions on the basis of partnership, and the knowledge that we are dependent on one another, have once again been demonstrated. During our Presidency of the Community, we shall seek to deflate further the conflicts of opinion which have come to mar transatlantic relations, and to achieve close co-ordination between Europe and the United States.

Genscher

An imbalance has arisen in our trade with Japan which the Community can no longer accept. It must be righted, not by cutting back our imports but by stepping up our exports. We have a right to expect Japan to do more about making its markets really accessible than has hitherto been the case. In so doing it would be better fulfilling its responsibility towards the open world trading system. At the same time, it would be making a contribution on behalf of the free world which would be commensurate with Japan's great capabilities and potential. On 5 January 1983, I had a long talk with the Japanese Foreign Minister on these problems.

Alongside the Europe-US-Japan triangular relationship, the progress of East-West relations, a fateful issue for our continent, will make great demands on our attention. The attitude of the Ten towards the Eastern bloc is marked by a firmness in the defence of our own interests and principles combined with a willingness to negotiate and co-operate. We have been following this line with our constructive co-operation in the Madrid CSCE follow-up conference, which is due to resume in February 1983. We expect to know in the next few months whether our goal of a successful outcome in Madrid can be achieved. Together with their friends and allies, the Ten will continue to work in Madrid for the adoption of a substantial and balanced final document which also contains a precise mandate for a Conference on Disarmament in Europe (CDE). The purpose of such a CDE is, in an initial phase, to work out confidence-building measures for the whole of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The Ten have from the outset spoken out clearly on events which place East-West relations under strain, be it the persecution of dissidents, the invasion of Afghanistan or repression in Poland. We have clearly established the responsibility for these events and left no doubt that they cannot fail to influence the quality of East-West relations. Conversely, we are prepared to step up the dialogue and co-operation to the extent that signs of readiness to make definite improvements become visible in the Eastern bloc. We shall react positively to positive signs.

It is therefore up to the Soviet Union and its allies in the Warsaw Pact to create the conditions for their declared wish to improve East-West relations. We expect the Soviet Union to give way at last to the wishes of the overwhelming majority of nations and withdraw its troops from Afghanistan.

(Applause)

As the European Council in Copenhagen confirmed, the Ten are prepared to support any realistic efforts to achieve a comprehensive settlement based on respect for the independence, sovereignty and non-alignment of Afghanistan, and refer in this connection to their proposal of 30 June 1981.

In the field of disarmament and arms control, not least, we expect the Soviet Union to respond to the West's genuine wish to negotiate and also show a serious willingness to reach a conclusion and compromise in the current negotiations (MBFR, INF, START, CDE). The Ten are at one in their view that arms control and disarmament are indispensable and integral features of their security and peace policy. The basis for this policy is the ban on the use of force in Article II of the UN Charter. Accordingly, the use of all weapons must be ruled out, except in defence against attack. This must apply both to the nuclear and to the conventional sector. In their efforts to obtain disarmament, the Ten attach high priority to progress in specific arms control and disarmament negotiations. They are aiming at results on the arms-control front which respect the principle of equality and parity, and which must be verifiable.

Despite all setbacks and disappointments, in the interests of peace and the survival of Europe our aim must remain the furtherance of *détente* and co-operation and progress with disarmament. It is consistent with this aim that all East European proposals be given serious and careful scrutiny and every negotiating opportunity exploited. We will therefore give the most careful analysis to the latest suggestions from the Warsaw Pact countries — regardless of the polemical terms in which they are couched — and assess them without preconceptions. We will pursue our peace policies in a constructive spirit. The failure of any genuinely serious peace initiative shall not be attributable to us.

The Ten's common security interests require close co-ordination within the framework of European political cooperation, as called for in the London Report of November 1981 and the Italo-German initiative on European Union. Europe must not become the object of the power politics of foreign powers but must be the subject of an active common security and peace policy.

(Applause)

We must strive for a European security policy which is governed by the interests of the Member States.

There are particularly close relations linking the Community with the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean States. The Community's overall Mediterranean approach and a network of agreements with the Maghreb and Mashreq countries, Israel, Malta, Cyprus and Turkey make provision for this. The new financial protocols must be quickly translated into specific projects, so that they can promote the economic development of the region. The financial protocols will have to be renegotiated in the case of Malta and Cyprus. We are aware of the anxieties which the southern extension of the Community is causing to our Mediterranean partners in particular; I am convinced that the Council will continue to make every effort to meet their understandable concern.

Genscher

Wer are following developments in our association with Turkey with sympathy and concern. We hope and expect that the continuation of the democratic process which has been initiated will make it possible to breathe new life into the association with this important partner. The necessary adjustments to economic realities in the Member States must not have a detrimental effect on the application of the Association Agreement.

We are about to embark on the fourth renegotiation of our association with the African, Caribbean and Pacific States. This association, acknowledged by the world as an exemplary model of cooperation, is to be continued. The renegotiation is due to begin in the autumn of 1983. The Community must therefore determine the guidelines for its approach to the negotiations during the coming six months. The aim, more than ever, will be to promote stable economic development in the ACP States. It should first and foremost serve the people and help to free them from hunger, misery, sickness and inadequate education. In this way, the most favourable conditions will be created for the attainment of human rights.

The development of the third world in peace and in economic and social stability remains a crucial question for the future of mankind, and one on which the fate of Europe also depends. Crises in the third world carry with them the risk of escalation into world conflicts. They provide foreign powers with the opportunity or pretext for power-political expansion or for direct intervention. They endanger the independence and economic development of the States concerned. Genuine non-alignment helps the third world States to preserve their independence and to resist the dangers of foreign domination. Regional groupings and regional cooperation, which we support, also promote international stability and the economic independence and development of the participating States.

The most important precondition for the development of the third world in stability and independence is the elimination of hunger and poverty. The Community's development policy must therefore remain a vital factor in the common third world policy. The Community's development policy and the cooperation of the Member States must be extended and their efforts made more effective.

We in Europe have close cooperation links with the countries in the South-East Asian community of States. The European Community and ASEAN are the two most successful regional groupings in the world. They have both drawn close together, economically and politically.

The ASEAN States have developed into a united regional grouping which plays an independent and positive role in the striving for peace and stability in South-East Asia. Just as the European Community exercises a stabilizing influence in a perilous and inse-

cure world, the ASEAN States have also succeeded in increasing the economic and political strength of their region. We attach great importance to the fourth EEC-ASEAN Ministerial Conference, scheduled for the first half of 1983. Through this meeting, which follows on naturally from the previous Ministerial Conferences in Brussels (1978), Kuala Lumpur (1980) and London (1981), appropriate emphasis will again be placed on the quality of the relationship between the Community and ASEAN in the economic and political sphere. We shall do everything possible to bring this meeting to a successful conclusion.

Together with the ASEAN States, the Ten deplore the continuing presence of Vietnamese forces in Cambodia. Here again a small, independent State has been attacked and invaded by a foreign power without regard for international law. This is threatening world peace and international security, is causing untold grief to the population of the country and is raising acute problems for neighbouring States. We have accordingly endorsed the ASEAN position on the Cambodia question.

In other crisis-stricken regions of the world, too, the Ten are attempting to contribute to a peaceful resolution of conflicts. In the Near East despite the continuing seriousness of the situation, the Ten are observing a more realistic assessment by the parties concerned of the possibilities for settling the Arab-Israeli conflict. The initiative of the US President of 1 September last year has indicated one feasible means of achieving this. In Fez, the Arab States have approved the principle of a negotiated peace. A serious discussion has begun on how this principle is to be translated into specific action.

The concern now is to use all political means in order to overcome the stagnation in the peace process. The Ten are aware of the fact that there is an indissoluble connection between peace in this region and their own security. They are therefore prepared to back the peace process with practical contributions of their own wherever the parties desire this.

We remain convinced: if there is to be a comprehensive, just and lasting peace, then the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination must be honoured in the same way as the claim of all the States in the region, including Israel, to a secure existence. Only a renunciation of violence by all the parties concerned can produce a climate of trust which will bring the parties to the negotiating table.

A state of peace in the Near East also entails the restoration of peace and unity in Lebanon. The precondition for this is the withdrawal of all foreign troops, which would enable the Lebanese Government to exercise its sovereign rights fully over the whole territory of Lebanon.

The Ten are resolutely in favour of an early peaceful settlement of the war between Iran and Iraq, which

Genscher

has now been continuing for over two years and has claimed heavy sacrifices on both sides. They are ready to support the peace initiatives and to help with the reconstruction of the two countries.

We also hope to be able to resume the dialogue with the Arab Gulf States, which this Parliament has so effectively supported.

The Ten observe the growing tensions in southern Africa with increasing concern. Only last month we had cause to condemn strongly a South African attack on Lesotho and the dreadful consequences. The escalation of violence, which we repudiate, whatever side is responsible, makes the urgent need to remove the causes of conflict in this region all the clearer. The Ten are resolved to continue working consistently for peaceful transition with the aim of completely abolishing racial discrimination in South Africa, and early independence for Namibia in accordance with the plan under Security Council Resolution No 435.

The traditionally friendly relations between the Ten and the Latin American States, which have weathered difficult times, are and remain an important element in European foreign policy. The Federal Government will use its Presidency to focus the Community's attention more sharply on these countries. The Ten deeply regretted the fact that the Falklands conflict upset both bilateral and region-to-region relations. The German Presidency will therefore promote the cause of intensifying the dialogue with Latin America, in order to clear away misunderstandings and foster the realization among Latin Americans that Europe does have due regard for Latin American interests. The imminent resumption of the institutionalized dialogue with the Latin American Group in Brussels and of the negotiations with the Andean Pact, together with the extension and practical application of existing cooperation agreements, should make this clear and improve the conditions for inter-regional cooperation.

The Ten view developments in Central America with concern. The political tensions in this region carry with them the risk of unforeseeable critical escalations. The countries of the European Community accordingly welcome initiatives from States of the region designed to reduce these tensions, such as the peace plan by the Foreign Minister of Honduras, the San José declaration of 4 October 1982 or the efforts made by Mexico and Venezuela. There is cause for deep scepticism over developments in Nicaragua, which is moving further and further away from its original goals of pluralism, a mixed economy and non-alignment to become the focal point of critical developments in Central America.

The special programme for Central America, in which this House played such an active part, should be swiftly translated into effective assistance for the beneficiary States.

Allow me to conclude with a few words on cooperation by the Ten in international organizations and conferences and their participation in international multilateral measures.

The German Presidency intends to devote special attention to such cooperation. This will apply in particular to the United Nations and its numerous specialized organizations. The contribution Europe is able to make to resolving acute world problems and to building a better world order will hinge essentially on the solidarity of our behaviour and actions within such organizations.

The UNCTAD Conference begins in Belgrade on 6 June. Here the EEC has a decisive role to play as the third world's biggest trading partner and the major donor of official development aid. In the present state of the world economy, the stable further development of many countries in the third world is gravely threatened. In Belgrade, we shall primarily be concerned with problems of indebtedness and raw materials. There too, it is necessary to resist protectionist tendencies and to put into practice the decisions taken by the GATT Ministerial Conference. Give-and-take and cooperation as amongst partners are called for. For that reason we deplore the delay in initiating global negotiations.

We shall strongly advocate further strengthening of the Ten's cooperation in the United Nations and a reinforcing of the Community's constructive role in that organization. Moreover, we know that we are as one in the determination of all our partners to strengthen the United Nations and to safeguard its universal character, so that the aims of the Charter — the maintenance of peace and security, abandonment of the use of force, economic and social progress, self-determination and human rights — may be realized world-wide.

When Germany last took on the Presidency of the EEC and I, as President of the Council, addressed this House on 4 July 1978, I concluded by saying, with reference to the coming first direct election to the European Parliament:

A Parliament elected directly and throughout the Community will carry new political weight. The European Parliament has always been a power which has prompted the Council to embark upon its dealings with an eye to the future of Europe. Nor will this be otherwise, I am sure, during the coming months of the German Presidency.

To this I would add: in the same spirit of confidence, I ask you today, as President of the Council, to demonstrate your trust and your willingness for close and fruitful cooperation between Parliament and Council.

(Prolonged applause)

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, Mr Genscher, ladies and gentlemen, every six months, in January and July, we go through the same ritual. A new Member State takes over the Presidency of the Council, hopeful to begin with, flexing its muscles, giving the impression of being well trained like a steeplechaser. The course and the obstacles have been recognized for what they are. Six months later, in June or December, we find our steeplechaser exhausted, having negotiated few if any of the obstacles, which have in fact been joined by new ones.

Mr Genscher, you are no exception. On the contrary, the way you have just listed many of the problems for the House, you are evidently trying to create the impression that you are Superman. On 7 June, at the end of the German Presidency, we shall be talking to each other again. We shall then see whether Superman is made of flesh and blood or is just an inflated rubber doll. When I say we shall be talking to each other again, I am not being quite accurate. I shall certainly still be here. Your continued presence would not be entirely in keeping with what this House has been used to.

(Cries from the centre and left)

President. — I would just point out that not all Members understand German. Exclamations should therefore be made into the microphone!

(Laughter)

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) In the last few years we have had a speciality: the steeplechaser that appears at the start is usually withdrawn from the race at the half-way point. This is what happened during the Irish, Dutch, Italian, Belgian and Danish Presidencies. Mr Genscher, you have a good chance of perpetuating this tradition.

I am not saying this on polemical grounds, and I am not saying it with any malice either. I feel that this is one of the critical aspects of the European Community. Six months of Council Presidency without regard for the situation at home is such a burden on the Presidency of the Council that we ought to be thinking of possible changes to the system. Some Members of the House protested just now when I referred to the risks inherent in this situation. But only last week the German Head of State said there was no longer a working parliamentary majority to support the government's policy. According to your Federal President, therefore, you no longer command enough support in the Bundestag.

(Cries from the right)

Mr Bangemann, you cannot wipe out the words of the Federal German President by shouting.

We had great hopes of the Federal Republic's Presidency, it being after all the strongest Member State in population, economically and above all financially. Your government will not have a working parliamentary majority until 6 March at the earliest. In the meantime, you will be engaged in an election campaign, if not a fight for your existence. Then the Bundestag will be constituted, and only then will a new government be formed. At a conservative estimate that will not be until May, so if we are lucky, we shall have a Council Presidency with a working parliamentary majority for only the last four weeks.

To revert to the image of the steeplechaser, it is being put into the race without being properly shod and without public support. To be completely objective, the German Presidency has more handicaps than any of its predecessors. You are familiar with the catalogue of sins committed by the Council of Ministers. I do not need to repeat it here. This catalogue of sins is weighing you down before you even start. It is marked in large letters: Largely caused by the inability of the Council of Ministers, which refuses to tackle the problems and does not take any final political decisions.

The worst sins in this catalogue are the non-fulfilment of the mandate of May 1980, in words: nineteen hundred and eighty; the rejection of the supplementary 1982 budget; the fishing crisis; the legal proceedings taken against the Council for remaining inactive over the transport policy; the imbalance of the budget; the failure to reform the common agricultural policy and, as a result, the many cases of fraud that have now come to light.

You have our utmost sympathy, which will come as a surprise to some Members of this House. The Socialist Group fully agrees with the head of your government, Helmut Kohl, when shortly after taking office he referred to the situation in Europe as being pitiful.

On top of this, we are going through the most serious economic crisis since the Second World War, with unemployment an expression both of this crisis and of the restructuring which has only just begun. To revert to the steeplechase, in addition to all the handicaps, you face a very strong headwind.

There is only one thing to do: flatten your ears and try to make yourself as streamlined as possible. You really do need help. My group is quite prepared to give it. Not out of exuberant personal sympathy, but in an effort to lighten the burden, to make some of the obstacles smaller and to get you out of the headwind.

Let me give you a few more examples. You referred to a demand which the chairman of my group has repeatedly voiced: away with the right of veto in the Council, which contravenes the Treaty. Thank you for joining our ranks.

You say you want to help Parliament to strengthen its position and its right to a say in Community matters.

Arndt

Excellent! But why did your government in effect do precisely the opposite of what you are today advocating in the case of the supplementary 1982 budget. The same happened with the 1981 and 1982 budgets, when Germany had a different head of government, and we objected just as much then.

You said Parliament must be the motive force in European unification. Then look at the decisions we have taken. We *are* the motive force. But we would have made a great deal more progress if the Council was not the one that applied the brakes in Europe. And your government — not only the present one, but its predecessor as well — was very good at applying the brakes.

You said that a major concern of the new Presidency would be to take practical measures in the fight against youth unemployment. And yet your government voted against the amendments to the 1983 budget proposed by Parliament in this respect, for example against a programme for the creation of jobs for young people, against an increase in resources to prepare young people for working life, against measures for training in information technology and against resources for continuing education. Up until 16 December 1982 your government was opposed to measures to fight youth unemployment, but now, in January 1983, you are completely in favour.

The German Government could turn out to be a successful Presidency if it simply ensured that what it proclaims in great speeches on Sunday is not totally inconsistent with what it achieves in the Council of Ministers from Monday to Saturday.

(Applause)

One of the greatest inconsistencies is the undesirable development of the agricultural policy and the Christian Democrats' and Liberals' reaction to it. It is in itself schizophrenic to call, rightly, in the European Parliament for moderate guaranteed prices and for a smaller proportion of expenditure to go to agriculture and then to vote for precisely the opposite, as the Christian Democrats and Liberals did in calling for increases of 16% and 14% when the agricultural prices were being fixed in 1981 and 1982. A consistent policy on the part of your government, which should above all place greater confidence in the laws of the market, as my group proposes, should put an end to these dual standards. Unless adjustments are made in the agricultural sector, nothing else will work in Europe.

For years the Socialist Group and this Parliament have called for unemployment to be combated with more public investments and a coordinated approach by all the Member States, and the European Council is now also convinced that this is the right way. But as I recall, this is precisely what your present Economics Minis-

ter, under a different government, has opposed in the past.

The Council has surely had enough practical proposals from this Parliament on how the imbalance in the budget should be corrected. What I have to say on this is not only the policy my group has pursued for years but also the policy recommended by the vast majority of this House.

We want an effective Community regional policy, with the emphasis on the regions in actual need and equipped with appropriate financial resources, the Social Fund developed to become an instrument which can help in the fight against unemployment, energy and industrial policies to meet the needs of the employment and regional structural policies, a transport policy that incorporates financial assistance for Community projects of supranational importance, a stronger environmental policy that affects all Community policies and is endowed with financial resources, an increase in resources for development and cooperation and more action to fight hunger in the world.

These measures must satisfy the requirements for the effective use of resources and be designed to do more for the weaker regions of the Community more than redistribution.

The Socialist Group supports the call for the apportionment of revenue between the economically stronger and weaker regions of the Community. The advantages of economic integration are unevenly distributed, and apportionment measures are therefore necessary.

The Socialist Group also considers it necessary for there to be a balance in the burden Member States have to bear under the Community's budget. Burdens and advantages accruing from the Community budget should be proportionate to the economic performance of the Member States and their citizens.

You have agreed to all these points and said they are your political objectives. As you will admit, your remark on the budget, referring to the need for determined action, is not enough. Why do you not at least say that you and your government endorse the policy of the Socialists and the majority of Parliament and will vote accordingly in the Council in future?

(Applause from the left)

Post-war German Governments, regardless of their composition, have always set great store by monetary stability. This is another major task for the German Presidency, but unlike you, we do not believe that Europe yet has a uniform monetary policy.

We need a monetary policy which is capable of ensuring that the European currencies help each other and

Arndt

enables a joint position to be adopted on the dollar so that European monetary stability can be strengthened.

For years the European Parliament has been trying to convince the Council and the governments of the need for the Community to become far less dependent on others for its energy supplies. But it has so far proved impossible to develop a common European energy policy. And yet there is enormous potential in this field. If energy was used more rationally, renewable energy sources were developed, a Community price policy was adopted and energy conservation measures were consistently promoted at European level, economic and political dependence on the oil-producing countries could be substantially reduced.

Against this background, you surely cannot be serious when all you can say is that we must 'not weaken' in the energy sector. What we must do in fact is use all our strength to bring about the European energy policy we in Parliament have been demanding for years. The Council and particularly your government have so far prevented the adoption of a common energy policy by failing to take any action.

The third focal point of your statement, Mr Genscher, was southward enlargement. We welcome this. But there is not much point in regular and euphoric statements on the political need for the accession of the two Iberian countries if their accession is blocked when it comes to creating the economic and financial conditions.

You also said that Europe should have a common security policy. My group fully endorses this sentiment. We believe that, in view of the present nuclear threat and the dramatic confrontation between the superpowers and between North and South, this is one of the major tasks to be tackled in Europe. This confrontation calls for a Europe capable of taking independent political initiatives within or outside existing alliances. For these reasons and as a logical consequence of the development of political cooperation, cooperation on security questions seems necessary, particularly with regard to international disarmament negotiations, and you can count on all our help in your efforts.

Wherever human rights are trodden underfoot in this world, the European Parliament has taken up the matter and stated its opinion. This has often been more effective than the threatening military behaviour of some major powers. The European institutions, you of the Council, we of Parliament and the Commission, must beware, however, of making their fight against the violation of human rights dependent on the side which is violating them. No one has the right to condemn the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the situation in Poland or the persecution of dissidents while defending Chile or South Africa or the events in Beirut, and vice versa.

The Vice-President of the Commission has said in this House that in the present circumstances, with human rights being violated and democracy spurned, Turkey will not be receiving any more assistance from the Community. This conflicts with your statement that the democratic process has been initiated in Turkey. We wish it were so. But the democratic process has not been initiated in either Poland or Turkey, whatever the two military dictators may repeatedly say to the contrary. You can count on our sympathy and indeed on our approval if you make progress in only a few of the areas you have mentioned.

We Socialists in the European Parliament do not see it as our task to form a national opposition at European level to the present transitional German Government. It must be obvious to everyone here that we were not sparing in our criticism even when my political colleagues were in power. If we voiced our criticism then, we will surely be allowed to do so now that a government not to our political liking is in power.

Consequently, although you can count on our help, you must also count on our constantly comparing your actions with your general statements. We shall not remain silent if all we get in the future are fine words, because the future development of Europe will depend not on the great speeches made by those in power on a Sunday but on the realities from Monday to Saturday.

(Applause)

Mr Rumor (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, since I am Italian I feel no need to imitate Mr Arndt and deck my speech with allusions to German internal politics — a thing I would not do even if I were German.

Permit me therefore, Mr President of the Council, to express the pleasure I have in speaking on your report on behalf of my group.

This is also a suitable moment for acknowledging your dedication to the cause of European Union. In furtherance of this cause you and your Italian colleague Mr Colombo recently presented the draft European Act.

Your Presidency, Mr Minister, coincides with a period which is decisive for the Community.

We are less than a year away from the second direct parliamentary elections, which will see a spirit of realistic evaluation succeed the spirit of hopeful optimism which governed the first.

Such an evaluation will inevitably include not only the work of Parliament — whose legal and formal limitations are well known — but also that of all the Community institutions, and it will encompass the degree of economic integration achieved, the need for common policies, and the development of inter-institutional relationships.

Rumor

I do not believe that the results we have to offer up to the present are very convincing. Permit me to say that this is also due to the intolerance and indifference not infrequently displayed by the Council in regard to Parliament, as exemplified by the futile obstinacy shown by the Council in its dispute over the supplementary budget for 1982, which Parliament — without questioning the intergovernmental agreements — wanted to restore to the logic of Community rules.

But this is no time for disputes!

It is time to affirm the united determination of all the institutions.

The first sign of this affirmation is that each one should do its part and let the others do theirs.

I appeal above all to the Commission, Mr President. We say to the Commission: avail yourselves of all the powers granted to you in the treaty, and never allow your rights and duties to be pre-empted.

I appeal to you, Mr President of the Council. It has been recently demonstrated, during the Presidency of Mr Tindemans, that it is politically possible to return to the Community rule laid down in the treaty and to take decisions by a majority, while maintaining the collegiality necessary to confront the most serious economic situation ever to affect our Community.

When this collegiality is lacking, it is evident that the divergencies arise not from legitimate differences over the interests of the Community, but from the persistence of a nationalistic viewpoint — I am thinking of the incredible war over fishing — which does not admit that in this crisis in the world economy we must either save ourselves together or perish together.

It is unthinkable that a Community which represents the largest commercial centre in the world should not be aware that the first problem it must face is represented by the mass of 12 million unemployed which has become the unhappy symbol of our inventive and functional incapacity.

What internal peace can we guarantee, what hope for the new generations which are most severely affected? What faith in the vision of union can we create if we do not ban protectionism, open up our frontiers, pursue common policies — if we refuse to provide adequate own resources for Community use?

Let us not indulge ourselves by laying the blame on the international crisis, which, however, is serious enough. Let us not commit the suicidal act of declaring ourselves unable to deal with it.

Mr President of the Council, with political determination one can deal with anything, even though the solutions may be partial and reached after long efforts, if they are reached at all.

In this connection, there is an issue which we must confront boldly and with resolution: the accession of Spain and Portugal.

There is no doubt that this accession involves economic, technical, and institutional difficulties.

These difficulties cannot be allowed to compromise the ultimate goal, which is a political one, and as such it should be maintained. Only in this way can the Community preserve its credibility in the international arena and in respect of the problems being debated there.

The areas of conflict with the United States have diminished considerably. An understanding between the two sides of the Atlantic is indispensable. However, the United States must understand the complementary nature of the interests which bind them to Europe. We cannot view their economy as a variable unconnected with the European economy and with the basic problems of development, whose solution is a common responsibility. A partnership can exist only between equals.

I believe that the Italian proposal for systematic consultation on the vital interests of the Community and the United States is an initiative which can provide a timely solution to problems similar to those which have arisen in recent months and preserve the indispensable collaboration between the two great partners.

In this regard, Mr President of the Council, I think it right to acknowledge that we have been witnessing more decisive and timely action in the area of political cooperation, within the context of the disturbed and ever-changing international scene. We are still only at the stage of a general approach, however, which has not yet been embodied in concrete political initiatives.

I think the European Council has taken a great step forward in including the political problems of security among the issues involving political cooperation. This is a courageous and realistic recognition of the natural integration of inter-related problems in the development of European Union.

There are two more points which I would like to touch on briefly. Most important is the Middle East question, on which, however, I do not intend to dwell. I took careful note of the Council's position as you explained it in your speech on the programme of the German Presidency. I wish only to call your attention to the concrete proposals contained in the Penders resolution, which Parliament has just been debating.

The second point concerns the very significant events which have been taking place within the Soviet sphere of influence.

The change of leadership there, with the coming to power of Yuri Andropov, led to an offer of negotia-

Rumor

tions and possible agreements for a policy of security and peace. These proposals should be examined with all the caution dictated by the disillusionments of the past, but also with the objective attention due to any prospect for a peaceful settlement between East and West.

We should do this without abandoning what for us has been the *conditio sine qua non* from the beginning, that is, that arms reduction should be balanced, simultaneous and supervised.

Negotiations on disarmament have never been as complex as they are now, as demonstrated by the fact that they are taking place in at least four distinct but closely connected centres: the talks in Geneva, to which the two NATO decisions are connected, the START negotiations, the MBFR negotiations in Vienna, and finally, the Madrid Conference, where the possibility of organizing a conference on European disarmament has been introduced.

Mr Genscher, I have listed all these possibilities of negotiation in order to underline the historical responsibility borne by you and your colleagues to slow down and halt the arms race, thus breaking out of the vicious circle imprisoning Europe and the world. We must bear in mind that the basis for disarmament is the creation of peaceful coexistence and mutual good faith. The situation in Afghanistan, in Poland, and in other countries subject to armed occupation or strict Soviet control is certainly not yet one which is conducive to good faith.

We therefore issue a firm request to the governments of the Community, which have so far demonstrated a praiseworthy solidarity, not to allow the Madrid Conference to be brought to a close without a clarification in the area of human rights.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this Community and this Parliament are rooted in the reaction against the accumulated horrors of totalitarian violations of the rights of man and of peoples; they have assumed the historical task of defending — not only in Eastern Europe, but anywhere in the world — the right of each individual and each people to be masters of their own destinies.

Mr President Genscher, I have purposely chosen to speak only on questions of vital importance. Time does not permit me to examine an issue which is now occupying our full attention: the trends toward European unity as they appear in the development of the institutional relationships within the Community.

I hope that on 24 January next we will have a meeting with the Foreign Ministers precisely in order to discuss this issue.

Mr President, it may encourage you to know that we are all aware that the task you face is an enormous one, and that our hopes may be impossible to fulfil.

Because of your experience as a partisan of Europe, we ask more of you than of others.

For this reason you are in need of sincere and firm good wishes, and close and genuine collaboration.

On our part, such good wishes will not be lacking, Mr President of the Council!

(Applause)

Lady Elles (ED). — Mr President, Mr President-in-Office, I would like to join with my colleague, Mr Rumor, in welcoming Mr Genscher to this Parliament as President. Without wishing to interfere in the internal affairs of Mr Arndt and his electorate I hope very much that Mr Genscher will be here in June 1983 to report to the Parliament. Not only because we are all aware of the great respect that he holds for this Parliament since he came to this Parliament outside his own Presidency to report on his draft European Act, which I think was an act, if I may say so, both of bravery and of democracy and which we very much admire. And also because, slightly more self-interestedly of course, I hope very much that he will listen seriously to all the points that are being made to him today and no doubt over the next few weeks — boringly perhaps — and that he shall therefore be in a position to reply to us on his undertakings in June 1983.

Now, Mr President, to reply to the speech that Mr Genscher has made reminds me of a Chinese saying: when you have visited a country for about a fortnight, then to give a lecture on it is like trying to pick flowers in a field from a galloping horse. I think this is rather the situation today and I can therefore only pick a few of the flowers from the speech of Mr Genscher and elaborate on one or two of these matters. But it does not mean to say that we do not attach, among my group, the greatest importance to some of the other matters, indeed to all the matters, on which he has touched.

The first point on which I would like to make a few comments is the question of trade. We in this Parliament, Ministers of all the Member States, have frequently paid lip service to the words 'free world trade'. Of course it is very easy to talk about free world trade when we impose our own tariffs and expect others to reduce theirs. But it is also necessary if we are to have any proper international trading system that we respect each other's trading patterns, we respect each other's economies and that we seek to reduce tariff barriers between our different countries. We only had to see the comparative failure of the GATT ministerial meetings at Geneva recently to know what a very difficult task that is.

But there are some matters which we have to face in this Community and the sooner we face them the better.

Elles

One of them is the way we treat newly industrialized countries. Is it sensible to allow them to have Community preference for their goods when their standard of living is as high now as in many parts of the Community? I only put this as a question. This is a matter that must be considered.

We must also consider the other side of the question — Europe has been investing in less-developed countries for years. Is it sensible therefore to go on investing and encourage them to produce goods which we then refuse to accept in our Community except with the greatest difficulty? This is the other side of the coin.

Again with Japan we have the same sort of problems. They have high tariffs. They are now saying that they are reducing them. But to reduce tariffs from 36 to 30% on confectionery is not frankly a very great help.

On the other hand, the Japanese say that they have set up a fair trading office to listen to all complaints on matters of discrimination. But they also report, funnily enough, that of the complaints they have received only two for instance have come from British companies. While five have come from Japanese companies on discrimination against Japanese companies trying to trade with the West. This too is something we must look at. We must also be careful in the way we treat Japan. After all, it has other outlets in the Far East; we cannot afford to lose its friendship in our general stand in the West. It is a democratic country and we should not seek to undermine its standing in the world economy.

Nevertheless, we have a new problem in that they are now sending car parts and spares to be assembled in less-developed countries. This is again going to create burdens in the competition in prices between the Japanese and European motorcar industries.

An aspect which has already been touched on and is crucial is the question of the export of agricultural produce. This, Mr President, is after all a new situation. Only in the last 20 years has the European Community become the biggest importer of food products in the world and it is now second only to the United States in food exports. This is a comparatively new situation, and the Community as such, because it does not have the mechanisms and it does not have the will, was unable to face this particular difficulty until recently, when it turned up on our doorstep in the form of dissension with America. For this reason my group and I welcome the initiative of the Commission in asking Mr Villain, Director-General of Agriculture, to go to the States to explain the position of the European Community and its Common Agricultural Policy and to see whether measures cannot be taken on the basis of our mutual interests and agreement. In our dealings with America, what is needed above all is explanation of our policies, because, after all, both America and we have exactly the same objectives in

our agricultural policies — to support the farmer, to have a stable community and to make ourselves self-sufficient in food supplies. These objectives, I may say, no other countries in the world have managed to achieve, particularly those with Marxist economies. So these efforts of the Community are not to be thrown away lightly without due consideration and discussion.

Another aspect of trade is going to be our problem with enlargement. I would particularly refer to the agreement of 1970 with Spain, from which cars, as you know, come in with a duty of 4.4% and yet exporting cars into Spain carries a duty of 36.7%. Where is the free trade? Where are the mutual respect and reciprocity of tariffs?

These are just some of the problems which arise in trade. They will, I know, be taken on board by the Presidency when considering policies designed to meet at least some of these difficulties.

Successful trading policies, however, must have consequences for employment, and on this particular subject I wish to say a few words. Protectionist policies introduced to save jobs are a short-term expedient which often results in losses of competitive power on world markets, with consequent greater unemployment in the end. It is therefore up to the Council to adopt positive measures to meet this critical situation.

We welcome the declaration of 1983 as Small Business Year, and we invite the Council to stimulate the creation of new employment in small businesses. One only has to compare the US small-business administration's investment in 1980 of 4 billion dollars with the EIB's effort over three years of 335 million ECU — something like, I suppose, 330 million dollars to see that some attempt should be made to correct this imbalance.

Here we might recall the efforts of the European Parliament in this field, where through our amendments we have at least exempted small businesses from the effects, or possible effects, of the draft Vredeling directive: that is something the European Parliament can be thankful for having done.

In formation of the common market, please remember the liberalization of services. There is a general movement of employment from manufacturer to the services sector; but how is this possible when the Community refuses to take measures to enable insurance to be profited from throughout the Community as a whole, when housing finance is blocked by national measures and when the failure of the Council to take the necessary measures to liberalize housing finance has abysmally failed?

In this field, there is also the removal of restrictions on exchange control, which only the United Kingdom so far has had the courage to introduce; and I think this

Elles

is again something which the Council should do something about.

Regrettably, I see that the Labour and Education Ministers are again going to meet. What did they do at their last meeting at the European Jumbo Council? Apparently nothing came out of it at all. Would it not be more important for the Ministers of Industry to meet in order to discuss an industrial policy for the Community, to analyse and assess future world market trends, to encourage Community expenditure on research and development instead of having it organized piecemeal on a national basis, very often with overlaps which are irrelevant to the creation of jobs?

Finally on this point, I would request the Council most urgently to do everything to encourage investment from outside the Community, on which thousands of jobs already depend, and not to tolerate proposals from the Commission such as the draft Vredeling directive, which has not only not served to create one single job, but has already — before it has been even considered by the Council — proved a positive deterrent to investment from outside. I hope the Council, if it has the possibility, will turn down this draft directive with all possible speed.

Finally, Mr President, I would just say a word on security, because this clearly must have top priority on the agenda of European political cooperation. This subject was, of course, debated in this Parliament in July 1981 and received our strong support, for we cannot afford in the West to go it alone: we must have the support of America. It is, however, worth recalling, in our reactions to the Andropov proposals, that we after all have been making peace proposals to the Russians for years. There is no new initiative in the Prague pact *vis-à-vis* the West. We have been suggesting these proposals for years, and it is easy for the Warsaw Pact countries to make such proposals for disarmament when Mr Andropov has already carried on a policy and encouraged and given the go-ahead for two new nuclear missiles to replace SS20.

I know my time is up, Mr President, but I would just like to say that unless we stick together and have a common security policy and do not leave our American friends in the lurch, we shall find that all the policies that we have tried to follow in the economic, commercial and financial fields will be wasted.

One last word, Mr President, on the question of the United Kingdom. We request the Council most urgently to undertake its main task of solving the problem of the British contribution to the European budget. It is a Council obligation; it is a Council responsibility; and we hope that by June 1983, whatever the President of the Council has already said, they will make enormous efforts to do what they can to solve this problem. We shall all be going to the polls in 1984, and we have to present to the British people a credible

and viable Community. We can only do that with the cooperation of the Council.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR B. FRIEDRICH

Vice-President

Mr Spinelli (COM). — (FR) Mr President, there is something disappointing, indeed almost disembodied, in this twice-yearly ritual according to which the new President of the Council gives us a catalogue of his aspirations. We know perfectly well that his powers are strictly limited and that he cannot guarantee the attainment of any of the objectives which he lists to us. We also understand the particular difficulty experienced by the German Government in assuming this responsibility at a time when the fact of being one of the most influential members of the Council is compensated by the imminent prospect of an election whose outcome is most uncertain.

Alongside all these negative elements, we must put on record the fact that Mr Genscher is a well-known European, a committed European, a European who has for a long time borne responsibility for the external policy of the Federal German Republic and is familiar with the dramas of this Community; sometimes, over the years, he has had his own vision of the future of Europe and he is now speaking to us at a time which marks a turning point in his own political life. He might have spoken to us with some detachment, drawing on his deepest thoughts instead of on the files of his permanent representation and of the Council secretariat. The disappointment engendered by his speech is greater than that which we usually feel on similar occasions.

Speaking on behalf of the Italian Communist and Allied Members I shall confine my attention to a few aspects because I do not have time to express our own views at greater length.

On the subject of cooperation Mr Genscher drew our attention to the serious problems posed for us by the developing countries and he touched on the problem of their debt levels. What did he propose? To consolidate, reduce or cancel those debts? These are the real decisions which will shortly have to underly our policy towards the third world. He spoke also of the commitment which Europe must assume if it is to stop the process of progress towards peace from being halted and if we are to exploit every opportunity of progress towards détente and make a determined effort to stop the arms race. He did not say a single word about the heavy pressure exerted day by day on all our countries

Spinelli

in the west and east alike, to undermine the fragile and uncertain agreement which has been established between our countries; nor did he say a word about the need to strengthen this union of political wills including measures of political cooperation. Mr Genscher spoke to us of the fight against unemployment as a first priority but all he proposed was an increase in expenditure on professional training and support on a scale which he did not define for small and medium-sized undertakings. That really is very little, Mr Genscher, as a response to so serious a problem.

You spoke too, Mr Genscher, of the development of our internal market as a second priority, but you failed to point out that if our internal frontiers are the scene of many abuses these are due primarily to the fact that VAT rates still vary widely from one country to another and nothing has yet been done to harmonize them. You devoted only four lines to the need to embark at long last on a common transport policy. Are you aware, Mr Genscher, of the resolution adopted by the European Parliament which is proposing to take action in the Court of Justice against the Council of Ministers because of its failure to discharge the responsibilities vested in it by the Treaty in this area?

You spoke as your third priority of enlargement, but nothing in your speech indicated whether the Council was about to reach a conclusion or not.

I shall not now dwell on the long list of stages which would have to be crossed if we are to make progress with the common policies; in most cases the measures would be desirable but the Council's ability to reach decisions remains the great unknown. Mr Genscher, you well know that in this situation we cannot make progress with the institutional system which our peoples set up 25 or 30 years ago; you have repeated this yourself on a number of occasions. You well know that the Genscher-Colombo plan is making little progress if it has not already been shunted onto a siding. You well know that this Parliament intends to propose to the governments and parliaments of our Member States a draft treaty establishing at long last a union whose attainment is provided for in the original Treaties and advocated in countless declarations; but you did not say a single word about this.

Mr Genscher, we expected more of you today than this set of vague words and intentional or embarrassed silence. You will not be surprised to see that we did not applaud you.

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) Mr President, the Liberal and Democratic Group welcomes a further opportunity of conducting a European dialogue with the new President-in-Office of the Council, for that is what we intend to do. With one exception, all the previous speakers have begun this European dialogue with the Council and have made no attempt to resort

to party political arguments. I do not intend to do so either. However, I should like to say a few words to Mr Arndt in the hope that he may heed my words on a future occasion, when another President-in-Office of the Council is sitting here.

(Interjection from Mr Arndt)

I do not say this for polemical reasons, just as you did not resort to polemic, Mr Arndt. And I should not like to hear a polemical speech from you in these circumstances, as you will no doubt understand.

When I was elected as a candidate to stand for my party, I was asked as what I would actually be standing, as a German, a Liberal, a European or what. I said that I would stand, first, as a European, second, as a Liberal and, third, of course, as a German. Listening to your speech, Mr Arndt, I had the feeling you were speaking, first, as an electioneering German, second, as a short-sighted Socialist and, third, perhaps as a blind European. That was not the right thing to do.

We must concentrate on what Mr Genscher said in his statement. And this, Mr Arndt, is the programme of a government which may change or may not change. The only real explanation for the fear of change you have expressed here is that you expect less of a possibly different government than the one represented here, and that is truly remarkable. What Mr Genscher has given us is a programme which follows on from the programmes of many other Presidencies, but is different in one respect: it contains a number of new impulses, never before mentioned by a Council Presidency. Never before has a President-in-Office of the Council referred so clearly to the need for the introduction of a European security policy. This is very significant. Other member of my group will be taking up other aspects of Mr Genscher's statement later. With your permission, therefore, I should like to concentrate on this one aspect. My group considers this subject so important because we are convinced that this European security policy is one of the means not only of ensuring the Community's future existence but also of forging closer and stronger links now, if we succeed in giving this programme of the German Presidency our support. That is why I feel we should concentrate on this aspect. What does it signify? A number of misunderstandings need to be cleared up here.

Firstly, security policy is more than just a military defence policy. It is a collection of external, security and sometimes even economic and external economic policy decisions of the type, as the President of the Council has pointed out, which the Community has, moreover, been taking with some elegance and to some effect in the last few months. We must not overlook the fact, after all, that more common ground has been found in European Political Cooperation than in the traditional areas of Community policy. And that must not leave this Parliament unmoved. We are interested in seeing the number of common policies

Bangemann

increased. This security policy is an opportunity in this respect.

Secondly, security policy would not signify a re-emergence of the dispute of blessed memory between Europeans and supporters of the Atlantic Alliance but an attempt — thirdly — to give the European Community more weight in NATO, which is necessary if we really want to defend European interests within this alliance. We can see from the arguments with the Americans, which the President of the Council mentioned, that, where we have remained firm and adopted a common approach, it has been possible to reach a satisfactory compromise, which we can then use to give renewed strength to the Atlantic Alliance. What we also need — and the European Parliament has a primary interest in this — is a more public debate on security. Much of what has been misunderstood by the public and has also resulted in greater enthusiasm for the peace movement, because it has been able to profit from misunderstandings among the public, was only possible because the national parliaments have placed excessive confidence in consultations in NATO. This is where the European Parliament should be stepping in: we should ensure this debate is public.

And finally, security policy is, as I and my group see it, part of the policy for peace. Security policy cannot be opposed to the policy for peace. Those who want peace must also want this European security policy, because if the European Community makes an appropriate effort to arm for the event it hopes will never occur or to disarm to avoid this event, it will be contributing to the maintenance of peace. I welcome this statement from the German Presidency of the Council, and it would be fitting for a German Member of this Parliament to say so even if belongs to a different political party.

(Interjection from Mr Arndt)

What the Socialist Group, like all the other groups, wants to see — must want to see — is this European Community making progress. If anything is to be connected with the name Genscher, then it is the initiative he has taken with his Italian colleague, and the main ingredient of this initiative is a European security policy. I feel this should be heavily underlined, and it is in this area that the Liberal and Democratic Group has great hopes of this Council Presidency and this President-in-Office of the Council.

(Applause)

Mr Lalor (DEP). — Mr President, I want to take the opportunity of joining with my colleagues here today in welcoming Mr Genscher and expressing the hope that over the next six months the Council over which he will be presiding will give useful and beneficial guidance to our Community as a whole.

I was naturally pleased that he should have mentioned in his opening remarks today that top priority would be given to the fight against unemployment. He did stress the unfortunate fact that young people under 25 years of age represent 40% of the overall unemployed in the Community at the present time. I have to say in this regard by way of criticism of both Council and Commission that Community action so far to combat unemployment in the Community is derisory, particularly among young people. If we are serious therefore about what we expect from the Community at this difficult time, we have to give Europe the means to deal with this unemployment problem, assisting those economies that are weakest and need special help to catch up. We have to improve the capacity of the various financial instruments — the Social Fund, the European Investment Bank, the Regional Fund — to provide the help to improve those areas that are worst hit. As I see it at this stage, the German presidency must therefore have as a priority the putting together of a crisis package that will (a) alleviate some of the difficulties that Member States are facing in the creation of productive employment and (b) encourage the Member States to follow agreed guidelines with regard to reducing public deficits, reducing the vast burden of cost in the public service and encouraging reasonable wage demands. This is the only way that we can start moving towards creating the much needed employment that the Community and the world require.

Unfortunately, the type of contribution that I have to make on behalf of my group necessarily obliges one to cover a wide area. I will move on therefore from unemployment and go straight to the Regional Fund and the reference that Mr Genscher made to that. He talked of the slight increase that has taken place in the provision — we now have 2 000 million ECUs in commitment appropriations — and duly pays proper tribute to Parliament in this regard. But he goes on to say that we can only talk about a meaningful reform of the Regional Fund if the Fund's resources are concentrated on the really disadvantaged regions. In this regard I would be hoping that by building that particular remark into his introductory speech at the start of his six months of office he does give the clear indication that he intends taking that particular fact seriously. The people in my country have been extremely disappointed with the outcome of the Regional Fund in Ireland simply and solely because none of the benefits that had been expected when we joined 10 years ago have become a reality. We still find that the countries divide this money in a proportional kind of way, so that the Regional Fund is not in fact being steered or directed to where it is most required, namely the really badly-off areas in the Community.

We have had a budgetary crisis in the Community, and a great deal has been said about the UK and the German rebates. I certainly don't propose to repeat the views that my group has expressed from time to time. All I will say is this. If a Member State has a particular

Lalor

problem, then European solidarity comes into play. An effort must be made through Europe to help that particular country. But if that country wishes to attach conditions that are tantamount to reforming or revising the Treaty or Treaty commitments in relation to the operation of the common agricultural policy, then we cannot agree to sign something which amounts to robbing Peter to pay Paul. Having said this, I do hope that a lasting solution can be found to the problem of the budgetary contributions of the UK and Germany.

Now, there are institutional problems and we have heard a great deal from different Presidents-in-Office of the Council about improving institutional links between the Council and Parliament. Yet our public are becoming increasingly disillusioned with the way in which we reach our decisions. I can say that Mr Genscher and Mr Colombo have produced fine proposals for a European Union, but we must lower our sights while accepting the long-term vision and necessity of these proposals. We have to improve and reform immediately the way in which we reach decisions. In the Council majority voting should apply to matters that are based on the Treaty and unanimity to new initiatives. Our own Parliament will have to be reformed in its working methods. We cannot go on dealing with everything and anything if we are to have public opinion behind us in our quest for greater power. We have to sharpen our image and ensure that our deliberations are communicated to the public in a clear-cut fashion.

Parliament and Commission will also have to develop a more political relationship. There is no point in the European Commission saying that it will respect Parliament's views and then going ahead and ignoring them. Parliament, on the other hand, should have set up a control committee, as I see it, to monitor certain management activities of the Commission and its staff, instead of this Institutional Affairs (Spinelli) Committee, which is undoubtedly a cause of the understandable disillusionment felt by the public, as evidenced in the Eurobarometer. I have been quite amazed recently to read the general European man-in-the-street's reaction and feelings about the European Parliament. I do think it is something that we must apply ourselves to at Parliament level and I would remind the Council and Commission that it might do no harm if they applied themselves to that examination as well.

The system of political cooperation can be considered one of the real achievements, as I see the Community. 1983 will undoubtedly be a year of security problems between East and West. I know the responsibility of the German President-in-Office in this regard will be enormous. While participating fully in political cooperation in relation to security matters, care must be taken to ensure that Member States which are not members of any military alliance should not be compromised in any way. The Community is not the framework for dealing with defence pacts. I think that that type of statement from somebody like myself

from a country that is not aligned in this way is one that has to be taken notice of in this Assembly.

We must also come to grips with the fact that the only way to recovery for our different countries in the present economic crisis is through a distinctively European approach. Our budgetary deficits, our unemployment, our inflation can only be tackled when the EEC as a solid united bloc can tackle the world economic imbalances, the trade between the US, Japan and ourselves, world monetary disorder and our continuing problem over energy. I was pleased to find that in his address this morning the President-in-Office went on from the question of unemployment to speak of the problem of protectionism in industry and devoted some time to it. This is something that he must be encouraged to continue to examine and to clear up.

Speaking of agriculture, he said that since 1979 it had been possible to reduce the percentage of agricultural expenditure from 74% to 62%. This was a considerable achievement, but quite an amount of that achievement was arrived at the expense of the farmers of the Community. I would advise the President-in-Office to be very very careful about pressing on in that direction. He did say in his speech that the foundations of the common agricultural policy must be preserved and that the common agricultural policy has guaranteed us supplies of high-quality food and shielded us from the many disturbances on the world markets. These are the type of sentiments that ought to be kept in mind. I was encouraged to see that the President-in-Office of the Council built that into his speech and I would hope that that particular point of view will be maintained by him over the six months while he is President-in-Office of the Council.

Mr Bøgh (CDI). — (DA) Mr President, when I hear the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers talk about all the problems the German Presidency intends to take up and solve within the next six months, I am reminded of a Bible quotation which runs as follows: 'He who will build a tower does not first sit down and calculate what it will cost, lest he become a laughing-stock?'

The German Presidency does not only want to move the Community a bit further towards European union, but also wants to launch an energetic campaign against unemployment. It wants to solve the problems of youth training, develop medium-sized undertakings, break down barriers to trade, liberalize world trade, bring new countries into the Community, solve the problems of the budget, create new credit systems and extend existing ones, boost activity in the energy sector, protect the environment, reform the agricultural policy, resolve the fisheries crisis and protect seal pups. It wants the Ten to speak with one voice more often in international negotiations, it wants to consolidate the relationship with Japan into equilibrium and improve relations between East and West. It wants to apply

Bøgh

arms reduction initiatives and armament controls, and it wants to build up a security policy which will make it possible for the Community to take on commitments in Turkey, the Middle East, the Far East, Iran, Iraq, the Gulf States, South America, Latin America, Central America etc.

Mr President, for us who are of a more earthbound and pragmatic political tradition, it is natural to ask about the order of priorities in this horn of plenty. We might, for example, make a start by phasing out commitments which internationally are the concern of other organizations and which, according to the Treaty of Rome, are not among the Community's tasks at all. This applies first and foremost to foreign policy, security policy and defence policy. And, by the same token, we could withdraw from affairs which fall within the competence of the national parliaments. We could refrain from becoming involved with problems we cannot solve, because they fall outside our competence and capability, and we could stay away from questions which in reality we do not want to pay the price of solving. In short, if we can't button our own trousers, we should refrain from taking responsibility for the whole world, thus complicating things for those who really do have responsibility. The Community would suffer the same sad fate as the man whose tombstone reads: 'He felt that everything was of concern to him, and that was what he died of.'

Mr De Goede (NI). — (NL) Mr President, the Danish presidency had to overcome a government crisis back home. The German presidency which has just commenced will be hamstrung by the parliamentary elections scheduled to take place on 6 March in the Federal Republic which will be a crucial test for the present government in general but more particularly for its coalition partner, the FDP (Liberal Party) and thus for the Council President, Mr Genscher. That may not prevent the Council presidency from fulfilling its task with the necessary commitment and force. Indeed the problems besetting the Community demand as much.

Allow me to mention a series of those problems in rapid succession: first, the fisheries dispute. Efforts are continuing apace in order to find a compromise solution. Neither the British use of arms nor the stubborn conviction of the Danes — and Mr Kirk has weighed in in his inimitable un-Community way — can resolve the problem. An experienced politician of the calibre of Mr Genscher can do sterling work by upholding the primacy of Community cohesion.

Relations between the Community and Japan: The latest talks have achieved precious little. Long and difficult negotiations lie ahead in order to restore a certain degree of equilibrium in bilateral trade. The debate on imports of Japanese motor vehicles into the Community, scheduled for later today, should provide the House with an opportunity of going into the matter in more depth.

The accession to the Community of Spain and Portugal: The Douro report, recently debated in this House, was subsequently adopted by a large majority. Rapid progress must now be made on a number of important points. Would the President-in-office of the Council be kind enough to give further consideration to the demands and opinions voiced in that report?

East-West relations: Both the statements formulated at the recently held Warsaw Pact Summit in Prague and the Andropov proposals on nuclear disarmament call for further consultations in the EPC framework. Whilst feeling the West's cautious reaction to be justified I consider it vital to keep all options open while giving the matter further consideration. The real tests will be supplied by developments in Poland, Soviet-sponsored initiatives on Afghanistan and progress at the Helsinki CSCE follow-up talks currently taking place in Madrid. I would like to stress the importance of having a coordinated Western reply for, as matters now stand, they have been totally frittered away and are uneven in content.

The uniform electoral procedure in the Member States: The president of the Council has informed us that deliberations on this issue will begin this forthcoming 24 January. I sincerely hope that such a uniform electoral procedure will be adopted by all Member States before 1984 for it is clearly contradictory to democratic principles that as a result of the British first-past-the-post electoral system, whereby the winner, by however small a margin, takes all, the distribution of seats in the European Parliament should be so falsified. Indeed it has to be said that the over-representation in this House of British conservatives, which is a direct result of such an electoral system in the UK, has upset the natural balance of power between the groups in this house and that must not be repeated in 1984.

Unemployment: We fully subscribe to the priorities outlined by the German presidency of which combating unemployment is priority number one. If only such brave words could, just for once, be followed by a specific policy. When will the next Councils of Ministers of Employment and Education, to which the President of the Council referred, take place? We approve of the attention given earlier today to the small and medium-sized undertakings.

The internal market: We likewise subscribe to the importance of maintaining and strengthening the Community's internal market. A simplification of frontier formalities is sorely needed. I am also curious to see the concrete measures the Council intends to elaborate, and curious especially to see by how many hours the Council president will have managed to reduce the current 10 hours it takes to fill in the necessary formalities for heavy goods transport between the Netherlands and Italy, by the end of the German presidency six months from now.

De Goede

Finally, for when has the next meeting of the Council of Ministers of Health been scheduled in this coming 6 month period? When does the next European Council take place and does the Council President share the view that not only employment problems for the future, but also the more than modest results which have heretofore accrued from such summits, should be on the order of business?

Mr J. Moreau (S). — (FR) Mr President, it would be a platitude to point out that the Federal Republic of Germany has taken over the presidency of the Council of Ministers at a particularly difficult juncture for the Community. As Parliament recently pointed out in its report on the economic situation, unemployment is rising and will continue to increase in coming months. We still see no sign of an economic revival and we know that no general improvement can be expected in the immediate future. People are beginning to doubt and public opinion is sometimes surprised by the slowness with which the Community reaches its decisions and by the weakness of the proposals adopted by the Council of Ministers. We are well aware of the difficulties facing the Member States and the Community as a whole. But the remedy does not lie in inaction since that brings with it dangers which present a mortal threat to our development unless they are counteracted. It is not enough to say that protectionism cannot provide an answer to the Community's problems. We must see action to prove that the Council is resolved to face squarely up to the problem of relations between the Community and the rest of the world, in particular the United States, Japan and the newly industrialised countries.

Every effort must be made to ensure that identical rules are applied throughout the world and that the real causes or distortions of competition disappear; otherwise how can we be surprised to see every country trying, with varying degrees of skill, to protect its own interests? The denunciation of certain regrettable practices finds its justification only in the proposals which the Council might adopt to improve its relations with those who try to draw excessive benefit from the present divisions on this specific matter within the Community.

There is no point in discussing these problems if we do not find a solution to the issue of the functioning of the European domestic market. This matter is often discussed here. However, despite the Commission's efforts, we are making no progress and the European domestic market is showing an increasing number of cracks. We hope that the high level working party formed to examine the existing difficulties, will bring about a rapprochement of views and facilitate the rapid adoption of the outstanding directives. I know that you have a personal commitment on this point and I hope you will be successful. The unity of the European domestic market is essential for the defence of European undertakings and to provide them with

the essential base for further development. Without that uniformity Europe will remain fragile and the process of European unification will come to a standstill.

We cannot continue in the present way — as many speakers recognise — in face of the persistent deterioration of the European economy. There is little point in my stressing our disappointment after the Jumbo Council Meeting and at the weakness of the guidelines adopted by the European Council in Copenhagen.

We Socialists believe that restoration of the economic situation must aim firstly at an improvement in the employment situation in all our countries. We expect favourable guidance on this during your presidency and — as you pointed out in your statement this morning — working hours will have to be reduced under conditions appropriate to each individual situation. I am familiar with the arguments which have been exchanged on this matter but we are convinced that this path is possible today as part of a policy for flexible organisation of working time.

I would like to end by stressing the need to consolidate the European Monetary System. Parliament has repeatedly affirmed its desire for progress to the second phase of the EMS. That is a difficult transition as we well know but the difficulties cannot justify stagnation. You alluded to this problem in your address this morning.

One year ago the Commission made, admittedly limited, proposals and recommendations but, if they are accepted, they will permit some development and consolidation of the European Monetary System.

Mr President, when we come to take stock of your presidency in just over five months time I hope we shall be able to record progress in the monetary sector. Events of recent days underline the need for progress and for our respective positions to be clarified.

In conclusion, Mr President, you will be judged not by your words to us today, but by the progress which you manage to accomplish in the sensitive areas I have just outlined to the House.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome the fact that, at a time when the Community is stagnating and suffering serious setbacks, the President of the Council, Mr Genscher, has made a clear declaration of loyalty to European integration. This is an encouraging sign.

Underlying this is a philosophy which has always been vigorously endorsed by European Christian Democrats and according to which there is no future alternative to a united Europe whose citizens live in freedom. If the Presidency of the Council intends to make Europe a major policy issue, it will have the full sup-

Klepsch

port of my group, and we hope that the phrase 'major policy issue', which Federal Chancellor Kohl has repeatedly emphasized, will remain the guiding principle. I have one request to make of you: encourage the Commission to do more to play the role the Treaty confers on it. As you can see, it is not taking any further part in our debate. We find it regrettable that the Commission increasingly give the impression that it is there to carry the Council's briefcases and ensure it has everything it needs. Its main task is protect the Community's interests against everyone else. Hence our request, Mr Genscher: encourage the Commission to play its proper role again.

I referred to serious setbacks just now, and in this context I have something to say to the Socialist Group's spokesman. He rather boldly offered the support of the Socialist Group. He could do two things very easily. One would be to tell his Danish colleagues that they should abandon their opposition to the Community's solution to the fishing dispute.

(Applause)

As you know, of course, the fault lies entirely with the Danish Socialists, who are represented in the Socialist Group here. A second piece of advice: have a serious word with your Greek colleagues. What kind of Member State is this, that is now beginning to upset the monetary Community by devaluing its currency by a substantial amount without saying a word beforehand?

(Applause)

We know you cannot handle money, but to impose import restrictions on goods from the other Community countries, and this at a time when we are giving priority to the discussion of the internal market... I believe these two tasks are deserving of a little effort.

(Cries)

We therefore welcome the fact that the goal of Political Union laid down in the European Act is to be pursued further as an important step in the right direction. We shall measure the willingness of the German Presidency in particular by its courage to set priorities.

In contrast to some statements I have heard here, the President of the Council has gratifyingly refrained from bringing a list of good intentions with him to Strasbourg. He has concentrated his efforts and shown a great deal of discipline in setting priorities for the next six months. At any rate, we take this seriously, because we know that there is not enough time for miracles. But there is enough time to put important things on the right track. We therefore fully approve your priorities.

The recovery of the internal European market is one of the subjects to which the Council should devote its attention in an effort to achieve a result because, in

our view, the internal market is still the source of our considerable prosperity in the Community. Unhindered competition and closer economic cooperation, encourage investments and protect jobs. We realize that. But sometimes we rather have the feeling that in this situation the Member States tackle the problem of the internal market in a remarkable and short-sighted way. I have this picture in my mind of a boat which has sprung several leaks. Instead of everyone taking it in turns to pump out the water, the man at the bow is trying to solve the problem at his end of the boat by tearing up a plank at the stern and nailing it over the hole. That is not the way to do it. I therefore urge the Presidency of the Council to seize the opportunities created by the Council's decisions in the next few months: fight unemployment with a coordinated vocational training policy, say yes to a European policy on small and medium-sized undertakings and encourage private initiative and the willingness to take risks.

When we speak of the internal market and the fight against unemployment, we want to make it easier not only for goods to cross frontiers, for which the Treaty, of course, provides, but for people too. We appeal to the Presidency of the Council not only to eliminate the present deficiencies at the Community's internal frontiers but to consider Benelux as a model for the whole Community.

If the enlargement of the Community is said to be a priority, then there is no escaping the structural questions which affect the budget, the question of the limit to the Community's own resources. The European Community has so far always managed to balance its budget — there is no need to appeal to us to save. The question of an increase in the Community's own resources must be discussed in terms of our being prepared to be as thrifty as possible.

But the main question for us is this: what can be done better and more cheaply in Europe than in the individual Member States? We must also discuss the question of the financial system. We welcome the intention to improve the procedure for reconciling the Council's and Parliament's views and to strengthen Parliament's role in the conclusion of agreements with third countries. But we believe that strengthening can only mean ratification here.

We agree that European Political Cooperation is not the most important thing. It is very important, but the most important thing is to maintain the European Community's ability to act and function and to develop further. But we agree that the extension of European Political Cooperation and the planned inclusion of the security policy represent another positive step forward. Parliament must not be bypassed, however. We do not want a Europe of the governments but a Europe of the peoples, and rapid progress must consequently be made towards making Parliament into a fully fledged controlling and decision-making body in the Community. My colleagues will be

Klepsch

referring to the other aspects. Our thanks and good luck in your efforts.

(Applause)

Mr Møller (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President-in-Office, it would not be proper for me to become involved in the German election campaign which has obviously opened today in the European Parliament. It is therefore not interference in the election campaign which prompts me to thank Foreign Minister Genscher for the programme speech he has given, it is merely a friendly gesture.

The trouble with programmes is that it is difficult within a period of six months to get anything reasonable from them. Many lines are charted, and many perspectives and ambitions are put before us. Perhaps what is presented to us here every six months, when a Council President comes here and tells us what is going to be done in six months with all the world's problems, is too ambitious. It simply cannot be done. The first question I want to ask therefore is whether we should not have a look at the Treaties and see if the Council Presidency should not last a bit longer, so that it would at least have a chance of implementing policies instead of just casting a line and hoping that others will follow it up later, for that is a weakness. We know — and we have often wondered at the fact — that the great Roman Empire was ruled by consuls, who changed every year. That was also a failure, and it is something we should try to avoid, if possible. The times when it was not a failure and crises were overcome were due to extensions of the consulates and the introduction of dictatorship, and we should avoid that too.

Mr President-in-Office, this is my first point: see if there is a way of extending the period of the Presidency, for it is too short to prepare and implement anything which even resembles a European policy. We know that it is difficult to get the European institutions to function as they ought. We know that God's mill grinds, but it grinds slowly, and the same applies to Europe. It gets built, but slowly.

I should like to say to you therefore, Mr President-in-Office, that the most important thing for us is not actually to undertake a reform on the lines of that which bears the names of yourself and Foreign Minister Colombo but to concentrate on getting the internal market to function, before taking the next step, going on to the second phase. It does not in fact function! We just saw last October the repercussions on the internal market of the French protectionist measures and I fear that, the day the fisheries problem is solved, it will not be on the basis of free fishing but on the basis of further restrictions — more power to those who exercise consular authority, I nearly said, to the Commission, which will be given new powers to intervene in free fishing, so that we shall have less freedom

in that area. But freedom is one of the cornerstones of the Treaty of Rome, and we should be keen to uphold it.

We should first be quite sure that the internal market is functioning, so that we do not get repercussions such as those we have witnessed, and shall perhaps see again if the fisheries problem is solved, in which I actually hope and pray the President-in-Office will be successful.

But over and beyond that, I have another problem I must mention. It is the question of getting out of the habit of always stating that unemployment is the most important problem and then doing nothing about it. In fact, every single time we have had a change of President, the new one has affirmed that our most important task is to combat unemployment in Europe. I am of the opinion that we can only fight unemployment by common action and by pursuing a coordinated economic policy. I therefore think that some positive proposals and ideas must be put forward, which may give us new faith that the Community is capable of implementing a policy which will give us more employment. Of course it is important to get a free market for the whole world, but it will be a long time before others dismantle their tariffs and restrictions. I ask you therefore, during your Presidency, to pay attention to the need, in the context of the unemployment problem, to get beyond the stage of programmes and get down to a practical solution, for otherwise the peoples of Europe will not listen to programme speeches, of which they have heard so many. They want to see realities, preferably in the form of jobs for the twelve million unemployed.

Mr M. Martin (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, the speech by the President of the Council raised too many questions for us to make more than a few observations in the short time available to us.

My first observation concerns enlargement. Mr President, we are sorry that this important and complex matter received your attention for only a few moments. However you, like your predecessors, will not be able to evade the real issues. In its inventory, the Commission was obliged to define those problems even more vigorously than in 1978 because the crisis has worsened in the meantime with a deterioration in the agricultural imbalance and an acceleration of the rate at which undertakings are being closed and workers made redundant in particular in the textile sector, the steel industry, shipbuilding and fisheries. That being so it is not surprising that enlargement should elicit such strong opposition from the workers, especially in the Mediterranean regions. We have helped to make that opposition grow and we consider the present pause in the negotiations as a success for our own action.

Mr President, do you in turn intend to evade the real issues and pursue your escapist approach which would

M. Martin

jeopardise the existing achievements of the Community in particular by abandoning the unanimity rule? Of course you cannot expect us to follow you down this dangerous path. We are increasingly convinced that a further enlargement would bring no solution to the problems facing the Community today and would not correspond to the interests of the people in the Member States or in the applicant countries. Whatever pretexts and alibis may be invoked, the sole underlying purpose is to enable the big companies to redeploy their capital to enlarge their market and obtain supplies even more cheaply than up to now.

Is it surprising that countries like the Federal Republic of Germany which has a trading surplus with the applicant countries are the most favourable towards enlargement? The same interests deliberately minimize the problems and refuse to adopt the regulations and budgetary appropriations to remedy the consequences of a possible enlargement. They want the price of accession to be paid by those sectors which are already the most exposed, particularly in the Mediterranean regions and to the detriment of the existing common policies.

Instead of declarations of institutional intent, do you intend to announce practical measures to us such as a tax on imported oils and fats if only to finance the olive oil budget? Instead of engaging in interminable negotiations which raise an unending succession of new problems for all countries, would it not be preferable to prepare with the applicant countries an effective policy of cooperation to our mutual advantage based on complimentary development?

We are afraid that enlargement will be used as a means of bringing about institutional changes whose supranational aspects could in no way constitute an adequate response to the present crisis.

We must address our attention to the fundamental problems, in particular to that of the conditions for a real economic recovery. In that respect the proposals made by the Council President seem insufficient.

We have certain proposals to make: firstly, we must recognise the failure of austerity and wage control policies. Efforts at consultation on economic policy can be made if they appear useful to promote recovery but national choices must be respected.

Secondly, we must show greater firmness in our trading policy with third countries, in particular the United States and Japan. That firmness must contribute to the efforts now undertaken in Europe to restore the balance of trade, a point on which far-reaching reflection is necessary in the Community. We are disturbed by the fact that, according to the published statistics for 1982, France has a deficit with all the Community countries except Greece. The French deficit with the Federal Republic of Germany will be in

the order of 30 000 million francs as against 20 000 million with the United States.

Thirdly, the operation of the European Monetary System must be strengthened particularly in the face of fluctuations in the value of the dollar.

Fourthly, we believe that the criteria for utilising Community financial resources must be reviewed bearing in mind the fact that the budget and borrowing operations should promote employment, professional training and research with a view to economic growth and earnings growth particularly for the lowest paid.

In this respect we believe that farm prices should be fixed at a level higher than that proposed by the Commission to maintain or increase the purchasing power of farmers. Finally, I want to put a question to which we should like a clear reply: in your speech, Mr President, you implicitly envisaged application of the EEC/Turkey association agreement. We have seen press reports on the decisions taken by the Economic and Foreign Affairs Committees of the Bundestag releasing aid of 165 million dollars frozen by the previous government and military aid of 132 million dollars. However the situation in Turkey is definitely not improving: torture is a common practice and intellectuals and trade union, its are being threatened with death. We should therefore like an assurance that the Council will not in any way contribute to the maintenance of this situation. Can you confirm, Mr President, that you do not intend to revive the EEC/Turkey financial protocol?

Mrs von Alemann (L). — (DE) Mr President, a very brief word to Rudi Arndt while he is still in the Chamber. That was the old Rudi Arndt we know from the Federal Republic. A pity, really, that European courtesy has worn off in the last two and a half years.

Mr Genscher, your statement was very interesting. When you last spoke here during a German Presidency, you were able to announce the agreement of all the Member States to the first European direct elections. Today, almost four years later, here we sit, older and wiser, and I, a newcomer, having taken up politics in 1979, far more disappointed than I might have expected when I first entered Parliament. We therefore welcome the fact that you have raised practical issues in your statement and intend to take practical action during your Presidency.

I should just like to take up three points very briefly. Firstly, electoral law. On behalf of my group, I urge you, Mr Genscher, to support the introduction of proportional representation in all the countries of the Community despite the doubts you have. The travesty to which the first-past-the-post system used in one country gives rise in this House is unacceptable in the long run. It is unacceptable, for example, that the Bri-

von Alemann

tish Liberals should not be represented here even though they won 14% of the votes at the first direct elections.

Secondly, transport policy. You say the common transport policy is closely connected with the expansion of the internal market — and the fight against unemployment, I would add, Mr Genscher. We do not need a new concept for the transport policy if by that you mean a concept from the Commission. We need a new concept from the Council. That is what is needed, and the Committee on Transport has already said a great deal on the matter and even threatened legal proceedings.

Thirdly, environmental protection. We very much welcome, Mr Genscher, your announcement of environmental protection measures. My group intends to call for an urgent debate on acid rain and the destruction of forests. The protection of the environment really cannot be ensured by individual countries any longer. We have been saying this for years, and all the experts know this to be true. But it is important for the Presidency to look into this and then to take practical action. If you take up the cause of the air and water conservation and environmental compatibility, you will have our support in every respect.

To conclude, Mr Genscher, I would urge you to be consistent. The citizens of Europe neither expect nor want any more great declarations of loyalty to European Union. They expect practical steps to be taken, steps which make day-to-day life easier in very practical ways for the citizen, the tourist, the businessman, the shopper abroad, the salesman, the housewife and the farmer. Then the outcome of the second European direct elections in May of next year will be reasonable and pro-European, which is what we all want.

(Applause)

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (CDI). — *(NL)* Mr President, the overall tone of the Council President's statement to the House was optimistic. There was praise for the considerable headway deemed to have been made in recent years but I intend to take the liberty of refusing to share such optimism.

The Council president addressed himself first to the direct elections of 1984. The results of a public opinion survey published last week revealed that only 56% of the Community's citizens were aware of the existence of the European Parliament and that a majority of the Community's citizens considered it to be simply worthless. It says a lot about the limitations on our powers and goes a long way towards explaining just how little heed the Council takes of this House. The German president-in-office of the Council is by no means the first to present a package of policy goals to this House. We adopted a resolution on the application by all Member States of a uniform

voting procedure some ten months ago. The Council will only get round to examining it this forthcoming 24 January and the result of their deliberations is very much in the balance.

We have great expectations from the German Council presidency particularly concerning Spanish and Portuguese accession for we believe a Council President whose own country is federalized to be particularly apt at examining not only the more obvious aspects of accession but also the constitutionally acknowledged regions associated with such accession. When does the Council intend to deliberate on the suggestions contained in the Douro report?

We have been informed that the fight against unemployment in the Community is to be given pride of place. Well, we've heard that before too. The November Jumbo Council was devoted to this issue and it was a disastrous flop. The individual Member States' policies are gradually deteriorating and degenerating into self-protection and egoism. It would now seem that, following the leads given by the United Kingdom, Belgium and the Netherlands even the Federal Republic of Germany has taken to trying to revive its manufacturing industry by instilling some oxygen into them and by the adoption of a deflationary policy. A one-sided liberalization with very few corrective measures to offset social injustices accruing therefrom. The order of the day in these Member States are restrictions, moderation and wage freeze which leads me to wonder just how many Community citizens still have the purchasing power necessary to acquire the products available on Community markets. A minister in the government of my country summed it up like this: 'My donkey is dead, but how can that be? After all, I had just got him out of the habit of eating?'

Pressure of time prevents me from going into the many pages of the German Council priorities over the coming 6 months. Would it not have been more honest and realistic to confine oneself to only a few priorities? More realistic because one could have concentrated rather than dissipated one's energies on achieving real results. I very much doubt that we can expect the Community to make any real headway over the next 6 months. Or will I be accused of exaggerating by saying that the German presidency, far from according priority to Community matters during that period, will in reality devote all its energies to the Federal Republic's parliamentary elections. This is the less edifying side of the coin which Council President Genscher revealed to the House in a far too optimistic style earlier today.

Mr Romualdi. — *(IT)* Mr President, we were familiar with Mr Genscher's political position: we could have no doubts as to the acceptability of the political line he would take in launching the programme for the term of the German presidency. He has reaffirmed this with a precision and vigour which honour his personal

Romualdi

commitment to Europe and that of the new coalition government in whose name he spoke today. We hope that his party will be able to overcome the difficulties it is experiencing at present, and that it will continue to be a political force on which Germany and the Community can rely.

But we would not be candid if, in saying this, we did not add that your speech was a speech of good intentions. As other speakers have said, it resembled the list of hoped-for presents that German children give to their parents on Christmas night. This declaration of principle is everywhere contradicted by the facts, by the concrete commitments which the German presidency, on behalf of its government, thought itself obliged to make, or rather, not to make. It is not enough to say that Europe should be all the fine things that we all wish it to be, that the European Act should speedily lead us towards an ever closer political integration, to a greater unity, and to add right afterwards that Germany, and therefore the Council, are not only unwilling to increase our budget by raising the 1% VAT ceiling, as is necessary, but that they even intend to reduce it because they erroneously believe further sacrifices to be impossible. They are thus refusing to support the measures necessary to ensure not only the development but the very survival of the Community.

One cannot declare oneself in favour of Europe, of European political unity, of European political action throughout the world, and at the same time cut the Community budgets. Cutting the budgets is tantamount to dealing a mortal blow to Europe; it extinguishes any vital impulse. One cannot wish for an economically and politically strong Europe without giving consideration to the fact that a Mediterranean economy exists, and should be assisted, for it is important not only for the countries directly concerned but for the entire Community as a link with the Third World. One cannot go on lamenting over our 12 million unemployed without making it possible to develop an adequate regional and social policy which would at least inform us as to the nature of this unemployment and how it affects the quality of our lives.

It is futile to believe that we can preserve, even within the inevitable and well-known limitations, prosperity, employment, productivity and the marketability of our countries' products by stifling Europe, by preventing it, through internal mistakes more frequently due to party politics than to national policy, from using its enormous potential and productive capacity to influence the development of the world economy.

Europe, coordinating its resources, its efforts, its proven technological abilities, can be the largest and most powerful manufacturer of goods and the largest consumer market in the world. Do we want to go on inviting humiliation? Do we want to remain prisoners of our short-sighted egotism? For now I will say no more, save that we cannot continue to be unconscious of the magnitude of our economic, political, and

moral strength and to mourn over our difficulties, insisting on feeding a misplaced and reductive national vanity. In any event, President Genscher, I wish good luck to you and to our Europe.

Mr Petersen (S). — (DA) Mr President, the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Genscher, dealt in his speech with the Community's progress towards European union. Taking words spoken by Mr Larock 25 years ago, he defined European union as full-scale integration. As a Danish social-democrat, I should like, to pass a few comments on that.

To begin with, I find that there is actual inconsistency in Mr Genscher's speech between the objective of a union through full integration and Mr Genscher's statement of what he calls the European model. And he describes this model as a non-dominant association of free states having equal rights. This model, Mr President-in-Office, is more a confederalist state model than a federal union model, because cooperation is entered into by free states enjoying equal rights. It is thus more the Hanseatic League than the model of the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany or the Soviet Union, which Mr Genscher has in mind.

But, Mr President-in-Office, this does not fit in with the so-called Genscher-Colombo Plan for, according to that Plan, Parliament is to be strengthened, and Parliament is a supranational body, the right of veto is to be limited, the area of cooperation to be extended and the Community and European Political Cooperation are to move up into a higher unit. So the Genscher-Colombo Plan coincides better with Mr Genscher's introductory remarks on full-scale integration than with Mr Genscher's European model for cooperation between free states having equal rights. This model, the confederal model, is something we Danish social-democrats can associate ourselves with, because the right of veto in this model is there by definition and not just assured through the Luxembourg compromise. We must therefore reject the Genscher-Colombo Plan, and that is something we are not agreed on. We do not agree to that in Denmark. A united Folketing — and all parties will say this, including the liberals and conservatives — rejected all the essential points and elements in the Genscher-Colombo Plan during a debate in November of last year. That is perhaps why, Mr President-in-Office, and no doubt also because of opposition from other countries, that the President-in-Office has not given us a report today on the position with regard to his and Mr Colombo's Plan, for it can only be bad.

I cannot but breathe a sigh from the heart over all the fine efforts expended on the union question by Mr Genscher, by Mr Colombo and many others, and by Mr Spinelli, who also has a constitution for a European Union in preparation. Come back to earth, gentlemen! Let us do our deed for the day, let us really

Petersen

get to grips with the crisis in a concrete way and get unemployment abolished. We Danish social-democrats think that this union-mongering is damaging the Community, because it is diverting attention away from essentials.

Indeed it was a weak cup of tea that the Council President poured us in regard to the unemployment problem. The liberal colleague of the President-in-Office here in the Chamber, Mr Bangemann, took the liberty before Christmas of saying that it was a scandal that Denmark would not give Parliament more power. I say, Mr President-in-Office, that it is a tragedy that this House, because of the way it dissipates its thinking, because of union-illusions and wars waged with Council of Ministers, does not take enough time to concern itself with its real task, namely to give advice, to give good advice, for in the world we live in good advice is more important than misguided action. That is something which I think both Mr Bangemann and you, Mr President-in-Office, should take note of, and take note that the European Parliament has to date not given a single piece of advice which has been followed up in all of our countries, let alone the big wide world outside the European Community. To put it briefly: let us roll up our sleeves and get to work, instead of making fine speeches!

Mr Goppel (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, Mr Genscher, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by saying how pleased I am that, despite the situation in Germany, despite the reduction of the election campaign to a mere 60 days, the President of the Council has referred with such clarity and in agreement with the Federal Government to the goals of European unification, which will extend well beyond 6 March, and I should like to thank him most sincerely for this.

(Applause)

Six months — as a previous speaker implied — was not regarded as enough even by the Roman consuls, although they had only a city state to govern. We realize, therefore, that there will be no red letter days during these six months and that the President of the Council cannot, Mr Arndt, do in eleven days what you have accused him of in winding your film back thirteen years.

(Applause)

That, I must say, was not just an anachronistic but an antichronistic enumeration of events you have us.

(Interjection from Mr Arndt)

Yes, yes. I have not yet been told by an ear specialist that I should do something about my hearing.

(Interjection from Mr Arndt)

Ladies and gentlemen, we should have realized from all this and from the many comments that have been made today that European unification is not something that is pushed along from outside: it needs to be encouraged from within, by us all, in all the Member States, as the present Federal Chancellor clearly stated to the Bundestag on 25 November 1982. The President-in-Office of the Council is, of course, Vice-Chancellor and stands by what Mr Kohl said. I quote:

From the results of the Versailles economic summit we have seen that, in the present difficult situation in particular, it is important that no one should seek solutions to his own economic difficulties for which his partners will have to pay.

This is so clear and important a message that we must all join in, not just the poor, lonely President of the Council or the Presidency. All Ten have a duty in this case. All the various subsidies, interventions and all the rest of it — I do not know what other technical terms are used in our market — should be revealed, and it should not simply be said that they are needed to give protection against the outside world and to maintain the internal market.

Many references have been made to the internal market today. Anyone who locks himself away in his own economic shell must count on starving in it one day . . .

(Applause)

What has been mentioned here is therefore a very dangerous matter.

I should now like to ask a question that has been on my mind for a long time. When did unemployment, the monetary difficulties, the trade difficulties begin, yesterday or today? From how far away have these difficulties come? That is why we should not be building a wailing wall, but a consultation bank, although complaining is preferred here to real consultation.

I was also pleased to hear what was said just now so federalistically about the integration of Spain. I should like to quote the Chancellor again in this context:

Not least, and I should like to emphasize this, because I believe that European competition can only succeed, the political unification of Europe is only possible if the larger Member States treat the smaller countries of the Community with particular respect in European cooperation.

That is an avowal of faith by a large Member State, Germany. And I feel this should also give us courage for the future.

(Applause)

I could say quite a deal more that is of concern to us and myself in particular, coming as I do from an area close to the frontier with the Eastern Bloc countries,

Goppel

from Bavaria. We know what the checks at these frontiers mean, and we therefore find it all the more painful when they are made within our own part of Europe, and I therefore feel we should do something about this. We find it just as painful that some of the measures we regard as so essential could not, of course, be taken from 1 to 11 January. But I too have one request to make. We complain about bureaucracy and about technocracy: I call on the President-in-Office of the Council to begin the age of Eurocracy, then we can look forward to a satisfactory future.

(Applause)

Mr de Ferranti (ED). — Mr President and colleagues, in his excellent speech the President-in-Office of the Council challenged us as a Parliament to be 'the engine of Euro-progress'. These were the words that he used. The very fact that he is here with us today and troubling to listen to our speeches is a great encouragement to those of us who are indeed endeavouring to make this Parliament an engine of Euro-progress.

I would like to add one particular fact to the speeches made by my colleagues about the internal market, which is the one area where perhaps together we can be the engine. Not only is the internal market basic to jobs and basic to a return to growth, but the restrictions on that market are currently costing consumers in a very direct sense fifteen billion ECU. Fifteen billion ECU, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, is the current cost. Something must be done urgently, and the proposals that you have before you and which are being discussed today are fundamental to it.

Mr President-in-Office of the Council, you heard the response of the House an hour or so ago when you told us of the ten-hour delay in the twenty-six hour journey from the North to the South of Europe. You heard how we reacted to your words, and you understood in which sense we meant it too. We are against the delay. You then said: '*Das ist klar*'. If it is clear to you, that is an encouragement to us and we can get on and deal with some of the problems that you now face in the Council.

First of all, the frontier formalities problems are immensely complex. The MCA, the collection of VAT, the customs forms, the collection of statistics. Progress is certainly possible, but it will take a long long time. The decisions that you must make by the end of March are fundamental to getting on with the job. And one of the most important ones, Mr President, is to get on with what is called CADIA, the CADIA cooperation scheme between customs authorities. The second area at which you are going to be looking is the interchange of information on standards formation. I would beg you to be careful. Encourage the standards authorities to communicate with the Commission by all means, but do not allow the Com-

mission to meddle in too much detail in the standards formation process or, frankly, they are more likely to slow it down.

The most important area of all, Mr President, to which you will be turning your attention during the coming months will be the question of getting through by the end of March the proposals for dealing with testing and giving type-approval certificates to products coming into the Community from third countries. It sounds technical and boring, but this is a dramatically important subject, for it is the basis of achieving Community preference in the non-tariff area. We have Community preference in the tariff area; we do not have it in the non-tariff area. And without that Community preference in the non-tariff area, frankly, the Common Market is not really meaningful either to us in this Parliament or to the vast majority of people trading within the Community.

I believe you are rather close to an agreement. There is this delegation quibbling about this article and that delegation quibbling about another. I suspect that all of them are worrying in their heart of hearts about their own sovereignty. They still want to retain a measure of control. They want to have their cake and eat it, as do all Member States of the Community. But I would say to them that in this area no one Member State has got sovereignty now. They are not able to make a deal with the Japanese because they lack the negotiating power. The only way in which any of us can have sovereignty is by acting together and it is as important to act together in this case as it is in the tariff case.

As you go through the long hours in the Council, Mr President, say to those delegations who are quibbling: Listen, do you want to help your people or not? Because this is the only way in which we can do it. Only by common agreement will we get anywhere. Say to them as well that the simple fact is that without Community testing and product-approval procedures we will never be able to negotiate easier access for Community products into their markets. It is not the basis of a debate on protectionism at all. What we are talking about is the only way in which we can actually reduce protectionism throughout the world, i.e. by having a powerful enough negotiating hand when we go into the Council chambers. That is really the crunch.

So, Mr President-in-Office, we wish you well in your period of office. We thank you for listening to us and we hope that you will report progress to us in these precious months in which perhaps we can at last make some progress with the Community.

(Applause)

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, on behalf of the Communist Party of Greece I want to

Alavanos

say quite sincerely that it is difficult for us to speak about the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council whom, in November 1981, we knew as Foreign Minister in a Social Democrat government, and whom we now see as Foreign Minister in a Christian Democrat government that, furthermore, includes Herr Strauss. But, despite this, we shall pass comment on the speech made by the President-in-Office of the Council in emphasizing that the position he has explicated represents the most negative of trends prevailing in the European Economic Community today with regard to our country, working people, but also in the overall context of Western European Affairs. A trend which is reinforcing supranational integration, chiefly by achieving the political emasculation of Member States via the familiar provisions contained in the European Act.

I want to put forward certain questions, not to the President-in-Office of the Council, but to the Greek Government. Cannot the Greek Government see that the remarks by the President-in-Office on unemployment and the social problems of working people are nothing but hypocrisy, in view of the fact that the change of government in the German Federal Republic took place on the pretext of these problems?

Can it not see that the abolition of tariffs and other protective measures will result in increased exportation of unemployment to the weaker Member States?

Can it not see the increased restraints on the funding of Mediterranean products, about which Mr Genscher clearly told us?

Can it not see the reductions in the prices of agricultural products, the trend towards increased contributions to the Community, the redistribution of budgetary revenue in favour of West Germany and Britain?

Is it not aware of the abolition of the veto? Can it not see that Mr Genscher seeks for it to support at the UN and in other international forums, not the viewpoints of Greece, but those of the EEC?

Can it not see that Mr Genscher remembers Afghanistan and Poland but forgets Cyprus, though Cyprus is a country which has association with the EEC, and though a large part of its territory is occupied by Turkey, a country which likewise has association with the EEC?

Can it not see that Mr Genscher said nothing about Pershing and Cruise, the greatest problem facing Europe?

We would like to hope that under Mr Genscher's presidency of the Council our country will not suffer the same fate as the Free Democrats in West Germany, and it will not suffer this fate if it takes firm steps to disentangle itself from the EEC.

I would like to make two brief observations. We believe that the President-in-Office of the Council is not equipped to speak of democracy and pluralistic societies since in his country thousands of people are denied the right to work because of their political allegiance — by the *Berufsverbot* — and that it would be very helpful if Mr Genscher, who seeks respect for animals by human societies, could show the respect he has for seals to human beings themselves, and specifically to the Turkish people, who belong to a country associated with the Community and whose plight and suffering under torture are well-known, as is likewise the travesty of democracy pertaining in that country.

Mr Jürgens (L). — (DE) Mr President, I must point out that the statement by the President of the Council today did not include one word of criticism of the Commission or this Parliament and that the will to cooperate was apparent throughout this statement. I believe that this cooperation will also form the basis for the solution of the problems to which the President of the Council referred in his statement today as being the major issues in the next six months. I feel it is important for the Council to take seriously what we produce, our resolution and our proposals. I am very grateful to the President of the Council for acknowledging that budgetary expenditure on agriculture has been reduced from over 70% to 62.5%. I believe that the agricultural policy should be seen in these terms in particular and that it is important for us to submit proposals to the President of the Council for the implementation of his proposals. I believe the family farm must continue to be the guiding light of the agricultural policy, that we must do everything we can to ensure the continued existence of such farms, that they must be given special assistance where they are located in certain underdeveloped areas and that, on the other hand, the objective method must be applied to family farms when prices are calculated.

My second point concerns the surpluses in the Community. I believe we must combat surpluses where they occur. I therefore feel we must above all make a distinction where the co-responsibility levy is concerned to ensure that it is paid where surpluses occur. Secondly, we must see to it that no further grants are paid at national level to farms on which surpluses are produced, and thirdly, exports of agricultural products must be increased. It is less important to tax oil seeds than to persuade other countries, the United States, for example, to take our exports, our processed products. Increased exports is the answer, and I believe this is where the link with the regional policy and the development policy lies. By raising living standards in the undeveloped regions, we shall create a new market for goods produced in Europe and elsewhere. These problems, like the problem of frontier arrangements, competition and so on, can only be solved by political means. I therefore believe that the Genscher-Colombo proposals and European political solidarity are the

Jürgens

way to make progress, to find the political means to solve Europe's real problems.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

Mr Blaney (CDI). — Might I just very quickly say to the President-in-Office of the Council that I admire his concern with peace throughout the world as I also admire his wish to abolish discrimination in places such as South Africa and indeed his precondition for peace in places like Poland and Afghanistan, that is the withdrawal of foreign troops.

While saying that, might I just appeal to him very very directly during his presidency to concern himself nearer home with part of my country which is occupied, where discrimination is rampant and where there is in fact a state of war.

Could I then turn to his concern with unemployment and say how much I agree with his concern there, but I question his judgement in seeming to indicate that free world trade and, on the other hand, internal protection have been the cause of this. Far from it, in my estimation, when we look at the situation in the smaller national economies.

The Social and Regional Funds are naturally and properly very important, as has been said by the President. But of what avail are these funds when we consider that over the years and year by year the national and regional imbalances continue to grow? I put it to the President that a realistic reappraisal is urgently required of the strategy of the entire EEC concept. Otherwise I think that our next direct elections, which are not far away, may bring us a rude awakening as to how the people really have come to view what was once a grand concept but is now an abysmal failure on the horizon.

Lady Elles (ED). — In order to correct the false impression given by the previous speaker, may I remind the House that Northern Ireland is part of the United Kingdom. The only war in that country is the result of IRA terrorist activity and I strongly object to the statement that he has made to the President-in-Office.

(Protests from various quarters)

Mr Pesmazoglou (NI). — *(GR)* Mr President, the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council

confirms his commitment to the concept of European unity, but the work of the presidency in this respect, such as over the next six months, will be judged on the extent to which principles and declarations are converted into genuine results, into works of substance and duration. I think that the declaration made by Mr Genscher today confirms his belief that European unity constitutes the only way forward to progress and security for our people, for the protection of peace, and likewise for ensuring decent human standards for the people of the Third World.

I would like to make three very specific observations, Mr President.

To overcome the present crisis and combat the issue of unemployment there is a need for a Community policy on social and political development in Europe. This requires a budgetary sum much greater than that currently at the Community's disposal, and also an active policy on regional development with emphasis on the importance of development in the Mediterranean south. On this issue the comments of the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers, and the perspective he drew, were extremely feeble.

My second observation concerns the fact that if progress is to be made towards political unity there is a need for a whole series of reforms to be carried through. The time for these is already ripe, Mr President, and certain decisions are required. Parliament has already set up a committee to discuss these reforms. However, the indications coming out of Mr Genscher's speech as regards implementation of these reforms were, in this respect also, extremely vapid. Included in these reforms would be the establishment of European Political cooperation on an institutional basis, something suggested by both the Foreign Minister of Federal Germany and his colleague the Italian Foreign Minister.

My third observation, Mr President, has to do with the joint policy on foreign affairs. For this to acquire credibility and force it must have substance and carry weight in all quarters. If our position on Afghanistan is to be convincing it must be made clear that the huge breach of international law which is going on in Europe, specifically in Cyprus, will not be tolerated apathetically by Europe. Anomalies such as these devalue Europe's credibility and prestige and they must cease.

Mr President, I believe that if we surmount these obstacles our policy will acquire credibility and carry weight in all quarters, and we shall be making progress towards unity.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, we have already exceeded the time allowed for this debate. Question Time ought to begin at 6.30 p.m. but there are still five Members down to speak in the debate.

President

I therefore propose that we continue the debate until 7 p.m. and then move onto Question Time from 7 p.m. to 8.15 p.m.

(Parliament approved this proposal)

Mr Moreland (ED). — Mr President, we are, of course, given set speaking time for each group, and I suspect that one problem may be that some speakers have gone over their time. I do hope that their excess time will be deducted from the remaining five speakers who are to come.

Mr Croux (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, colleagues, in an effort to summarize as succinctly as possible the various statements by members of my group I would like to express a wish and simultaneously launch an appeal to the new German president of the Council to implement the European Act. After all, it stems from an initiative jointly sponsored by yourself and Minister Colombo some two years ago and the house was deeply moved by the conviction and eloquence with which you defended your Draft European Act before us on 14 October last. With such a reserve of goodwill you now find yourself ideally placed to proceed to implementation. That is our desire and that is our appeal to you. In the meantime we are grateful to the Council for its decision to open negotiations in Brussels with Parliament's Bureau on the role of the European Parliament and we believe the terms of these discussions will go beyond those envisaged in your Draft European Act. You are aware of this and we trust we shall be able to conduct useful negotiations with you on 24 January next.

In order to comply with our President's appeal to make our interventions as short as possible I shall quickly make three very short observations. We consider the Draft European Act to be more than a purely institutional document, it is the crystallization of an evolutionary process in three areas. Firstly, socio-economic. We are awaiting from the German Council presidency that it elaborates an operational act for combating unemployment, that is to say, action rather than words. It is widely recognized that the Federal Republic of Germany has a wealth of practical experience and knowledge in the fields of management, strategy, implementation and of specific projects. It has always been a flaw of Community policies that they were too narrowly defined. We expect from you concrete action in the overall context of that which was outlined at the last Council meeting in Copenhagen.

My second remark concerns security policy. In your Draft European Act you said that we must extend cooperation to embrace Community security policy and last month, at the end of the Danish presidency, we had further evidence of the evolution of political cooperation in the field of security. Already at this stage of the German Council presidency a new scena-

rio and a new area have been created. The ministers present at the Council meeting in Copenhagen stated at the time that they were awaiting signals from Moscow. Well, have we received those signals? Some would say yes. There have been various initiatives which represent a change of policy. It is a crucial period and we believe that, in conformity with the goals set out in your Draft European Act, this favourable moment should be seized upon to make headway while we can.

My third point concerns Community enlargement — the accession of Spain and Portugal. It is a momentous political affair having economic and financial ramifications, a few snares and, not surprisingly, some difficulties. We would appeal to the Community's citizens to be more broad-minded in their approach to this enlargement, to pay more attention to its economic aspects and not to lose sight of the fact that 25 years ago the Community was in a transitional stage from national restrictive policies to the synergy, the widening of the scale of operations, the replacement policy on a larger scale with all the accruing benefits such policies bestowed upon the (then) Six. Why should we no longer look forward to Community enlargement with confidence? For political considerations alone we owe it to the Iberian Peninsula to facilitate its accession to the Community and, besides I need hardly remind the House how urgent the matter has become.

The foregoing is a summary of the comments on your speech, Mr President of the Council, from the Group of the European People's Party. Under the motto: Go ahead with implementation of the European Act along the lines which you have announced, economic, social, institutional, on peace policy and on Community enlargement all of which is to say, not just in area but also in time.

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, I come from the extraordinary country which annoys our Christian Democrat colleague and I must say I find it extraordinary that such extraordinary talk has been heard in this Chamber. The German presidency made reference to its own preferred topics. It told us a great deal. It devoted 20 lines to the problems of seals and 8 lines to the Regional Fund, it dealt scantily with Mediterranean problems and the agricultural policy and made the claim that farming incomes underwent an improvement last year. One sees quite clearly that the preferred topics are those which interest well-heeled circles in the affluent countries, and it is obvious that the way out of the crisis is concomitant with a change in this policy. Mr Genscher, progress towards the political integration you yearn after, and with which you have associated your name, is conditional on there being a corroboration of solidarity, particularly, of course, towards the weaker countries. However, following on the Greek Government's devaluation of the drachma — a harsh measure which will inflict hardship on Greek working people — the

Kyrkos

Community has begun to gnash its teeth malignly and to hint at indirect counter-measures. We would suggest that you corroborate the declarations of the German presidency with firm measures and specific initiatives both in the field of European autonomy and with regard to the less-developed areas of the Community, and we would appreciate a comment from you about this.

Mr Imer (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, what you want is sometimes less important than the way you go about achieving it. Of the proposals the President of the Council has made there is scarcely one that does not have our whole-hearted support. We would ask him, however, to pay particular attention to the decision-making processes in the Council of Ministers. He has said — and I welcome this statement — that he will take action against the unanimity principle. It is high time the right of veto, a right which does not in fact exist, was abolished.

(Applause)

I was very interested to hear him say that he would stand up for close and fruitful cooperation between the Council and Parliament. But not, I hope, of the kind we have just had in December, when the Council unilaterally declared that conciliation on the basic regulation on foodstuffs had been completed by simply saying that it had accepted one of Parliament's proposals and had thus done what it wanted, so conciliation had now been achieved, and that was the end of Parliament's say in the matter. We expect there to be a permanent change in this situation under your Presidency, Mr Genscher.

You also said you hoped that the business of compensation for the United Kingdom and the associated payments to the Federal Republic could be brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

(Applause)

The conclusion perhaps envisaged by some people in the Council or even the Commission unfortunately cannot be regarded as satisfactory. It conflicts with what we decided here in December by a vast majority. I urge the Council very strongly to adhere strictly to what was said in this House, because we have the last word in this matter.

We are prepared to cooperate, but not if it means everything being done as the Council imagines without anyone giving any prior thought to how Parliament may react. My appeal to you and the German Presidency, Mr Genscher, is this: it would be a good thing if you put something of a curb on some of the Council officials who prepare the decisions. What often happens is that, while the Minister may do the thinking, the official does the steering. We would hope for a change under the German Presidency. *You*

make policy, and *you* should also personally ensure that this policy is implemented. Mr Genscher, your and my party programme states that development policy should be progressively transferred from the Member States to the Community. A very important issue is the budgetization of the development fund. We urge you to take the initiative during the German Presidency so that a solution may at last be found to this tiresome problem.

(Applause)

Mrs Spaak (NI). — *(FR)* Mr President, I shall try to be as concise as possible to give the President of the Council an opportunity to answer all the questions.

I am grateful to him for recalling the responsibility borne by Members of the European Parliament and also by the Council now that the next direct elections are approaching; we have the responsibility to public opinion and also to history. We all too often forget that we are living through an exceptional experience and that this is the first time that a parliament has united so many peoples.

As regards relations between the European Parliament and the national parliaments, could the Council not make an effort to encourage the national parliaments to associate Members of the European Parliament far more actively in their own work?

In Belgium, Members of the European Parliament are able to participate in the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Could one not envisage participation by European members in all the committees? For my part, I took the initiative of distributing to the Belgian National Defence Committee the Haagerup report which will be discussed by it.

We also welcome the action advocated by you for small and medium sized undertakings. At national level it is possible to envisage a whole series of measures to promote those undertakings which as you so rightly point out, generate employment. But could you tell me what specific and concrete measures the European Council intends to take? You pointed out that the German Presidency already has proposals to make on this.

In conclusion, Mr President, I wish to congratulate you on the tone of your speech which reflected conviction and hope in the future of a project dear to our hearts: the deepening and completion of European union.

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am encouraged by the debate which you have devoted to the statement I made as President of the Council. I can even say this of the second part of Mr Arndt's speech.

Genscher

I regard the first part merely as a stimulus, and to the Members of the European Parliament who are not so familiar with the situation in Germany as Mr Arndt ought to be, I should like to say that it is a good thing for Europe for the Presidency to be held by a government which can count on the undivided support in the German Bundestag of the parties which form it.

(Applause from the centre and right)

I shall make use of all the advice, support and also objective criticism I have heard here during my term as President of the Council and in talks with my colleagues. It is clear to me that — with a few exceptions — we agree on the major objectives and that what we must do above all else is strengthen Europe's internal and external role. You can rely on me to see this as my special task.

When you assess the statement of a President of the Council — and by this I mean not only my statement but also those of my predecessors and of my successors — I would ask you to remember that the President of the Council and an independent Member are fighting with unequal weapons. A Member of Parliament states his convictions. The President of the Council, on the other hand, must take account of what nine other governments regard as their opinions.

But what he must be, and this on his own responsibility, is objectively and personally committed to Europe. I can promise the House that I shall leave nothing to be desired in this respect. In my third term as President of the Council, my commitment to Europe again takes pride of place in my political activities.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.¹

6. Question Time

President. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. 1-1094/82).

We begin with questions to the Council.

Question No 57, by Mr Martin (H-447/82):

Does the Council intend to harmonize excise duties on wine as it has frequently been asked to do by the European Parliament, most recently in the resolution on the market in wine it adopted in July 1982?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(DE)* The Council can assure the honourable Member

that considerable efforts have been made in recent years to harmonize the excise duties on alcoholic beverages. At its meeting on 21 October 1981, however, the Council decided that in the present circumstances there appeared to be no chance of an agreement. The Council would also like to point out to the honourable Member that considerable importance will be attached in this context to the judgment of the Court of Justice in Case 17/78 (the Commission versus the United Kingdom) on the fiscal treatment of wine and beer.

Mr M. Martin (COM). — *(FR)* Can the Council say why it is impossible to reach agreement at present?

Mr Genscher. — *(DE)* There are many reasons.

Mr M. Martin (COM). — *(FR)* The Council says there are many reasons. I should like to know at least one of those reasons if they are so numerous.

President. — The Council is free to give you whatever reply it thinks fit. If you do not accept it, you may put other questions to the Council in writing.

Question No 58, by Mr Pranchère, taken over by Mrs Le Roux (H-505/82):

Talks have been opened between the Community and certain countries (Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt) on the conclusion of long-term agreements on agricultural products. In the absence of a Council decision, these countries are liable to turn to other exporting countries prepared to conclude multiannual contracts.

Is the Council aware of this situation and will it now implement long-term multiannual supply contracts in agricultural products in common with such major exporting countries as Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(DE)* The file on outline or long-term agreements between the Community and third countries on multiannual supplies of agricultural products has been under consideration for a long time. The Council has been discussing it regularly since 1975.

Following the submission by the Commission on 10 March 1982 of a formal proposal for a recommendation on a decision, the Council began the practical business of seeking economically, financially and politically acceptable solutions on the basis of the communication on the common agricultural policy received from the Commission in 1980, although it has so far failed to achieve a consensus.

In its deliberations the Council has noted with considerable interest the position adopted by the European

¹ Topical and urgent debate (Announcement): see Minutes.

Genscher

Parliament in this matter, particularly in its resolution of 17 June 1981 on possible improvements to the common agricultural policy.

Aware of the importance of this matter, the Council agreed to discuss it at its meeting of 17/18 January 1983.

Mrs Le Roux (COM). — (FR) Does the Council intend to reach a rapid decision on this matter after its discussions?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) Yes.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) The EEC/ACP Consultative Assembly pronounced in favour of long term agreements for the supply of agricultural products on preferential terms. Has the Council decided to fall in with the Consultative Assembly's recommendation?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) We shall certainly take this into account. It is impossible to say now whether the Council will ultimately so decide.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Would the President-in-Office agree that one of the dangers of long-term contracts would be that surplus production would, as it were, become entrenched? Will the Council take account of the fact that this would put tremendous strain on the Community budget, which is already very near its ceiling? Can we be sure that long-term contracts will not involve the payment of huge export refunds for ever and a day?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) The Council is aware of the problems you have mentioned.

Miss Hooper (ED). — Would the President-in-Office give us an assurance that in concluding any such long-term agreements the Council will fully take into account the interests of Spain and Portugal in the light of their imminent membership of the European Community?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) On my own behalf, I can assure the honourable Member this will be the case. Whether the Council will follow this line, I cannot say. I can only hope so.

President. — Question No 59, by Mr Konrad Schön (H-545/82):

On 12 November 1982, a day after the arrest of two leading German terrorists, checks on persons

entering and leaving the country were intensified at German frontier points. As a result, drivers could expect to have to wait for over two hours. Mile-long tailbacks stretched back into the towns, inconveniencing, and even endangering, ordinary citizens.

Does the Council share the German authorities' patent belief that terrorists wishing to cross the border from one Member State to another spend hours in traffic jams obediently awaiting their turn at customs control?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) The Member States are responsible for the formalities involved in police checks at frontiers.

Mr Konrad Schön (PPE). — (DE) I admit that my question is not well phrased, but what I intended was this: is the Council prepared to ensure that tangible progress is made towards facilitating the crossing of frontiers by the ordinary citizen before the next direct elections?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I cannot anticipate the Council's decision in this matter, but I do not think I will offend anyone in the Council by saying that the efforts to achieve closer cooperation among the Member States of the European Community firstly in the harmonization of legislation and secondly in collaboration among the police forces and the authorities responsible for criminal prosecution will make it easier for action to be taken to make it clear to people that they are living in a Community when they cross frontiers, which is what you obviously want. The more cooperation we therefore have among the Member States of the European Community in the fight against crime, the more progress we can make in the direction which you and I consider desirable.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Would you be prepared as President-in-Office of the Council and as Germany's Foreign Minister to raise the idea that, since controls cannot be abolished overnight, a formal proposal should at least be made for the progressive abolition of these tiresome frontier controls?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I feel that, if we accept full responsibility for internal security in the territory of the European Community, a timetable of this kind can only be put forward together with a timetable for improving cooperation in the fight against crime. By achieving better cooperation in police activities and also by harmonizing legislation, we must create the conditions for the abolition or at least the relaxation of frontier controls, which is what we all want. This dual development must be appreciated, and this may account for the fact that these areas are also mentioned in the initiative for a European act.

Mr Rogalla (S). — *(DE)* I should like to take this opportunity to point out that I submitted a timetable of this kind during a debate last September and that it refers to the very aspects which the President of the Council has mentioned. I now have a personal question: would the President of the Council be so kind as to tell me how often he himself had to wait at internal frontiers in the Community in 1982, how long did he have to wait, what were his feelings? And my main question: is he aware that the Commission's official legal view is that the Community Treaty, which has existed since 1958, after all, gives every citizen a legal right to cross frontiers unhindered and that this entails the abolition of all obstacles, including that constituted by passport controls? This legal right thus already exists. Is the President of the Council aware of the Commission's legal view in this matter?

Mr Genscher. — *(DE)* I was not aware of this legal view. I shall, however, endeavour to obtain some information on it. I can say how often I have crossed the frontier. When I had to wait, I was just as annoyed as you.

(Laughter)

Mr Antoniazzi. — *(IT)* Mr President, do you believe that the adoption of the European Passport can facilitate free internal circulation, eventually leading to tighter controls on external traffic?

Mr Genscher. — *(DE)* I believe it can fairly be said that a passport of this kind would facilitate the control formalities.

Mr Van Minnen (S). — *(NL)* I rather doubt that the Council President has tried to cross the frontier, even over the past 12 months, in a small Citroën 2CV wearing casual clothes so that he has probably been spared the numerous border controls which are on the increase of late, and to which quite a few Community citizens have been subjected. Given that the police authorities in his country have such a detailed description of the kind of terrorists they are seeking, tension is growing apace on the German/Dutch border. Would the Council President not agree that a great number of these border controls, ostensibly as a search for terrorists has in reality now degenerated into a bureaucracy of which the victims are primarily young people, young Community voters who are thus being stripped of the last vestiges of belief in the Community, and is he prepared to do something about it?

Mr Genscher. — *(DE)* I should like to say straight away that even a President of the Council does some private travelling from time to time and is then subject to the same rules when crossing frontiers as anyone else. Secondly, never in my political career have I left

anyone in any doubt about my belief that the abolition of frontier controls will be a step towards a Europe of the people and particularly young people.

Thirdly, I must say that I am very well aware from the very difficult internal security problems I faced during my time as German Internal Affairs Minister that removing frontier controls completely and not replacing them with closer transfrontier cooperation in the fight against crime would expose the citizens of our Member States to danger. I believe that anyone who is as committed as I am to the progressive abolition of frontier controls must be equally committed to improved cooperation in the fight against crime.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, the fight against crime is repeatedly quoted in justification of internal frontiers in the European Community. Can you tell me how many terrorists have been caught at the Community's internal frontiers in the last few years ...

(Applause)

... and would you agree with me that, in this respect at least, the terrorists are better organized than the European Community and that most drugs come not from Luxembourg or France but from countries outside the European Community and it is therefore of primary importance to safeguard the Community's external frontiers? Can you also tell me if statistics can be provided not only on how many seizures are made at frontiers but how many of these seizures are made at internal frontiers and how many at external frontiers? We have not received any such statistics in recent years.

Mr Genscher. — *(DE)* Not wanting to give you answers which later prove to be inaccurate, I will take up your suggestion regarding statistics. But whatever statistics are produced, there is no escaping the fact that we must together — governments and Parliament — endeavour to ensure that transfrontier cooperation among the security authorities is improved in the large territory of the European Community.

Mrs von Alemann (L). — *(DE)* Can the President of the Council tell me whether the authorities which carry out these frontiers controls have quotas, requiring them, for example, to check every passenger car at the frontier within 20 minutes? I mean quite specific quotas, like the ones usually found in industry.

Mr Genscher. — *(DE)* I cannot answer this question, certainly not for ten Member States. But if I were allowed to forget that I am the President of the Council, as it were, I would not mind telling some of you outside in the corridors what I would do if I could.

Mr Enright (S). — Is the President-in-Office suggesting that the United Kingdom considers all Greeks to be criminals and will he therefore take up with the United Kingdom the question of gross discrimination against Greeks at Heathrow Airport and suggest that they stop a custom whereby they are looked upon as criminals?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I cannot imagine this is true of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom, with their innate sense of fairness.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Does the President-in-Office know whether there are any countries who are prepared to introduce the European passport before 1986 and if not, will Germany give the lead which it has already been giving in other areas by introducing it before 1986?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I cannot tell you which countries are prepared to do this before 1986. As for the Federal Government, I will give careful consideration to your suggestion.

President. — Question No 60, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-645/82):¹

Can the Council give the reasons for its absence from the debate on the various documents relating to the Jumbo Council and, more generally, on unemployment, which is the most serious problem facing the European Community?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) The Council has long demonstrated its interest in the European Parliament's debates through the presence of its President. However, as the President of the Council, regardless of the department for which he is responsible, also has tasks to perform as a Minister in his own country, the Council set out in a letter of 20 February 1977 the details relating to the participation of its President in debates during the European Parliament's part-sessions.

As to the specific case referred to by the honourable Member, the Council would point out that it was not informed that its presence during the sitting of 12 October 1982 was required by the European Parliament.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (IT) I would like to ask whether the President of the Council, the members of the House and its officials know how to read, considering that Parliament's agenda is written in languages that

we all can understand. Your answer implies that the agenda has not even been read. If it had been, the representatives of the Council of Ministers should have been present, all the more so considering that employment, as you yourself pointed out, is one of the Community's priority issues.

(In listening to the speaker Mr Genscher turned his back to the microphone, and he began to speak without being heard.)

Mr Genscher, you should not look at me; you should face the microphone, or else no one will hear you.

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I find it difficult to take my eyes off the honourable Member.

(Laughter)

The Council has always kept an open mind on the problems caused by the economic and social situation and has frequently discussed them. As evidence of the special interest the Council takes in these problems, it held, for example, as the honourable Member knows, a major meeting to discuss this subject on 16 November.

Careful account was taken of the European Parliament's resolutions during the preparations for this meeting and during the Council's actual deliberations. Furthermore, the President of the Council of Employment and Social Ministers attended a joint meeting of the European Parliament's Committee on Employment and Social Affairs and the Economic and Social Committee's Section for Social Questions held on 20 October to prepare for the Jumbo Council.

To conclude, I should like to say to the honourable Member that, although I do not know everything about the staff of the Council, I can confirm they can all read.

Mr Boyes (S). — The question from Mrs Squarcialupi mentions specifically unemployment, which the President-in-Office has not dealt with. Might I ask him a question specifically about that and his philosophy towards it? The position of the Council, as I have understood it over the last three years — and I hear it explained to me week by week by the Prime Minister of Britain — is that the best way to tackle unemployment is to increase competitiveness, and this means a series of economic mechanisms reducing inflation, improving the balance of payments, etc. If the Council agrees with this premise, would the President-in-Office explain to me in simple terms how it is possible that all ten countries in the EEC can increase competitiveness simultaneously when it implies that they will be competing against each other?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I will do my utmost to attend Parliament's sittings, as my colleagues do, to improve

¹ Formerly oral question without debate (0-97/82), converted to question for Question Time.

Genscher

cooperation among the institutions of the European Communities.

As regards the fight against unemployment, the elimination of competitive disadvantages is certainly not the only way of reviving the economy, but it is an indispensable part of the whole, and any distortions of competition — I will not refer to protectionist tendencies — are likely to obstruct economic recovery.

In the European Council we have always felt that it is necessary to clear the way for new investments, that action must be taken to reduce inflation, that the conditions must be created for a reduction in interest rates, that the situation for private investors must be improved in the European Community by limiting public spending and that the competitiveness of the European economy with its rivals in the world market, to whom I referred earlier today in my inaugural speech, must generally be improved.

If it can be said that the problems we have to contend with in the Community today are the sum of the mistakes made in the Member States, then it is also true to say that only the sum of the joint efforts of the Member States will enable us to overcome unemployment.

Mr Marshall (ED). — The President-in-Office emphasized the need to get rid of distortions of competition. Can he tell us whether it is going to be a priority of the German Presidency to create a common market in services as well as in manufactured goods? And would he confirm for the benefit of Mr Boyes that a large number of people in this Community are employed in exporting goods and services to third countries and that in order to do so they have to be competitive in price, delivery dates and quality?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) Everything that helps to strengthen the internal market in any sector has priority.

Mr van Minnen (S). — (NL). My question concerned the Jumbo Council; a German minister will have the opportunity in the course of the next 6 months to discuss Community unemployment with this House for we shall be devoting a special sitting to the subject. Has the President of the Council any precise ideas as to what we can expect in the context of the zoological garden in which the Jumbo plays such a role? For example, does the Council already have a specific idea of the practical implementation of its intention to combat unemployment by allocating greater financial resources to this end?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) The Council is not at present considering anything beyond what I have mentioned.

President. — Question No 61, by Mr Lalor (H-481/82):

Will the Council state whether or not it has succeeded in raising the urgent matter of providing Community aid for housing schemes in Belfast at Council level, a subject which I raised during the last September session and one which is of considerable importance to the people of Belfast?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) As the President of the Council told the European Parliament's Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning on 25 November 1982, the Council had not had an opportunity to consider this matter since its meeting of 21/22 June 1982, since certain fundamental objections to the use of Community resources to finance housing projects intended for all sections of the population of the area concerned persist in the Council.

Mr Lalor (DEP). — I am rather horrified to find the President-in-Office replying that the Council have not discussed this matter further despite a promise given by Mr Ellemann-Jensen at the September part-session that the question would be discussed again.

I am asking the President-in-Office whether it is possible that the President-in-Office of the Council in September last deceived us by telling us it would be discussed again since now he says it has not.

Secondly, is he aware that an allegation was made in the House in September by way of a follow-on to this question to the effect that it was his own German government that was responsible for standing in the way of this £20 million payment being made to build 750 houses for needy people in Belfast, and would he, under the circumstances and as the person responsible for replying to this question to the House this evening, assure us that that objection is now withdrawn?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) Efforts are still being made, along the lines of this project, and for Northern Ireland, to come to an arrangement which complies with existing Community policies. To overcome the fundamental objections, I hear that consideration is being given to the possibility of a solidarity action in Northern Ireland's favour paid for out of Community resources as part of an alternative project. The Council awaits the Commission's proposal in this matter.

Mr J. D. Taylor (ED). — I would like to say to the President-in-Office of the Council as Member for Belfast that not only did this House give overwhelming support to the programme for housing in that city, but any allegations that may have been made about a particular national member of this Community were certainly not made against the present government of Germany. Since there has been a change of government and since we now have a general election in that country, can the President-in-Office state whether the

J. D. Taylor

people of Belfast can have greater hope that there will be support for a project in that city in the very near future and whether Germany, like all countries, will be keen to support Belfast within the Council of Ministers at the earliest possible moment?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) Notwithstanding the elections to which you refer, you may derive encouragement from my previous comment, and I should like to make a point of confirming this once again.

President. — Since their subject matter is similar, I call simultaneously Question No 62 by Mr Flanagan (H-531-/82):

Will the Council give due reason as to why it has been unable to adopt proposal for a directive COM(75) 688 final concerning the dumping of wastes at sea, particularly in view of reported increases in such activities around the Irish coasts?

and Question No 63, by Mrs Weber (H-621/82)¹:

1. Did (or does) the Council know about the transport of two tonnes of highly toxic waste (dioxin) from Seveso (Italy) to another European country?
2. Does the Council know to which Community or other country the toxic waste was transported?
3. Does the Council know whether this toxic waste is being stored in such a way that it no longer poses any threat to human beings or the environment?
4. Can the Council state with certainty that the toxic waste was not dumped at sea?
5. When does the Council intend to finally approve the guideline contained in Doc. COM/75/688 ('Concerning the dumping of wastes at sea'), which were submitted to it on 19. 11. 1976?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) I should like to answer the two questions together. As regards the proposal for a directive on the dumping of wastes at sea, the Council noted at its meeting of 19 December 1978 that the Commission intended to withdraw the proposal because the Council had approved the decision on the opening of negotiations on the Community's accession to the Oslo convention on the dumping of wastes in the North Sea.

Since that time this question has been considered by the Council's various bodies in connection with the

Community's accession to the second protocol forming part of the Barcelona convention and to the Bonn convention. This protocol and this convention concern the uncontrolled discharge of oil into the Mediterranean and North Sea respectively.

At its meeting of 19 May 1982 the Council approved the Community's accession to the second protocol forming part of the Barcelona convention and the opening of negotiations on the Community's accession to the Bonn convention. On the other hand, it has not yet been possible to achieve a consensus on the Community's accession to the Oslo convention. The Commission has therefore informed the Council's various bodies that it is now trying to solve the problem of the dumping of wastes at sea in a proposal which would amend or supplement the directive of 20 March 1978 on toxic and dangerous wastes.

With specific reference to the first aspect of Mrs Weber's question, all I can tell you is that the Council has no knowledge of certain quantities of dioxin being transported from the Seveso district to a European country. It cannot therefore express an opinion on how this substance has been stored or dumped.

Mrs Weber (S). — (DE) Mr President, can I assume that you have read something about this matter in the newspapers? I consider it an intolerable situation for a Member to put a question in November and to have to wait six weeks before the Council gives an answer, only to find after two months that it has not even been willing or able to obtain the information required to answer the question but stands here and tells us it cannot give an answer. I find this all the more regrettable as the Federal Republic may have been one of the countries through which these dangerous wastes were transported. In the previous German government you had a ministerial colleague, a member of your party, who was responsible for these matters in his capacity as Internal Affairs Minister.

Do you see any chance of finding out whether Germans or other European people may be endangered by these wastes? You have not, moreover, answered the question about the possibility of the waste being dumped at sea. Do you think, thirdly, that there is any chance of the European Community adopting a joint position at the negotiations on the London anti-dumping convention, which will be taking place in February? Do you think that such issues should also be discussed during these negotiations?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) Through the appropriate Minister, the Federal Minister for Internal Affairs, the Presidency has made a considerable effort to obtain information from the Italian authorities on the whereabouts of the toxic waste from Seveso. Rumours were put about by the German press — and this is what you are referring to — that some of the waste had been

¹ Formerly oral question without debate (0-112/82), converted to question for Question Time.

Genscher

taken to the Federal Republic or the GDR. No evidence was, however, found to support these assumptions.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (IT) First I would like to say that I do not understand why the two questions were not dealt with separately. Since they have to do with different subjects, they should have had two different answers. I direct my remarks to you, Mr President, and not to the President of the Council.

My second observation is addressed instead to the President of the Council and it reflects my profound anxiety concerning the problem of the dioxin which has been transported from Seveso to some unknown place. I remind the President of the Council, who states that he does not know where it has been taken, that he should have been aware of this since at least the month of November, that is, since this question was presented. My remark is the following: if the free circulation of persons and goods is one of the soundest Community principles, the same cannot be said of the free circulation of dioxin. Mr President of the Council, is it possible that the Council does not know where this dioxin is and whether it was transported with all the necessary precautions? If I concern myself with this, it is because I would like to reassure my colleagues' electors, for my Italian constituents have nothing more to worry about: the dioxin is no longer in Seveso.

Mr Genscher. — (DE) From what the Presidency has been able to ascertain the company concerned removed the wastes to an unknown place outside Italy, where it was disposed of in the proper manner, as certified by a notary. I realize that the honourable Member — and probably others besides her — will find this answer unsatisfactory, but I can say no more than what it has been possible to find out.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Is the President-in-Office aware that Mrs Weber was the author of a resolution banning the dumping of nuclear waste in the sea and does he realize that that was not representative of parliamentary opinion because there was a snap vote taken in the Parliament when we were not properly represented and it does not represent the proper opinion of the Parliament? Dumping of waste at sea is perfectly well supervised and controlled.

Mr Rogers (S). — Can I first of all say that it is fairly obvious that Mr Seligman feels that things are only democratic when they win. Can I wish the President-in-Office a very happy New Year, although obviously, speaking from this side of the House, I hope it is not too successful.

(Laughter)

If I can come to my supplementary question, I wonder if the Minister could tell me what they actually intend to do on this issue because I find his answer to the question quite incredible — the fact that he does not know what has happened. He has had two months to find out. As the Minister well knows the disposal of industrial waste, much of which is biologically non-degradable, is a very acute and urgent problem. Does not the Council feel that a European initiative in respect of toxic materials is imperative and long overdue and would the Council not consider sending observers to the Geological Society Conference which is being held shortly in London and which will be dealing specifically with the complicated issues relating to the technical aspects of sub-surface disposal of toxic materials?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I fully accept everything the honourable Member has said. I share the concern revealed by his question. I will gladly look into the possibility of sending an observer to this conference. If it is possible, I will endeavour to see to it that this is done.

Mr Didò. — (IT) The President of the Council has told us that he questioned the Italian authorities about the toxic waste in Seveso. I would like to know what their answer was, for both the regional and national authorities know exactly how and where this waste was transported. There may still be reservations about its ultimate destination, although this is debatable, but the fact remains that this is a matter on which we would like to be reassured, perhaps by the Community institutions. Could the Council or the other institutions check to see that all possible precautions have been taken to prevent the waste from Seveso from causing harm to any population or area?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) The additional information I gave in reply to Mrs Weber's supplementary question was based on information obtained from the Italian authorities. From the questions which have been put here I can see that the need for information felt in the House has not been satisfied. It is a feeling I share. I will go back to the Council on this and try to obtain satisfaction.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President-in-Office of the Council, sharing the anxiety of my colleagues on the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection about the route taken by, and the eventual destination of, this dioxin-contaminated substance, I can only presume that when you say you do not know, you are using that terminology in the strictly legal sense in that there is no power existing in the Council by which you can be officially aware of this movement. Is there, in fact, any directive, any tool, any method of exploration which you can command to know this information? Should it not be

Sherlock

there, should we perhaps be picking up Mr Rogers' point and inviting the Commission to fashion such an implement?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I cannot tell the honourable Member that. I can only tell him what we regard as particularly urgent. I share the concern that has been expressed by all those who have put questions.

Mr Maher (L). — In view of the fact that this is a matter of concern to all the peoples of Europe, from the point of view of their own health and the health of the environment, can the Council not be more precise about when action will be taken? When will this Oslo Convention be signed? I have a feeling that we could be back in six months getting more or less the same answers we have got from you today. And that is not good enough. Can you give us some idea as to when action will be taken?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I cannot say. All I can say is that we regard the matter as particularly urgent. I repeat: I share the concern that was evident from all the questions which have been put on this subject.

Mrs Le Roux (COM). — (FR) The UK Government recently authorised discharges off the Atlantic coast. We have already had occasion to put questions on this matter which have remained unanswered. What does the Council intend to do about these discharges? Does it intend to react and if so, how?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I am sorry to have to tell the honourable Member that I am not familiar with this aspect of the matter. I will find an opportunity to look into it.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S). — (DE) Could Mr Genscher also answer the second part of Mrs Weber's question about the London anti-dumping convention?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I am afraid I am unable to do so at the moment.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S). — (DE) Then you will do so next time.

Mr Genscher. — (DE) Gladly.

President. — Question No 64, by Mr Habsburg (H-575/82):

Does the Council agree that the special tax on Yugoslav nationals travelling abroad is a restric-

tion on their freedom of movement and is therefore incompatible with the Helsinki Protocols and is the Council prepared, within the framework of the negotiations with Yugoslavia on economic and financial issues, to induce the Yugoslav government to desist from this measure which is extremely damaging to neighbouring countries and, moreover, infringes the rights of Yugoslav citizens?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) It was not for the Council to look into the honourable Member's question since it does not concern the provisions of the agreement between the European Community and Yugoslavia.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) I am very sorry, but I must say that I do not find the answer given by the President of the Council entirely satisfactory. We have a special relationship with Yugoslavia, and our economic and also our human interest in Yugoslavia is such that, when measures are taken which restrict the liberty and the freedom of movement of its citizens, we are directly concerned, and very much so. Would the Council therefore be prepared to look into this question?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) Mr Habsburg, I will see what can be done. I must say to you and to various other Members of this House that, if you are not satisfied with one or other answer I give, you can take it that not only Council President Genscher but others as well share this feeling from time to time. If you can imagine having to put a question on which you have previously had to agree with nine other Members from different groups and different countries, I am sure you will agree that it would be just as difficult as some of the answers we have to give here.

President. — We now move on to questions to the Foreign Ministers.

Since the author is absent, Question No 85 will be answered in writing¹.

Question No 86, by Mrs Lizin (H-527/82):

Have the Foreign Ministers considered making a specific request to the Argentinian Government, in connection with the appalling discoveries of mass graves in several Argentinian towns, that a committee of inquiry be set up to establish where responsibility lies?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation. — (DE) The Ten

¹ See Annex of 12. 1. 1983.

Genscher

are constantly considering how they can most effectively take action against violations of human rights throughout the world. This applies not least to overt attempts on people's lives and their freedom from injury, including the forcible or involuntary disappearance of people, as happened in many countries, Argentina among them, particularly in the latter half of the 70s.

To this end, the Ten have actively supported the establishment and subsequent activities of the working group set up by the United Nations Human Rights Commission in 1980 to investigate questions connected with the forcible or involuntary disappearance of persons. It is worth mentioning that an increasing number of governments, including Argentina's, are cooperating with the working group, whose activities have had positive results.

The Foreign Ministers of the Ten share the deep concern expressed by the European Parliament in its resolution of 18 November 1982 on the disappearance of people in Argentina. They will continue to keep a close watch on the situation.

In its latest opinion the Presidency stated in the human rights debate during the 37th session of the United Nations General Assembly in early December: 'The practice involving the forcible or involuntary disappearance of persons ignores or violates many of the human rights of the victims and their families.' The shocking evidence recently uncovered in Argentina of the fate suffered by many of those who have disappeared underlines the magnitude and urgency of this problem.

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) I am grateful to the President, because this is perhaps the first time that we have seen a President of the Council who knows perfectly well that the answers he is giving are unsatisfactory or manage to be long without answering the real question.

You know that the Parliament has recently adopted a resolution by written procedure opting in favour of a common approach, namely a mission to Argentina to look into the problem of the missing persons. Would the Council be willing to give material and political support to such a Parliamentary mission to Argentina?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) This question is still being considered in the Council.

Mr van Minnen (S). — (NL) It is really a blessing for Parliament's activities that the answers to supplementary questions cannot be written down in advance. That way we hear something else over the microphone. Mr President of the Council, does not the Council think it high time that the Ministers meeting in political cooperation adopted a more systematic

approach to the matter of mass graves, mass murder and disappearances on a massive scale in a state very close to Argentina — Suriname? It may not be comparable in size to Argentina but, like that country, it is well on the way towards acquiring an unenviable record in human rights violations. Such similarity must inevitably give the Council cause for concern. At least my question is, does it?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) Yes. It believe the Council finds these incidents no less depressing than the House. What we say about human rights questions and what causes us concern in this respect depends not on the country in which the incident occurs but on the extent to which human rights are violated.

We must certainly avoid taking a one-sided view of this question. We must realize that human rights are unfortunately being violated today in various parts of the world and under extremely varied political systems. I shall do everything I can during my term of office to ensure that the Council devotes the closest attention possible to the concern that is felt and seizes every opportunity that arises to exercise influence.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Would the President-in-Office not agree that his original answer was strong on principle and weak on action, and would he tell this House whether in fact the decision of the French Government to supply arms to this disgraceful fascist dictatorship is in line with the thinking of the Council?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) These are decisions which the national governments have to take for themselves. I can only speak about the Council's efforts to prevent violations anywhere in the world.

Mr Boyes (S). — I don't think that answer was satisfactory to the last gentleman, and I would like to underline his question — I *am* concerned about weapons that might be used against external aggressors, but I am actually asking about weapons that are used for internal discipline, because the answer to this problem is the reestablishment of democracy in the Argentine, and that is being made increasingly difficult by the sophisticated weapons that the army has to keep down the progressive forces in that country. I believe that the Ten, acting together, have an obligation to try to stop arms sales to that country, and will the President-in-Office work towards that aim?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) On the question of supplies of weapons, there is no Council opinion as such. You will be aware that my own government pursues an extremely restrictive policy in this regard.

Mr Hord (ED). — Would the President-in-Office agree that France's decision to resume exports of wea-

Hord

pons to Argentina — a country that is still technically at war with a Member State — sustains the military regime of Argentina and undermines Community solidarity, and that such arms sales by all Member States to Argentina should be halted?

(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I can only answer questions on which the Council has formed an opinion. The Council has not yet formed an opinion on this question.

President. — Question No 87, by Mrs Boserup (H-536/82):

The Commission states in its 15th General Report that 'in future the Commission will be fully involved in political cooperation at all levels'. (Commission of the European Communities: 15th General Report on the Activities of the European Communities 1982, p. 286).

Does the Foreign Minister agree with his predecessor, Kjeld Olesen, that this implies only that the Commission holds a permanent observer post in EPC cooperation or is the Foreign Minister of the opinion that this implies that the Commission takes part on an equal footing with the ten participating countries?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation. — (DE) As you undoubtedly know, the London report of October 1981 states that the Commission of the European Communities is fully involved in political cooperation at all levels subject to the appropriate procedural rules. This does not alter the fact that decisions that come under the heading of European Political Cooperation are taken solely by the participating states.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — (DA) I can assure Mr Genscher that I am not here to annoy him or indulge in hair-splitting, but only to provide my constituents with information. I understand that Foreign Minister Genscher disagrees with the previous Danish Foreign Minister, Mr Kjeld Olesen, and I will not worry Mr Genscher with that. But I should like to ask how that much-talked-about agreement which is to be reached between the participating states will work. Could we perhaps have an example of that, for information to the electorate? How was it possible to reach an agreement which corresponds to the statement made by the Foreign Minister this afternoon, on Turkey as an indispensable partner country? Is there agreement among the foreign ministers that Turkey is an indispensable partner country?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I would say yes to the honourable Member's last question. The deliberations on the

Italo-German proposal for a European Act will, of course, also bring progress as regards the extent of the involvement of the Commission of the European Communities in EPC.

We must realize that decisions that come under the heading of European Political Cooperation are taken solely by the participating states. This corresponds to the structure of the subject matter. Any progress made towards a common foreign policy will also increase the Commission's involvement.

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (FR) Am I right in assuming that the President gave a negative reply to Mrs Boserup's question? If so I am grateful to him because the Member States have certain responsibilities of independence and sovereignty and I cannot imagine for one moment as the Treaties stand at present how the Commission could participate on an equal footing in the negotiations.

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I am not sure that we agree on what is desirable. I personally consider it desirable — and this is a tendency that has also become apparent in the Council — for European Political Cooperation to become increasingly close. Ultimately there should be a common foreign policy. This will, of course, require the full involvement of the Commission of the European Communities.

As the opinion-forming process now stands, it is open to discussion what equal rights means from a legal point of view. There is no disputing that the Commission's representative has no less influence on the discussion and the formation of opinions than the other participants.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) I would like to ask a supplementary question concerning the development of political cooperation and everything the President-in-Office of the Council has said on this matter in his previous statements.

I would like to ask by what means the German presidency intends to develop political cooperation in these six months, and how, for example, it intends to solve the problem posed by the Greek Government which, I believe, currently takes a different position from that taken by other EEC Member States, and particularly from that of the West German Government, on many major international issues, such as on the Middle East, on Cyprus, on the problem existing between Greece and Turkey and on the Soviet proposals for arms limitation in Europe?

And one last point about the President's reply concerning Turkey: does his opinion that the Evren junta is a reliable partner reflect the opinion of the Council, that is, of all the Ministers and including the Greek

Alavanos

Government, or is exclusively the opinion of the West German Government?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) The answers I give here are as the President of the Council of Ministers of the European Community. The European Community does not have any confederates. What it does have are associated partners. Greece, by which you have been deputed to speak here, has accepted this association by signing the Treaty of Accession, just as all the other Member States have done. We are convinced that Greece would not have done so if it had not considered association with Turkey to be as important as the other nine Member States.

During its term of office the German Presidency will do everything it can to extend European Political Cooperation wherever this is possible. This is in the interests of the ability of the European democracies to take action externally, and it would be a good thing if we could make progress in this respect.

From various remarks the honourable Member made in his speech on my opening statement I am fairly sure that we shall most definitely not agree on the objectives which should be pursued by European Political Cooperation.

Mr Antoniazzi. — (IT) Mr President, I believe that the distinction between the Council of Ministers and the Foreign Affairs Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation is destined to disappear, leading to the fusion in a single institution of the functions of these two groups. Can you give us some sort of assurance in this connection in order to simplify and facilitate institutional development?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) Any breakdown of the division is a step forward as regards the European Community's ability to take joint political action.

President. — Question No 88, by Mr Berkhouwer (H-581/82):

Are the Ministers aware of the fact that for some time now France has again been delivering arms to the totalitarian regime in Argentina including the notorious Exocet missile used to sink two British ships during the Falklands war and do they not think it deplorable that, as a result of France's decision to resume arms supplies, the united front hitherto maintained by the 10 in the matter of delivery of weapons to Argentina has been broken unilaterally and without consultation by one of the Member States?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation. —

(DE) Immediately after the invasion of the Falkland Islands the Ten declared that their governments had decided at national level to impose an unqualified embargo on the export of arms and military equipment to Argentina. This embargo applied throughout the hostilities. Once the hostilities had ended, the Ten had an unofficial exchange of views on national attitudes in this area.

Mr Berkhouwer (L). — (NL). Does the President of the Council of Foreign Ministers not find it a deplorable state of affairs that, while one of the ten Member States of our Community is still technically at war with Argentina — a point the military junta reminded Mrs Thatcher of during her recent trip to the Falkland Islands — another Community Member State is continuing to supply arms to Buenos Aires after all Member States had given a commitment not to supply arms to Argentina, a measure we greatly approved of? What do you feel about this? I think it is a downright scandal.

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I regret that I am unable to convey the Council's opinion to you on this question.

Mr Howell (ED). — The United Kingdom must also take a measure of blame in this matter, since Germany is already giving Argentina a number of warships which, I have to say, are to be powered by Rolls Royce engines. So this is a British, German and French matter, if I may say so. Nevertheless, it does highlight the need for a common arms sales policy within the European Community.

We already have some movement towards common arms procurement. We already have common policies ...

(The President urged the speaker to put his question)

Will the President-in-Office ask the Council of Foreign Ministers as a matter of urgency to put on its agenda the possibility of seeking a common arms sales policy, particularly in regard to allies' requirements in the South Atlantic at this moment?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) You will recall that, when presenting the Italo-German initiative and again today, during my statement, I referred to the need for security questions to become part of our common policy. Policy on the export of weapons is an elementary component of such security questions. I believe that the problems which have just been discussed and to which I cannot reply as President of the Council because the Council does not have an opinion on them reveal how urgent this is. If that is how you intended your question, then I can answer yes.

Mr Marshall (ED). — In answer to a supplementary question the President-in-Office of the Council said that he could not give the Council's view on the French decision to supply arms to Argentina because the Council had not discussed the matter.

Can he tell us when the Council will discuss the matter and can he give us an assurance that he regards it as an item of major importance which will be on the agenda of the next meeting of the Council?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) To revert to the question put by the previous Member, I must emphasize once again that efforts to formulate a common policy on the export of weapons are in the Community's interests.

President. — At the request of their authors Questions Nos 89 and 90 are carried forward to the next part-session.

Question No 91, by Mr Didò (H-620/82):

In view of the serious facts coming to light in Italy as a result of investigations being carried out into the attempted assassination of the Pope and international terrorist connections, would the Foreign Ministers consider making a statement and possibly taking steps to combat those who resort to criminal methods as a means of waging political battles or bringing political influence to bear, with the aim of destabilizing the free democracies? Do the Foreign Ministers not consider, moreover, that such actions are a grave threat to world peace?

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation. — (DE) The question of the Italian investigations into the attempt on the Pope's life has not yet been discussed by the Ten. In view of their common interest in controlling terrorism, the Ten have long given careful thought to this subject. Practical cooperation among the Ten in the fight against international terrorism consists in the preparation of the meetings of the Internal Affairs Ministers by a group of senior officials.

It has also been proposed that the Justice Ministers should generally consider what steps can be taken to improve and harmonize existing penal procedures. Cooperation among the Ten offers adequate opportunities for terrorism to be effectively combated.

Mr Didò. — (IT) I thank the President of the Council for his answer. I would like, however, to stress the fact that, apart from the investigation in progress on the attempt on the life of the Pope, which we cannot evaluate before seeing its final results, there have emerged clear indications of a connection between the arms traffic and terrorism in certain Community countries. I

would like to know if the Council considers these facts to be very serious, also in view of the activities of certain secret services endangering peace in Europe, and if it will inform the Council of Ministers of the need to adopt concrete measures to fight this international terrorist connection.

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I do not at present have any information regarding the attempt on the Pope's life. Leaving this case aside, the Council naturally feels — as you will have gathered from answers on other subjects — that controlling terrorism must be regarded by all democratic countries as a task of the utmost importance. If terrorism is to be controlled, it is, of course essential to try to uncover international connections which favour it. Terrorism is an attack on human dignity and it is also a threat to world peace. We must all therefore do our best to stamp it out.

Mr van Minnen (S). — (NL) Anyone would think we were speaking of Europe during the war. We should remind ourselves that we are talking about laws in times of peace. Your first answer concerned adaptation of the law. Don't you think that the danger of terrorism risks being surpassed by the dangerous precedents such legal adaptations represent, a matter of the highest political order in your own country, and that such adaptations in their turn pose a danger to the constitutional state?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) It is not the adjustment of legislation that can be a threat to a constitutional state but its content. A constitutional state may also be threatened if it shows that it is no longer able to guarantee the security of its citizens.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) It is well-known that the attempt on the Pope's life has been linked by the Italian authorities, unsuccessfully of course, with activities by Bulgarian citizens.

I would like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council if the fire in the Reichstag was also started by Bulgarian communists, and also if he is aware of the P2 freemasonry scandal, that terrorism in Italy, that is, has links with the State itself, indeed with people in high places, and that in many instances is used to further political ends?

Mr Genscher. — (DE) I must reject the insinuation that the attempt is being made to compare fascist Germany with democratic Italy.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, in reply to an earlier question on frontier controls you went into gratifying detail on the approximation of legislation, which, of course, also raises the question of the

Habsburg

legal territory of the Community. Can you say specifically what initiatives will be taken next? We have long heard talk about the need for the approximation of legislation and the legal territory. It is now time this was achieved so that we can do away with frontier controls.

Mr Genscher. — (DE) The specific initiative is the Italo-German European Act.

President. — The first part of Question Time is closed.¹

I should particularly like to thank the President-in-Office of the Council for literally standing through the whole of Question Time, without being brought to his knees!²

(Applause — The sitting closed at 8.20 p.m.)

¹ See Annex of 12. 1. 1983.

² Membership of Parliament — Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX

Votes

This annex indicates rapporteurs' opinions on amendments and reproduces the texts of explanations of vote. For further details of the voting the reader is referred to the Minutes.

ELLES REPORT (Doc. 1-977/82 'Cyprus'): ADOPTED

Explanations of vote

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, I shall vote in favour of Lady Elles' report on the problem of missing persons in Cyprus because I would like to hope that it will make some contribution towards resolving a major humanitarian problem in a country which has an association with the EEC. This problem, which is a blot on the very meaning of civilization, arose with the Turkish invasion of 1974 and with the unfortunately still continuing occupation of 40% of the territory of the independent Cyprus Republic. It is an indisputable fact that Turkey is failing to show due respect for decisions on the issue by the UN, some of which she herself voted for, and thus, eight whole years after the Cyprus tragedy, the wives, the parents and the brothers and sisters of 1 800 persons do not know if their loved ones are alive or dead. The European Parliament, with its long tradition, must strongly condemn the unacceptable position of the Turkish Government in showing contempt for every canon of moral behaviour and international law, and in continuing to violate the most elementary human rights of 200 000 Greek Cypriots in defiance of the United Nations charter. In concluding I would say that to approve Lady Elles' report is the least we can do for the human beings of a country with a civilization thousands of years old and which lies in our own continent of Europe.

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my group and I personally will vote in favour of the report by Lady Elles. I want to explain to her why.

We are obviously anxious over the fate of the missing persons and moved by the distress of their families. I should have liked to see you, Lady Elles, give greater attention to the fate of the missing persons in the other community which you dealt with rather rapidly in a ten-line paragraph. Far be it for me, Lady Elles, to criticize you and your action because you well know the esteem in which I hold you — and I say that not as a trite statement but in real sincerity; however, I should have preferred you to go to both parts of the island. The truth may differ and I am afraid we have heard only one side of the truth however true it may be.

Then I have my doubts about paragraph 5. Let us not be deluded by your references to the withdrawal of foreign troops. Believe me, I do not endorse the action of the Greeks or of the Turks. I do not wear a Greek skirt or the fez to which Attaturk was so deeply attached. But facts are facts: the Turkish Cypriot population does not look upon the Turkish army as a foreign army. It sees it as the bulwark of its security. Moreover the partition is a *fait accompli*: there are 113 Turks in the south, 500 Maronites and 2 000 Greeks in the north in the Carpathians. I have been there and I know what I am talking about.

We are witnessing the bitter lemons of the partition of the island. In 'Bitter Lemons' Durrell recounted the history of 'Enosis' with much fervour and nostalgia based on his familiarity with the classics and his affection for the ordinary Greek people. It is a bitter-sweet history with elements of both cruelty and tenderness. There was little reference to the Turks in that book. Now they have written their own history.

Lady Elles, you do not seem to have understood that history. This is why your report seems incomplete to me. However, I shall vote in favour of your report because I do not want to cause any injustice to the Greek or Turkish families. The Greeks and the Turks have suffered, they have inflicted great suffering upon themselves. Today they are learning to live separately. Let us leave them time enough to learn not to fear one another.

Mr Battersby (ED). — Once again I am speaking for myself and not for my group. But I will be voting for the Lady Elles resolution and I beg to differ with the previous speaker. I believe she does understand the history and understands it very well. First of all it is a fair, balanced and humanitarian resolution. And, secondly, its paragraph 5 emphasizes the one obvious fact — a fact which cannot be emphasized enough — which precludes any lasting solution. The presence of approximately 25 000 Turkish troops occupying the north of the Republic, in addition to the Greek and Turkish troops which are there under Treaty, is causing the major problem. Their withdrawal is a prerequisite to any solution to the basic problems of Cyprus.

Mr Kallias (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, the Group of the European People's Party has decided unanimously to vote in favour of the motion for a resolution contained in Lady Elles' report concerning the search for missing persons in Cyprus. The resolution deals with the humanitarian aspect of the missing person tragedy. The issue was raised originally in a motion for a resolution tabled by all the Greek Members of the European Parliament who belong to the New Democracy Party prior to its being subsumed in the Group of the European People's Party. Those of us belonging to the New Democracy Party, namely Mr Bournias, who has already spoken, Mr Papaefstratiou, Mr Gerokostopoulos, Mr Gontikas, Mr Kaloyannis, Mr Protopapadakis, Mr Kazazis and I myself — who are all of us part of the Group of the European People's Party — confined ourselves, out of deference for the tragedy of the missing persons and the distress felt by their families, to the humanitarian aspect of the problem and avoided seeking to attach blame, political and otherwise, in the belief that we could thus gain unanimous support, or at least the support of a broad majority of Members, on the great moral and humanitarian problems of the missing persons. We express our warm gratitude to Lady Elles, to the Political Affairs Committee and to all the speakers who have voiced their sympathy for the victims and offered their sympathetic understanding in lightening the burden of grief felt by their families. However, we are saddened because a few colleagues, in playing the advocate for those responsible, have sought, with inaccurate references and false assumptions, to alter the truth and break down the unity of Parliament on a humanitarian issue.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Mr President, the question of the missing persons is part of a very much wider problem, and one of the tragedies is that Europe's efforts to deal with this much wider problem have been so feeble. We have been outmanoeuvred by the Eastern bloc, and one can point to three specific areas where we should have taken action.

The first such area is the Association Agreement. Despite the unanimous vote of this House, the Council of Ministers has failed to move to the next stage of the Association Agreement. Secondly, universities in certain Community countries discriminate against Cypriot students, whilst 1 500 Cypriot students are awarded scholarships to study at academies and universities in Russia. The Eastern bloc is interested in making Cyprus a dependency of them rather than a free country. Thirdly, there has been little direct effort to achieve a political solution on the part of the European countries. I believe that the three guarantor powers should call an international conference to try to solve the political crisis in Cyprus which threatens the future of NATO and threatens to have a searing impact on the future of our Community.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) Mr President, the report by Lady Elles has the essential virtue of adopting the necessary objectivity in dealing with a painful problem to which the French Communists and Allies would like to see an equitable, rapid and effective solution. This is essentially a humanitarian problem. The fate of the missing persons in Cyprus must be clarified primarily for the benefit of the families directly concerned. The inhuman situ-

ation facing those families cannot be allowed to last. If we help to resolve it we shall be making our contribution to respect for human rights.

We also believe that an equitable solution to this humanitarian problem can contribute to a peaceful settlement to the Cyprus problem, particularly through respect for and application of the UN resolutions.

The Political Affairs Committee of our Assembly unanimously adopted the report by Lady Elles. We hope that, given its exclusively humanitarian nature, the whole Assembly will do likewise. For our part, we shall vote in favour of the resolution contained in the report by Lady Elles.

Mr Gerokostopoulos (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, I shall support the motion for a resolution on the problem of missing persons in Cyprus despite having reservations about the way in which certain aspects of the resolution are framed.

I shall confine myself, Mr President, to voicing my main reservation. This rests on the view that the factor which constitutes the main reason for the prolongation over eight whole years of a situation justly described as tragic and inhuman by both the honourable rapporteur, Lady Elles, and others who have spoken earlier, is not emphasized as it should be.

This factor is the obstructiveness of the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot sides which have succeeded up until the present time in impeding the work of the Committee on Missing Persons by conjuring up inadmissible hair-splitting arguments. As other colleagues have pointed out, our eminent colleague, Lady Elles, showed particular diligence in compiling her report, and I wish to congratulate her on this diligence except in as much that she limited herself to making only one feeble allusion to the aforementioned factor. She mentions the willingness to cooperate shown by the representatives of the legitimate Cyprus Government who have accepted the conducting of an investigation in the territory controlled by them, whereas she did not meet with the same helpful understanding from the other side.

In finishing, Mr President, I deem it my duty to extol paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution over which our dear colleague, Mr Beyer de Ryke, raised unwarranted objections, and also to express my intense displeasure that some colleagues, fortunately only a very few, have sown a note of discord in what should have been a unanimous declaration of support for the missing persons in Cyprus and their families.

Mr Forth (ED). — Mr President, the title of this report is 'Missing persons in Cyprus'; and one would therefore have hoped and assumed that it would cover the problem of all missing persons from both of the major communities. The amendments tabled by myself and others attempted to reflect this by referring to certain dates which are of great significance in the history of Cyprus. Unfortunately, the House has seen fit to reject these amendments and thus leaves the report with only one date, which therefore reflects the problem of only one of the major communities of the island.

I think we have to acknowledge that this is principally because Greece is a member of this Community and Turkey is not. There are Greek Members in this House but no Turkish Members, and Greek colleagues have been able to exert influence, quite fairly, on their colleagues to make this report one-sided. We have heard many speeches today in Greek, but none in Turkish. I am afraid that the report reflects this fact and reflects the fact of Greek membership of the Community and of this House. This is regrettable and it is equally regrettable that an attempt to balance the report by making allusion to the earlier dates of the problems of the island was rejected. I am now unable to support this report, because I am afraid it does not do credit to the House and reflects the fact that one of the main communities concerned is represented here and the other is not. I think that that is regrettable and unfortunate and has not allowed the House to take a fair view of the matter.

That, Mr President, is why I am now no longer able to support this report.

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — (DA) Mr President, I must join with Mr Forth in saying that I cannot vote for this report. I also cannot vote against it for, of course, I fully realize that the fate of the Greeks who have disappeared must be investigated but, as I said yesterday during the debate, I take the view that we in Parliament must support the principles of justice, and justice in the present case is something which is due to the citizens of both the southern part and the northern part of Cyprus. The draft resolution is insufficiently tied in with the explanatory statement itself. I can accept the draft resolution, for it is sufficiently vague in its wording. On the other hand, I cannot accept the explanatory statement which, in my opinion, is politically one-sided and could be misused.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — Mr President, I have to say with regret that if this House votes in favour of this report, it will be regarded as a propaganda victory for Greece and Greek interests in Cyprus. I do not say that the rapporteur intended it to be so, but it will be interpreted as such and used as such in Athens and Nicosia. I regard the report as breath-takingly silent on the issue of those Turkish Cypriots who have lost their lives in the long history of sadness and misfortune which has divided this island since 1963. I feel that it fails utterly to take account of the real issues that have atrophied the United Nations Committee on Missing Persons, which was set up to discover the real facts of the missing persons in Cyprus and whose work has in my view been subjected to improper political interference by Greek and Greek Cypriot authorities.

I regret therefore, Mr President, that I shall not be able to support this report.

J. D. Taylor (ED) in writing. — This report is inadequate, poorly researched, and certainly biased. It ignores the hundreds of missing Turkish Cypriots between 1963 and 1974 as documented by the United Nations.

This Assembly brings itself into disrepute by approving one-sided resolutions. The rapporteur has done a disservice to both Cyprus and this Assembly. She could and should have been more evenhanded.

It is a remarkable achievement to ignore the missing Cypriots since 1963; it is deplorable that she spoke to four Greek Cypriot but no Turkish Cypriot political parties, it is an outrage that she restricted her contacts to Southern Cyprus; it was wrong to have made her travel arrangements when the Turkish Cypriot spokesman was away in Geneva; it is inexplicable why she refused to speak to the Turkish Cypriot Member of the ICMP in Strasbourg; it is inexcusable that she took advantage of the private hospitality and a holiday from the President of the Greek Cypriot Assembly, Mr Ladas.

The 'Troops Out' slogan is an oversimplification. Greek, and indeed Turkish troops, can only leave in coordination with constitutional progress.

The leader of our Cyprus Delegation was refused permission by the Greek Cypriots to stay overnight in Northern Cyprus — how can the rapporteur honestly suggest that there is free movement?

By including an amendment which will refer to missing Cypriots since 1963 some balance will be restored to this resolution. Otherwise, like the majority of the 434 Members of this House, I will not vote for the resolution.

Mr Hord (ED), in writing. — Mr President, I shall vote against the Elles report as I do not consider the report to be balanced and the Turkish point of view has not been taken into account. I believe we could have had an evenly balanced report if the rapporteur had visited the north side of the island rather than just the south (Greek) side.

Furthermore, in my view the report does nothing to advance a solution of the missing persons in Cyprus over and above the actions of the United Nations.

I am therefore unable to support the report and feel that it deserves a negative response.

*
* *

PENDERS REPORT (Doc. 1-786/82 'Middle East'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke:

- IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 6, 21, 22, 50, 78 and 83; and
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39/corr., 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95 and 96.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) Mr President, I must apologize to you and to my colleagues for asking to explain my vote in this way and not in writing. I believe, however, that we have rarely discussed a report which is so important to world peace and I see that, for the first time, we are using this procedure of presenting all the explanations of vote in writing whereas we are speaking not only for our electors and for the press but also, I hope, for our colleagues and to express our own personal views as is the right of a Member of Parliament.

Let me say at once that I shall abstain. I shall abstain because I believe we have voted very quickly on amendments whose implications we did not always fully appreciate. These implications are far-reaching because, for many years, there have been disputes in the Middle East over a single word or comma in Article 242 and each single word which we use — autonomy, people, State, autonomous group — has a totally different meaning.

I did not vote in favour of the motion by our colleague, Mr Blumenfeld, because I felt it was too late to postpone the vote on the amendments. But I would hope that on another occasion for so important a debate, we shall allow a delay of one part-session between the tabling of amendments and the time at which they are discussed. These are extremely serious matters. I have sufficient respect for the European Parliament to believe that these resolutions are highly important and that they are studied by the parties on both sides. We cannot vote without complete certainty when each word is so important. That is why I shall abstain.

(Applause)

Mr Galluzzi (COM). — (IT) Mr President, we and other groups had tabled a number of amendments which would have removed from the Penders report some ambiguous features regarding the three key points — that is, the need for a European initiative, the fact that the Camp David agreements are now out of date and the need to give full recognition to the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

These amendments have been rejected. In the view of our group, however, the Penders report still has something to be said for it, particularly as regards the call for a negotiated solution of the conflict, and for this reason we shall vote in favour.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE), in writing. — (DE) I found that I was unable to vote for the resolution and, after due consideration, voted against it. I regret this, because the rapporteur has done his best to bring some balance into the very complex political subject of Middle East policy.

Nevertheless, in my view, the resolution, which the House evidently intends to adopt by a large majority, has been deprived of a basis of political reality in respect of a number of fundamental demands and statements and is worded in ambiguous rather than clear terms. There will be no peace or security in the Middle East until the Arab States in the region join Israel at the negotiating table, as Egypt has done. For over 30 years, all the Heads of the front-line States with the exception of the late President Sadat have refused to take this step and instead have tried to destroy Israel with war and terrorist attacks since 1948.

It is therefore high time we Europeans called on the governments of Syria, Jordan and Saudi Arabia to accept, without prior conditions, the open invitation extended in the Camp David agreement to take part in negotiations with Israel.

Since Israel's campaign in Lebanon in June 1982 the political, strategic and military picture has changed dramatically in the Middle East. A few weeks ago Lebanon, having suffered so much, began negotiations with Israel, with the USA in attendance, on the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanese soil and the normalization of neighbourly relations between Lebanon and Israel. Jordan is about to take a similar step. These facts have not been considered, and instead Israel is held up as the country in the region which, through its insistence on safeguards for its citizens, is blocking the peace process. Amendments which sought to correct this incorrect depiction of the situation have been rejected by varying majorities. I have consequently voted against the motion for a resolution.

Mr De Goede (NI) — (NL). We believe the Penders Report to be first-class. We are pleased to subscribe to the motion for a resolution, albeit with two reservations. As far as the situation in Lebanon is concerned we believe it is no simple matter to provide troops for the international peace-keeping force.

In the first place we have a strong preference for the maintenance of such a force under UN auspices. In the event of this not being feasible we believe that any international peace-keeping force would have to comply with the following: (1) the approval of all parties involved, (2) a clearly delineated framework such as the MFO in Sinai, and (3) clearly circumscribed tasks and responsibilities.

We see no role for a large-scale Community Middle East initiative at this point. Despite considerable differences between the Reagan Initiative, the Fahd Plan, as adopted by the Summit in Fez, and the Community's Venice Declaration the most recent of these, the Reagan Initiative of September 1982, clearly goes a long way towards matching the terms of the Venice Declaration and, most important, the Arab and US proposals, possibly in coordination with the ideas expressed by King Hussein of Jordan would appear to offer a basis for further talks with a view to finding an eventual all-embracing solution to the Middle East problems.

We feel that the Community should play a more important role in this process by acting as a mediator between the Camp David signatories on the one hand, and the moderate Arab States, on the other, than by once again launching new Community Middle East peace proposals.

Mr Ephremidis (COM), in writing. — (GR) Our position on the matter under debate is founded on a desire to contribute to a just peace in the Middle East. Such a solution is in the best interests of the people of the area, particularly of the Israeli and Palestinian peoples. The rationale of the Penders resolution runs counter to this end.

After a long drawn-out meander through the history of the Middle East problem containing many inaccuracies and distortions about facts and incidents, it attempts misleadingly in the enjoinment to fence up the problem of the Middle East, and specifically the Palestinian problem, within the framework of Camp David and the strategic cooperation agreement between Israel and the USA. Within processes, that is, which have been rejected by all the Arab countries except Egypt, and which life itself has rejected during the course of the last four years. Because, in seeking to establish American and Israeli dominance over the Middle East, these processes have led to, amongst other things, the Israeli invasion, slaughter and genocide in Lebanon. The resolution fails to explicitly condemn this invasion though it has been condemned by international public opinion, just as it avoids the question of the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli invaders from Lebanon.

The resolution is also unacceptable because it underrates the importance of Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, and likewise the proposals of the Arab Summit at Fez in 1982, which hold forth a serious possibility for the achievement of a peaceful and just settlement.

At the same time, in reference to the rights of the Palestinian people, the resolution uses the term 'self-determination' but speaks only of the 'option' of an independent Palestinian State.

Likewise it disputes the position of the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, though it has gained this right through carrying on a bloody struggle over many years, and is recognized as such by the UN and most of the international community.

In all these respects the Penders resolution offers nothing new, and much less can it be deemed as a Community initiative since — by virtue of quite explicit references — it is subordinate to and serves American plans in the area.

We shall thus vote against it, and we maintain, without wishing to appear as prophets, that it will not help to promote a solution to the Middle East problem, but will complicate the issue even further and aggravate the dangers to peace, not only in this area but also on a wider scale.

Mr Israël (DEP), in writing. — (FR) I shall abstain in the vote on all the resolutions because a number of most important amendments tabled on behalf of the DEP Group were not accepted by the rapporteur.

I believe it is essential today for the European Parliament to denounce all those who wish to perpetuate the war in Lebanon and all those who wish to make peace between Israel and the Arab States impossible. Here Syria bears an obvious responsibility as has been proved today in the Tripoli combats. But behind Syria there is a much more powerful nation which is trying to confuse the issue and prevent the possibility of peace which may be appearing at long last from materializing.

Of course I believe that Israel must make certain gestures of good will especially by putting an end to its policy of settlements. We should also allow a common Jordanian/Palestinian front to be established because this is the only way of obtaining the support of the Palestinian people for the peace process.

Let me repeat that the Palestinian people are entitled to justice and to their own existence on their own territory, but there can be no question as paragraph 10 of the Penders report unfortunately seems to suggest, of the PLO being unconditionally associated in the negotiations. The PLO is unable to achieve a balanced position: sometimes it claims to be in favour of a political solution at others it seeks to wage a purely military war confined to the occupied territories; on other occasions it subscribes to a total combat including terrorism as proved by the bomb recently planted in a civilian bus in Tel Aviv. The doctrine of the PLO is totally confused.

I therefore call upon our Assembly to show greater rigour in dealing with the Middle East question which may hold the key to world peace.

Mrs Le Roux (COM), in writing. — (FR) Despite the few amendments which have been adopted the report by Mr Penders still retains its original content and spirit. It follows the Camp David line and falls in with American policy. It holds out no prospect for a constructive contribution to the peace effort or the dialogue now opened through the Franco-Egyptian proposals and those made by the Fez Summit and the PLO.

On the contrary, this report fails to take account of the lesson of recent history and Israeli aggression namely the national rights of peoples and the rights of a people to build their own independent State. Are the Palestinian people not legitimately entitled to benefit from this right just as the other peoples of the region benefit from it today?

The report by Mr Penders takes no account of the need for immediate withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanon. That is the essential first step towards respect for the sovereignty of this country.

Finally, in general terms the report fails to draw attention to the responsibility of Israel and of the United States in the terrible events of last summer and in the present difficulties in making progress towards a peaceful settlement; this only confuses the conditions and principles which must underlie the search for a peaceful settlement and the political process leading to that aim.

Those are the essential reasons for which we shall vote against this report.

Mr Marshall (ED) in writing. — I shall vote against the Penders Report for two basic reasons.

The first is that it now calls for Israel to 'withdraw immediately from the occupied territories'. This ignores the special position of East Jerusalem. No Jew can ever be expected to allow the Wailing Wall to be given up. Just as importantly it ignores the importance of the Golan. Israel has never used the Golan to attack Syria. The Syrians used the Golan to send rockets and murderers against Israel. For Israel to leave the 'occupied territories' is to invite her destruction. If she had not occupied these territories before the 1973 war, there might be no Israel today. That sobering thought should cause us to re-examine this proposal.

Secondly, there are too many who look on the PLO as some old-style freedom movement. The leaders of the PLO are not latterday Gandhis. They are the only so-called freedom movement whose philosophy is based on genocide. They seek to destroy Israel.

Israel has many friends in Europe. Let us remember that, unlike us, she has four times had to fight for her freedom in the past 35 years. We should sympathize with and not condemn her.

Mr Prag (ED), in writing. — It is with the greatest regret that I shall vote against the Penders resolution on the situation in the Middle East. But there is no way in which I could vote in favour of a resolution which, as amended, goes beyond Resolution 242 of the Security Council and puts virtually the whole of the blame for the situation in the Middle East on Israel.

The amendment which has made a nonsense of the resolution is that of Mr Seeler (German Socialist), which says Israel must withdraw from the occupied territories *immediately*. It was adopted by only 90 votes to 88. That would leave her with no security and no real guarantees of secure borders or of continued existence as a State.

The resolution, as it now stands, is not only out of line with the policy of our governments. It is also out of line with reality. In order to indulge the anti-Israel sentiments of some, and the oil-supply considerations of others, the resolution supports policies which are totally unachievable.

The resolution was also voted in considerable chaos. Rarely have I seen such confusion in this House. What happened testified to the incompetence of the Bureau, the impossible burden on the translators — 50 of the 96 amendments were available only this morning, not long before the vote — and the confusion created by the chairing: the President went through the amendments so fast, much of the time, that the interpreters were quite unable to keep up with him.

On some amendments, members did not know whether they were voting for or against or abstaining, or even which amendment they were voting on. One could only thank heaven that from time to time an electronic vote slowed things down.

My main reason for voting against this resolution, however, is the flagrant lack of balance and fairness in the text which has emerged. Owing to the obsession with recent events in Lebanon — which is partly understandable — Israel is given the lion's share of the blame for everything that has happened in the Middle East in the last 34 years. There is no perspective, no mention of the years of Arab intransigence which must surely bear the main responsibility for the repeated wars and the thousands of deaths they have brought.

For 24 years, with the honourable exception of Egypt, and now at last of Lebanon, the Arab States have refused to recognize Israel, to talk to Israel, or even to consider ending the state of war with Israel which they themselves declared against her when the armies of six Arab States marched into the infant State of Israel, just set up by the United Nations in 1948. Only by negotiation, compromise, and above all goodwill can peace in the Middle East be achieved.

In short, the Penders resolution has become a nonsense, a piece of unreality. It offers no prospect or guidance for the peace which the people of the Middle East are longing for and so badly need.

Mr Schmid (S), in writing. — (DE) The motion tabled by Mr Penders is, notwithstanding the vote, still intact so far as its central features are concerned. Moreover, the House has adopted amendments tabled by my group which make its position even clearer. Our two main concerns — that is to say, security for Israel and self-determination for the Palestinians, even in the form of a State — have been taken into account.

The Socialist Group therefore gives the resolution its backing.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S), in writing. — (DE) Although I still have political objections to the report, I shall vote for it on the following grounds:

1. Fundamentally, it represents a step forward.
2. It calls for a homeland for the Palestinian people.
3. It calls for negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians.
4. Amendments tabled by the Socialist Group have changed it so that less importance is now attached to the Camp David agreement and more to the Fahd Plan and the Fez Declaration.

Furthermore, while maintaining my position in principle, I withdraw my criticism of the decision taken by a majority of the House not, for example, to give full recognition to the PLO as the *sole* representative of the Palestinian people or to condemn the massacres perpetrated by the Israeli army in Lebanon.

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 12 JANUARY 1983

Contents

1. *Oils and fats — Report (Doc. 1-964/82) by Mr Vgenopoulos:*
Mr Vgenopoulos; Mr Gatto; Mr Ligios; Mr Hord; Mr Vitale; Mr Delatte; Mr Pesmazoglou; Mr Louwes; Mr Kaloyannis; Mr Martin; Mr Maher; Mr Markopoulos; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Adamou; Mr Sutra; Mr Dalsager (Commission) 108
2. *Automobile market — Report (Doc. 1-997/82) by Mr Filippi and Oral Questions with debate to the Commission, (Doc. 1-149/82) by Mr Berkhouwer and others, (Doc. 1-544/82) by Mr C. Jackson and others and (Doc. 1-802/82) by Mrs J. Hoffmann and others:*
Mr Filippi; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr C. Jackson; Mrs J. Hoffmann; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mr Muller-Hermann; Sir John Stewart-Clark; Mr Bonaccini; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Bord; Mr De Goede; Mr Seal; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Beazley; Mr Petronio; Mr J. Moreau; Mr Mihr; Mr Vernimmen; Mr Narjes (Commission) 119
3. *Intra-Community trade — Turnover — Reports (Doc. 1-960/82) by Mr von Wogau, (Doc. 1-976/82) by Mr Rogalla and (Doc. 1-968/82) by Mr Welsh:*
Mr von Wogau; Mr Rogalla; Mr Welsh; Mr Moreland; Mr Seal 136
4. *Question Time (Doc. 1-1094/82) (continuation):*
Questions to the Commission:
Mr Lomas; Lord Harmar-Nicholls 140
 - *Question No 1, by Mr Kaloyannis: Failure to use the Community merchant marine for the transportation of material for the construction of the Russian gas pipeline:*
Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Mr Kaloyannis; Mr Contogeorgis; Mr Marshall; Mr Contogeorgis 141
 - *Question No 3, by Mr Maher: Breakdown of CAP finance:*
Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Maher; Mr Dalsager; Mr Bonde; Mr Dalsager 141
 - *Question No 4, by Mr Moorhouse: Transport policy:*
Mr Burke (Commission); Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Burke; Mr Moreland; Mr Burke 143
 - *Question No 5, by Mrs Ewing: The CFP and flags of convenience, and Question No 32 by Mr Harris: Flag of convenience:*
Mr Contogeorgis; Mrs Ewing; Mr Contogeorgis; Mr Harris; Mr Contogeorgis 144
 - *Question No 7 by Sir Peter Vanneck: Common Customs Tariff on Aeronautical products:*
Mr Narjes (Commission); Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Narjes; Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman; Mr Moreland; Mrs Ewing; Mr Beazley 145
 - *Question No 12, by Mr Moreland: Football:*
Mr Davignon (Commission); Mr Moreland; Mr Davignon; Mr Seligman; Mr Davignon; Mr Paisley; Mr Davignon; Mr Seefeld; Mr Davignon; Mr Bonde; Mr Davignon 146
 - *Question No 13, by Mrs Lizin: Television interview with Mr Davignon — Steel:*
Mr Davignon; Mrs Lizin; Mr Davignon; Mr Rogalla; Mr Davignon; Mrs Clwyd; Mr Davignon; Mr Bonde; Mr Davignon; Mr Seligman; Mr Davignon 148
 - *Question No 14, by Mr Bocklet: Information seminar on a uniform electoral system:*
Mr Thorn (Commission); Mr Bocklet; Mr Thorn; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Thorn 149
 - *Question No 15, by Mr Kazazis: Franco-Soviet agreement, and Question No 29, by Mr Hord: The Franco-Russian Agricultural Trade Agreement:*
Mr Thorn; Mr Kazazis; Mr Thorn; Mr

- | | | | |
|--|-----|--|-----|
| <i>Hord; Mr Thorn; Mr Marshall; Mr Thorn</i> | 150 | <i>Mr Rogalla; Mr Beumer; Mr Turner; Mr De Gucht; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> | 155 |
| • <i>Question No 16, by Mr Bonde: Budget guidelines:</i> | | 6. <i>Parliament and discharge for 1980 — Discharge to the Commission on the implementation of the budget for 1980 — Embargo on exports of cereals to the USSR in 1980 — Reports (Doc. 1-760/82) by Mr Key and (Doc. 1-1003/82) by Mr Battersby:</i> | |
| <i>Mr Ortoli (Commission); Mr Bonde; Mr Ortoli; Mr Bonde; Mr Ortoli</i> | 151 | <i>Mr Key; Mr Battersby; Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Konrad Schon; Mr Edward Kellett-Bowman</i> | 160 |
| • <i>Question No 18, by Mr Gontikas: Filling A2 and A3 posts with Greek nationals:</i> | | 7. <i>Votes:</i> | |
| <i>Mr Burke; Mr Gontikas; Mr Burke; Mr Alavanos; Mr Burke; Mr Lagakos; Mr Burke</i> | 152 | <i>Mr Vgenopoulos; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Patterson; Mr Ligios; Mr Aigner</i> | 167 |
| • <i>Question No 19, by Mr Lalor: 'Two-speed' Community:</i> | | <i>Annexes:</i> | |
| <i>Mr Thorn; Mr Lalor; Mr Thorn; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Thorn</i> | 154 | <i>Mr Sutra; Mr Kyrkos; Mrs Castle; Mr Gautier; Mr Protopapadakis; Mr Alavanos; Mr Pininfarina; Mr Bonaccini; Mr Bord; Mr Damseaux; Mr Wurtz</i> | 168 |
| • <i>Question No 20, by Mrs Castle: Milk productions:</i> | | | |
| <i>Mr Dalsager; Mrs Castle; Mr Dalsager; Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman; Mr Dalsager; Mr Marshall</i> | 154 | | |
| 5. <i>Intra-Community trade — Turnover (continuation):</i> | | | |

IN THE CHAIR : MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)¹

1. Oils and fats

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-964/82) by Mr Vgenopoulos, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-66/82 — COM(82) 85 final) for a regulation amending Regulation No 136/66/EEC on the establishment of a common organization of the market in oils and fats and on the olive oil sector.

¹ Approval of the minutes — Membership of Parliament — Deadline for tabling amendments — Documents received — Referral to committee: see Minutes.

Mr Vgenopoulos (S) rapporteur. — (GR) Mr President, Fellow Members, this report on olive oil follows the reports on fruit and on wine, and completes the group of Mediterranean products concerning which problems are likely to arise, or already existing problems will be exacerbated when Spain and Portugal join the Community. The European Parliament is now called upon to express an opinion on the proposal of the Commission modifying Regulation 136 of 1966 that deals with the sector of fatty substances.

In drawing up the present report, account was taken not only of the Commission's proposal but also of three proposed resolutions by our colleagues Mr Kyrkos, Mr Costanzo and others, who called for some action to protect olive oil against other, cheaper seed oils. The cultivation of the olive is particularly important for the economies of various parts of the Community, where this activity is an essential source of income for a significant fraction of the population, but also where olive oil is the most important source of fatty substances for notable categories of consumers. The areas in which the cultivation of olives predominates are among the most disadvantaged in the Community, with fairly low incomes and with very little chance of converting the agriculture to other products owing to the characteristics of the terrain. The main

Vgenopoulos

producer country is Italy, with 70% of the production in the Community, with Greece second at 29.6% and France third at 0.4%. It should be remembered that the Community has placed limits on the production of olive oil, and that production units created later than 1978 no longer receive any support.

The fact that the olive is cultivated in mountainous and infertile places in the Mediterranean is a factor that limits the possibility of increasing productivity, and consequently reducing the costs of production. If to this we add the great extent to which the production units are scattered, where $\frac{3}{4}$ of the olive groves occupy less than one hectare, the difficulties associated with mechanization will be readily understood. The result of this is that one and a half million agricultural workers in the Community are occupied in the cultivation of olives even though the total area of the land on which they are employed amounts to only 2.5% of the total agricultural area of the Community.

From one point of view this is encouraging against the background of the unemployment crisis we are passing through, since the cultivation of olives occupies 12.5% of the total agricultural population in the Community. This happens because there are no capitalistic forms of exploitation within this sector and nearly all the olive cultivators are agricultural workers. However, if we take into account that this 12.5% of the Community's total agricultural population produce only 1.4% of the Community's total agricultural output, the social and economic problems associated with the cultivation of olives become clear.

The Community of Ten is now self-sufficient in olive oil to the extent of 96%. However, the degree of self-sufficiency in vegetable oils derived from seeds is poor, amounting to about 21%. This means that overall, there is a shortfall of vegetable fatty substances in the Community. However, with the accession of Spain, which is a major producer of olives, the Community's degree of self-sufficiency in olive oil would increase to 107% if today's rate of consumption of olive oil were to be maintained. However, this is unlikely to be the case because the consumption of olive oil in Spain is at the moment powerfully protected against seed oils. This means that high taxes are imposed on seed oils to ensure that they will not be substantially cheaper than olive oil. To be specific, the price ratio between olive oil and sunflower-seed oil in Spain is 1.4/1, and in the case of soya oil 1.7/1; there are, moreover, quotas limiting the imports of seed oils. But these protective restrictions applied today will cease to be once Spain has joined the Community, and as a result olive oil will no longer be able to compete on the Spanish market and the consumption of seed oils will increase.

I call to your attention that the same thing has happened in Greece, where in the last 2 years, i.e. following our accession to the Community, the consumption of seed oils has increased to the disadvantage of olive oil. Thus, the Commission foresees that the Com-

munity's degree of self-sufficiency in olive oil will not be 107% after the enlargement, but 122% as a result of the fall in the consumption of olive oil within the Community, unless steps are taken to prevent such a development.

Now, since this surplus will not constitute a problem for Spain or for the other Mediterranean countries that produce olive oil, but will be a problem for the CAP, i.e. for the Community as a whole, the Commission proposes the price ratio for olive oil — seed oils, which is at the moment about 2.7/1, should be made 2/1 so that the consumption of olive oil will remain at the same level. According to the Commission's calculations, it is anticipated that the degree of self-sufficiency will no longer be 122% but 106%. In the long term this would be an advantage from a budgetary standpoint, as I shall explain. If today's consumption of olive oil is not maintained, the Community will be obliged to pay the producers at the intervention price and to store the olive oil. Thus, we would find ourselves facing the same problems that we have at present with a butter mountain that we don't know what to do with.

According to the Commission, then, a price ratio of 2/1 will allow the consumption of olive oil to be maintained, and in the long term this will bring a benefit of 40 million accounting units to the common budget, compared to the expenditure entailed by not having this price ratio. The manner in which the Commission proposes that this ratio should be achieved is to support consumption.

I will now digress slightly, to say that there are two kinds of support: One, the support of production, is designed to guarantee the incomes of the producers. The other, the support of consumption, aims at assisting the absorption of the Community's olive oil, also taking into account the prices of the competing seed oils.

Thus, with the Commission's proposal for a price ratio of 2/1 it will be ensured that the Community's production will be used up within the Community itself, so avoiding any world-wide upheavals in the market for olive oil. Moreover, this situation creates no difficulties in countries that supply vegetable oils to the Community, since the proportion of these on the Community market will not be affected since the effort is directed at maintaining the consumption of olive oil at today's levels.

The Commission should have submitted proposals to modify the price ratio of olive oil — seed oils in parallel with the accession of Greece to the Community. This omission places an obligation on the Community to take immediate measures before there is an irreparable deterioration in the situation of evident declining demand for olive oil in the countries that are traditionally consumers of it, such as Italy, Greece and France. For this reason, the modified regulation should come

Vgenopoulos

into force as soon as possible and this is indeed called for in an amendment put forward by the Committee on Agriculture.

Furthermore, the committee on Agriculture is of the opinion that support for consumption should not be a substitute for support for production, and that the cornerstone of the market organization will still have to be the support of production, to avoid any exacerbation of the income problems of the producers.

As for the controls, the Committee on Agriculture calls upon the Commission to propose measures and regulations to ensure:

1. that controls in the provision of support for production should be facilitated,
2. that support for consumption should have an integral effect on the price paid by consumers, and that it should not benefit only the packaging companies, and
3. that no mixtures or adulterations with seed oils should be allowed, to protect the consumer.

On the basis of all the above, Mr President, and because the matter is both important and urgent if the consumption of olive oil is to be maintained, at least in the countries where it is produced, I call upon Parliament to approve the Committee on Agriculture's report calling for the amendment of Article 7 of the Council's Regulation 136 of 1966.

(Applause)

Mr Gatto (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, I shall only say a very few words to express my support for the rapporteur, who has presented a much-needed, balanced and carefully prepared report. A great deal could be said on this subject; we appear to be talking about a food-stuff, but in the background lie problems that are in my view more complex, and which concern the whole equilibrium of the common agricultural policy. Olive oil is being attacked with all sorts of accusations; to what end, it might be asked, but we will pass over that. There are things that are not right about the CAP, but there are things that are not right in every sector. You can criticize the way it is managed, but then, again, no other sector is beyond similar criticism. The problem facing us should be seen instead in a social context: a Community policy that took no account of the wide social base involved in the Mediterranean area and the other areas of the Community, would cause a serious political crisis. From this point of view, therefore, the question is not one concerned merely with agriculture, production or food — it is a political matter also.

I do not want to keep going over all the arguments. I know that there is opposition, some of it in good faith, and such opposition in good faith is entitled to the greatest respect.

But some of the opposition, on the other hand, seems to me in all sincerity not to be in very good faith,

because, when criticism is expressed which, if applied in practice, would favour the interests of large economic and industrial groups at the expense of small growers, I think that good faith no longer comes into it. However, since my purpose was only to say a few words in support of the rapporteur, and to thank him and compliment him on what he has achieved, I will stop here.

Mr Ligios (EPP). — *(IT)* Mr. President, before saying anything about the Vgenopoulos report, which I consider a good one, and regarding which I compliment the rapporteur on the excellent work that he has done, I think it is necessary to make some reference to a certain atmosphere of 'scandal' — which Mr. Gatto merely referred to in passing — that has been created around this olive oil problem in precisely these last few weeks; at the time, in other words, when we are about to discuss — and, we hope, launch — the proposals prepared by the Executive Committee for placing this sector on a footing that will take account not only of the problems that have been under consideration for some time now but, above all, those that will be created when Spain and Portugal join the Community.

It is, I believe, the fact that the entire seed oil industry is officially up in arms against this proposal — and, not least, is endeavouring to put pressure on many of us — that is at the bottom of this atmosphere of scandal that has grown up over the Christmas period. Perhaps it might be as well, for the benefit of members, to go over the course of events.

Last December, an internal document of the Commission (which should have remained 'internal') gave emphasis to a series of assumptions that prompted the suspicion that there is a discrepancy between oil produced and oil consumed. This document was fed to the press, and the Financial Times published its contents in an article that, however, if you read it carefully, provides no concrete proof. I therefore invite the honourable member to examine the article carefully (I have had it translated, because I don't speak his language very well): he will find that it says absolutely nothing firm, and the reason why other newspapers, including Italian ones, reported the news is solely because it appeared in a paper of the standing of the Financial Times.

If we look at the question of fraud, the only official document that I have available is the one regarding the conclusions on EAGGF that were brought to our attention in October 1981. The investigation reported in this document certainly contains nothing against the olive oil producers, or against any specific countries.

Fraud is something that must in any event be investigated in all sectors and, if it exists, the fact must be established. The Commission cannot allow insinuations. It must set up proper machinery of its own to combat fraud. It is in fact up to the Community — and

Ligos

not Member States — to fight food frauds, which not only concern the producer but must concern, above all, the traders and wholesale dealers and, where adulteration is concerned, the manufacturers. Ladies and gentlemen, you will undoubtedly be familiar with what happened to olive oil in Spain a few years ago when, through chemical adulteration and inadequate refinement of the product, the dealers — not the olive oil producers — caused the death of hundreds of people, whilst others will carry the marks of that adulteration for the rest of their lives.

The Commission must therefore set up the machinery to enable us to combat fraud in all sectors — not only olive oil — and stamp out this wretched evil, that today has technological resources at its command that are often so sophisticated as to defeat the technical and laboratory skills of government scientists. On this point we are perfectly in agreement but, my honourable conservative friend, to go on from there and hand out gratuitous insinuations unsupported by proof is unacceptable, and does not constitute a very valuable contribution, either from this Parliament, or from the persons making such insinuations.

Having said this, Mr President, I come back to Mr Vgenopoulos' report, which I welcome, and the value of which I acknowledge. I reaffirm the support that we, as Parliament, are giving, and that we have solidly given in the Committee on Agriculture and in the EPP group, to the proposal that the price ratio of two to one between olive oil and other vegetable oils, which the manufacturers dislike so much, shall finally be put into effect. This is one of the very few ways open to us, ladies and gentlemen, not of increasing olive oil consumption — which no-one asks — but at least of maintaining the level of consumption for a product that is not — my honourable conservative friend — in surplus production; a product on account of which the Community — and perhaps the honourable member is unaware of this — spends less than it spends on rapeseed oil, the problem of which simply did not exist before the Community was formed, whereas the olive oil problem did.

With regard to the need, mentioned in the report, for the production of the oil register, I would point out that this is being done at the expense of the growers' association and not at the expense of the Community — the only case of its kind in Community policy.

Finally, I must again emphasize that olive oil in the Mediterranean regions is a fundamental problem, not only social in character, but mainly economic.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, the olive oil sector is in a mess. We do not know how many olive trees there are, even though counting started back in 1978. We do not know how much olive oil is produced. We do not know how much is consumed and by whom. We have massive ongoing frauds in Italy, currently

estimated to cost the Community some 238 million ECU a year. We have the prospect of Spanish and Portuguese entry, and the likely effect on consumption of olive oil is that this will fall dramatically after accession. We have the forecast that the cost of the olive oil regime will increase from something like 685 million ECU this year to more than double this figure — to 1 600 million ECU — in 1985.

Over and above the chaotic and uncontrolled situation, there is a presumption, accepted by the Commission, that one can automatically substitute cheaper vegetable oils with very expensive olive oil regardless of price. Olive oil is not acceptable in most food processing operations. The strong flavour of olive oil precludes such use. Rapeseed oil, a good alternative, costs £ 246 per tonne. EEC olive oil costs £ 1 475 per tonne, i. e. five times as much. The Commission proposal for olive oil is nothing more or less than a blatant attempt to manipulate the market in olive oil and other competing vegetable oils. The Commission states: 'thou shalt have a price ratio of two to one'.

What have the producers of cheaper vegetable oils done to deserve this high-handed, autocratic and artificial dictum from the Commission? Since when has the Treaty of Rome ordained that the Commission can regulate the price in the market place? What have the consumers and the large number of taxpayers done to deserve the prospect of dearer vegetable oils, more inflation, bankruptcies and more unemployment? What have the taxpayers done to deserve the further demand for a thousand million ECU after 1985? We can all ask what the Commission is doing about the huge frauds that beset the olive oil industry. The present situation is that the cost is nearly twice the margin of manoeuvre that Parliament concerns itself with in the Community budget and which it agonizes over for some three months every year. When is the Commission going to do something about this outrageous scandal of false claims in respect of an estimated 350 thousand tonnes of olive oil? Has the Commission yielded to the mafiosi without so much as an enquiry?

What is clear, Mr President, is that the Commission's proposal is premature. Its initiative is irresponsible, insofar as it is specifying price proposals when officials are still engaged in the production of a detailed report into olive oil. It has not yet finished compiling the olive register. Mr President, my group is extremely disturbed about the scandal of the Community olive oil sector. It feels that there is an increasing prospect that consumption will fall and that the cost to the budget will rise dramatically. A series of amendments has been tabled recognizing the need to sustain the olive oil growing, but that support should be of a structural nature and related to the number of existing trees. In this way it is felt that, with grubbing-up allowances, the olive oil surplus can be reduced and alternative crops, such as almonds, and forestry schemes introduced. My group deplores the Committee on Agriculture's amendments designed to bring

Hord

forward the date of the implementation of the proposal prior to the accession of Spain and Portugal. It is our hope that the Commission, being increasingly aware that the olive oil sector is utterly out of control and costing taxpayers millions of ECU in fraudulent claims, will withdraw its proposal. That is our demand.

Furthermore, the arbitrary nature of the proposed price ratio is impractical, indefensible, untried, unfair and contrary to market forces. We call upon the Commission to take back its proposal and submit a fresh initiative only after it has completed its current investigation into the olive oil sector and produced the olive oil register.

(Applause)

Mr. Vitale (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the olive oil question is the subject of a vast debate that has been going on for many years within the Commission and the Council: a debate that has perhaps never before been accompanied, as it is now, by very heavy pressure — let us make no bones about it — from large margarine manufacturers who are trying to influence public opinion, even with scandal-smear campaigns the echoes of which — and as politician I regret this — are to be heard in this chamber, regarding the use of price integration.

Of course — and I say this very clearly — if there are frauds let them be punished, as happens in every civilized society. The same with the land register, too! Let us step up the checks! The Commission has already undertaken to do this, and we, as a group, will be putting forward proposals in this connection.

Having said that, we reject the multi-nationals' use of this kind of argument as a pretext to bring about the downfall of the Mediterranean olive growing industry. The problem facing us is, how to ensure the survival of a centuries' old agricultural industry that involves 1 600 000 small producers in the Community. This industry, I must tell my friend and comrade Gautier, must not be sacrificed to the interests of a group of big businessmen! This is the problem, which is political as well as economic.

We shall vote for the Vgenopoulos report, if the amendments do not twist it beyond all recognition. We shall vote for it also because the Committee on Agriculture has approved many of our amendments, including the one that allows the intervention machinery to put products on the market so as to prevent price speculation and avoid any alteration of the ratio between the price of seed oil and that of olive oil.

We must however go beyond these immediate 'buffer' measures, Commissioner Dalsager! We must go beyond mere 'assistentialism', making the fullest use of the Community instruments at our disposal. The market regulations must be revised. But all of this, I must

emphasize, can only be done in the framework of a policy that reopens — as Parliament has already done when approving the Sutra report on enlargement — the question of the 'zero duty' on oil products imported from outside the Community. A zero duty the greatest benefits of which go not, as many would have us believe, to the developing countries, but to the United States. When it is said that olive oil must be supported so as to maintain a fair ratio to seed oil prices, it must be remembered that much of the competitiveness of seed oil, which obliges the Community to pay out money, is a direct result of the zero duty on oil products.

Whilst, therefore, we give our approval today to the Vgenopoulos report as it stands, we call on the Commission to put forward longer term programmes and strategies for this sector that will show the true extent of the commitment which the Community intends to undertake where the Mediterranean regions are concerned.

(Applause from the benches of the Left).

Mr Delatte (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, my dear colleagues, for time out of mind the production of olive oil has given employment to many families of producers in the southern regions of the Community. Moreover, considerable numbers of these families lead a precarious existence in the most disadvantaged regions. This is very often the only form of production available to these families in the regions concerned. It was on these grounds that the Commission originally decided to support the incomes of these producers by means of production aids in combination with aids to promote consumption. The system has so far proved efficient, although a number of difficulties have arisen.

What is the problem today? It is of course necessary to sustain output and ensure that produce is marketed, but this can not be done without continuing to provide finance for aid, although the conditions must be acceptable. It is for this reason that it is urgent for a proper register to be drawn up, for the number of olive trees to be established and for appropriate controls to be maintained. It is necessary to prevent fraud, certainly; this is essential. But why this constant harping on scandal when it is often lack of organization that is to blame?

We have to demonstrate that we are capable of organizing production, of organizing a market and, above all of enforcing the rules. That is the message of the proposals made in the Vgenopoulos report, and of the Commission's proposals. Personally — and this is also the opinion of my group — I am prepared to accept these proposals.

I should like to make the further point that olive oil has a reputation for quality which we cannot allow to be tarnished by the scandals that are being brought to

Delatte

the surface day after day. If we are seeking to organize this market, I believe that it is precisely in order to avoid all these mistakes that are being made. I would add, Mr. President, very briefly since my time is limited, that the need to tax all fats, and imported fats in particular, has become urgent. When we entered into the GATT agreements we had a serious shortfall in production of fats. We have now increased our output substantially. Overall taxation of fats has become a matter of urgency.

Mr Pasmazoglou (NI). — (GR) Mr President, I would like to call upon the European Parliament to take note that the matter under discussion is presently of concern to 1.5 million cultivators within the Community of Ten, and that this will become 3 million in the Community of Twelve. Moreover, olive oil is a basic commodity that interests the entire population of Europe's Mediterranean countries, and allow me to observe that the two basic characteristics of the Mediterranean tradition of civilization, which is the foundation of European civilization, are olive oil and wine. I do not think, therefore, that the matter can be dismissed by the sort of comments that we heard a little while ago from Mr Hord, concerning the statistics and the allegations of scandals which, as pointed out by Mr Ligios, are a little strange and of doubtful accuracy and reliability. I should like to put before Parliament certain information that I think is worthy of attention.

The expenditure on olive oil, which as I mentioned now involves 1.5 million cultivators, is 450 million ECU.

The expenditure on milk, involving 3 million workers, is 4 000 million ECU.

I think this ratio is striking because of the anomaly it reveals, and I want to add something that Mr Hord did not mention a little while ago, namely that 560 million ECU are spent on seed oils, which involve an incomparably smaller number of cultivators. Thus, there is an anomaly in these ratios and this anomaly justifies the need for a policy by the European Community. It is precisely this policy that is being proposed by the Commission and by Mr Vgenopoulos' very praiseworthy report.

My second comment is that in a European Community that is developing towards economic and political unity, the application of a consumer policy is something self-evident. What is needed, and what is indeed very simple to achieve, is to establish ratios that will allow the absorption of the olive oil produced within the European Community and even in the Mediterranean countries of North Africa, and this can in fact be done.

Mr President, Fellow-Members, I ask you to note that the consumption of olive oil represents only 1/10 of the total consumption of olive oil and seed oils taken

together. Thus, if the ratio and the measures proposed by the Commission are established, this will comfortably ensure the absorption of the olive oil produced today and that will be produced when Spain and Portugal join the Community. It will also be possible to absorb the surpluses of the North African Mediterranean countries. This means that with a total of about 5 million tonnes of oils — olive oil and seed oils — there will be an insignificant increase in the proportion of total olive oil consumption. And I also ask the European Parliament to note that 80 % of the seed oils consumed are imported not from developing countries but from the United States. The economic interest of the USA is well founded and indeed it is reasonable for our friends the Americans to protect it. However, I think that there can be an understanding, a fair negotiation such that will ensure normal absorption and avoid surpluses of a commodity that is of national importance for all the Mediterranean peoples.

I would therefore like, Mr President, to ask all our colleagues to take note of the Commission's proposal and of Mr Vgenopoulos' report, which constitute logical solutions compatible with the overall policies of the Community and which ensure a proper and absolutely fair solution for a European product of fundamental importance.

Mr Louwes (L). — (NL) Mr President, I must apologise for the fact that I was not present in the Chamber when you called me the first time.

The Committee on Budgets on whose behalf I am now speaking, showed great caution on the agricultural policy aspects of olive oil. We did not wish to go into the merits of olive growing nor into the benefits or drawbacks of support for producers or consumers and certainly not into the general policy relating to oils and fats in our Community. Our committee has financial terms of reference and we considered this subject within that framework.

First of all, we naturally endorse the need which has been generally emphasised for greater transparency and better control of existing regulations even if they require certain adjustments. We would stress the need for adjustment of the existing rules in connection with Spain and Portugal. However, we are afraid that these adjustments will make the financial consequences and the budgetary implications even greater than has been the case up to now. In 1979 we witnessed a sharp increase in the budgetary costs of olive oil production. We are afraid that this will continue after accession and that we shall once again have an open-ended expenditure item.

By open-ended I mean expenditure which cannot be controlled. We are now trying to bring all other products under effective control and the Committee on Budgets is afraid that in this particular sector we may lose all control.

Louwes

We have doubts about the Commission's proposal that a two to one price relationship should be established between olive oil and other oils. We doubt whether the elasticity of consumption is large enough for that, particularly because available statistics and publications do not suggest that a reduction in the price of olive oil will stimulate consumption correspondingly.

As I said before, we have serious doubts about the possibility of effecting local control. I have therefore tabled two amendments on behalf of the Committee on Budgets. These are additions rather than changes and, on behalf of my committee, I hope that Parliament will adopt them.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have been trying to fight my way through the olive oil jungle for about a year and a half and I can tell you that there is scarcely any other area of Community policy about which so little is known and on which there are so few reliable statistics. It is a disaster area.

May I establish one thing in advance: it must not be said in this debate that the proposal is directed against the small-holder. What we are discussing today is not primarily concerned with the income of farmers, for that is determined by the production target price and not by the amount of aid to consumption, and the production target price is in no way affected by these measures.

In view of the forthcoming accession of Spain, the Commission is proposing that the price ratio of olive oil to other seed oils should be fixed at 2:1 in order to boost consumption. Personally, I have never heard anything so absurd! We have no statistics at all to suggest that this would be reasonable. Just imagine, a price ratio is expected to boost consumption!

To give an example: if 1 litre of olive oil costs DM 2 and 1 litre of seed oil costs DM 1, that gives a price ratio of 2:1. If 1 litre of olive oil costs DM 100 and 1 litre of seed oil costs DM 50, that is also a price ratio of 2:1. The purchaser is not interested in the price ratio, however; the buyer who goes into the shop to buy olive oil is interested in the actual price level and whether he can afford it or not. I can calculate a 2:1 price ratio by all kinds of means. For instance, a rise in the dollar rate — which happened recently — necessarily increases the price of all sorts of vegetable oils, as Mr Pasmazoglou has just said, because most of them are imported. This also changes the price ratio between vegetable oils and olive oil. So, even from this point of view, the idea is ridiculous.

Secondly, the Commission has no information on where olive oil can be marketed most sensibly. People who want to sell something these days have a market survey done and ask where the main market is and under what conditions the consumer would buy the

product. The Commission has not done this but simply states that if the price ratio is changed, everything will be all right again, which is not true.

Thirdly, the Commission's statistics in fact show how absurd this is. For example, in 1979 production aid was paid for 540 000 tonnes and consumption aid was paid for 193 000 tonnes. That gives a difference of 340 000 tonnes or so, for which no consumption aid was paid. So most of the olive oil production must have been sold at a price of about 400 ECU more than that for the other 200 000 tonnes. And then I am expected to believe that the price ratio has an effect, even though most of the olive oil was sold without any consumption aid at all!

When I asked the Commission to explain this, it said it could be partly explained by the fact that a small part of the production was for own consumption and, moreover, one must take into account the difficulties of controlling production aids. That leads me to ask whether these 300 000 tonnes of olive oil even exist. I wonder what more has to happen in this sector before a bit of sanity returns and Parliament does not simply follow the motto that the most important thing is for money to go to Italy or Greece, because every ECU that goes to Greece is a good ECU. If that is how we make policies, we might as well say: let us send off a cheque every year — as we do to Mrs Thatcher — and that will settle the matter!

Since the Commission's proposal leaves the door wide open for swindles and, moreover, is unnecessary because Article 11(6) of the Commission's regulation already makes it possible to fix the aid to consumption in line with market requirements, I cannot understand why this is now to be laid down formally. It would be of no use at all to the Spaniards because they already have a price ratio of 1.7:1 or 1.3:1. In fact, it would be a disaster if the absolute price level went up in Spain while at the same time the price ratio changed too.

So there is no need for this Commission proposal and I call upon the Commission to withdraw it and to propose other alternatives. It might be worth considering a degressive aid per hectare or a flat-rate aid per olive tree and shutting out the large-scale producers on whom none of us is so keen — though I still do not know why — and giving the small producers more. In my view the existing system, as it stands, is a swindle, has no real basis and needs to be changed radically.

Mr Kaloyannis (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, I have listened to all the speakers most attentively and I was particularly impressed by the report of my colleague and compatriot Mr Vgenopoulos, which apart from being an excellent piece of work in its own right, is at the same time the product of many months of work by the Committee on Agriculture within whose framework the necessary improvements, amendments and

Kaloyannis

adaptations were formulated. After all that I do not think we should have heard some of the objections raised against the report, which I think covers all the weaknesses indicated. I share the indignation of my colleague Mr Ligios against those who, in alleging scandals of a rather unproven nature — which I would not wish to support if they are indeed true — seek to arrive at conclusions opposite from those of the report. These are the tactics according to which the patient, instead of getting cured, would do better to die. The controls envisaged in the report we are debating, concerning the support of production and consumption, when they are applied, and they must indeed be applied as is emphasized in the Committee on Agriculture's proposed resolution, are I think unlikely to create dangers, or at any rate the said dangers should not threaten the producers of the olive oil who, according to the figures quoted to us here, today number some 1 500 000 families and will shortly become 2 000 000 or even 3 000 000.

As my colleague Mr Pesmazoglou also mentioned, when the support for olive oil, which concerns a number representing 12% of the total working agricultural population, amounts to only 4 000 000 ECU and when, for other products such as milk and wine there is a great deal more made available for a proportionally much smaller fraction of the working agricultural population, it should not be possible for there to be a reaction of this kind in Parliament, even though isolated.

In the light of all this, Mr President, and because I do not wish to abuse my allocation of time, I think that this report should be approved because it is both objective and realistic, and because it will, I repeat, render possible the survival of a category of people who are exclusively occupied in the cultivation of the olive tree.

Mr Martin (COM). — (FR) Mr President, the olive oil issue has in a sense become the kernel of the negotiations on enlargement. At the same time it is very revealing. How can the Commission expect to convince us that it is going to solve the problems raised by the market in oils after enlargement by simply reducing the price ratio between olive oils and competing oils? Granted, this in itself is not a negative measure. It is a first step towards stabilizing consumption of olive oil at its current level, but it is far from certain how effective it will be, particularly in view of the sharp fall in consumption of olive oil in favour of imported vegetable oil that has occurred in Greece since its accession. In fact the Commission, while obliged to recognize the seriousness of the problems raised by enlargement, is diverting its attention to side-issues and settling for yet another patching-up exercise. However, even this little step is still too much for some of the adherents of enlargement, who are keen to expand the markets of the financial groups whose interests they habitually defend, but only as long as the

cost is borne by the peoples of the applicant States and the regions in the South. Instead of quibbling at the few ECUs paid to olive oil producers, why does not Mr Gautier, for instance, make a scrutiny of Unilever's accounts so that he can tell us the amount of sums diverted by failure to comply with Community preference requirements?

(Applause)

It is regrettable — but significant indeed — that the Commission has not grasped this opportunity to undertake an overall analysis of the problem of oils and fats which could lead to the establishment of a genuine policy based on observance of the principles enshrined in the Treaty, and more particularly on Community preference. Although it has improved in recent years, the Ten's self-supply rate in vegetable oils other than olive oil is currently above 20%. This being the case, is there not an urgent need to restrict imports of vegetable oils and fats and to develop Community production? I can already hear the chorus of keeners bemoaning the fate of the developing countries. Enough of their crocodile tears. It is true that we import oil or seed for crushing from the developing countries, notably the ACP countries, but what prospect is there of groundnuts, copra, palm nuts etc., being produced in the EEC? This is why, in the interests of these countries, we are proposing the maintenance and even extension of the advantages granted to them. But can the same be said of other countries, such as the United States, which export soya and sunflower, which we can produce, to our countries? Here, the only solution is to uphold the principle of Community preference by taxing such imports.

The Vgenopoulos report provides a pertinent analysis of the problems of the olive oil sector, from which it draws practical proposals which we approve. It also expresses an awareness that these proposals, however valid they may be, will not be enough to solve the problems unless they are implemented as part of a common policy on oils and fats. In this it is on all fours with the main drift of our approach. We shall not fail to support it.

(Applause)

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, I would like to compliment the rapporteur on his report. I am not saying that I would agree with every line of it, but it is a very comprehensive report and, I think, a very useful one for the work of this Parliament.

I want to draw attention to just a couple of points as I have very little time. I think, Mr President, we will continue to discuss the problem of the supply of fats and oils interminably and without really making any progress until such time as the Community makes up its mind to have a concerted approach towards the whole question of oils and fats production within the

Maher

Community as well as imports. We do not have that policy as of now and we are all the time floating around in a sea of uncertainty. I would plead strongly that we adopt a comprehensive approach to this question.

It is not very realistic to talk about having open borders for the importation of substitutes for fats and oils produced within the Community and at the same time to claim to be trying to ensure that the people who so often are endeavouring to make a subsistence living from these products within the Community continue to live in the regions in which they now are.

I would urge also, Mr President, the need for further research into the uses of this kind of product. We are, for instance, very short of energy within the European Community. Is there a way in which olive oil or this kind of oil could be used to produce more of the energy of which we are short, or do we agree that inevitably the use that is presently made of a product like olives is the only possible use? We are constantly pushing back the boundary of research. This is one area where a great deal more needs to be done.

A further point, Mr President: should we not look at this problem in the context of an overall forestry policy? The regions which are currently growing olive trees could conceivably be growing trees for other uses. We are importing large quantities of wood and will continue to do so into this Community over a very long period. We are not going to be self-sufficient even in the new century. So could we look at the question of whether we could support a forestry policy in these regions growing other kinds of trees? Of course it would be expensive, but it is also expensive to support the producers of olive oil.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER*Vice-President*

Mr Markopoulos (S). — (GR) Mr President, the report presented by Mr Vgenopoulos deals with the very important matter of olive cultivation, which today concerns 1 500 000 agricultural workers, and after the accession to the Community of Spain and Portugal, which this Parliament approved some two months ago, it will involve 3 000 000 workers.

Olive oil is quintessentially a Mediterranean product, and as has indeed been said repeatedly already, Mediterranean products unfortunately receive poor treatment compared with products from the north. Recently in particular, there has begun a campaign of calumny against the sector of olive oil, whose aim is to bring about its capture by the multinationals dealing in

seed oils. One of the arguments used is that olive oil places a great burden of expense on the common budget. Expensive compared to what, though? You have had an answer to that from Mr Pasmazoglou in connection with milk, and I would like to add here, that for the same number of producers the cost ratio of milk compared with olive oil in the Community is 6 to 1. Why then is there all this fuss, when the oil-bearing seeds that compete with olive oil benefit from an import situation that is the most liberal that could possibly exist and whose purpose is to safeguard the interests of the seed-oil multinationals? What more do we have to do? Wipe out the cultivation of olives to leave the field open to the seed oils? Uproot our olive trees? For that is what it amounts to. We are dealing, here, with a product, olive oil, that is produced to the extent of 100% within the Community, and with the seed oils, 80% of which are imported. So yet again, Mr President, I have to raise the subject of Community preference, because the non-application of Community preference cannot be allowed to affect Mediterranean products exclusively, and not only that, but we cannot allow the entire olive oil sector to fall into disrepute.

It is no fault of the olive cultivators if the EEC cannot or will not make a decision concerning the creation of a global policy covering fats and oils.

Mr President, the price ratio of 2 to 1 proposed in order to maintain the consumption of olive oil is a real step forwards. But we should not leave it at that. The Committee on Agriculture's proposed resolution contains sufficient positive indications to face the problems of olive cultivation in the Community. However, studies should also be carried out to ensure a real reorganization of olive cultivation in the Community, with an improvement of the infrastructure, the productivity, but also better information to those living in the EEC countries. I can mention as an example that last October, in this very chamber, when we were debating a report dealing with the organizations of olive oil producers, I heard Mr Purvis saying that he would like to buy olive oil but that he could not find it in Scotland. Now, this is what needs to be done: there should be publicity campaigns for olive oil so that consumers may become informed about it, and so that its special health properties may become widely known.

Mr President, olive oil is a product that has been cultivated since the earliest times in the Mediterranean regions and that involves 12.5% of all the agricultural workers in the Community. In my own country, in particular, the olive has been and still is the staple nourishment of poor inhabitants in many areas, while the olive branch is a well known ancient symbol of peace and friendship. Even today olive oil is one of the most important products of the labours of my countrymen. If we do not try to find solutions that will help this traditional cultivation, which is part of the very lives of the Mediterranean peoples, then we shall indeed be facing a real social problem. Because what is

Markopoulos

to become of all those producers? Should we add them, too, to the queues of urban unemployed, or should we send them up north?

PASOK is in favour of Mr Vgenopoulos' report because it is a positive effort towards solving the problem of olive cultivation in the Community, and we shall therefore vote in its favour.

(Applause)

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, I too come from Greece, a country quintessentially involved in the production of olives, and I come from the island of Lesbos which is lucky enough, or rather unlucky enough to have had a few million olive trees for the last few thousand years. The production of oil is the only work, and the only source of income for 1.5 million agricultural workers in the EEC who, as has already been said, would not find it possible to turn towards the production of other products because, as fellow-members will know, olive trees usually grow in mountainous, semi-mountainous and generally infertile areas that do not offer themselves for other crops. Moreover, there is each year a large amount of insecurity and uncertainty concerning the quantities ultimately produced, owing to unfavourable weather conditions, diseases such as blight, etc. For this reason the Commission's figures concerning the quantities produced are not always absolute because they are usually lower than what had been foreseen. Moreover, the Mediterranean regions in which this product is produced are affected by high inflation and high production costs. And this raises the question: What are we to do with these hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens? Will they be forced to join the millions of urban unemployed? No indeed, my friends! We must grant them every possible reasonable support, for the sake of their survival but also for reasons of fairness because, as we have heard, there are other privileged agricultural products on which the Community spends far greater sums. However, we must at the same time consume other adulterated products and thereby lose the high biological and nutritional value of olive oil, which has been acknowledged scientifically. On this point, I am sure that if our colleague Mr Hord were to try really pure olive oil he would change his mind on several of the issues he raised earlier. In addition, stress has frequently been laid on the need to impose a high duty on imported fatty vegetable substances, but this has not been done to date. The Community should therefore bear the cost of revealing the truth to the wide consumer public, namely the great advantages of consuming olive oil. Thus, the Commission's proposal and the excellent report by my colleague Mr Vgenopoulos place matters on their correct footing and should be approved by our vote for that reason.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the matter of supporting the production of olive oil is very

vital for Greece. The value of olive oil represents 11% of the value of the entire agricultural production of our country. 300 thousand families are involved in olive production, i.e. about 1 million people. And since the gathering of olives and their processing to extract the oil are tasks that require much labour over 5-6 months of the year, it becomes possible during this period for thousands of unemployed to find work, particularly those who come from olive-producing areas. Thus, apart from the fact that it provides a basic fatty substance suitable for consumption, the production of olives acquires considerable social importance for the occupation of labour, particularly in the present period of severe economic crisis and high unemployment. However, olive production in Greece is facing a crisis. It is known that the 117 million olive trees in our country are located mainly in semi-mountainous, hilly and infertile regions which are unsuitable for other crops. But the low price of the oil, which is determined not by the cost of production but by the price level of seed oils, i.e. on the basis of the interests of the monopolies, have led to the desertion of entire olive growing areas. The consumption of olive oil has already fallen a great deal and it is estimated that this year there will be a surplus of 200 000 tonnes. Moreover, the Community's decision not to give support to new olive-producing units compels many new agricultural workers to seek employment in the cities, i.e. to swell the numbers of the unemployed. Again, instead of subsidizing production the Community is subsidizing consumption, i.e. the factory owners and the exporters who process and package the oil in 5-litre containers. However, this shuts out the producers who in part consume their own produce, the exporters of unpackaged oil, and the quantities of oil passed on for concentration. This manner of subsidizing does not substantially help either production or consumption, but only secures exaggerated profits for the factory owners and the major exporters.

The report presented by Mr Vgenopoulos characterized the whole problem very accurately. We would like to add and to stress the following:

The producers should receive support via collective partnerships which will also guarantee the true levels of their production.

The support should be related to the price of olive oil, and should be exempt from deductions.

Duty should be imposed on all fatty substances imported into the Community from third countries.

Measures should be taken to reduce production costs, and productivity should be increased. The infrastructure of the production and distribution of oil should be improved, and finally oil should be included among the products that are given away as aid in the form of foodstuffs, so that the surpluses may be absorbed.

Mr Sutra (S). — (FR) Mr President, my dear colleagues, the problem of olive oil is simply expressed, but finding solutions is a very different matter.

The problem is the problem of enlargement of the Community. In Spain there is already overproduction, while consumption is heavily protected by all manner of customs barriers. The Commission has informed us of the gross effect in prospect; assuming no change in the present rules, Spain's accession will result in additional expenditure of 800 million units of account, bringing the total to 1 650 000 000 ECU. The only experts who do not agree with the Commission are the French, who believe that the reality will be even worse and that, although this figure is correct for the first year, the expenditure will have doubled within three years of enlargement if nothing is done. The problem is therefore simple in its terms, but very difficult to solve.

I would merely say that the Commission's proposals are along the right lines and that the Vgenopoulos report is very good, but it only makes improvements to the Commission's proposals so that its chief merit consists in having said that the Commission's do not go far enough.

I would add that the task of solving this already difficult problem has been further complicated by what I make no bones about describing as the defamatory comments that have been peddled here and there, as though by chance, over the past few days.

It is not true that any particular scandal has arisen in recent weeks. There is a problem of management which has persisted for years. However, the press campaign which has been orchestrated over the past week — and we know who is behind it — is absolutely scandalous. In common with a previous speaker, I find it regrettable that reverberations of this scandal should have reached the chamber of the European Parliament. We are well aware that Unilever and various other companies would wish us to ruin the poorest regions and the most defenceless farmers, leaving them to use all means at their disposal to grab the markets of Spain, Italy and Greece. My country is only very marginally concerned, and it is as a responsible European — and there will be many others with me — that I support the only realistic proposal that we have seen. Having adopted my report two months ago, the European Parliament would be displaying consistency by accepting this report.

If I may say a final word, through you, Mr President, to the rapporteur; it was too modest of him to have failed to mention at the beginning of his speech that he is a cardiologist and that this is another reason why he speaks in favour of olive oil.

(Applause)

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, first and foremost I would like to say that

the Commission has read, with great interest, the Committee for Agriculture's and Mr Vgenopoulos' motion for a resolution on amendments of the current Community law for the Olive Oil Sector, and I have also listened with great interest to the speakers this morning who have come forward with such broad-ranging viewpoints.

With regard to the amendment to the Commission's proposal on the way of putting forward the date for commencing the use of the proposed price ratio of two to one, I would like to state the following considerations: the base for the Commission's proposal has been the price situation and the present price ratio between olive oil and other vegetable oils in the Ten and in Spain. The price ratio mentioned, which, by the way, the Commission is trying to maintain for the time being within the Ten is approximately 2.3 to 1. In Spain it is 1.6 to 1. The present price conditions in the Ten do not prevent the balance between production and consumption from being maintained. And therefore — under the present circumstances — it is not necessary to change this for the moment. On the other hand it must be said, that when Spain has joined the Community, then, because of the more advantageous price ratio between olive oil and other vegetable oils in that country, it will become necessary to change the price ratio in question in the enlarged Community. This is the background to why the Commission has deemed it necessary and sufficient that the stipulations in the proposal for a regulation, which you are debating, will come into effect from the date Spain and Portugal join the Community.

The rapporteur has dealt with certain fundamental aspects of the Common organization of the olive oil market. Several of the arguments stated are not within the scope of this debate on the problems in relation to the accession. It must be admitted, however, that the existing problems in this sector will increase with the accession of the new states. The Commission has dealt with these problems earlier in connection with the mandate, and the Parliament has debated the proposals for a solution contained in Doc. COM(81) 608 of 23 October 1981, and has delivered its opinion on this matter.

With regard to the deliberations in the report on the basic aspects of the Common organization of the olive oil market the Commission agrees fully with the aims listed, but in spite of this it does not deem it necessary to deviate from the policy that has so far been followed in the fats sector. However, the Commission must underline one of those problems which it has earlier on pointed out in its document concerning the mandate: that is, control of aid granted to producers of olive oil, and this has already been referred to by several speakers today. The Commission has to note, that in spite of of great endeavours, there has not been any success in solving this problem. Therefore it intends to use all its means to improve the control and inspection of aid to producers within the framework

Dalsager

of the present arrangement. In view of this the completion of the olive-grove register must be speeded up, as this will give a clearer picture of the size of the olive areas, and thereby it should be possible to safeguard that aid payments are only given to those who have a right to them.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

2. Automobile market

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

— the report (Doc. 1-997/82) by Mr Filippi, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the imports of Japanese cars into the EEC

— the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-149/82) by Mr Berkhouwer and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Commission:

Subject: Community automobile market

In view of the fact that the Community automobile industry is characterized by an extremely high degree of national compartmentalization and consequently considerable consumer price discrepancies between the various Community Member States for cars of identical make and type, does the Commission consider that the rules on competition of the Treaty of Rome are being respected?

— the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-544/82) by Mr Christopher Jackson and others to the Commission:

Subject: The private vehicle market in the Community

What action does the Commission propose to take:

(a) in order to remove the non-tariff barriers to trade in motor vehicles between Member States?

(b) in order to ensure that consumers may, within reason, purchase the vehicle of their choice in the cheapest market available in the Community?

— the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-802/82) by Mrs Hoffmann and others to the Commission:

Subject: Employment, qualifications, competitiveness and research in the motor vehicle industry

In view of the motor vehicle industry's current problems, which are chiefly caused by the increas-

ing number of motor vehicles imported from Japan and other third countries, would the Commission indicate what might be the main features of an effective trade policy designed to impose greater restrictions on such imports in order to afford greater protection to the Member States' domestic markets and to help their employment situation?

Would the Commission state its views on the features which an industrial policy for the motor vehicle sector ought to embody for it to be capable of generating productive employment in every country of the Community? Does the Commission agree that the introduction of robots and 'flexible workshops' and the general principle of encouraging technological progress in production processes, especially in the context of global growth, are important factors both in improving competitiveness, and in creating employment, particularly skilled employment? And do such trends not also greatly encourage the development of industrial democracy?

What action does the Commission intend to take, in terms of industrial policy or financial measures, to help Member States' research and development efforts in this sector?

Mr Filippi (EPP), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to start by recalling, first of all, a number of very relevant points: the authoritative statement by the President of the Executive Commission, Gaston Thorn, at the inauguration of the academic year in Bruges in September 1982, in which he emphasized that Japan must realize that the Community automobile industry must have an adequate period of time available for reorganization, during which it will be obliged to take adequate measures for its protection; the decision of the Executive Commission, at the end of this year, to include cars amongst the list of 'sensitive' products deserving adequate protection; the very recent visit during the last few days of the Japanese foreign minister to see European governments and, most important of all, the Executive Commission; and the imminent visit of Prime Minister Nakasone to the White House — and it is not without significance that I refer to this visit, not least because, in my report, I point out that Japan appears to be working along other lines, and taking other initiatives, with a view to forms of association — particularly with American manufacturers — that may at some future date constitute a serious threat to the European car industry.

I am referring here to the recent meeting between Ford Motors and Toyo Kogyo, which manufactures the Mazda range. These two companies are examining the possibility of manufacturing a new car together, which will be very largely Japanese in origin, but which will be marketed throughout the world, and therefore also in the EEC, by Ford. General Motors

Filippi

and Toyota envisage forming a company of the same kind. The consequences for the European car industry are obvious, in terms of the competition that these new Japanese-American cars will provide. At the end of 1982 the position of the European car industry can be summed up in terms of 2 500 000 unsold cars, and spiralling unemployment in those countries where the car industry operates. In Great Britain, in 1979, there were 482 000 employed in the industry, whilst at the end of '82 the figure had fallen to 300 000 (these are figures supplied by the SMMT). In France, where 453 000 persons were employed in the industry in 1978, the figure had fallen by the end of 1982 to 340 000, from which we must further deduct the 10 000 made redundant by Renault in the last 48 hours (and these figures were provided by the *Chambre Syndicale des Constructeurs d'Automobiles*). In Belgium, which has no car industry proper but assembles cars, the number employed fell from 59 000 in 1980 to approximately 50 000 at the end of 1982 (figures supplied by the *Federation Belge de l'Industrie Automobile*). In Italy, which employed 280 000 in 1979, the number has fallen to about 235 000 in 1982 (figures supplied by the *Associazione Nazionale Fabbrikanti dell'Industria Automobilistica*). The only country that is an exception is Germany, and we are delighted by the fact: here the level of employment remained constant, with around 658 000 employed in the industry.

This, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, is the background to our parliamentary initiative, our motion for a resolution. A background of crisis. And why crisis? Because there have been deep changes in the economic order and, above all — which is the motive underlying the motion that we have presented — there has been very heavy Japanese penetration.

Between 1970 and 1980 Japan has increased its vehicle production by 14%, and has exported 27.2% of what it produced. I will only quote two particularly indicative years: in 1970 Japan exported 0.6% to Europe, a total of 48 000 cars. In 1980 it exported 8.9% of its production, amounting to 750 000 cars. In 10 years, that is, we have gone from 48 000 to 750 000 cars. True, in the first 4 months of 1982 there was some easing off, but at the end of this period Japanese exports started to flow again at the same speed as before.

What are the reasons for Japan's success? This country makes use of the advantages offered by a social/economic system that is without equal in Europe and the other industrialized countries. It knew how to make the logic of industrialized systems its own, applying it rigorously and with shrewdness. In addition to all this, Japan gives quite appreciable tax concessions, which put Japanese industry in an advantageous position compared with the car industries of the rest of the world.

And, by no means last, there is the currency parity of the yen, which allows Japanese industry in general,

and the car industry in particular, to be competitive up to the hilt. Japan has set up an extremely efficient production and marketing system, and the combined effect of all these factors is that Japanese products reach foreign markets at a cost that is on average 25-30% lower than that of similar products from Europe or from the rest of the world. At this point we have to say that Europe cannot allow itself to repeat, in this field also, the tragic errors committed in the case of the photographic industry, mass electronics, the motorcycle industry, and so on. In the light of the foregoing, therefore, we have to make an appropriate response. My motion for a resolution contains various points that I am prepared to look at again and compare with the many amendments that have been put forward. I say this partly because I have the impression, as I read the amendments, that some of them tend to re-shape my text along the lines of the original conceptual format that we duly presented to the Committee on External Economic Relations. The European Parliament, Mr President, cannot lose this opportunity to take a central position, that is not in favour of protectionism — as is said in paragraph 15 of my motion for resolution — but is not in favour, either, of holding back, with a sort of pseudo-free trade outlook, as is likewise stated, on page 35 of the explanatory statement. This crisis is part of the broader picture of the crisis in European industry. We have on a number of occasions passed resolutions that have referred in a general way to the critical state of European industry: on this occasion, too, our response must be consistent with the positions we have already taken up. It must be a united, uniform response in regard to everything relating to the internal market, work distribution, research policy, safety at work, the connection between cars and electronics, and the needs of the environment which on this occasion, too, deserves to be protected.

The role of Parliament has already been abundantly emphasized in the Committee for External Economic Relations, as also have the roles of industry and the trade unions. I think we have to bring this European logic to bear on everything in order to draw up, for this specific question also, a European plan.

Mr Berkhouwer (F). — (NL) Mr President, there are several different aspects to this debate. One fundamental factor is the position of the European automobile industry in relation to other producers, particularly in Japan, with whom it has to compete. However, in tabling this question we concentrated specifically on the aspect of the unity of the internal market.

Unfortunately we are experiencing a trend for the domestic market no longer to be considered as the common market of the whole Community but rather, to an increasing extent, as the fragmented national market of an individual Member State. A new expression has been coined: *reconquérir le marché intérieur* — to regain control of the domestic market. But this is

Berkhouwer

not the domestic market of the whole Community — Mr Narjes knows exactly what I am talking about. 1250 years ago in Poitiers, Charles Martel halted the advance of the Moors; Michel Jobert is now trying to stem the flood of Japanese imports.

I must make one point clear, Mr President. We have not embarked on a crusade against the European automobile industry; that is certainly not our intention since the European motor industry is already in real difficulty and is having to contend with all kinds of national barriers. However, I have in front of me a report by the European Bureau of Consumers Unions which makes the following valid point:

'In a genuine, unified common market the price of such a common and standardized product as a motor car should vary very little from country to country. This is quite obviously not the case. There are several reasons for this, the most important certainly being the desire of the motor manufacturers to treat each country as a specific market in which they pursue a specific marketing policy.'

That, Mr President, is a valid point. It is usual, indeed almost traditional, to attribute the wide price differences for the same model of motor car in the different Community countries to the considerable differences in tax levels. That is a very partial explanation since, as the European Bureau of Consumers Unions goes on to point out:

'Our study shows, however, that the compartmentalisation of the market to which the Commission refers is not due so much to differences in tax systems as to a deliberate policy on the part of the manufacturers. The differences between the tax systems quite clearly conceal this compartmentalization from the consumer. However, it is surprising that the Commission should apparently be unaware of this phenomenon.'

This surprising fact is irrefutably confirmed in a table which I have in front of me which indicates incredible price differences before tax has been added, and I think you should all take note of this. To begin with an expensive model, a Jaguar, costs 24 000 units of account in England; the same car costs 16 000 units of account, or two thirds of the English price, in Denmark. An Englishman has to pay 24 000 units of account for the vehicle which he can buy in Copenhagen for 16 000 — in other words a difference of 8 000 units of account or one third between London and Copenhagen. And this situation does not apply solely to luxury vehicles; the situation as regards popular models is much the same; a Mini-Morris costs 4 000 units of account in England but can be bought for 2 500 in Luxembourg. Somebody must be making a profit on this transaction. I can give you other examples, Mr President. A rather more luxurious vehicle, the Rover, — which means rip-off in Dutch but what's in a name — costs 19 000 units of account in the United Kingdom and 9 000 in Denmark. The differ-

ence is 10 000 units of account or more than 50%. The most astonishing situation, and this will be my last point, concerns the Mercedes in Denmark. It is a great pity that we should have all these different tax levels but I cannot do anything about it. Taxes are of course necessary but they should not be too high. Well now, Mr President, I am speaking to you as a Dane and I hope that you will contradict me if I am wrong. If you buy a Mercedes in Denmark you are in fact paying the price of three Mercedes i.e. one to the dealer and two to the Danish Government. That is quite incredible. This is the reason why it is so convenient for Germans who live in Schleswig-Holstein to cross the frontier and buy a Mercedes in Denmark which they then take back with them to Germany before the other two Mercedes have been paid to the Danish state. Then they have a cheap Mercedes from Denmark.

That, Mr President, is the horrifying situation of car prices in the Community today. I hope that my honourable interlocutor, in this case I suppose, Mr Narjes, will not now try and pull the wool over our eyes but will instead take a serious look at this whole matter because the situation is really horrifying.

President. — Mr Berkhouwer, I listened with great interest to your comments on the Danish system of taxes and duties. You may have thought I was not paying much attention, but in fact, having been at one time Minister for Finance in Denmark, I was very well aware of all the facts that you set forth so clearly.

Mr C. Jackson (ED). — Mr President, I am very pleased to be able at long last to introduce the oral question by myself and colleagues on the subject of the private vehicle market within the Community. This debate is, I believe, of exceptional importance. First, for many people buying their car is the biggest purchase they make, apart from buying their own home. Yet despite the existence of the common market, today, more than 25 years after the EEC was created and more than 10 years after the United Kingdom joined the Community, our citizens still cannot freely buy the car of their choice where they wish throughout the Community. This is nothing short of a scandal.

Second, in just over one year's time the people of the Community will express — through the polls — their verdict not only on this Parliament but also indirectly on the Commission and the Council. Now yesterday Mr Genscher called this Parliament the engine of unification. Let us show today that the engine can work, for the subject of our debate is to millions of people symbolic of whether the Community has the will to progress in a way that will bring a direct and obvious benefit to them. It is a horrifying indictment of the lack of progress of the Community, and especially, I must say, of the lack of will in the Council of Ministers, that it is necessary today for Members of this Parliament to stand up to affirm that consumers

Jackson

should have the right, clearly envisaged in the Treaty of Rome, to buy the car of their choice where they wish in the European Community free of technical barriers and of artificial restraints on competition.

For me the whole thing was summed up by a British car dealer who said to me two years ago: 'What sort of a Common Market is this where I am prevented from buying cars in the cheapest market in the European Community and then selling them on to my customers?' He had been buying left-hand drive British Leyland Minis in Belgium and then converting them to right-hand drive, undercutting all his local competitors by several hundred pounds in the process. Not surprisingly he had a thriving local business, but he was stopped dead in his tracks by certain safety checks called British national type-approval. His complaint to me was that the application of these type-approval regulations was contrary to the Treaty. His complaint was upheld by the Commission, which then started infringement proceedings. The British Government then announced that it would maintain the personal import system and expressed its intention to make type-approval readily available. Discussions to that end are, I understand, still proceeding. Infringement proceedings along the same lines are pending against Belgium and France as well.

Such national type-approval regulations are a totally unacceptable barrier to trade in this Community. They effectively place an importing monopoly in the hands of the manufacturers, preventing wider competition and permitting the huge pre-tax discrepancies of which Mr Berkhouwer spoke to arise between the different Member States. This is absurd, because despite all the type-approvals in the name of safety we can all of us legally and easily drive our cars in any Community country we wish. It's all very well that the Commission and the Council have since 1973 agreed no fewer than 59 directives on details of type-approval of cars. Three more are needed. Agreement on windshields, tyres and trailer weights still eludes the Council. If they were agreed, we could have a Community type-approval, a common safety standard for the Ten, sweeping aside the barriers of which I have spoken.

Apparently all the technical difficulties are resolved, but national bureaucrats and the Council of Ministers still drag their feet. Some Member States fear that a common type-approval would leave them without adequate defence against Japanese imports, yet this is the reverse of the truth. Common type-approval is a vital weapon which we need. So I ask Commissioner Narjes whether we can expect Community type-approval for cars to be agreed by the European Council deadline of March 1983.

Type-approval is not, however, our only concern. In some countries, including the UK, individuals are allowed to bring back, regardless of type-approval, a vehicle which they have purchased abroad. Now let us leave on one side the fact that this makes a mockery of

the argument advanced by some governments that national type-approval is necessary on safety grounds. Not surprisingly, this personal imports practice has grown rapidly. It is estimated that last year some 70 000 people from my country crossed the Channel to bring back a cheaper car from abroad. Some of my colleagues were among them. The Consumer Association in London has had 50 000 requests for information about importing cheaper cars from the Continent. Why? Quite simply, as has been said, savings of thousands of pounds, from 20 to 50 % of the pre-tax list price, could be made. Last year it was estimated that British consumers paid 1 400 million pounds more for their cars than they would have done had pre-tax prices been at Continental levels. Of this some 1 000 million pounds flowed abroad in the shape of super-profits going to manufacturers around the world.

Now the truth is that British manufacturers with historically poor productivity have been only too happy to take these high prices and to let other manufacturers take advantage of them as well, thanks to the cosy non-tariff barriers. However, in the last 18 months, as the Commission well knows, worried by the undermining of their import monopoly through personal imports, certain manufacturers have unleashed what I can only call their 'dirty tricks departments' to stop supplies of right-hand-drive cars on the Continent. I welcome the Commission's firm legal action against these practices, and I congratulate especially Commissioner Andriessen on the work he has done. But we need something more general and stronger. I know a draft regulation on distribution and dealership exists. May I ask the Commissioner when will it be published? Above all, will it contain some formulation establishing the basic right of our consumers to buy the vehicle of their choice as a right-hand-drive model in continental countries?

But, as Mr Berkhouwer said, this is not a crusade against manufacturers, although I have so far been stressing the abuse of the right of consumers. The manufacturers do have several legitimate complaints.

First, competition from Spain, Japan and the Eastern bloc is unfairly protected, to the disadvantage of our manufacturers. We urgently need a common type-approval and a common Community position to wield our full bargaining strength on this point.

Secondly, currency and inflation fluctuations do create difficulties for all trade in the Community. I believe the Commission's proposed regulation must make some allowance for this. But more, we need Mr Ortoli to get progress towards economic and monetary union on the move again.

Third, price controls in certain countries cause distortions. I believe such price controls will be found to be against the Treaty, and I hope the Commission will soon come off the fence and say so.

Jackson

Finally, I reject the manufacturer's complaint about the distorting effects of national fiscal policy. It is but a minor factor in this case.

Mr President, the people of the Community should have been able to enjoy the benefits of a true common market in cars many years ago. I can promise the Commission my support in their work to bring this true common market about. But I also can promise them unrelenting pressure until this right is established, not only as a principle but as a fact.

(Applause)

Mrs J. Hoffmann (COM). — *(FR)* Ladies and gentlemen, the difficulties of the motor industry in Europe are not new, but it is universally acknowledged that the situation has never been so disturbing. We have been overtaken by recession, even in the traditional strongholds of the Community market, with thousands of jobs being lost each year while Japanese and American manufacturers invade our market.

According to Mr Filippi's report, the blame is to be put on oil and on competition. The market is saturated. Consequently, there can be no solution without an overall industrial strategy and a thoroughgoing structural reorganization of the automobile sector.

My immediate reaction is to ask why competition is so fierce in Europe if the market really is saturated? How can the French market be saturated when 30% of households do not yet have a car? No, although very fashionable in reactionary circles and among employers, these explanations are unsatisfactory, and the same can be said of efforts to lay the blame for the industry's difficulties at the door of workers such as those at Citroën, Talbot and Renault in France who are demanding better wages and respect for their dignity. On the contrary, these workers' struggle can only help to bring about a recovery in motor vehicle production, whereas the basic reasons why this industry has lost competitiveness in Europe are to be found in the austerity measures that have been applied, the excessive exploitation of workers, indiscriminate redeployment policies and the waste of human and material resources that they are causing.

However, serious though the situation may be, there is no justification for taking a catastrophic view. I believe that each of our countries has the necessary resources, the companies and workers capable of making the motor industry competitive again, as long as new management criteria are adopted so that profitability ceases to be the only consideration and the people's needs and aspirations are taken into account. The solution is not to copy the Japanese model, but to give due weight to serious proposals and realistic objectives such as those which we want to see adopted by our own country.

The first of these objectives is the re-capture of our domestic market. This calls for a more rigorous response to the protectionism of a trading partner such as Japan, which is invading our market while keeping its own closed.

The second objective is to change the content and organization of work in our companies. On the one hand, the employees want the opportunity to do better work organized along different lines; they are no longer content to remain semi-skilled operatives for the whole of their lives. On the other hand, consumers want cars produced to the highest standards of quality. In advanced technologies such as robotics, automated production, flexible workshops and computer-assisted controls, the means with which to satisfy these twin aspirations are available. In order to increase productivity and reduce production costs, we must invest both in technology and in the skills of our workforce; as of now we should be training young people in the skills that will be needed in the year 2000. Hence the need to promote the development of research on new technologies, new materials, energy conservation and safety, this on the basis of cooperation. The money for increased investment is available, as long as action is taken to prevent the waste of material and financial resources. This means that the recovery of the motor industry depends above all on involvement of the workers in decision-making, so that they can bring influence to bear on the manufacturers' strategic options and investment planning.

In this connection, in view of the fact that France was the only country in a crisis-ridden Europe where car sales increased by over 10% in 1981, I cannot share the view of the rapporteur that national solutions are out of the question. What explanation is there for this improvement other than the new economic and social policies adopted by the French Government? Only if the domestic markets of the various Member States are developed can there be better cooperation based on mutually advantageous trade; only if our national industries are competitive will the Community be able to meet the challenge of maintaining employment and growth in this sector.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S). — *(DE)* Ladies and gentlemen, the debate on the report by Mr Filippi, whom I would like to thank for his work, responds to a specific need, especially as regards Japanese car exports. My group also sees it as an opportunity to check what the Commission has done in connection with Mr Bonaccini's report which we adopted here only two years ago. In the resolution, which was adopted by a large majority, Mr Bonaccini and Parliament called upon the Commission to negotiate a voluntary restraints agreement for Japanese exports to the Community and at the same time to propose further practical measures.

This discussion is taking place against the backdrop of a worldwide stagnation of demand and the — now

Wieczorek-Zeul

slightly weaker — Japanese export offensive on the automobile market, which recently also led to sharper competition with the European motor vehicle industry on the world market.

Since our last debate in this Parliament, there has been a slight fall in 1981/82 in exports of Japanese cars to the European Community, but Mr Filippi rightly points out that this only applies overall and that the figures for individual markets, in particular Greece, are very much higher.

I would like to take this opportunity to ask what negotiating strategy the Commission is following. We know that a senior Commission official is currently in Japan to negotiate. What is the strategy? Is the Commission aiming at an informal voluntary restraints agreement for the automobile sector? What relation does it bear to the negotiations on other products such as video, hi-fi, etc.? What is the position? In any case, and I am addressing these words to the Commission, you have the support of the Socialist Group for such negotiations, even if informal, with the Japanese. On the occasion of this debate, we would like to know what general guidelines the Commission will propose to the Council in the discussion on trade with Japan.

In Mr Filippi's report the Committee on External Economic Relations proposes a common foreign trade policy. That means — and you must take this point very seriously — that individual rules in the national Member States must be suspended and that we must have a strategy towards Japan that is planned on a Community basis and does not simply operate on the principle of free trade. This would really have to happen.

A final point that is very important to my group: employment in the automobile industry. More voluntary restraints on the part of Japan would only very partially solve the job problem. Restructuring and cooperation agreements go hand in hand with massive rationalization measures and the destruction of jobs. The employment prospects in the automobile industry, as forecast, suggest that up to 100 000 jobs will be lost in this sector in the coming years. I find it admirable that Mr Filippi, the rapporteur, calls for workers and unions to join forces in this situation and to try to obtain adequate information on future plans from the employers, because the workers and their jobs are the pledges for the undertakings' policy in this sector.

That is why I ask the Commission again: what have you done to follow up the request made in Mr Bonaccini's report under the heading 'employment and social measures'? This report calls for information to be given to the workers in the framework of an industrial policy. What are you doing to respond to the demands of the European association of metal-workers and to help to ensure that in future tripartite talks will be held at European level so that industrial policy and restructuring will not put jobs at risk?

Mr Müller-Hermann (EPP). — (DE) Mr President, the report by Mr Filippi, who has taken great pains with it, contains two extremely important points which deserve the full backing of this House. One is the request to the Japanese Government to open up the Japanese market to European products, in particular motor vehicles. The second is the request to the Commission and the national governments to ensure that we follow a common trade policy *vis-à-vis* Japan and suspend the existing national measures, especially in the motor vehicle sector. These are two fundamental demands made in the report, which deserve all our support.

At another point Mr Filippi suggest in his report that the existing national regulations in France and Italy, with their quantitative restrictions and quotas, could be extended to the whole Community. We must consider whether we should take that road, since it would certainly not strengthen our negotiating position *vis-à-vis* Japan if we in the Community ourselves followed such practices and followed the path of protectionism. Then there are also a number of amendments which we must still discuss.

In my view, our answer to the Japanese competition, which is particularly strong in the automobile sector, must be for the European automobile industry to take up the challenge and try to overcome this competition. The Japanese build good cars but surely not better cars than the Europeans. But there is no doubt their cars are cheaper. I find it very encouraging that in recent years the European automobile industry in all the Member States has been undertaking a gigantic investment programme. That means that we are trying very hard, on the basis of technological developments, to become sufficiently competitive and to offer cars that are at least as cheap as the Japanese cars and to improve our competitive position by saving costs.

May I hazard the slightly critical observation that the report would have made even more impact if it had in fact confined itself to these crucial points in our relations with the Japanese. In practice we all agree that in Europe today we can only compete successfully if we produce on a mass basis. We will certainly have to consider the question of the distribution system separately one of these days.

I have some doubts about the remark that we are going through a crisis in the automobile industry. We have enough sectors in Europe which are really at crisis point, and we should not talk a Community economic asset, which is still strong and healthy, into a crisis situation by making such remarks or expressing such fears on these benches.

Throughout Europe the automobile industry has experienced years of excellent sales. Now, of course, huge problems have cropped up, and not only because purchasing power has fallen in a number of Member States but partly also because major markets, such as

Müller-Hermann

the Middle East, have disappeared or at least dwindled, especially in the commercial vehicle sector.

However, if we look at the figures for motor vehicle licensing and production, including those for 1982, we still find a considerable increase in the Community. New licences, including, of course, those for Japanese cars, rose by an average of 1.8% in the Community in 1982, although with major differences from one place to another. The main areas of improvement are to be found in Germany and Ireland. But all the other countries also recorded some considerable increases, to which we are no longer accustomed now. As for the production of motor vehicles, it increased by 4.9% in 1982 compared to 1981, although this was accompanied by a fall in the production of commercial vehicles for the reasons I mentioned earlier. That is why I really do not see any reason to use the word crisis. What we are facing is a more difficult situation in world competition.

The report also rightly calls for an industrial policy adapted to the situation. However, I would warn against adopting sectoral industrial policies for the various branches in the Community, as the report originally asked. We need the right framework conditions to enable all areas of industry to adjust to the new international division of labour and the sharper competition. So I would warn against formulating a specific industrial policy for each sector of our Community industry. I was most interested in the proposal by Mr Berkhouwer and Mr Jackson on the price situation in the common market. I too made a proposal on this subject, which will probably be forwarded to the Commission without delay.

May I refer to one further aspect on which Commissioner Narjes should perhaps also speak. It is the customary practice in the Community for automobile manufacturers to fix different ex-works prices for the different Member States on the grounds that, in view of the different tax imposed, this is the only way for them to maintain their position on the Member States' various markets. In fact the differences in tax within the Community range from 13 to 160%. What does the Commission propose to do about this? If we wait for turnover tax to be harmonized in the Community, we may have to wait 20 or 30 years. It is doubtful whether the consumer will allow this. The Commission must do something about this and say what it intends to do. In my view and that of my friends, the car has a long and happy future in the Community; and since it is an instrument of personal freedom, we should do all we can to promote it, although of course without going to extremes.

So we should really not talk about a crisis when, thank God, there is no crisis yet worth speaking of. There are difficulties, and in political terms the Commission and this House can make their own contribution towards overcoming these difficulties. What we should avoid doing is to over dramatize the situation.

Sir John Stewart-Clark (ED). — Mr President, may I first of all say that I regret that two such important subjects as the internal pricing of cars and Japanese automobile imports should have been combined in one debate. It really does not make for a good debate.

I welcome Mr Filippi's report. I would say, first of all to the European car industry, that we do understand their problems, but this is no substitute for being competitive. If we over-protect home markets, the Japanese will take away trade from us overseas. Fortunately, there is much evidence that the right action is now being taken in our automobile industries in the EEC.

Secondly, there really is no mistake about the Japanese workforce. It has been proved in television manufacturing that Japanese management can obtain almost as good results with European workers as with Japanese. It is largely a question of management methods, of entrenched union attitudes in European industry and of automation.

Thirdly, to the Commission and to national governments, I would say that we must have joint Community action to agree with the Japanese on imports of vehicles per country. If not, the Japanese will play off one country against another. In the first nine months of 1982 over 1981 German car imports were down by 35%, but British car imports were up by 13%.

The Japanese are very good at making cars and trucks; they are also very good at making robots and computers and electrical components. The threat to the automobile industry today will be the threat to the new technology industries tomorrow. Therefore the closest cooperation between the Commission and national governments is vital and has effects well beyond automobiles.

Finally, to the Japanese I would say that by showing statesmanship they can also be businesslike. I would like to quote from a speech made in Geneva last year by the President of the Confederation of Japanese Automobile Workers' Unions. He said:

The automobile industry means, for any country which possesses it, an industry involved in the total national security of the country. We in the Japanese automobile trade union believe that the international motor trade should be conducted in an orderly way to ensure fair trade. If the unemployment problem of countries concerned, caused by trade frictions and their political and social problems, are given no prospect of improvement, then the world economy will be pushed into the *cul de sac* of ever-recurring contractions. The role of the Japanese trade unions today is to prevent such a danger.

I welcome that statement. Unemployment in Europe is increasingly serious. In the automobile industry in the

Stewart-Clark

UK 482 000 people were employed in 1979. By 1981 this had reduced to 330 000. The Japanese must recognize this. Firstly, they must open up their markets. Secondly, they must continue to moderate their exports. Thirdly, they must increase their investment in the EEC. Fourthly, in doing so, they must do as the Americans do, i.e., integrate into the European scene.

Mr President, I beg to support the motion.

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I think that today's debate has already shown its usefulness, because of the broad spectrum of opinion and judgement that we have seen, and which will certainly be useful for a further examination of the general situation in this sector.

I am grateful to Messrs. Berkhouwer, Jackson and Hoffmann for what they have said regarding market problems. In this connection, Mr Berkhouwer, I once put forward a proposal, when presenting a report on the price problem, but the Assembly did not agree. I do not remember how you voted on that occasion, but I think we can always correct our past mistakes and we can, for example, still create the conditions whereby monetary union, so warmly hoped for by Mr Jackson — and I agree with him — can receive, from him and his group, the help that is indispensable to its realization.

I am grateful to Mr Filippi because he has rid the field of an outlook, which to me seemed apparent in a whole series of amendments, based on an ideological approach that would deny that there is any crisis.

Mr Hermann, there is no particularly deplorable significance attaching to the word 'crisis', which derives from a verb that, in classical Greek, implies judging or reflecting on a situation that, obviously, requires reflection, investigation, and a degree of reorganization, at least where a whole number of factors are concerned. It seems to me, therefore, that Mr Filippi's report today has made it clear that these elements exist and cannot be ignored.

In my view, to discuss protectionism would be to give way to ideological pressure. We are concerned with the internal market and we are, I think, united, or should be united, in wanting the internal market to be as free as possible. The EEC Treaty and common sense itself, however, lead us to give a certain amount of thought to external trade relations which must, of course, be as free as possible — and I share that view — but not divorced entirely from reality.

Reality, where Japanese exports are concerned — and I am coming now to the central point in the report we are discussing — consists of an exhausting series of negotiations and meetings that lead nowhere. In my view it would indeed be odd for us to recognize the difficulties of reaching agreement with Japan on the

reasonable settlement of these problems, and then conclude that the only way is to open our frontiers to Japanese intervention! This would really be an unusual conclusion, one that I hope we shall not reach. The amendments that we and other members have presented are founded on this precept.

After two years it is time to draw conclusions, and this the Council of Ministers appears already to have done. I should not like us to draw back, in regard to the policy of the Council.

The measures that we take must therefore be firm and precise, and must not leave the Japanese manufacturers or the Japanese Government with any illusions as to the possibility of our continuing in this direction. This means no sales or commercial war — which would be madness — but firmness of policy and the determination, called for in this chamber by a number of members, to achieve a fair outcome to this battle. Mr Filippi hoped for a single, united verdict from Parliament on a line of action that, for that matter, it had already approved. I share this view. Our amendments are aimed at achieving this, and we hope therefore that they will be accepted. That is the basis on which we will give our final verdict on the motion.

Mrs Pruvot (L). — *(FR)* I, along with my colleagues, wish to thank Mr Filippi for having presented this report to us and especially for having overcome all the difficulties that he had to tackle in order to table this motion today.

I should just like to say that the Liberal and Democratic Group has serious doubts as to the usefulness of adding a further report to the excellent one drawn up two years ago by Mr Bonaccini. We feel that the content of Mr Bonaccini's report could be diluted by the presentation at this stage of a second report setting out some of its clearly reasoned conclusions in different ways. Was it really necessary to go over ground which had already been covered?

A central aspect of the motion gives our Group cause for concern. This is the matter of the common industrial policy and industrial cooperation between European motor industries. The Liberal and Democratic Group considers that it was not a bad idea to establish an industrial policy which could accompany the running-down of public aid and subsidies in various spheres so that companies producing consumer goods could be helped to make their way gradually into the market economy. Such a policy would be a great step forward. However, the report before us makes little attempt to deal with the practicalities of how a Community policy for the motor industry would be applied. A few concrete proposals on this subject would have been welcome, although, I repeat, they should have been put into a report from the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Pruvot

Further points about which we have certain reservations are the coordination of research between private industrial concerns and the scheme to set up a pilot marketing system. It is obviously desirable to avoid wasteful use of resources in research and development, both in individual companies and at the level of national economies. However, it is clear that direct public intervention would have the effect of limiting the range of research work done by the European motor industry and would in all probability cause it to lose ground rapidly to competitors in the United States and Japan.

Another key issue raised in the motion for a resolution is the question of Japanese investment in the European Community. In common with the rapporteur and the majority of the committee, the Liberal and Democratic Group considers it extremely desirable to have such investment. However, the limitations that the rapporteur wishes to see imposed would represent such serious obstacles to Japanese investment that in most cases it would never materialize. In stating that such investment is desirable as long as it does not lead to overcapacity, paragraph 16 betrays a misunderstanding of the situation. The automobile sector is at one and the same time a domestic market and an export-oriented industry. The problem of capacity has to be settled in the light of outlets; in other words, it is not some government body, but consumers themselves, through the pattern of their spending, who determine which products are right for the market. Moreover, it should be remembered that Japanese investment, whether organized under official controls or on the basis of arrangements with European industrial concerns, will not only make for a considerable reduction in imports of Japanese cars, thus cutting the serious deficit on our balance of payments with Japan, but will also create jobs and earnings within the Community. In our view such investment and production within the Community will not lead to an immediate increase in sales of Japanese cars on the Community market. On the other hand, they will create jobs and income for thousands of unemployed people in the Community.

Paragraph 5 of the resolution for a motion refers to a central political objective which the Parliament has consistently emphasized. It is indeed necessary for the Member States to agree on a common negotiating strategy and to give the Commission the means with which to defend this strategy. It is not acceptable in the longer term for our voluntary restraint agreements to vary from one country to another.

Even if some people are tempted to believe that it would be in the interests of, say, the Italian motor industry to be protected by the most restrictive agreement possible limiting imports of Japanese cars, this view is only partly justified since, if the Italian market is too heavily protected, Italian manufacturers will lose outlets in Denmark, Belgium and other Community countries which have no such agreement or only much less strict agreements. The European market, which is

the biggest in the Western world, is so heterogeneous that Japanese manufacturers have had no difficulty in playing off the 10 Member Governments against one another.

In conclusion, I have no alternative but to confirm on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group that, unless many essential parts of the motion for a resolution are substantially reworded, our Group will have to vote against the report. We would find it preferable, unless of course amendments are made, for the Parliament to abide by the report drafted by Mr Bonaccini which it has already adopted, since that report expressed Parliament's position on the motor industry faithfully and comprehensively.

Mr Bord (DEP). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should first of all like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Filippi, and tell him that his report has been received with particular interest by the Group on whose behalf I have the honour to speak in this debate.

The Japanese industry, which did not even exist 20 years ago, is now the world leader and by far the biggest exporter of cars. If no action is taken, Japanese penetration in Europe, which has increased four-fold in ten years, will, within a few years, rise to between 15% and 20% of the market, taking account of all European makes. It should also be borne in mind that Japan's prosperity has been built up on the strength of 20 years of uncompromising protectionism.

There are many reasons why Europe cannot contemplate abandoning this industry. It is an essential outlet for vital sectors of our economy. With its ongoing large-scale investment programmes, it stimulates production of plant, machine tools and now robots, for which it is the biggest market. Ladies and gentlemen, my dear colleagues, it is now and will remain in the future one of the most promising outlets for Europe's electronics industry. Consequently, confronted with the extraordinary extent to which our markets have been penetrated by Japan, and since there can be no question of abandoning such an important branch of economic activity, Europe must make a stand. In so doing, ladies and gentlemen, it should rely, not on the traditional armoury of protectionist weapons, but on analysis of what it really is that makes Japanese firms successful.

The essential factor is Japan's competitiveness, which it achieves through the combination of its productivity and its exchange rate. The fact is that the yen is structurally undervalued; Japanese revaluations are always gradual and lag behind the country's economic development. The Japanese are therefore very price-competitive in export markets. The second factor in their favour is the level of their productivity. The ratio of two to one in relation to Europe is accounted for primarily by more efficient use of plant and equipment. An effort is called for from Europe to improve

Bord

its competitiveness, and this can be achieved through greater responsibility on the part of company managements and better use of manpower. It has to be recognized that a country cannot distribute more wealth than it produces and that it is therefore no longer possible to raise the level of general benefits already available in Europe. In fact it is arithmetically impossible to work less and earn more. Another factor to be borne in mind is the absence of major industrial disputes in Japan, which relieves manufacturers in that country of the need to incur the considerable cost of maintaining strategic stocks. In short, rationalization of the European motor industry is inevitable, and this will mean redeployment to secure its future.

In conclusion, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I hope that the Japanese will come to a realistic assessment of the ability of export markets to absorb their products. With the inter-penetration of markets and interlocking financial structures, our future and theirs are bound up with each other, and reasonable voluntary restraint on the part of their exporters could avoid an undesirable use of protectionism in Europe which would be to the advantage of no one, except of course those who exploit the weakening of the entire world economy.

Mr De Goede (NI). — (NL) Mr President, the rapporteur, Mr Filippi, has quite rightly pointed out that the problems of the European automobile industry must be dealt with in the context of a Community industrial policy. The whole economic position of our Community must be reviewed in the light of a depressed world economy. Our relations with the United States, Japan and the developing countries have changed considerably while our own internal problems are increasing.

I think that we should be clear about a few facts in looking at the problems of the automobile industry. Firstly, this industry is extremely important. The Community used to be the largest motor manufacturer but we have now been displaced by Japan. In 1979 the EEC countries manufactured 11.4 million motor cars but that figure has now fallen to 9.8 million. At the same time Japan has increased its output from 9.6 to 11.2 million while production in the United States has fallen from 11.4 to 7.9 million vehicles.

A second point: the situation is fortunately not as bad as in the sectors of electronics, photography, motor cycles and so on where Japan has almost completely ousted the Community but the trend is dangerous. In 1970 Japan sold only 48 000 cars in the EEC; they are now selling 20 times as many.

Third point: in ten years our motor vehicle exports have fallen by 23%, from 2.5 million to 1.9 million. At the same time world exports have risen by 77% and Japanese exports by more than 400%. If the Community had been able to preserve its share of world

trade we would have sold 2.4 million vehicles more than has in fact been the case; our disadvantaged position seems likely to become permanent. In 1983 Europe is likely to import more cars than it exports.

Mr President, the rapporteur, Mr Filippi, makes a number of important observations about structural differences between the European and Japanese motor industries. Some differences are difficult to remedy such as the different level of involvement of the employees in the undertaking. However, productivity, absenteeism and commitment are worse in Europe and there is room for a great deal of improvement here. Japanese penetration is certainly attributable to some extent to the gradual elimination of differences in quality between our respective products. But here too there are new possibilities for our European industry, for example in the areas of fuel economy, noise abatement, environmental protection and so on. The situation of the Japanese currency to which the previous speaker referred is a further important factor. International pressure can help here. I have the impression that not all the possibilities have been used as yet. The divided approach of the United States and the EEC to Japanese activities is definitely harmful. Faster and more effective intervention by the European Commission would have been appropriate. I cannot escape the impression that the agreement reached last year between the United States and Japan made our own problems even worse. Is it not always the case that Japanese self-limitation on the American market almost automatically leads to more intensive activity on the European market?

Mr President, the Filippi report rightly calls for an effective industrial policy adapted to the new needs of the European industry. We need a policy which encourages innovation and new technology and improves competitiveness. It is also vital to introduce a better Community export policy. We willingly endorse the view that the European Commission should be encouraged to show vigour and inventiveness in putting forward new proposals and ideas with the help of the European motor industry. The stakes are high and we must act accordingly.

Mr Seal (S). — Mr President, while there are many good points in the Filippi report, we feel that it is misdirected and mistimed and, in fact, that this whole debate is mistimed. In our opinion, it would have been much better to include the Filippi report in a joint debate when Mr Bonaccini produces his second report on the car industry for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

This report is supposed to deal purely with imports of Japanese cars. Now we know that you can not totally divorce trade from the industry. However, if you examine the report, you will find that 14 of the paragraphs actually deal solely with the internal industry, whilst only 9 deal with trade. Because of that, we feel

Seal

that the report covers a lot of the ground that has already been dealt with in the first Bonaccini report, and dealt with, in our opinion, in a better way. We also preferred the way in which Mr Bonaccini suggested that we approach the Japanese.

As speakers have mentioned already this morning, one of the main points in this report concerns a common EEC trade policy. In fact, what they mean, and what the report suggests, is that we have a common protectionist approach by the EEC towards the Japanese. Now I support this. I actually agree with this. But do not let us fool ourselves, Mr President, that we are talking about voluntary restraints or a gentle approach or whatever. What we are talking about is a common protectionist approach towards the Japanese. But we must be consistent. We are never consistent in this House. While we talk about a protectionist approach for the EEC as a whole, and no doubt we will support this, I feel we have got to go further. We have got to support the car industries on a national basis. You see, the car industries in each Member State are too necessary to wealth and jobs to allow them to disappear.

I also agree wholeheartedly that we must try to force the Japanese to open their markets, otherwise we take action. Japan has shown, in spite of what has been said in talks with Japan, that it is not prepared to give one inch as far as opening its markets is concerned.

Whatever action we do take, Mr President, I feel that this Parliament and the Commission must do something to ensure that every Member State with a car production facility is able to maintain that car production facility. I also support very much the sections on cooperation within the EEC. Whatever successes the Japanese or the Americans have had, the fact is that European engineering at its best is far and away the best in the world. The industry could and should work together, for example, on a European basis to produce a European engine for motor cars. This is something that I feel the industry would benefit from and something that is needed. It should use its best resources to make such an engine and to make it the most efficient, the most economical, the best engineered and designed and yet the cheapest to produce. We did it with Concorde; there is no problem in doing it with cars if we work together. I know that the Wankel rotary engine was actually designed in Europe and then abandoned by the car manufacturers to the Japanese, who now have it in their production cars.

The report also suggests, Mr President, that we continue with European-Japanese links, such as the ones forged by BL, Fiat and others. I feel that these should be ended. I feel that it was a mistake, for instance, for British Leyland to tie up with Honda. A much better link-up, in our opinion, would have been between British Leyland and Renault. This was on the cards; had it not been for the attitude of the chairman of BL at that time, I feel that would have gone ahead.

What we need, Mr President, is not Japanese investment. With reference to the points made by Sir John Stewart-Clark, I would point out what we need is for our management to have more self-confidence. When Sir Fred Warner and I met the head of Nissan in Tokyo, he was quite prepared to come and build a car plant in Europe using British workers, British education and British components to take on the rest of Europe. It is management that needs to improve its attitude, not the trade unions.

I will finish, Mr President, by saying that European cooperation is a must. I support it absolutely. The European car industries are a must. We must take whatever action we can to ensure that they continue to survive.

Mr Blumenfeld (EPP). — *(DE)* Mr President, the European automobile industry is not in a state of crisis, as Mr Müller-Hermann also said earlier. I agree with him. We are, however, facing extremely sharp worldwide competition. We should accept the Japanese challenge as such, and I think the European automobile industry, its good hard workers and engineers and the heads of the undertakings are able to do so.

Now, European undertakings are just as dependent on exports of their production as the Japanese and Americans. A large part of their production is sold on markets throughout the world. Substantial financial resources have been invested in recent years in the necessary distribution and service organizations. That is why the European car industry is dependent on unrestricted access to the markets. Any protectionist measures — taken for whatever reason — risk leading to chain reactions and reprisals.

So import restrictions are no answer; what is needed is non-bilateral negotiations conducted by the Community with Japan, together with a demand for general restraint in view of the economic decline which has meanwhile also affected Japan. But the main thing is to make it clear to the Japanese that they cannot, as they did in past years, blithely wander around the Community market organizing sectoral sales which, sad to say, were supported by the governments of some of our Member States.

European economic policy should restrict itself to creating the general framework conditions for all undertakings and should adhere to them, especially when harmonizing safety and exhaust standards and legal provisions, while of course always remembering what is economically feasible.

It is essential to European economic policy that the technical efficiency of the European car industry is strengthened, and I expect proposals to that effect from the Commission. Yet it is up to the undertakings to embark on the necessary restructuring of produc-

Blumenfeld

tion planning and to carry out investment projects. The success of the investment measures to improve production will depend upon whether free access to all world markets is maintained.

For the rest, free competition among European automobile producers gives a greater incentive to the efficient use of research and development than any guidance measures and mechanisms imposed from above or even bureaucratic Community bodies can provide.

In my view — and I also emphasize what Mr Müller-Hermann said on behalf of our group — a number of amendments must be very carefully perused in the hours to come before they can be adopted, to ensure that the significance and impact of the Filippi report is strengthened. I hope this will be the case.

Mr Beazley (ED). — Mr President, Oscar Wilde with his sardonic wit made the cultural and ethical distinction between the cynic who knew the price of everything and the value of nothing and the romantic who knew the value of everything and the price of nothing.

In this debate I have no wish to be either sardonic or witty but merely practical. I wish to distinguish between those who know the price of everything and the costs of nothing. In regard to the motor cars and the common market, we hear a great deal about price, little about value and nothing about costs. Failure to make proper assessments as to these three important concepts gives rise to weak economies and unemployment. History shows all too clearly where this approach to price, value and costs has led great nations. Hence the present recognition of the truth of the statement that there is no such thing as a free meal.

Consumers expect to be able to buy motor cars within the common market where they like at the lowest price, and this is quite right. Manufacturers must not be allowed to build technical barriers to protect national markets. The Commission, furthermore, believes that arm's length competition between manufacturers across frontiers helps to create a common market, and this is right too. Where then lies the problem? It lies in the extent to which the price of a motor car within this common market is only partially dependent on the manufacturer's costs. The rest of the price is dependent on the decisions of 10 separate sovereign States, only four of which have a genuine motor car manufacturing industry rather than assembly plants for knocked-down kits or pure import markets.

Two of these national markets, which are much better protected against Japanese imports than other national markets, also enjoy nationalized industries. Meanwhile, large State subsidies are available in one Member State, quite legally within the terms of the Treaty, to reconstruct a major nationalized industry so as to provide employment and, hopefully, to return it to

profitability. How then do we assess the price levels of such an industry in competitive terms?

First, let me point out that the economics of countries which are genuine manufacturers, compared with those which are importers or assemblers of knocked-down kits, are quite different. The factors which the Commission must take more seriously into consideration, as BEUC, the European Consumers Association, has done in its latest report, are the extent to which the government-controlled elements of price affect the flows of trade rather than the manufacturer's costs alone and how far the stripping off of high national fiscal costs assists in making a common market.

We must not only create a common market for private-enterprise manufacturers but also a common market for value-added taxes, discriminatory car taxes, interest rates, price freezes, etc. And we must all strive to remove all forms of restrictive practices which seriously affect the achievable level of productivity and hence competitiveness within both the internal and the external market. Currency parity differences can change the flow of trade overnight. If the pound sterling continues to weaken against European currencies, or if Britain, with a different government, were to have a devaluation, as France and Belgium have had, the direction of the flow would change back to where it was largely between 1973 and 1979 — that is, from the UK to the Continent and not vice versa. With devaluation the manufacturer's costs will in fact increase in real terms, as he pays more for his imported raw materials and in due course for his labour but will have to service his capital over five to seven years with real and not with devalued money.

So let our aim, to be achieved over three to five years, be to remove all technical barriers to trade. We can quickly dismantle national type-approval tests and institute a Community test, but we must expose motor manufacturers to genuine arm's length competition with other manufacturers who have the real costs of operating in an up-to-date motor industry.

Finally, we must also persuade Member States to take prompt and genuine steps to align their fiscal, financial and economic measures in order to create a real common market which will offer stable employment and economic security.

Mr Petronio (NA). — (IT) Mr President, we of the Italian political right would not like the recent visits from the Japanese authorities, and the talks between them and those who would be their European partners, to be seen at more than their true value, and considered something to be welcomed. We should not like these talks to be smoke in the eyes of the European Community, preventing it from a full realization of all its crises, expecting who knows what from these discussions, at a time moreover when, over Europe's head, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, Japanese-Amer-

Petronio

ican cars are being planned, through the agreements between Ford and Toio-Kogyo, and General Motors and Toyota. The fact that these two great world powers, with the forthcoming visit of Prime Minister Nakasone to the White House, are in fact examining the possibility of combining the great experience of the Japanese and the financial resources of the Americans, and of launching one or two such cars on European and world markets, confirms that the situation is a serious one, so that we have every reason to thank Mr Filippi for having drawn our attention to the irrefutable facts of the crisis which — as Mr Bonaccini rightly said a short time ago — is a 'time for reflection' but is also, etymologically speaking, the time when an illness is at its peak.

A crisis, this, the evidence of which is there for all to see in the increase in unemployment, the frightening number of EEC cars remaining unsold, and the constant loss of foreign markets that it will be very difficult to recapture, unless Europe equips itself adequately in regard to research, new technologies, energy saving, electronics in cars, and the development of new materials, so as to produce products that are competitive.

But how can we expect to give a market time to pause and reflect, to reorganize itself and rise again, unless it is defended — I will not say 'protected', because that is a word that might cause misunderstandings — at a time when it is in greatest difficulty? How can this be expected in the face of an invasion that causes crisis, and as a result brings less investment in plant and research, so that we are unable to keep abreast of technological advance and regain our competitiveness? This is not a question of protectionism — we are faced here with bald facts, facts we simply have to face, and to which we must find an answer. And the answer, as Mr Filippi so rightly said, must be given with one voice. As Mr Pininfarina said at a press conference, we have to put an end to this Europe with its 56 car industries in as many States. The components industry must be concentrated, as also must research in every direction and every sector, so that overheads act as a multiplier and are not merely the simple sum of the various national aid schemes or research programmes. In other words, as a great German author once said, we must not let an advanced civilization, such as the industrial civilization of the motor car once was, become a tragedy, like any other civilization — cultural ones included. And if we do not react now it really could be a tragedy for Europe's car industry and the rest of European industry as well, for employment prospects in Europe, and for European society and the European economy generally.

Mr J. Moreau (S). — (FR) The report by our colleague Mr Filippi is concerned with a clearly defined subject: imports of Japanese cars into the Community.

The report drawn up by our colleague Mr Bonaccini also dealt with this issue and we discussed it at length

during our debate on that report. In addition, over the months ahead the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs will be preparing a report, in the light of a study by the Commission, in which it will be making a first appraisal of Community policy in this field and putting forward further proposals. I fully appreciate that all the issues involved are interconnected, and when are discussing Japanese imports, we are naturally tempted to talk about the motor industry as a whole.

Nevertheless, it is undesirable in my view for this Parliament to adopt an unduly fragmented approach to a problem as essential as the future of Europe's motor industry. In the light of the report submitted to us this morning, I should like to stress three points.

The first naturally concerns our relations with Japan. Europe should present a united front; it is very much in its interests to do so in negotiations with Japan, just as it has everything to gain from adopting a uniform line of conduct in regard to the establishment of Japanese firms in Europe and the possibility of cooperation with them.

I fully realize that a common negotiating stance has to be consistent with the policies of the firms operating on Europe's internal market and on markets beyond our frontiers. Nevertheless, negotiations with the Japanese should be conducted by the Community, not by individual Member States. This is a necessity which we cannot afford to ignore; if we do, Japanese penetration will increase, with the agreement, more voluntary in some cases than in others, of a number of Member States. A common strategy towards Japan, and towards the other countries concerned, is essential, and I believe that any delay in setting it up will be prejudicial to the survival of the motor industry and, of course, the survival of our own firms.

The second point concerns the internal market. An oral question has touched upon this topic. Unification of the market is a priority, as we keep repeating, and I believe that it is constantly in the minds of our own Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. However, the fact that we talk about it often does not mean that progress is being made, and I for my part believe that we are — regrettably — witnessing an increasing fragmentation of the internal market, particularly in the motor industry.

Proposals were put forward in the Bonaccini report. Our impression is that matters are progressing far too slowly. I am well aware that some developments are likely to be seen in the coming months, but I for my part believe that unification would not only strengthen European firms, but would undoubtedly also enhance our solidarity and therefore our strength as Europeans.

The third and final point is concerned with the desirability of a Community strategy in the automobile sec-

Moreau

tor. I should like to stress a specific aspect here. It would appear — and all of us on the committee involved in preparing the Bonaccini report gained this impression from our soundings — that the manufacturers are too concerned to operate alone, or at least to decide when and with whom they should in fact cooperate, and that they do not regard the formulation of a common strategy by the Community on this issue as a matter of any great urgency.

The central aim of Community strategy is therefore to make this industry competitive. This strategy, as I have indicated, comprises several aspects, to which we have referred. The future of Europe's motor industry will be decided over the next very few years. It is therefore important for this industry not to try to rely on the internal market alone, but to display an aggressive approach to external markets; it is for this reason, in my opinion, that the agreement with the Japanese must not be confined to the problems of the internal market, but must also cover the forms of cooperation to be developed on external markets.

Mr Mihr (S). — (DE) Mr President, I find it a pity that a branch of industry as important as the automobile industry in the European Community is being discussed in terms of an important but nevertheless minor problem. I am saying this partly because I was instructed by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to draft an opinion on the Filippi report and advised my committee, after examining this report, to request the Legal Affairs Committee to postpone it, because only two or three sections deal with foreign trade questions and all the rest is really concerned with internal market questions which fall within the terms of reference of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

It is not only the question of terms of reference which led me to do so. Mr Filippi, as can be seen from his report, also noticed very soon that the problems of the European automobile industry cannot be resolved through trade policy only. Rather, they should be regarded as a whole. I think this will have to be discussed again here in the course of the year, in conjunction with the Bonaccini report.

In the past few years the Japanese automobile industry has had a considerable effect on the world economic balance. No doubt the European Community's political influence helped to maintain some balance on the markets, but we should not have any illusions about the future. Potentially, the Japanese automobile industry is still a very serious threat. If the Japanese fully exploited their existing advantages in competition, the imbalances would worsen dramatically.

That is why I do not think it is enough for the Commission to regard foreign investment and industrial cooperation as the main instruments for restoring the balance. I consider economic cooperation equally

important if not more so. We must constantly make it clear to Japanese economic policy-makers that their procedures cannot serve as a worldwide model. Thanks to economic support, the Japanese automobile industry set in motion an unequalled process of rationalization and automation, and the only reason why the resulting gains in productivity did not lead to disasters in employment policy is that the industry achieved a similar growth on the export markets.

For compelling reasons of logic, this procedure cannot serve as a model for the other major automobile industries in the world. Initially, no doubt, they will be forced to adopt the Japanese level of rationalization. But the second stage cannot be imitated. Not all automobile industries can compensate for the gains in productivity obtained in the first stage by increasing their exports. For exports from one place are always imports into another. If everyone wanted to export more, this would necessarily lead to a complete jam on the world markets. The logical consequence would be a worldwide crisis of employment in the automobile industry. The Commission must keep this danger in mind. A policy of voluntary restraints is the only desirable alternative to this uncontrolled headlong rush which brings hundreds of thousands of workers and their families up against insoluble problems.

The Commission has also set itself another ambitious target. In order to find a new balance, it considers it essential for the three major producer zones to coordinate their investments abroad. The closer the Commission comes to achieving this aim, the more the problems in the major automobile zones in the West would be eased. I assure the Commission that we fully support it here.

We also call on the Commission to do all it can to standardize the Community automobile market further. It is the second largest market in the world and is therefore an important strategic trump card for the European Community.

We do not only owe this harmonization to the people of our densely settled Europe. It is also urgent for purely economic reasons. Our penetration of foreign markets is already being impeded by lack of direction. Here I would like to state emphatically that the standardization of the European automobile market will give us greater political power.

Mr Vernimmen (S). — (FR) Mr President, this is not our first debate about the motor industry and, significantly enough, the Commission has on each previous occasion announced a series of measures which came to nothing because we quite evidently have no industrial policy. I admit that this situation cannot easily be remedied if we are not to fall back on protectionism from which nobody would really benefit. The motor industry must make heavy and continuing investments in order to produce vehicles of competitive quality at

Vernimmen

prices which are internationally competitive. The motor industry also needs time to implement its plans and is waiting for a period of prolonged economic viability to make a return on its investment.

In the next 10 years heavy investment will be necessary to improve our products and hold costs down through increased productivity. The motor industry is becoming increasingly capital-intensive and a process of adaptation is necessary. We must not look for protection for this industry but we must be allowed the time to become competitive and allow the natural market forces to play their role. The Commission must therefore take action to enable the motor industry not simply to survive but to grow further.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, first I would like to thank Mr Filippi, the rapporteur, and those Members who put questions for giving us the opportunity, thanks to their careful and most useful contributions, to provide a kind of interim report on the state of the European automobile industry. In our view, this interim report follows the guidelines which we set out in our comprehensive opinion in June 1981, which will shortly be expanded into a progress report setting out all the practical measures and initiatives taken by the Commission in this sector.

I am sure this progress report will be useful to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the other committees concerned in drawing up the second Bonaccini report. I called it an interim report because at present many things are in a state of flux and, to use an expression drawn from photography, at present we can only give a kind of snapshot view which, moreover, will be quite fleeting, because this debate has taken up more time than the Bureau had expected. To keep matters brief, I shall therefore make a few preliminary general remarks.

In our view, the problem does not reside in the mediocre technical quality of European cars. We have no reason to regard our products as being of lower quality or in any way backward compared to those of any other automobile producer. Technically speaking too, we have some grounds for confidence. The problem lies in manufacturing techniques, production conditions, production costs and all the aspects which determine the competitiveness of the European automobile industry. We must not forget either that at present the European automobile industry is only just entering the stage where it can reap the benefits from the enormous investment efforts made in the past three or four years. As you know, major investments were made in the European automobile industry in nearly all the Member States in the past few years. This did much to ensure that the stagnation and slight recession was not even worse.

That is why it is now the task of European and national economic policy to identify the specific rea-

sons for the lower competitiveness, higher manufacturing costs and inadequate manufacturing techniques, to remove them and, in particular, to ensure that this situation does not repeat itself by creating better framework conditions.

We know that it is not our responsibility to influence or interfere with the autonomy of decisions taken by undertakings and thus to reduce competition, since the competition principle is rooted in the Treaty of Rome and thus has a constitutional character. And when we undertake analyses, we must guard against confusing macroeconomic developments and the current recession, to which no end is yet in sight, with problems specific to certain industries.

At any rate I think it is important to repeat what many speakers have said, namely, that the automobile sector is most important to the European economy. We are aware of this. For reasons of time I will not go into this matter in detail and will instead discuss a number of problem areas which were referred to in the debate.

With respect to the internal market, much has been achieved for the European automobile industry, perhaps more than some critics realise. On the question of type-approval rules, i.e., on the technical side, we have a deadline which may prove very important. You know that in Copenhagen some weeks ago the European Council instructed the Councils of Ministers to adopt, no later than the end of March 1983, an immediate programme for the development and stimulation of the internal market. One of the three main points of this first programme is the third-country aspects of our technical standards. If the question of third-country effects has been resolved by the end of March — and I have no doubt it will, given the unanimous request by the Heads of State or Government to the Councils of Ministers — this would allow for a limited breakthrough in the question of type-approval rules on the automobile market.

As far as I can see, there would then be no difficulty about implementing the three remaining and still pending directives on the approximation of technical standards in the Community. So here we have a chance to make a limited breakthrough in the coming months. If the European Parliament can agree with this view in its resolution, it would be making a useful contribution to our negotiations with the Council on 1 March. The internal market aspect also includes the question of different price trends. Since this is a matter closely connected with competition law, may I begin by pointing out that, following a large number of oral questions and statements by Members of this House, the Commission is fully aware of the importance of this question and of the scale of the differences. May I remind you of one very blatant case in which the Community defended itself before the European Court of Justice in an action taken by Ford of Germany. I will quote a sentence from the Commission's defence, which also answers Mr Jackson's question.

Narjes

The Commission stated that a marketing system must on principle enable the customer to buy through any authorized dealer any mass-produced car model offered within the Community. This is all the more relevant in that Ford-AG itself produces right-hand drive cars and sells them in the United Kingdom. That is one of the crucial points of our defence before the European Court of Justice, and I think that in that respect we agree with the requirements set out by Mr Jackson.

Furthermore, we are, of course, considering how to tackle the problem generally, and it is no secret that we are considering whether and if so to what extent a general exemption regulation in respect of Article 85(1) of the Treaties could create the conditions for protecting the consumer and creating calculable marketing strategies in the Community. These deliberations, which have by no means led to Commission decisions yet, aim in the direction of exemption clauses for marketing tie-ups, provided they fulfil our requirements. Our requirements will include a general clause on the right of disposal, obliging producers, in line with our submission in the Ford case which I just quoted, to supply all models to all Member States, even if these models are not usually supplied there.

I am giving away no secrets when I say that this would not necessarily be welcomed wholeheartedly by the producers, but we owe it to the common internal market and to the consumer, and we think that when the Ford proceedings have been decided, we will have a chance of success on the basis of such a formula.

We are also considering whether to recommend specific percentages up to which differences in price are possible. But such percentages would be so low as to give the consumer no further incentive to pay the additional costs of importing a car from a neighbouring country.

Mr Müller-Hermann asked, referring, I think, to the Danish case, what we intended to do specifically about the wide discrepancies in indirect taxation. May I point out that the legal situation is definitely against us. The Treaty of Rome contains only Article 95 for the transitional stage, and that does not apply to the existing situation.

Apart from that, I basically share his scepticism about the rate at which indirect taxation will be coordinated in the Community, but I regard this as a challenge to tackle the matter of harmonizing indirect taxes more forcefully, more consistently and on a more political basis than before, instead of settling for a trend which under certain circumstances could totally paralyse us in this and many other areas of the internal market. We cannot mutely accept the trend towards disparate taxes as a punishment of fate at a time like now when we are trying to restore the public budgets to health.

The point is, when can we politically advise the Member States to harmonize their indirect taxes? Until this

happens, with a 1:10 ratio between the lowest and highest indirect taxation, we have the situation where producers from the Community and from third countries are always faced with the question of whether to continue to sell at a low price on these particularly heavily taxed markets in order to cover at least some of their costs and not be driven right off the market in case the indirect taxes should some day be more closely approximated to each other, or whether to withdraw completely from this market. That is, of course, a very difficult decision for any undertaking.

The Community must realise that this is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. Schleswig-Holstein was mentioned just now. There the problem is that cars re-exported from Denmark are exempt from all indirect Danish taxes and can be offered on neighbouring markets at the highly competitive prices of the Danish market, e.g. in Schleswig-Holstein, overseas, in the United Kingdom and in the Benelux.

So here we have a situation of discrimination against marketing networks which must not continue but which is a great headache to us for purely legal reasons, because we do not have the instruments to deal with it that we would like to have. Only a political solution will have any longterm effect, based on the harmonization of duties and indirect taxes. But please do not think I am being pessimistic if I point out that in the present crisis the Finance Ministers of all the Member States will fight for each unit of account of revenue because they are already up to their ears in debt and don't know what to do about it. As for employment, may I refer to our written report.

Now we come to the question of Japan and the trade policy problems that arise there. First, we must of course differentiate between the various protectionist tendencies in the world. The Spanish problem, which was referred to here, will of course lose in importance, the sooner we manage to complete the accession negotiations and to move to the transitional stage. So the Spanish question can be regarded as a purely medium-term problem that can certainly be resolved.

The real problem therefore lies in our differences with Japan. I must formulate this rather carefully, since we are in the midst of negotiations. I cannot at this point, as requested by some Members, identify the strategic maximum and minimum aims, since this would endanger the negotiations.

But may I point out that after the 1981 debate in the European Parliament and the subsequent serious talks with Japan, the Japanese began a policy of voluntary restraints which remains unchanged, although at present this is overshadowed by the fact that Japanese exports to Europe are now falling anyway for other reasons. Anyway, it would certainly be very useful to analyse these reasons in more detail, because this would show that Japanese producers only use ordinary methods too and cannot work miracles, since they too

Narjes

must do their sums. In passing I may note that macro-economic trends play their part there too.

In 1981 a text was produced which serves as the model for these relations; I will read it out in English:

The Japanese authorities are requested to provide tangible assurances that from 1982 onwards Japan will pursue a policy of effective moderation towards the European Community as a whole as regards Japanese exports in sectors where an increase in Japanese exports to the Community would cause significant problems, notably passenger cars, colour televisions and so on.

That is more or less the basis on which we negotiated and which would remain valid tomorrow if Japanese exports to Europe of these products rose again for other reasons. Moreover, you know that we have referred to Article 23 of GATT, to a procedure which I do not think has yet been applied in GATT in this form and which offers us ways and means of influencing Japanese policy as a whole.

In the interests of the European automobile industry we must certainly take the offensive and be dynamic. We must not only seek access to the Japanese market but also create the right conditions to enable the European automobile industry to compete with Japan again on third country markets. Only then, and only to the extent that we manage to become competitive again on third country markets, will be able to reverse the worldwide production trend and acquire a greater share of the market, which will give us a chance to market European cars, and especially European car components, throughout the world.

Basically this offensive approach consists of a joint analysis in GATT of the Japanese import restrictions which, I think, in many cases have been wrongly assessed in the past. The Japanese problem is not a problem of high duties; it is not merely a problem of language barriers. It is a problem of the structure of marketing systems, of access to investment, of deliberate quotas, of regulating technical type-approval measures and suchlike, all of which have for years forced the European exporter and even the European investor in Japan to risk starvation in the vague hope that one day he would make a profit.

This is in part related to the further hope — and this is another subject which will arise — of one day being able to supply the Far East from Japanese soil. Here too it is worth considering the possibility of opening up other sites in the Far East for supplying that market.

These are a few remarks on the subject of Japan. Yet I cannot conclude without mentioning the third partner involved, the United States. I would like to recommend caution to all those who might want to follow the questionable precedent of local content rules. We

should offer neither pretexts nor precedents for the protectionists in the American Congress who are trying with the help of local content provisions virtually to seal off the American market. For us, the biggest trading power in the world, this would entail a considerable risk in many other areas of production. If we start to apply such provisions for one product, it will only rebound on ourselves in regard to countless other products.

We are standing on the threshold of a suicidal protectionism. We must do all we can to tackle these local content problems with the greatest caution and treat them simply as problems that may arise. In this way we can build up our bargaining power *vis-a-vis* one or other partner and preserve our European identity, but we must not exploit the situation as a long-term means of guiding and directing trade flows. If we were to do this, we would certainly be the losers in the medium term.

I ask your understanding, for I have spoken for somewhat longer than intended, but I have only been able to answer some of the questions put to me and would ask you to accept that we will answer the remainder in writing in our progress report.

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

The debate is closed.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.¹

3. *Intra-Community trade — Turnover*

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

— the report (Doc. 1-960/82) by Mr von Wogau, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council on

- I. a directive on the facilitation of formalities and inspections in respect of the carriage of goods between Member States (Doc. 1-226/82 — COM(82) 189 final)

¹ Request for an early vote: see Minutes.

President

- II. — a regulation simplifying customs formalities in trade within the Community
- a regulation amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 2102/77 introducing a Community export declaration form
- a regulation amending for the fifth time Regulation (EEC) No 222/77 on Community transit (Doc. 1-550/82/part b — COM(82) 401 final)
- the report (Doc. 1-976/82) by Mr Rogalla, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-550/82/part c — COM(82) 402 final) for a fourteenth directive on the harmonization of the laws of the Member States relating to turnover taxes — deferred payment of the tax payable on importation by taxable persons
- the report (Doc. 1-968/82) by Mr Welsh, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on increasing the number of customs personnel at the Community's external borders and the elimination of controls at the Community's internal borders.

Mr von Wogau (EPP), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, honourable Members, yesterday's debate on the programme of the German presidency and the debate on the automobile market which has just closed showed the priority this Parliament attaches to the completion of the internal market, measures to combat protectionism in the European Community and opening up the borders of the European Community even further. We at the European Parliament must show that we are able as Europeans to provide the citizens of Europe with practical benefits and progress, and it is not enough to say that we will introduce a European passport in 1984. We must ensure that the borders remain as open as they are today and that step by step they will be opened wider, on the model already followed in the Benelux countries and in the Scandinavian passport union.

May I refer to another aspect of great importance in this context. 1983 is the year of the small and medium-sized undertaking. And we must remember that more than half the workers in the European Community are employed in small and medium-sized undertakings. In recent years, during the economic crisis, they proved most flexible and willing to innovate. The policy for small and medium-sized undertakings which we are pursuing here cannot start out from the idea that we should begin by granting additional subsidies but should be aimed at creating fairer conditions of competition for them in the European Community. Here I would like to touch on the question of internal frontiers. The maze of different para-

graphs in the regulations has created a kind of two-tier society at the borders. For instance, if tenders are invited for the transport of a complicated load of goods from Stuttgart to Paris in a period of 24 hours, there will only be a comparatively small number of specialized, and usually large firms that have sufficient staff to do so. Smaller undertakings who do not have specialists of this kind will lose this order. That means that if we manage to throw light on this maze of provisions applying at the frontiers, we will also help ensure fairer conditions of competition for the small and medium-sized undertakings in the Community.

It was pointed out in the debate yesterday that between 5% and 7% of the turnover from the carriage of goods within the Community remains stuck at the internal frontiers. The figure mentioned by Mr Genscher was between DM 36 000 million and DM 37 000 million. The European undertakings have to find this sum every year to pass the internal frontiers.

These sums which have to be found, but which do not have to be found by undertakings with a large domestic market, threaten our competitiveness and therefore jobs in the Community. Our attempt to combat these internal frontiers in the European Community and to open up the internal market is one of the main contributions which we as a European Community can make towards combatting unemployment.

That is why I certainly welcome the fact that in the past year and past months the Commission has been very active in this area and has submitted a whole package of individual proposals to this end. Three of these proposals are the subject of our debate today.

First, the proposal on the facilitation of formalities in intra-Community trade, which proposes an end to systematic inspections, mutual recognition of facts by the customs administrations and harmonization of opening times for the undertakings. The European Parliament made several further suggestions, such as setting up data banks at frontier posts where transport operators and others may obtain information on the opening times of the internal and external frontier posts of the Community. We think this could do much to facilitate the carriage of goods for small undertakings.

We also want to do away with the difficulties which constantly arise when money has to be changed at the frontier. We call for the acceptance of Eurocheques, for instance, at the frontier and do not think one can expect the lorry driver to drive into town to obtain the correct currency for paying the required customs duties. That is another very important proposal as regards current practice. We hope the Commission will approve it.

The second proposal from the Commission concerns the single administrative document, designed to replace the numerous other customs and trade docu-

von Wogau

ments currently used in the European Community. We are very much in favour of the basic principle of this proposal. Yet we would like to suggest two restrictions. Firstly, it must not affect the more far-reaching simplifications that have already been implemented and are now being carried out in the Community. They must remain as they stand. Nor must the proposal for a single administrative document impede or prejudice the future use of electronic data processing for customs formalities.

Thirdly, before giving our final opinion, we would like to see this document. It seems that the various Member States made so many demands about its content that it was feared the document would become so complicated as not to improve matters at all. That is why we want to see this document and be able to discuss it in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs before giving our final opinion on it. We accept the principle of a single document, however.

Lastly, a few words on the third proposal, which is perhaps the most important now and was dealt with in Mr Rogalla's report. It concerns the deferred payment of the import-turnover tax payable at the frontier. Import-turnover tax is not a customs duty, it is a tax. So it is logical for it not to be collected by the customs administration but dealt with by the tax offices, together with the other declarations. Since a large number of the formalities which cause delays at the frontiers are connected with VAT, we believe this is one of the areas where we should really move forward without delay. This procedure is already followed in the Benelux countries, in the United Kingdom and in Ireland. Why should it not be possible for the other Community countries? That is why I give my full support to the Rogalla report.

May I mention one last point. During our debates here we constantly hear people say, as regards turnover tax on importation: yes, of course we could do it, but what about the passenger checks and why should it not be done there too? Others refer to the countervailing import duty payable at frontiers for agricultural products, others to statistics collected at frontiers, others to veterinary controls, and so on and so forth. We must break through this vicious circle. In my view, the proposals before us today could greatly help to throw light on the maze of provisions applying at the frontiers of the European Community.

Mr Rogalla (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, my report too is run of the mill. It does not hazard any new political initiative but is carefully linked to the customs union provisions. Fortunately there is little controversy among us here and anyone in this House or among the public who has not yet noticed this should realise that in recent months a working party was formed of representatives of all the groups which dealt with important and difficult administrative matters in great detail, which knows all the traps, tricks

and arguments and intends to remind the public again and again that we must make progress along this road. It is merely a question of technical matters and not of political barriers, yet such matters require constant work.

Parliament was consulted on my report pursuant to Article 100 of the EEC Treaty, which makes such consultation obligatory. According to a satirical saying, which you may know, nearly everyone is keen to produce great political ideas but very few will consistently and patiently devote themselves to the necessary legal and practical details, which often involves laborious attempts to convince others. We Parliamentarians generally belong in the first category!

On behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs I can say that the Commission's proposal on the deferred payment of the turnover tax on importation can be regarded as responding to the repeated wishes of the European Parliament, and that the Commission is to be thanked for submitting this proposal with a view to the completion of the internal market and the customs union which, contrary to what many think, have not yet been achieved. May I emphasize that for taxable persons this proposal has indisputable administrative advantages and that any ensuing difficulties in reorganizing the customs authorities, to which the Commission also refers in its report, must simply be accepted — for instance the changed relations between the customs administration and the tax authorities, the setting up of a consistent information procedure, the information which is forwarded from the customs posts to the tax offices, etc. These problems will arise, but they are far less important than the resulting advantages, and especially the incentives, to those liable to customs duties, taxable persons and economic circles.

We were not convinced in my committee that deferred tax payment and the minor effects on liquid resources would cause any serious problems and we think that the use and further development of electronic data processing, and especially the mutual aid of the Member States' tax administrations, will absorb these procedural changes without difficulty and without incurring additional costs. Closer administrative assistance also means that the Member States' administrations must enable their officials to learn foreign languages so that they can deal with documents in the various languages.

The Sixth Council Directive, on which this Commission proposal is based, dates — do not look surprised — from 17 May 1977. So nearly six years have passed, and the citizen of Europe may show surprise at how long the preliminary work took until the Commission proposal was finally submitted in July 1982. But if you remember that this is a question of payments and that tax differences of a financial nature had to be calculated very carefully, since in some Member States it is possible to defer the payment of tax on importation

Rogalla

and in other Member States this is not possible, it becomes fairly clear that a great deal of preliminary work was necessary before such a proposal could be submitted to the European Parliament for its opinion.

Therefore I would like to warmly thank the Commission and its many experts, and the officials here in Parliament and in the Council, who gave their assistance and ensured the progress of the work.

I regard it as a wise procedure, and one worth imitating, that some Member States collect the turnover tax on importation neither at the border nor later but allow it to be included in the periodic tax return, which saves a major administrative procedure. This procedure of including it in the general tax collection and return is perhaps not an immediately acceptable one, but it is a very constructive procedure. The disadvantages are only a few minor losses of liquidity and interest. What is possible in the Benelux and the United Kingdom should in my view, and here I can only support Mr von Wogau, surely also be possible in other Member States.

What is certain is that we must all make further efforts in this area. This includes reducing the differences in the Member States' taxation rates — what is called harmonization — and here I can refer back to what Mr Narjes of the Commission just said. I am my committee's rapporteur on this subject and I know what I am talking about. Money, a great deal of money, is involved, and it is this financial question which I shall keep in mind in my activities. I wonder whether it is even necessary completely to harmonize all the tax rates, and whether one could not begin by introducing a standstill with a binding upper limit. Once a system to further approximate these rates has been introduced, then individual Member States must not be able to increase or reduce the base rates again. I hope this report, which will be submitted to Parliament in the next few months, will also encourage the Commission to submit new proposals on introducing a step by step procedure — perhaps over a 10-year period — and set up a transparent system of financial contributions.

I should also like to take this opportunity to encourage the Commission and its officials to continue along this thorny path of approximating legislative provisions. Here too I am sufficiently aware of the realities, especially in the Community, so my appeal cannot be regarded as empty rhetoric. Ladies and gentlemen, apply the technique of wearing out the opposition. Exert pressure on the Member States without respite and at all levels! Try to tackle and resolve the problem practically, and not just from your desks. Make your presence felt in the Member States in as many different nationalities as possible — Members, senior Commission officials and others; the French in Germany and vice versa, the English in Italy, etc.

Give the experts homework to do. Try to pressurize the middle management in the ministries and try to

offer these officials promotion incentives if they can achieve simplifications in the internal market and the customs union. Without constant pressure and the accompanying public relations effort on the part of the Commission and Parliament nothing, or at least not enough, will happen.

Finally, a word on the small question of the tax basis, which is not the subject of my report but could arise during the further negotiations, although no opportunity has yet arisen to prepare an amending proposal. The Sixth Directive wants to create close parallelism between the tax basis for domestic turnovers and for importation and has therefore taken the customs value as its basis. During the negotiations the Commission could perhaps suggest to the Council that it no longer allow the Member States to apply the provisions of the customs regulation and the customs value when valuing an object imported from a Member State. Parliament would have no quarrel with this kind of simplification.

I hope that today we will take a big step forward along this practical road towards achieving the internal market.

Mr Welsh (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, in introducing this report, I feel rather humble at having to follow Mr van Wogau and Mr Rogalla, because they, of course, are very great experts in these matters. I think it is an excellent thing that these three reports were all adopted unanimously by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. There are many things that we disagree about in this place, but one thing I believe we all agree about is the supreme importance of the completion of the internal market. We look to the Council in particular to honour the declaration made by the European Council at Copenhagen and to make sure that rapid, speedy and important progress is made by the end of March in building a genuine Community market.

My report, Mr President, concerns itself with the customs service. The customs, of course, are the visible sign and the visible symbols of national barriers. They get a great deal of unfair criticism, because very largely they have to reflect the attitudes of national governments. We Europeans tend to resent customs officers, because we feel that they stand for all the things that we dislike most about the way in which our common market is constructed. However, if the customs service is to really grow and reflect the ideals of a unified market, then it has to be given a great deal of encouragement. It has to be given encouragement in the form of training, it has to be given encouragement in the form of systems and, above all, the habit of cooperation between the different national customs services must be encouraged. My report makes five what I hope are constructive suggestions to the Commission as to how this might be improved.

Welsh

The second element I would wish to draw attention to is the question of how goods within the internal market are physically handled. It is really quite ridiculous that in many cases it is actually more complicated clearing goods that have originated in intra-Community trade than goods that have actually come from outside the Community. Surely what we should be aiming for is a little positive discrimination in favour of Community goods. Two small measures that would certainly expedite this are, first of all, the development of inland clearance centres and secondly, the physical segregation, wherever possible, of intra-Community goods from extra-Community goods within those clearance centres. Some action and some thought by the Commission on these lines, we feel, would be most welcome.

We are, as I said at the beginning, all committed to the idea of the internal market. We all tend to lecture the Commission on how important it is to get on with this work. I think we do this a little unfairly, because the Commission and Mr Narjes, whom I am glad to see in his place, have been in the forefront of the attack on non-tariff barriers to trade. They have introduced many many proposals, all of which get blocked regularly in the Council. I think that honourable Members would be better employed, rather than preaching at the Commission here to get on with things, to go back home and preach to their national governments about getting the Commission's proposals implemented fast, because the delay, Mr President, does not lie in Brussels, it lies in places like London and Bonn and Rome and, dare I even say, Paris. And it is there we should be directing our fight for the approval of public opinion.

May I close with a warning. There are those who believe that the best way to promote the internal market is to discriminate against products coming from other countries. In other words, the internal market is a cover for external protection. One of the criticisms that was levelled at the Community in the early days was that it was an inwardlooking club for rich countries. I think it would be a great pity if we allowed ourselves to get trapped into a position that was outlined very clearly by Mr Seal in an earlier debate this morning, when he suggested that the price of European cooperation should actually be excluding goods from other countries wherever possible when they competed with European goods. That sort of internal market is not the one I believe in, and I think that we should be very careful to ensure that we build our internal market by improving our own systems, by making the flow of goods easier, as advocated by my friends, Mr von Wogau and Mr Rogalla, but not by leaving things as they are here and putting up all sorts of protective barriers to keep other people's goods out.

Mr Moreland (ED), draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Transport. — Mr President, the object of these directives, particularly the directive on facili-

tation, is to improve procedures at borders so as to reduce the waiting time for transport operators. The final decision is the responsibility of the Transport Council, but when it comes to the Parliament it is not the responsibility of the Committee on Transport but that of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Now, Mr President — and I am sure that as a member of the Committee on Transport you will agree with me — as the representative of the Committee on Transport I should complain loudly, particularly as at first sight the amendments of the Committee on Transport have not all been accepted. Nevertheless, my complaints are muted, because the rapporteur, Mr von Wogau, has done an excellent job and has accepted the main amendments of the Committee on Transport or improved upon them and has introduced good new amendments of his own. I hope the House will accept his report.

Nevertheless, committee jurisdiction is important in the sense that controls are introduced at borders for many reasons. But very rarely is consideration given to the difficulties they create for transport operators. Yet lorries can be delayed at some borders for an average of an hour. Railway freight can be shuttled for days across borders. Vessels on waterways can be passed from jetty to jetty because it is unclear which jetty should deal with the vessel.

The Commission's proposal, of course, does not remove the need for controls, but it is a useful start and should be generally welcomed. It is also to be welcomed that at the Copenhagen Summit the Transport Council was instructed to come to a conclusion on this directive quickly. We welcome much that is in the proposal, particularly the ending of systematic checks, express lanes, the harmonization of documents and improvements in the opening time at borders.

Nevertheless, there must be a question to the Commission, which is: could the Commission have gone further? As I stressed earlier, the proposal is only a step and has perhaps certain limitations.

First of all we believe that it should be clarified to cover all modes of transport, particularly in the context of Article 8 of the directive which refers to express lanes. The Commission's explanatory memorandum on this article appears, and I emphasize appears, to be primarily concerned with road haulage, whereas it should be made more clearly comprehensive to cover procedures at airports and at border railway marshalling yards. We in the Committee on Transport recognize that our original amendment was too detailed, and perhaps Parliament will therefore accept the amendment in my name which seeks to clarify Article 8.

Secondly, we very much agree with Mr von Wogau that the directive could be extended to cover the

Moreland

removal of unnecessary statistical collection and establish a computerized data bank on all matters such as opening hours of border crossings so as to provide an information service for all operators before embarking on a journey.

Perhaps I should say to the rapporteur, and indeed to the Commissioner, that the problem of unnecessary statistical collection is, I understand, particularly a problem at the German borders, so perhaps they might use their influence there.

Thirdly, we stress not only the importance of this directive but also of wider European agreement and agreement on the UN convention, the international convention on the harmonization of frontier controls of goods. It is important to have our procedures in line with third countries.

Finally, Mr President, may I ask the Commission and the Council yet again: why is it that we cannot get rid of such controls as the checks on fuel tanks at borders, the *carnet de passage*, the certificates of origin, which latter the Commission itself has declared to be illegal. Why does it not follow that up? It seems to me, therefore, that there is some more room for manoeuvre. Perhaps the time has come for a Member such as myself to ram this home by taking a trip across Europe and seeing how things stand. Other Members are doing the same. I might perhaps follow in the footsteps of my colleague, the deputy leader of my group, Captain Kirk, to prove what European law really is.

(Laughter — The sitting was adjourned at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES*Vice-President*

Mr Seal (S). — On a point of order, Madam President, I understand that there is in this Parliament building at the present time a delegation from South Africa. I wonder if you could tell us who invited them and whether they have met the President officially.

President. — I cannot give you an answer straight away, I will find out and have the answer read out in due course during the afternoon.¹

4. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time.

We shall begin with the questions to the Commission (Doc. 1-1094/82).

Mr Lomas (S). — On a point of order, Madam President, under Rule 44, Annex I, paragraph 3, which refers to guidelines for Question Time, I want to raise two serious points.

I submitted a question two months ago for an oral reply. This was kept off the agenda last month and I was advised that it was too long for a question for oral reply.

I checked with previous questions and can give you several examples of questions much longer than mine which have been received for oral reply. I advised your office therefore that I was not prepared to withdraw it. I was then approached by my own political group, because your office had been to the group secretariat asking them to try to persuade me to withdraw the question. I believe it is very serious, Madam President, firstly that questions should be excluded from the agenda and secondly, that my political group should be asked to lean on me to withdraw it.

I know it is an embarrassing question — it is about the issue of contracts to American multinationals. There is some very shady business going on probably somewhere, and I can understand the desire of people to keep it off the agenda. But there is no reason under the Rules for that to have been done, and I want to raise this serious matter and ask you to act under the Rule which I have quoted.

President. — Thank you for raising that matter, Mr Lomas. I am advised that your question is now under consideration by the President and you will get a reply directly from him. I, of course, cannot give you an immediate answer now, but it is under consideration.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls (ED). — Madam President, is it in the interests of Parliament to allow a part of the question, which was a very proper question, to carry with it innuendos suggesting that there are wrong motives behind the people who are organizing the machinery? To suggest that this question was not put on the agenda because, for policy reasons, people in charge of the machinery did not agree with the implication behind the question is dangerous and, I believe, unacceptable.

To suggest that the question was too long is a firm enough point to argue, but I do not believe that the record should stand with the suggestion that this ulterior motive was the reason for the question not being accepted.

President. — Lord Harmar Nicholls, both your intervention and the statement by Mr Lomas will be sent to

¹ Topical and urgent debate (objections): see minutes.

President

the President so that he can take note of what has been said in the House on this issue. Thank you for making that statement.

Question No 1, by Mr Kaloyannis (H-449/82):

I have received information that all the various material originating in the Member States of the Community and destined for the construction of the Russian gas pipeline is being transported in Russian vessels. Can the Council confirm whether this is true? If so, why did it not take care to prevent this state of affairs and what action does it intend taking to ensure that from now on these materials are shipped by Community vessels since the Community merchant marine has for some time been going through a serious crisis which is adding considerably to the number of unemployed in the Community and is increasing the number of Community ships laid up? As the Greek fleet accounts for 26% of the Community's merchant marine, the prejudice it suffers is particularly great.

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission — (GR) According to the Commission's information some construction materials for the gas pipeline have been transported in merchant vessels from the Community but most, it is true, have gone on Soviet vessels. As you know, when the terms of a sales agreement are cif it is the seller of the goods who has the right to choose the ship. In the cases when cif terms had been specified it was not certain that the seller of the product or goods could always use ships from his own country, or more generally Community shipping, since sometimes none were available and sometimes the freight charges quoted were not competitive. However, in cases when the terms of the sales agreement are fob it is the purchaser who has the right to choose the ship, and as you know, the Soviets generally favour and specify fob terms in sales contracts for the purchase of materials. This gives them the right to choose the ships used for transport.

Mr Kaloyannis (PPE). — (GR) I think the Commissioner's answer goes some way towards explaining the matter, but at our last sitting the representative of the Council of Ministers gave a different answer to the same question. He said, in fact, that he was not fully conversant with the matter but that it could be looked into. My question, then, was as follows: What were the possibilities open to us for influencing and exerting pressure on the Member States that were about to conclude these sale and transport contracts with Russia? That was the content of my question, and also whether during that phase any specific guidelines had been given by the competent Ministers in Council to the Member States, aiming to help the Community's merchant shipping which, as is known, has been particularly hard hit.

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) I would like to point out that the Community's policy on the subject of shipping is a policy of freedom, and we do not intervene during the procedure of allocating freight.

Besides, the concluding of sales contracts for materials from countries in the Community to the Soviet Union is a matter of negotiations between the seller and the purchaser, and I repeat that in this too, the Community cannot intervene. If the seller considers that it is more in his interests to sell fob, he will draw up his contract in fob terms, when the purchaser, in this instance the Soviet Union, will have the right to choose the ship. On the other hand, if the seller sells cif, then of course he retains the right to choose the transport vessel, but then again it is up to him to find a ship offering competitive rates and of course ships must be available. If in this situation too he finds a cheaper Soviet Ship it is obvious that his economic interests will lead him to choose the cheapest ship he can find. It is not possible for the Community to intervene in this purely commercial transaction — for that is what it is.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Would the Commissioner not agree that the Falklands crisis underlined the virtue of having a strong merchant marine, and what steps does he intend to take to ensure that the Community industry remains prosperous, or does he regard benign neglect as a policy?

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) The Commission shares the view that it is of course in our interests to have a strong merchant marine, and the policy of the Commission is to strengthen the maritime strength of the Community through whatever measures can be taken at an international, or indeed a Community level. However, I repeat that freedom of transport is the basis of its policy. This is the cornerstone of our policy. We strive for reinforcement by other measures designed to make the Community's shipping more competitive on the international market.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 2 will be answered in writing¹.

Question No 3, by Mr Maher (H-422/82):

What proportion of the finance used in the CAP for the support of European agriculture is going direct to farmers in the Member States and what proportion is being used under other headings, including administration, at European level and at the level of the Member States?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Firstly I would like to say that Mr Maher's

¹ See Annex II.

Dalsager

question is not quite clear to me, as it is phrased in such a way that it leads one to believe that Mr Maher thinks that the common agricultural policy functions in such a way that we pay money directly to the farmer. This is only done in very few cases. Therefore I can say that generally speaking, the agricultural policy works in such a way that we, for instance, guarantee the farmers some minimum prices that are secured by intervention purchases or the payment of export refunds. But in neither case would the money be paid directly to the farmer, but to those in charge of export, storage etc. Therefore the question is very difficult to answer if it does not become rephrased. But even then, it will be very hard to answer, because it implies that we must carry out a study of the national administrative costs as regards the common agricultural policy as we simply do not have these figures at the moment.

As regards the administrative cost at EC-level we can refer to the accounts and the budget, wherein the personnel dealing with these matters and their salaries are listed in order to enable one to see how large a proportion of the Community budget is used for administration in relation to the amount spent on the actual agricultural policy.

The other aspect appears to concern the methods by which European agriculture is supported. They vary considerably depending on which sectors are concerned, and which measures have been chosen to support the incomes. There is direct support for producers in certain cases. In other cases the support is given to the processing industry, thus giving an indirect support to the producers, in so far as the processing industry also consists of, e.g. administration and salaries and wages for the staff that process these goods.

On the other hand the measures used to carry out the structural policy also vary: there are socio-structural measures, mainly with a view to modernization of farms, and in the less-favoured areas to maintain the farms by granting farmers compensatory allowances because of physical handicaps; there are measures designed to improve production structures, e.g. conversion and re-planting. Finally there are measures to improve the marketing and processing networks.

Nearly all the measures within the first two groups imply direct payments. Whereas in the case of the last group the payments will usually be indirect payments to the farmers. Regardless of the nature of the various Community measures they all contribute towards supporting the farmers' income and improve the economic conditions of agriculture, whether they be paid directly or indirectly.

I can say that as far as the Guidance Section is concerned, then 232 m ECU, or 32% of the budget is used for structural measures; 300 m ECU, or 43% of the budget is used for production structures; for marketing and processing, which are typical examples of

indirect support for farmers, 172 m ECU, or 25% of the budget. I have, of course, also figures which tell the size of the percentages of the Guarantee Section budget allocated to various purposes; but in all cases there will be two kinds of support, namely direct and indirect support.

To answer the question with a thorough compilation of these figures would require the work of many men and women over a very long period of time. And I am not sure if that is really what Mr Maher is looking for.

Mr Maher (L). — I thank the commissioner for his answer, even if he did not understand what I was asking about, although to judge from his answer he must have some notion of what I was talking about. I could, of course, have asked a long-winded question, but I decided not to do so because I thought it would only confuse the issue. The trouble is that I have got one...

President. — May I suggest that you do not now give a long-winded explanation of your question but either put a brief question or put another question next time. You have a choice.

Mr Maher (L). — What I do want to ask the Commission is that, if they do not have the information about the proportion of the resources going to farmers under the CAP, then they should find out, because we are constantly discussing this problem in the House. We shall be discussing it in a month's time; the media talk about farming, and it is important for us to know exactly how much is going to farmers and how much to other people. Then we can begin to discuss the CAP on a more precise basis than before.

Could the Commission also tell us in precise figures — and I did not get this answer either from the Commissioner — exactly how much is being absorbed in administrative costs at Community level in relation to the policies that are being administered by the Commission?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) The administrative costs at Community level are evident from the published budgets and accounts. What is spent on administration at national level is not known to the Community, as these costs will vary country to country. What, for instance, is spent on processing costs, will also depend on the general level of expense and on the level of salaries and wages in the different countries. Therefore, what I am saying, Mr Maher, is: it will take a great amount of investigation and it will be extremely work-consuming to produce that precise information which Mr Maher is asking for. I do not think this large amount of work will yield a result which will satisfy Mr Maher, because it is evident that administration constitutes a very small part of the overall expenditure.

Dalsager

It is just as evident that the proportion that goes directly to the farmer will vary from country to country, and that it will depend on those points I have already mentioned. Therefore I think that it will be very difficult to produce this exact information. But I do believe that the vast majority of the funds used by the Community for the CAP, is spent on ensuring the farmers those prices which the Community has decided must be the minimum prices for their products; and — when all is said and done — that is what CAP is based on, and not on the proportion of money the farmer gets directly either from the Community or from the buyers or producers who process his products.

Mr Bonde. — (DA) I think that Mr Maher asked a very relevant question, and I understand completely that Mr Dalsager cannot answer it verbally. Therefore I would like to ask Mr Dalsager, if this question should be repeated as a written question, would he then be willing to give extensive answers with regard to the proportion of Community's finance which is paid to agriculture and to various other purposes?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) It is a well known fact that the Commission is always very willing to answer questions, even questions which are almost unanswerable. Part of this answer is to be found with the national governments, as many of the items we are talking about here are administered by the national governments. It can be difficult for the EC Commission always to know what proportion is attributed to wages, for instance, and what proportion of the price for a slaughtered animal goes to the slaughter house; what proportion is given to the farmer, what proportion to transport; what proportion is given to storage in the relevant country, etc. But, to the extent that we have the possibility to answer a question — involving an acceptable amount of work — we will, naturally, always do so.

President. — Question No 4, by Mr Moorhouse, for whom Dame Shelagh Roberts is deputizing (H-511/82):

In the light of Parliament's action against the Council under Article 175, does the Commission regard transport as a priority area for the allocation of staff and other resources?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The Commission has up to the present time been able to allocate sufficient resources to the transport sector to enable it to fulfil its obligations in the following three respects:

- (1) to initiate proposals to the Council on a series of major transport policy issues;
- (2) to carry out studies of urgent transport problems; and

(3) to monitor, where required by the relevant legislation, the implementation of Council decisions in the transport area.

The honourable Member will be aware that the Commission would welcome any new impetus given to the development of a common transport policy by Parliament's present actions and, in the event of any new decisions being taken by the Council, would take such decisions into account in the allocation of staff and credits to priority sectors and the establishment of its new budgetary requests.

In this latter respect, I would point out that in the past the Commission has seen its requests for additional staff regularly reduced by the budgetary authority. The additional resources made available to the Commission each year have in consequence to be shared out sparingly between the urgent priority sectors. If a major new initiative is taken on transport policy, the Commission would therefore ask Parliament and Council to take full account of the consequences of such an initiative in the examination of future budgetary requests.

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED). — Will the Commissioner accept from me that the Committee on Transport will be dismayed by that answer and probably Parliament as well? The Commissioner has reiterated that sufficient resources are available to implement transport policy which is currently in being, and there is no quarrel on that score. But the question is directed towards Parliament's action against the Council for failure to implement a transport policy in accord with its obligations under the Treaty, and I do not think the Commissioner, in his reply, addressed himself to that in any shape or form. It would be quite absurd for this Parliament to proceed, with — as we have been led to expect — the support of the Commission, in our action against the Council if the Commission have not made contingency plans, in the event of a favourable decision in the Court, to implement the Court's findings. May I now ask the Commissioner for an assurance that he will take very seriously into account the protest which I have just made, and may I also ask the Commissioner for an assurance that the Commission still share the enthusiasm and determination of Parliament to ensure that the Council does implement a transport policy in accordance with its obligations under the Treaty of Rome?

(Applause)

Mr Burke. — In reply to the honourable Member, I can understand the frustration which she and a number of Members may feel about the slow progress of the common transport policy, having had the responsibility myself for four years in the previous Commission. I therefore understand the first part of her supplementary question, but the second part I think I have

Burke

already answered. If in fact these major new initiatives do take place, I can assure the honourable Members of this Parliament that within the limits put on us — as I have explained in the latter part of my answer — the Commission will do what it can, subject to Parliamentary and Council approval of the necessary resources, to give effect, in staff and credits, to the results of such policies.

Mr Moreland (ED). — While the Commissioner may be correct in passing the blame largely to the other institutions of the Community, is it not also fair that the Commission should take some of the blame itself for not giving priority within the Commission to the subject of transport, and in particular by giving it very scant attention in the mandate of 30 May?

Mr Burke. — I have some difficulty in replying to that, because I was not around this Commission at the time of the said mandate.

I am sure that my colleague more particularly responsible can reply on another occasion to the transport aspect of the matter; but I would reiterate that, given the scarce resources available generally to the Commission for staff and staff policy, while one would have wished in the past to have more staff, we do the best we can. I can assure the honourable Members — and they know this from my previous responsibility — that as far as I personally am concerned I will do everything I can to help them on the road on which they have now embarked.

President. — Question No 5, by Mrs Ewing (H-518/82):

In view of the fact that more than 60 Spanish fishing vessels have gained access to fishing grounds and quotas in Irish and UK waters by registering in those countries, will the Commission state what measures are envisaged in the proposed CFP to prevent vessels from other countries (including vessels from other Member States) from gaining access to national and regional fishing grounds and quotas by flying flags of convenience?

and Question No 32, by Mr Harris (H-587/82):

How many fishing boats from non-EEC countries have been re-registered in Member States over the last three years and so have gained access to Community waters and what action is the Commission now considering in conjunction with Member States to deal with this practice of 'flag of convenience' fishing particularly by Spain, which has re-registered over 60 boats in the United Kingdom?

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) The Commission has no figures relating to the

number of ships from third countries registered with Member States of the Community in the last three years. As the Commission has repeatedly said in reply to both written and oral questions, the registration of fishing vessels with Member States is a matter for the competent authorities in those Member States, whose own legislation defines the conditions and preconditions for the registration of ships. Thus, the Commission has no authority to intervene directly in the matter. If Council eventually accepts the Commission's proposals for a common fishing policy and the regulation proposed by the Commission for a common system of conserving and managing fishery resources is accepted, then the Commission will examine the possibilities that might emerge from this regulation, for ensuring that the use of the quotas defined for Member States will indeed be confined to fishing vessels belonging to the Member States, and that there can be no circumventions by means of registration. However, as I have mentioned, Council has not yet decided and, I repeat in order to avoid misunderstandings, only when it does so will we examine what possibilities exist. There can be no positive order giving the Commission a right to intervene in Member States over their procedures for the registration of ships.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Would the Commissioner agree with me that it is an incredible answer to a very serious question when he states to this House that he doesn't know about the number of vessels? How can he justify his job if he doesn't know about this? Is it not true that 10 years of patient and painful negotiation on delicate, vital questions such as quotas and licences are totally undermined if this practice is not stopped? That is in the interests of all Member States who want to agree on a common fisheries policy, and most of them do.

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) As I have said, the procedures and conditions for the registration of fishing vessels in the Member States are governed by the competent authorities in those Member States. The Commission cannot intervene. We know that in recent years, in one country in the Community, namely Great Britain, fishing vessels from a country outside the Community have been registered and thus, since those vessels fly and circulate under the flag of their country of registration, they share in the exploitation of the quotas. However, I repeat that we are not empowered to intervene. The matter is in the hands of the competent authorities of the country that accepts the registration of those vessels. As for the exploitation of the quotas I would like to remind Mrs. Ewing that the apportionment of fishery resources between the Member States is not carried out according to how many vessels each country can lay claim to, and consequently that these registrations do not affect the apportionment. The apportionment is governed by criteria such as traditional fishing methods, the protection of the fishing populations of sensitive regions, and other criteria laid down by the Council of Ministers.

Mr Harris (ED). — Could I reinforce the point that the whole business of the common fisheries policy could be totally undermined if this dangerous practice is allowed to spread?

Can the Commissioner confirm that the United Kingdom Government has been in touch with the Commission to look for Commission action on this subject? My information is that they have been in touch asking and pressing for Commission action, because it is not just a matter for the United Kingdom. If that is the case, when on earth is the Commission going to take this action, or is the Commissioner just going to sit there and do nothing?

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) The Commission is first awaiting a Community decision for a common fishing policy, because this is the basis and cornerstone on which we can act. As I mentioned earlier, within the framework of this policy there will exist the possibilities for the Community to intervene in the sector of ship registration as well, but in the absence of any decision by Council concerning a fishing policy, the matter of registration remains in the hands of the competent authorities in the Member States, who should face the problem and take steps to avoid the registration of ships from third countries under their flags.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 6 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 7, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-546/82):

Are military aircraft manufactured in the Community placed at a competitive disadvantage, relative to similar aircraft of US design or manufacture, in those Member States which invoke Article 223 of the EEC Treaty as a straightforward entitlement to import products originating in the United States of America intended for use in the construction, maintenance and repair of military aircraft?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) In the Commission's view, the tax-free importation of military aircraft or components, in respect of which a majority of Member States invokes Article 223, does have an effect on the conditions of competition in this branch of industry.

In assessing this situation, the Commission must also take into account that decisions on procurement measures of this kind involve not only financial but also important military and political considerations. The Commission also knows that the step by step develop-

ment of a European defence industry will require a common internal market for armaments and a coordinated procurement policy. So, as I have shown, this question touches on some aspects of a complex political issue.

In practical terms the Commission, as it indicated in its reply to Question H-353/82, will for the time being continue to urge that the existing situation, characterized by autonomous measures taken by individual Member States, will be replaced by a Community regulation pursuant to Article 28. However, Article 28 calls for a unanimous decision and does not give the Commission the right of proposal.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — I agree, of course, with the Commissioner that this is a complicated issue, but what I would like to hear from him is the answer to this question. Does this mean that intra-Community aircraft trade is inhibited by bilateral agreements between individual Member States and America, or can I be reassured that in each Member State there is fair competition, if not a European preference, *vis-à-vis* the sales efforts of the United States?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) I think we should distinguish between three cases. 1. There are several suppliers in a Member State. In that case there are no competition problems. 2. A European firm wants to purchase and has several European suppliers. In this case there is not yet a European preference in the public procurement system. This subject will come on the agenda later. However, I expect that once the Genscher-Colombo proposal has been adopted, it will give us grounds for creating a European preference in the area of the procurement of European armaments. At present, however, there is nothing of the kind.

3. A European purchaser is faced with competing European and American firms. In this case too there is at present no preference for the European supplier. But the situation would change if our proposal on Article 28 was implemented. In that case the European producer would certainly enjoy a limited tariff protection.

President. — As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 will be answered in writing¹.

I would like to state for the benefit of Members — and I will ask the President of Parliament to write to all Members to this effect — that when they do put down questions, they should be here in the House when they are taken. This is particularly true of questions to the

¹ See Annex II.

¹ See Annex II.

President

Commission. We have had at least eight Commissioners sitting ready waiting to answer these questions.

(Applause)

It is quite disgraceful that Members are not here to put their questions. When they are not able to be here, they should at least get a representative from their group or a colleague to put the question on their behalf. I really think it is a great discourtesy to the Members of the Commission, especially when we ask them to come and answer on their own areas of responsibility to this House.

(Applause)

Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED). — May I point out that two very important questions on textiles have unfortunately already been omitted, precisely because those who claim to care for textiles simply are not here?

President. — I am well aware of that, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, and I think it is a very great pity that the House as a whole is deprived of the answers of the Commission because Members themselves have failed to meet their responsibilities by being here for their questions. I put it therefore to all of you — and I should be glad if you would raise it in your groups as well — that when Members cannot be present for some specific reason, they should ask their colleagues to take over the question. I take this opportunity of apologizing to the President and Members of the Commission that some of the questions put to them could not be raised in this House today.

Mr Moreland (ED). — Madam President, I am very apologetic. I should explain that I went out of the Chamber about seven minutes ago when you were on, I think, Question No 6. I really did not think that you would leap through six questions in just as many minutes.

President. — Mr Moreland, you should take nothing for granted in this world, especially when I am presiding.

(Laughter)

Mr Moreland (ED). — Madam President, with you I never take anything for granted.

(Laughter)

President. — Well, since you do not take anything for granted, I will allow you to put your question.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Madam President, while I am the very first to accept your strictures on those who do

not attend — and I myself really like Question Time and try to attend — I would say this, that Question Time keeps being changed. The very fact that there was a total switch between questions to the Commission and questions to the Council means that many Members have got their appointments arranged accordingly. I think your strictures — while I agree with them — were not justified because it was not the Members who created that change. And that change was quite unjustifiable.

President. — Thank you for making that point, Mrs Ewing.

Mr Beazley (ED). — Madam President, when Members have put down questions on which others want to ask supplementaries and have already notified the Presidency that they want to do so, would it not be more practical for those other persons to take over the questions? Otherwise the questions go by the board, the Commissioners sit here wasting their time and answers are not provided to current important matters?

President. — We will now close this discussion. I will raise this matter with the President and we will try and come to some satisfactory arrangement for dealing with all the different aspects of the problem that have been raised.

Question No 12, by Mr Moreland (H-561/82):

Recent reports have indicated that Commissioner Richard has been taking an interest in the membership of football clubs on behalf of the Commission.

What role does the Commission believe the Community can play to improve the state of European football?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Judging from the results of the last World Cup competition, it is clear that there is little call for action on the part of the Commission to improve the state of football in the Community, since three of our teams were among the four best in the world, which is no doubt the direct result of our support, although not of any action that we have taken.

On the substance of the question, as the honourable Member is aware, the Commission takes an interest in these matters in so far as they affect the free movement of workers, in this case professional footballers, whose status has been defined by the Court in two judgments. A number of arrangements have been concluded during the 1980s and we are watching the situation to ensure that they are being observed in the best interests of spectators and the Community.

Mr Moreland (ED). — The reason I put down this question was that I had read in the press that the Commission had recently been having talks with UEFA about the playing membership of certain clubs and the national make-up of certain clubs and discrimination against nationalities.

Can the Commissioner say anything about that? Also does he not think that there is a role for the Commission, as I have put to him before, in looking at the iniquities of the transfer fees scheme across Europe?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) We are concerned here with the professional footballer, since people who play this sport for pleasure are happily able to do so without reference to any rules other than those of the game.

As far as professionals are concerned, we and the various European federations have agreed upon an arrangement reconciling satisfactory operation of national competitions and compliance with the rules against discrimination between nationals of the Community, and my colleague Mr Richard has simply taken stock of the situation recently to satisfy himself that this arrangement is working properly.

The second question that you ask is concerned with the problem of transfers and contracts of employment; this belongs to another context and is not specific to this sport. Here again various legal discussions are in progress and the Commission is watching the situation to ensure that fair rules are applied.

Mr Seligman (ED). — I do not have a very serious question, but as a member of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport I feel that we do not give enough attention to the sporting aspects of football and I think we should do more to encourage the practice of amateur football as opposed to the professional football that Mr Moreland was referring to, particularly in the school curriculum. Football is a British invention, it is our contribution to the Community, and it should be taken into account.

President. — Was that a question, Mr Seligman, or a statement?

Mr Seligman (ED). — It was a sort of question.

(Laughter)

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) I thought that your comment was intended to draw my attention to the fact that a number of members who had put down questions were absent because they were playing football!

Mr Paisley (NI). — In view of the very fine performance of the Northern Ireland team in the World Cup series, would the Commissioner not agree that the people of Northern Ireland deserved to have their intervention butter before Christmas and not after Christmas?

(Applause)

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) I will leave Mr Dalsager to reply on the technical aspect, but I should like to say that in the days when I played football — some fifty years ago — oranges and lemons were distributed at half time, not butter; I should imagine that this is still the practice.

Mr Seefeld (S). — (DE) Now that Mr Seligman has established that football is an English invention I realise why Mr Moreland put his question. He seems concerned less about the state of European football than about that of English football.

But to be serious, Mr Commissioner. Some time ago you said you would talk to the UEFA about ways of abolishing the blocking clause which exists in some European football associations and under which there is no guarantee of the free choice of job in professional football.

I would be grateful if you could say what resulted from these talks and whether there is any prospect of the blocking clause being abolished and, if not, whether the Commission sees this as grounds for intervention.

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) The Commission took action in this matter several years ago when a worker who was a Community national suffered discrimination in regard to taking part in the championships. The problem of national teams, which have a different structure, is another matter.

We have been able to conclude, with UEFA and the various federations, arrangements under which it will be possible to eliminate these forms of discrimination in the Community. As a result, players who are nationals of other Community countries can now play in Italy. We had the impression that these arrangements were found to be generally satisfactory, bearing in mind that the numbers of people who can hope to play in these teams are not great.

My colleague Mr Richard checks whether the arrangements made are satisfactory on all sides, and we think that they are. Should this prove not to be the case, rest assured that we would take further steps in the interests of spectators, players and fair competition.

Mr Bonde. — (DA) I presume that football was not what one had in mind at the time the EEC Treaty was signed. Therefore I would like to ask the Commissioner when football became the resort of the EC authorities?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) When a footballer took his case to the Court of Justice, which found in his favour.

President. — Question No 13 by Mrs Lizin (H-571/82):

In a television interview on Sunday, 21 November, Mr Davignon stated that three Members of the Commission, Mr Ortoli, Mr Andriessen and himself, were dealing with the steel problem.

Does not the Commission consider it odd that Mr Richard is not also one of the Members involved, since the social implications are a matter of urgency for regions in difficulty such as Wallonia?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Two comments on this question. First, as the honourable Member is well aware, the Commission's decisions are always taken collectively, as the structure of that institution requires. Secondly, Mr Richard has on more than one occasion expressed his deep appreciation to the honourable Member for the kindness of her concern for the exercise of his responsibilities, which he has already mentioned in public during a meeting of the Ministers of Industry in Elsinore, and the absolutely essential responsibilities in the field of social affairs are being discharged most satisfactorily in the Commission and Community.

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) My supplementary question is as follows: The Commission is at present preparing a second social programme, the budget for which amounts to some 300 million ECU; I should like to know what priority is to be given to Wallonia's steel industry, bearing in mind that social aspects have now become a matter of priority in many struggling steel concerns.

A second supplementary question: To what extent will the Commission be taking account of the recent fire which has caused such devastation at one of the Cockerill-Sambre steelworks, creating even more difficult and urgent social problems in the past 48 hours?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Contrary to what the honourable Member thinks, social measures on behalf of steelworkers are not applied on the basis of quotas, nor according to any breakdown by country or company. These measures are applied in accordance with the ECSC Treaty in order to deal with problems as they arise. This, I

believe, is the extraordinary merit of the ECSC: It tackles practical problems, without concerning itself with proportional scales; in other words, social measures are adopted according to the seriousness of the problems concerned.

In the same spirit, the Commission has submitted practical proposals not only for social measures but also for conversion, proposals relating to the non-quota section. Consequently, account is taken of priority automatically, as soon as a real problem presents itself. Specific problems arising out of short-time working are dealt with through the agreements concluded between each Member State and the ECSC. There can therefore be no departure from these rules.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) I am interested in the material aspect of this question and the search for European solutions for the steel industry. Can I therefore ask whether the Commission intends to contact high-ranking figures and experts on this matter, to consider possible solutions in the steel sector in various Member States, and whether, in case it has not yet given thought to this, it will accept my proposal to establish contact with leading national experts and officials?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) I truly believe that, in the case of iron and steel, contact between those who are directly involved in the problems — whether structural reorganization or conversion, whether at national or regional level — and the Commission is organized on a systematic basis. More specifically, three persons who have the task of analysing these problems in the Federal Republic — and it is no doubt to this Mr Rogalla's question refers — will be having a meeting next Monday with Commission officials responsible for monitoring these problems, myself included.

Mrs Clwyd (S). — The Commissioner must be aware that Member States do not always play this according to the rules. If he remembers the situation in Britain two years ago when we had massive job losses in the steel industry, the then Social Affairs Commissioner, Mr Vredeling, said that the Commission was not consulted by the British Government or the British Steel Corporation about its plans to restructure the industry and that if it had been consulted, then it would have prevailed upon the British Government to take greater account of the social consequences of the job losses caused by running down the steel industry in Britain at that rate.

Can he assure us that this time the social and all the other consequences will be thought about more deeply as far as the United Kingdom is concerned, taking into account that last time round the Commission was not consulted and that the social consequences of the very rapid job losses in the steel industry have been excessive as far as the United Kingdom is concerned? Will

Clwyd

he please also assure us that other steel-producing countries will now take their fair share of job losses in the steel industry?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) I think that, since the time to which the honourable Member refers, the new legal instrument adopted unanimously by the Council — the Aid Code — has come into force. This instrument stipulates — and this is the only qualification in my reply — that where public aid is to be provided the Commission must be consulted and the programme to be implemented must take account of all relevant aspects of the case. These include the social impact of conversion since, unfortunately, as the Commission has indicated, the deterioration in the steel industry will necessitate further restructuring over the period to 1985, and this will inevitably entail more job losses.

Regarding the need for a display of solidarity with everyone in the Community working for a solution to this problem — without which there will be no solution — the Commission is very much aware of its responsibility and of the fact that nothing short of total solidarity will serve the purpose. If the objective that we have set ourselves is to be achieved, a combined effort from all concerned is required. The Commission is very mindful of this aspect of the situation.

Mr Bonde. — (DA) I would like to ask the Commissioner if it is not reasonable to make special allowances for the one and only steel works of a single Member State, considering that 'Det danske Stålværk' in Frederiksværk is based on recycling, and considering that Denmark is a big net-importer of iron and steel products from the other EC Countries? Will the Commissioner then make special allowances and avoid carrying out the tough quotas for the steel production in Frederiksværk? And, finally, I would like to ask the Commissioner if he would show us what re-structuring plans for the steel works in Frederiksværk that may have been designed in cooperation with the British firm of consultants?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) On this point it is clear that the Commission has formally recognized that Denmark and Ireland are special cases by virtue of having only small steel industries in comparison with others. It was this that led us nearly two years ago, under very difficult conditions, to find an arrangement under which the Danish steel industry was able to receive substantial State aid. Similarly, if we have allowed for possible exceptions, particularly in the context of the steel arrangement concluded with the United States, so as to find a balance between what is legitimate in view of the special situation and what is necessary in order to maintain the Community approach, I think that we have so far been successful.

Regarding the last point — structural reorganization plans — it is too early for the Commission to make any statement. As always, a number of concomitant plans are under examination and a decision will have to be taken as to which is the best. We are working on this at present and I feel that it would be premature at this stage to state a position on any of the formulas. We shall do so by the month of June.

Mr Seligman (ED). — My question is a long way from the television interview which was the original point, but I would like to take advantage of the presence of the Commissioner to ask him how it is that Italy has in fact been increasing its steel production during his period of office. Secondly, what measures does he intend to bring in to expand demand for steel and to resist the flooding of the European market by steel from outside?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) I think we can take it, Mr Seligman, that it is inappropriate to use words like invasion or flooding when referring to imports. The statistics prove the exact opposite. Over the past three years imports into the Community have fallen in proportion, whereas our exports have increased. I think we should be clear on this. I am not suggesting that there have not been problems here and there, but that is not the general pattern.

Secondly, it is true that the Italian steel industry has expanded, and this stands to reason since Italy, which had been lagging considerably behind other industrialized countries in developing its steel industry, invested in capacity in 1974, at a time when no one suspected what was going to happen. This capacity came on stream during the crisis years.

Moreover, the Italian steel industry has benefited from the advantages of competitiveness in the case of small electrically powered plants using a technological process which has proved very cost-competitive, having coincided with a slump in the price of scrap. Today, scrap is very much cheaper than ore.

This being the case — and I refer back to my replies to the two previous speakers in connection with the structural reorganization programme calling for a concerted effort — our discussions with the Italian Government will culminate in the Commission giving its agreement only if the two conditions of the Aid Code are fulfilled, the first of these conditions being a contribution to the reduction of capacity in the Community, given the structural overcapacity, the second being the organization of the steel industry on lines guaranteeing future viability.

President. — Question No 14 by Mr Bocklet (H-586/82):

President

Is it true that an information seminar with experts on electoral law has been held at the instigation and/or with the participation of the Commission on the European Parliament's proposal for a uniform electoral system, and on what grounds did the Commission not see fit to invite the European Parliament, the rapporteur on the draft electoral law, in particular, or any other Members concerned with this subject?

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) I should like to reply to the honourable Member that the Commission has not held any seminar on the subject of a uniform electoral system. But the honourable Member no doubt refers to what should more correctly be called a consultation of experts on electoral systems which was organized by our staff in a perfectly normal, not to say routine way, precisely for the purpose of preparing for the Commission's contribution to the proceedings of an expert working party in which the Council of Ministers had invited it to take part. Under the circumstances, as always in such cases, we consulted experts in order to obtain the necessary background information. This was not exactly a seminar on the subject of a uniform electoral system.

Mr Bocklet (EPP). — (DE) Mr President of the Commission, can you also make the results of this consultation, to use your term, available to Parliament or inform us of the results of this consultation? How will you follow up these results? And a last question: in this electoral law procedure, the roles are allocated in a different way from the usual system under the Treaties. Parliament has the right of initiative and the Commission is consulted. What is your view of this step from this aspect, for there is a risk that because of these special relations between Commission and Council, Parliament might forfeit its role as initiator in the introduction of universal suffrage?

Mr Thorn. — (FR) I would reply to the honourable Member that this consultation of experts took place in Florence in September 1982, as you probably know. If the Parliament's relevant committee wishes to discuss what was said, we shall of course be pleased to pass on the technical information. My colleague Mr Andriessen has been in contact with Mr Seitlinger, on 2 December last I believe, to brief him on what actually happened; there is therefore no reason why this exchange of information should not be enlarged.

Regarding the essential prerogative of this Parliament, I should like to underline — not once, but two or three times — that the Commission has pointed out to the Council how important it is for the European Parliament to be involved in its work. It has done so on many occasions and will not fail to do so again. We are essentially on standby, but when the Council asks us to send officials to attend this working party, we do, and as a result we are a little better informed. But

we have no intention — and nor does the working party or the Council — of depriving the Parliament of its right of initiative, least of all in this matter.

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED). — Would the Commission accept my assurance that there are a number of Members of this House who would regard it as perfectly appropriate for the Commission to wish to take expert advice on Parliament's proposals for a so-called uniform electoral procedure? Indeed, if the rapporteur had thought about it, it might have been appropriate for him to have associated himself with the Commission in taking that sort of objective and expert advice before he produced a report to this House. Had he done so, he might have produced a report commanding a greater degree of interest than total vote of Parliament, which I believe was less than 50% of all Members, would indicate.

Mr Thorn. — (FR) I have listened most attentively, but I do not think that the second part in particular of the honourable Member's question is addressed to the Commission, so that it does not call for an answer from me. However, I have noted the first part and assure her that we shall take all necessary steps to comply with what she suggests.

President. — Since they deal with the same subject, I call Question No 15, by Mr Kazazis (H-588/82):

Could the Commission inform the House of the terms of the Franco-Soviet agreement (signed by Mrs Cresson, the French Minister of Agriculture) providing for exports of cereals and sugar to the Soviet Union and can it assure us that the terms of this agreement are not contrary to the common agricultural policy or the rules on cargo sharing laid down by UNCTAD, of which France is a member?

and Question No 29, by Mr Hord (H-659/82)¹:

What agreements have recently been made between the Government of France and the Soviet Union for the sale of agricultural products?

What steps have the Commission taken to ensure that full information as to their agreements has been given to them?

What action is the Commission preparing to take to ensure that the provisions of the Treaties relating to trade agreements between a Member State and a third country are observed?

What is the estimated cost to Community funds if these agreements are implemented?

¹ Former oral question without debate (O-125/82), converted into question for Question Time.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Our Commission has indeed received a copy of the exchange of letters between the French Minister of Agriculture and the authorities of the USSR signed in Moscow on 15 October 1982, concerning the sale to the Soviet Union of certain agricultural produce and foodstuffs of French origin. The Commission has rightly carried out a detailed examination of these letters. While reserving its final judgment of the agreement in question, the Commission very recently, on 5 January 1983 to be precise, wrote to the Government of the French Republic pointing out the exchange of letters in question is in breach Article 113 and Council Decision 69/694 (EEC). In this letter we insist on acceptance of the exclusive competence of the Community in this matter, which the Commission is determined to uphold by taking the steps for which provision is made in the Treaty of Rome against any Member State which disregards Community competence by signing such agreements. Thirdly, in this same letter the Commission asks the French Government to provide further information and additional clarification.

Regarding the specific aspects raised by the honourable Member — and although no final assessment of these aspects have yet been made, as I mentioned earlier — the Commission considers that various aspects of the exchange of letters are incompatible with certain fundamental provisions of the Treaty of Rome, and in particular the principle of not discriminating on the grounds of nationality. However, having received certain very positive assurances from the French Government, the Commission is awaiting confirmation and further clarification, following which we shall be pleased to give you the additional information sought by this Parliament.

Mr Kazazis (PPE). — (GR) I thank the President of the Commission warmly for the answer he was kind enough to give to my question. This answer completely satisfies the question, because it confirms certain information that some quarters have attempted to discredit, and which if confirmed, implies a contravention of Article 113 of the Treaty of Rome.

I would like to ask, if after the clarification due to be given it is in fact established that there has been a departure from the principles of the Treaty of Rome, what measures will the Commission take in view of this violation, granted that we are all fully aware of the crisis affecting the Community's merchant fleets and particularly the Greek merchant fleet, about 25 % of whose strength is lying idle while according to information all this transporting between France and Russia is to be carried out exclusively by the merchant fleets of the two countries involved.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) I take the honourable Member's declarations as exhortations

addressed to the Commission, and it is as such that we note them, particularly as regards the transport aspect of the Soviet agreement, which is concerned essentially with foodstuffs. We are currently examining it. Here again, we are awaiting further information from the French Government. I shall not fail to bear in mind the concern expressed by the honourable Member.

Mr Hord (ED). — I am somewhat encouraged by the reply given by the President of the Commission. I would be grateful, however, if he could indicate to the House, at this stage, the quantities of produce involved, reported to include 10 million tonnes of cereals. Will he also confirm that no Community funds will be utilized for these sales?

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Given that we have intervened to remind the French authorities of the need to adhere strictly to the Community rules, it is impossible at this stage to talk of guaranteed quantities, which we are still discussing with the French Government. Should the honourable member's fears eventually prove to be founded, I shall be pleased to return to this question at the material time.

Mr Marshall (ED). — I thank the Commissioner for his encouraging reply on this discouraging agreement. Would he agree that what the French Government is trying to do is to institutionalize surplus food production which would cost the Community taxpayers very dear as well as introducing an agreement in breach of Community law?

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) I am not here to give notice of intent to take proceedings against the Government of a Member State. As the honourable Member's words make very clear, such a policy would be a bad policy. How, then, could a Member State take such a course?

President. — Question No 16, by Mr Bonde (H-355/82/rev.):

Can the Commission state which budgetary guidelines were put forward for Denmark during the ministerial meeting on 12 July 1982 and whether the proposed quantitative budgetary guidelines were drawn up in Brussels or in collaboration with Danish officials?

Before it put forward those guidelines, did the Commission solicit ideas from and hold talks with, for instance, the Danish Trades Union Congress, trade unions, pensioners' organizations, students' organizations, etc.?

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) The budgetary policy guidelines for 1983, which

Ortoli

were examined on 12 July 1982 by the Council of Ministers for Economic Affairs and Finance, were drawn up by the Commission in accordance with Article 3 of the Council Decision of 18 February 1974 on the examination of the economic situation in the Community, which takes place in the middle of each year. This article specifically states that the quantitative budgetary guidelines are considered on this occasion, and that they are not published.

In the case of Denmark, in common with all other Member States, the Commission made preparations by making contact as appropriate with national Government bodies and obtaining opinions from the relevant committees, specifically the economic policy committee and the economic and financial policy coordination group, on which all the Member States have high-level representation. As for contact with the social partners, our policy in this sphere is not directly connected with the budgetary guidelines. Nevertheless, before submitting the guidelines to the Council, we contribute to the drafting of two opinions by the Economic and Social Committee, one on the economic situation, the other on social trends in the Community; these opinions were adopted on 1 July 1982.

Mr Bonde. — (DA) I would like to ask the Commission if this economic advice could not at least be published *a posteriori*, in order that one could get a fair chance to find out to what extent the Member States obey these guidelines which are called binding in the directive? Furthermore I would like to ask the Commission, if they consider that the complete cancellation of the cost of living allowance, which certain governments have enforced, is satisfactory in relation to the Commission's guidelines?

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) As regards the opinions of the Economic and Social Committee — if I have correctly understood the question — they are published. There is therefore not the slightest problem on this point. In this connection, I would mention that in October, when all the work covering a year has been completed, we submit a report which is discussed — indeed all economic reports are discussed in this very chamber — and which gives an indication of the general outlook in the Community, including forecasts and discussing the context in which each of the countries will be pursuing its own economic activity and the implications in terms of compatibility with both national and Community objectives.

Regarding high cost of living allowances, I am not sure — and I apologize for this — that the translation into French is correct, because the term high cost of living allowance is extremely specific and applies only in exceptional circumstances. Perhaps you could repeat the question, since I do not think that you were referring to high cost of living allowances. An example

of a high cost of living allowance would be if, say, tomorrow morning it was decided to give people 50 Belgian francs a day because there had been a sharp rise in prices. Since this is not, as I understand it, what you are referring to, may I ask you to clarify your question so that I can reply more fully.

Mr Bonde. — (DA) It concerns the cost of living allowance — 'dyrtidsregulering' is the Danish expression, — and it is called 'indexation' in some of the other languages. I would like to ask the Commission if it is satisfied with, for instance, the cancellation enforced by the Danish government of the index regulations for the coming two years, or if one wants it completely abolished?

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) That could be the subject of a long debate. In July last year the Commission submitted a communication on the subject of indexation, indicating the types of problem which could arise if indexation were introduced on a widespread basis throughout the European economy. We recommended a number of developments which have in fact been taken into consideration not only in Denmark but also in other Member States, so that they are now part of the debate going on within each of the countries in our Community. I can therefore readily refer the honourable Member to the clear position of the Commission, which is expressed in unambiguous terms in the document submitted last July.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 17 will be answered in writing¹.

Question No 18, by Mr Gontikas (H-421/82):

Can the Commission definitely state whether the five grade A 2 posts originally allocated to Greece have recently been reduced to four, and if so, why? And can Parliament confirm that, before the end of 1982, persons will be recruited and engaged for the A 2 posts of director and the grade A 3 posts allocated to Greece under the Derogatory System?

In addition, would the Commission inform Parliament whether it is true that the delays in the A 2 and A 3 appointments are due to pressure on the part of the present Greek Government, which would like its nominees from among the ranks of PASOK to be appointed instead of those preferred by the Commission and selected on the basis of strict criteria?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The original intention of the Commission was to allocate five direc-

¹ See Annex II.

Burke

tor posts and twelve head of division posts to Greek candidates. For reasons of internal organization, the Commission subsequently decided to recruit only four Greek directors and to increase to fourteen the number of Greek heads of division.

It should be noted that the Council derogation under which most Greek recruitment took place, and which ended on 31 December last, did not and does not apply to the A 2 level appointments.

The delay in filling these important and demanding posts is due to the Commission's obligation to find the very best candidates available.

As for the head of division posts, at A 3 level, the series of special competitions was concluded at the end of last October and the nominations resulting from these competitions were all adopted by the Commission within the deadline established under the derogation. Not all of the posts have been filled, however, because one successful candidate has declined the offer made to him by the Commission.

It follows from this that there have been no undue delays in making these appointments, and consequently the question of pressure on the part the Greek Government does not arise.

Mr Gontikas (PPE). — (GR) I am surprised by the insincerity of the Commission's answer. I cannot accept that two whole years after Greece joined the Community no suitable candidates have yet been found to fill the A 2 posts. The Commission's statement is a provocation against all the Greek professional people whose applications, in entirely sufficient numbers, already lie in the Commission's archives today. The matter must therefore be transferred to a different dimension which is anything but flattering for the methods of selection by merit pursued by the Commission.

(The speaker continued his question in English)

Having said that, I call upon the Commissioner to answer clearly whether or not the reduction of the number of A 2 posts was made under pressure from the Socialist Government of Greece in order to get an A 3 post, as has already been mentioned by the Commissioner, for one of the PASOK candidates who finally did not accept the post, so that Greece is losing a post which now cannot be filled under the derogatory system.

Mr Burke. — I have already replied in some detail to the honourable Member's question and I would point out that at A level the Greek nationality have had more than 120% success in that particular and very important grade.

I would further say that if we take into account the whole gamut of Greek appointments in the Commission, and if we take a balanced picture as we should do, it can be seen that the recruitment has been extraordinarily successful. Greek representation in the senior grade of the Commission services is now proportionately ahead of that of any of the three Member States who joined the Community in 1973.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) I would like to submit a supplementary question to the Commissioner, but before doing so I would like to say, following Mr Gontikas' Greek-English intervention, that the only party which can level no criticism at the Greek Government on the grounds of partisanship is the New Democratic party, whose prime minister, when they were in power, had called for certificates of political affiliation for all Greek subjects due to work for the Community.

The supplementary question I would like to put to the Commissioner is: Is he aware that there is a great deal of disquiet among those working in the Community, both for the Commission and for the European Parliament, because problems of favouritism and various other problems do indeed arise, mainly in the Community's services? Moreover, is the Commission disposed to look into the case of the Auditing Council, where the wife of a Greek already working on the Auditing Council was taken on by a Greek superior without any competition?

President. — The Commissioner is not bound to answer this question because I think it is outside his competence to do so, but perhaps the Commissioner would like to make a comment on this.

Mr Burke. — I think I will avail myself of your very clear indication that it is not my responsibility, except perhaps with your permission to say, further to the general answer I have already given, that while I have given certain broad indications of magnitude, it is always to be remembered that there is no such thing as a legally binding quota for any nationality in the Commission services.

Mr Lagakos (S). — (GR) I would like to thank the Commissioner for his answer, which however seems vague to me, and I would like to know whether there is in fact some sort of collusion between Mr Gontikas and the Commission leading to the question and the answer given, because from what I know and from information I have received, there is still a great deal of favouritism so far as the appointments made by the Commission are concerned, and most of the Greeks — if not all — appointed to A 2 and A 3 posts are unfortunately all members of the New Democratic Party and were appointed on criteria other than merit alone.

Mr Burke. — I can assure the honourable Member that there has been no collusion between Mr Gontikas and the Commission or indeed myself in this matter.

President. — I must say, chairing this sitting at the moment, that I regret some of the comments that have been made on this particular question implying misconduct on the part of the Commission.

Question No 19, by Mr Lalor (H-433/82):

Will the Commission admit it has begun talks on the possibility of developing a 'two-speed' Community and state at whose request such talks have been initiated and how it intends to safeguard Ireland's position within the Community?

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Although the Commission did not moot any such idea, it is nevertheless of the opinion that it has a duty to examine — even on its own initiative — any proposal which may be favourable to the future development of the Community.

Consequently, although it has had absolutely no part in originating the idea of a two-speed Community, the Commission regards it as one among very many ideas for consideration, and it has a duty to make its voice heard. It is on this basis that we have made various comments, and in the past we have drawn attention to the dangers involved in the development of a Community comprising two groups of Member States moving ahead at different speeds.

Our position on this matter has not changed. I will therefore reply to the honourable Member that the Commission has no intention of proposing the abandonment of any part of the Community patrimony or of excluding a Member State such as Ireland — since he has mentioned that country — from its rights and obligations with respect to that patrimony.

Situations could nevertheless arise in which one or more Member States were unable to go all the way with the others along the Community path, or rather were unable to do so immediately and at the same pace. Unification of rules does not necessarily preclude all differentiation. As we have said on many occasions, differentiation can be necessary. Let me quote a few examples of differentiation, purely to illustrate what I mean. We have had differentiated time limits for the application of certain rules or temporary derogations, the transitional periods in connection with enlargement, the different agricultural compensatory amounts, the organization of the market in sheepmeat, the regulations on agricultural producer groups (whose application is limited to Belgium, France and Italy), the different margins of fluctuation. In the EMS, and the United Kingdom's opting out of the exchange rate and intervention mechanism. This is what we understand by differentiation, which is not

incompatible with uniformity of our law. I trust that this covers the essentials of Mr Lalor's question.

Mr Lalor (DEP). — I thank President Thorn for his reply. Quite frankly I had prepared two supplementaries, one in the event of his saying that they were guilty and the other that they were not. Can I have an assurance from President Thorn that Ireland, which he mentioned in this regard, will continue to benefit in a full and complete way from the revision of the European Regional Development Fund and the Social Fund and that the Commission will actively pursue and implement new policies seeking to reduce the imbalances between the Member States, Ireland *vis-à-vis* Germany, say, in relation to regional assistance?

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) To paraphrase a slightly different answer given by one of my colleagues, my reply to this supplementary question from Mr Lalor is: yes, yes, yes...

Mr Pesmazoglou (NI). — (GR) Since the matter is one of general political importance and since the meaning of the two speeds has been defined and made known from previous debates in Parliament, we can place a clear interpretation on what the President of the Commission has said, namely that there is no sense in which a two-speed Community is intended. Even Mr Lalor's comments do not refer to a two-speed intention. They relate to policies that are of greater interest to some countries than to others. However, this in no way implies two speeds. I think it politically necessary for the President to give a categorical answer on this point.

Mr Thorn. — (FR) No comment.

President. — Question No 20, by Mrs Castle (H-570/82):

Will the Commission state what increase in milk production it anticipates in the current year and where and in what way it proposes to dispose of the excess?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) The Commission estimated that milk production would increase by 2.5% in 1982 in relation to 1981. The rise in the amount collected will apparently be 2.7%, in so far as we have not yet the final figures. Considering the development on the internal market we can say that approximately 2.1 million tonnes of milk can be considered surplus production, which corresponds to 90 000 tonnes of butter and 179 000 tonnes of skimmed milk powder. The Commission has proposed to dispose of the surplus by using special arrangements in the case of an augmentation of the butter consumption in the Community, namely by granting consumer

Dalsager

aid to butter, by granting aid to butter and butter oil used in bakeries and ice cream factories, and also by the special sale of Christmas butter. As regards skimmed milk powder the Commission, amongst other things, has introduced the sale of extra quantities to the pigmeat and poultry sectors. In 1982/80 000 tonnes were sold there, and 250 000 tonnes are expected to be sold there in 1983.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mrs Castle (S). — But is it not a fact that some of this ridiculous surplus is to be disposed of once again by selling to third countries at cut prices much lower than the European consumer has to pay? Would it not be far better to avoid this nonsense by fixing the original price at a level which the consumer could afford to pay? And far from the Commission proposing, as it now is, that there should be a further approximately 3¼% increase in the intervention price of butter and skimmed milk in the coming year, should not the Commission demand a freezing of all prices in the surplus sectors until the surpluses have disappeared?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) It is completely correct, Mrs Castle, that when we sell agricultural products, including butter, from the Community to third countries, then the Community must sell under the same conditions as all the other countries dealing in this product. Otherwise we could not compete in the third country market. But, what Mrs Castle wishes, is that we cancel the common agricultural policy and, for instance, freeze the prices without regard to the income of our farmers. There is hardly a majority in the Community in favour of conducting such a policy, as I believe that there is general agreement that we have some obligations towards the farmers that we must fulfil in accordance with the Rome Treaty.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED). — Is the Commissioner aware that, welcome though the sales of Christmas butter were, there were a certain number of teething troubles? For example, Maryport in my constituency ran very short of butter because of some difficulty over the packaging. Would he take this on board for next year?

Would he further consider doing all he can to encourage the production of regional and local farmhouse cheeses, which are of a high value and would help to use up any temporary surpluses which may in future arise?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) I agree with the honourable Member that last year we did not have much time in which to prepare this sale of Christmas butter, and that this fact presumably has led to certain technical difficulties in the single Member States. I do hope very much — if we want to undertake a similar action next year — that that we can prepare better for this situation and in adequate time. It does not solely depend on the Commission if the decisions that are to be taken in this context are in fact taken in their own good time. If we want to continue these actions, we must have more time for technical preparation, so that the difficulties referred to by the honourable Member, do not arise again.

With regard to the cheese production in the Community, the fact is that it has certainly risen. But so has the consumption of cheese, more so than for instance the consumption of fresh milk and other milk products. Therefore cheese production in the Community may have had slightly better conditions than other forms of milk production. But apart from that, it is up to the producers themselves to choose whatever products they presume will sell best, and which will render the highest profits.

President. — I declare Question Time closed.¹

Mr Marshall (ED). — Madam President, I would like to raise a point of order about the order in which questions are printed. Question No 13 was clearly received by the secretariat no earlier than 22 November, and it may well have been received later than that. My question, which is No 25, was certainly received before then. I would like to know why my question is at No 25 and not ahead of No 13.

Furthermore, all the questions have an index number, which, I suggest, probably relates to the date on which they are received. Yet those index numbers do not bear any relation to the order in which they are printed.

President. — Mr Marshall, I shall consider the matter and let you have a reply as soon as possible.

5. *Intra-Community trade — Turnover (continuation)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the internal market.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) Madam President, I have been asked to present the opinion of the Socialist Group on the von Wogau and Welsh reports and to

¹ See Annex II.

Rogalla

say that essentially we fully agree with both. We are pleased that once again the European Parliament can give its support to the important work being done on the internal market by delivering its opinion. We will vote in favour of the amendments tabled by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and those tabled by Mr Moreland.

We have one criticism to make about one of these amendments, since it calls for conflicting procedures and rules between the Community and third countries to be reduced to the minimum. After considerable doubt, we decided to vote for this amendment too, although in our view it could bring new harmonization problems into the debate. Perhaps this is not the moment to burden or complicate the already difficult adjustment between Member States on the internal market with further demands for harmonization and new provisions relating to wider legal frameworks than that of the Community.

A further remark on the amendment on committee procedure which calls for the provisions to be amended in such a way that the European Parliament can also be heard during this procedure.

May I urgently request the Commission to approve this amendment in spite of any systematic doubts and to defend it before the Council simply because — given that the committee procedure is an institutional procedure — the fact that the European Parliament represents the people and is close to them certainly enriches and gives more depth to the proposals. If there are any doubts as to formalities, I can to some extent alleviate them by saying that our proposals in fact provide for a three-month time-limit and that the procedure can continue uninterrupted if Parliament makes no proposals during this time-limit.

I must not miss this opportunity, as a former official of the German Federal Customs Administration, most strongly to support Mr Welsh's proposals in his report. For I think that many of the duties of the customs authorities at the external borders must be assumed by a European agency and European officials if we really want to create the internal market and abandon superfluous controls, if only to counteract any doubts as to the trustworthiness of this or that national administration. The simple fact is that as a result of traditional developments in our Member States prejudices have arisen here and there. These can best be counteracted by building up a common customs administration. I know there is no legal basis for this yet in the Member States or the Community, but as always in the case of good ideas and important matters, nothing prevents us from creating such a legal basis.

I therefore conclude my brief opinion with the above appeal and hope that the Commission, with its facilities and contacts in the Member States, will work very

actively to ensure that this happens in the foreseeable future, within a period of five years.

(Applause)

Mr Beumer (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, everyone is deeply concerned in this Parliament and elsewhere at the problem of employment, and in particular the question of the specific European contribution that we might make. Is it not true that one of the most European, most practical, most feasible and most useful contributions could be much more thorough exploitation of a freer domestic market? When we read the explanatory statement in Mr von Wogau's report we are astonished to see that 5% of turnover in goods crossing our frontiers has to contend with barriers; this creates huge costs. These resources could far more usefully be employed to create a more dynamic market and encourage investment. It is therefore particularly desirable to emphasize the important links between this threatened market, the inextricable links within our market and the need to take action to improve the employment situation; I am pleased to note that these observations were made in Copenhagen. Against that background we welcome the reports by Messrs von Wogau, Rogalla and Welsh.

If I may be allowed to comment briefly on Mr Rogalla's report, I would point out that one of our important principles is that the processing of VAT at every stage from calculation to collection should be effected between the Member States in exactly the same way as it is within the individual Member States — as emphasised in the Rogalla report. We believe that despite the remaining tariff differences which should be reduced, the situation can be helped by making use of technical facilities — I have in mind the use of electronic data processing and support provided between the individual countries.

In this connection I should like to ask three questions: can we assume that the assistance in taxation matters at present given between the Member States could be made more effective to deal with the problem raised by Mr Rogalla and also included in the proposals put forward by the Commission, namely much better processing of VAT — not simply at the frontiers? Because there can be no substitute for the harmonization of legislation we would hope that the Commission will go much further towards harmonization which is necessary if we are to liberalize the domestic market.

I should also like an answer to the question raised in the Rogalla report: should it not be possible to do away with frontier barriers in the case of goods which are subject only to VAT? I should like to hear the Commission's conclusions on this point. I know, Madam President, that certain objections have been made to these proposals; they are mentioned in the Rogalla report — I have in mind the possible objections of the public authorities from the angle of cash

Beumer

flow and as regards the greater possibility of fraud — but I do think that, given the much better technical facilities now available and the good experience gained in other countries, the advantages to the tax-payer, to industry and to the public authorities far outweigh the drawbacks. My group will therefore unreservedly support the proposals contained in the Rogalla report. We therefore also support the Commission's proposal and would encourage the Commission to achieve much greater progress in this area.

Mr Turner (ED). — Madam President, on behalf of my group I would first of all like to say that we support all these reports.

Secondly, I would like to say that we congratulate Commissioner Narjes on what he has done. I think he has found the basic answer to the question of customs delays: it is in the concept of one uniform document. As Mr von Wogau said earlier, he is killing all the birds with one stone.

The great point about this singular document is that it accompanies the goods from the start of their journey to the end and is basically unchanged throughout the whole procedure. That makes it impossible for national authorities to start practices of their own that diverge from those of other countries, which, of course, cause the delays.

It will be a revolution. I believe, if we achieve this simple objective. The exporter will now fill in the form, and he is the best person to do it because he knows what the goods are. He is the one who is most concerned to have a successful transfer of the goods. In the past the exporter has had to face unknown and uncontrollable difficulties when his goods arrive at the border of the country to which he is exporting. Now this will change. Now the onus will be on him to get his forms right in the first place, and they will go through with the goods from one end of the journey to the other. I think it will be a great incentive to him to fill in his forms accurately.

I represent a fairly important set of ports: the haven ports of Felixstowe, Harwich and Ipswich. There quite often the difficulties arise because goods arrive on the quay of which the importer does not know all the details because they have not come with a form filled in by the exporter which will deal with the problems raised by the customs of the importer. Now that is the basic principle.

Secondly, I would say this. I have seen the draft of the single document and I believe it is basically what we want. It has a common classification code for all goods, which will probably amount to eight digits. Those digits will cover all the statistics that any government should want, and all governments will have the same statistical information because they will all be using the same code. You will note, Madam

President, that the committee has already proposed an amendment to Article 6 of the relevant directive to say that statistics should not be allowed to add to the delay of goods crossing a frontier. It is most important, therefore, that we have this one common code.

There will be seven copies of this document. The consignor gets one, the consignee gets another, the various authorities get the others. The important thing from the point of view of the customs services is that both the consignor and the consignee sign the document, and therefore they will have the guarantee that they need against fraud and error. In my constituency this matter has been specifically raised. There need be no checks because both the consignor and the consignee will have signed the document.

Madam President, I have consulted with the port users in my constituency in Felixstowe and Harwich for six months on this and, of course, they have fears about any change as people normally do. They also have fears that the customs services may not adopt the proposals; that they will be rejected. But I believe that we can succeed here if we can persuade the national authorities to accept the proposals that the Commission is now putting forward. If we in the European Parliament can join with the Commission and say to the Council that they should act now, I believe that it will produce the biggest breakthrough in speeding up transit inside the Community that we have had since the EEC was started.

Mr De Gucht (L). — (FR) Madam President, the attainment of the domestic market is a cornerstone of Community commercial policy. At a time when protectionist trends threaten the very existence of the Community from both within and without, a strong common transport policy is more than ever necessary to support the internal market. It is regrettable that such a policy has not been laid down more effectively at an earlier stage and we cannot criticize the Council's negligence in this matter too highly. However, it is not enough to point an accusing finger at the Council. We therefore endorse the report by Mr Rogalla and Mr von Wogau who have emphasized, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, the importance of transport policy and the urgent need to take appropriate action. The Rogalla report rightly points out that the harmonization of tax legislation in the Member States is a necessary condition for further strengthening of the market. That was apparent too from the Council's reply to Mr Seefeld's pertinent question when he asked what had actually happened about the demands which Parliament had put to the Council as long ago as 1979.

In addition to a number of other arguments, the Council referred for the first time to the lack of fiscal harmonization. More specifically, the harmonization of VAT presupposes identical tax rates. There is also no uniformity at present as regards the point in time at

De Gucht

which payment must be made. In principle VAT is paid on importation but simplified procedures are applied between the different Member States so that in practice there is a degree of harmonization. I might also draw your attention to what happens in the Benelux which is a very good example of how things should really be done. The fiscal problem must also be solved to prevent the Council from using it as a permanent excuse for its lack of energetic action on transport policy.

The report by Mr von Wogau lends support to the Commission's proposal concerning the simplification of formalities and controls in the transport of goods and for greater flexibility in trade flows within the Community in general. A number of structural adjustments at our frontiers would already provide a measure of improvement. There is still far too little difference between controls at the external frontiers and controls at the internal borders of the Community.

As regards transport documents the same considerations apply as to fiscal provisions. If these documents are harmonized the crossing of frontiers and processing of traffic in general will become easier. The consolidation of transport policy clearly has both practical and technical aspects. Practical in the sense that border crossing infrastructures will have to be adapted as regards staffing policy, opening hours and so forth; technical, since it is essential to harmonize tax provisions and formalities. In the normal course of events technical measures precede practical developments. For that simple reason we must make sure that investments in frontier posts, however well intentioned they may be, do not create infrastructures which then acquire an existence of their own and a right to continue to exist in future. Once technical barriers have been eliminated these infrastructures would be an obstacle to the effective opening of our domestic frontiers.

I have almost finished, Madam President. The difficulties are not insuperable. Transport policy must be revitalized and there is reason enough to do so. Firstly, trans-frontier goods and passenger transport represents an enormous cost to commercial transactions. Secondly, the smooth movement of goods and persons has an enormous psychological impact on European citizens. Thirdly, a healthy transport policy must form part of the basis of the internal market which will determine the Community's commercial policy. A strong internal market is essential if Europe is to play its part in instilling fresh vitality into the world economy. But there can be no internal market without an appropriate transport policy.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mrs President, may I begin by warmly thanking Mr von Wogau, Mr Rogalla and Mr Welsh for their most stimulating and positive reports. With these three reports, they have successfully concluded the activities

of 1982. In our view, we managed in that year to enrich an important area of intra-Community trade by the practical implementation of earlier intentions and proposals, by creating the conditions for a rapid decision in 1983 — we hope. Large areas of our proposals comply with the suggestions made in this Parliament since 1978/79, under the heading 'introduction of the Benelux system at Community level'.

I very much hope Parliament will continue to give its support in the coming months too. At any rate we have not heard any misgivings voiced during this debate. We are all the more dependent on such support in that we should make no mistake about the nature and obstinacy of the opposition we will have to face in implementing these proposals. The combination of bureaucratic opposition and some opposition from the middle ranks of the large undertakings is one form of resistance. In both areas there is resistance to change, and in both there are attempts to retain minor assets without consideration of the political implications and disadvantages this would entail overall. We hope we can overcome the opposition. And now we come to the guidelines of our proposal.

Basically, the Benelux procedure destroys the widespread theory that substantial progress in the simplification of intra-Community trade is dependent on prior harmonization in the most varied sectors, such as indirect taxation, statistics, etc. Such objections, which we hear all too frequently and which have prevented any progress for 25 years, ignore the fact that a procedural differentiation between intra-Community trade and foreign trade is an essential prerequisite for approaching anywhere near the ultimate target of intra-Community trade, which is surely to remove any form of control or document and not just to produce standard forms.

We have made considerable progress along this road with our proposal. The critics, who can often not see the connection, mistake the aims and the requirements which we must respect when pursuing them. Moreover, the more than 10 years of experience in the Benelux show that even if different tax rates and other administrative provisions remain in force for the time being, this still leaves considerable scope for rationalization and the reduction of formalities. We are concerned with exploiting these rationalization possibilities as far as possible in the initial stage. Certainly this also demands a change in the attitude of those involved. In particular, it means abandoning the idea that as long as the least little differences in the legal systems of the various States have not been completely harmonized, each administration will continue without question to follow the same procedures and defend them, with total complacency and sealing itself off as far as possible against outside influences. This applies, for example, to their own particular customs documents and formalities.

We know what this would mean in practice in the case of 10 or even 12 Member States. We are taking three

Narjes

major steps towards the creation of a genuine internal market; firstly the introduction of the so-called single document; secondly, relieving the burden on the customs offices in collecting VAT; and thirdly, the simplification of controls and formalities in the carriage of goods. I need not again describe the single document. It has received the attention it deserves in the reports and the speeches made today. The Commission completed its deliberations on this single document, which is to be put into circulation, shortly before Christmas and forwarded it to the Council with the request that it would also consult Parliament on it. We hope Parliament will be able to express its views without delay on the Commission's proposals regarding the actual formulation of this single document. We urge speed because if possible we would like to be able to take full account of the outcome of your discussions when we consider the first package of reports towards the end of the first quarter of 1983. May I suggest that perhaps the simplified committee procedure under Rule 33 of the Rules of Procedure would be most suitable in this case, so that the outcome may be decided rapidly.

The second part of our reform proposals — the deferred payment of VAT on imported goods at the tax offices of the Member States — is, in our view, also of signal importance. Here again we want to change an obsolete ritual.

Again the arguments have received sufficient attention already, so I need not repeat them. And here again I urge that this step be taken and the proposal implemented as soon as possible.

The third part of our proposal, facilitation of formalities and inspections in intra-Community trade, aims at simplifying and speeding up border formalities in respect of the carriage of goods by a package of organizational and practical individual measures. We regard this as a first rational step towards tangible simplifications. The remainder must come later. These simplifications will not be purely administrative and for the convenience of those concerned, but will also have a considerable impact on costs. I shall refrain from talking in hundreds of millions, given the differences in methods of calculation depending on the assumptions on which these savings are based.

Lastly, I offer special thanks to Mr Welsh for his report on increasing the number of customs personnel at the Community's external borders and the elimination of controls at the Community's internal borders. He is responsible for making us more aware of certain important organizational aspects of our policy of simplification. We have spoken of this matter many times in this Chamber and called not only for a uniform European customs law but also for a European customs administration as a medium-term aim. Mr Welsh's report shows the way to achieve this aim by various practical measures, and especially by indicating practical means of simplifying border formalities. Everything that points in that direction is good, pro-

vided it does not call for any additional buildings or investment at the borders, since all these measures are designed to be a transitional solution before total abolition, and must not lead to new buildings, to new bricks and cement at the borders.

In conclusion I would like to say a few words about some of the amendments — we are in full agreement with the majority — and to let you know our views on them. Firstly, there is Amendment No 5 which refers to Community EDP banks. In principle we are for this proposal, but cannot support it until we have carried out a feasibility study to establish whether we are really aware of all the implications of this technical change and whether it really would bring progress.

We have slightly more reservations and doubts about Amendment No 10 to Article 4(2) which calls for a clause to the effect that translation may not be required if the declaration is drawn up in a language normally used in international trade. The question of language in customs formalities is a very thorny one and has become highly political. May I once again request the authors of this amendment to reconsider all its aspects in detail. Our doubts primarily concern the words 'language normally used in international trade'. There is no reference material for this at all. The interpretation of this concept would give rise to disputes and cause more difficulties than it would bring benefits. The formula we have chosen has already been used successfully in other Community legislative documents. We have particular reservations about accepting your formula because negative conclusions could be drawn from it, i.e. anything drawn up in other, not internationally used languages must automatically and in every case be translated in full and integrally. That would be a further barrier to trade and not a simplification. I am only pointing to these few aspects in order to ask you to look at Amendment No 10 again before voting on it.

We then have Amendment No 11 to Article 8(a), introduction of a new article to determine the procedure for urgent consignments. On this matter we have no quarrel with Parliament, but we do think that the procedure you propose would result in unnecessary delays, complications and slowing down of the accelerated procedure we are aiming at.

Surely we should leave the details of the accelerated procedure to the implementing provisions and not set them out in full in a legal act or regulation. A legal act cannot by its nature include such details, for example on the use of computers or suchlike, which will of course be needed. Implementing provisions and legal acts would be unnecessarily intertwined, with the result that the slightest change of practice would require a change of law and could not be corrected by amending the implementing provisions. That is why we also have reservations of principle about Article 155 which, as you know, the Council of Ministers has unnecessarily curtailed and limited but which

Narjes

we, on the contrary, must expand if we are to manage to conduct the day to day affairs of the Community competently. Your proposal also curtailed Article 155 and for that reason alone would not be compatible with the institutional aims pursued by Parliament in other committees and other contexts. The same applies indirectly to Amendment No 13 to Article 14(3). In the form in which you have proposed it, it would lead to a delay of up to three months in the decision-making procedure on matters which fall within the terms of reference of the executive body and, secondly, it would adversely affect and restrict Article 155, which is precisely the one we aim to expand so that we can make rapid and meaningful decisions. If we are unable to act in the executive area, the Community will do itself further unnecessary damage. So I would be grateful if you could take into account my remarks on these two articles.

Lastly, we accept without reservation the supplementary amendment by Mr Rogalla tabled today.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

6. Parliament and discharge for 1980 — Discharge to the Commission on the implementation of the budget for 1980 — Embargo on exports of cereals to the USSR in 1980

President. — The next item is the joint debate on

— the report (Doc. 1-760/82) by Mr Key, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on

- I. the accounts of the European Parliament and the discharge in respect of the 1980 financial year
- II. the discharge to be granted to the Commission on the implementation of the budget of the European Community for the 1980 financial year and the report of the Court of Auditors (Doc. 1-820/81)
- III. the discharge to be granted to the Commission of the European Communities in respect of the utilization of the appropriations of the fourth European Development Fund in the 1980 financial year
- IV. the comments accompanying the decision granting a discharge on the implementation of the budget of the European Communities for the 1980 financial year (Article 85 of the Financial Regulation of 21 December 1977)
- V. the discharge to be granted to the Commission of the European Communities in respect of the activities of the first, second and third

European Development Funds in the 1980 financial year

- the report (Doc. 1-1003/82) by Mr Battersby, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the budgetary control aspects of the 1980 embargo on deliveries of agricultural products to the USSR.

Mr Key (S), rapporteur. — Madam President, the Treaty of 1975 strengthened the powers of this House insofar as the control and use of Community funds were concerned. This Treaty also reinforced public accounting practice and capacity of this Community. Within the European Parliament the Committee on Budgetary Control has been given the responsibility for carrying out the continuing supervision of the implementation of the Community budget. This work has entailed checking both the legality and the regularity of expenditure, investigating allegations of fraud affecting Community funds, developing techniques of examining cost effectiveness of expenditure, and we have had to cooperate with, and we are desirous of cooperating very closely with, the Court of Auditors and other spending committees of this House.

The Parliament and the Committee on Budgetary Control look upon this role from a very political point of view. As far as possible we try to cooperate with the other institutions.

The major power of this House, and of the committee, is to be able to grant or refuse the discharge of the budget within our control, within the financial regulation. When this House grants discharge, it indicates to the Commission and to the other institutions that the management of Community funds during that relevant year has been found to be sound, regular and cost effective.

If this House decided to refuse to grant discharge, it would in fact be tantamount to saying that the Commission has misused resources available to it. That should be a very political pronouncement. Indeed Mr Tugendhat, in very many statements he has made, has recognized this on behalf of the Commission.

In carrying out the work the committee has been concerned with looking after the Community taxpayer's money. That is what we were elected to do. For behind the granting of discharge we look a good deal at very complicated technical problems much of the time. Indeed in the spring of last year, when we looked at the 1980 budget, when we considered the Court of Auditors report, we found that there were many issues that needed clarification and further investigation. But we did recognize in this House, and the House agreed, that it was not the moment to refuse discharge. We took a middle course and we asked the Commission to go back and give us answers on 11 issues. We gave them until 1 September to provide answers to us.

Key

All I can say is that the Commission responded totally both in written form and verbally to us, which meant that in September the committee was able to listen to and accept the statements made by the Commission. I think you can see from my explanatory statement that we got many reassurances and many comments from the Commission which we found acceptable. I know a number of colleagues who are also pleased to be able to see texts provided to them by the Commission on many issues which were causing concern to this House.

We accepted many of the assurances that the Commission have given and we are very grateful for many of their statements. We also took account of the real progress that has been made from April 1982 until the present time and we give due credit to the Commission and their staff.

The decision before use today is to grant discharge, and I think it is important to record exactly what we are granting discharge for. First, we are going to grant discharge to the President of the Parliament with respect to the budget of our own institution. In particular I would ask Members to refer very carefully to paragraphs 2 to 8 of this proposed decision. I know my colleague Mr Schön will also be speaking on this, because this House has been very concerned about the problems within our own institution. All I can say is that those discussions will continue and progress.

The second decision on discharge is what we grant to the Commission.

The third discharge is on the European Development Fund.

The point about the Commission discharge is that there is a harmonious relationship between the Commission and ourselves, and I know that we can move on with that.

My position in the committee has always been that I do not go in for a lot of flowery speeches or verbal inflation. Indeed many of my comments, I would say, have been very polite. But that does not prevent us from feeling the binding character of the assurances that the Commission have given to us. They are very important and we will be following them very carefully.

The element of the discharge we have to grant is in respect of the Commission's activities in relation to the European Development Fund. We have been very concerned in this House about this fund. We do grant discharge on that and I hope that all those issues will be covered by them.

Can I just now turn to the issue which has given us most concern. At this stage I do not just speak on behalf of the committee, I speak on behalf of the

Socialist Group because I understand that we have run out of time today.

I have not, nor have any of us, yet spoken about the 1980 embargo problem. This has been a vexed question for the Committee on Budgetary Control, and we have had many debates in this House on the issue. I know Mr Battersby will be raising it in his own report.

The real work of the Committee on Budgetary Control, which has the full support of the Socialist Group, is concerned with the effectiveness and legality of the embargo imposed in 1980. We have no intention as a group of intruding into the spheres of responsibility of the Committee on Agriculture or the Committee on External Economic Relations. But I think I must say this: the political wish of Parliament and the Council in 1980 was not respected. There was also an information failure within the Commission.

Further, there was a failure to pass on the news of this breakdown of the embargo until it was far too late in 1980 to do anything about it. This was a very complex and worrying issue for us all. As I have said, I know Mr Battersby will be pursuing it. We have slight differences with his group on some of the amendments, but the point is that the Commission has given us very extensive written statements on the embargo and from our point of view, both as a committee and as a group, there is no longer a problem concerning discharge.

The final point I want to raise, on behalf of the committee, and which has given us grave concern, is the importance I attach to very sound management policy within the budgetary control context. This applies both to the Commission and to the House itself. I accept that, by any yardstick, to operate within an international community, an international organization, is very difficult. In spite of all the criticisms we get, we are fairly efficient on many things. Indeed at many levels, especially at the middle and lower ranges of our staff, the standard is very good.

However, there is always room for improvement, especially at the top levels of responsibility. There are cases where officials have been promoted and have kept their old responsibilities. There have been instances of inadequate delegation within directorates-general. Directors have often failed both to initiate and direct. Many times directors and director-generals have lacked management techniques which are desirable in any institution; I think there is a real need for frequent mobility of directors and directors-general. When we deal with staff matters, we deal with a substantial chunk of the expenditure of this Community. In those matters efficiency should be the keynote and we should continually seek reforms.

Before closing my remarks, Madam President, I would like to pay a special tribute to the chairman of our committee, Mr Aigner, and to all the members of the committee who submitted excellent reports and work-

Key

ing documents to me. I would also like to thank the Members and staff of the Commission, and in particular Mr Tugendhat, with whom I have often not seen eye to eye on many issues. Indeed we had a big argument not many months ago. But I really must say that he has worked hard at pulling together the responses to the Commission and I am very grateful for that.

I would also like to record the help that I have been given by the staff of this House at all levels. That has been very important to me.

The discharge procedure is very complicated and often tedious, but it is a very important instrument for safeguarding the taxpayers' money. I think that this year we have strengthened this instrument and have reinforced the effectiveness of this House. The examination of the way in which the Community budget was spent and the preparation of the discharge debate are major responsibilities conferred on this House by the Treaty.

I think I can safely say that the reports put before you today, drafted by the Committee on Budgetary Control, fully reflect our mandate.

It is with these words, Madam President, that I recommend the 1980 discharge for the institutions to this House for approval.

(Applause)

Mr Battersby (ED), rapporteur. — Madam President, this House has attached very great importance to various aspects of the failure of the 1980 embargo on the export of agricultural products to the USSR. The embargo was introduced early in 1980 following clear political pronouncements by Parliament, by the Council and by the Commission itself. The embargo came into force because of the clearly-expressed political will to show abhorrence of the way in which the USSR was disregarding the rights of individuals, notably in the case of Andrei Sakharov, and also because of the use of Soviet military forces against the small, virtually defenceless, independent neighbouring country of Afghanistan.

The intention was that deliveries of agricultural products to the USSR should not exceed in 1980 the average of deliveries in the three preceding years. The purpose underlying the embargo was to make the Soviets aware of the potential hardship which could be imposed on Soviet consumers if the USSR persisted with its objectionable policies.

However, the outturn in 1980 was quite different from what had been hoped for. The tables given at the end of the report now being presented to you indicate the extent to which Community agricultural exports to the Soviet Union in 1980 exceeded average deliveries over the three preceding years. The increases were huge in

the cases of cereals, butter and butter oil, milling-industry products, sugar and soya cake.

The report now being put before you notes that it proved impossible for the Commission at the time to render the 1980 embargo effective to any meaningful degree.

I should say that this is not the first occasion on which this House has pronounced strongly on the 1980 embargo. For example, on 8 March 1982 a resolution was adopted which stated:

The Commission not only gave incorrect information to Parliament but, contrary to its own statements, conducted a policy which differed from that which Parliament had been led to understand was being conducted.

Again, on 20 April 1982 Parliament adopted a resolution accompanying Mr Key's report on the deferment of the 1980 discharge, which made strong comments on the failure of the embargo.

I must emphasize that the report which I now present on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control is not an attack on individuals. Its purpose is to underline a serious point of principle. It must be recognized that over the years the Commission has tended far too often to ignore the political wishes expressed by the European Parliament.

In the case of the 1980 embargo, the fact which troubled this House most of all was that in statements made in Parliament the then Commission did not fully reveal the situation in regard to the extent to which deliveries exceeded the average for the years 1977-79. Had such revelations been made in good time, it is possible that the Commission would have been given instruments adequate to meet the task entrusted to it by Parliament and by the Council.

Paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution proves that those measures actually taken by the Commission during the early months of 1980 helped to reinforce the system of control. It is, however, to be regretted that such measures were not taken earlier. The Committee on Budgetary Control asks the Commission to take any further necessary measures that will enable it in future to ensure that all declarations of destination are respected.

The increase in deliveries of milling-industry products was very considerable. We are talking here of hundreds of thousands of tonnes. Therefore, in view of the significance of the logistic effort involved in these transactions and in view of the exceptional nature of these transactions, the committee believes that the Commission should provide detailed information on this substantial change in trading patterns.

I would draw the attention of Members to paragraph 7 of the motion, which reflects the positive approach

Battersby

which the Committee on Budgetary Control follows in its relations with the Commission. Here once again, we welcome the Commission's realization of the advantages they would have from improved programming and realistic, profitable, long-term agreements with third countries, including the Eastern Bloc.

There is a wind of change beginning to blow from Moscow, and we hope it is also a trade wind. However, we must not give our agricultural products away just because the customer or his agent is playing hard to get — one of the oldest tricks in the game — or be used as the salami in world agricultural price-fixing.

It is for this reason that I welcome the fact that the Commission accepts the idea of greater coordination with other major supplying powers such as the United States. We have now succeeded in bringing in a far greater degree of control, and it would be a retrograde, stupid and short-sighted act if the Commission gave way to any pressure, be it from the trade or individual Member States, to revert to an unregulated and uncontrollable open-certificate system. The Commission has our assurance that it will receive every possible support from the Budgetary Control Committee in standing firm against these pressures.

At the heart of the dispute between Parliament and the Commission over the 1980 embargo, there was the failure to make the facts available to Parliament promptly, fully and clearly. Therefore I would suggest to colleagues that paragraph 8 of the motion is of notable importance insofar as relations between Parliament and the Commission are concerned. In this paragraph the Committee on Budgetary Control puts forward the criteria that should apply when statements are made in Parliament: at all times, such statements should be scrupulously correct, unambiguous and trustworthy.

To sum up, the report I now present to the House is positive in several aspects. It shows the improvements that the Commission has already effected. It approves of the changes that are now under way. Nevertheless, it draws attention to the massive increase in deliveries to the USSR for the year in question, an increase which was not revealed in good time to the political authorities. It lays down the criteria that should apply to statements made in this House by the Commission; and finally, on a point of detail, it calls for further clarification of the facts surrounding the huge increase in the 1980 deliveries of milling products to the USSR.

As for the amendments, Madam President, these have not been discussed in the Budgetary Control Committee. I personally believe that the report as it stands, unamended, is strong enough, makes its point, and that the present Commission has responded well to our demand to be given the whole unadulterated truth.

With these remarks I would like to leave the decision on the amendments to the wisdom of the House and to present this report to the House for its approval.

(Applause)

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — Madam President, as the House knows, the Commission would have wished this debate and this decision to have taken place some months ago. Parliament decided, for reasons which Mr Key has described, that there should be a delay and Parliament obviously has the right to take such decisions. I am grateful to Mr Key for his remarks about the way in which the Commission has cooperated in the work to which Parliament's decision gave rise.

I would also like to take this opportunity of thanking the services of the Commission, on whose shoulders the burden of the work to which Mr Key has referred actually fell, and congratulating them on having risen to the standards that he set. I should also, Madam President, like to say at the outset of my speech that I will in fact be addressing myself to Mr Key's report and not to Mr Battersby's. My colleague, Mr Dalsager, who, as the House can see, is sitting beside me, will be winding up this debate for the Commission, and he, as I think is appropriate, will deal primarily with Mr Battersby's report.

Madam President, Mr Key said some kind things about the Commission, but his resolution also raises a number of specific points on which I imagine he would like me to comment, albeit briefly perhaps, because of the time at which we now are. I have in mind, for instance, the safeguarding of the financial autonomy of the Community. At its last session of 1982 Parliament adopted opinions on the draft regulations concerning own resources. I know this is a subject which interests a number of the Members here present, particularly perhaps Mr Notenboom with whom I have had a number of exchanges on this subject in the past.

The Commission's proposals include the possibility of the Commission making control visits on its own responsibility rather than in association with the Member States. The Commission has also proposed that assets held in its accounts in the Member States should henceforth bear interest to the benefit of the Community, a rather more topical point at the moment perhaps than it might have seemed when that suggestion was made earlier. Particularly in the light of recent exchanges in this Chamber, I feel I can say that the arguments in favour of Commission accounts receiving interest have perhaps been underlined. I hope very much that those Members of the House who doubted the wisdom of this proposition by the Commission will now be encouraged to support us.

Furthermore, Madam President, the Commission has taken up again its proposal for the revision of the

Tugendhat

financial regulation which dates from December 1980. This proposal, which was not adopted by the Council, would significantly strengthen the financial autonomy of the Community by introducing a new provision whereby the balance of a budget year should remain available for two years rather than one year. Your rapporteur, Mr Simonnet, has given this formula his full support. We shall continue to make every effort to have it succeed.

I should also like to comment on the references in Mr Key's motion for a resolution to the provisional twelfths regime. Here I can confirm that the Commission's view is that the European Parliament must be able to exercise a real influence over the way in which the Commission is authorized to implement the budget. Nevertheless, for this influence to be exercised, the Commission must have an exact knowledge of the will of Parliament expressed in a timely, clear and unambiguous fashion on the basis of responsibilities belonging to it by virtue of the Treaty and the Financial Regulation. In other words, we are very anxious to carry out the will of Parliament, but Parliament for its part must make its will clearly known at a reasonable stage and in a manner that we can all of us understand. Work on the revision of the Financial Regulation will be resumed very shortly in Parliament's Committee on Budgets. It is important that it should allow the ambiguities with which we are familiar in this area to be eliminated.

In paragraph 4 of Mr Key's motion for a resolution the Committee on Budgetary Control is asked to prepare a report on the management of certain administrative appropriations. The Commission is prepared to cooperate, but I must point out that we would need the assistance of the other institutions, since the report concerns them all. While I am on the subject of other institutions, I should add that virtually all the outstanding problems of a procedural nature between the Commission and the Court of Auditors in relation to the annual as well as to the special reports have been resolved in a pragmatic manner.

As regards questions relating to accounting, I am pleased to be able to say that substantial progress has been made, as Mr Key mentioned. These efforts will be continued within the framework of the new accounts directorate, which I hope will be set up in the context of the 1983 budget, thanks to the support of Parliament which, at the initiative of Mr Aigner, chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control, and Mr Jackson, the budget rapporteur, agreed to grant the Commission a supplementary post of accounting director in the 1983 budget.

As regards research, this was treated in detail in the Kellett-Bowman resolution adopted by Parliament on 16 November 1982. This resolution notes the improvements already achieved. The Commission will continue its efforts in this direction. On the ERDF, Parliament is familiar with the proposed revision on which it

gave a favourable opinion. Work at the Council level is, unfortunately, slow. There is nothing unusual in that. It is, however, important that it should reach a positive conclusion, particularly since the solution to the problems of the non-quota section has also to be found in a new framework. As for the European Social Fund, work is now actively proceeding on the recent important proposals we have put forward for revising the rules to take account of today's problems.

On the EAGGF (Guidance Section) the Commission will in the course of this year discuss its future development and present appropriate proposals. The Guarantee Section of the EAGGF was the subject of the Wettig resolution adopted by Parliament on 16 November. That resolution dealt with a large number of questions in this area, and I do not think that it is necessary for me to refer to it in the present context.

So far as the decentralized organs are concerned, the Commission has made the necessary proposals for the modification of the financial regulations applicable to Dublin and Berlin. Parliament will, I hope, deliver its opinion on them soon without awaiting the revision of the financial regulation or the general budget. The Commission is also exercising particular vigilance over frauds affecting both own resources and Community expenditure. I understand that the Committee on Budgetary Control wants shortly to go into this sector in depth. It can count on the Commission's entire cooperation. In the realm of food aid and development I noted that the views of Parliament and Commission are almost identical, as the rapporteur, Mr Key, has indicated. I wish to confirm that the Commission shares the conclusions of the reports concerning the necessity of budgetizing the next European Development Fund. We shall maintain our position on this point and will insert an appropriate reception structure into our preliminary draft budget.

That, brings me to the end of my remarks. I would like to finish by underlining once again that the Commission fully recognizes the importance of Parliament's powers in this area. Indeed, I think I may fairly claim that I was emphasizing the importance of those powers even before this Parliament was elected in conjunction with a political friend — perhaps a personal friend too — of Mr Key, namely, Lord Bruce of Donington. I am pleased to be able to make the point again.

We must now close the debate on the 1980 discharge. The Court of Auditors' 1981 report is already being examined, and Parliament has designated Mr Schön as its rapporteur on that subject. The Commission can, I assure you, promise him all the assistance that he deems useful, and I hope very much that we will be able to rise to the occasion with him as we have with Mr Key.

Mr President, as the House has filled up a little since I began my speech, I would like to emphasize that I

Tugendhat

have dealt only with the points in Mr Key's report and that my colleague, Mr Dalsager, will be replying to those in Mr Battersby's report. Mr President, I would also like to thank the Committee on Budgets for the very hard work which it has put in and to say how much I believe that it is absolutely essential that, at the European level as well as at the national level, everything possible should be done to ensure that taxpayers' money is not only used as it should be used, but that it should be seen to be used as it should be used.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) I wish to thank you, Madam President, for once again giving me the opportunity to have the floor on the question which is dealt with in the Battersby report. And I also hope that this will be the last time we shall deal with this question in the Parliament.

I also believe that the Members of this Parliament wish that we could conclude this debate now. I presume that several of us have the feeling that we are discussing problems which we have only read about, and which throughout this debate, time after time, have been pointed out as problems which go back some years, when several of us at any rate were not in the Parliament or in the Commission and had not then the possibility to partake in the then current debate.

Many times previously the Commission and Parliament have debated how, in connection with the export of certain agricultural products to the USSR, the measures worked in 1980-1981 during the duration of the embargo. The Commission hopes that this debate can lead to a general improvement of trade connections in the agricultural sector with the State-trading countries in Eastern Europe.

With regard to the way in which the embargo actually operated during 1980-1981, Parliament, as already mentioned, discussed this question on previous occasions, also with members of the Commission. After the Council had made its decision in January 1980, Parliament, in a resolution adopted on 15 February 1980, called on the Commission to impose a trade embargo on all sales of surplus commodities involving subsidies to the Soviet Union. The Commission, through its Vice-President Mr Gundelach, however, made it clear to Parliament that the Commission in view of the Council's decision could not agree to this. And I shall allow myself to refer to Mr Gundelach's answer, which was as follows: 'I understand very well the feelings and motives which are the basis for what has been said by the European Parliament. But at the same time it is, however, my duty to tell this Assembly that the Commission has no authority to impose a trade embargo on the export of agricultural goods, or any other product for that matter, nor to take any other steps which in reality are tantamount to an embargo'. This does not mean that we did not understand the opinion of the Parliament at that time: on the contrary, we understand it fully, but the Commission worked within certain boundaries.

Let me stress — as the Commission has already done in its extensive answer to the proposed decision my Mr Key — that, with regard to the most important products, the situation was as follows: The Community did not issue any licences at all, with or without a prefixed export refund, for the export of wheat to the Soviet Union during the whole of the embargo period. Furthermore the Community did not issue any licences with or without a prefixed refund for use in 1980 for export of barley to the Soviet Union. With regard to certain products, as e.g. flour, where we had no instruments to monitor the tender system, we took steps to cut down or cancel the normal refunds. I conclude that the Commission, on the grounds I have adduced, cannot agree on what is stated in paragraphs 1 and 2 at the beginning of this motion for a resolution, but that the Commission can endorse the more important conclusions made in paragraphs 3 to 7.

As for the tabled amendments, indeed it is Members of this Parliament and not members of the Committee on Budgetary Control who have tabled a number of amendments. And in the light of what I just said, I must stress that in my opinion these amendments are unrealistic and amount to a completely exaggerated criticism of the Commission. Therefore I hope that Parliament will not accept them, but instead concentrate on the constructive elements of the Battersby report.

Mr Schön (EPP). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party will support the Key report in its entirety; may I also announce that after careful examination we have decided to reject all the draft amendments.

The reason why this report could not be adopted until today is largely because the Committee on Budgetary Control and this Parliament very carefully checked the accounts on the basis of the report by the Court of Auditors.

I am grateful to Mr Tugendhat for agreeing that he, and his colleagues, are prepared to meet us halfway at any time in respect of the next discharge. In recent times this was not always the case, and I must point this out. At times the Commission proved rather obstinate. To stress one point again; the report of the Court of Auditors is no use if we do not draw the political consequences of this control. The Committee on Budgetary Control exercises political control. It is a feature of the nature of our parliamentary democracy and of this House that despite its autonomy as an institution the Commission is also subject to parliamentary control.

The result set out in the Key report are notable. But I assure the Commission, and here I offer the constructive cooperation both of the group and of the committee, that we will have to check whether the assurances made will be respected. It is not enough to

Schön

accept verbal statements. Continuous control by Parliament also means continuity of discharge decisions, and apart from our share of budgetary powers, our most important right, which we will have to exercise very seriously in future we have the right to dismiss the executive, body of the Community, namely the Commission.

Three political aspects had to be considered in this discussion and at first they led to some disappointment in Parliament. First there was the question of safeguarding own resources. On that subject I may say to Mr Tugendhat that Parliament unanimously approved the report by Mr Notenboom. So it has no reservations about the interest rate policy of the national accounts. Parliament showed this by approving Mr Notenboom's report unanimously.

The second political point we regard as important is the question of repayments to the Member States, where we were particularly critical of the methods by which resources were transferred to the national accounts, and we shall carefully check on this in future, again on the basis of Mr Notenboom's arguments.

The third aspect which we shall continue to keep a close eye on is the tiresome question of food aid. Here again, gentlemen of the Commission, matters should be cleared up soon.

A further remark in my capacity as rapporteur on the discharge for the European Parliament. I have much sympathy with the proposals of Mrs Booserup. The President should provide Parliament, and in particular the Committee on Budgetary Control, with more prompt, detailed and open information on any deficiencies in its own administration. If we have accepted the right — and we have done so — of controlling the other institutions, then the control by the Committee on Budgetary Control of our own institution must be carried out with as little friction as possible. Paragraph 6 of the Key report was formulated as it is with an eye to the European Parliament and, Mr Rapporteur, we fully agree with this.

We give a discharge today, but we shall still continue conscientiously to carry out investigations wherever we have any doubts — and the doubts have by no means all been cleared up — and especially in areas where, as today's debate on the embargo showed, we are dealing with longer-term political trends.

It is not a question here of the sense or nonsense of embargoes. That is a matter of philosophy. It is simply a question of whether the political resolve which is defined and formulated in the Community is respected by those responsible for translating it into action. The Commission has again declared itself prepared to do so today. But in spite of our confidence in it, we shall naturally not give up our right to in-depth control.

IN THE CHAIR: MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

Mr Kellett-Bowman (ED). — Mr President, the discharge for 1980 has had a troubled passage through Parliament. It is nine months later than required by the Financial Regulation, and this is the third time it has come before the House. Parliament was not satisfied with some of the Commission's replies to criticisms from the Court of Auditors and the Committee on Budgetary Control. However, as stated in the excellent motion for a resolution which Mr Key has put before the House today, this situation has improved. Special investigations have been carried out, and some are still taking place.

The discharge for 1980 can safely be granted today, but that is not the end of the story. Discharge does not finish by closing the books on the past: it merely grants a discharge of liability to the handlers of the funds for the period concerned. In addition, the motion for a resolution accompanying the discharge contains expectations and demands for the future. This resolution is not just a statement of the opinion of Parliament, it is *quasi* legislative in its effect. The Commission must take on board Parliament's requests, and failure to do so might result in Parliament's taking action in the 1984 budgetary process.

Yes, this is the big stick, but Parliament has a responsibility to act on behalf of Europe's taxpayers, and it must not be ignored in this field. Parliament's treaty powers are very much limited to the budget, so future institutional development for the Parliament will be *via* the budgets, which will be closely monitored through its control powers. These control powers are executed through the discharge, through close scrutiny of the quarterly accounts and through the watchful supervision of transfers.

It is possible that the big stick of withholding funds will not be necessary. Not all the staff of the Commission resent Parliament's interest in controlling the budget; in fact of the Commission's staff believe in the Community and see Parliament as an ally and its role as the road to progress.

An offspring of the Key report is the Battersby report on agricultural products to the USSR. I thank Mr Battersby for his hard work and his hard-hitting report, which I commend. He has not shirked his task of uncovering the facts and apportioning the blame in a forthright manner. He would be the first to thank Mr Aigner, Mr Tyrrell and Mr Hord for their contributions to the work.

Parliament's own accounts have been the subject of a special report. The President of Parliament, together with the Bureau, and the Committee on Budgetary

Kellett-Bowman

Control are carrying out investigations in depth. Mr President, we who have the responsibility to control the budgets of the other institutions must be seen to be above reproach ourselves.

The 1981 discharge is already under consideration, with April as the likely date. This is too early for the Court of Auditors, to whom we owe a very great debt, to report on any improvements. We shall therefore place a great deal of emphasis on the statements of intent which the Commission are able to make between now and then. There must be promise of a better performance. The Committee on Budgetary Control will extract special points and seek to produce 'own-initiative' reports. In this way the spotlight of enquiry will go more deeply into trouble-spots.

Under the chairmanship of that stalwart, Dr Heinrich Aigner, the committee is ready to get on with its new work. We are glad to see he is safely recovered from his serious operation.

I commend the Key report and the Battersby report to the House.

(Applause)

President. — As voting time has arrived, we shall now adjourn the debate which will be resumed tomorrow.

7. Votes¹

VGENOPOULOS REPORT (Doc. 1-964/82 — oils and fats)

Proposal for a regulation — Article 2 — Amendment No 6

Mr Vgenopoulos (S), rapporteur. — (GR) I wish to add that the representative of the Commission this morning was also in favour of changing the date before the accession of Spain and Portugal, and therefore in favour of the amendment.

President. — I did not ask the rapporteur for his opinion, because after all the amendment was tabled by his own committee.

After the adoption of Amendment No 6

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) When I ask for the floor it is for the purpose of explaining a misunderstanding, that must have arisen. In my speech I have expressly said the opposite of what the rapporteur claims I am in favour of; I said that this decision should come into effect at the same time as the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Communities.

President. — We shall see to it that that is recorded in the minutes.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Did I understand the Commissioner to say that he was not in favour of the amendment of the Committee on Agriculture? Is that what he said, because when the rapporteur spoke he misled the House very badly. If that is the case, we ought to take the vote again.

President. — That has all been cleared up, Mr Patterson.

Paragraph 4 — Before the vote on Amendment No 7

Mr Ligios. — (IT) Mr President, I ask that voting on Mr Aigner's amendment, Amendment No 7, be by way of separate votes on the two parts of paragraph 4.

From the Italian text I consider, in fact, that to ask for part of the paragraph to be delayed makes no sense, since we have all of us accepted, verbally at least, a greater degree of control against fraud and so on. Besides, knowing Mr Aigner as I do, I am sure that this is not what he meant.

With regard to the second part, there is some confusion due, in my opinion, to the way in which the paragraph is worded. I think in fact that the wording is incorrect, since the trade associations, which the Community wanted, must in my view be motivated: their work needs greater supervision . . .

President. — If I may interrupt you, Mr Ligios, you have presented your request, but the only thing I gathered from it is that you want a separate vote. This is not possible, however, since the amendment merely seeks to delete paragraph 4.

Mr Aigner (EPP). — (DE) Mr President, I know that this amendment is being wrongly interpreted, as though I were against professional associations or producer associations. The background to it is simply that we are drawing up a report on the olives scandal and only this report can discover whether the irregularities — I am being careful about my terms — are specifically connected with the producer associations. Of course I am leaving the question open of where the blame lies.

(The sitting was closed at 7.15 p.m.)¹

¹ See Annex I.

¹ Decision on requests for early votes — Agenda — Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX

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.

VGENOPOULOS REPORT (Doc. 1-964/82 — Oils and fats): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was:

- IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 8, 9 and 12;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25 and 26.

Explanations of vote

Mr Sutra (S). — (FR) Mr President, my dear colleagues, we shall be voting for the report of my friend Mr Vgenopoulos and many of us will be doing so, especially since all the amendments which sought to undermine and distort it have been rejected.

I should like to say that I am most surprised to see how Mr Hord sets himself up as an expert on such a wide variety of subjects, in this case Mediterranean agriculture. After what he told us this morning about olive oil, its flavour, its smell, its strength and its disadvantages, I not only reject any claim he may lay to being a specialist, but assure him that I would not take him on as a cook.

(Smiles)

On the other hand, I would have every confidence in entrusting my health to Mr Vgenopoulos, who is a cardiologist. He knows what he is talking about; he is aware of the essential dietary role played by olive oil in the developed countries.

(Applause)

Mr. Kyrkos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, we are voting in favour of the proposed resolution and the report of our colleague Mr Vgenopoulos. In a proposal of our own we called for more radical measures and we hope that in due course the Community will show a more positive approach. With our vote we will also be severely condemning the voices heard in this House and the attempts made to degrade and to eliminate one of the most important Mediterranean products. Some people referred to scandals allegedly perpetrated in Italy, while others called for the olive groves to be replaced by forests because the Community could not afford to pay for the accumulation of undisposed surpluses.

For any scandals perpetrated there must of course be strict mechanisms of censure, and earlier we had proposed timely finance for the drawing up of a land register; moreover, we stress the importance of the relevant paragraph in the resolution.

As for the uprooting of the olive trees, those who proposed it should think twice because this should be preceded by stopping the accumulation of the butter mountain, granted that butter is indeed harmful to the human organism and that the butter mountain is paralysing the CAP.

With our vote we shall be calling on Parliament to protect the production of olives in Europe, which provides work and incomes for millions of agricultural workers, by adopt-

ing the measures basically put forward in the Vgenopoulos report: the immediate enforcement of the regulation, the diminution of the price differential between olive oil and other vegetable substances, and the promotion of olive oil and olive consumption on the European market to the detriment of imported substitutes.

With our vote we shall at the same time call for support for the producers of olives, their associations and their collectives, and ask that the relevant provisions should not remain on paper, because there is a great problem of underdevelopment in Mediterranean agriculture, and that the cost of the products — oil and olives — should be reduced, which can only be achieved by introducing new technology and by modernizing the organization of the production.

Fellow Members, today's debate reflected the war of the monopolies, and particularly the American ones, against the European olive producers. Are olive producers to be eliminated? Are the olive trees to be uprooted? Certainly, so that fortunes can be made by the purveyors of the American Soya and of other vegetable oils. At the same time, this is a test of the sincerity of the Community's statements that it wishes to protect Mediterranean agriculture and to contribute to bridging the gap between the rich and the less developed regions in the Community.

Mr President, we shall reply to both these matters by voting in favour of the proposed resolution.

Mrs Castle (S). — Mr President, I am going to vote against this motion for a resolution. This is not because I do not believe that poorer regions of the Community, such as Greece and Italy, need greater help under the CAP. Of course they do. However, I am voting against, because I believe that to pursue these proposals would have exactly the opposite effect. Of course our Greek and Italian colleagues are right when they say that they are unfairly treated under the CAP. Of course they are right when they say the CAP, as at present organized, is widening disparities between farmers' incomes and between regions and is leading to waste as well as fraud. But what I said to them before and I say to them again is that they will not solve the problem of poverty in their area by extending the principles of the CAP, which have caused such waste and disparities in the northern regions, to the southern part of the Community. That is no answer. That is no alternative to proper regional policies. That is no proper alternative to direct aid, directed where it is most needed.

Above all, I say to them that while it is a Socialist principle to fight poverty, it is also a Socialist principle not to do that at the expense of the poorer consumers in our Community. This proposal is a proposal to solve the problem of poorer producers in the southern regions by taxing the commodities which our own working people need to buy, such as margarine. Never will I vote in this Parliament for taxes on the food needed by those hardest hit. That is why I shall vote against.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall also vote against this report. As I already explained this morning, this has nothing to do with farmers' incomes. They see none of the money, because it is really only a form of consumer aid which goes to the undertakings.

The only thing that baffles me is the attitude of my German colleagues from the Christian-Democratic Group. In Germany they throw it into our faces that we are not able to handle public money. Yet here they can lightheartedly give away 300 million DM for a measure of doubtful social value, while at the same time they vote in paragraph 10 for the imposition of certain taxes on vegetable oils and fats.

All I can do is ask them to put forward the same position back home in Germany and not to put out lying reports there while taking a different line altogether in their voting here in this House.

Protopapadakis (PPE), in writing. — (GR) The support of the olive producers is not only a fair act, but also one that is beneficial to the Community as a whole, because the

olive is a factor for economic development mainly in infertile areas, and has also been a symbol of civilization and peace since ancient times. For those reasons I shall vote in favour of the proposal in the certainty that the few reservations expressed are ill-founded and are not based on scientific or technical facts, as for example the view that olive oil is supposedly not good for people or that certain managerial errors, or even frauds perpetrated by isolated individuals should become the reason for limiting the support granted to olive producers. More particularly, I wish to insist that by voting in favour of support for olive producers, we are not courting the risk of creating over production, as happened in the northern countries of the Community with cereals and dairy products. The production of olive oil cannot be adjusted upwards or downwards by temporary measures. An olive tree does not develop easily, and its production depends on the climatic conditions and not on factors such as watering, etc.

*
* *

FILIPPI REPORT (Doc. 1-997/82 — Automobile market): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was:

- IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 6, 10, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 25, 27, 28, 36, 37, 38, 39, 44, 45, 47 and 55;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 2, 7, 8, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 33, 34, 40, 41, 50, 51 and 52.

Explanations of vote

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the modifications envisaged in Mr Filippi's report and in the proposed resolution are aimed at a reorganization of motor manufacturing within the EEC, based on the creation of an even more concentrated trust of the major monopolies of capitalist Europe which will be founded on the intensity of the exploitation of the common market, the national economies, and the workers. This will be all the more harmful to our country, Greece, which has no motor manufacturing industry of her own but only an auxiliary industry and craftsmanship that basically covers the needs for coachwork and that depends, like Viamax, on large West German companies like Deutz. With the accession of Greece to the EEC all talk of a motor manufacturing industry in our country ceased, as also did any discussion of the possibility of increasing the added value of cars, because of the increased granting of prerogatives to motor manufacturing industries within the Community. The reorganization envisaged by the Filippi report will make the consequences for our country even more harmful and we shall therefore vote against the proposed resolution.

Mr Pininfarina (L). — (IT) Mr President, the Liberal Group will abstain from voting on the motion for a resolution put forward by the Committee on External Relations. Our attitude reflects the fact that, a short time ago, Parliament introduced a number of amendments designed positively, if only partly, to change the original text. Other points, however, which we did not feel it important enough to change, have remained as they were in the initial text. Taken overall, therefore, the text of the motion represents a small improvement compared with the position approved by the Committee on External Economic Relations, but still contains a number of contradictions that make it impossible for us to go so far as to support the motion.

I shall personally vote against it. By abstaining, the Liberal Group shows its acknowledgement of the changes introduced in this chamber, and the valuable work carried out in recent months by the rapporteur, but at the same time it is intended to show our criticism, in part also because we detect a certain contrast between the explanatory statement attached to the motion, and the motion itself. The latter, in fact, even with the amendments introduced a short time ago, still appears based on certain assumptions regarding

the situation in the car industry that are in fact far from reality. In order to pursue a policy of agreement and trade with Japan as outlined, we should in fact need to be in a situation of growth and expansion, of sustained employment in the industry, and this we are unfortunately not. It would therefore be anachronistic, if, at the start of a year that is uncertain to a degree we have rarely seen before where the car industry is concerned, the European Parliament were to base its decisions on something that is really no more than a hope for future revival.

We should all obviously like trade relations with Japan to be better and more open on both sides: and we know very well that we cannot think of the future in terms of protectionism. But today we have to fight hard, first of all, to ensure any future at all for Europe's car industries.

Especially after the modifications that have been made, the Filippi motion contains a number of points that take this into account: I refer particularly to the priority that investment from outside the Community must have over imports, in a climate of collaboration, particularly in the fields of research and component production. To avoid the two evil extremes of hard-line protectionism, on the one hand, and surrender to penetration from outside the Community, on the other, European policy for the car industry must finally take shape within the institutional framework to which it belongs, and that is, under the auspices of the Commission. The Commission must be responsible for taking stronger, more penetrating action in a sector of industry that is still of prime importance if we are to come through the present economic crisis, the repercussions of which on investment and employment must be of the gravest concern to us in this difficult early part of 1983.

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I do not think that we have all of us, together, done a very good job — and I say this both critically and self-critically — as far as helping the forthcoming negotiations with Japan is concerned. By coming to these discussions with the weak elements that, at the end of the debate, the motion still shows, we are not helping those discussions and, I repeat, we are fostering illusions amongst the Japanese that we ought not to foster. Just imagine, we have approved an amendment in which the word 'European' has been taken out; the Community is not even taking part as a European Community, but as just any community — it is not quite clear what kind.

For the reasons already given from many sides during the debate, and also because of everything that happened during voting, we consider that in the end we cannot vote for this resolution which, in our view, finally constitutes more an element of weakness than one likely to strengthen Community policy in this sector.

Mr Bord (DEP). — *(FR)* Ladies and gentlemen, my dear colleagues, we were prepared to vote in favour of this report, but unfortunately cannot do so in view of the adoption of Article 13. In our view, asking us to give up certain national measures, albeit limited, is tantamount to sacrificing the present for a rather hypothetical future.

Mr Damseaux (L), in writing. — *(FR)* Mr President, I shall confine myself to three comments:

First, if we accept the principle that free trade is the only way to secure the general wellbeing and the vitality necessary to economic progress, the problem is not one of finding artificial means of limiting Japanese exports to Europe, but of developing our export opportunities. Consequently, there is only one course open to us if we are to reduce our trade deficit with Japan, which is currently running at 14 billion dollars: we must make a realistic response on a lasting basis through innovation and structural reorganization of our national industries according to a Community model.

This takes me to my second point: the real damage to Europe's economic activity derives much more from Japan's tariff and nontariff barriers than from its excessive exports to our countries.

The measures announced recently by Mr Abe, Minister for Foreign Affairs, which are expected to reduce the customs duty on 73 products, are not enough. It is the other pro-

tective barriers, the invisible ones, which are most prohibitive, and here the Japanese have the most subtle technology.

These non-tariff barriers include the structure of the customs authorities and the economy in general, the type-approval procedures, the plant health measures limiting our exports of food and agricultural produce, and the many national oligopolies that the banks, industry and commerce run among themselves. This is what we are up against.

My third and final point is to stress the urgency of the need for action, for we must realize that the Japanese might well give priority to acceding to extreme demands from the United States, where the situation is becoming critical, with the result that they have no further scope for negotiation.

Any victory gained by the United States over Japan will intensify the pressure on the European market.

Mr Wurtz, (COM) in writing. — (FR) It is clear that the trade problem must be taken seriously, given the increase in Japanese imports. In 1981 their car manufacturers took more than 8% of the European market.

In France, although their market share was only 2% that year, the general situation on the automobile market has been deteriorating steadily. In 1982 registrations of foreign vehicles rose by four times as much as those of vehicles produced in France. In the first nine months of 1982 France had a deficit of about 1·8 billion francs with Japan, but one of over 8 billion francs with the Federal Republic of Germany. This problem therefore calls for the closest scrutiny.

In our view, however, the industrial and social aspects are the real crux of the matter. We should be dealing first and foremost with the question of the resources and conditions necessary for development of the motor sector, which is outside the remit of Mr Filippi's report, which was supposed to have been concerned exclusively with imports of Japanese cars. We hope that it will be possible to discuss these problems in a future debate in this House, when we shall put forward constructive proposals.

Finally, although we have formed a rather favourable view of some of the things contained in the Filippi report, we shall be voting against it, first because it goes beyond the range of the subject that it should have tackled and secondly because its proposals for industrial and social measures do not represent a realistic approach to the development of the motor industry in the current crisis.

*
* *

ANNEX II

I. *Questions to the Council**Question No 65, by Mr Tyrrell (H-591/82)*

Subject: Second directive on motor insurance

Is the Council aware that the second directive on insurance against civil liability in regard to the use of motor vehicles has been awaiting implementation since the Parliament's adoption of the Jecchino report in October 1981; can the Council state when implementation is envisaged, and why there has been such delay in removing so manifest a restriction to the free movement of persons within the European Community?

Answer

Since the proposal amended by the Commission in the light of the Opinions of the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee was received on 4 March 1982, the Council bodies have held two meetings, in April and June 1982, in order to finalize the text of the directive. The Presidency intends to continue the work on this proposal.

*
* *

Question No 66, by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (H-599/82)

Subject: East-West Trade

Have the USA and the EEC Member States agreed on restrictions in the field of East-West trade which are connected with the lifting of the US pipeline embargo and, if so, is the Council's position a united one? What is the situation with regard to credit restrictions and are any EEC measures envisaged in this field?

Answer

The suspension of the US embargo against firms supplying equipment for the Siberian gas pipeline was a unilateral decision on the part of the US authorities.

As the honourable Member no doubt knows, consultations took place between the Western countries and it was agreed to carry out investigations into East-West relations in the fields of economy and trade in suitable forums, such as the OECD.

In the near future the Commission will be presenting an overall analysis of these relations, especially in the following areas: export policy, trade in agricultural products, energy supplies and trade in technology.

When the current investigations are concluded, the Council will decide what conclusions to draw and how best to deliberate on the matter with the main industrial countries. To date, therefore, future practical measures have in no way been prejudiced.

*
* *

Question No 67, by Mr Antoniozzi (H-600/82)

Subject: Protection of tourists engaged in international travel

Does the Council intend to support the proposals put forward by the Commission concerning tourism and, in particular, does it intend to adopt common rules for the protec-

tion of tourists engaged in international travel in view of the numerous serious incidents in various parts of the world, including the recent episode in which two Italian tourists in Bulgaria were deprived of their freedom, and of the fact that the free movement of tourists promotes understanding between peoples, brings nations together at a human level, encourages *détente*, prompts exchanges and strengthens cultural ties and that the Helsinki Charter, whose signatories include Bulgaria and the ten European Community countries, also requires respect for these freedoms as part of the wider framework of human rights?

Answer

In July 1982 the Council received a communication from the Commission giving the first guidelines for a Community policy on Touring, which will be examined in the first half of 1983. In this communication the Commission declares its intention to draw up proposals for the protection of tourists. No proposals on those lines have however yet been passed to the Council.

*
* *

Question No 69, by Mr Adamou (H-606/82)

Subject: Subsidization of Community butter in the EEC

During the Christmas period 1 500 tonnes of EEC butter will have been imported into Greece at a special reduced price, a quantity roughly equivalent to 1/4 of Greek production, one of the results being that major problems have arisen as regards the disposal of Greek produce and Greek dairy farmers have been seriously affected.

Could the Council state why the Greek market was not subsidized solely for butter of Greek origin irrespective of its packaging, which would have benefited the consumers and helped local production?

Answer

On November 9, 1982 the Council issued Regulation (EEC) No 2989/82¹ concerning the provision of support for the consumption of butter in Denmark, Greece, Italy and Luxembourg. This regulation was issued within the framework of the action known as 'Butter for Christmas' and envisages the possibility of subsidizing certain quantities of marketed butter in the above countries. In the other Member States the 'Butter for Christmas' action applied to intervention quantities of butter, which were not available in private or public (State-owned) storage in sufficient quantities in the above four Member States.

The measures for applying Regulation (EEC) No 2989/82 were defined by Regulation (EEC) No 2991/82 of the Commission. They aim, as is fitting, at the absorption, without perturbing the smooth process of trading, of marketed or privately stored butter, whether this comes from the Member State in which it is consumed or from any other Member State of the Community. The Commission's regulation envisages the possibility of subsidizing in Greece, the packaging in small packs of a quantity of 1 500 tonnes of 'Community' marketed butter. For legal reasons the 'Butter for Christmas' action cannot in fact be limited to the butter produced in just one Member State.

*
* *

¹ OJ L 314, 10. 11. 1982, p. 25.

Question No 70, by Mr Ephremidis (H-609/82)

Subject: Lemon imports into Greece

The large-scale importation onto the Greek market of lemons from Spain, Turkey and even Uruguay, channelled via the Federal Republic of Germany, is having dangerous repercussions on domestic production, while, at the same time, the general obstacles erected by the EEC to the development of commercial relations with the Socialist countries are creating problems for the disposal of lemons on that traditional market.

In view of the Commission's lack of interest in the fate of lemons and, more generally, citrus fruits produced in Greece, does the Council intend taking any immediate measures and, if so, what measures to protect and support Greek production?

Answer

To encourage the production of lemons in Greece, Council decided, on May 18, 1982, to extend the field of application of Regulation (EEC) No 2611/69 to lemons.

According to this regulation 'sellers of lemons who are established in the producer Member States have the right, subject to certain preconditions, to economic compensation for lemons from those Member States sold to other Member States'. Moreover, the regulation envisages support for the conversion of lemon orchards to other varieties of lemons with the aim of adapting their produce to the demands of consumers.

To secure Community preference and to allow economically significant exports of the Community's production, the rules in force envisage returns in exporting. So far as concerns, among other things, the exporting of lemons to countries of central and eastern Europe with planned economies, the levels of these returns were raised in December 1982, from the previous figure of 6.04 ECU/100 Kg to 12 ECU/100 Kg.

*
* . *

Question No 71, by Mr Alavanos (H-612/82)

Subject: The Commission and application of the automatic cost-of-living adjustment mechanism in Greece

In its document on the 'Economic Situation in 1982 and Economic Policy Guidelines for 1983' the Commission directly interferes in Greece's incomes policy, claiming that in 1983 Greece will have to slow down considerably its cost-of-living adjustments and, in particular, efforts to restrain the rise in incomes will have to be continued while pursuing application of the automatic cost-of-living adjustment mechanism that will avert dangers.

Seeing that similar EEC interference led to the abandonment of this mechanism in Belgium and to its adulteration in the Netherlands, Denmark and Italy, could the Council state whether and why it adopts the Commission's inadmissible interference in adulterating today and abandoning tomorrow application of the automatic cost-of-living adjustment mechanism in Greece, and, more generally, whether the economic policy guidelines for Greece met with the unanimous approval of the Council of Ministers?

Answer

The annual report on the economic state of the Community and the general guidelines on economic policy for 1983 were decreed by Council on December 17, 1982. The texts of these were published in the Official Bulletin of the European Communities.

Council's decision of last December 17 is based on the Treaty concerning the founding of the European Economic Community.

In article 103 the Treaty envisages the obligation of the Member States to consider as a matter of common interest the policy of mutual approach.

In article 145 the Treaty provides that 'Council shall ensure the coordination of the general economic policies of Member States, and shall have authority to make decisions'.

With its decision of February 18, 1974, Council laid down the procedures that allow the achievement of a high degree of coincidence between the economic policies of Member States. In this decision it is envisaged that Council, following a proposal by the Commission, 'shall decree the guidelines of the economic policy that the Community and each Member State must follow in order to achieve a harmonious economic development'.

Owing to the importance of incomes policy within the framework of the general economic policies of the Member States, Council considers that it has the right to decree guidelines in relation to incomes policy when it judges this to be opportune.

*
* *

Question No 73, by Mrs Poirier (H-625/82)

Subject: Problems relating to Spanish fishermen

French fishing boats off the Atlantic coast have recently been subject to severe harassment from Spanish vessels some of which were under British licence.

Has this matter been referred to the Council and has it decided to take action over the above offences and to remedy swiftly this situation which is harmful to French fishing interests?

Answer

A solution to this problem, which was raised by the French delegation during the 794th session of the Council, held in Luxembourg on Monday 4 October 1982, should be worked out during the annual negotiations with Spain on the fisheries policy. These negotiations were suspended on 16 December 1982, and they are scheduled to resume in the coming weeks.

*
* *

Question No 74, by Mr Scott-Hopkins (H-626/82)

Subject: Recent GATT meeting in Geneva

In the light of the recent GATT meeting in Geneva, how does the Council of Ministers intend to reinforce the commitment of the Ten towards freer trade in world markets?

Answer

The guidelines formulated by the European Council at its meeting in Copenhagen on 3 and 4 December 1982 concerning trade policy and relations with third countries form a package intended to help the fight against the economic crisis and protectionism and to help maintain stable and open trade relations. What is more, they complement the approaches to the economic and social situation defined on the domestic front.

Absolute priority must be given to strengthening *international cooperation* in all major areas to combat the crisis, particularly through a return to monetary, financial and com-

mercial stability. In this connection, I would in particular note that, as the European Council had wished, a decision has subsequently been taken to increase IMF quotas.

The Community is resolved to play a constructive role in the follow-up to the GATT ministerial meeting. Work will enter an active phase in Geneva as from the beginning of 1983.

As far as *the United States* are concerned, it is vital to continue talks in all areas in which conflicts could arise. Major consultations between the Commission and the United States were held quite recently on the problem of agriculture in particular. Contacts will be pursued in the first quarter of next year.

I shall have an opportunity to inform you of the recent decisions of the Council on the subject of *Japan* in my answer to the Oral Question put by the Honourable Mr Deleau.

Ensuring that the *developing countries* are better able to bring their own economic and financial problems under control is another significant way of helping to overcome the crisis.

Finally, the council has emphasized how vital it is for the Community to maintain its *unity* as it has succeeded in doing in recent months under difficult circumstances.

*
* *

Question No 79, By Lord Bethell (H-649/82)

Subject: Landing cards for nationals of other Member States

In view of the welcome decision by most EC-governments, most recently the French Government in December 1982, to abolish the landing card requirement for nationals of other Member States entering their territory, will the Council consider this matter and agree that the Italian and Greek Governments should also abolish this requirement?

Answer

The Council would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that the Italian Government informed the Commission in December 1982 that nationals of the Member States were no longer required to fill in landing cards as from 1 December 1982.

At present Greece is therefore the only Member State which requires nationals of the Member States to fill in landing cards.

The Council has on several occasions stated its interest in the simplification of border checks.

*
* *

Question No 80, by Miss Hooper (H-650/82)

Subject: Paper recycling

In view of the unanimous support by this Parliament for the Recommendation on Paper Recycling sent to Member governments and Community institutions in 1981, would the Council indicate both the percentage of increased use and the actual amount of recycled paper used in:

- a) its publications
- b) its internal documentation

c) its paper for photocopying?

Answer

The Council uses no recycled paper for its publications, internal documentation or photocopying.

*
* *

Question No 81, by Mr Johnston (H-651/82)

Subject: Seals

In view of the Council's failure to achieve agreement on the Commission's proposal for a regulation to bar the importation into the Community of products coming from young harp and hooded seals, will the Council undertake to return to this item as a matter of urgency and in any case in time to allow the draft regulation to be adopted before the beginning of the next seal-hunt in March 1983?

Answer

At its meeting on 17 December 1982 the Council undertook to examine the Commission's communications and proposals on the subject of hunting baby seals, and in particular the proposal for a regulation already submitted concerning an import ban. It also undertook to adopt by 1 March 1983 at the latest, in the framework of its review, all appropriate measures on the basis of all the necessary data, while honouring the Community's obligations, particularly in the field of international trade.

*
* *

Question No 82, by Mr Cottrell (H-653/82)

Subject: EEC/Cyprus

Will the Council state whether it is satisfied with the operation of the current EEC/Cyprus agreement in all respects, and if not, which aspect causes it concern?

Answer

Trade has developed under the EEC-Cyprus Association Agreement. Progress has been noted in financial cooperation and the Association bodies have operated normally.

It is nonetheless true that there has been a delay in implementing the Decision of the Association Council of 24 November 1980 on the process of transition to the second stage of the Association Agreement between the Community and Cyprus for a number of reasons relating to the internal situation in the Community, accession negotiations and the current work on the consequences for the Mediterranean countries of the future enlargement of the Community. Turning more specifically to the contractual definition of the trade arrangements to apply in 1983 in EEC-Cyprus trade, negotiations are now in progress but *because of certain difficulties* have not yet been concluded; this has led the Council unilaterally to extend until 30 June 1983 the arrangements hitherto applicable to trade with Cyprus.

*
* *

*Questions to the Foreign Ministers**Question No 85, by Mr Galland (H-400/82)*

Subject: Employment of prisoners in the construction of the trans-Siberian gas pipeline

As in August it was learned in Europe that the workers employed in the construction of the trans-Siberian gas pipeline were common law prisoners and political detainees, have the Ministers decided, as the French Government has, to inquire into this matter?

Answer

This question has already been answered in Answer No H-339/82 of 13 October 1982 and in the written answer of 19 November 1982 to Question No 1278/82, to which I refer the honourable Member in this matter.

*
* *

Question No 92, by Mr Scott-Hopkins (H-594/82)

Subject: Relations EEC-USA

When next does the President of the Council of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs intend to meet the President of the United States of America?

Answer

At this stage the German Presidency has not yet fixed any dates. In view of the importance which all Member States attach to good relations between Europe and the United States, I assume that a meeting, on a date yet to be decided, will take place between the President of the Council and the American Foreign Minister during the German Presidency.

*
* *

Question No 93, by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (H-598/82)

Subject: Restrictions on East-West trade

Do the possible restrictions on East-West trade concern the COCOM list of security-sensitive products and the products which would be excluded from such trade? If not, to what could the restrictions otherwise relate?

Answer

So far, no decisions on any new restrictions of East-West trade have been taken. Various bodies are currently examining various aspects of economic relations between East and West or will do so in the near future. Following the practice of many years, the COCOM lists are confidential. So I cannot make any public statement about their content.

*
* *

Question No 94, by Mr Adamou (H-607/82)

Subject: The Ten and US policy in Central America

Recently the EEC has been taking a series of economic and political initiatives in Central America.

What has been the attitude of the Foreign Ministers to the repeated provocations and threats of military intervention by Honduras — which has relations with the EEC — against Nicaragua, and to the open support given by the Reagan Administration to the sanguinary juntas of Central America, which the US President himself described as 'democratic regimes' on his recent visit?

Answer

The Foreign Ministers of the Ten have repeatedly discussed the situation in Central America. Like other States in that region, Honduras too is suffering the effects of the recession and of social injustices which are difficult to surmount and are accompanied by border tensions resulting from the influx of refugees from neighbouring countries in the throes of conflict.

The US Government is well aware of the concern the Ten have expressed about certain developments in Central America and of the position the Ten have adopted *vis à vis* these worrying developments.

It must be pointed out that the Ten welcome any proposals aimed at promoting peaceful solutions by means of negotiations and reducing the tensions between the countries of that region.

*
* *

Question No 95, by Mr Ephremidis (H-610/82)

Subject: The Cyprus question and the recent European Council in Copenhagen

Once again the European Council has in its communiqué demonstratively omitted to mention the critical problem of Cyprus, even though a proposal was made on the subject by the Greek Government and even though 40% of Cypriot territory continues to undergo military occupation by Turkish NATO troops.

Could the Foreign Ministers state why the EEC continues to cover up the occupation by troops from Turkey, a country associated with the EEC, and thus undermines the application of the UN Resolutions on the independence, sovereignty and demilitarization of Cyprus?

Answer

As we stated in the replies to similar questions — including H-12/82, H-102/82 and H-820/81 — the Ten support a solution to the Cyprus question that is based on Resolution 3212 (XXIX) which was adopted by the UN General Assembly on 1 November 1974. The Ten reiterate their hope that the talks between ethnic groups under the aegis of the Secretary-General of the UN will resolve the problems between the two groups and that substantial progress will be made as soon as possible.

*
* *

Question No 96, by Mr Alavanos (H-611/82)

Subject: Installation of new MX intercontinental missiles

The communique issued by the European Council in Copenhagen, while mentioning the EEC's views on the major international issues, passes over in silence the USA's provocations against world peace with its programmes for constructing MX intercontinental missiles, which infringe the SALT 1 and SALT 2 Treaties, and the installation of Pershing and Cruise missiles.

Could the Foreign Ministers state why the Ten do not mention the fundamental problems for international peace created by the USA's policy, why they go along with the USA's aggressive cold-war policy (since most of the Governments of the Ten adopted the American projects at the NATO meeting of Defence Ministers held a few days ago in Brussels) and why they demonstratively ignore the requests of the mass European movement for disarmament?

Answer

The Ten attach great importance to all attempts directed at substantial, balanced and comprehensive worldwide arms control and disarmament. But this specific question has not been discussed by the foreign ministers of the Ten in the European Council.

*
* *

Question No 97, by Mr Antoniozzi (H-614/82)

Subject: Conclusions reached at the meeting of the European Council in Copenhagen at the beginning of December 1982

Alarming reports are currently circulating about the economic situation, unemployment, trade relations with the USA, security problems, East-West and North-South political relations and institutional development which is the fundamental instrument of European progress.

What prospects are open to Europe following the meeting in Copenhagen?

Answer

As the honourable Member knows, the President-in-Office of the Council and of European Political Cooperation informed this Chamber of the outcome of the European Council in detail on 15 December. So I can confine myself to the following observations:

At the European Council in Copenhagen, the Heads of State and Government agreed on a number of practical aims, which are priority elements of a comprehensive economic strategy to improve the situation on the employment market.

The responsible Community bodies will start on the necessary work without delay. The Council (General Affairs) will report on this at the next European Council in Brussels on 21/22 March 1983.

The European Council also emphasized the importance it attaches to international cooperation with other industrialized countries with a view to overcoming the worldwide recession. As regards the United States, the Community has reiterated its desire for a genuine and effective dialogue and has since made further progress in talks between the Commission and a delegation headed by the American Foreign Minister.

As regards institutional developments, which are an important instrument in the progress of Europe, several proposals were put forward which are now being examined by the

Member States. The questions raised by the honourable Member are in fact key questions of European integration. Europe's future prospects depend on their solution.

The European Council also considered in detail the East-West questions, especially the situation in Poland and the Madrid CSCE follow-up meeting. The exchange of views on these questions will continue in the framework of European Political Cooperation. The Ten will urge the rapid drawing up of a substantial and balanced final document which should contain improvements in the humanitarian field and a precise mandate for a conference on disarmament in Europe.

In the case of Poland, the Ten will observe with particular attention how the situation created by the Warsaw Government with the suspension of martial law develops.

The Ten will continue to pursue a policy of cooperation in partnership with the Third World countries, with a view to peaceful progress in the world. They respect the independence of these countries and regard the policy of non-alignment with the blocs as an element of peace and stability. They are against importing the East-West dispute into the Third World.

As the major trade partner of the Third World and the most important source of development aid, the Community is endeavouring to bring about a trustful and fruitful dialogue with these countries. It believes that in view of the scale of the current crisis in all the economies of the world and especially in the developing countries, special importance must be attached to this dialogue.

The European Council also agreed on the urgent need to ensure that the developing countries manage to overcome their economic and financial problems more successfully, which would be an important factor in bringing about an international economic upswing.

In this context, the Sixth UNCTAD meeting in Belgrade in June 1983 should offer an opportunity to make significant progress in international economic cooperation. In this respect, the Ten are resolved to move forward.

*
* *

Question No 98, by Mr Pearce (H-616/82)

Subject: South Africa

What steps have the Ministers taken to study the course of constitutional development being undertaken in South Africa, with the stated aim of enabling all national groups to participate in decision-making as regards common issues, through *inter alia*; the formation of a new Ministry responsible for constitutional development, headed by a minister of cabinet rank; commitments to reform strong enough to cause two ministers and eighteen other MPs to leave the government party in protest; the announcement of proposals for a 'confederation' and for consultations with various groups to establish it; and do Ministers agree that the economic and strategic importance of South Africa to the European Community requires them to support these developments as part of a gradual process of reform in South Africa?

Answer

The Ten, meeting in Political Cooperation, regularly consult on South African affairs. During these consultations, the Ten take into consideration all developments of any importance, including the intended constitutional changes in South Africa to which the honourable Member refers.

These proposals provide for a limited right of political co-determination for those of mixed race and Indians, but do not concern the black majority in South Africa.

The Ten reaffirm their conviction that it is urgently necessary to satisfy the political, social and economic expectations of all South Africans. The apartheid system must be abolished quickly. The Ten will continue their crucial dialogue with South Africa with a view to encouraging peaceful change. They will also continue to bring the great influence of the European Community to bear on South Africa, to urge it to abolish the apartheid system and build a society which offers all its members peace and justice.

*
* *

Answers to the questions to the Commission

Question No 2, by Mr Galland (H-401/82)

Subject: Four new Japans

In view of the industrial development in Asia of four new Japans — South Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan — which are currently preparing for a transition from labour-intensive industries to high technology, has the Commission implemented the measures needed to ensure that Europe has a concerted plan to respond to competition from these countries?

Answer

The policy of the Community toward countries such as those mentioned by the Honourable Member is based on the following factors:

- the need to preserve freedom of trade, insofar as this is possible;
- the desirability of a gradual assumption by the developing countries, whose economic performances are increasingly comparable to those of the industrialized countries, of the responsibilities which constitute the rights and duties of the industrialized countries, and this also in the context of the international organizations;
- the opportunities for Community industry represented by the markets of the countries in question (some of these countries have a particularly high purchase potential in the areas of equipment and high technology: Korea and Taiwan, for example).

Because of the highly competitive nature of certain goods and the effort made by these countries to penetrate the Community market, and not ruling out eventual recourse to protective measures if they should prove to be indispensable, certain specific provisions can be distinguished:

- import regulations for textile products and clothing (by contract, except in the case of Taiwan);
- regulations for certain products, such as those with Korea on iron and steel products;
- the limitation of tariff duty on the import of very sensitive products, in the context of the GPS, originating in countries which are particularly competitive (Hong Kong and Korea, in particular; Taiwan does not benefit from the Generalized Preferences Scheme.)

In order to meet international competition, including that of the four countries in question, the Community must also increase its own competitiveness. The policy of industrial restructuring and the high technology research programmes, particularly the Esprit programme (research and development in the field of information technologies) are intended to bring new assets to the Community in this respect.

Furthermore, the proposals made by the Commission in its communications to the Council on innovation and on the stimulation of productive investments represent an approach that can strengthen the Community's commercial position in relation to its partners.

*
* *

Question No 6, by Mrs Boserup (H-535/82)

Subject: The Commission's participation in EPC

Can the Commission explain what specific implications the statement that 'in future the Commission will be fully involved in political cooperation at all levels' (Commission of the European Communities: Fifteenth General Report on the Activities of the European Communities in 1981, p. 286) has had in terms of Commission participation in EPC?

Answer

The full association of the Commission at all levels of European Political Cooperation is the result of the decision taken by the Foreign Affairs Ministers in the framework of the London report, adopted on 13 October 1981.

In concrete terms, the Commission, owing to this decision, was able to participate in all the meetings and additional activities of Political Cooperation.

*
* *

Question No 8, by Mr Mouchel (H-555/82)

Subject: Renegotiation of textile agreements

Exactly what stage has been reached in the current renegotiation under the MFA of multi-annual bilateral textile agreements between the Community and low-cost supplier countries, what are the countries with which negotiations have not yet been completed, and what difficulties has the Commission encountered in the negotiations?

Answer

The Commission has concluded negotiations with the member countries of the MFA with the exception of Argentina. The 'dominant' countries, like Hong Kong, Korea, and Macao are among those with which negotiations have been concluded. The negotiations in general were carried out in conformity with the directives issued by the Council in respect to the legal enacting terms and the volume of imports, including the comprehensive ceilings.

*
* *

Question No 9, by Mr Paulhan (H-557/82)

Subject: Selling price of French cigarettes in Germany

Is the Commission aware that a packet of the French cigarettes 'Gauloises filtre longues' which sells for FF 4.90 in France costs DM 3.80 in Germany, three times the French price net of tax? Does it feel that this practice is commensurate with the economic objec-

tive of a single internal market in the Community, and is it in a position to react to this form of masked protectionism by a Member State?

Answer

The Commission is aware of the differences between the sales prices (pre-tax) of cigarettes of the same brand in the various Member States. Clearly this applies to the prices of 'Gauloise filter — long' in France and in Germany, although the German pre-tax price is not, as the honourable Member asserts, three times but only about twice as high.

Apart from additional costs for transport, advertising, packaging and trading margins, in wholesale and in retail, these differences can also be traced to the export market policy of the producer concerned, which in turn is influenced by the tax burden on the product concerned¹.

In any case, the EEC Treaty does not prohibit, subject to the possible applicability of Article 85 and 86, the producer from setting different prices for a same product sold on different markets.

This possibility is formally set out in Council Directive 72/464/EEC of 19 December 1972. Article 5 of that directive states that producers and importers may freely decide the maximum retail price for each of their products, although they must also take account of the level and structure of the taxes imposed on these products.

*
* *

Question No 10, by Mrs Anglade (H-558/82)

Subject: 'Acid rain' pollution

Is the Commission aware of a report by the US Congress on pollution by sulphur dioxide, apparently originating in coal-fired power stations and ore processing plants, which can be fatal for man and a very serious threat to the environment? Has it already taken up this problem and made suitable proposals?

Answer

Despite great efforts, the Commission has been unable as yet to obtain a copy of the specialized report to which the question refers. When it does, it will examine it without delay.

In any case, the Commission is as fully informed about the problem of acid rain and its causes as the existing data permits. It very much hopes that scientific research in this field will progress rapidly. It also noted with some interest the studies carried out in the Federal Republic, during which the public was informed of the part played by ozone. All these developments are being followed with great attention.

Independently of the definite results which further scientific investigation may produce, there is enough evidence on hand to justify, in certain areas, preventative measures with respect to the most likely causes, i.e. plants etc. which emit SO₂ and NO₂. The Commission has taken measures in the past aimed at reducing harmful pollutants which produce acid rain. They include the directives on limiting the sulphur content of gasoline and limiting the SO₂ concentration in the atmosphere.

Further measures which should make a significant contribution to resolving this problem are under preparation. For instance there is the preliminary draft of a general directive on

¹ Cigarettes are subject to different proportional taxes in the various Member States (consumer taxes + VAT), calculated on the basis of the *retail sales price*, and to different specific consumer taxes; so the producer has to take the effects of these taxes into account when fixing the retail sales price on a particular market.

strengthening the control of pollutants from fixed plant which, as is well-known, contribute considerably to producing acid rain.

The Commission has nearly completed a draft directive on limiting the NO₂ concentration in the atmosphere.

This proposal will indirectly contribute to controlling the pollution from nitric oxides.

On the basis of current scientific knowledge and the implementation of the relevant international agreements — with special reference to the Geneva Convention on widescale, transfrontier atmospheric pollution — the Commission will examine the need for and prospects of success of further measures in this area.

*
* *

Question No 11, by Mr Junot (H-560/82)

Subject: Change in the place of origin of officials of the Commission

Why, after more than four years, has the Commission still not responded to the applications made by some of its officials for their place of origin to be changed pursuant to the administrative rules it issued in April 1978, and can it assure Parliament that it will quickly settle the problem in accordance with the Staff Regulations and be seen to act like a fully responsible institution?

Answer

1. Following the republication in 1978 of the internal guidelines (originally adopted in 1968) on the criteria for determining and revising the place of origin of Commission officials, requests were made by a number of officials for a change in their established place of origin.
2. In the course of considering the requests, certain difficulties in the interpretation of the guidelines became apparent, the legal aspects of which required careful consideration as did the individual merits of each case.
3. While a certain number of the cases have been settled, the difficulties mentioned above have caused quite considerable delay in the final determination of these cases. However, I can assure the Honourable Parliamentarian that it is envisaged that a final position on the remainder of the cases will be taken by the end of February.

*
* *

Question No 17, by Mr Davern (H-414/82)

Subject: New Zealand's share of the UK butter market

Will the Commission explain its interpretation of Community preference in the butter market where EEC figures show that while in 1975 Denmark and Ireland had 75% of the British market, in 1981 their share had sunk to 33% and the share of a non-Member State, New Zealand, had risen from 25% to at least 30%?

Answer

Community preference is based on absence of restriction in intra-Community trade, that is without either quantitative limitations or financial charges, whereas imports from New Zealand are subject both to a quota and an import levy.

Supplies from Member States to the British market have reduced in the period between 1975 and 1981 as a result, particularly, of a substantial increase in UK production (+256% in the period mentioned) coupled with a decrease in consumption by 31% in the same period.

According to official Community statistics imports from Denmark and Ireland in 1975 represented 28% of British consumption whereas in 1981 this figure was 21%. The New Zealand share in the same period has increased from 25% to 28%.

This situation has arisen because in 1975 New Zealand did not export its full quota of about 152 000 tonnes which at that time represented 31% of UK consumption.

*
* *

Question No 21, by Mr Cousté (H-467/82)

Subject: Replacement of the Head of the Commission delegation to Japan

Does the Commission consider that leaving the post of Head of the Commission delegation to Japan vacant for so long is good for the image of the Community in that country?

Answer

On 20 October 1982 the Commission has taken the necessary steps to allow for rapid nomination of its Head of Delegation in Tokyo.

Following normal procedures the Commission has on 11 November 1982 received the agreement of the Japanese Government for nominating Mr Laurens Jan Brinkhorst. The appointment has been formally decided by the Commission on 17 November 1982 and Mr Brinkhorst has taken up his new functions in Japan on 4 December 1982.

*
* *

Question No 25, by Mr Marshall (H-523/82)

Subject: Sugar

In its answer to my oral question 14th September 1982 (H-325/82)¹, the Commission states that it published a major survey of the world agricultural markets in 1976. Can the Commission state: the increase in Community output, as well as the extent to which Community surpluses have increased, relative to the world market, since that date and whether it has carried out a survey of the effect of high EEC sugar prices on sugar-using industries in the EEC?

Answer

We estimate that over the 7-year period 1976/77 to 1982/83 Community sugar production has increased by about 3.6 million tonnes white value and that the Community's disposable surplus has risen by roughly the same amount. From 1976 to 1982, the latest period for which ISO data are available, the total net trade on the world free market rose by 4.8 million tonnes raw value (4.4 million tonnes white value) and total world production increased by 5.8 (5.3) million tonnes. It is worth noting that the increase in world free market trade has been almost exclusively in white sugar (4 to 8 million tonnes), of which the EEC is the main world supplier. We have not made a survey of the kind

¹ Debates I-288 of 15. 9. 1982.

referred to. Such a survey would present great difficulties because of the continually varying relativities between the Community price and the world price. But if the Community's sugar-using industries themselves feel that a survey is desirable it would be for them to carry it out.

*
* *

Question No 27, by Mr Adam (H-551/82)

Subject: UK lamb exports to France

What progress has the Commission made in eliminating the border health checks which are delaying the entry of lamb into France from the UK?

Answer

Subsequent to the problems which arose in September of 1982 concerning the import into France of sheepmeat originating in the United Kingdom, the Commission alerted the French authorities to the restrictions imposed on their action by Article 36 of the EEC treaty.

The French authorities informed the Commission that these border checks had been discontinued on 22 October 1982.

*
* *

Question No 28, by Mr Basil de Ferranti (H-565/82)

Subject: Raw material costs for the biotechnology industry

Is starch, glucose and sugar available in Europe at low enough prices to ensure the competitiveness of the biotechnology industry; this industry is small at present but is the Commission aware of how vital it will be for future employment?

Answer

The Commission is well aware of the likely future importance of the biotechnology industry and of its potential for adding value to agricultural raw materials, including starch, glucose and sugar, and the necessity for this to have access to them at competitive prices.

It is therefore studying ways of encouraging the development of these industries as a logical extension of the agricultural sector, with a view to launching such initiatives (including research, development, and demonstration) as are shown to be necessary.

Small production refunds are already paid for raw materials used in the manufacture of starch (which also influences the output price of glucose) and for sugar used in the chemical industry. In the present price package the Commission is proposing modest increases in these refunds.

The Community pays a production refund for raw materials used for the manufacture of starch. This also influences the output price of glucose. The production refund is intended to keep the Community starch industry competitive and in the present price package the Commission is proposing small increases in these refunds. The Community also pays a production refund on sugar used in the chemical industry which is calculated in order to maintain a fair balance between sugar and cereals as a raw material for these productions.

*
* *

Question No 30, by Mrs Scrivener (H-579/82)

Subject: Lead in petrol

Can the Commission say whether the Community is carrying out research into the reduction of the lead content of petrol and whether it intends to draw up new regulations aimed at gradually promoting the production of lead-free petrol?

Answer

For many years now the problem of the lead content of petrol has been a crucial element of the Commission's environmental and consumer protection policy.

An important first step was taken with the adoption of Directive 78/611 of 29 June 1978 on the approximation of Member States' legislations on the lead content of petrol and the fixing of an upper limit of 0.4 g lead/litre.

For technical reasons, the directive provides for a lower limit of 0.15 g lead/litre and allows the Member States to reduce the lead content for their territory to that level. Hitherto, however, only the Federal Republic of Germany (1976), Denmark and the United Kingdom have made use of this possibility to reduce lead pollution. The Danish measures will come into force in July 1983 for normal petrol and in July 1984 for super petrol. The British measures are due to enter into force at the end of 1985. The Netherlands government has also announced that it intends to follow suit. So it is still quite possible for the other Member States to reduce the lead content of their petrol.

On the question of replacing lead in petrol by the addition of other substances, the Commission has just concluded a study which will be published in the near future.¹

The reduction of lead in petrol has a direct effect on energy consumption and on pollution values in general. These two factors in turn affect vehicle weights and driver and passenger safety — a further area in which the Commission is called upon to act. The same can be said for noise levels.

Because of this interrelationship, it would be reasonable to coordinate the legislative activity on the various areas, if only to prevent rules having to be amended again after a short period of time. That is why in June 1981 the Commission decided in favour of a *global approach* which would take account of all the above problems, including lead pollution.

Under this global procedure, the Commission is examining a wide variety of technical solutions, including those requiring the use of low lead content or lead-free petrol. It is taking into account that the refineries and the petrochemical industry are already moving increasingly towards the manufacture of components, such as methanol or higher alcohols, which to some extent increase the antiknocking properties of the motor fuel and can therefore, at least in part, replace the usual lead compounds.

I hope to be able to present an interim report on this global approach before the end of the first half of 1983. Then it will also be possible to determine the date of the proposal for the entire package of measures. It is my aim to present a document before the end of this term of office.

*
* *

Question No 33, by Miss Quin (H-592/82)

Subject: EEC Agricultural export restitutions

Which other countries in the world use the system of export restitutions to subsidize agricultural exports in the same way as the EEC and how does the level of export restitutions

¹ 'Study on the possibilities for the replacement of lead in gasoline by the addition of compounds', a survey carried out for the Commission of the European Communities by Chem Systems International Ltd.

of other countries (if these exist) compare with the average EEC level for such products as cereals and dairy products?

Answer

It is first necessary to explain that the Community system of export restitutions is not intended to subsidize agricultural exports but solely to make up the difference between internal prices and world prices. The EEC maintains the level of its internal prices by means of levies on imports.

At the present time few countries have a system of export restitutions for agricultural products which is analogous to that of the EEC. There is the case of Sweden, however, which compensates upon export for differences between domestic prices and world prices. The premiums rendered necessary by such a system are financed by domestic taxes and levies on imports.

This having been said, any country which practises any sort of price support in favour of agricultural producers finds itself obliged to adopt some form of intervention in order to help its exports.

Occasionally the balance between domestic prices in the exporting countries and world prices is restored through direct state aid to a central body responsible for export. This is the case in Switzerland, where the Swiss organization for the export of cheese is compensated for its losses by the federal budget.

This is also the case for the export of the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the USA (the sale of butter in 1981).

Among other forms of aid to exports one can mention long term credit at special conditions (the mixed credit introduced by the USA for the export of agricultural products).

Aid to agricultural exports takes many different forms which are difficult to compare or evaluate.

This is the reason for the decision taken at the most recent GATT conference to create a Committee on Agriculture. One of the principal tasks of this committee will be to study subsidies and all other forms of aid to exports on the basis of a system of notification which should increase the transparency of the various systems.

*
* *

Question No 34, by Mr Scott-Hopkins (H-593/82)

Subject: Barrage across the River Severn

Has the Commission at any stage over the last nine years received a request for financial aid towards the building of a barrage across the River Severn; if such a request were received, would the Commission view it favourably?

Answer

The Commission has not received any request for financial aid towards the building of a barrage across the River Seven.

It emphasizes, however, that the European Community could use some of the financial instruments that are available, to help towards the construction of the type of infrastructure to which the honourable member refers.

Obviously, a final decision regarding eligibility for financial aid for such a project can only be taken after formal application has been made, and following scrutiny to show that all the requisite conditions for the use of such aids are satisfied.

*
* *

Question No 35, by Mr Haagerup (H-595/82)

Subject: Greenland's withdrawal from the Communities

Would the Commission please state what schedule it has drawn up for considering Greenland's withdrawal from the Communities?

Answer

The Commission can say for its part that the opinion it is required to give in the procedure laid down in Article 236 of the EEC Treaty and Article 204 of the Euratom Treaty will be submitted in January of this year.

It is not for the Commission to make any pronouncements on timetables in relation to matters that fall within the terms of reference of other institutions, such as the opinion of Parliament, the decision of the Council on the opening of negotiations between the Member States or the decisions of the Member States themselves, the actual negotiations themselves and the national ratification procedures.

*
* *

Question No 36, by Mr Patterson (H-596/82)

Subject: National language used as a non-tariff barrier

Can the Commission categorically state that the insistence of the French Government that all documentation concerning goods coming from other EEC countries must be in the French language constitutes an illegal and unacceptable non-tariff barrier? In view of the fact that, if such a barrier is allowed to continue, every other EEC country could take similar steps, with catastrophic results for intra-Community trade, will the Commission give an assurance that legal proceedings against the French Government will be pressed at the highest degree of urgency?

Answer

1. In its circular order of 20 October 1982, the French Government revised the implementation of the law of 31 December 1975 on the use of the French language. This makes it obligatory, without exception, to use the French language in the accompanying documents for the importation of goods and services into France (bills, forwarding and consignment documents, etc.) and to describe the goods themselves (labels, instructions, etc.).

The French Government justifies these measures with special reference to the need to protect the French language and the consumer.

2. The Commission considers it legitimate in principle to want to protect the French language and the consumer. However, it takes the view that the measures taken by the French Government to this end as set out in the circular order of 20 October 1982 go beyond the basic objective and conflict with Article 30 of the EEC Treaty. The general and systematic requirement that all the necessary documents, descriptions of goods etc.

for the importation of goods and services must be drawn up in the French language, or that where necessary translations must be provided, have a disproportionately adverse effect on imports from other Member States.

Under Community legislation, a translation of customs documents may be required only in exceptional cases; in principle they can be drawn up in any of the official languages of the Community. For the rest, the needs of consumer protection by no means require checks at the time of the import formalities as to whether descriptions of goods, instructions for their use, etc. have been drawn up in the French language; in this respect it would seem quite sufficient for such checks to be carried out at the level of the wholesale or retail trade.

3. On 9 November 1982 the Commission started proceedings against the French Government for infringement of the Treaty, which it is actively pursuing. Meanwhile it presumes that the French Government is endeavouring to find a solution compatible with Community law as soon as possible.

*
* *

Question No 38, by Mr Vandemeulebroucke (H-602/82)

Subject: Restructuring of the petrochemical industry

At its annual meeting in October 1982, the European section of the Union of Chemical Industries requested the Commission to draw up rules on competition and to work out a restructuring plan for the petrochemical industry in order to eliminate production surpluses of over 40%.

Also according to the Union of Chemical Industries, current monthly losses total 200 million EUA.

Would the Commission state its views on this matter?

Answer

The Commission is of the opinion that the sector of the petrochemical industry is experiencing cost/price restrictions for various reasons:

- economic recession (circumstantial cause)
- overcapacity (structural cause)
- financial losses (non-competitive system of production)
- competition (struggle for shares of the market)

and that this sector, in order to deal with its structural problems, needs to carry out a rationalization of the structure of supply.

This problem is not limited to the production of thermoplastics, particularly PVC and low density polyethylene, but it also affects intermediate and primary products, especially ethylene.

In certain Member States the problem is centred around the number of products affected and the volume of the uneconomical production to be restructured.

In July of 1982 the Commissioners competent to deal with the problems of this sector (industry, competition, and internal market) received representatives from the large European chemical groups.

These representatives stated that they wished:

- to make a joint study of the problems of the sector,
- to present their view of these problems to the Commission,
- to draw up proposed solutions for their problems.

They offered to submit a study and proposals for solutions to the Commission within a few months.

The Commission is still waiting for the results of this work.

In regard to the rules of conduct in an eventual restructuring of this sector, the Commission has described its position in the 11th report on competition.

It will provide further clarifications in the 13th Competition Report, which will appear at the beginning of January.

*
* *

Question No 39, by Mr Radoux (H-603/82)

Subject: Accession of Norway to the EEC

Considering the benefits which Denmark has derived from its membership of the European Communities, does the Commission not think that talks should be resumed with Norway, as sufficient time has now elapsed to enable that country to reconsider what accession to the EEC would represent in terms of its own and Scandinavian interests?

Answer

A request for membership in the Community implies a political initiative on the part of the country wishing to become part of the Community. In the particular case referred to by the Honourable Member this initiative depends upon a political assessment to be made by the Norwegian government, which has not discussed this matter with the Community since the defeat of the referendum of September 1972.

For its part, the Community can feel satisfaction at the excellent relations existing between itself and Norway, relations confirmed by the Free Trade Agreement of 14 May 1973.

*
* *

Question No 40, by Mr Adamou (H-605/82)

Subject: Imports of citrus fruit into Greece

The problem of imported citrus fruits (oranges, mandarins, etc) from EEC countries and countries with preferential relations with the EEC (Spain, Turkey, etc) has become particularly acute at a time when Greek farmers are anxiously seeking ways of disposing of their own crops of citrus fruits for this year and the prices for their products are consequently being depressed.

What immediate measures does the Commission intend taking to counteract the above-mentioned imports and to bring about the timely disposal of this year's Greek crop of citrus fruits (last year thousands of tonnes had to be destroyed) by developing imports of the other nine EEC States and by facilitating development of our exports to the socialist countries, which are the traditional purchasers of Greek citrus fruits?

*Answer*1) *Import arrangements*

The system of reference prices set up on the Community level applies to Greece as well as to the other Member States. The Greek authorities have forwarded no information on quantities or rates in connection with the import of citrus fruit originating in third countries, as EEC rule No 2118/74 requires them to do, and this would seem to imply that there have been no imports of these products from third countries.

2) *Financial compensation*

Member States which produce citrus fruits and export them to another Member State receive a financial compensation called a marketing premium. In the case of Greece, the premium is adapted to the provisions of the Act of Accession, specifically Articles 68 and 76. According to the information available it can be affirmed that no exchange of these products is taking place between Italy and Greece.

3) *Measures concerning market administration*

Export refunds for citrus fruit, particularly oranges and lemons, were considerably increased on 16 December 1982, especially for exports to the Eastern countries, with the purpose of improving marketing prospects for citrus fruit produced in Greece.

4) *Structural measures*

EEC regulation No 2511/19, recently made more attractive for producers by the Council, provides, for measures aimed at the reconversion of citrus orchards to crops in greater consumer demand.

*
* *

Question No 41, by Mr Ephremidis (H-608/82)

Subject: The Cyprus question and the Commission's standpoint

In the daily bulletin put out by the Commission's Spokesman's Group, an interview with Mr Kenanan Atakol was published under the title 'The Federal State of Cyprus and the EEC', this representing an inadmissible cover-up of the plans for dividing Cyprus into two parts by Turkey, whose troops have occupied 40% of Cypriot territory.

Does the Commission categorically condemn these provocative actions which are repeated every so often to the detriment of the Republic of Cyprus, a country associated with the EEC, does it support the UN Resolutions on the Cyprus question and does it intend to take definite measures against those responsible for this political provocation?

Answer

The article in question was taken from a Turkish weekly press review and reprinted in an internal Commission bulletin. The Commission acknowledges that the wording of the article was inaccurate and has asked the editor of the Turkish press review to take greater care in future with the quality of his articles.

The Commission has not changed the position it has taken up ever since 1974 on the situation in Cyprus and the solution of the problems arising therefrom.

*
* *

Question No 42, by Mr Alavanos (H-613/82)

Subject: The Greek pharmaceutical industry

The Commission, through its Commissioners Narjes and Andriessen, has been interfering in Greece's economic affairs, namely in questions of regulation by law of pharmaceutical and insurance companies, seeking to nullify regulations in these sectors which, in the Commission's opinion, strengthened the public sector's role.

In the Commission's view, is the Greek Government the competent authority to formulate policy in Greece or is it the Commission?

Answer

Article 155 of the EEC Treaty instructs the Commission to ensure that the provisions of the Treaty and the measures taken by the institutions pursuant thereto are applied, in order to ensure the proper functioning and development of the common market.

That means that the Commission must examine the compatibility with Community legislation of all legal and administrative provisions of the individual states which could run counter to the Member States' obligations under Community rules.

In carrying out its role as the guardian of the Treaties, the Commission acts either on its own initiative or in response to complaints brought before it.

In the above case the Commission found evidence of serious incompatibility between the draft law and the EEC Treaty — in particular Articles 30, 37, 90 and 92 thereof.

Consequently, the Commission drew the attention of the Greek authorities to those points in the draft law which in its view needed to be changed in order to make this bill compatible with Greece's obligations under the EEC Treaty.

Thereupon the Greek authorities expressed their intention to make the necessary changes.

The Commission is now awaiting the official forwarding of the text of the law as adopted by the Greek Parliament in early December 1982. Only when it has carefully examined the final text of the law can it decide its further position.

In the case of the insurance companies mentioned by the honourable Member, the Commission has received numerous complaints. Law No 1256/82 stipulates that all goods owned by the state or national undertakings must be insured with Greek state insurance companies. It also obliges state-owned Greek banks to urge borrowers to insure themselves with these state insurance companies.

During its contacts with the Greek authorities, the Commission also pointed out the incompatibility of these measures with the Treaty.

In this matter too, the Commission cannot adopt a definitive position until it has received an official answer from the Greek authorities. It hopes to receive this answer in the near future.

*
* *

Question No 43, by Mrs von Alemann (H-618/82)

Subject: Nuclear power stations in border areas

When will the Commission be submitting a directive on nuclear power stations in border areas?

Answer

In 1976 the Commission introduced a draft Council regulation instituting a Community consultation procedure in cases where electric power plants potentially affect the territory of another Member State. This proposal is not restricted to nuclear power plants, but applies to all electric power plants above a certain power level.

During 1977 and 1978 this proposal remained blocked at the technical level of the Council.

In May of 1979, the Commission resubmitted its 1976 proposal to the Council, together with a new statement on the reasons behind it.

Since that time, Council-level discussions and the search for a compromise have led to modifications of the original proposal, but no agreement has as yet been reached within the Council.

The Commission is now examining the problem of nuclear safety, and it will eventually submit proposals to the Council concerning nuclear installations in frontier areas. The Commission reminds the Honourable Member that an important aspect of the problem is covered by Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty. According to this provision each Member State must furnish the Commission with general data concerning any project to dispose of radioactive effluents in any form, making it possible to determine whether the realization of the project would cause radioactive contamination of the water, soil, or air space of another Member State.

The communication of data should take place not less than a year and six months before the installation goes into operation.

After consultation with a group of experts, the Commission gives its opinion within six months.

Furthermore, in its recommendation of 3. 2. 1982 on the implementation of Article 37, the Commission called for preliminary data for new projects to be submitted before the granting of a construction permit by the national authorities.

*
* *

Question No 46, by Mr Ryan (H-637/82)

Subject: Taxes on Inter-Community travel

Does the Commission approve of the imposition of national taxes on travellers engaged on journeys within the European Community such as the Irish tax on journeys abroad originating in Ireland and the Belgian Airport tax, which taxes appear to infringe the right of free travel within the Community, and if the Commission disapproves, what action will the Commission take to prevent the collection of such taxes?

Answer

The free movement of persons within the Community is one of the foundations of the common market. It follows that the Commission is opposed in principle to any measure which renders travel and tourism from one Member State to another more expensive than travel within the frontiers of a Member State. The Commission has therefore examined the compatibility of the taxes in question with the fiscal provisions of the Treaty, but has concluded that, in their present form, and at the present stage of development of Community law these taxes are not unlawful.

*
* *

Question No 49, by Lord Bethell (H-648/82)

Subject: Landing cards for nationals of other Member States

In view of the welcome decision by certain EC governments, most recently the French Government in December 1982, to abolish the requirement for landing cards for nationals of other Member States, will the Commission urge the Italian and Greek Governments also to abolish this requirement?

Answer

In December 1982 the Italian Government informed the Commission that nationals of the Member States need no longer fill in a landing card from 1 December 1982. The proceedings against Italy for infringement of the Treaty have therefore been suspended. Since France has also abolished landing cards for nationals of the Member States, as the honourable Member was informed in December 1982 in reply to his question (No 567/82), the only current proceedings for infringement of the Treaty concern Greece. These proceedings were initiated later than the other two. The Commission expects Greece to follow the example of the other two governments in the near future.

*
* *

Question No 50, by Mr Cottrell (H-652/82)

Subject: Contacts between the Community and the Turkish Cypriot administered area of Cyprus

Will the Commission describe the present position with regard to contacts between the Community and the authorities in the Turkish Cypriot administered area of Cyprus?

Answer

The policy of the Community, like that of all Member States, has always been to recognize the Government of the Republic of Cyprus as the sole legitimate representative of the island. Within the framework of the Association Agreement, the Commission has always endeavoured to ensure that the interests of the island's population as a whole are safeguarded.

*
* *

Question No 53, by Mr Normanton (H-657/82)

Subject: Forestry in the ACP States

Recalling the report by Mr Seligman on biomass for energy and the ecological benefit of trees, what steps is the Commission taking to encourage forestry in the developing countries?

Answer

The Commission is aware that serious problems exist in the forestry sector in the developing countries. Population increases lead to extended cultivation at the expense of the forest, and the consumption of fuelwood by households and small-scale industries aggravates the situation, resulting in excessive exploitation of the sector. It was with this in mind that the Commission, in 1981 in the context of a programme to combat world hunger (doc.

COM(81)560) proposed certain priority measures, one of which concerns reforestation and the more rational use of wood as an energy source. In another communication (doc. COM(82)320 final), in June of 1982, also sent to Parliament, the Commission proposed measures to implement this plan. More detailed proposals are now being elaborated by the services of the Commission and they too will be communicated to Parliament as soon as they are ready.

*
* *

Question No 55, by Mr Griffiths (H-663/82)

Subject: ERDF grants

Will the Commission detail how each national government's tax laws affect ERDF grants made to companies in private and public sectors?

Answer

In the short time available the Commission has not been able to carry out the thorough research needed in order to answer this question.

*
* *

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 13 JANUARY 1983

Contents

1. Topical and urgent debate:

Fisheries — Motions for resolutions by Mr Helms and others (Doc. 1-1108/82/rev.), Mrs Pery and others (Doc. 1-1116/82), Lord O'Hagan and others (Doc. 1-1119/82), Mrs Le Roux and others (Doc. 1-1123/82) and Mrs Ewing and others (Doc. 1-1132/82):

Mr Helms; Mrs Pery; Mr Provan; Mrs Le Roux; Mrs Ewing; Mr Nielsen; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Miss Quin; Mr Clinton; Mr Kirk; Mrs Kelllett-Bowman; Mrs Castle; Mr Kirk; Mr Balfour; Mr Calvez; Mr Skovmand; Mr Fich; Mr Battersby 200

Terrorism — Motions for resolutions by Mr Israël and others (Doc. 1-1104/82), Mr Antoniozzi and others (Doc. 1-1113/82) and Mr Bettiza and others (Doc. 1-1115/82):

Mr Israël; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Bettiza; Mr Didò; Mr Papaefstratiou; Lord Bethell; Mr Pajetta; Mrs Castellina; Mr Alavanos; Mr Chambeiron 209

Prague declaration — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1118/82) by Mr Fergusson:

Mr Fergusson; Mr Van Miert; Mr Habsburg; Mr Pajetta; Mr Haagerup; Mr Bord; Mr Pesmazoglou; Mr Bruno Friedrich; Mr Ephremidis 214

Nicaragua — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1112/82) by Mr Langes:

Mr Langes; Mr Thorn (Commission) 217

Jews in the USSR — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1117/82) by Mrs Théobald-Paoli and others:

Mrs Théobald-Paoli; Mr Israël; Mr Thorn (Commission) 217

Namibia — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1124/82) by Mr Luster and others:

Mr Luster; Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Thorn (Commission) 219

Natural disasters — Motion for resolution by Mrs Cinciari Rodano (Doc. 1-1099/82), Mr de la Malène and Mr Remilly (Doc. 1-1103/82), Mr Barbagli and others (Doc. 1-1109/

82), Mr Barbi (Doc. 1-1110/82) and Mr Simonnet and others (Doc. 1-1131/82):

Mr Israël; Mr Barbi; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Giolitti (Commission) 220

Mediterranean programmes — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1121/82) by Mr De Pasquale and others:

Mr de Pasquale; Mr Pöttering; Mr Giolitti (Commission) 221

2. Political cooperation and European security — Report (Doc. 1-946/82) by Mr Haagerup and oral questions with debate by Mr Filippi and others (Doc. 1-616/81) to the Foreign Ministers and Mr Seligman (Doc. 1-591/82) to the Council:

Mr Denis; Mr Haagerup; Mr Mertes (Council); Mr Radoux; Mr Seligman; Mr Mertes; Mr Bruno Friedrich; Mr Schall; Mr Ferguson; Mr Nord; Mr Thorn (Commission); Mr Israël; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Romualdi; Mrs Charzat; Mr Mommersteeg; Mr Normanton; Mr Segre; Mr Bord; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Pesmazoglou; Mr Fich; Mrs Gaiotti De Biase; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Alexiadis; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Seligman; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Treacy; Mr Haagerup; Mr Mertes 222

3. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania — Report (Doc. 1-656/82) by Mr Habsburg:

Mr Habsburg; Mr Seeler; Mr Wedekind; Mr Simmonds; Mr Gawronski; Mr Romualdi 245

4. Conscientious objection — Report (Doc. 1-546/82) by Mrs Macciocchi:

Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Janssen van Raay; Mr D'Angelosante; Mrs Veil 248

5. Action against the Council:

Mr Seefeld; Mrs Veil; Mr Davignon (Commission) 253

6. Dates of next part-sessions:

Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Barbi; Mr Wurtz; Mr Sherlock; Mr Glinne; Mr Martin; Mr Bord;

- Mr Kirk; Mr Enright; Mr Glinne; Mr de Courcy Ling* 254
7. *Votes:*
Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Radoux; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Radoux; Mr Glinne; Mr Radoux; Mr Haagerup; Mr Mommersteeg; Mrs Kellett-Bowman 256
8. *Conscientious objection (continuation):*
Mrs Bonino; Mr Eisma; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Gontikas; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Gendebien; Mrs Gaiotti De Biase 257
9. *ERDF — Oral questions with debate to the Council by Mrs Boot, Mr von der Vring, Mr Harris, Mr Cecovini, Mrs Ewing and Mr Kyrkos (Doc. 1-1048/82) and Mr De Pasquale, Mr Harris, Mr Hutton, Mr Muntingh, Mr Nikolaou, Mr Pöttering, Mr J. D. Taylor, Mr von der Vring and Mr Ziagas (Doc. 1-1049/82):*
Mrs Boot; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Schlecht (Council); Mr Giolitti (Commission); Mr Nikolaou; Mr Ingo Friedrich; Mr Harris; Mr Cecovini; Mr Gendebien; Mr Eisma; Mr O'Donnell; Mr Simpson; Mrs Boot; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Schlecht; Mrs Kellett-Bowman 260
10. *Parliament and discharge for 1980 — Discharge to the Commission on the implementation of the budget for 1980 — Embargo on exports of cereals to the USSR in 1980 (Docs. 1-760/82 and 1-1003/82) (continuation):*
Mrs Boserup; Mr Mart; Mr Marck; Mr Hord; Mr Martin; Mr Maher; Mr Clinton; Mr Aigner 270
- Annex:*
Mr Leonardi; Mr Gérard Fuchs; Mr Bournias; Mrs Charzat; Mr De Goede; Mrs Poirier; Mr McCartin; Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul; Mr Glinne; Mr Nordmann; Mrs Castellina; Mrs Lizin; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Lomas; Mrs Boserup; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Griffiths; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Albers; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mrs Dury; Mr Kyrkos; Mrs Clwyd; Mr Van Minnen; Mrs Buchan; Mr Bøgh; Mr Boyes; Mr Schinzel; Mr Fergusson; Mr Kallias; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Hahn; Mr Adamou 275

IN THE CHAIR: MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)¹

1. Topical and urgent debate

Fisheries

President. — The next item is the joint debate on five motions for resolutions:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1108/82/rev.), tabled by Mr Helms and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) and Mr Calvez, on the problems of the common fisheries policy;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1116/82) by Mrs Pery and others on the need to reach an agreement on the common fisheries policy;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1119/82), tabled by Lord O'Hagan and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on a common fisheries policy;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1123/82) by Mrs Le Roux and others on the urgent need to conclude a satisfactory agreement on fisheries between Member States;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1132/82) by Mrs Ewing and others on the common fisheries policy crisis.

Mr Helms (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we begin today's topical and urgent debate with the question of the Community's difficult protracted fisheries agreements. After the expiry of the deadline of 31 December 1980 set by the Council for reaching a decision, the European Parliament has repeatedly called upon the Council and Commission in urgent resolutions to take the urgently necessary decisions to institute a common fisheries policy, initially in line with the Treaties of the Six and then with the

¹ Approval of Minutes — Documents received — Agenda — Membership of Parliament: see Minutes.

Helms

Treaties of Accession of the other Member States. Just two years ago, at the plenary session of January 1981, I tabled an urgent motion for a resolution on the fisheries issue in the European Parliament on behalf of the EPP Group, which was adopted unanimously.

In 1982, in further urgent resolutions, the last of which was tabled in December, the European Parliament appealed to the Council to avoid at all costs the impending legal vacuum from 31 December 1982, and hence any risk of jeopardizing all compromises and agreements reached hitherto. According to the reports given to us here in Strasbourg the day before yesterday by the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Genscher, on the intensive efforts and consultations, and by the Danish Foreign Minister on the positive atmosphere during the Council negotiations, the situation has now become relaxed. In actual fact, however, although the Danish Government has called the package of compromises submitted by the Commission in December a carefully prepared solution, the Danish Parliament's veto has brought the crisis to a head. Seen from the Danish point of view, it was justified on principle. Our colleague, Mr Kent Kirk, commented on it yesterday at a press conference which I attended; this sensational, well-orchestrated incident is a further sign of the incapacity and inability of the entire Community to take action, and for many underscores the desolate situation it is in.

From intensive consultations in the Fisheries Subcommittee and with the Commission in the Fisheries Council we know that there have been intensive efforts and good progress has been made. Now, however, it would be intolerable if again no decision were to be taken at the Fisheries Council meeting scheduled for 25 January.

Our group welcomes the Commission's compromise proposals, which have been approved by the nine Member States. It accepts the national agreements made on 5 January. In short, we call upon the Commission and Council to carry on on the basis of the national agreements accepted by nine Member States if the deadline expires on 26 January so that no vacuum is created. These 'national' agreements must enable negotiations with third countries to be continued immediately by the Commission with a mandate from all the Member States. This is the most important point in my view. My group expects the disrupted negotiations with third countries to be continued, and in this connection I would like to refer to the text of our resolution.

Even if the efforts to achieve agreements are particularly strenuous, the Group of the European People's Party expects a majority decision to be taken according to Article 3 and the spirit of the Treaty. We would like to encourage the Commission and Council President to proceed along these lines. The European Community is a Community of law and we expect these conflicts not to be settled by force. These were the

main ideas of the EPP Group. We shall approve the joint motion of all the major groups.

Mrs Pery (S). — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the events which occurred at sea last week between Danish fishermen and the British authorities only bear out the concern voiced last month by Parliament.

Our colleague over there playing the pirate with the Queen's fish — if I may put it that way — is but the first act in a comedy which can soon turn into a tragedy, as we all know. It is more necessary than ever to reach agreement on a common fisheries policy signed by the 10 countries, without however losing sight of the bases which have already been accepted by nine Member States. One could hardly pay more dearly for this agreement. Furthermore, the fisheries crisis in Europe is not without repercussions for the non-member countries with which we have concluded agreements, such as Spain and Norway.

These agreements have been suspended since 31 December by virtue of the lack of agreement among the Ten. Every year, pending Spain's entry to the EEC, an agreement is negotiated between that country and the Community. To limit the extent of the crisis, the Commission had proposed to Spain an interim agreement for sixty days, broadly reproducing the 1982 agreement for licences and quotas; on the other hand, Spain had to agree to reduce the number of its small deep-sea trawlers from 45 to 15, in view of the many incidents which had occurred in the Bay of Biscay, off the coast of Brittany and in the southern Ireland zone. At the last Council meeting of fisheries ministers, several member countries approved the restriction of the number of trawlers but wanted to limit the agreement to 30 days, in the hope that an overall solution could be found at the Council meeting of 25 January. The Spanish Government refused this proposal.

What is the situation today? Community vessels can no longer fish in Norwegian waters, and Spanish vessels can no longer enter EEC waters. Negotiations with European non-member countries must resume before the situation completely seizes up and the Franco-Spanish border is closed to imports of fish from the EEC.

Even assuming a new failure on the part of the Ten on 25 January, the Commission must study the legal framework in which these agreements could be signed, of course without prejudice to their content, which is to be negotiated on the basis of Commission proposals.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, although public attention was mainly focussed on the events off the Shetlands, the absence of an agreement among the Ten has many repercussions. I wanted to emphasize

Pery

one of its consequences which is perhaps less well known to you. The European Parliament must reaffirm forcefully to the Council the need to arrive at a global agreement at the Council meeting on 25 January, so as to ensure peace at sea, respect for access and good management of stocks. The failure of Community fisheries policy in 1982 is but the reflection of the crisis shaking Europe. A successful common fisheries policy is therefore bound to give fresh impetus to the building of Europe, and we must apply ourselves to this with all the determination we can muster.

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, I had the pleasure yesterday of being on the inaugural flight from Humberside to Esbjerg. I took the opportunity whilst in Esbjerg, which seems to be the hotbed of problems for the common fisheries policy at the present time, of acquainting myself with some of the views of the people of Denmark. I must say I have come back, as I expected to come back, Mr President, finding divided opinions. Some people think that what has happened recently has been correct and, of course, other people like myself feel that what has happened was wrong. That seems to be the consensus in Denmark as well.

We had a demonstrative expedition last week which, I feel, was wrong, because in fact it is hardening opinions within the Community. It is hardening opinions in favour, Mr President, of an urgent settlement for the common fisheries policy. Now, the people who want to see the Community achieve something want to see stability for the common fisheries policy. I hope that the proposals that are on the table from the Commission are properly understood by the fishermen of Denmark and by the fishermen of the Community. I believe that we have had very, very difficult negotiations and I know that this House has had many tortuous debates and we have come in fact to a consensus. I understand that, as far as cod equivalent is concerned, Denmark since 1973 to 1978, has been catching 23.56% of the cod equivalent. In the proposals and I think this is important for all those concerned to understand, from the Commission, it is proposed to enact 24.38% and therefore, that would be a stable catch quota for the fishermen of Denmark, slightly an increase on what they caught during the period 1973/78. Therefore, when we are talking about a resource that is scarce for a Member State that, I accept, is dependent to a large extent on its fisheries' to have that type of enactment, I believe, is sensible and right. I ask everybody involved in this debate to realize that other Member States have taken quite considerable cuts in their proportion so that we can get stability for the industry.

There is one thing that I would like to comment on specifically, Mr President, and that is a charge that is made against the United Kingdom fishing industry, namely that it is not an efficient industry. The United Kingdom fisheries catching sector is one of the most efficient in the Community, and just because at the

present time we are going through traumatic experience of instability, it has been decided to tie the amount of fish that a certain boat can catch to the number of people it is carrying on board. But that does not mean to say that our industry could not operate at very reduced manning levels. It is only when we get a common fisheries policy in operation, when we have the restructuring that is necessary for the entire Community fleet and when we know what the total catch quota is, that any Member State can really get down to achieving the manning levels and the size of fleet that are matched to the fishing capability it requires.

On 30 May 1980 the Council of Ministers decided that free fishing, as defined in Council Regulation 101/76, would end on 31 December 1982. Only one Member State has prevented the Council from adopting regulations giving effect to that decision of 30 May 1980. The proposals on the table cover very, very interesting possibilities, I believe, for giving Community fishermen a stable future and a proper economic return. There are proposals for marketing, there are proposals for structures, there are proposals for quotas and for policing. If we put the whole package together, all the torture we have been through in this House will have been worthwhile. The Commission and the Council have worked extremely hard to try to get the proper agreements by 31 December, and, unfortunately, time is slipping past. It is therefore urgent that it does happen and as soon as possible.

The resolution before us this morning has been subject to a compromise amendment. I am glad that my group will be able to support fully and endorse the compromise resolution before us. The Norwegian Government has also been party to some of the problems that we have been facing. We well understand the problems of the Norwegian fisheries sector and its interest in our negotiations and our efforts to reach agreement. We welcome assistance given us by the Norwegian Government in ensuring that we have got proper fishing capacities and opportunities in our shared waters, so that we can have proper management within the Community.

Mr President, I urge all in this House to show solidarity so that we can at this stage reach the agreement that we all urgently want.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mrs Le Roux (COM). — (FR) Mr President, despite the progress made in drawing up a common fisheries policy, a legal void has existed since the 31 December 1982, just as we had feared would happen. The Community's fishery resources are seriously threatened, and here it is my duty to inform the members of this Parliament of the legitimate concern of French fishermen, and of all those who depend on fishing for their livelihood.

Le Roux

This is why we wished to sign the joint amendment submitted this morning, expressing a reservation, however, as regards the reference — which we consider debatable — to Article 43. It is urgent that the Commission reach an agreement. It is urgent that a policy be introduced which respects national traditions, permits progress in the working and living conditions of fishermen, and guarantees the future of marine resources. This common policy must not be contrary to the interests of fishermen and to the benefit of a few large companies, but rather in the interests of fishermen, and therefore in consultation with them. When this policy is being drawn up, they must be consulted extensively, and professional organizations likewise must be consulted.

What do we regard as the most important elements of this policy? First of all we welcome the fact that the negotiations solved the problem of rights of access in a manner satisfactory to French fisheries.

Concerning the allocation of catches, recent events, namely the sailing under the British flag of some 20 or 30 Spanish trawlers and small trawlers, confirm the legitimacy of our claim for a fairer quota for our fishing industry. If the United Kingdom has to call on foreign vessels, is it not because the quotas allocated to it are too large?

As regards the organization of markets, we welcome the progress which has been made, but we hope that it will be possible to examine the possibility of greater protection against excessive imports. Our country's economy is suffering from these low-price imports which, far from benefitting consumers, simply help to increase the profits of big fish processors.

As regards prices, the Commission's proposals to retain last year's prices for herrings and sardines this year and to raise the guide prices of the other species from 2 to 6%, are totally unacceptable to us. It is the income of a whole population sector which is at stake, and we know only too well the risks which fishermen take to earn a decent living. Only yesterday, off the coast of Brittany, twelve sailors on two trawlers perished. Every year 50 Breton fishermen are lost at sea. And here I am speaking only of my own region.

This is why we regard it as essential that a large portion of this fisheries policy be devoted to an examination of social questions, to a serious attempt to harmonize social provisions upwards. The social aspect must not be an appendix but rather the heart of this policy. The policy of protecting resources in the Atlantic and in the North Sea has proved its worth. Today we are reaping the fruits. This is why I would like, to conclude, to draw attention to the need to examine the possibility of reducing fishmeal fishing, to introduce rapidly, in cooperation with the coastal states, a policy to protect the resources of the Mediterranean.

Finally, I would like to repeat the conviction of the French Communists and Allies — and this is further

confirmed on reading the Commission's list — that the enlargement of the common market would be catastrophic for all the fishermen of the European Community, but also for those of the applicant countries. The problems posed by the invasion of French coasts in the Bay of Biscay are only a prelude to these difficulties.

(Applause from the Communists and Allies Group)

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Mr President, I have no criticisms to make of the remarks made by any of the previous speakers, and I think that those of you who have listened patiently over the years to many fishing debates will know that those of us who represent directly large numbers of fishermen usually do find a wide consensus.

Mine is the only resolution left on the agenda before you, other than the composite resolution which replaces — as I understand it, by amendment — all the resolutions put down by the groups. I was unable to go along with that composite resolution, not because I disagree with it — it is a good resolution — but because it does not say certain things that have got to be said in this Chamber if this Parliament is to do its job.

I am sorry it should be me that has to say the unpleasant things, but then it is my duty. It is my duty to those whom I have tried to represent and who have been patient in their negotiations. Even the Danes, I am sure, will concede that the UK fishermen, of whom a majority come from Scotland and from my area in particular, have been patient and fair in their long 10 years of negotiation. No one can say otherwise. So it falls to me to call a spade a spade and to remind you that the race shouldn't be to the unreasonable and the battle to the publicist, but the reward should go to those who have fairly compromised in a community of spirit. That is what I am here to do, and I would like you to look at my resolution, because it narrates the straightforward facts of recent times.

I am afraid I regard the attempt by the Tory group as a whitewash job to excuse the actions of their own vice-chairman, Mr Kirk, which I regard as totally contemptible. Against 10 years of patient negotiation, we have a vice-chairman of a political group playing the part of the most publicized MEP breaking the law — certainly the law of the Member State I belong to — and being fined, but, as my fishermen say 'millionaires dinna make very convincing martyrs!'

Now I'm sorry it should be my lone voice to narrate these events. Why didn't the Danes get worked up about these matters earlier? Why did they wait until the eleventh hour? Why did they oppose urgent procedure in recent months and then play this kind of game, where apparently it's in the Danish vital interest to secure a few thousand tons of mackerel, while the

Ewing

Norwegians contemptuously say that the Danes are making no sacrifice and the other Scandinavians are offering to make up some of the gap? How, in the light of the Danes' fishing record and their expansionism, can a few thousand tons of mackerel which they want from my West-coast waters be of vital interest to them when we, the whole of the UK, have halved our catching capacity in 10 years?

The figures are there for everyone to see. The UK fleet has halved its capacity to 900 000 tons, while the Danish fleet has doubled its capacity from a million tons and over to two million tons. When you look at the other countries, you find that Germany has reduced her catching capacity by a third, France has cut back, and the capacities of Italy, the Netherlands and Belgium have remained more or less static.

Against this background and for the sake of a few thousand tons of mackerel, they are holding up an agreement and causing the hardships that Mrs Le Roux mentioned. The Norwegians have closed their waters to all Community fishermen. Admittedly, the Danes suffer most there, ironically, because there are more Danish boats — 450 of them to 150 EEC boats — but that is one of the direct results of their intransigence, which, quite simply, is this: they are playing politics against 10 years of patience, of compromise, of sacrifice that was called for and given, and that sacrifice is a human tragedy every time a boat is tied up. I have had to watch it, and like Mrs Le Roux we have all had to watch disasters and losses of life in this very dangerous job that fishermen voluntarily spend their lives pursuing.

How is it that we have arrived at a situation where we halve our fleet, the Danes double theirs and now they are saying that a few thousand tons of mackerel are a vital interest? We have heard from Mrs Le Roux about some of the Spanish consequences, the Norwegian consequences, the consequences with the arrangements made about the Shetland box, which I think are very unfair but which concern French and other Community fishermen.

The situation is extremely serious, and is made even more serious by what seems to be a certain degree of unawareness on the part of the Commission. In Question Time, two questions were put — one by Mr Harris, one by myself — on the fact that, by a device, Spanish boats can register in a Member State. That Member State — the UK — has asked the Commission for support here, and the Commission seems to know nothing about it. On 6 January, we had a statement from the Commission about avoiding a suspension of fishing operations with Norway when they were already suspended! What confidence can we, representatives of fishing interests, have in this state of affairs? At least the chaos should not be caused, blatantly and deliberately, by one Member State.

I would ask you to look at my resolution, which talks in practical terms about compensating those fishermen

from any Member State who have suffered directly as a result of this failure to reach agreement. I would say to you that if you are prepared to turn deaf ears when one Member State behaves in this way and leave it to one person to stand up and say what has got to be said, then I suggest, as an elected Member, that the man in the street in the end isn't fooled: he is not fooled by a whitewash job, because a whitewash job, in my long political experience, rebounds on those who attempt it. Your man in the street and mine will know perfectly well what is going on.

I ask you to support my resolution.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Brøndlund Nielsen (L). — (DA) On a point of order, Mr President, I am in doubt again today as to who is speaking on whose behalf, Mr President, I would like to ask whether Mrs Ewing was speaking on behalf of her group, whether she had speaking time for her group, and whether Mr Nyborg belongs to this group.

President. — Mrs Ewing had extra speaking time for her group.

Lord O'Hagan (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. On behalf of my group, I wish to make it clear that I object strongly to the vicious attack of the nation of Denmark, which is an equal Member of this Community, and the unpleasant tone of the personal assault made by Mrs Ewing on a member of this group. I ask for Mr Kirk to be given extra time to reply to Mrs Ewing, who has degraded the tartan that she wears.

President. — That was not a point of order.

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, the Commission has listened carefully to the views expressed by the honourable Members in the course of this debate.

As you know, at the Council meeting on fisheries on 21 December last, it was established that, despite all efforts, the Member States were unable to agree on a common fisheries policy to run from 1 January 1983 and based on an overall compromise proposal from the Commission which took account of the interests of all Member States and which, as you also know, was accepted by nine of the Member States. In the face of this failure, the Commission issued a statement calling on the Member States to take, as soon as possible, national conservation measures which would then be submitted to the Commission for examination, coordination and a decision on their approval. The duty and the right of the Member States to take national meas-

Contogeorgis

ures to conserve fish resources, and the need for such measures to be approved by the Commission, derive from Articles 5 and 155 of the Treaty of Rome, whose interpretation has been confirmed by the judgments of the European Court of Justice. At the same time, the Commission statement reminded the Member States of their duty to adhere to the requirements of the regulation on the monitoring of fishing activities, which was approved last year and which came into force on 1 January 1983, and on the basis of which the Member States are obliged to inform the Commission of their catches.

At the meeting on 5 January 1983, in order on the one hand to provide time for a study of the content of the national measures which had been submitted in the meantime by the Member States, and to coordinate these measures between the Member States, and on the other hand to prevent any unpleasant situation arising while these national measures were being studied, the Commission decided as follows:

Firstly, all the national measures submitted were approved provisionally until 26 January 1983; secondly, this interim decision does not prejudice the content of the measures to be decided upon in the final analysis. Until 26 January 1983 this decision establishes a system under which fishing in Community waters will be carried out as laid down in the proposals which the Commission has submitted to the Council — proposals which are now before the Council and on which it was impossible to reach a decision at the last Council meeting in December.

All the Member States have now communicated to the Commission the national measures which they intend to take to conserve Community fish stocks and to allow fishing. Many of these replies are not as complete as they should be, but the Commission — as I said before — is studying all the measures which have been submitted with a view to reaching a definitive decision.

I would, however, ask you to bear in mind that the Commission's coordination of these measures by the Member States is not a simple task, particularly when some Member States were late in submitting their national measures — which they adopted only two or three days ago — or when the measures they have submitted are incomplete and require additions or clarification.

As regards the fishing situation in 1983 for third countries such as Norway, the Faroe Islands and Sweden, the Commission has discussed the relative agreements, and I must inform you that it decided, at its meeting yesterday, to initial the agreements immediately and to ask the Council immediately to approve them for an interim period up till 30 April 1983, so as to allow fishing by these countries to be resumed immediately until such time as the Council reaches a decision after con-

sidering, among other things, the views of Parliament, which will be debating these agreements.

Mr President, that is the situation on fisheries in the absence of a decision by the Council and with the implementation of a temporary system which will run until 26 January of this year. At this point I might add that the last few days have produced a political initiative aimed at achieving acceptance of a common fisheries policy. Within the framework of this initiative, the Commission is making — and will continue to make — every effort to achieve agreement as soon as possible, because this is in the interests of the Community and its fishing population, and in order to avoid friction between the Member States in future.

Miss Quin (S). — Mr President, when I left Strasbourg at the end of the December part-session, I fervently hoped that this month I would not be involved in yet another debate on the fisheries issue because I also hoped that by this time an agreement would have entered into force. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

Since then, the temperature has been raised by various events, particularly of last week, and Mrs Ewing has shown just how strong the reaction to those events has been in certain areas. I myself have already spoken about this both in this Chamber and, strongly, outside it. I think, by now, far too much attention has been paid to it.

I should just say one thing, however, in passing to Kent Kirk. I remember that in a report he did on fish catches over a year ago, he called for more sophisticated fishery control. I am sure that he was just delighted to find how effective his fishing control is off the North-East English coast.

(Applause)

Now we are told that the signs for an agreement next week are good. While I hope that this will be so, I would like to make one point strongly, namely, that this possible agreement does not represent a situation in which one Member State is unhappy and everyone else is perfectly content. This agreement involves considerable sacrifices on the part of many countries and I would like to say that in my own country, for example, a great deal of criticism of the agreement has been expressed by various fishermen's groups and also in my own political party. The best that can be said for it is that it is better than some kind of dangerous free-for-all which would harm the future of the fishing industry throughout Europe.

My Danish colleagues are obviously worried about jobs in Denmark, but I would respectfully point out that jobs have been lost in the fishing industry in the last 10 to 15 years for various reasons, but particularly because of the loss of fishing opportunities in third country waters. Both the United Kingdom and Ger-

Quin

many in particular have lost out in this respect. We know what it is to lose jobs, particularly in areas where alternative employment is scarce and where the standard of living is not very high.

Finally, as we have said time and time again in this chamber, that we need a climate of security for the fishing industry to plan for the future and to prosper, and it is the foundation of this security that we look to the Government to assure for us next week or as soon as possible. We need this agreement now and without any further delay.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — Mr President, we are fortunate in this Parliament in having a number of people who know quite a lot about the fishing industry. And when they have spoken there is very little left to be said. I must admit that I had considerable reservations as to whether a long list of resolutions from the various political groups in this Parliament would help the present difficult situation, and I am now very pleased that we have all been able to reach a common position on our approach to trying to find a solution. Of course Mrs Ewing did not feel able to join with the other groups in this regard, and one can very readily understand her feelings in this matter because she represents an area that is very dependent on the fishing industry.

It is right indeed that Parliament should be concerned and it is right that this concern should be expressed in a reasonable and constructive manner. Much valuable work has been done in this Parliament in an effort to prepare the ground for a common fisheries policy that would benefit all the Member States' fishermen. If ever there was a strong case to be made for a common policy it is certainly in fisheries because, as we know only too well, fish do not respect any boundaries. And if we are to have proper conservation measures, if we are to have the sea properly farmed, we can only do that if we have a common fisheries policy. My feeling is that we are inclined to come into this Parliament very often and call on the Commission to do this and the other about many things in fact that they have gone as far as they possibly can go. When it has done all its work and when the Council has done all its work Parliament sits down and takes no specific action itself, only expresses its view. I had the very strong feeling in relation to this matter that perhaps what we should be doing is to appoint a high-powered delegation and go to Denmark and speak to the government there and speak to the special committee that is holding up a final decision on a common fisheries policy.

I want to say quite clearly that I fully understand the Danish attitude on this whole matter, because fishing is so important to the Danes. They are an extremely small country and they have a strong fishing fleet and they want to hold on to it. And I have nothing but admiration for the way their Minister has done his negotiations. I wish I could say the same thing about the Irish Minister that conducted our negotiations in

relation to fisheries. The Danes are a very small country, as I said. They are landing approximately two million tonnes of fish. Ireland is landing 150 000 tonnes of fish. And we are expected to stay with that for 20 years and have no expansion. And the Danes are complaining — recently the Minister himself complained bitterly that he was bound to accept this for 20 years. He could accept it but this special committee could not. And I would now appeal very strongly to the Danes to look at the actual position, look at the position of the other Member States look at the other Member State who is the weakest Member State, and see the deal it got as a result of its negotiations. See that it is prepared to accept something that it never should accept — and that is 150 000 tonnes of fish. Denmark is the size of one of our provinces, and so we all have to try to be reasonable, we all have to try and compromise if we are ever to have a Community.

(Applause)

Mr Kirk (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, I have been listening to the proceedings this morning and noticed that what everyone has been talking about all the time is 'we': we Irish, we Scots, we English, we Danes, we Germans. What has happened to the Community? Where is the Community?

On 21 October 1805, Admiral Nelson signalled to his fleet 'England expects every man to do his duty'. A lot has happened since 1805. There is no longer any need to signal: we have efficient communications equipment. Also, we live in a Community in which the countries of Europe have come together, and can we say that the Community today expects every man to do his duty for the Community? Has the Commission done its duty with the proposals it has tabled? Has the Commission managed to safeguard the Community's interests? Speaking as someone who is very deeply committed to the European ideal, my answer is no. The Commission has not managed to do this. It has allowed itself to be forced into a situation in which it has become the mouthpiece and mediator for the large Member States. Has this anything to do with the Community?

Since 1977 we have devoted our energies to the establishment of a common fisheries policy. I myself have worked on it, first directly as an organization representative and later, from 1979 on, as a Member of this House. And what has happened? Great Britain has said 'no' over and over again. The Commission has tabled one proposal after another and Great Britain has said 'no'. I do not reproach Great Britain for this because she was in a difficult political situation after the extension of the economic zones to 200 sea miles in 1977. I understand this. But now, all of a sudden, because Denmark says, 'We can no longer agree, you have taken too much away from us: our fishing fleet cannot continue to exist,' Denmark is then told that she *must* agree. A country can therefore say 'no' for

Kirk

five years because it is a large Member State, but when a small Member State says 'no' for five months, the heavy artillery is brought in against her, and by the Commission as well! The Commission has used every diplomatic means to pressure the Danish government into a solution which is unacceptable to the Danish fishing industry. I am talking about Denmark now; I would like to talk about the Community. I would like to talk about the Community in which there are some ideas we should defend.

One of the ideas is that there should be no discrimination by nationality. What is the Commission doing? The Commission has agreed that, because a Danish fisherman sailed to the British coast in a Danish fishing vessel, he can be fined \$30 000. If it had been a German, French or Belgian vessel, nothing could have happened to him. Or if it had been a British vessel. I shall not repudiate all the personal attacks. I know that Mrs Ewing and others living in the Scottish Highlands bear the stamp of nature, and I am used to associating with people who bear the stamp of nature. And so under no circumstances, Mrs Ewing, do I intend to take your attack personally. I understand what it is you are fighting for. But I believe all the same that in many ways you have been giving us incorrect information. I know the Scottish fishing fleet, too. I know, too, how it has developed. It is not the Scottish fleet that has been forced to cut back! It is other parts of the British fleet, and therefore it is tantamount to presenting slightly false figures when you try to show that the problems are especially grave in Scotland.

What has happened to free competition in the Commission's proposal? May I ask the Commission, 'What has happened to free competition?' How is the Community to develop?

(Interruption by Mrs Castle)

It is not just a question of the Community's fishing interests, it is also a question of consumers' interests, Mrs Barbara Castle. They are also interested in getting fish supplies as freshly and cheaply as possible. But if it is the most inefficient fishing fleet that is to be allowed to catch the fish, what does this mean in terms of consumer prices? They will go up.

(Interruption by Mrs Castle)

Mrs Castle (S). — I am not speaking on behalf of any Group. I am speaking as an individual Member here. I am speaking as an individual Member and I want to explain to everybody that we have to go back to ideas and stop all this crazy talk about nationality.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED). — Mr President, I was just going to raise the point. You announced in your original introduction that Mr Kirk was speaking on behalf of the Conservative Group. Mr Kirk has now

himself cleared up that point: he was not speaking on behalf of our group, but as democrats we allow other points of view to be expressed.

President. — Your comment is noted, Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Castle (S). — I just want to clear up one very important procedural point. Is it not a fact that when you announce that someone is speaking on behalf of the group, they get a longer speaking time than they otherwise would? Was this or was this not British Conservative time that he was using? And was he or was he not speaking with their agreement?

President. — Yes, Mrs Castle, he was using the time allocated to the European Democratic Group, but each group may divide up its speaking time as it pleases.

Mr Kirk (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, I believe there was a slight misunderstanding when you allowed me to speak before, because you definitely said I was speaking on behalf of the European Democratic Group; I was not, and I pointed this out in my speech, and therefore I believe the misunderstanding is that you introduced it as such from the President's chair. We all know that Mr Provan was speaking on behalf of the European Democratic Group. I have my own individual point of view, and the fact that we are allowed to do so is one of the things we attach great value to in our group.

Mr Balfour (ED). — Mr President, I simply want to draw your attention to the fact that you consistently refer to this group as the British Conservative Group. It is actually known as the European Democratic Group which has a powerful British Conservative contingent in it and if this group is prepared to allow one of its Danish Members group time, that is not a concession of the British Conservatives, it is a decision of the European Democratic Group.

President. — That is correct, Mr Balfour.

Mr Calvez (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, may I point out that I am speaking here on my own behalf as signatory of a motion for a resolution.

By including amongst the questions for urgent debate this morning the failure to arrive at a common fisheries policy, Parliament has displayed realism and common sense. First of all I would like to pay tribute to the Commission and in particular to its President, Gaston Thorn, for the effort it has made to try to convince the Council to adopt a majority decision.

Calvez

The work to establish or, to use a more maritime term, to launch a common fisheries policy started about seven years ago. Seven years of reflection, is that not long enough to arrive at an agreement? Last year it looked as if everything was about to be settled. It was too good to be true, but a tidal wave suddenly upset everything.

How often in this hemicycle have we discussed the situation of fishermen and the difficulties of getting this European fisheries policy off the ground! At the end of each year, the legitimate hopes of seeing the birth of a new common policy to be added to that of agriculture, a new policy would open the door to other common policies which a very large number of the members present here would like to see, have given way to disappointment.

The 120 000 or so European fishermen who are eager for the conservation of the fish banks and do not wish to destroy them, convinced that the zones most rich in fish situated in British waters must not be depopulated, are looking to us. We must not disappoint them, because they count more on Parliament than on the Council.

Danish fishermen, who make one quarter of European catches, also have problems which they wish to have solved, and here there should be no accused and no accusers. We are very concerned at the great uncertainty of the present situation. The failure of the Council of Fisheries Ministers has created a legal void.

The Commission has told us that all the Member States have informed it of their national measures — incomplete measures in the case of some States — but it has remained silent on the measures which the Member States must take to ensure that these national agreements are observed.

When nine Member States out of 10 are in agreement, a decision will have to be taken one day on the basis of Article 43 of the Treaty of Rome, which provides for the possibility of a majority decision. I believe that what is at stake here is the future of European integration, and the debate this morning is an illustration of what awaits us tomorrow in finding the necessary compromises between 10 today and 12 tomorrow in order to build new common policies.

Mr Skovmand (CDI). — (DA) Mr President, the motions which have been tabled hardly do justice to the Danish position in the fisheries issue. They mention a fair solution for the Danish fishing industry to which we did not agree. They mention systematic obstruction on the part of one Member State. They also talk about making the Danish fishing industry fully aware of Community solidarity and making certain that the proposals are fully understood by the industry in Denmark.

I believe it is not inappropriate to seek to create understanding for the problems which exist in Denmark and resulted in no agreement being reached in December. The Danish fishing industry is characterized by small boats and near-water fishing from ports along the entire western coast of Jutland. For a good few years, the Danish fishing industry had a very large proportion of the fishing in the North Sea, and in some years accounted for over 35 % of the cod or cod equivalent landed. The reduction with which this fishing industry is now threatened is more severe than that affecting any other country and is being introduced at the same time as other fishing industries are being given permission to extend their fishing. It is therefore not a good idea to say how unreasonable it is for one country not to accept something which nine others agree to. One could also ask why there are nine countries agreeing and one country disagreeing? The answer could be that it is precisely because the nine are taking something away from that one country.

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) On reading the motions which have been tabled on fishing, one finds that they all have the same refrain — that it is completely incomprehensible that a single country among the Ten should not quite be willing to accept the compromise proposal which has been put forward. Allow me to explain in simple words why this is actually so.

A few years ago, for example, the one country, namely Denmark, landed 42 % of the EEC's fish, and according to the proposals now on the table, our share would be reduced to 24 % of the EEC's fish. This alone shows that our share has been cut back year after year and that we have now simply reached the limit beyond which we cannot go.

According to the current proposal, the nine countries would be given higher quotas than they have had on average over the past three years while only one country, namely Denmark, would be given a lower quota than she has averaged over the past three years. And so it suddenly becomes very clear why nine countries can accept this, namely because they get more, and why there is one country which must absolutely disagree with such a solution, namely because it gets less.

May I also add that it is of course completely impossible to explain to Danes working in the fishing industry that we cannot, for example, obtain a guaranteed quota of 20 000 tonnes of mackerel, whereas we know from the British Intervention Board that 30 000 tonnes of mackerel are destroyed every year in Great Britain, and in Holland for example mackerel is vastly overfished up to a level of some 150 000 tonnes. Why can a single country not be given 20 000 tonnes of mackerel then? You cannot explain this to any reasonable person at all. What we are dealing with here is of course jobs, first and foremost. It is really a grave situation. In quite a number of small towns it will cost hundreds or even thousands of jobs if we accept the current proposal.

Fich

The issue has been debated for an entire day, and one Member of this Parliament recently carried out a noteworthy action. Our party clearly dissociated itself from this action because we believe it was not productive and did not serve any purpose at all. If anyone wished to take the matter to court, he could lodge a complaint against those he had in mind, and there was no need for any action. On the contrary, this action has in our opinion resulted in an unnecessary worsening of the climate for negotiations.

I would like to conclude by saying that a compromise was recently proposed by the Danish Government which also meets with sympathy from our party, and I am so optimistic that I believe a solution can be found within only a few weeks.

Mr Battersby (ED). — I had not intended to speak today because other Members have spoken extremely well on this and made the point very well.

I would like, however, to say that Mr Kirk is wrong in his interpretation and presentation of the historical rights situation round the British coast.

The great majority in this Parliament are fully behind the Commission and fully behind the Council. We want an agreement; we have to have an agreement and we have to have it now. And any action or any declaration which wittingly or unwittingly delays that agreement is *anti-communautaire* and as such is bitterly opposed by the European Democratic Group.

President. — The joint debate is closed.

Vote¹

Terrorism

President. — The next item is the joint debate on three motions for resolutions:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1104/82), tabled by Mr Israël and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the attempt on the life of John Paul II;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1113/82), tabled by Mr Antoniozzi and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) and Mr Visentini and others, on international connections between secret services and their attempts to destabilize the countries of the West;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1115/82), tabled by Mr Bettiza and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the activities of secret services of the countries of the East on the Community's territory.

Mr Israël (DEP). — (*FR*) Mr President, why an emergency resolution on an assassination attempt which took place 18 months ago? Simply because we believed for a long time that the attack on Pope John Paul II was the isolated act of a madman. We were unaware that it was a conspiracy, and now that we know that there is actually an organization trying to assassinate the Holy Father, we have the right to ask questions. This organization, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, is not all composed of a band of criminals, but rather it is an organization controlled by responsible and sovereign States.

This is extremely grave and dangerous. The person who is the target is not just an ordinary man, he is the head of the Catholic church and the champion of human rights, but he is also of Polish origin. This conspiracy is directed, therefore, against a man who intends to say 'no' to oppression in his country, 'no' to all forms of violation of human rights everywhere in the world. This man uses his own weapons, which are not political weapons properly speaking, but spiritual weapons. This is what disturbs the people who organized the assassination attempt. In fact spiritual weapons are often far more powerful than political weapons.

Of course, Mr President, the whole of Europe is not Catholic. Our continent is the home of various faiths. Allow me — perhaps me more than another — to say that this Europe feels personally slighted when States plot against the Pope's life.

(*Applause — Interruptions from the Communist and Allies Group*)

It is urgent today, Mr President, to expose this danger. Now I should like to emphasize an aspect which will demonstrate to you that the interruptions of our Communist colleagues are not justified. In fact my resolution does not accuse anyone, does not mention secret services or give any details. It simply seeks to denounce a veritable scandal, a scandal the like of which we have not seen for several centuries, namely that men conspire against a champion of peace who naturally enjoys our greatest respect.

(*Applause*)

Mr Antoniozzi (PPE). — (*IT*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for some years now the world has been witness to various events in the form of crimes, attacks and massacres, and it has often been said that secret services might be behind them. More recently

¹ See Annex.

Antoniozzi

incidents of this kind have increased alarmingly, especially in the West. The attempt on the Pope's life spotlighted a situation which I have no hesitation in calling serious. The fact is that Pope John Paul II has an irreplaceable role for peace and for people's freedom. To all of us he stands out as a persuasive and fundamental point of reference, and consequently the attempt on his life takes on a very important and broad significance, which we should all consider with a proper sense of responsibility.

The Italian magistrates are an independent body within the set-up of a democratic States and together with various institutions in other countries they have started investigations which are revealing connections with the secret services of eastern European countries, especially Bulgaria. These connections also point to terrorism, drugs and arms smuggling. In view of these events which are directly affecting western Europe and are clearly intended as a destabilizing factor, the European Parliament invites the Council of Ministers, and the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, to obtain more detailed information, to speed up the process of creating a European judicial area and to set in train the appropriate political initiatives to remove that which threatens peace and peaceful coexistence, so as to discourage any recourse to unacceptable forms of action by secret services in international activities.

All this is to be done in conjunction with countries which have signed international treaties and conventions which do not tolerate such action. I am thinking of the Convention on Human Rights, the UN Charter and the Helsinki Agreement. It is the view of the Group of the European People's Party that the European Parliament — an institution which emerged as part of a Community move towards peace, progress and friendship among peoples — must voice its protest against such action and must reject it and condemn those who are behind it or those who go along with it either actively or passively, wherever they may be.

It is for these reasons, which are vibrant with feelings and values which are particularly dear to all of us, that we are asking Parliament to adopt this motion for a resolution which was tabled by the Group of the European People's Party and which has been merged in a joint motion tabled also by the Socialist Group, the European Democratic Group, the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr Bord.

Mr Bettiza (L). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Liberal and Democratic Group's motion for a resolution has a relevance which goes far beyond the Bulgarian connection which has just been revealed so dramatically in Italy. Of course, we shall have to wait for the outcome of the investigations before assigning any blame or complicity. As Mr Genscher said the day before yesterday, we do not have any proof yet regarding the attempt on the Pope's life.

However, after the alarming statement by the Italian Minister of Defence who said that the attempt was an act of war in peacetime against the backdrop of the serious crisis in Poland, after the disconcerting evidence of the Turkish gunman's links with Bulgaria, after the revelations about the contacts which Bulgarian agents made with Italian citizens and with the Red Brigades and after the repeated statements by the President of Italy on the international background to terrorism in the Mediterranean, we feel that a clear distinction has to be made between what is legal and what is political.

There has never been a case in which the more or less permanent fingerprints which some secret service has left behind at the scene of the crime have led to those behind the crime. It has never happened and it is unlikely it is going to happen this time. This does not alter the fact, however, that a number of clues unearthed by several Italian parties, by the international press and by people who must be respected for the position they have or have had suggest an element of political suspicion which is serious and, if the truth be known, also quite alarming.

There have been too many weapons, drugs and terrorists passing from Turkey to Italy by way of Bulgaria not to cast a suspicious shadow on the latter country. When there are so many questions to be answered, you cannot help getting suspicious. What is the reason? How is it that Ali Agca, the St Peter's Square gunman, found refuge in Bulgaria in 1979 after he had escaped from a Turkish prison? What was Ali Agca doing for another seven weeks in Bulgaria in 1981, shortly before the attempt on the Pope's life? How come that Bekir Celenk, another Turk and a well-known dealer in weapons and drugs, was able to operate with impunity from a luxury hotel in Sofia in spite of an international arrest warrant issued by Interpol? Why is that many of the smuggled weapons seized in Turkey in recent years were packed in cases bearing the name of Kintex, the state organization which controls all Bulgarian imports and exports?

There is no question about it that a broad plan of destabilizing tactics has been unleashed in the countries around the Mediterranean, and especially in Italy. And as far as Italy goes, you would be taking a very blinkered view if you thought that what was going on was simply a bilateral matter between my country and the secret service of a foreign power. Italy is part of the EEC and the Atlantic alliance and it is perhaps the European Community and the West as a whole which they are trying to get at.

It is for this reason that we feel that the fight against terrorism and its international ramifications must — and here I should like to recall what Mr Genscher said — represent a top priority for the Ten Member States. We need to come up with as soon as possible a real definition of this European legal area which we have

Bettiza

talked about so much but about which so little has been done.

We do believe that if there is collaboration among the Ministers of the Interior and the Ministers of Justice within the Community, there is no doubt that it will be possible to do something about creating this area of coordination and collaboration among the various national legal systems.

We are placing a lot of faith in the six months of the German Presidency and in the personal commitment of Mr Genscher, and I do not mean just political cooperation among the Foreign Ministers but also cooperation between these ministers and their counterparts in the Ministries of Justice and the Interior.

(Applause from various quarters).

Mr Didò (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, it goes without saying that the general public in the world was shocked at the criminal attempt on the life of Pope John Paul II, even if it was simply the most recent in a long series of similar incidents which had involved a wide range of people. Luckily the attempt failed on this occasion but it did show the depths to which political struggles in the world, and not only Europe, have sunk.

It is not our job here to reach any hasty conclusions before the Italian magistrates have completed their investigations. Anyway, we fully realise how very difficult it is in such cases to uncover definite proof. What has emerged as a very clear fact, however, is that there is a network of international complicity with the involvement of certain secret services in massive arms dealing which is in fact tied up with the drugs traffic and which gives support and help to terrorist activities in various European countries, including Italy.

This is the proof of a certain approach. There are some people who will not hesitate to use criminal methods to achieve their political ends and these methods are designed to destabilize democracy in the free nations. The worst thing we could do would be to underestimate the tremendous threat which stems from such actions. It is not simply democracy and freedom in our countries which are being undermined — and you only have to look at history to see that when democracy collapses in a country the negative consequences are felt throughout Europe — but the even greater risk is that world peace itself is being threatened.

That is why, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group together with other groups feels there is an urgent need for our governments to adopt a clear stand on terrorism, arms dealing and the international connections behind them. There has to be more collaboration and cooperation among the Member States to deal with the situation, no matter who is affected.

There has to be no delay in creating the methods and the means to enable this Community of ours to act swiftly and effectively to thwart any attempt to destabilize the political fabric of our society.

(Applause)

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE). — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am not going to repeat what has already been said about the truly deplorable and abominable attempt on the life of the Pope which shocked international public opinion, because the available facts have been analysed with sufficient thoroughness by our Italian colleagues, who naturally are following the subject more closely. At the same time we are waiting for the final conclusions of the court which is hearing the case.

What I would like to point out is that our countries seem to have attached no special significance to the fact that for about 35 years now, ever since the end of the Second World War, there have been a great number of incidents of international espionage against countries with free parliamentary systems and many cases of terrorism. It is also to be deplored that, as can be seen from the findings of independent courts in free democratic countries, all these acts fit into a common pattern and point in one particular direction — and this despite the fact that all the countries have approved détente and have signed the Acts of Helsinki and Belgrade. Let us hope that sometime it will be possible to put an end to this attempt to destabilize our free democratic systems which — as we know — have but one ambition: to ensure the peace and prosperity both of their own peoples and of the entire world. Accordingly, Mr President, we should appeal to the Council of Ministers to pay closer attention to the known facts and to prepare the way for decisions aimed at discouraging those — whoever they may be — who unfortunately persist in these condemnable actions in their attempts to destabilize our free and democratic systems, because it is quite obvious that free men cannot but condemn facts and actions such as these.

Lord Bethell (ED). — Mr President, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the people of the European Community are alarmed at the facts which are beginning to emerge from the Italian authorities with respect to the assassination attempt against Pope John Paul II. As yet there is no proof that any foreign country was involved in this terrible crime. Nevertheless, certain suspicious facts have emerged and these have been carefully enumerated in the speech of my colleague, Mr Bettiza,

I would only add that the State of Bulgaria has, I believe, been involved in certain other assassination attempts in recent years, and I would mention in particular the murder of Mr Georgi Markov in Lon-

Bethell

don a few years ago. It is proved, certainly to my satisfaction, that he was murdered and there can be no other logical conclusion than that it was done by the East European security services — such were the circumstances of his violent death. There is also no doubt that Bulgaria and the Soviet Union have in the past indulged in political murder in western countries, as proved by the murder of Mr Stephan Bendera some years ago and other well-known opponents of Soviet rule. And so while there is as yet no proof of Bulgarian involvement, and I sincerely hope for political reasons that there will not be such proof, nevertheless suspicions must remain. Given the close link between the Bulgarian services and the Soviet services, the matter becomes even more alarming.

Terrorism is, of course, only one of the very serious elements in this whole matter of East European secret services and their attempts against our 10 Member States.

In my Member State there have been four Soviet diplomats or officials expelled in the past 18 months. Only yesterday Mr Chernov, an official of the International Wheat Agency, was asked to leave the United Kingdom for activities unsuited to a member of an international organization.

So there is case after case. In Switzerland only a few days ago another Soviet diplomat was asked to leave because of espionage. Other colleagues have mentioned problems over drugs, and arms and, of course, I should mention the fact that Soviet arms are frequently found in the possession of members of the IRA in Northern Ireland.

I would therefore like to echo the words of colleagues inviting the Italian authorities to make the most scrupulous inquiries into the Antonov case and other persons involved and to ask the ministers to make the greatest efforts to coordinate their inquiries and to establish the judicial area as set out in the amendment to this resolutions.

Ideological conflict between East and West will continue, but there can be no normal relations between Eastern and Western Europe so long as these activities are allowed to carry on.

Mr Pajetta (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, there is far too much about this debate which we feel is simply a pretext and which is being used deliberately as a propaganda exercise. As far as the Italian Communist are concerned, our view on the problems connected with the criminal attempt on the Pope's life and the political implications of these problems has been clearly stated in the Italian Parliament and all we can do here is to state that view again.

There are a number of legal cases pending — this is mentioned in one of the various documents which

people then thought it better to consolidate in a less shameless text — and if these cases are pending we have to acknowledge the fact that there is now a need to search deeper for the truth concerning very serious matters which we have already condemned at home and in our Parliament. It was in our Parliament that we urged the Italian police and magistrates to be brought into this affair. They are the ones with first and immediate responsibility in this matter because the crime was committed in Italy. If a number of Italian MPs here have wanted to make it clear that they are still present, I do not see how this helps the course of justice.

We said in Rome — and I am going to say it again here with good reason — that no Parliament can anticipate the results of the investigations. It is useless, Mr Bettiza, to say so and then to deny it with the next breath. We cannot anticipate the police investigations, and so we have to be even more careful when it comes to statements and sentences which are the job of the magistrates and which, before anyone else has his say, have to be given in a court of law.

I believe that in every country with representatives here, and not only in Italy, there is a division of authority. We are not here as the jury or as the plaintiff. Let me make it quite clear that we are not representing anyone in court here. We have said and we shall go on saying that we shall have to get to the bottom of the matter and that the investigation has to go ahead with the sole aim of finding out the truth. We feel that there should be absolutely no interference in the work of those who have to deal with the matter. As I said before, these people are the Italian police and magistrates.

The only thing we are asking here — and we hope that one day it will be possible — is that there should be no manipulation of all this for propaganda purposes. You have to remember that we are looking for the guilty parties, regardless of who they might be and where they may be found on the political map. And we should like people to remember that there are four directions on any map.

We condemn any bias for propaganda purposes just as we can want to make it clear again that we condemn the attack on the Pope and hope that the truth can be discovered. At the same time we reject the tone and the intentions of the people who tabled these resolutions because we feel they are not going to help matters. If there was any doubt about this, it was dispelled when Mr Israël spoke. And we heard the same thing from a British Member and, you know, I found it difficult to believe that I was listening to the representative of a country with a long parliamentary tradition and who should therefore be able to teach us a thing or two.

There was somebody who mentioned — I think it was Mr Bettiza — an Italian minister who said something

Pajetta

about an act of war in peacetime. Well, luckily, these unfortunate words have not been taken up by any member of the Italian Government or by any member of the Italian Parliament. It is precisely because of the tone people have tried to stamp on this debate that we have decided to have no part in the vote.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

Mrs Castellina (CDI). — *(IT)* Quite honestly, Mr President, I have no idea what we are being asked to vote on. Are we supposed to condemn the efforts to destabilize the West? What efforts? The references to the attempt on the Pope's life and Italian-Bulgarian relations which appear in various texts, including the one by Mr Didò and others, shows in fact that the idea is to get Parliament to consider this ridiculous and scandalous story which is being put about in Italy, and by no less a person than our own Minister for Defence, Mr Lagorio. You know, it was not at dinner with a few friends but openly in Parliament that he came out with the statement that the Soviet Union decided to put a contract on the Pope because it had not gone into Poland.

Any sensible person must realise what a stupid theory this is, that the Soviet Union is going to use the Bulgarians to recruit a Turk who has escaped from prison and who is obviously open to all kinds of blackmail and who cannot be relied on to keep his mouth shut, and that they then actually have him taken to the scene of the crime in St Peter's Square by a diplomat who is officially accredited to the Italian State.

The apparent proof which led our minister to make these irresponsible statements comes from the sudden confession which the Turk made from his Italian prison two years after the events and — would you believe it? — after getting an unannounced visit from the Italian secret service. This is the real scandal. He was visited in prison by the Italian secret service and the magistrate in charge of the case knew nothing about it. Even the parliamentary committee responsible for monitoring the activities of the secret service was not informed.

It is quite right for the Italian magistrates to get to the bottom of things and find out what all these secret services are doing in Italy, beginning with the Bulgarian agents who like everyone else are undoubtedly involved in shady goings-on. But before the magistrates arrive at any tangible conclusions, it is quite irresponsible to link Bulgaria in this absurd fashion and without any proof to such a politically-charged event as the attempt on the Pope's life. The western secret services have had a good laugh at all this, and now the whole of Italy is joining in. But it is no joke. In Italy this ploy has been an attempt to steer our country towards a break-up of Europe. If a similar idea is taken up — even indirectly — by this Parliament, it has the same serious political significance and

I am surprised that groups which are usually more careful about siding with the more blinkered ideas of US extremism can go along with this ploy here today.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, the Greek Communist Party, which has severely condemned the attempt on the Pope's life, equally severely condemns today's attempt by some Members to exploit it against peace, against the participation of Catholics in the peace movement, against the cause of détente, in an irresponsible manner which is unworthy of the European Parliament.

Firstly, they call on the European Parliament to make decisions when not even the secret services of the United States and Israel have dared to give their backing to the Italian authorities and the Italian secret services.

Secondly, Mr Antoniozzi and the other Italian Members did not mention — before speaking of the secret services of other countries — the secret services of Italy itself. I would merely like to remind you of the well-known scandal of the P2 lodge, where terrorists and those responsible for hunting terrorists pursued the same political goals.

Thirdly, these Members have come half a century too late. Exactly 50 years ago Dimitrov and the Bulgarian Communists were accused of trying to destabilize democracy in Germany. We have seen who destabilized whom and who it was finally laid the fire which destroyed peace and the democratic institutions and led to the carnage of war.

Finally there is one point which we find particularly regrettable. This motion for a resolution has also been signed by two Greek Members of the European Parliament, Mr Papaefstratiou and Mr Gondikas. The question arises: have they the backing of their party and are they unaware of the great efforts which the President of the Hellenic Republic himself has undertaken with a view to strengthening and developing our links with our Bulgarian neighbour, when they adopt this irresponsible stand in the European Parliament?

The Greek Communist Party will vote against this motion for a resolution.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, I believe that one can say a lot in 30 seconds. I am not going to explain again the position of the French Communists and Allies with regard to acts of terrorism. We have denounced them and we have never been ambiguous or equivocal on this point; there is no need, therefore, for me to repeat this type of speech.

Chambeiron

I want to say that I am not quite clear, after our debate as to what we want to prove. I was somewhat concerned, however, to hear the representative of the European Democratic Group, tell us that there were no proofs, there were only suspicions. There is a desire here to set ourselves up as a tribunal; we are neither prosecutors — it has been said — nor judges, and so let justice take its course and shed light on the issue. For my part I wish nonetheless to denounce this propaganda operation, which is designed to damage the good relations which some countries have with Bulgaria and, generally speaking, with the countries of the Eastern Europe.

This is why we will vote against the motions for resolutions before us.

(Applause from the extreme left)

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote¹

Prague declaration

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1118/82), tabled by Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Party, on the Prague declaration.

Mr Fergusson (ED). — Mr President, following what Mr Genscher said to us yesterday, we now have the opportunity to put on paper our positive Community response to the concerted declaration from the Warsaw Pact meeting last week. It is a chance to put on record once again what we mean by peace and how we hope to maintain it.

First, we are only interested in the guaranteed combination of peace and freedom. We are not interested in the peace of the desert, the peace of the grave, the peace of the police state, the peace of oppression. Second, inasmuch as the existence of two heavily armed blocs carries a frightening inherent risk of war, and of nuclear war in particular, we want disarmament. Inasmuch as the price of military preparations today makes more worthy worldwide aims unachievable, we need disarmament.

So far as the Atlantic Alliance is concerned, what stands in the way of disarmament and prevents an end to the arms race is quite simply our lack of trust in the good faith of Moscow. Our mistrust is both reasonable and necessary. To justify our mistrust we need look no

further back than the ultimate shocking aggression against Afghanistan, which still continues and even includes the use of chemical weapons, which the Warsaw Pact now say they want eliminated. We have seen the cynical, wilful abuse of the years of trust, the years dedicated to détente after Helsinki, as the Soviet Union, exporting destabilization to the entire world, attempted to change the balance of military power on a global scale. So why should we believe that anything has changed in Moscow, in the Kremlin, simply because the soldier there has been replaced by the head of the secret police? To borrow Mr Andropov's own phrase, we are not naive.

However, there is one seed of hope in the latest offer from the Warsaw Post, couched as it may be in the sickly cloud of propaganda. And we all know that this offer would not have been made had any members of the Atlantic Alliance embarked on a programme of highhanded unilateralism in the meantime. Our hope is in the indication that Moscow understands that there can be no progress without trust. The Prague Declaration refers to proper measures to verify the implementation of arms reduction including, when necessary, international procedures.

We may ask why the Soviets do not make their belief in non-aggression credible by leaving Afghanistan. We could ask why they do not simply refer their new ideas to the Madrid Conference, where confidence-building measures are permanently on the agenda and where our own wish for mutual, balanced arms reduction is perfectly plain. We can ask why Mr Andropov and his approach places such high emphasis on nuclear disarmament, and when we ask that, we are bound to reflect on the build-up of Soviet conventional forces whose importance would be so signally promoted in the absence of the deterrent.

Nevertheless, there remains the possibility and the hope that, against all our experience of the dark workings of the closed secretive society by which we all feel threatened, the Soviets now require change so badly that they are able to trade for it the conditions under which the West might at last feel safe. For that reason, though without lowering our guard, it is our duty to take up the challenge we have been given and to press it as hard as we can until we find out. So we invite the United States, on our behalf and sharing our hope, to join in this positive approach and to pursue, wherever it leads and as far as it will go, the road to genuine multilateral disarmament.

With that I commend this resolution to the House.

(Applause)

Mr Van Miert (S). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome this resolution and what it contains on behalf of the Socialist Group, although we have proposed an amendment aimed at making para-

¹ See Annex.

Van Miert

graph 4 more precise. However, my colleague, Mr Bruno Friedrich, will go into this shortly.

We welcome this resolution because it clearly states that lasting peace in Europe can be guaranteed only by negotiation and the conclusion of international agreements to reduce the nuclear and other forces deployed, or capable of deployment, in Europe. This represents a departure from the naive belief that more and more weapons mean more security. This resolution makes it clear that it is high time to call a halt to the lunatic arms race and return to the period when negotiations were conducted seriously and results were achieved.

I am pleased to note that the Conservatives would also appear to be returning to this realization. There has been far too much procrastination, and serious negotiations have far too long been overshadowed by play-acting on the part of the major powers or simply by a reluctance to negotiate. We are currently entering a crucial phase, since in the absence of substantial progress over the next few months as regards arms control — both strategic and conventional weapons and medium-range missiles — Europe in particular will end up in a very precarious situation, and in view of this we welcome the Prague Declaration by the Warsaw Pact countries. Without actually adopting this Declaration ourselves — since question marks have been placed against a great many points and some of the objections are quite reasonable — it would be nevertheless politically irresponsible not to take it seriously and not to produce a well-founded reply.

We think it is important that the Soviet Union would now appear to be prepared to offer new points of departure for progress in connection with balance of conventional weapons in Europe and verification measures. As the German defence specialist, Egon Bahr, put it only recently:

(The speaker continued in German)

... negotiations on a balance of conventional weapons will also shed new light on the questions concerning nuclear weapons, and in particular tactical nuclear weapons, in Europe. In many cases when strategic and medium-range missiles are being discussed, it is forgotten that the so-called small tactical weapons represent a particular risk of crossing the nuclear threshold in the event of a conflict in Europe.

He went on to say:

... so many pleas have been made for a global disarmament strategy for the West which would leave no loopholes or grey areas for a further arms race. There is now a chance for the West to test the word of the new Soviet leader. The West should, for its part, propose negotiations for a comprehensive conventional balance in Europe

which might make tactical nuclear weapons superfluous.

(The speaker continued in Dutch)

The ball, ladies and gentlemen, is now in our court. It is high time that serious proposals were made with a view to achieving results. Even in the United States the debate is already well underway between those who wish to reach agreements in spite of being referred to as hawks in certain quarters, and those who have publicly spoken out against agreements of any kind, such as the negotiator, Mr Rawney.

It is a good thing, therefore, that Parliament should side with those who call for agreement on the basis of a comparable military balance at as low a level as possible. This will substantially increase security in Europe, take the strain off the budgets which are showing deficits, and offer the younger generation some prospects other than the hopelessness with which they are often confronted.

Nor have we any alternative. If no agreements are concluded, we will get more SS20 missiles, SS21 missiles and SS22 missiles, which will be able to reach Western Europe even quicker in a few minutes from East Germany or Czechoslovakia, and over 9 000 cruise missiles on the American side, as well as yet more submarines and yet more nuclear weapons, when there are already 31 000 nuclear weapons in the West and over 20 000 behind the Iron Curtain. It is time we called a halt to this lunacy.

IN THE CHAIR: MR NIKOLAOU

Vice-President

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, to anyone dealing with Europe's recent history, the words 'non-aggression pact' have an odd, if not ominous, ring about them. Whenever Hitler was planning an invasion, he presented the victim he had in mind with a non-aggression pact like the Padishah in the Ottoman Empire presenting victims with a silk cord. He then attacked on a Saturday. In actual fact, this sort of pact is not worth the paper it is written on because since the Kellogg Pact of 1928 all our States have been committed to not invading their neighbours.

If in spite of these misgivings we approve this motion, then it is in order to reaffirm our staunch desire for peace, which, however, should never be mistaken for willingness to capitulate or unilateralism. We are always there to negotiate, but have no illusions. We are willing to probe every possibility but not to forget the lessons we have learned from Budapest, Prague,

Habsburg

Warsaw and Kabul, because Andropov is not a fresh start: he is only the new version of the old hegemonic nomenclature. No liberalism can come from the KGB!

Now more than ever, we as Europeans are called upon to continue the unification of this continent with all our might and without delay because a united Europe is the only realistic hope for peace according to the centuries-old historical precept that peace cannot be achieved through day-dreams, magic words and rhetorical appeals, but only if the peace-loving countries are strong enough to make the belligerent ones afraid to attack them.

(Applause)

Mr Pajetta (COM). — *(IT)* Ladies and gentlemen, we are pleased with the motion which Mr Fergusson is asking the House to adopt. We shall be voting in favour primarily on account of the thinking behind it. A lot of the things he said here we do not agree with of course, but what is down in the text echoes our desire for peace and also our firm belief that only negotiation, supervision and a balanced reduction of arms are of any use in a serious situation in which no option could or should be neglected, not least any slight chance that might help us along the road of détente.

We are not voting here, and we are not asking other people to vote, for some biased diplomatic motion. What we are voting for is an appeal for reflection and good will, and it is an appeal which we feel is even more important in the sense that it comes from a point on the political spectrum which is far removed from ours in this Parliament. We really do hope that this appeal will get the backing of all the political parties which are represented here in the European Parliament.

Mr Haagerup (L). — *(DA)* Mr President, the Liberal group also supports Mr Fergusson's proposal. However, we do not support the amendments, so had there been an opportunity for a broad discussion we might perhaps have wished to submit amendments ourselves.

I must agree with Mr Habsburg that a non-aggression pact does not evoke a purely positive reaction on our part: a fair amount of scepticism is called for. But I agree with the basic concept in Mr Fergusson's proposal, namely that in the present situation we must grasp at even the slightest indication of a real change in the Soviet attitude expressed in the extremely long-winded declaration by the Warsaw Pact countries. We are in favour of taking up this offer of negotiations, if that is what it proves to be, but I wish to add that, should nothing come of the negotiations, we will be all the more disappointed. We think it important, therefore, to take up the invitation contained in the Warsaw Pact countries' move, but we must undoubtedly remain

sceptical in view of the many years of vain negotiations and the stream of propaganda from the other side.

(Applause from the extreme right)

Mr Bord (DEP). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, all the Members of this Assembly are committed to peace. Even so, I feel there is very little we can do to influence the course of political events and prevent conflict. In our view the Prague declaration is a tactical ploy, and so we believe that our first duty is to be prudent, because we have heard many such declarations in the last few years. And we have not forgotten the writings of Marshal Gretchkov.

This being so, it seems to me that the Soviet Union is engaging in a sort of campaign of charm, which might well appear interesting but which, in my view, is simply intended to gain time by influencing public opinion. We agree to the idea of negotiations because we believe that the Soviet Union must provide much more tangible proof of its desire for peace. This is the thinking behind our decision to vote for Mr Haagerup's motion for a resolution.

Mr Pesmazoglou (NI). — *(GR)* Mr President, I would like to stress the importance of Mr Fergusson's resolution and to say that it deserves unanimous approval. Such an outcome would underscore the common political and defence interests of our peoples as well as the need for an attentive scrutiny of the Warsaw Pact proposals.

I have listened to the observations of the earlier speakers and noted their reservations, irrespective of whether they are justified or not, and I think that it is the political duty of the European Parliament to call for an evaluation of the proposals contained in the Prague Declaration and to determine to what extent they can broaden, political and military détente and help consolidate peace in Europe and the world. I think this is a very valuable initiative and I hope, Mr President, that the outcome will be a unanimous approval of the motion for a resolution.

Mr Bruno Friedrich (S). — *(DE)* We approve of Mr Fergusson's motion, which stands in pleasant contrast to what Mr Habsburg had to say because, in the face of the arms race in Europe and the rest of the world, no member can afford to dismiss the proposal of a newly elected General Secretary of the Soviet Union simply as propaganda without examining it first. We must follow Mr Fergusson's proposal and test the Soviet proposition for its credibility.

But we can only test it if the other superpower, too, presents precise proposals. It is our hope, also expressed in our amendment, that during his visit Vice-President Bush will agree to provide us with clear

Friedrich

details of the American proposals, which are currently the subject of controversy in the USA, too. We also expect specific US proposals on the continuation of the Madrid Conference in the next few months. We have therefore tabled our amendment and ask you to adopt it.

Mr Efraimidis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, we believe that Mr Fergusson's motion has been prepared under pressure at a time when peace is in grave jeopardy; it has been influenced by the activities of the worldwide — and in particular European — peace movement and also by the impossibility of ignoring the sincerity and realism of the proposals contained in the Prague Declaration.

However, we would like to point out that the resolution is framed in a very hesitant manner and that this indecision was compounded in Mr Fergusson's oral presentation, ignoring the fact that a number of important leaders in Western Europe itself — including the Prime Minister of our own country — have greeted this declaration as a very important contribution which provides opportunities for putting an end to the Cold War climate which characterizes the present critical situation and for opening the way towards détente, disarmament and peace.

We will vote for Mr Fergusson's motion, while naturally maintaining the reservations I referred to above concerning certain formulations it contains.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote¹

Nicaragua

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1112/82), tabled by Mr Langes on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on Nicaragua.

Mr Langes (PPE). — (DE) Ladies and gentlemen, the aims of my group's motion on Nicaragua are purely humanitarian. Without any doubt, one of the European Community's main commitments is to provide help to people in the world who need it. Before doing so, we always ask how great their need is. This is the aim of our motion.

I know that the European Parliament, especially in the past few years, has always been prepared to provide

appropriate funds from the various budget items, and the disaster fund in particular. What we now ask of you is 1 million ECU for the original inhabitants of Nicaragua — the Miskitos, the Ramas and the Sumos. As you know, the representatives of these races have asked both the UN and the European Community for help.

The situation of these three Indian races is an extremely difficult one. They have no food supplies and medical aid is inadequate. We should therefore be generous and provide aid without hesitation, and I am glad the President of the Commission is present and knows that we are calling upon the Commission, deliberately and yet very clearly, to provide these funds.

I ask you to give your support to my group's proposals. It is certain that the relief materials will reach the right people via church or other non-government organizations. In this way we Europeans shall be fulfilling a commitment.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, as Mr Langes has just said, the European Community recognizes the complexity of the events — although they are contested by some — but it has not remained inactive in the face of the problems of the Meskitos, which are very tangible.

Last year, in 1982, we granted food aid to the UNRWA for the refugees in Honduras. This decision involved nearly 600 000 ECU and was intended for the distribution of maize, beans, milk powder — just to give you some details — to Salvador refugees but also to the Meskitos.

I am informed that the distribution of the aid has almost been completed. Furthermore, as part of an emergency aid of 10 million ECU for the refugees of Central America, which was adopted in 1982, three-quarters was paid to the same organization, which itself has spent 2.2 million ECU in assisting the Meskitos who have left their homes.

I know that it is a modest sum, but I want to tell this Assembly that we are aware of the problem and that we are trying to do as much as we can within the bounds of budgetary limits and the many requests we receive.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote¹

¹ See Annex.

¹ See Annex.

Jews in the USSR

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1117/82), tabled by Mrs Théobald-Paoli and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the reduction in 1982 of the number of Jews authorized to leave the USSR.

Mrs Théobald-Paoli (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is the bounden duty of this Parliament, elected by universal suffrage by 270 million Europeans, to use its indisputable moral authority to defend human rights wherever they are in danger. We must be vigilant wherever in the world liberty is threatened. Experience has proven that the accused governments are at least embarrassed in respect of their wrongdoing by the accusing vote of a Parliament common to 10 democracies, which, despite some imperfections, remain models of respect for human rights.

Is a basic freedom not that which we consider so natural when we can exercise it: namely the simple freedom to come and go? This right is again being challenged in the case of the Soviet Jews who wish to leave the USSR. The historical reasons motivating them are a mystery to no one. The immense hope at the time of the overthrow of the Tsarist Empire was followed by a return to discrimination during the 1930s and then by the Nazi barbarity which ran riot for three years in Russia and in some neighboring countries. Then there was the return to anti-Semitism by the State after the War and, simultaneously, the creation of a State of Israel, which cristalizes the aspirations for a normal life for a community which has never known it.

Since 1969, the road into voluntary exile opened up for the Jews of the USSR. By tens of thousands they were authorized to leave, obviously not without having to wait for one, two or three years for an exit visa, during which time they were deprived of work and the effective exercise of any rights and exposed to every sort of discrimination. But finally, they left, apart from a few dramatic cases when, as an example, people were prevented from leaving.

Since 1969, two thousand have left of the three million Soviet Jews, of whom at least one million have applied for exile. Apart from the specific problem of Soviet Jews, the policy launched by the USSR in 1969 represented a move towards more liberalism. However, since 1980, probably for international political reasons, because of the revival of East-West tensions, Soviet leaders have considerably reduced the number of visas granted to Jews. The figures speak for themselves: 51 000 in 1979, 21 000 in 1980, 9 500 in 1981 and 2 600 in 1982, or 95% less than in 1979.

The period required to obtain visas is growing, and it is time for us to intervene. The resolution that I pro-

pose for your approval is a sign of hope, in a great country which fought so bitterly alongside Western democracies to free Europe from the Nazi source; the vote on this text is a call to the new Soviet leaders to renounce their former erring ways and return to the course of liberalization, permitting those who choose to take the road to freedom.

Mr Israël (DEP). — (FR) Ladies and gentlemen, the case of Soviet Jews is characteristic of a specific human rights situation in the USSR. It is not a problem peculiar to the Jews; it concerns the deep aspirations to freedom of all the peoples of the Soviet Union.

However, as regards the specific case which concerns us, it must be stressed, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that we are witnessing the inadmissible compounding of a form of internal persecution and the ban on emigration. This is an entirely new phenomenon!

But gravest of all is the fact, Mr President, of using a humanitarian question as the barometer of international relations. If the situation is good, the USSR pleases the Americans and allows some Jews to leave; otherwise, the door is closed. That is unacceptable! It is a form of international blackmail to which we are being subjected, and I pay special tribute to our colleague, Mrs Théobald-Paoli, for having presented the problem in all its complexity. I support her in her call to the country in which tens of millions died during the war trying to save a certain form of liberty and which, unfortunately, since that time has not succeeded in finding its way to what Mrs Théobald-Paoli very aptly called the road to freedom.

My group, Mr President, will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Théobald-Paoli.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, this resolution is also addressed to the Commission, though principally to the Council and the governments of the Member States. I am bound to point out the great value the Commission has always attached to respect for human rights and accordingly my instinctive support for this resolution. Let me remind you that, in particular at the Madrid Conference, our Community, either through the Presidency or through the Member States, has always done everything in its power to further the application of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act regarding human rights. We share your regret that our repeated appeals have not always been effective. But that is not a reason for not making them.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote¹

Namibia

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1124/82), tabled by Mr Luster on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the need for development aid to Namibia.

Mr Luster (PPE).— (*DE*) Mr President, we all hope that Namibia will be given her independence as quickly as possible; however, the negotiations on how this is to be achieved have been dragging on for at least six years now. Unfortunately, it is not in the power of the people of Namibia to bring about their own independence. In the past, the people have been generously promised development aid by the international community for the day after they gain independence.

In our view, however, the black and brown population of Namibia should be given humanitarian aid now because the people there have suffered long enough. They need our humanitarian aid. Although legally the policy of apartheid may no longer be applied in Namibia, its consequences are still noticeable, especially in the field of education and training.

Our motion excludes all aid for the government in Namibia or for party-political purposes. It provides for the creation of projects at the non-government level between non-government organizations in Namibia and Europe, e.g. foundation trusts, to improve the daily life of the black and brown population and make it more bearable. We know that this type of project can be implemented effectively. European aid in particular is needed in the fields of vocational training, adult education, training and further education of teachers and in the field of health for the black and coloured population of this country. We have tried to word our motion in such a way as to allow anyone, irrespective of his political and social beliefs, to approve the application for aid for the black and coloured population of Namibia. We ask you to back this motion. We want Namibia to gain independence without any problems or difficulties and without delay. Our aid is also intended to serve as a symbol for Europe, providing relief to the black and coloured people of Namibia in their dire need.

(*Applause*)

Mrs Lentz-Cornette (PPE). — (*DE*) Mr President, I would just like to underline what Mr Luster has just said, namely that it is not a question of judging or supporting individual political groups. The funds go to

neutral groups which use them directly so that they really benefit the men and women and above all the children. It would be particularly useful if European aid could be used to guarantee the water supply, which is a particularly big problem there. In addition to Namibia's own problems there is also the problem of refugees, who come from various countries, e.g. Angola, and to whom international groups have paid very little attention so far.

The European People's Party would welcome it if this resolution were approved and money could be sent to this country for humanitarian purposes.

(*Applause*)

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — (*FR*) Mr President, that which has been well thought out can be clearly expressed. It has been said, and emphasized often enough, that the aid which we are being asked to subscribe to belongs in a humanitarian context: for this reason we will subscribe to it. However, it remains undeniably a political problem which deserves to be discussed, but that will not be today. We take note of this and will answer next month when the report by Sir James is debated.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (*FR*) Mr President, while participating fully in political cooperation, the Commission must, out of respect for Parliament and the Members who have spoken, give a few words of explanation as to why the allocation of aid which would not be purely specific, humanitarian aid, by our Community to Namibia, would raise serious problems at present, since South Africa is illegally occupying this territory and the Windhoek administration is not recognized by us or internationally.

Thus until now, in line with your wishes, Community aid has been directed towards the humanitarian and educational needs of Namibian refugees in neighbouring countries, particularly in Angola and Zambia. It has been despatched through the intermediary of European non-government organizations and international bodies such as the United Nations Institute for Namibia.

Undoubtedly very considerable progress has been made in recent months in the negotiations of the contact group on the subject of Namibia's independence. Resolution 435 of the Security Council provides, when the results of these negotiations have been submitted, for the conclusion of a cease-fire in these territories and the setting up of a transitional United Nations assistance group at Windhoek under the direction of the special representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

It is at that stage, Mr President, that it will be possible for the Community to envisage granting direct assist-

¹ See Annex.

Thorn

ance to Namibia, as was the case in similar circumstances for Zimbabwe, for example, which was allocated exceptional aid cofinanced with European non-government organizations. When this stage has been arrived at — and this is the opinion of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation — the Commission will define the uses to which these various forms of aid could be put, keeping in mind the suggestions made on this subject in the resolution at present under discussion.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote¹**Natural disasters*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on five motions for resolutions on natural disasters:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1099/82), tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on emergency aid for the town of Ancona which had been seriously damaged by a landslide;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1103/82), tabled by Mr de la Malène and Mr Remilly on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on urgent action to be taken to assist the French *départements* stricken by floods at the end of December 1982;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1109/82), tabled by Mr Barbagli and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the huge landslide in the suburbs of the town of Ancona;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1110/82), tabled by Mr Barbi and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on emergency measures to assist the Catalonia region hit by serious floods;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1131/82), tabled by Mr Simonnet and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on urgent measures for the benefit of the victims of the recent floods which have affected many regions of France.

Mr Israël (DEP). — (FR) Mr President, I should like to draw the attention of the House to this motion

which concerns a natural occurrence for which Parliament is usually willing to grant aid. I shall simply say that this is a matter of some importance to those affected by the floods.

Mr Barbi (PPE). — (IT) It is not to explain the motion — which speaks for itself — that I have asked to speak, Mr President, but to say that I am against the amendment put forward by my Communist colleague, Mr Pranchère, who wants to see the deletion in recital (d) of the reference to the fact that Spain will be joining the Community in the near future. If you ask me, it is precisely on account of this accession that we should be paying particular attention to events in Catalonia. I would therefore ask the honourable Members not to amend this recital.

Mr d'Ormesson (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, the motion for a resolution which is before the House speaks for itself. There has been very serious flooding in the regions in question and we are asking for the solidarity of the European Community to be expressed to the victims.

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — (IT) Mr President, the Commission has taken a careful look at the options open to it with regard to granting emergency Community aid to the people of Spain who were affected by the flooding in Catalonia last October. As there was no way of acting under Article 690 of the budget, since these funds are for emergency action within the Community, the Commission resorted to the funds which come under Article 950 concerning emergency aid for third countries. Under the terms of this article the Commission made 80 000 ECU available to the Red Cross in order to provide the victims with foodstuffs, blankets, clothing, tents, field kitchens, medical supplies and so on.

As for the disaster which struck Ancona, the Commission decided in principle on 21 December to grant emergency aid to victims in that city. On the basis of the official information which has been forthcoming on the extent of the disaster, the Commission decided to grant aid of 300 000 ECU. This aid, which comes under Article 690 of the budget, is to go to those who are less well off and who have suffered most from this tragedy.

Lastly, in the case of the disasters which have hit France, the Commission's departments have been in touch with the Permanent Representatives of the French Government in Brussels to ask the French authorities for official information on the repercussions of the extreme weather conditions which affected in particular the Atlantic coasts of France. As soon as the information is forthcoming, the Commission will quickly be in a position to assess whether emergency aid, again under Article 690 of the budget, can be granted to those affected.

¹ See Annex.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote¹

Mediterranean programmes

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1121/82) by Mr De Pasquale and others on the delay in presenting Mediterranean programmes.

Mr De Pasquale (COM). — *(IT)* Just a couple of words, Mr President, to urge the Commission to submit the Mediterranean programmes to the Council and Parliament. Under the terms of the mandate they were promised for 31 December 1982 but this promise has not been kept. I would point out that failure to keep promises and to observe deadlines undermines the credibility of the Community, and this credibility is already precarious in the Mediterranean regions. I think there is a call for some explanation, especially as these are matters which are prompting a lot of expectation.

I want to make it clear that the economic and social situation in the Mediterranean regions is getting worse every day, that unemployment is growing at twice the Community rate and that the submission of these programmes is consequently a matter of the utmost urgency. I urge the House to adopt this resolution.

Mr Pöttering (PPE). — *(DE)* Ladies and gentlemen, we agree with the motion tabled by Mr De Pasquale and his colleagues. Incidentally, we would have thought it right for Mr De Pasquale, who after all is the Chairman of our Committee, to contact other groups on this matter, who support its content. It was precisely our group, the Group of the European People's Party, that introduced the Mediterranean Plan into this Parliament. We adopted it in February last year.

Now we are waiting for the Commission to announce its proposals for the integrated programmes. However, Mr Giolitti, we also expect you to examine these ideas, especially the one on the introduction of a loan system as part of the integrated programmes for the Mediterranean region. If you now present your proposals soon, and I know you are devoting your energy to this work, you will receive the full support of the European People's Party. I therefore ask you to do this. We approve of Mr De Pasquale's motion.

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — *(IT)* Mr President, I can assure the honourable Members who

spoke and the House as a whole that the Commission attaches special importance to the urgency of this matter. It shares the feelings that were outlined a few moments ago by Mr De Pasquale. And I can tell Mr Pöttering that when it comes to these programmes attention will of course be paid to the use of the loan facility which he mentioned just now.

It goes without saying that the preparation of the integrated programmes for the Mediterranean regions, along the lines which the Commission originally indicated in its famous report on the mandate of 30 May 1980 and subsequently in the communication to the Council on 23 October 1981, required a great deal of work.

In the first place we had to carry out a thorough analysis of the characteristics of the regions in question, their drawbacks and their potential, so that we could identify the sectors and activities which are best suited to the development of these regions.

This work was done during the first half of 1982 and came to an end with the adoption of an internal report by the Commission on 22 June 1982. This was an internal working document for the Commission and was used as a basis for the initial contacts with the authorities of the Member States who were directly involved so that we could check out the guidelines that had been elaborated and see how they fitted in with the national programmes for regional development.

Once the scope of the programmes and the appropriate geographical areas had been defined, the next step was to define the aims of each programme, to see what measures were most suitable for achieving these aims and to calculate the necessary finances.

The nature of these integrated programmes has meant that we had to study the operating procedures which, on the basis of past experience, were the most suitable in order to ensure the optimum effectiveness of these measures.

The tremendous amount of work that had to be got through and the fact that we were trying to come up with something which to some extent was original and new meant that the Commission departments overran the original schedule.

The preparatory work can now be considered over. The Commission had a first exchange of ideas on the general outline of the programmes at its meeting on 5 January, with the result that it expects to be able to adopt formal proposals for the Council within the next few weeks.

President. — The debate is closed.

¹ See Annex.

Vote¹

(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)²

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

2. Political cooperation and European security

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-946/82), drawn up by Mr Haagerup on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on European political cooperation and European security.

The following oral questions are also included in the debate:

- oral question with debate (Doc. 1-616/81) by Mr Filippi and others to the Foreign Ministers:

Subject: Need for an integrated defence plan for the European Community countries in view of the seriousness of the current international situation

- In view of the deep concern felt by the people of Europe at the seriousness of the current international situation;
- Bearing in mind the evident tendencies of the superpowers to pursue policies which are becoming more dangerous every day, with less and less regard for the demands and expectations of the peoples of Europe;
- Having regard to the consequent risk that the Community countries will simply be required to bear the consequences of catastrophic decisions taken elsewhere without even being consulted or given any say in the matter;
- Considering the grave risk that the concern of the peoples of Europe for peace could be exploited to subversive and undemocratic ends through dangerous, alarming and barbarous acts of terrorism such as the attack on NATO bases and on the commander of the American forces in Germany;

Would the Foreign Ministers please state:

- whether they do not feel it imperative for a European initiative at politico-diplomatic level to be introduced without further delay,

in order to restore essential international credibility to the Community as a whole and to the individual Member States *vis-à-vis* both the USA as allies and the USSR as interlocutors;

- what initiatives have or will be taken to give fresh impetus to the process of Community integration, not only at economic level but also at political and defence level, in order to ensure security and peace for the peoples of Europe and of the world at a very difficult conjuncture in world affairs;
- whether they do not consider it essential to draw up immediately an integrated defence plan — at all levels — for the Community countries and within the more general context of NATO;
- whether they do not consider it necessary to hold special talks immediately on these vital matters in the relevant Community bodies, calling on all the political forces of Europe to give their opinion on the best ways and means of protecting our independence and of ensuring the very survival of our peoples.

- oral question with debate (Doc. 1-591/82) by Mr Seligman to the Council:

Subject: Non-Proliferation Treaty

Is the Council satisfied that the International Atomic Energy Agency is exercising its responsibilities at the world level in such a manner that the Agency's credibility is maintained, or better still enhanced?

Is the Council concerned about the effectiveness of safeguards in countries which are not signatories of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, particularly the Argentine, Brazil, India, Israel, Pakistan and the Republic of South Africa?

Is there cause for disquiet about moves by these countries towards the possession of nuclear explosives?

Mr Denis (COM). — (FR) On a point of order, Madam President. I want to speak under Rule 84. We are being asked to debate an oral question by Mr Filippi on the need for an integrated defence plan for the European Community countries. The fact is — as everyone knows and as the Council itself has stated — the Community has no competence when it comes to military or defence matters. While certain political matters linked to *détente* and disarmament can be accepted as a topic for discussion, we cannot accept when people try to go too far. It is obvious that an integrated defence plan is inadmissible as a subject because it affects the authority of each State. By adding this item to the agenda, there is an attempt to influence the debate on Mr Haagerup's report and to

¹ See Annex.

² Agenda: see Minutes.

Denis

give it a particular bias. In the circumstances, Madam President, under Rule 84 of the Rules of Procedure I move the inadmissibility of Mr Filippi's oral question.

President. — Rule 84 of the Rules of Procedure in fact allows for an item to be ruled inadmissible. However, I must inform the House that in the meantime Mr Filippi has withdrawn the oral question which he tabled together with a number of other Members.

Mr Haagerup (L), rapporteur. — (DK) Madam President, this is by no means the first time that Parliament has discussed political cooperation between our Member States. Let me start by acknowledging the value and importance of the reports on political cooperation which have preceded mine.

First of all there was Mr Mommersteeg's report, now 10 years old, dating from a time in the history of the indirectly-elected Parliament when there was as yet little political cooperation, but when Mr Mommersteeg's report — and Mr Mommersteeg is again amongst us here in Parliament — constituted an important development. Then we had a report by Lord Gladwyn in 1975 and another by Erik Blumenfeld in 1978. After that, the directly-elected Parliament adopted Lady Elles' report in 1981, and I should like to say that I have built on these reports and upon the experience which has been gained in the field of political cooperation, particularly in the most recent years.

For this reason my report is a follow-up to these earlier reports, but it greatly extends and develops the security dimension, and it does so for several reasons. Security problems, as we all know, are a cause of very great concern to our peoples, among other things because of widespread anxiety about current developments in this field, and it would be strange if Parliament did not react to this marked preoccupation with security problems, nuclear weapons, the threat of war and disarmament proposals. And the other reason I have dwelt at length on the security policy dimension, as was envisaged in the mandate I received when I was appointed rapporteur more than one-and-a-half years ago, is of course that political cooperation between our 10 Member States has long had implications for the security aspect of foreign policy. Moreover the London report of 1981 stated that the political aspects of security problems could and would be discussed, as in fact had been done for some time in connection with the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the plans for a disarmament conference etc.

However, security policy is also involved in political cooperation when our 10 Member States take a stand on developments in the Middle East, developments in Eastern Europe, including Poland and Afghanistan, on the possible imposition of sanctions etc. This is why my report expressly emphasizes the gradual emergence of a special European view of security. This means that

the Community countries have, and are to an increasing extent aware of, a range of overall interests which are not always identical with, for example, those of the USA. That does not mean that we cannot cooperate with the USA on defence and other matters, but I believe that we can do this better if we fully recognize that there are, and must necessarily be, differences of opinion between us. This is the background, Madam President, to my call in paragraph 5 for more effective coordination of the political consultations between the Ten and the corresponding political consultations in NATO. There is, of course, no question — as has been feared by some — of subordinating political cooperation between the Ten to what happens within NATO. On the contrary — and this emerges clearly from my report — I regard it as important that our 10 countries often adopt a common approach, but it is essential that this approach is expressed just as clearly in the Ten as it is expressed within the Sixteen, and that there are no unnecessary misunderstandings with countries such as the USA, Canada and Norway, who are members of the Atlantic Alliance but not of the Community.

However, to make this clear and to show that coordination does not concern the military issues within NATO, I myself submitted an amendment — my only one here in the plenary session — to paragraph 5, so as to emphasize that this coordination, which is moreover already a fact, should involve only the political and economic issues related to security. This is also intended to demonstrate that this coordination will not raise special problems for Ireland.

Madam President, this report has, I realize, taken a long time to prepare. This is not due solely to the rapporteur's idleness, but just as much to my desire to obtain the broadest possible support here in Parliament. I considered this particularly necessary for a report of this nature, so as to demonstrate that over and above party and ideological lines we can reach agreement on a basis for joint reflections while starting from different attitudes on European security.

It has been amongst my most positive experiences in Parliament to conduct these negotiations with all six political groups before finally drafting my report. It was gradually possible to get party groups such as the European People's Party and the European Democratic Group to understand that it was necessary to tone down one's expectations with regard to this first real security policy report from Parliament. There can and will, and I had to make this clear, be no question at present of doing anything even remotely evocative of a European Defence Community. On the other hand, it was possible to get the large majority of the members of the Socialist and Communist groups to drop a number of strong reservations about concerning oneself with security at all and to recognize that it is quite possible to discuss security without necessarily at the same time demanding a special military dimension for the Community.

Haagerup

I should like here to compliment my negotiating partners and at the same time thank them for their readiness to adapt their views of each other during these long negotiations in the recognition that it is important that this report should not split Parliament down the middle. On the other hand, Madam President, I call on the minority which also exists here in Parliament, and which is opposed to the development of the Community, which is opposed to cooperation with North America, to vote against my report. Of course, I wish to have a large majority, but I should also like to put the spotlight on those who are opposed both to both the one and the other.

Allow me, finally, Madam President, to sum up my conclusion in English.

This Parliament, Madam President, of talkative European parliamentarians — and I admit freely I am one of those talkative European parliamentarians — has shown that it can not only talk, argue and adopt resolutions, it can also listen. This is the message from this House to all those many millions in Europe who have expressed, and are expressing, their serious concern about peace and stability in Europe and in the world. By adopting this resolution, Madam President, our Parliament, with the support of all six political groups, will be telling the outside world, and especially our own voters, that we are as concerned about the issues related to peace and security as they are.

We are also saying that peace is not won just by slogans and demonstrations in the streets. Nor are peace and security won by the production and deployment of arms. Security is a much more complex issue than that involving military as well as non-military means. We are not presenting to the outside world a definitive formula for peace and security. Rather, we are attempting to show, Madam President, that we present reports that are the product of many months of negotiation and discussion and that reflect our concern and preoccupation with problems transcending narrow political and ideological bounds. We have not all agreed, and we cannot all agree, on one security policy but by giving almost unanimous support to this report we will at least demonstrate our deep awareness of the most important issues that we are facing and our determination, Madam President, to go on exploring in what ways we can possibly contribute to a more enlightened debate leading to a constructive policy on how to maintain peace and security in freedom.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Mertes. I should like, on behalf of the House, to extend to him a cordial welcome in this Chamber.

(Applause)

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I have

read the report before us now with great interest, and it is, in my view, an encouraging development that the European Parliament should be concerning itself with European security. It therefore gives me great pleasure to take part in this debate, another reason being that the joint German and Italian initiative on European Union has already resulted in an agreement to the effect that the Member States should coordinate their views on the political and certain economic aspects of the security issue. I regard that as a substantive element of the joint initiative. All our thinking on a European peace and security concept must be based on the political and military realities obtaining in Europe.

In view of the tremendous military potential of the Soviet Union — a potential which is steadily increasing as the arms build-up continues unchecked — and given the unabating virulence of the political factors behind this build-up, Western Europe has no alternative but to cooperate closely with the United States and Canada in bringing about the military balance of power which is essential to our common security. The continued presence of American troops and the United States' nuclear guarantee for Europe — and no-one else can give us this guarantee — remain indispensable.

Transatlantic cooperation in the interests of our joint security remains a matter for the Atlantic Alliance, which is the basic element in the West's security system. Any security policy cooperation on the part of the Ten must likewise build on this foundation.

Arms control and disarmament are integral elements of our security policy, and I have no hesitation in saying that our efforts in this field are dictated by the ethical and rational thinking of our age. Any steps taken in this direction must, however, be balanced and verifiable. At no time since the Second World War have negotiations on the questions of disarmament and arms control been conducted in so many places at once as is the case at present.

As regards conventional arms control in Europe, the aim of the negotiations in Vienna on a mutual and balanced reduction in forces is to ensure that both sides reduce the strength of their military forces in the central European theatre. Negotiations are still being hampered by the fact that East and West have so far failed to reach agreement on the numerical basis on which such reductions should be effected. Clearly, therefore the central element is the data problem, which is more of a political than a technical problem. The significance of these negotiations is further restricted by the fact that the terms of reference are confined to central Europe. There would be more chance of including the whole of Europe — from the Atlantic to the Urals — in the East-West disarmament dialogue if a conference could be held on disarmament in Europe, and that is why the Ten support the French proposal for the convening of such a conference, and are in favour of the formulation of a precise negotiat-

Mertes

ing mandate as part and parcel of a balanced and substantive document at the Madrid review session on the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

We have taken note with interest of the willingness expressed by Secretary-General Andropov in his speech on 21 December 1982 to seek reasonable and mutually acceptable solutions on the question of conventional arms limitation. If the Soviet Union were prepared to enter into negotiations on conventional arms control in the whole of Europe — including the European part of the Soviet Union — it would give a great boost to the current negotiations on both conventional and nuclear arms limitation. As far as nuclear weapons are concerned, we welcome the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union have commenced START negotiations in Geneva on drastic cuts in the number of intercontinental missiles. Mr Andropov professed willingness to reduce strategic systems by 25% is a step in the right direction, although the American START proposals go a good deal further.

I feel I must sound a warning regarding the Soviet demand that British and French missiles be taken into account in the negotiations on medium-range missiles. The fact is that third countries' systems are not covered by the NATO double decision. Their inclusion would violate the principle of equality, in that it would be tantamount to recognition of Soviet superiority over the USA, thus giving the Soviet Union a monopoly of battlefield land-based nuclear weapons in the European theatre. In the quest for peace, we would view this as an intolerable situation.

The Federal Government, along with its allies, will be subjecting the Prague Declaration of the Warsaw Pact of the beginning of January this year to careful and detailed scrutiny with a view to substantive proposals in the interests of maintaining and securing peaceful relations. The same goes for the proposal for a treaty of non-aggression on the part of the two alliance systems.

Non-aggression has always been the policy pursued by the Federal Republic of Germany and the West as a whole. Indeed, it features in the Helsinki Final Act and more particularly is enshrined as current international law in the UN Charter. A renewed public declaration on the subject would take humanity a step further if it were coupled with the cessation of the use of force on the part of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan and the disavowal by the Soviet Union of the right of intervention laid down in the doctrine of proletarian internationalism. In this instance, it is up to the Soviet Union to match words with deeds. As far as non-aggression is concerned, what we need is not more verbiage, but more action.

Let me now move on from my introductory remarks to the central theme of this report. Virtually ever since its inception in 1969/70, European Political Coopera-

tion has concerned itself — sometimes highly energetically — with security issues. Most of the EPC working parties have to do with security policy issues or have at least some connections with security policy. Allow me to cite as an example the cooperation on the part of the Ten in the CSCE process, which has undoubtedly been one of the most remarkable successes of EPC and which is again today — with the review conference going on in Madrid — in the forefront of foreign policy efforts.

As I mentioned earlier, in the statement of 20 November 1979, the Foreign Ministers gave their support to the French proposals for the convening of a disarmament conference in Europe. Cooperation on security policy is therefore of a long-standing practical nature, and has proved its worth. In the London report of October 1981, the Foreign Ministers formalized the existing practice in that, for the first time in an official political document, they expressly stated that security issues were also the subject of European Political Cooperation.

Over recent years, there has been a tendency among the Ten to widen the scope of their interest in security matters. The negotiations on the European Act are evidently going beyond the terms of the London report, and there is already agreement among the Member States of the Community on the fact that European Political Cooperation should embrace political and certain economic aspects of the security issue. However, despite this progress, the Ten continue to insist that military and defence policy aspects of security are not a matter for EPC. For those Member States which are also members of the Atlantic Alliance, these aspects remain a NATO matter. So much for the basic aspects.

I should now like to move on to deal briefly with the report itself, whose main point — that European Political Cooperation is at present the only forum in Western Europe which can play an increasingly important part in the development of a European security concept — I fully endorse. I too see no alternative to this policy. The reasons set out in the report carry conviction. Allow me in particular to advance two major arguments in favour of EPC. For one thing, if the Ten are to develop in the direction of European Union, we cannot ignore security issues. Secondly, the cooperation among the Member States aimed at European Union must include all the Member States, which is only possible in an EPC context. Anything that applies to the Ten as a whole must of necessity apply to security policy cooperation too. We cannot afford an *à la carte* Europe in this respect. Security is indivisible.

I feel bound to deny the claim made in the report that EPC consultations have tended to devalue consultations within the Alliance. The Alliance is concerned primarily with security policy in the transatlantic context, and there already exists within NATO an European consultation forum in the shape of the Euro-

Mertes

Group. As far as security policy is concerned, EPC is given a more specific flavour by the fact that it is restricted to Europeans and does not extend to military issues. In other words, EPC and NATO should not be in competition with each other, but should instead complement and strengthen each other. The important thing is that the members of NATO and EPC should share common convictions and security interests, and should be convinced of the fact that the basic element of their existence — security — is truly indivisible.

There is therefore just as little likelihood of rivalry between EPC and NATO as there is of a division of work, whereby EPC would deal with the politically more attractive issues including arms control and disarmament, leaving the more controversial and more unpleasant issues to NATO. A strong and united Europe is a welcome factor in the Alliance by virtue of its political predictability, and there is general acknowledgement of the important role we play *vis-à-vis* political stability in Europe and hence for peace in the world. The fact that we are discussing security policy issues can have no effect on the close and trusting cooperation which characterizes the relations of the Ten to other friendly and allied states.

A second critical comment I have to make relates to the differences of opinion between the Europeans and the Americans, dealt with in the chapter entitled 'EPC versus NATO consultations', which to my mind is excessively pessimistic. It is perfectly normal for differences of opinion to arise among equal partners in the Alliance, just as in the Community. The members of the Alliance can no more be forced into line than can the Member States of the Community. In the Alliance, any differences of opinion often result from the more global view of problems taken by the USA compared with the more regional outlook of the Europeans. We shall simply have to learn to live with this fact, which is caused by a variety of geographical, historical and other factors.

So far — and this is a measure of the true value of the institution — the Atlantic Alliance has always managed to agree on a common approach as a result of its close consultations in a spirit of mutual confidence. We should not underestimate the political strength of this ability of ours to reach agreement. The latest instance we have of the phenomenon is the gradual concurrence of views on East-West economic relations, which resulted in the lifting of American sanctions against European firms. In this respect, the report could be a little more up-to-date.

I should like to follow up these comments on the report itself by pointing out that the government of the Federal Republic of Germany, which I am here to represent, has always attached very great importance to security policy cooperation within the framework of EPC, and we shall continue to do so during our tenure of the Presidency.

Allow me to say in conclusion that there is conflict and tension in the world not because we have soldiers and arms. The soldiers and the arms are in fact themselves the consequence of unsolved political problems. For that reason, we cannot talk about peace and security unless we are prepared to go to the very roots of the political problems. In that respect, any form of political cooperation is a *conditio sine qua non* for a discussion on peace and security.

(Applause)

Mr Radoux (S). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to make the point that some of the Council representative's speech was outside the terms of reference of Mr Haagerup's report and that, in fact, he was speaking as a member of a national government and not on behalf of the Council. As such, his remarks had no place here.

Mr Seligman (ED). — I would just like to draw attention to the fact that the Minister did not answer my oral question with debate on nonproliferation. When does he intend to answer that question?

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) Madam President, I think it was evident from what I had to say in what respects I put the position of the Ten, and in what respects I was referring to a specific position of the Federal Republic of Germany.

As regards Mr Seligman's oral question, I should like to remind you that the Council does not think it appropriate to pass a value judgement on how the IAEA in Vienna goes about its tasks. I am sure Mr Seligman knows that, under the terms of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community, it is up to the Community to foster the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and to establish controls to ensure that nuclear materials are not used for purposes other than those for which they were intended. The Community and the Member States have concluded agreements with the IAEA on the basis of their specific responsibilities to ensure that, on the sovereign territories of the Member States, IAEA inspections and checks can be carried out according to the modalities laid down in the said agreements. In this respect, it is up to the Commission, acting on behalf of the Community, to ensure that the verification agreements function as they were intended. Of course, everyone in the council is well aware of the problems to do with the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the policies pursued by the Member States are specially geared to their international commitments.

Mr Bruno Friedrich (S). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, no matter what decision this House may take today on Mr Haagerup's report, the fact that we are for the first time discussing the basic

Friedrich

issues of European security is a milestone in the work of the directly elected European Parliament. Regardless of whether we approve or reject the report, it is worth reminding ourselves at the beginning of this debate that the two world wars which have been fought in this century began as European civil wars, and it was only after Europe had destroyed itself that the process of peaceful unification could get underway, the European Community being the major expression of that process to date.

It therefore follows that, given the experience of those two world wars, the only demand we can really make in this debate on the Haagerup Report is that we, the Members of the European parliament, must do everything in our power to ensure that European civilization is not annihilated by nuclear war. That is what the Haagerup Report itself says, and I should like to add that the people of Europe have entrusted no more important task to us than the obligation to use every means at our disposal to prevent a third world war beginning in Europe. The Socialist Group therefore endorses the major demands made in the report, although we shall only decide on our final position after the vote has been taken on the amendments.

The basic principle of the European Community is the inviolability of its Member States' vital national interests. European security interests as a European concept are only conceivable as the sum of national security interests, and in that respect, I regret the fact that, in important passages, Mr Mertes was speaking on behalf of his government rather than of the Council. After all, on military issues in particular, we must work on the basis of the principle of the inviolability of national sovereignty, and that principle applies not only to the Irish, the French and the Danes, who — as we know — have very different views on this matter. Only if this principle is adhered to will a lot of Members feel able to give their support to the Haagerup Report.

The view of the Socialist Group is that the European Community is not a parallel organization to NATO, and that European Political Cooperation is not a parallel policy to that pursued by NATO. NATO has 16 member countries, only eight of which are likewise Member States of the European Community. That is something we must bear in mind in discussing this report.

The Community should therefore harbour no ambitions to take the place of NATO or do its job. However, at the same time, we shall always oppose any attempt on the part of the superpowers to develop a form of security which is increasingly based on one-sided dominance and on the military aspect to the exclusion of all other aspects.

Since Helsinki, security has come to mean something completely different from just military security policy. The increasing dominance of military matters in the

superpowers' thinking in the midst of a world economic crisis which is having its effect even on those superpowers will, with frightening inevitability, bring mankind to the very brink of a nuclear war. We therefore deplore the fact that, in the Political Affairs Committee, the Socialists' amendment directed against the dominance of purely military aspects of security policy was rejected.

Over recent weeks, we Europeans have come to realize that some movement is taking place in the superpowers' negotiations on arms limitation and control. The major world powers are beginning to realize that the arms race cannot continue at its old pace. What this amounts to — and what the European Parliament expects — is that compromises must be found by the superpowers on questions relating to arms limitation and control. In this respect, the Haagerup Report could be an important contribution on the part of the Europeans should it come to a resumption of the process of *détente* as envisaged by the Helsinki Final Act, a process which was interrupted by developments in Afghanistan and Poland and the superpowers' new armaments spiral.

But solutions in the form of compromises — and I stress the word 'compromises' — will only be possible so long as neither of the superpowers tries to establish a position of superiority over its rival, and we Europeans are certainly not mere putty in the hands of the superpowers.

Right from the start, the directly elected European Parliament has espoused the peace policy enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act. In the first weeks of this Parliament's life, Willy Brandt initiated a hearing on the Final Act which was well received throughout Europe, and we have consistently recognized the importance of the Act despite the cooling-down in the process of *détente*. It should be the Council's job to formulate a European proposal and present it as a European contribution at the Madrid review conference, and we can only hope that the French proposal on confidence-building measures will lead to genuine arms limitation and control in Europe.

The passive attitude of the Council as regards the formulation of a European security concept is bound to reinforce the impression that we Europeans are prepared to leave it up to the superpowers to define what is meant by a European security policy. In making this point, I am in no way criticizing our American allies, who have taken on major burdens, but this House did make the point in July of last year that we expect to be treated on equal terms by our American partners on security matters and on all matters involving cooperation. Let us not forget that, in 1979, the European Community's gross national product exceeded that of the United States. We attach great importance to acknowledgement of our specific European identity on these matters.

Friedrich

We also wish to enter into a dialogue with the Soviet Union and the other countries of Eastern Europe, and this would be an easier matter if the Soviet Union were prepared at long last to accept the Community as a political reality. The establishment of a Soviet Embassy attached to the European Community in Brussels would constitute a qualitative change in the nature of the dialogue with the Soviet Union and the other countries of Eastern Europe.

The Socialist Group rejects point 5 of the Haagerup Report. We think it would be entirely wrong to harmonize the political elements of European Political Cooperation and NATO on the grounds that it would be a wrong step at the wrong time. What has happened to the European security concept which was supposed to be forthcoming here? Even the President-in-Office of the Council made no reference to this. I deplore the fact that NATO is at present in a state of structural crisis and that a great deal of controversy has blown up in the United States between Globalists and Atlanticists, who want to see America's security policy orientated towards the global interests of the USA, which would mean ousting Europe as the central element of security policy. That is how things stand in the USA, and it is the kind of thing we want to hear more about when Vice-President Bush comes to Europe. In that respect, point 5 tends, in my view, to weaken the European position. If, Mr Haagerup, you take a look at points 1 and 5 of your motion for a resolution, you will realize that there is not only a political contradiction, but also a logical one. It therefore seems to me that you too should be prepared to strike out point 5. In conclusion, I should like to make the point that the Socialist Group is firmly rooted in the tradition of the worldwide peace movement.

(Applause)

That being so, allow me to remind you of what Jean Jaurès said about European politicians making their own fate and their own existence dependent on the maintenance of peace in Europe and throughout the world. And so, in our first security debate here in Strasbourg, I should like to conclude by saying that we Europeans as a whole — no matter what political group we may belong to — should deal with this report in the tradition and the obligation expressed by Jean Jaurès.

(Applause)

Mr Schall (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party very much welcomes this motion for a resolution on the subject of European Political Cooperation and European security, and I should like to address a first word of thanks to our rapporteur, Mr Haagerup. He has managed to make a political subject which has been the source of many years' controversy and which is of importance to the future of the European Com-

munity acceptable to a majority of the Political Affairs Committee as well as — I am sure I am right in saying this — to a majority of this House.

The motion for a resolution we have before us now is based essentially on another motion for a resolution which I tabled on behalf of my Group on 9 March 1981 — in other words, almost two years ago — on European Political Cooperation on matters of security policy.

Of course, it is true that this House has already adopted three resolutions on detailed security policy matters, but, in adopting this particular resolution, the European Parliament will be taking decisions of principle which will be of major future importance. The Member States of the European Community share a number of important security interests which are worth investigating with a view to the formulation of a genuinely European peace and security concept. Public opinion in Europe must be kept better informed than has been the case so far on a future European security concept, and in this respect, it is up to the European Parliament to formulate joint European security interests by extending — both quantitatively and, in particular, qualitatively — its responsibility, its scope and — let me stress — its powers.

It is with a sense of great satisfaction that my Group sees this motion for a resolution as the fulfilment of a demand made many years ago in the Tindemans Report, in our election manifesto and most recently at the EPP Conference held in Paris in December that political priority be given to the creation of a future European Union. The same is also true of all the Members from virtually all the Groups represented in this House who, for more than two years now, have been discussing questions relating to European security policy in the inter-group working party on security.

At this juncture, I should like to welcome the very clear points made by Mr Mertes on behalf of the Council and the fundamental principles spelt out just now by Mr Friedrich. The oft-cited criticism that the Treaties of Rome prohibit the European Parliament from discussing security policy issues is erroneous and must be rejected. It would be quite grotesque and absurd if this House were to debate any number of political details, but refuse to discuss a political matter of the very highest priority.

It is only understandable that those Members who deny that the security of our Member States is under threat from the Soviet Union or who refuse to recognise that fact will vote against the motion for a resolution, along with Members who are opposed to the European Community as such. The rapporteur has already made this point, and I should like to underline his arguments. However, the overwhelming majority of this House is conscious of its responsibilities *vis-à-vis* the people of Europe and their vital interests, and are thus working towards the aim of European Union

Schall

as a peace-keeping force and a force capable of peace on the world political stage, and these Members will welcome this motion for a resolution as a milestone along the road towards a joint European foreign policy.

Konrad Adenauer wrote in his political memoirs that domestic policy determines *how* we live, but that foreign and security policy determines *whether* we live at all, and what he had in mind was of course living in freedom. As Foreign Minister Colombo said in the explanatory statement on the Genscher-Colombo proposal, which is so vital to the further development of the European Community, Europe must be concerned not only to create such important factors as stability, political development and economic growth, but must also make a coordinated and effective contribution towards its own security. He went on to say that a European security policy seemed in this respect to be not only justified, but essential, a policy which would take on its true dimension by way of European Political Cooperation.

Following on from these comments on the main aspects of the motion for a resolution, I should like to stress two particularly important factors. Security and the maintenance of peace as the principal and all-pervading aim of a common European security policy run like a thread throughout the motion for a resolution.

The principal aim and the true justification of all political activity is peace — peace in liberty and with the right to self-expression and self-determination on the part of all the peoples of the European Community. Security policy as such is not an absolute political aim, but is in fact the means whereby politics can attain and guarantee the principal aim of peace. As a result of the all but inconceivable changes which have taken place in the kind of military hardware available, the principle of preparing for war if what you want is peace, which had been valid from the beginning of time until just a few decades ago, has now undergone a qualitative and quantitative shift to become 'if what you want is peace, then prepare for peace'.

Along with the demands for joint action as a contribution to peace and stability, for negotiations on armaments control and for the dismantling of military deterrence potential, the motion for a resolution calls for the preparation of a European security concept capable of making a genuine contribution towards the establishment and maintenance of peace.

I should like to draw your attention to the amendments tabled by my Group, and to appeal to you to accept their inexorable logic and give them your support. In conclusion, I should like to state on behalf of my Group that this motion for a resolution represents a milestone on the European Community's road towards European Union, that European Political Cooperation is for the first time becoming an effective instrument, that the European Parliament is thus tak-

ing a major step forward in terms of its importance and its democratic responsibilities, and that the adoption of this resolution will underpin the most important issue facing our countries today — the maintenance of peace in a spirit of liberty.

(Applause)

Mr Fergusson (ED). — Madam President, it is to my mind a fine thing that this thoughtful and persuasive and timely report should coincide with this morning's unchallenged declaration by the Parliament in favour of lasting peace through mutual negotiations on disarmament — nuclear and conventional — by East and West. For here now arises the essential companion of disarmament: the security which alone can guarantee the freedom of the peace which it must help promote. It is evident that some aspects of this report passed by the Political Affairs Committee by so large a majority still disturb various elements in the Parliament. To those who affect to maintain that it threatens to turn the Community into a military complex of some kind I have nothing to say because argument is a waste of time as regards those who use the issue of mutual security, our very survival, to undermine the Community or to play on the popular fear that membership of the Community could drag us into war, there is no time to waste on them either. And actually not many of them are here with us today.

But to those who fear that this report, or others on the same subject, represent some new and possibly hazardous departure, I would point this out! We have in this document — all parts of it — a skilled and instructive assertion of what in terms of Community and parliamentary competence the process of political cooperation, if nothing else, already is. It is the more impressive and forceful precisely because it embodies and gives wings to an idea whose time has come — a Community security policy; as the Minister has asserted to us, not in rivalry to the Atlantic Alliance but complementary to it. I agree with Mr Friedrich. We are not replacing NATO and must not. Mr Haagerup is now bringing the Parliament to terms with a state of affairs in respect of security — call it what you will — which already exists. He invites us to accept, as we all have to, that for that growth of political union in the Community in which we have continually expressed our joint belief, the political security aspect is as important as the foreign policy one.

And this is not merely to speak of defence. The Community attitude to Afghanistan, to Poland, to the Middle East, to East-West trade, to South Africa, to Turkey, to energy, to raw materials supplies, the lot — all this is part and parcel of our security, our survival. Worries have been expressed again about clause 5, which covers political consultation with the Western Alliance. But this consultation is already taking place, as the Council has pointed out. How else could we usefully have concerted our joint position for the

Fergusson

Madrid talks on détente? If this consultation is essential and accepted by the Council, why should this Parliament deny itself the right positively to influence the course of such events? If we limit our scope as a democratic body, we are merely hobbling ourselves. Worse, we make ourselves incredible if we deny in such a way our concern, our interest in our own safety.

I must agree with Mr Schall. The Treaty of Rome does not, and cannot, confine what we think and what we say. No doubt, of course, there are limits, if not to the legality, at least to the propriety of our involvement.

But let me put this to you. Those in the European Parliament who demand disarmament, whether multi- or unilateral, are already interfering fundamentally — perhaps critically, if their advice is taken — in defence policy. Indeed, some of them, in doing so, come dangerously close to asserting what this report does not, i.e., a parliamentary role in deciding military strategy. For to call for the removal of, say, theatre nuclear weapons has as many strategic implications as to call for their installation.

There is one other matter to which I must refer in this connection. Again and again our right to speak on security matters has been challenged — it has happened again today — in spite of the accepted fact that they are dealt with in political cooperation and in spite of the fact that Members of this Parliament with no apparent love for the Community or its development, still less for the United States, have sent to the Political Affairs Committee resolutions expressly dealing with security, including questions concerning arms sales, or nuclear weapon deployment or anything else you like.

Once this report has been passed by ourselves, it would be of the greatest satisfaction to all of us who are anxious to save time and patience, if we were all to accept once and for all that no power, no treaty on earth has the right to stop us from discussing what we wish to discuss and that arguments about security-related reports, in which the Commission, I suspect, will have a more direct concern than it has in this present one, should be rational in argument and not crudely emotional.

Madam President, my group, as I am sure you will know, gives its wholehearted support to what the Political Affairs Committee, through Mr Haagerup, has said to us.

(Applause)

Mr Gremetz (COM). — *(FR)* Ladies and gentlemen, the scale of the popular movement with unprecedented vigour demanding peace and disarmament in Europe can be felt even in this Assembly. I would like to say straightaway that this is a good thing which cannot but encourage all those already working for these noble

objectives to reinforce their efforts in joint and separate action.

France, and the other countries represented here, have in fact an important role to play with the help of this movement, in the context of political cooperation, too, in putting an end to the insane arms race, so that the negotiations started as a result of popular pressure will result in genuine balanced steps to reduce arms, guaranteeing security for all.

However, in spite of the references to this general concern featuring in the resolution before us, is this in fact the road it is suggested we should take? We already know of other plans of the past which in actual fact amounted to attempts to introduce here a climate of cold war and crusading, and attempts to make us debate issues which the Council itself has recognized as being outside our competence. The problems of defence and security are the exclusive domain of each sovereign State.

I would like solemnly to reiterate here the basic position of the French Communist Party on this matter. Being in favour of our independent deterrent force, which is a basic element of our country's security, the Communist Party could not allow it to be discussed by this Assembly or any other body. The motion may present things less crassly than on other occasions, but the reference to movement in public opinion cannot hide the main point. As the report incidentally shows in its conclusion, it is 'a search for a common strategy in the field of security' that is being proposed to us for ratification.

As illustrated by the note submitted by the French Government, Mr Haagerup's report tends to go well beyond the defined limits. One paragraph of the resolution is just as revealing as others. Was it in fact not necessary, according to this text, 'to coordinate the political consultations conducted by the European Political Affairs Committee and NATO respectively', although our country is no longer a member of the organization of the Atlantic Alliance, and has no intention of returning to it? For us, it is quite simply unacceptable.

Completely different channels should, we believe, be sought when questions of peace and disarmament have to be discussed, which is quite normal. The accumulation of arms, missiles, bombs and nuclear weapons, whose use would lead to our planet's destruction, has become intolerable for the various nations, countries and governments. The fabulous amounts of money wasted are also intolerable at a time when 800 million human beings are suffering misery, poverty and often hunger and most countries of the so-called Third World do not have the financial, technological or economic means for their development. This is what is deeply repulsive to the universal conscience.

The Communists' commitment to peace and disarmament is not new. We have always been militants for

Gremetz

peace. Our ideal is a world without arms and war. This is why, and I will confine myself here to a recent period, we have never stopped making proposals to advance gradually but resolutely in this direction. This was the spirit of the 20 proposals made in 1979 to achieve a Europe of cooperation and peace, and it is the spirit of the French Communist Party's address to the UN last June.

We are pleased that today associations, political parties, churches, men and women of varying sympathies, in short the most varied movements, in a multitude of actions taking the most varied forms and for the most varied motives, are expressing common concerns as recently formulated in our country by us in conjunction with the Socialist Party: 'the need for progressive controlled and balanced disarmament, a reduction in all weapons and the link between disarmament and development'.

It is in this spirit that we believe that France, while respecting her alliances, must show that she is active and take the initiative to achieve peace and disarmament. Yes, it is urgently necessary that the negotiations being conducted in Geneva should result as quickly as possible in the limitation and reduction of arms in Europe on the basis of an equilibrium of forces and security for each country. It is also necessary that the meeting in Madrid should lead as soon as possible to the calling of a conference on disarmament in Europe. These negotiations are the affair of the governments, but of all the nations as well; they must be held completely in the open.

Large numbers of proposals are presented by numerous States, by the movement of non-aligned nations and by the neutral countries, etc. Wherever these proposals originate, they must be scrutinized seriously enough to find every means of making progress. Incidentally, this is why, although items were still open to discussion, we voted for the Fergusson resolution, recommending a close scrutiny of the proposals made by the Warsaw Pact in Prague.

We have always been believers in the simultaneous dissolution of the blocs, and we think it is today up to the States or governments, with the backing of the people, to take the initiative for peace and disarmament. In this sense, there is plenty of scope for cooperation, but this is not the spirit of the resolution we are debating.

Even though it is not up to our Assembly to deal with — and I repeat — problems of defence and security, it would nevertheless be quite useful and a positive step if we maintained the hopes of the people of Europe and adopted a resolution in favour of peace and disarmament, in favour of a positive conclusion to the negotiations which have been started.

This is the spirit in which we shall support the amendments to the proposed text tabled by the European

parliamentarians for Nuclear Disarmament which is a sign of the times and of the power assumed by the popular movement of the European parliamentarians, and which we are in favour of. Coming from different countries and being members of different parties, they all have this one essential target, this prime human right, that of living in peace and, since I have respect for the Assembly, you will see that I am finishing 30 seconds before the end of my speaking time.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

Mr Nord (L). — (NL) Madam President, my group has decided unanimously to give its backing to the report produced by Mr Haagerup on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee. I should like briefly to explain why we are so much in favour of the report and, at the same time, comment on our own attitude to the subject dealt with therein.

Firstly, Madam President, I should like to say that we are delighted that this debate is taking place at all. We Liberals have always found it impossible to understand how anyone could claim that we have no right to discuss such matters in this House. As we all know, very many people throughout Europe are worried about the security issue, and rightly so. These matters generate highly emotional reactions in many quarters, and we therefore have not only a right but also a duty — as the elected representatives of the people of Europe — to discuss in public these matters which rightly are of great concern to our people. That is the view we Liberals have always taken, and we are pleased that many others have now come around to our way of thinking, and that a broader measure of consensus has now crystallized on this point.

Madam President, in the debate on the statement made by the President-in-Office of the Council on Tuesday, Mr Bangemann made the point that security policy involved a lot more than just military self-defence. What we need above all is a joint European approach to all aspects of the security of our part of the world, and it is up to us to get together to formulate such an approach. The Haagerup report is a first step in this respect, and we welcome the way in which the rapporteur has set about his task. He has endeavoured in the first instance to stress those elements that many of us here can agree on, and he has evidently succeeded in his aim, if the vote in the Political Affairs Committee is anything to go by. Let us not delude ourselves into thinking that, when it comes to discussing the problems raised by Mr Haagerup in more detail on future occasions, there will be no differences of opinion within this House. Of course, there will be differing views, and that is of course as it should be. At the moment, though, we should like to congratulate the rapporteur on choosing to adopt an approach whereby, in the current phase, he has set out to achieve as broad a consensus as possible among all those in this House who really have the fate of Europe

Nord

at heart, who know that it is only by acting together that we can serve the interests of our people and that major priority must be given to security matters.

To speak of European security, Madam President, is automatically to speak of the Atlantic Alliance and our relations with the United States. As far as we are concerned, there is no inherent contradiction in formulating a European security concept of our own and at the same time continuing to believe that the Atlantic ties are of vital importance to our future well-being. On the contrary, we believe that Europe has no right to simply sit back and leave its security up to the Americans. Our true strength lies neither in European isolation nor in disregarding our own responsibilities within the Alliance. It is precisely by formulating a European security concept of our own that we can ensure that the Atlantic factor is more effective, and can free our transatlantic relations from many of their shackles. We are quite sure that this kind of development would be heartily welcomed by the Americans too.

Madam President, we regard this debate as a starting point. This is, as far as we are concerned, the Haagerup Report Mark I, which we hope will be quickly followed by Haagerup Mark II, dealing with a number of detailed and fundamental matters and giving more form and substance to the European security concept we so urgently need. It is with this in mind, Madam President, that I can assure you of my group's support for the report.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Madam President, I would like to thank you for allowing me to speak and I would ask all the honourable Members, beginning with Mr Israël, to excuse me for asking to speak before them but, because of other tasks I have ahead of me, I shall have to leave Strasbourg in a few minutes.

As you can well imagine, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission has not spent a long time examining this report and has not decided to adopt any stance for legal reasons you are well aware of. However, since the Commission fully participates in political cooperation, I thought it would be normal for us to take part in this debate and for me to say something, at least from my personal point of view since I believe that when it is a question of extending the Community's powers, we should all accept our responsibilities and commit ourselves to an opinion. And I would like to say straightaway that this debate and your Political Affairs Committee's report are of prime importance, which is obviously not appreciated by some people and, without wishing to bring the term 'historic' into disrepute, I would like to say that for us, the European Community is a Community which must be interested in everything and from which nothing, absolutely nothing, should be excluded.

I would therefore like to thank your Political Affairs Committee, and above all your rapporteur, for the balanced report he has presented and for the ideas set forth in it.

My personal opinion is that the European Community, as you wish it, ladies and gentlemen, and as certainly the Commission would like it to be, is a community destined to a common future and to which nothing should be alien. Let us be honest: we know that we shall proceed towards economic integration right to the very end and have begun by being an economic community; we shall not be a properly integrated economic community and we cannot ask for the solidarity of all our citizens until the day we really have common views on the main items of policy.

Well, can we achieve this economic integration? Can we ask our citizens for these sacrifices? Can we, as you have just said, set the lines of policy if we have not got the courage to talk about our security together?

(Applause)

There is no example in the history of human society, since the start, of security not being what it should be: the fundamental aim of every society. A society is created, and a collectivity is created to ensure its survival and security, and we seem to be acting here as though we thought we could form a community on the basis of the essential and ask sacrifices from the professions or the people, without sharing the same concern for our security. It is absolutely impossible and we must realize this once and for all.

It is not because long before us (the economic community started in 1950 in the form of the ECSC), those who preceded us, following this logical sequence, committed themselves to political union one year later, nor because, following the same logical sequence, they committed themselves to the European Defence Community two years later, nor because four years later this Defence Community failed, that we today, with our legs still severed, should not have the courage for the rest of eternity to assume our responsibilities and talk about what is essential to each of us.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, and I would like to conclude with this, it is not up to us to say that we are not to talk about NATO and the WEU or the links between these organizations. Security at an initial stage is essential and we should not repeat the same errors as were perhaps committed in 1950. Let us talk about security and defence; we shall talk a little later about the military, i.e. the executive arm. We should begin by discussing among ourselves how we envisage security: *pacta sunt servanda*.

We shall assume our responsibilities, the countries which are members of NATO will assume their responsibilities. Those who do not wish will refrain from doing so, but let it be said among us that nothing

Thorn

should be taboo among the members of one and the same community; we should be ready, I believe, to talk about everything together. Then we shall see how far we can go. But how can we hope to share a grand design and a great destiny if we do not see eye to eye on security, i.e. the survival of those whose lives have been entrusted to us?

(Applause)

Mr Israël (DEP). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we are aware above all of a major concern of the European nations: the people want to safeguard their own existence. There is a feeling of insecurity in our consumer society and a number of citizens of this ancient Europe of ours are wondering about their future and casting an anxious eye on the incredible accumulation of weapons lining the two camps which share our continent from East to West.

The Haagerup report asks us to consider the argument that the European Parliament should reflect these wishes of the people and define a policy to guarantee this security.

Since the meeting held in London in December 1981, European Political Cooperation includes, legitimately in our view, this concern for security in the European Community's general policy. It is obviously part of our duty to ensure that the European nations are concerned about collective security. It is certainly not a question of setting up political cooperation in a sort of defence institution, with structural links with the NATO military organization. Neither should the European Parliament be confused with the parliamentary assembly of the Western European Union. Furthermore, as Mr Haagerup says in his report, a new European Defence Community would be neither realistic nor desirable. However, since the countries of the European Community and the other countries of Western Europe, as well as the United States and Canada, are conducting negotiations with the Eastern bloc at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, it is normal that the conditions for collective security should be examined jointly by our Assembly.

In spite of the tragedies of Poland and Afghanistan, this joint examination should be oriented towards *détente*, because *détente* and security are indissolubly linked. Many will say that there has been peace in Europe for 35 years because the Western community has been armed. But what sort of peace, ladies and gentlemen? A peace which ruins our economies, creates distrust and guarantees the misery of the European nations enslaved by totalitarianism.

A policy of security and cooperation in Europe could not be conceived as representing acceptance of the political and moral imbalance affecting our continent and transforming half of the European population, and I say it with regret, into a community of slaves.

What everyone has agreed to call the balance of terror that is supposed to be held by nuclear weapons implies a certain degree of stability in East-West relations. This balance will be positive in its effect only if the causes of the conflict are eliminated. It must be realized that, in an event of serious crisis, nuclear balance is not necessarily a factor which would create calm and peace. The European Community must try to define a security policy, i.e. a common strategy to maintain peace and constantly seek channels for the peaceful development of the Community countries in a spirit of international cooperation. This is a duty we have towards the nations of Europe, and it is true that the collective security of the Europeans presents the European Community with inescapable problems.

We are well aware of the existence among the ten nations of the Community of tendencies towards pacifism and neutralism as well as a kind of general weariness in reaction to the war-torn record of human history. We know that large-scale movements, often led by major spiritual forces, extol a kind of demobilization of the spirit.

The main obligation of the European policy for security in Europe is to make the people understand that the duty to survive, which is a genuine collective form of self-preservation instinct, is the moral imperative for our society of freedom and abundance. The anti-nuclear movements, however respectable they may be, actually pose a serious threat to the security of Europe and it is up to the European Community to ensure that people are aware of this danger.

There is one further problem: it must be admitted that, at the moment, Europe is not capable alone of providing its own defence, in other words, a proportionate and adequate response to outside aggression. The French and British atomic weapons are forces whose use would have a totalizing effect, a little like the arm used by a terrorist. The denuclearization of Europe would quite simply consist in the recognition of Soviet domination of the continent and the finlandization of the countries of the Community.

And now for my last question, Madam President: Germany's contribution to security in Europe is essential. The difficulties are clear to everyone. Germany cannot be given the atomic bomb and does not want to have the supreme weapon. She is rocked by very strong pacifist movements. Tomorrow, she will perhaps be tempted to begin monumental negotiations, with the dizzy heights of reunification in mind. The Eastern countries are probably prepared to pay very dearly to detach the Federal Republic from the rest of us. Germany must stand fast.

As we can see, the whole range of problems surrounding the definition of a European security policy is of concern to both the governments and the nations represented by the European Parliament. They are problems which, in spite of the differences in interpre-

Israël

tation and the various difficulties naturally associated with them, concern Europe's future. It will be to our Assembly's great merit to ask these questions and to the satisfaction of our colleague, Mr Haagerup, to have referred to them. The questions of security in Europe are questions of survival. How could they be absent from our minds?

Mrs Hammerich (CDI). — (DA) Madam President, it is not difficult to see through this report in spite of its cautious language. Its intention is quite clear from the explanatory note. The underlying idea is that of union and a European Defence Community. Mr Haagerup writes that 'if the European Community has a future at all it is inevitable that security and one day even defence will become part of it'. However, as Mr Haagerup knows, it would be unrealistic to think in terms of a Defence Community until the time was ripe, and this is exactly what the report wants, i.e. to take the small cautious steps involving, for example, coordination between NATO and EPC. Mr Haagerup wants to extend the concept of 'Security' to include defence and military matters. This is hinted at in paragraph 2, 3 and 4 and stated more explicitly in the section on EPC, which recommends that strictly military questions should be discussed in that forum.

However, ingenious the report might be, it is miles away from the Treaty of Rome, from Danish Law and from what Mr Haagerup's electorate thinks the European Community should be dealing with. This Parliament is not competent to discuss military matters, as Mr Haagerup does for page after page, and voting against the report is obviously the only possible course of action open to every Dane and everyone else who wishes to respect law and order. Even people involved in the various peace movements should reject the report and not let themselves be taken in by the fact that the word 'peace' is used eight times in the motion for resolution. The peace movements get quite a reasonable mention in paragraph F, or 7 and paragraph 8, but a few pages later we read that they can represent 'a serious threat to European security', as Mr Israël also maintained.

The report is full of such self-contradictions, which are there for the purpose of a depressing piece of double dealing. The report speaks of concern at the number of nuclear weapons in existence but further on it is stated that security depends on the extent of one's defence systems. It also claims to advocate *détente* between East and West but later goes on to say that the Soviets will probably attack us anyway. It speaks piously of the North-South Dialogue but throughout that report the developing countries are merely referred to as places from which we can get our raw materials.

Members of the peace movement in Denmark were shocked at the report and its outdated and dangerous concept of security. People should think twice before

giving themselves over to an abstract faith in the idea that a large united European Community would be in the interests of peace. When has the formation of a new power bloc ever promoted peace? We must be realistic and realize that Mr Haagerup's report unfortunately reflects the approach to security which generally prevails in the Community today. Just imagine a European Community in the form of a large military-industrial complex! Imagine joint arms production — which is one of the things Mr Haagerup in fact advocates — and, over and above that, a political council making binding decisions so that the individual countries could not act independently — this would be a military-industrial complex and we know how difficult it is to steer a complex of this kind in a peaceful direction.

Imagine a European Community of the kind I just described with limited raw materials at its disposal in an acute situation. We have already seen wars over raw materials or — as people prefer to describe it — protection of world trade. We should realize that the safest thing to do would be to insist that the European Community has nothing to do with defence and military matters.

Finally, a present for the rapporteur — a dove with a chain around its foot in a cage with a solid padlock so there is no chance of it flying out and becoming, as Mr Haagerup has called the peace movement, a serious threat to European security. There are much more serious threats!

Mr Romualdi (NI). — (IT) Mr President, the fact that in the sphere of political cooperation the European Community has a fundamental duty to take an interest in problems concerning the security and defence of its people and of the rest of the world — and therefore arms and the production and selling of arms — is a fact that can be challenged, and even denied, only by the Communists and by the most rabid and radical leftwing parties and by everyone, left or right, who is against the political unity of Europe. I mention the Communists because they are in favour of Europe — and perhaps they are sincere, I am not saying they are not — but what they want is a Europe which is neutral and also neutralized almost to the extent of making sure that there is greater freedom and leeway for Soviet policy and for the power of the Warsaw Pact countries.

And I mention the leftwing parties because they are blindly faithful — in spite of constantly being rudely disillusioned — to their naive and eternal role as pacifists. The sad fact is that in the last forty years or so this role has served only to help the material, moral and psychological erosion of the West, whose nations, peoples, political parties and cultural circles have become incapable of reacting against or even understanding the tremendous outflanking manoeuvre which international Communism is carrying out

Romualdi

against the free world, and doing so in the name of freedom and national liberation. This is freedom and liberation which Soviet Russia fiercely denies the people in its own imperial thrall which is shamelessly colonial. And then you have all those, across the political spectrum, who do not want to see Europe united politically and therefore not even economically, because they realize that it is practically impossible for any political and therefore economic community to exist, capable of producing real political action and developing its own economy, unless it is also in a position to take an interest in matters concerning security and disarmament, the production and selling of arms. These are sectors of activity on which our lives depend in the general sense of existence and production, and there is no way they cannot be carefully and responsibly monitored by the great powers.

Is this the surreptitious route we want to follow in our efforts to build the European Defence Community which failed so miserably at the Palazzo Borbone some twenty years ago? Is this what the Haagerup report is suggesting? Of course not! It is made quite clear in the report that this is not an attempt to supplant NATO. The efforts of the esteemed Members and the report by Mr Haagerup are just an attempt to make the European Parliament face up to its responsibilities. We have to state an important need in that we have to assess all the aspects of the crisis in the Community. It is not only economic but political and military as well. Our indifference could make things worse and this would make the problem of defence and peace even more tricky. I am talking about a sense of responsibility which the European Parliament is quite right to remind us of. It is a shame that the Commission, whose favourable view we heard voiced today in the brief but stirring words by Mr Thorn, was not able to realize this even before we did and take the necessary measures.

Mrs Charzat (S). — (FR) I would like to make two criticisms of Mr Haagerup's report.

The first basic criticism is that the Haagerup report tends to continue the logic of Yalta. It dissociates Europe's security from the search for the introduction of greater autonomy for Europe from the two blocs. The political aspects of security in Europe are mainly analysed from the viewpoint of the protection afforded by the Atlantic Alliance. Now to my mind, Europe's security presupposes the development by the Europeans themselves of a dynamic, autonomous and voluntary project for the European Community for the decade to come. I have only time to give you one example: the absence of a common industrial policy and the presence of some 12 million unemployed expose the European Community to the risk of becoming dependent on others for all advanced industrial equipment. How could the Community face the political problems of security in view of the fact that it would become not only economically but also militar-

ily dependent for lack of the technology for the means of defence it employs to guarantee Europe's freedom?

The development of a Munich spirit in Europe, which does not favour the necessary disarmament, is a danger. But why should the youth, who make up a large majority of Europe's unemployed, defend a Community which offers it nothing but discouragement and resignation?

The second basic criticism I shall make of Mr Haagerup's report concerns the fact that he establishes a link between European Political Cooperation and the Atlantic Alliance. The Atlantic Alliance cannot be the medium for examining questions of security from the European viewpoint: in actual fact, Ireland, which is a full member of the European Community, is not a member of the Alliance, France is not integrated in NATO and the French representatives are not present when the Atlantic Council deals with military problems, because it is then supposed to be acting as a NATO body. Finally, there can be no question here of defence by the Ten since the Treaty of Rome gives the Community no competence in defence matters.

Mr Haagerup acknowledges that it is the WEU which is competent for Europe as far as collective security and defence are concerned. However, in his report he refuses to recognize the WEU as the vehicle for European cooperation in defence matters. France, for her part, believes that the WEU is an authentic European institution which should be developed and reinforced in the future. Furthermore, the seven members of the WEU belong to the European Community and Atlantic Alliance.

Better coordination could be created between the Assembly of the WEU and the European Parliament with regard to the political aspects of security, and the European Council could report on its activities to the two Assemblies. The European Parliament's Political Affairs Committee and the EWU's General Affairs Committee could meet to discuss questions of common interest.

It is by confirming its identity that Europe will contribute to the dissolution of the blocs, as well as to security and peace.

Mr Mommersteeg (PPE). — (NL) Madam President, the report on European Political Cooperation which was — as the rapporteur has reminded us — adopted in the then European Parliament almost exactly ten years ago was concerned, among other things, with the idea that EPC, directed as it is towards the convergence of the Member States' foreign policies, could not ignore security matters. This had nothing at all to do with the idea that it was time to breathe fresh life into the European Defence Community, but stemmed from the conviction that peace and security policy were an integral aspect of foreign policy. Some of the

Mommersteeg

then Members of the European Parliament may recall that, at the time, this was a controversial issue, but the report was adopted nonetheless.

The attitude adopted then has been legitimized *de facto* by events over the last ten years, and Mr Haagerup's report gives ample and balanced documentary evidence of this state of legitimacy. Events have shown that it is of the utmost European interest for the Europeans to seek a common standpoint, a consensus of the security needs of Europe and the West, based on the facts of life in Europe and European views, analyses and considerations. Mr Genscher said the day before yesterday that we must work towards a European security concept, and in view of the disquiet, confusion, and justified concern among sections of European public opinion, it is highly important that clarity is brought to what constitutes European security and a European security policy. Do we, as the directly elected representatives of the people of Europe, not have a duty to give consideration to this matter?

There need be no contradiction between the process of European awareness in this respect and the Atlantic Alliance. The important thing is that the European element must be strengthened in what is essentially a political body — the NATO Council. That is implicitly what paragraph 6 of the motion for a resolution has to say. In my view, the distinction between true Europeans and pure Atlanticists is obsolete.

I cannot go into all the points of the motion for a resolution, but I should like to devote particular attention to paragraph (j) of the preamble, expressing the conviction that 'arms control negotiations between East and West are important for both sides, that they should take the form of a continuous process and that they should be aimed at mutual security based on balanced military relations at the lowest possible arms level'. The Haagerup report sets out principles and ideas, and presents convincing arguments for common security interests and the need for a genuine European security concept. What it does not do — and was not called upon to do — is spell out such a concept.

It therefore follows that this motion for a resolution is merely a starting point, and the House is bound to ask itself what comes now. In our view, paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution gives only a partial and too general an answer to this question. We feel that it is up to the European Parliament to embark as soon as possible on a stock-taking exercise and a thorough and rigorous analysis and definition of what constitutes common European security interests, security risks and security needs.

That will be first and foremost the job of the Political Affairs Committee, working on the basis of the principles set out in the Haagerup Report, and the sensible approach with regard to this urgent and tricky undertaking would be for the Political Affairs Committee to

set up a working party to pass on information to the committee itself. That is the tenor of Amendment No 52 tabled by Mr Shall on behalf of the EPP Group — no more, no less. I would call on this House to give its approval to the said amendment.

Madam President, I should like to conclude by referring to something said by the President of the European Parliament, Mr Dankert, in a speech he gave last month in Brussels to the Belgian Royal Defence Institute. He said — and I go along with him — that the Alliance can only survive if it is based on a more independent European policy. As Europeans, he said, we have a right and a duty to stress the soundness of our vision of security and stability for Europe, but if we wish to lend sufficient weight to this view, we must have the political will to formulate and uphold a common and consistent standpoint, and in view of what is at stake, this could well be the supreme challenge the European Community will face in the 1980s.

Madam President, is it also a challenge to us, the European Parliament, and the Members of this House? It is up to us to decide.

Mr Normanton (ED). — Madam President, I am delighted to follow Mr Mommersteeg, particularly bearing in mind the words of President Dankert which he quoted to the House.

May I congratulate Mr Haagerup on the sense of realism and the sincerity with which he opened this debate. If I may compliment him on his skill and integrity in every sense of that word in the drafting of the explanatory statement in his report. Were the House to be voting on this, I for one would be much more enthusiastic in my contribution. But when I study the motion for a resolution on which we shall be voting and set it alongside the long and ever-growing list of problems and dangers with which Europe and the free world is beset, I am, to say the least, a little concerned.

However, let me say at once that I am in no way criticizing Mr Haagerup. As rapporteurs, each and every one of us knows that we are required to draft resolutions to meet the acceptance of the committee which appoints us, not exclusively to represent our own deepest feelings. Ultimately, the objective is to get them through this House. The almost anodyne terminology of the resolutions is, in my view, but a reflection of the extent to which some — some would say many — honourable Members in this House are at best politically out of touch with the realities of the world and at worst, dare I suggest, wanting to ensure that Europe opts out of the world events. We cannot, we must not. That is what Mr Haagerup is saying.

Some honourable Members who served in the European Parliament before direct elections may well, of course, recall the Klepsch resolution and the attached

Normanton

report drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. That report was adopted by a very significant majority of the House but with very strong vocal opposition to its content. However, I think it resurrected a line of political thinking which has gained some, but still insufficient, momentum. The development of European political cooperation, which really is at the heart and core of this particular report, is the most significant political development since the founding of the Community. Events in the last two or three years have confirmed that, if there had been any doubts in any of our minds. It means and what is more important, the world sees and hears that it means that Europe is no longer prepared to be purely a commercial giant but a political pygmy, which we were and to some extent still are. Instead we are determined to develop a political identity and an awareness that, in order to be responsible to our peoples in Europe and responsive to the demands placed upon us by the world, we the Community and this House must develop into something more than a producer of fine words and pious platitudinous declarations.

The Haagerup report makes this abundantly clear. The resolutions serve, as far as I am concerned, only as a pointer to the road which we the Community and this Parliament must take. However, given the political climate in this House and the political realities in the world outside, I put it at the level that even a figleaf is better than political nudity. I shall vote for the adoption of the Haagerup report and I shall, together with others in this House who do see the realities of the world in which we have these responsibilities as elected representatives, continue to give Mr Haagerup himself my fullest and total support in bringing the Community one more clear step forward along the road to political realism.

Mr Segre (COM). — (IT) Madam President, in spite of what the new President of the Council seemed to suggest, I would point out if I may that this is the European Parliament and not the *Bundestag*. We are discussing the Haagerup report here, at a time when it can be reasonably hoped that East and West are managing through negotiation to become aware of the danger which threatens us all and therefore they are becoming aware of the need to tackle the problem and make a serious attempt to find solutions which in guaranteeing the security of everyone also guarantee general security, this being the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement. The fact that we are discussing this report reflects the hope that Parliament expressed this morning when it voted on the Fergusson resolution.

When the long and involved work on this report first began in the Political Affairs Committee, the international situation was tense in quite a different manner and the clouds on the horizon were much blacker. The rapporteur is to be praised — and I should like to take this opportunity of paying tribute to his efforts — in

spite of the differences of opinion on certain parts of the text. I am thinking in particular of paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution, which has already been mentioned by Mr Friedrich for the Socialist Group. The rapporteur managed, I feel, to take a well-balanced view based on three specific points of reference.

First of all, he has managed to convey the unacceptability of the arms build-up in Europe and the world and together with this he has reflected the deep concern which has affected and aroused the general public on the subject of a shift in international relations, away from a rational approach to one of non-communication on account of an arms race which seemed — and to a large extent still seems — inevitable and uncontrollable and likely to sweep over everything, including the ability of the politicians to halt this plunge towards the abyss and operate an about-turn.

Secondly, there is the conviction that this about-turn must be helped by the constant efforts of the Ten. They have to stop assuming that there is no other option and instead develop a policy of *détente* and dialogue.

Thirdly, the report is based on a profound sense of commitment to Europe, in the sense that the Europe of the Ten and the political cooperation which has resulted will be able to exert a positive influence on events and steer the two superpowers away from their collision course, provided we can make it more and more clear — and I am talking about security, and therefore peace, as well — that we have a common destiny and common interests.

Madam President, the Italian Communists share these three convictions and we want to do all we can to give international prominence to this role of Europe and in this way to advance the process of European union, in the economic as well as in the political sphere. We are well aware that to get anywhere — and today's debate bears this out again — we have had in the past, we must today and we shall be obliged tomorrow to cope with all kinds of stubborn and even exaggerated reactions. If we believe that this process of building Europe is vital for the future, we cannot and must not be put off by this. What we have to do instead is to make gradual progress forward, expanding the range of our ideas and of our common policies.

Here of course there is a point of disagreement with many of the Members who have spoken. With today's debate and the vote on the Haagerup report another step forward is being made. We are taking this step, aware of what it means and the fact that by doing this and pointing out the benefits of joint security we are creating the conditions for a greater contribution towards *détente* and peace, towards halting the arms race and towards a Europe which instead of increasing its stock of terrible weapons of war can exert strong pressure on the two superpowers, and lastly towards

Segre

moves to bring about definite measures for a controlled and balanced reduction of arms.

Instead of being a year in which new missiles and new weapons are deployed, this new year of 1983 can and must be the year which sees the start of an about-turn that takes us back to a sense of reason and joint responsibility and the year which sees the emergence of a peace strategy. As this new year begins, there are some encouraging signs of light at the end of the hitherto dark tunnel of East-West relations.

If we are really going to make some progress in this direction, Europe has to hold on in there in the same way as all these movements and people and groups who in recent months have acted to put a stop to what seemed to be a mad rush towards disaster. In all these areas, so that 1983 will become the year when there is a decisive about-turn in the direction of peace and arms reduction and disarmament, the Italian Communists intend to pledge themselves to an even greater extent.

Mr Bord (DEP). — (*FR*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the rapporteur, whom I would like to congratulate, asks — not without reason — about the extent of our Parliament's competence in dealing with problems of security and defence, and in actual fact, the Treaties are quite formal on this (Mr Thorn pointed this out to us a few minutes ago) but we know that, however important the wording of the Treaties may be, the spirit of a law must be considered, and one cannot imagine that in such a grave and essential area the legislator should have wished to forbid any discussion of this subject in the absence of an established coherent doctrine.

History always takes it upon itself to reply to questions, even to those which it was thought would never or should never have been, asked. It could have been said that war was the continuation of politics by other means. Well, let us look at the state of war and then consider politics. Direct engagement of armed forces constitutes a state of war. Today, more than ever before, the nuclear hypothesis would appear to be the most probable, and by this I mean compared with a conventional type of conflict, and there is a reason for this: when the accuracy of ballistic weapons is improved to perfection, chiefs of staffs change their approach to nuclear conflicts.

We must be realistic. Today, for a distance of over 10 000 kilometers, the aiming accuracy is about 100 meters. The energy of destruction can therefore be considerably reduced and as a result, the large majority of fixed military installations could be destroyed without substantial human loss. This has dual consequences, ladies and gentlemen: no more apocalyptic conflicts on the one hand, and, since the conflicts are no longer apocalyptic, they become more probable. And so one of the difficulties we face lies in a mistaken

approach to certain concepts such as the parity of forces.

Finally, victory in a modern nuclear war depends on a combination of three factors: initiative (it is obvious, as we know, that democracies will never learn this), surprise, which makes all allied consultation impossible and, finally, the accuracy of the ballistic weapons which prevents any response by annihilating the adversary's nuclear potential by pinpointed 'surgical' operations.

Victory therefore goes to the one who takes the initiative in the conflict.

Parity is a lure. We must envisage every possibility. We hear it said that in the event of war, Europe will be the first to be hit. If we imagine a conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union, it is difficult to imagine Europe remaining on the sidelines. It is then better for Europe to have an effective weapon at her disposal. If we imagine a conflict between Europe and the Soviet Union, either of two things will happen: there will either be no Pershing type rocket in Europe, and then the United States, under pressure of their own public opinion or for other reasons, could regard Europe as not being a priority target to be preserved: in short that Europe was not worth a third world war, or alternatively, there are Pershing rockets or Cruise missiles in Europe, and then the Soviets are blocked, i.e. deterrence comes into full play. They can either choose to destroy our nuclear force without touching American weapons, but they cannot take the risk of encountering reactions from the Americans, especially if the national commands are involved in the firing of these rockets. The Soviets, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, can still decide to destroy the entire nuclear potential of the adversary, but they would be striking a direct blow against the interests of the Americans, who would then not fail to respond.

The Pershings in Europe are a further guarantee for our security. Therefore, to conclude, I hope we find the means for our security. Today, many organizations are studying this question and giving the impression of doing so without any particular concern for unity, or perhaps even coherence, and under no circumstances are they doing it efficiently enough.

Being the Gaullist that I am, I would like to remind you very briefly of what General de Gaulle said in March 1948. He said that for us, first of all, an economic, diplomatic and strategic group had to be formed between the free States of Europe, who would unite their production, exchanges, external action and means of defence. This assembly of perhaps 250 million people, uniting substantial and often complementary resources, eminent intellectual, spiritual, moral and social values, would give the old world its change again. Ladies and gentlemen, we must grasp this chance and, for the sake of this problem of Europe's security, I firmly believe in the need for this Parlia-

Bord

ment to provide itself officially with a consultative structure (and I congratulate the rapporteur on this) but personally, I would have liked us to go perhaps a little further, in other words, go so far as to create a Parliamentary committee.

It is high time, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that we became aware of an alarming situation by reacting no longer simply with words but with action. This is the price of the peace to which we are very deeply attached.

IN THE CHAIR: MR POUL MØLLER*Vice-President*

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (CDI). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to comment very briefly on the amendments I myself have tabled with the aim of basing this debate on the full range of the peace problem, covering not only security within the Atlantic Alliance, but also international and human rights and world-wide improvements for the common good.

After all, security covers much more than just the military dimension. As far as we in Europe are concerned, the issue has long since ceased to be just a matter of safeguarding our own sovereignty, and has now come to cover the safeguarding of all the aspects of our own particular development model. In other words, threats to our security can take many forms in addition to pure and simple military aggression on the part of a neighbouring country. We can be faced with economic sanctions, threats to our supplies of raw materials, aid conditions, and so on. The present world crisis shows, indeed, that our economic and social well-being cannot be safeguarded by military means alone. The Europe of the Ten has degenerated into a free-trade zone, with the political thinking and — above all — the political leadership being surrendered increasingly to NATO.

Our view is that a European policy should be supported by other elements such as European autonomy within NATO, East-West cooperation as a guarantee of European security, the dismantling of trade barriers between East and West, development cooperation on a non-commercial basis and rejection of an economically and financially ruinous policy of a balance of military power. The way to show the true desire for peace on the part of us Europeans would be to accept the well-publicized project for a security zone in Western and Eastern Europe free of nuclear weapons. Another way would be to place restrictions on the arms trade, of which so many Member States are guilty. It is in

this spirit that I hope my amendments will be viewed and approved by this House.

Mr Pesmazoglou (NI). — (GR) Mr President, Mr Haagerup's report on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee is of major importance, but I believe it will be of even greater importance if it is adopted unanimously or at least by an overwhelming majority. There are three points I should like to make.

Firstly, the economic and social progress of our peoples is impossible outside the European Community, and it is impossible for the European Community to make any progress unless it is founded and constructed on an active and joint European foreign and defence policy. The progress and security of our peoples — all our peoples — are closely interdependent.

Secondly, European defence policy means a joint and collective effort to protect the vital security interests of our peoples. This principle must be accepted both within and outside Europe, and, if this mission is to be accomplished, major responsibility will attach to the political leadership in our countries, and in this context today's contribution and initiative by the European Parliament, is of major significance.

Thirdly, European defence and political cooperation does not mean opposition to the United States or NATO. I do not think the misgivings expressed by the West German Minister and President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers are justified. Agreement with the USA and NATO, as well as contacts and dialogue with the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact on arms verification and limitation and on efforts to avoid an armed confrontation will be strengthened, not weakened, by an ever stronger European foreign and defence policy. The answer to the remark by Mr Friedrich — who was speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group — that our main objective must be to avoid a nuclear war, is that bringing the political weight of the Community to bear and establishing a common defence policy with cooperation and a joint concept on defence — at least as far as conventional weapons are concerned — is the surest way of protecting Europe against a nuclear confrontation and, more generally, of safeguarding peace in Europe and throughout the world.

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Mr President, the Danish members of the Socialist Group will be voting against the Haagerup report, and I should like to set out a few of the reasons why we shall be doing so.

Paragraph m) of the preamble says that 'the European Community and its institutions have no explicit responsibility for defence and military security'. As the paragraph stands, what is being intimated — or somewhat more than intimated — is that the Community does, however, indirectly have some degree of respon-

Fich

sibility for these matters, an idea which we find unacceptable.

In paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution, an even more serious element in our opinion is the reference to the European Parliament's 'growing participation in European Political Cooperation'. Our view is that European Political Cooperation is first and foremost a forum for consultations between governments, and we do not want this House to have any responsibility for foreign policy consultations.

Finally, we have paragraphs 5 and 6 of the motion for a resolution, which are closely bound up with each other, lumping together foreign policy consultations within the European Community and political consultations in NATO. We simply cannot accept any such thing. These are in effect two separate institutions which do not have — and should not have — anything to do with each other; nor should there be any form of coordination between the two.

We therefore feel bound to reject the Haagerup report on the basis of our election manifesto, which states clearly that membership of the Community should have no effect whatever on our security and defence policy. Our feeling is that, by adopting the Haagerup report, we would be taking a first — albeit cautious — step towards a process which would run counter to our manifesto.

In conclusion, I should just like to say that we of course accept that there should be something of the nature of European Political Cooperation and foreign policy consultations between governments. Indeed, we think that kind of thing quite useful, but the Haagerup report's proposals go beyond what we think should be the scope of such consultations. Major changes would have to be made to the report if we were to give it our approval, and I am pleased to note that the entire Socialist Group goes along with us in thinking that paragraph 5 will absolutely have to go. Nonetheless, we know that the Right can count on a majority in this House; we know that we cannot expect the requisite changes to be made, and we shall therefore be voting against the report.

Mrs Gaiotti De Biase (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this cautious and balanced report contains two basic truths which we should consider. First, there is a need for a definite contribution by Europe to the cause of peace, and this means that we need a European plan on security. Secondly, this Parliament has the duty and the necessary authority to help formulate such a plan and a sensible decision-making process.

It may be possible for a European security plan to be framed in many ways which we cannot foresee at the moment. But there are two restrictions. On the one hand it cannot be either neutral or non-neutral, while

on the other it is bound to reflect the traditions, interests and particular requirements of the people of Europe. Of course, the need for such a plan stems to some extent from the existence of new weapons and to the emergence of this idea of a European theatre of war, which explains the concern of the public and of young people in Europe.

The fact of the matter is that we are not neutral. This Parliament has shown that it is not neutral in judging democratic systems, human rights and the quality of foreign policy which in democracies depends on public support. Our aims are still peace and general disarmament but it has not been shown yet that the way to achieve this is by disarming ourselves. Our aims are security and peace but, to obtain these, it must still be shown that a mounting deterrent is sufficient.

We want to point out that a political approach is the main way of obtaining security. We need a European policy which takes account of the feelings, needs and requirements of the people of Europe and which takes account of the geographic, technological and human factors which affect us.

The second basic truth in the Haagerup report underlines the role of this Parliament in working out a European security plan. The genuine feelings of solidarity which increasingly link our citizens to a common destiny are much stronger and deeper than we politicians like to believe. We have no desire to question national competence in this area, but we all know that this competence is just a legal formality because it is no longer possible for anyone on his own to back it up either diplomatically or militarily. The sensible thing to do now and increasingly in the future is to look at these problems. But I should say that rather than common sense it is the need for peace which will make us do this. What better place is there for working out a common security policy, which is nonetheless neither neutral nor neutralist and which can be a symbol of peace, than in a supranational parliament which emerged from the desire to unite two different nations after two wars, a parliament which is aware of the territorial restrictions of a Community Europe when compared with the Europe of the past, and a parliament which is naturally critical of myths of power and of individual nations' illusions of domination? The ways in which we carry out this task are still to be decided, the answers to be given to the Assembly of the Western European Union and the De Poli report and the follow-up to the Fergusson and Prag reports in the Committee on Institutional Affairs. We have to avoid hypocritical excuses which seek to make an abstract distinction between this or that body when our common destiny is in the balance. What we hope to see with today's vote, which we hope will be carried with a large majority, is a signal of peace and strength to those outside Europe.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — Like the last speaker, Mr President, I am fully in favour of Mr Haagerup's report on political cooperation and security.

Vanneck

In the first place, it has been researched with ability and diligence, and all and sundry concerned with these affairs have given evidence, been interviewed or been consulted.

Secondly, it is timely in that, with the death of President Brezhnev, the affairs of the Soviet empire, about which we in the West have most concern, are under new dictatorial direction and this, therefore, is a time when we must reflect on our attitude in the European Community to the new and probing initiatives that are already being tried out on us today.

Thirdly, as Mr Nord has said, the fact that this debate is taking place at all here in the chamber in Strasbourg must encourage those many of us who have peace truly at heart that the European Parliament itself will give proper consideration to its continuance, its development and its furtherance into the foreseeable future.

There is in this report, I suggest to Mrs Hammerich, a peace movement in itself because there is understanding of the need for balanced arms reduction on both sides and the need for truth on both sides about the weaponry in each other's hands.

I am so pleased that in this discussion on security and defence we have in the official gallery representatives of the Western European Union. Members of this Parliament are of course aware that under the Treaty of Brussels, modified by the Treaty of Paris, the Western European Union of nominated national parliamentarians plays a prime role in discussing and advising within the context of the North Atlantic Treaty on matters of defence and I have believed for a long while that we must coordinate with them in order to achieve a symbolic relationship where we each feed one on another, and a synegetic outcome where our efforts combined can be more effective in the totality than those of either one of us alone.

With the exception of the Irish, the Member States of the EEC are equally members of the North Atlantic Organization. We look forward to Spain and Portugal joining the Community. We have the prospect therefore of a coordinated security outlook from the West to the Eastern bloc and this is something we must build on.

Forgetting the Irish again, an easy thing to do, although of course they are always happy to share our liberties while sheltering under our defence umbrella, we can surely in this forum, taking due note of this report, integrate more closely and effectively with each of our European neighbours. And thus in the fields of common arms procurement, with a common wish for multilateral arms reduction, common grounds with equally peaceful North African and indeed worldwide aspirations, we can forge hand in hand to form a stable, cohesive and effective deterrent to any

military or, hopefully, even ideological attack on our European Economic Community.

Mr President, Mr Haagerup's report is a milestone, a giant milestone, in the progress and the maturity of this Parliament.

Mr Efremidis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, to paraphrase a famous saying, at this critical moment and on this critical subject, the spectre haunting Europe is not the spectre of Communism. It is the spectre of the nuclear holocaust, since it is from Europe that the first nuclear strike with medium-range missiles is intended to come — with those missiles whose establishment is now being promoted — and Europe will be the theatre of the limited nuclear war, if it is possible to limit it.

Mr Haagerup's motion for a resolution does not deal with this terrible danger to which attention is being drawn by the powerful peace movement — which does not, as my colleagues Mr Gremetz and Mrs Hammerich have already said, consist only of Communists, but of people of all religious, ideological and political convictions. Instead of dealing with this danger it actually worsens it. We shall therefore resolutely oppose the motion — but for various other reasons as well.

Firstly, for reasons of principle. We are opposed to political integration, because that means economic subjugation — particularly of the small countries — and a restriction of their national sovereignty, and since the motion promotes political integration through so-called political cooperation, it is only natural that we should be opposed to it.

Secondly, we shall vote against the motion because, by means of political cooperation and, hence, political integration, it will lead to the involvement of the Community in security, defence and military matters — despite Mr Haagerup's skilful arguments to try to deceive us. In other words, this is an attempt to turn the Community into a military and political bloc, and this at the very time there are calls and proposals from the other side for both the existing alliances to be dissolved. Mr President, we are extremely attentive to this call, because our country has suffered terrible consequences from our accession to the military and political sides of NATO. In yesterday's debate someone said that we came from a strange country. That is very true, because as a member of NATO we are now suffering danger and threats to our territorial integrity and national sovereignty from another member of the same alliance, Turkey, and it is therefore impossible for us to be in favour of a motion which proposes that the Community turn itself into a new political and military bloc.

Thirdly, Mr President, we oppose the motion because this development of the Community into a new political and military bloc will simply be an addition to NATO. It will be yet further confirmation of our peo-

Efremidis

ple's slogan 'EEC and NATO are one and the same gang'.

Mr President, I would add that this complementary role for the Community in the military side of NATO is in no way acceptable even to those who dream of an independent presence for the European Community. On the contrary, it would mean the subjugation of the Community to Atlantic policy. For these reasons we shall vote against the motion, and we do not believe that any individual amendments will change its essence.

We, for our part, are proposing something which is within the sphere of responsibility of the Community as laid down in the Treaties. We have tabled an amendment which says that Parliament should express its hopes for a successful outcome to the negotiations in Geneva and for progress in the CSCE talks. That, Mr Haagerup, is the security system which will reduce the insecurity felt by the peoples of Europe — and not what you propose with your misrepresented facts, events and figures. I do not have time to tell you how many such inaccuracies and suspicious omissions there are in your long-winded and one-sided explanatory statement.

Mr Alexiadis (NI). — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I must start by saying that instead of touching upon the nub of the problem, Mr Haagerup's report circumvents it. If Europe is today in a subordinate position *vis-à-vis* the two super-powers, this is not for economic reasons or because of a lower level of technology or science, or even for any lack of creative initiatives, but rather because of the lack of autonomy in defence. Anyone dependent for his protection on the arms of others lacks political decisiveness and is obliged to align his steps with those of his protector, as the Romans already knew. The argument that increasing defence spending at a time of economic crisis will aggravate the situation does not hold water, because new jobs will be created and consumption stimulated through the increased resources available to those who are no longer among the ranks of the unemployed. On the eve of the Second World War, political forecasters — you might call them astrologists — foresaw a rapid downfall for the Nazi régime because of its enormous expenditure on arms to the neglect of all other production efforts. They were shown to be resoundingly wrong, and those who refused to bear their own arms were soon forced to manufacture and bear the arms of the victor. It required six years of cruel war and an alliance of nearly the whole of humanity to put an end to the Nazi tyranny. However, there appear to be some of us who have still not learnt this lesson. Once again, we are starting to hear declarations in favour of peace — with or without doves, such as the one which was brought into this House bound in a cage — and voices opposing arms. The intentions may be honourable, but it is being forgotten that peace and international *détente* — like love — require the cooperation

of two sides, otherwise they end up as a battle for self-sufficiency to the detriment of one's health. In ancient times in Southern Italy, which was known as Magna Graecia because of its Greek population, there were neighbouring cities — Sybaris and Croton. The former had set up what would today be called the consumer society *par excellence*. The latter was marked by the strictness of its morals, by its athletic achievements and by its military training. When it came to a battle between the two, Sybaris was not simply defeated but was wiped off the face of the earth, and it is only recently that some minor traces of its former existence have come to light.

If Europe is not to suffer the same fate as Sybaris it must decide to increase its defence spending.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — (GR) Ladies and gentlemen, for us Greek Socialists security policy in Europe within the framework of European political cooperation can only mean the acceptance and practical implementation, with all the means at our disposal, of a policy which will lead to *détente* and arms limitation, as well as to the peaceful coexistence of all nations and peoples on the basis of the principles of the UN and the 1975 Helsinki Declaration. Acceptance of such a policy is the reason we have tabled Amendment No 28, on behalf of the Socialist Group, to the Haagerup report. We believe that this amendment should provide an absolutely clear basis for discussion and a precondition for the acceptance of the report.

Our aim and our wish is to continue to believe in a Europe with common cultural ideals, with a profound awareness of the great historical tradition which binds all the peoples of Europe, regardless of the country in which they live, whether it be in the West or the East, and we are in no way prepared to accept fatalistically the present division.

None of this can be achieved if the European Community simply adopts any old security and cooperation policy. Such a policy must be based on the clearly-expressed wishes of the peoples and on the facts — in other words it must be a genuine peace policy and not one which, under various pretexts, we are being urged to pursue along the lines of the ancient doctrine of Imperial Rome: 'If you wish peace, prepare for war'. Because that, ladies and gentlemen, is what is happening at the moment. The repeated or unrelenting increase in arms, and particularly in nuclear arms, is preparing for war under the pretext of peace, and this has been realized by the broad masses in our countries, and especially by the young people, who would be the first to be used as cannon-fodder.

It is true that the rapporteur makes a praiseworthy attempt to reconcile in the motion for a resolution the differing positions and the various views held on security policy in Europe. Nevertheless, his attempt at reconciliation does not succeed in giving a clear mean-

Plaskovitis

ing to many important points in his report, with the result that there are understandable doubts and misgivings about the final objective of the report. The report aims to concern itself with security policy in Europe and to distinguish between this policy and matters of national defence — on which it is quite clear that neither the Community nor the European Parliament has any competence under the Treaties as they stand.

If, however, the aim — willingly or unwillingly — is to link security policy in Europe with defence policy as expressed by NATO and the Atlantic Alliance, then we are absolutely opposed to this. NATO does not even include all the countries of the Community, nor does it include all countries on the same terms. The statements in paragraphs 5 and 6 of Haagerup's motion, referring to consultations and talks on security policy in cooperation with NATO and the Atlantic Alliance, thus destroy the very foundation of the resolution.

If the rapporteur insists on this provision, and if the views on the Socialist Group on security are not taken into account, we too shall be obliged to vote against the report.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Mr President and Mr President-in-Office, in relation to my oral question, one of the biggest threats to peace is the danger that a minor power will accumulate enough weapon quality plutonium to build an atom bomb, and that is why my group considers the Non-proliferation Treaty to be absolutely vital. It allows the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna to inspect nuclear installations and materials in order to prevent the secret manufacture of nuclear weapons. It is tragic that the IAEA has recently been weakened by the withdrawal of the USA, which, I hope, is only temporary. Non-proliferation has also been weakened by some other countries who, I believe, have supplied nuclear materials for commercial gain — a very short-sighted thing to do.

The President-in-Office said that it was not appropriate for the Council to comment on the IAEA. That is just not good enough. The Members of the EEC should act together immediately in order to pressurize non-signatory nuclear nations into signing the Treaty and accepting regular nuclear inspection. Surely economic aid should be withheld from non-signatory nuclear nations until they do sign. I am glad to see today that Pakistan is at last negotiating to join the Treaty. Would that India and the Argentine and others did the same!

The EEC's full economic and political authority is needed now to get worldwide nuclear inspection established as the main tool for nuclear peace. My group would like to raise this subject again: because it is such an important one it deserves a debate on its own, and my group will move a resolution to that end.

Mr Kirkos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, Mr Haagerup took great care in drawing up his report, which contains useful statements as well as others which we find unacceptable. We are opposed to two main proposals in his motion for a resolution. These are paragraph 5, which calls for more effective coordination between the political consultations in EPC and NATO — something which must be rejected for many reasons — and paragraph 7, which calls for increased efforts to sustain close relations and intimate cooperation with the United States on the vital question of European security.

Both these proposals reflect a years-old concept of European security which has led to the present terrible dangers and to the threat of nuclear destruction, as well as to the total dependence of Europe on the United States, and more particularly on the hawks of the American military and industrial establishment. We do not underestimate the difficulties involved, the mutual distrust and enmity which has grown up over decades by the confrontation and antagonism of the military alliances. We are not *a priori* anti-American, but at the present time, when the people of Europe are transcending ideological barriers to rise up against the nuclear threat, against the deployment of the Pershing and Cruise missiles, in favour of disarmament and cooperation, there is a need for a new concept of European security whose central objective is not a further aggravation of antagonism between the military alliances, but their mutual reduction and dismantling. What we need is not greater dependence of Europe on the United States but an increase in its self-confidence and power of initiative *vis-à-vis* both the United States and the Soviet Union, so that Europe can become a bridge for peace and not a battlefield.

That, Mr Haagerup, is how we can reply to the feeling of insecurity and disquiet of the peoples of Europe. With this in mind I have tabled some amendments, and I also fully support the two amendments which we have submitted jointly with the members of the Group for Nuclear Disarmament.

Mr Treacy (S). — Mr President, at first sight this is a report which could command support across a wide spectrum of this Parliament. It contains an intelligent and comprehensive analysis of the current situation, and is based on what seems an objective and moderate view of Europe's security requirements. But then, appearances deceive. This report lays down the foundation for a future European security policy which is integrated into that of NATO. Should this report be adopted, it will give an enormous impetus to all those who are seeking to revive, in some form or another, the ill-fated European defence community of the 1950s. This Parliament should refrain from taking such a far-reaching step. It should not attempt to alter the basis upon which the Member States of the Community cooperate with each other. It should not seek to amend the Treaties of Rome and Paris by cunning

Treacy

or by stealth.

The report begins by asking: 'Where is the border-line between defence and security?' The answer is that there is, in effect, no long-term difference and that the security of Europe is indissolubly part of the Atlantic Alliance.

This is a position which I, as an Irish Socialist, cannot accept. For a start, the Irish Labour Party, to which I belong, has been committed to a policy of Irish neutrality since 1918 — a position reaffirmed as recently as 1981 at the party's annual conference.

Secondly, all Irish political parties are committed to the neutrality of Ireland and to a policy of non-involvement in military alliances. Ireland is the only Member State of the Community which is not a member of NATO. That unique position is contemptuously dismissed as being of no consequence by this report. There is the briefest of recognitions of this part of the alliance, but the argument is continued without any reference or regard to that fact. This is totally unacceptable, and it is a view which must be rejected by all the Irish representatives in this Parliament, irrespective of the group to which they belong.

Again, there is a reference to Irish neutrality on page 29 of the report, which is historically inaccurate and patronizing. Irish neutrality cannot only be seen as part of my country's historical relationship with the United Kingdom, with all its tragic consequences still vividly before the eyes of the world today; neither can it be dismissed as an aberration which adversely affects EPC deliberations on security. It is much more, Mr President, it has a positive, ideological content, and it is the duty of this House to recognize it for what it is and not to dismiss it so contemptuously, as does this report. The resolution does that in paragraph 5, where it urges that, a more effective coordination should take place between the consultations in EPC and NATO respectively'.

Should the resolution be adopted containing this paragraph, then it would constitute an unwarranted and unprecedented interference with the political sovereignty of my country, Ireland. Should that happen, it will give cause for a reassessment of Ireland's membership of this Community and it would lead many people in my country to oppose any further attempts at European integration at any level for fear of eventually creating a new version of the European defence community.

For these reasons, Mr President, and for many others which time does not allow me to mention, I ask Parliament not to accept this resolution as it now stands.

Mr Haagerup (L), rapporteur. — (DA) Mr President, I shall be brief, as there are plenty of other important matters on the agenda, and we shall after all be dealing

with my report again this evening when we come to vote on the report itself and the 62 amendments which have been tabled.

I should therefore just like to address a word of thanks to all those who have taken the trouble to read and comment on the report. My thanks are also due to the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission. I was perhaps slightly more pleased about what the President of the Commission had to say than about Mr Mertes's contribution. I got the impression that Mr Mertes thought I was being a little pessimistic in my views on relations between political cooperation and political consultations within NATO.

I should like to say to Mr Mertes that there have at times been certain misunderstandings as a result of developments in EPC over recent years, and I have always made it abundantly clear that my report is based on a very positive attitude on my part to the Atlantic Alliance and to the continuation of cooperation between Western Europe and North America on defence issues.

I am very keen to make the point — as I expressly stated both in my report and in my introductory speech here today — that there should be no misunderstanding of the kind which, as Mr Friedrich mentioned, might give the impression that we in Europe might be thinking about setting up a separate European defence organization. I am rather surprised at the fact that so much attention has been focused on paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution urging coordination, and I must say to Mr Friedrich that there is no mention there of harmonization, but only of coordination, which is another thing entirely.

That is, as other speakers have pointed out, precisely the point. Any work we may do in the Ten on matters relating to security, for instance in relation to the security conference in Europe — as Mr Mertes himself has said — will subsequently benefit the 16 NATO member countries. I would be glad to see these contacts extended, and I can see nothing wrong in a majority of this House coming out in favour of continued cooperation on security policy between Western Europe and North America; nor do I have any objection to a continuation of military cooperation — and here I can go along with Mr Bruno Friedrich and many other Members — under the terms of the Atlantic Pact. On the other hand, we can and must discuss the political aspects of security matters and, over the coming weeks and months, develop our ideas here in this House too, as is already the case in the context of European Political Cooperation at government level.

I could mention a number of speakers whose views I entirely concur with, and others whose views I am rather less enthusiastic about, but I see no point in going into detail. I should just like to say that I think this debate has demonstrated how sensitive a subject

Haagerup

we are dealing with here. I for one have never harboured any illusions on that score.

I greatly appreciate the kind remarks made by some members of the European Democratic Group, but I do feel that we could have done with some of the critical remarks which have been made to me more privately on the side, which would have set what we have heard today in somewhat more relief. For instance, one of the Danish Social Democrats said that the three Danish members of the Socialist Group would be voting against the motion for a resolution — including, presumably, the present chairman of the European Parliament delegation to the USA — which just goes to show that there are people in this House who feel that my proposal on European security is very far-reaching. On the other side of the coin, there were some critical comments from another source to the effect that my proposal was too tame and innocuous and had got this House no further at all.

I should like to say in conclusion that I expect the report to be approved, but not that total agreement will be reached on a particular security policy stance. What my report sets out to achieve is to lay the foundation for this House to continue its deliberations on security policy, and in this respect I should also like to thank all those critics who have acknowledged that this has been my aim, even if they did not entirely agree with my political premises, which inevitably reflect the majority opinion in the Political Affairs Committee, for which I have been acting as rapporteur.

It goes without saying, Mr President, that I cannot spare any thanks for the small group of Danish anti-marketeters, who have thought fit to reduce the European Parliament to a place for having a bit of a political row in. That is the kind of level the Danish anti-marketeters are wont to move on. At a time when the rest of us are discussing matters relating to peace and security from a variety of political standpoints, there is a small group of Members — and I am sorry to say that they are compatriots of mine — who have been elected to this House as self-professed saboteurs, and who have now shown themselves to be no more than cheap troublemakers. I believe this was a disgraceful intermezzo in this debate, and I as rapporteur would like to express my thanks once again for the long debate and the many constructive elements that have emerged from it.

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have listened very attentively to this debate and, one way or another, I have learnt something from each and every contribution. I shall be reporting back on it to the Council, and the Presidency will derive great benefit from what has been said.

Secondly, I should like to clear up what appears to be a misunderstanding with Mr Haagerup. We value the

balanced and thorough nature of his report, one of the most important elements of which is the fact that it has led to a serious exchange of views rather than a polarization in this House. Like Mr Haagerup, I should just like to underline the fact that we cannot afford to indulge in illusions as regards European security in this world of ours — a world in which 97% of all nuclear weapons are in the hands of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, and in which we belong to an alliance with free trade unions, but in which there is also an alliance in which free trade unions are being suppressed. It is absolutely essential that we continue to foster our alliance with the champion of freedom, quite consciously and without any trace of undignified subordination. Like you, I simply wanted to sound a warning about harbouring any illusions in our discussion of the security issue.

Thirdly, I share the view of Mr Schall in as much as peace and security are our people's most deeply-held interest and concern. A European Parliament cannot simply cut itself off from this deeply-held popular concern, and if Europe is to be a respected concept in 1984, it goes without saying that the European representatives of the peoples must take the matter to heart, so that people realize that you are in touch with their feelings. That, at any rate, is the view we take.

(Applause)

Finally, the chief Soviet representative at the MBFR talks in Vienna once told me during a personal discussion that security was the most valuable and most sacred asset a State and a people could have. I believe he was quite right in this, and it is up to us to make this sacred and valued asset our concern, regardless of the conclusions we may draw.

Disarmament is essential at a time of mass-destruction weaponry. As various speakers said, though, we must not view the disarmament issue in isolation from the security issue. That is why we are in favour of coupling the disarmament and security issues. We must not allow talking about disarmament to become a continuation of the arms race by other means. What we are after is disarmament with security, given that disarmament without security would, in the long run and in the light of historical experience, put peace at risk.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

3. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-656/82), drawn up by Mr Habsburg on behalf of the

President

Political Affairs Committee, on the situation in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

Mr Habsburg (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, the main element of any policy is its credibility. The crises of our day are due in particular to the fact that words are often not matched by deeds, the meaning of expressions is distorted and frequently things are measured by two different yardsticks and judged by different standards. No improvement is possible, according to the great Italian philosopher Guillermo Ferrero, until the same principles apply to everyone, weak or strong.

In its present meaning, the widely used concept of colonialism signifies the domination of a nation against its will by another, the exploitation of its labour and natural resources by the foreign rulers, contempt for and repression of its own independent culture, and often attempts to obliterate its nationality. These characteristics are continually referred to in the context of UN decolonization policy, especially in the world organization's Decolonization Subcommittee.

Today, there are few overseas colonies left. On the other hand, however, we have a colonial problem in Europe as a result of the Soviet Union's policy of hegemony. The Baltic States are a classic example of this. The Soviet Union has not only robbed them of their independence and democratic rights but as shown by this report, has also carried out a consistent brutal colonial extermination policy, that of systematic russification.

These Soviet efforts are meeting with the resistance of the Baltic nations. The religious forces in particular are determined not to be robbed of their faith. A remarkable aspect of this is that it is primarily the young people, who have been educated in militantly atheistic schools, who are putting up courageous, unselfish resistance. However, I would also like to mention the exemplary way in which the Baltic emigrants throughout the world have kept alive their feelings of attachment to their home countries, defending their nations' rights with disregard for party-political differences in their fight for their countries' self-determination: in short, the very embodiment of genuine patriotism. I hope you will allow your rapporteur to welcome the Baltic visitors who have come here today to witness a debate which proves that for us European parliamentarians, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania are integral parts of Europe.

(Applause)

The Balts are western Christians who consider themselves to be Europeans and believe in our form of parliamentary democracy. In the past they have contributed a great deal to our common cultural heritage. They have a right to our active solidarity. For this reason, many European countries, such as the United

Kingdom, have not recognized the Soviet occupation of the Baltic Republics. It is true that we cannot do much for these nations in the form of direct action. However, as the European Community, we can help to safeguard their rights. A right does not cease to exist until it is renounced. We can also mobilize world public opinion. This has made an impression even on the oppressors more than once already. This is the purpose of this report and motion. To give it a positive feature, it is proposed that the question of the Baltic States be brought before the UN Decolonization Subcommittee. No lawyer can question the legitimacy of this demand. The UN cannot evade the problem if it is to retain its credibility. If it did so, it would reveal its own crass incapacity. Seen from this angle, the question of the Baltic States is a touch-stone for the strength of legal and democratic declarations. I therefore call upon this House to approve the motion, which was unanimously adopted by the Political Affairs Committee.

(Applause)

Mr Seeler (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at almost all its sessions, this Parliament deals with the fate of oppressed, disenfranchised peoples of this earth. As recently as this Tuesday, we gave our support for a secure existence for the Jewish people in Israel as well as for the Palestinian people. This is why I believe it is in fact time to make a clear statement on the fate of the Baltic nations.

My group will approve the report, in particular because we consider human rights to be indivisible. If the Final Act of Helsinki is to become more than just a piece of paper, it must also apply to the Baltic peoples, and therefore we call upon the foreign ministers meeting in European Political Cooperation to put this subject on the agenda of the next follow-up conference.

The Soviet Union must know that she has assumed not only rights but also duties: duties towards all the nations in her sphere of influence. It is certainly true that the USSR continues to rule all the regions which were conquered and colonized by Tsarist Russia in the age of imperialism. Unlike the West European States, Russia has not granted these former colonies independence, and therefore it would be quite logical for the UN Decolonization Committee to take up this matter, especially in order to make this state of affairs very evident to the nations of Asia and Africa which were once colonies. However, we should not overrate the value of this type of step for the fate of the Baltic States. The right of nations to self-determination has, even today, not yet become a generally accepted part of international law.

After the First World War, between the wars and after the Second World War, it was, time and time again, almost always *power* which decided the fate of territories and nations and not their self-determination. The

Seeler

annexation of the Baltic States was the result of close cooperation between Hitler's fascism and Soviet communism. It is therefore for very good reasons that none of the EEC Member States has so far recognized this annexation under international law.

We can now ask ourselves what we can do as the European Parliament. What effect can a resolution of the type we intend to pass now have? Certainly no immediate change in the current situation in the Baltic. However, we can make it clear that these nations are not without their rights and that the Helsinki Agreement also applies to them. As representatives of the free nations of Europe, we have the right as well as the responsibility to do this because the Baltic nations are just as much part of Europe and its culture as the Polish, Hungarian and other nations of Eastern Europe. In so doing, we shall be giving the people there some measure of hope and certainty that they will not be forgotten by history.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT*President*

Mr Wedekind (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I would like to thank Mr Habsburg for his most excellent report, which illustrates from many angles what this Baltic States issue is actually all about, and I would hope that we adopt this report with great unanimity.

Over forty years ago the Soviet Union, in agreement with the Hitler regime, in an action akin to a war crime, invaded the three peace-loving, independent, liberal-democratic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and annexed them by military force, terror and suppression into the inhuman Red Empire, and this after the Soviet Union had concluded with these three States in 1920 treaties in which they were guaranteed the inviolability of their frontiers and eternal peace. Only twenty years later, for the imperialist, hegemonistic and, in my view, criminal gang in Moscow, these treaties were just scraps of paper which were swept off the table. Once again, the rulers in Moscow had proven that for them treaties were worthless. Once again, three nations had been raped.

For over forty years these three States of Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia have been colonially exploited and oppressed against their declared political will and have had their cultural, religious, economic and political liberties taken away from them.

Here we have two very good examples from which we can learn. First, the Soviet Union breaks any treaty if

in so doing she can with impurity gain advantage in her struggle for greater imperial power and succeed further in hegemonistic claims.

Secondly, anti-colonialist slogans uttered by the Soviet Union are pure hypocrisy. The greatest colonial oppressor of the present day is the Soviet Union. A regime which is without principles and without credibility, anti-liberal and anti-democratic.

With this in mind, what are we supposed to think of the dove-like cooings of a man like Andropov? Absolutely nothing! Unless it is proven by facts. Talk from the mouths of Soviet leaders, or even treaties, as well as non-aggression pacts etc, are nothing but deceitful and wicked lies, which, incidentally, Lenin actually recommended to this regime as a legitimate instrument of policy.

I approve of this motion and hope that the European Foreign Ministers will in fact have the courage to bring this issue before the UN Decolonization Committee in order to move one step further in this matter. I have my doubts, however, about the will of the European Foreign Ministers to take action. I believe there will be some delicate diplomatic manoeuvring and a good deal of cowardliness involved.

This will probably not be the last campaign to expose the feudalistic bureaucratic regime in Moscow and to make it clear that we do not believe the lies it propagates.

Let us reflect that the Baltic States in the 1920s were the most ardent Europeans and wanted to have European unity even as early as the period between the two World Wars. If we had acted as the Baltic States have always wished, free Europe would extend over the entire continent. We would have saved ourselves the Second World War. We have responsibility for all Europe, and Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania are part of this Europe and will remain so.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Simmonds (ED). — Mr President, I am proud to speak on this issue, which was raised originally in the Parliament by both British and Danish Conservatives.

Likewise, I am proud to support the subsequent report of Mr Habsburg, whose very name is identified with progress in Europe.

Also I am proud to welcome in the gallery representatives of the people of the Baltic States to our Parliament. Some of them have travelled many thousands of miles to be with us for this debate. I would also like to thank my own constituents who have lobbied me on this issue.

Mr President, there is a danger that we in the European Community take parliamentary democracy for

Simmonds

granted. Indeed, in my own country many people complain about the high cost of democracy, and some cannot even be bothered to vote. But ask any one from the Baltic States how they value democracy; how they would value the right to vote in a genuine election; to speak freely in their own language; to worship the religion of their choice without risk of arrest, persecution, deportation and worse; and then you will know from their answer the real value of democracy!

So often we debate and deplore the absence of human rights in far-away places and frequently we identify individuals who have been persecuted. But today we are talking about such problems here in continental Europe, and we refer to the fate of literally hundreds of thousands of people who are denied a whole catalogue of rights that we in the European Community take for granted.

In Eastern Europe, much use is made of the word 'solidarity' as an expression of unity and challenge to force against tyranny and for democracy. Today, the European Parliament has an opportunity to demonstrate solidarity with the people of the Baltic States, and that must be an issue which members of all parties and from all Member States can support.

(Applause)

Mr Gawronski (L). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, some of the references in this document by Mr Habsburg to a referendum and the self-determination and independence of the Baltic States may seem unrealistic and seem to indicate unattainable goals. And of course they are unattainable because the Soviet Union will never give in to what is simply moral pressure from international organizations such as the United Nations or this Parliament.

If you ask me, anyway, a referendum is not all that essential. My view is that the history of the Baltic States over the last forty years — since the time when the pact between the Nazis and the Russian Communists allowed Stalin's troops to move in — is quite simply an on-going referendum against the Soviet Union. In spite of police persecution dissent has never been quelled and there have been demonstrations and appeals and documents bravely put out by the clandestine press, especially in Lithuania.

Just over a year ago I was in Vilnius and I saw with my own eyes just how far russification has gone, with churches turned into warehouses and museums of atheism. I was able to see how brazenly the Soviet secret police, the KGB, operates. Right in the centre of the town they physically prevented the wife of an imprisoned dissident with whom I had an appointment from talking to me and telling me her story.

I know, it can seem senseless nowadays to talk about the self-determination and independence of the Baltic

States. But we should not forget the importance of principles and we must not forgive injustice simply because the situation has existed for a long time. If we do this, in a few years it will seem senseless to talk about the self-determination and independence of Afghanistan.

As I said at the start, it is not our adoption of the Habsburg resolution which is going to influence the Kremlin. The question we have to ask is this one: if the Soviet system is indifferent to external pressure, can it be reformed from within? More specifically, could Andropov be the man to bring about this change? However, I am afraid — even though I hope I am wrong — that for many years to come Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland and Afghanistan and the rest of the world are going to have to put up with Soviet power. It may be a little more willing to curb the arms race but it is going to remain deaf to any desire for freedom and democracy within its empire.

(Applause)

Mr Romualdi (NI). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my words here as I speak very briefly on behalf of the members of Italy's *Destra Nazionale* are in the first place a gesture of solidarity with those who are campaigning for the freedom and independence of the Baltic peoples, who are held in a state of permanent colonization by Soviet Russia and subjected to a systematic process to destroy their national identity by the authorities of the vast Communist empire.

The Baltic peoples have determinedly resisted this process for more than forty years. The European Parliament — which is the voice of the independent will of the free people of Europe, who are linked to the people of the Baltic States by unbreakable ties of culture, civilization and religion — cannot fail to condemn this serious and blatant violation of every human and political right and cannot fail to express its feelings of brotherly solidarity with these oppressed peoples.

Naturally, the adoption of this resolution is not going to induce the Kremlin to free these peoples, but it will certainly do some good.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

4. Conscientious objection

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-546/82), drawn up by Mrs Macciocchi on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on conscientious objection.

Mrs Macciocchi (S), rapporteur. — (IT) The report on conscientious objection that I am presenting on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, Mr President, is based essentially on the European Convention on Human Rights, and more exactly on its Article 9, together with Resolution 337 of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. This resolution on the right of conscientious objection states that:

Persons liable to conscription for military service who, for reasons of conscience or profound conviction arising from religious, ethical, moral, humanitarian, philosophical or similar motives, refuse to perform armed service shall enjoy a personal right to be released from the obligation to perform such service.

Parliament must state its opinion on this basic point of the law: is conscientious objection a right? Does the refusal to kill on the part of a conscientious objector constitute a right? The Legal Affairs Committee, which is competent for human rights within the Community, has practically said 'yes' already by stating its almost unanimous approval of the recognition of such rights (fourteen votes in favour and eight abstentions).

If I am to abide by the Committee's opinions and pay due respect to the discussions we have had, I feel I must say that it will not be possible to accept most of the amendments that have been proposed to the text of the motion for a resolution. I do not mean to show disrespect to anybody in saying this, but the amendments are generally unacceptable because they would spoil the homogeneous quality of the document and upset the balance between its various parts.

I should like to begin by correcting straight away the misapprehension in some minds that we on the Legal Affairs Committee have not followed European and international legal texts — such as those of the United Nations, Vatican II, the Council of Churches (at the ecumenical and European level) and Resolution 337 of the Council of Europe — where it is stated that those who refuse to perform military service ought to benefit from a right which allows them exemption from such service.

We have analysed the problem with great care, using, above all, the legal texts at our disposal as a basis and we really did want to disassociate this very delicate topic from other problems such as safety, defence, and the relationship between conscientious objection and the pacifist movement in Europe. We are not asking for demobilization, we are not confusing the issue with any national defence requirements or linking it with ill-defined patriotism. Nor are we advocating absence without leave or desertion; for us, the conscientious objector can no longer be viewed as an abnormal, cowardly or selfish creature. We have merely put forward the idea that conscientious objectors are young men who can still serve a useful purpose in their country and society, with an active and dynamic role to play in changing times.

Conscientious objection is therefore no longer something of which to be ashamed. On the contrary, it is a right to be exercised. I have met conscientious objectors myself in Cambodia; I have seen them helping to fit out make-shift boats to help South East Asian refugees. Conscientious objectors have been the first to come forward and offer help when disasters or catastrophes occur such as the earthquake which rocked Italy a short while ago. Many of the young conscientious objectors listening to us here today could offer us examples of their idealistic motivations: they are helping the most wretched sections of our societies, working in psychiatric hospitals and hospices for old people, helping out drug addicts trying to kick the habit, and giving assistance to invalids and disabled people.

Just as, in the past, this House exercised a positive choice for the abolition of the death penalty, the right of women to have abortions and the right to divorce, so today it must consider whether to uphold a subjective right which is both a matter of individual conscience and that of society.

Some people have raised the point that conscientious objection should be subject to the supervision or control of some kind of high authority or commission. But I ask you this: is it possible to enquire into the motivations of a right? Did anyone ever dream up the idea, for instance, of setting up a committee to investigate what was in the minds of women seeking to exercise their right to abort? Who on earth would be capable of deciding whether a man who rebels against the idea of killing another man and says so is sincere in his belief?

These questions answer themselves, I believe. I should like to refer to that ironic tale by Thomas Mann, in which the protagonist, Felix Krull, pretends to be wildly enthusiastic about military service and is therefore rejected because the military tribunal assessing him thinks that he is crazy. Conscientious objection, therefore, cannot be ascertained; the same respect that is shown towards all the other rights exercised in a democratic and free society must be shown to the person exercising conscientious objection. Such recognition differentiates democratic States working along these lines and totalitarian States which prohibit any form of objection.

Another specious argument that has been invoked is that there are too many divergences between European countries for the existing legislations to be aligned. In this respect, the opinion of the Political Affairs Committee — the committee which is competent on questions of human rights in the world — was of absolutely no help to us, since, with a somewhat paternalistic attitude to our Legal Affairs Committee, they counselled prudence, saying that it would not be wise to present this report at the present time.

On the contrary, however, this is precisely the right time, since changes in attitude — including that of

Macciocchi

governments — in favour of conscientious objection have been noted. A number of European countries — Greece is an exception — have undertaken, at this very moment in time, to devise and improve regulations governing conscientious objection; the beginnings of a set of regulations governing conscientious objectors can be found everywhere. An *ad hoc* commission set up in Matignon is expected to present the French Parliament with a law authorizing updated regulations which reveal a new awareness of this problem, as the Socialist Government has abolished judgments on exceptions whether made by the Court of National Defence or by military tribunals. I happened to be present in the Paris military tribunal in 1979 when the stormy trial of the conscientious objector Jean Fabre took place. The President of the tribunal read out a letter from President Mitterrand, addressed to Jean Fabre, which stated that a conscientious objector should be 'neither penalized, nor given preferential treatment' compared with other young men. In this way, the idea of condonation — which still bothers a number of benighted souls — was avoided.

The Italian Parliament will soon be presented with three draft laws which all stem from the need to put a stop to the confusion resulting from the 1972 law, which was a first faltering and hesitant step in this direction and was invalidated by attempts to thwart its innovations.

The Italian Constitutional Court has recently been called upon to pronounce on the warped application of this law and, more precisely, on the time limit of 6 months within which the Ministry of Defence must give a decision on a conscientious objector's appeal. There is such a scandalous delay in replying, and the wait is so wearing and mortifying that the best jurisprudence experts in Italy have not hesitated in describing a circular put out by the Minister of Defence on 19 September 1979 as grotesque. According to this circular, after a delay of 26 months, conscientious objectors would automatically be excused from military service. This is an open admission on the part of the Ministry of its failure to act and its indifference.

Within the Community, countries like Germany and the Netherlands grant the right to conscientious objection which is enshrined in the Constitution; the difference in length between military and civilian service is only a month in Germany, four months in the Netherlands, two months in Denmark and five in Belgium. In some countries, it is accepted that information can freely be disseminated — like in Belgium — and conscripts can get hold of it easily, whereas in others it is still outlawed (France) or fails to circulate through inertia (Italy). In the United Kingdom, Ireland and Luxembourg, military service is not compulsory and citizens in those countries have the right to refuse to do such service for reasons of conscience.

To sum up, the main point of my report is that Parliament should recognize conscientious objection as a basic human right.

Surely it would not be possible for this House — the first to have been directly elected — to deny a right which has already been inscribed in the European Convention on Human Rights and the International Covenant of the United Nations? I do not believe that it can and I look forward to seeing a big majority voting for such a right to be adopted.

(Applause)

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the protection of freedom of conscience has been made a binding obligation in the European Community and its Member States, by virtue of, on the one hand the European Convention on human rights — as already mentioned — and by the national constitutions on the other. The right to conscientious objection is a specific instance of this right to freedom of conscience. In principle, this right is protected in all our Member States — but the way in which it is protected reminds one a little of the famous answer to questions to radio Erevan: 'yes, in principle, but . . .'. This but covers a multitude of sins. Thus it is a question of how one can exercise this right.

First of all there is the question of recognition as a conscientious objector. Obviously, we want to avoid a situation whereby people who simply want to avoid having to do military service but are not genuine conscientious objectors being recognized. There are at present two possibilities for distinguishing these people from genuine conscientious objectors. On the one hand there is the tribunal, and so far I have only heard about negative aspects of this procedure. Hair-raising questions tend to be asked and unfortunately time does not permit me to give you any examples. However, some of them would not be admitted in criminal proceedings, at least in most of our Member States, on the grounds that they were leading questions.

Secondly, this so-called 'examination' of conscientious objectors' motives puts intellectuals in a privileged position as they obviously tend to be more articulate. A better idea would be alternative service under conditions which would simply stop it being worthwhile for people simply wishing to wriggle out of military service from refusing to go into the army.

Finally, the possibility of so called 'civil' service is important, since it can not be right to recognize conscientious objection to military service, on the one hand while at the same time expecting the person in question to do his alternative service inside the war machine — if I may put it that way. Furthermore, one should obviously be able — and I am still speaking about the situation in our Member States — to discuss the possibilities for conscientious objection publicly. Conscientious objection should not — as would appear to be the case, as I see it, in at least one Member State — be regarded so much as being a similar level to prostitution as to make it seem an embarrass-

Sieglerschmidt

ing and indeed reprehensible business which can not unfortunately be prohibited, with the result that one can not talk openly about it.

Finally, refusal to do military service on the part of persons not recognized as *bona fide* conscientious objectors or refusal to do even 'civil' alternative service should be penalized in a manner which is in keeping with the scale of the offence. Four years imprisonment for refusal to do military service or alternative service is simply disproportionate.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

We fully realize that we have no competency under Community law in this area and that we should not be too hasty in attempting to achieve harmonization in this field. However, we should nevertheless endeavour to approximate our views and arrive at common principles, as mentioned in the motion for resolution. The question is how best we can do this. Should officials or Members of Parliament get together in order to make an attempt of this kind? I have experience in both areas and I would therefore recommend Members of Parliament to get together if we want to achieve initial pragmatic results. Thus, the Socialist Group particularly recommends that you adopt Amendment No 19.

(Applause)

Mr Janssen Van Raay (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Christian Democratic Group supports Mrs Macciocchi's report but I would nevertheless point out, in the midst of all these pleas for respect for those who object to military service on ethical grounds — although these pleas are quite appropriate — that my group obviously also has respect and sympathy for those who do carry out their military service, and this is something we should obviously not lose sight of when discussing the respectable exception of the conscientious objector. That was the first general point I wished to make. We Christian-Democrats have in fact always felt that this was hardly a controversial issue in Europe, since even the two Member States which have abolished compulsory military service still recognize conscientious objection even in the case of an emergency. I am referring, of course to the United Kingdom and Ireland. We would not have thought this was a controversial issue in Europe. Thus, there is no objection whatsoever to taking an integrated approach to this matter, as embodied in Mrs Macciocchi's proposal, but we would nevertheless object if — and I should like to stress this point — the debate in this House were to turn into a full-scale attack and complaint against the youngest member of the European Community, i.e. Greece.

I should like to stress once more on behalf of my group that our support for the Macciocchi report and our respect for and acknowledgement of conscientious objection should under no circumstances be inter-

preted as a covert attack on Greece, and for this reason my group has left it to its members to decide which way to vote on a number of amendments tabled by a Greek fellow Socialist Member.

Those who think that by voting in favour of these amendments they would be eliminating any attack on Greece from the Macciocchi report have an opportunity to do so. I particularly stress this point since I think it would be a pity if Mrs Macciocchi's view, which in itself is entirely defensible and has also received the firm support of the Legal Affairs Committee, should be exploited for the purposes of purely political axe-grinding which has really nothing to do with the subject as such. It is almost as though I am giving an explanation of vote on behalf of my group. However, this is not my intention, Mr President, since then I would be speaking out of order. I merely wished to explain the context of our support for the Macciocchi report.

Mr D'Angelosante (COM). — (IT) We have little time at our disposal, Mr President, and I should like to use what there is to give a rapid explanation of our vote.

The Italian Communists and Allies will be voting in favour of the report by the Legal Affairs Committee on conscientious objection, just as we said we would in committee.

I should just like to make two quick points. As a general principle, the idea that one of the basis of the right to conscientious objection is the right to life seems questionable to us. If what is meant by this refers to the life of the person who would risk being killed by the objector's hand, then that is all well and good, but if it is meant to refer to the objector's life, I do not feel that the basis is legitimate. Conscientious objection is based on the right to express an opinion and consists of the refusal to kill a fellow creature — and that is all it is.

Furthermore, apart from the need for supervision, which others have already spoken about, I should like to point out to this House what I feel to be the need for the law to define with absolute scrupulousness exactly how objectors are to be assigned to other services. For it can happen — and has in fact happened in my country, where we have more than 20 000 objectors — that objectors who happen to be pals of the Minister of Defence's party are shown preference and sent to a replacement service in their own town, while others do not know where they will end up.

Having made my two brief points, made mainly with the aim of marking our presence in this debate, I repeat what I said at the beginning — namely we will be voting in favour of this report.

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) This motion for a resolution, Mr President, fits in with the European Parliament's

Veil

activities on behalf of human rights both within and outside the Community. It is an expression of democracy on the part of a community of ten countries who hold the defence of basic human rights dear to heart, and it is therefore quite normal for the European Parliament to concern itself with the effective implementation of these principles within our countries to give this concept its full value, particularly when what we are talking about is freedom of conscience. The refusal to bear arms for philosophical or religious reasons is not new: one need only remember the stance adopted by Romain Rolland during the First World War, even if, given the circumstances at the time, this attitude of refusing outright to defend one's country could have appeared outrageous. We should also remember the Jehovah's witnesses in Nazi Germany, who were among the first victims of Hitler's regime because of their refusal to join the army. I believe, therefore, that there is a need to emphasize that the problem is by no means a simple one and given new types of conflict and modern forms of warfare it raises problems of conscience which are more and more serious.

But there can be no mistaking the viewpoints of the Legal Affairs Committee in the way they have dealt with this question and adopted Mrs Macciocchi's report — and with a very large majority, I must say. But before we look more closely at the viewpoints and concepts contained in this report, I think we can afford a few moments to remind ourselves of the background to this question in the last few decades. I should like to begin by emphasizing a fact on which we may congratulate ourselves — since Europe is largely responsible for the situation — namely, that our countries nowadays no longer feel themselves directly threatened by a conflict which would put at direct risk the interests of the nations concerned or their territories.

Secondly, an awareness of the possible situations in which soliders who refuse to take part in certain activities may find themselves was awakened, if not driven home, by the Nuremberg trials. It was here for the first time that it was acknowledged that one could be condemned as a war criminal for having obeyed the orders of one's government or of a superior. In this way, the duty to obey — whatever the orders received — has occasionally been questioned.

My third point is that the very concept of individual rights in relation to the State has been deepened and enriched, and the possibilities for the State to pass over the individual's problems of conscience have consequently been lessened. This is in some ways the modern equivalent of Antigone's appeal to the effect that the individual's rights should transcend those of the State.

This is the psychological climate that has prevailed in the Community since the war and which has led all of our countries — I stress — to produce legislation on this question. In one of its resolutions, the Consulta-

tive Assembly of the Council of Europe expressly laid down the principle that conscientious objection was a basic right. Paradoxically, however, the very fact of legislating has raised problems for our various countries, as if it were easier to regard young men refusing to be called up as delinquents and to put them in prison because they refuse to fulfil their duty as soldiers. It is quite true that, if recourse is had to the law, legislators must lay down those cases in which conscientious objection can be invoked, the necessary application procedures, alternative service, procedures, and how long and at what point conscientious objection can be invoked — either when the youth is called up or at some other point. Mrs Macciocchi's report tries in a very broad way to tackle all these problems. The main aim of the report is to uphold the principle of freedom of conscience, and I want to insist on this point because it seems vital to me. It was not our intention in this report to seek to support in any way pacifist movements or to take up a key position on questions of defence and on the will of our countries to defend themselves and to sort out these problems among themselves. We did not even touch on these matters, and in this context I should like to point out that as far as the Liberal Group is concerned — of which I am the representative here today — we firmly reject all Mrs Gaiotti de Biase's amendments which, in our opinion, totally distort the report's basic approach. If these amendments were adopted, we would have to reject the report because conscientious objection would have been turned into something collective rather than individual.

This individual approach is precisely what appears essential to us, since we are talking about defending an individual right which is not — I hasten to point out — an encouragement to conscientious objection but the simple assurance that any individual has the right to refuse — for religious or philosophical reasons — to obey military orders which would lead him to kill another human being. We wanted to tackle only this problem of individual right, granted to each human individual, and not at all the collective aspect.

In the same way, another vital element in Mrs Macciocchi's report is its wholehearted support for the notion of solidarity. Conscientious objectors are not citizens excluded from the nation, they are not people who refuse to show solidarity with their community when they make this choice, because they do accept the obligation of performing civilian service — such as social service — which is of use to the nation or possibly — referring to Mr Pannella's amendment — service to developing countries. In other words, these people cannot be considered second-class citizens who turn their backs on their community, they simply want to show their solidarity in a way which fits in with their own conscience and its principles.

This seems to offer all the necessary guarantees for respecting individual rights with the aim of further strengthening the principle of freedom. For these rea-

Veil

sons, the Liberal Group will be voting in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by the Legal Affairs Committee.

President. — The debate is adjourned until the sitting is resumed this evening.

5. Action against the Council

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to inform you that an action against the Council for failure to act in the field of transport policy will be brought before the Court of Justice of the European Communities, as decided by Parliament in its resolution of 16 September 1982.

In accordance with the House's decision, the aim of this action is to establish that, by not taking the measures provided for in the EEC Treaty concerning the adoption of a common transport policy, the Council has infringed the Treaty. As requested and in accordance with Article 175 of the EEC Treaty, I asked the Council to act and to take a decision on the various proposals in question. The Council replied in a letter dated 22 November and this reply has been considered by the Committee on Transport and the Legal Affairs Committee. Since the Council reply was found unsatisfactory, the two committees asked for proceedings to be instituted, in view also of the fact that the meeting of the Council of Transport Ministers on 16 December did not produce any results likely to modify the attitude of the House.

In the circumstances Parliament is obliged, for the first time, to institute proceedings with the sole aim of ensuring respect for the treaties. Before taking this step, Parliament made every effort to persuade the Council to adopt the necessary measures for a common transport policy, which is essential if the aims of this Community of ours are to be attained. Resorting to the courts should be done only in the most exceptional circumstances. But after 25 years that the treaties have existed, the absence of a common transport policy — and even of the outline of such a policy — represents in our opinion a serious infringement of the treaties.

The members of the Council, which means the ministers of the Member States, are the only ones to blame for this infringement, principally because of their refusal to adopt proposals by majority decision, as laid down in the treaties. Naturally, we are counting on the support of the Commission, which Parliament has called on to endorse its action. In acting in this way, Parliament believes that it is acting to maintain the law and to safeguard the interests of every citizen of the Community.

(Applause)

Mr Seefeld (S), chairman of the Committee on Transport. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Committee on Transport let me say that I am delighted that the President of the European Parliament has decided — as we have just heard — to bring before the European Court of Justice an action against the Council of Ministers for failure to act in the field of transport policy, in accordance with our decision of 16 December 1982 and in line with the recommendation of our committee on 2 December 1982.

The representatives of Europe have had to follow the sad tale of the transport ministers' inability to take decisions for all too long. Since the beginning of the EEC, for more than 25 years, Parliament's Committee on Transport has produced a stream of general opinions and numerous specific opinions by way of indicating ideas and proposals for a genuine European transport plan. For its part the Council of Ministers in the last 20 years has indeed passed a few legal matters but many of the Commission's submissions and numerous proposals from the European Parliament have been left to gather dust where they have been filed.

In connection with the Council's reply to Parliament's call for action, the Committee on Transport has once again taken a very careful look at the Council's arguments. We have reached the conclusion that the individual measures which have been taken so far do not represent a common transport policy for the Community. The directly elected European Parliament, with its directly elected representatives of Europe, cannot and will not tolerate this situation any longer. Our disjointed transport system leads to distortion of competition and produces barriers to intra-Community trade. The Council's inertia also goes against the express desires of the authors of the treaties for the creation of a common transport policy.

Consequently, we accuse the Council of Ministers of infringing Articles 3 (e), 74 and 75 of the EEC Treaty and of failing to define the framework for the formulation of a common transport policy and of failing to act within the time limits laid down in the Treaty on numerous proposals which have been submitted by the Commission and approved by Parliament.

In instituting these proceedings, the European MPs are making use of a procedure for which there is provision in the treaties establishing the Communities. In doing so, we are pursuing our political objective, which is the establishment of a genuine European transport policy.

It will now be up to the Court of Justice to give a ruling on this action by Europe's representatives against the Council of Ministers. It is with great confidence and faith that I look forward to the outcome of these proceedings.

(Applause)

Mrs Veil (L), chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee. — (FR) On behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, Mr President, I just want to repeat the opinion which was drawn up by our committee at its meeting in Athens on 2-3 December and which has been submitted to the House.

It is the committee view in fact that the Council's reply was not a definition of its opinion in accordance with Article 175 of the Treaty establishing the EEC and that as a result action could be taken. Let me add that the opinion of the committee was adopted by 13 votes to two with three abstentions.

You were asked, Mr President, should you decide not to institute proceedings, to inform the two committees of this decision in time for a report to be drawn up for Parliament in accordance with paragraph 5 of the resolution which was adopted by the House on 16 September.

Finally, the Legal Affairs Committee decided that it would be better to leave you complete freedom to select the means of supporting this action so that there would be no debate here which might then be used in the court proceedings. The committee felt it would be better if you chose the methods to be adopted together with Parliament's legal experts.

(Applause)

Mr Davignon, Vice President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, on behalf of the Commission let me say that our institution endorses Parliament's aims regarding the development of a common transport policy and will play its part, as allowed by the treaty, in the action brought before the Court of Justice.

(Applause)

6. Dates of next part-sessions

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, at the sitting of 14 October 1982 Parliament adopted a resolution in favour of an additional part-session before the first European Council meeting this year. The purpose was:

to allow a wide-ranging debate and the drafting of specific proposals to stimulate coordinated economic policies capable of combating unemployment effectively.

With the aim of doing something by way of a follow-up to this decision by Parliament, the enlarged Bureau noted that the next European Council meeting was scheduled for the week of 21-25 March and it therefore came to the conclusion that if a debate on unemployment were to be held before then it should take place during the part-session from 7 to 11 March.

It would have been impossible, however, for any document or motion for a resolution to be drawn up in time by the relevant parliamentary committees which were far from finishing their work on the matter. Consideration was therefore given to holding the additional part-session which Parliament's resolution called for at a later date, in April, so that every effort could be made by the relevant committees, and in particular by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, to prepare for the debate in a thorough manner.

By majority vote the enlarged Bureau decided to propose that the additional part-session be postponed from March to April. I must ask Parliament to vote on this proposal.

You will realize that there is no question of having a debate on this matter but simply of sorting out a question of procedure. Consequently, I shall call one speaker in favour of the postponement to April and one against the proposal. Before the two speakers are called, I feel it would be a good idea to hear from the chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — (GR) Mr President, I do not wish to add anything to what you have said, but allow me to make a small correction. There is no objection on the part of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, which is continually dealing with the grave problem of unemployment and which has to submit resolutions, ideas, opinions and conclusions so that the European Council can adopt suitable measures. However we must observe and respect the decision of the plenary session, which has scheduled a special part-session of the European Parliament to discuss the critical problem of unemployment, with a view to presenting concrete proposals on urgent measures, and in view of the fact that — as you know — the European Summit Council will be meeting on 21 and 22 March, it is no longer feasible to convene an extraordinary part-session before this date.

In conclusion, with a view to a more complete examination of this major socio-economic issue, which is undoubtedly of interest to all the political groups in our Parliament, we think that this debate could be held at an extraordinary part-session in April or May, before the European Council meets in June.

(Applause)

Mr Barbi (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, at the meeting of the enlarged Bureau I supported your proposal and my group is willing to support it here because we believe that the problem of unemployment is far too serious and pressing and far too difficult and complicated to be solved unless the House treats the problem as a matter of the utmost gravity.

Barbi

We are dealing with a Council of Ministers and a European Council which have repeatedly said they are going to do something about unemployment but they have never followed up their words with any real Community policy. We are also dealing with a Commission which is lacking in ideas on the subject. Parliament is therefore obliged to adopt some definite resolutions which will make the Council and the Commission face up to their responsibilities. This is why we are ready to endorse your proposal for an adjournment until April, Mr President.

Of course, if the Council — as we have heard say — were to submit proposals for the immediate expansion of the new Community instrument, for financing and for Community policies on working hours, we should not stand in their way. But we have to ensure that the Committee on Social Affairs, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Energy and so on are in a position to offer serious and genuine proposals, so that the Council and the Commission have to face up to their responsibilities.

Mr Wurz (COM). — (FR) I just wanted to say that we are happy with this proposal but we want a firm commitment on the part of Parliament that the special part-session on farm prices will be held in March...

President. — Mr Wurtz, I am interrupting you because you were called to speak against the proposal. A point of order is the only other reason for speaking.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. I merely wished to point out, before we got into the use of Community instruments and all the rest of it, that April is ordained on the present calendar to have 30 days. On which of them...

President. — Mr Sherlock, that is not a procedural motion. I said April or May. That will be proposed by the Bureau.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, that makes it 61 days! I have other people to meet. I dare say even you have other people to meet.

President. — I suppose so, but that has nothing to do with procedure.

Mr Glinne (S). — (FR) Mr President, after duly considering this morning's discussions in the enlarged Bureau and various conversations I have had this afternoon, may I ask the House to look into the possibility of arranging our work as follows.

First of all, during the normal March part-session, we could spend half a day debating the document which the Commission has already drawn up on the reduction of working hours, as well as the promotion of public investment, particularly through the New Community Instrument. Subsequently, at a special part-session in April, we would examine all the other means of implementing an improved employment policy, bearing in mind that, in April, the Commission will be presenting its document on unemployment among young people and that, on 6 and 7 June, there will be a second European Council devoted particularly to employment policy, while the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs will be meeting on 6 June.

In this way we could act without undue haste and influence the deliberations of the European Council.

President. — Mr Glinne, any request to have the matter debated during the March part-session must be communicated to the enlarged Bureau. That is where responsibility lies for drawing up the agenda.

Mr Martin (COM). — (FR) Mr President, this is just to ask whether, on the understanding that we go along with the proposals which have been made, you can promise that farm prices will be discussed in March.

President. — I am waiting for the Committee on Agriculture to propose a date for the discussion of farm prices.

Mr Bord (DEP). — (FR) All the same, Mr President, we ought to know whether we shall be discussing farm prices during the ordinary part-session in March.

President. — We are not discussing a date for farm prices here but trying to change the date of a debate on employment policy.

Mr Kirk (ED). — (DA) At yesterday's meeting of the enlarged Bureau I understood that we had decided that, if Parliament voted not to hold a debate on unemployment during the ordinary part-session in March, then there would be a debate on agricultural prices. At the same time we decided not to fix a date for the special part-session on unemployment. Is that right?

President. — Mr Kirk, this is not the place to solve the problems the enlarged Bureau has to solve. There was a decision by the Parliament to hold a special session on employment before the first European Council in 1983. We have found that for various reasons the enlarged Bureau cannot accommodate that decision by Parliament. And as Parliament is more important than

President

the enlarged Bureau, Parliament has to decide whether it agrees to change that date or whether it does not. That is the only proposal before us, all the rest I would say is a matter for the enlarged Bureau and proposals for the agenda.

Mr Enright (S). — I would like clarification, Mr President. There is, I understand, involved in this employment question a certain oligarchy — the Catherwood conspiracy. Now you have been talking, I think quite properly, about what the Bureau should do and what Parliament should do. I would like to know under what rule of procedure this extraordinary committee of chairmen is operating. Should the matter not be referred in fact to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions?

President. — Mr Enright, this is not a question relating to the subject now under discussion.

Mr Glinne (S). — (FR) In view of the fact that the plenary sitting of this House agreed there should be a special debate before the European Council meeting of 21 and 22 March, and in an effort to reach a reasonable compromise, I would suggest that during the ordinary part-session in March we have a half-day debate on the problems of cutting the working week and of boosting public investment by means of the new Community instrument.

President. — Mr Glinne, it is up to the enlarged Bureau — of which you are a member — to propose an agenda for the March part-session.

I therefore propose that the additional part-session be postponed to April or May.

(Parliament approved the enlarged Bureau's proposal)

Mr de Courcy Ling (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. Before we proceed to the vote, will you please clarify the question of the date of the special session on agricultural prices? We need to know what the plans of the enlarged Bureau are in regard to the session.

President. — I cannot give you any information at the moment because it depends on the timing of the Committee on Agriculture and the enlarged Bureau has not taken notice of this question.

7. Votes¹**HAAGERUP REPORT (Doc. 1-946/82 'European security')****Paragraph 3 — Amendment No 43**

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — (NL) I cannot vote on this because I do not have the text of the amendment. It says literally that my text is not applicable to the Dutch version. According to the people who have produced this, it would seem to be a linguistic problem.

President. — Well, I shall have to hear from Mr Radoux that it is a linguistic problem, as he has been talking about a linguistic and a political problem. Can it be regarded as a linguistic problem, Mr Radoux? If so, there will be no need to vote and we simply have to make it correspond to the original text.

Mr Radoux (S). — (FR) It is linguistic, Mr President, but more than that it is political.

(Laughter)

President. — What cannot be translated into Dutch cannot be political, Mr Radoux.

(Laughter)

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) If it really is political, Mr President, I should like to know — in another language, if necessary — what it is about. On the piece of paper I have here it says *niet van toepassing in de Nederlandse tekst*.

President. — This seems to be an exceptionally difficult case. Perhaps you could explain what it means in Dutch, Mr Radoux.

Mr Radoux (S). — (NL) I am sorry, Mr President, it is quite clear in French.

(Mr Radoux read out the French version and continued in French)

I am saying that *en devenir* is the wrong phrase. It exists now.

President. — The only thing to do is to put Amendment No 43 to the vote. It has been read out in French which was the original language.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Glinne (S). — (FR) Mr President, the text is not available in all languages. As a member of the same linguistic community within Belgium, I shall ask my esteemed friend, Mr Radoux, if he would be so kind as to withdraw the amendment.

Mr Radoux (S). — (FR) Even a pretty woman could not resist such gallantry.

(Laughter — Applause)

Paragraph 4 — Amendment No 52

Mr Haagerup (L), rapporteur. — Mr President, this is slightly more complicated, because the committee rejected an amendment relating to the setting up of a permanent subcommittee. Now we have a total reformulation in which the most important part is that a report be drawn up, and therefore I must as rapporteur leave the decision to the House.

Mr Mommersteeg (PPE). — (NL) I supported the amendment on the basis of the original text which was tabled, and that was in French. I must say that the Dutch version goes quite beyond what is in the French version. For example, we have *inventaire* in French and *balans* in Dutch. In French there is *analyse* and in the Dutch version *studie*. The Dutch version will have to be revised since it is a poor rendering.

After the vote on the amendments and before the explanations of vote

Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED). — Mr President, earlier in the week, when Mr Klepsch was in the chair and there was a great deal of work to be done, he asked people to submit their explanations of vote in writing. Would it not be possible for you to do the same this evening, as we also have a great deal of very important work to get through now? It worked very successfully earlier in the week.

President. — The Members know that they can submit their explanations of vote in writing. You have now invited them to do so, and I join you in that. I do not think it will make much difference, though I hope it will. Sometimes it depends on the reports whether Members prefer to give their explanations of vote orally or in writing.¹

(The sitting was suspended at 9.05 p.m. and resumed at 10 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

8. *Conscientious objection (continuation)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report (Doc. 1-546/82) by Mrs Maciocchi on conscientious objection.

Mr Bonino (CDI). — (IT) I must start, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen — you few who are still here at this late hour of the evening — by deploring, albeit briefly, the fact that this — to my mind — crucial debate has been slotted in — for reasons known to the Chair, I dare say — at such a late hour, thus making the topic fragmented and disjointed.

I thought that this debate was crucial because it dealt with — and indeed, still does deal with — the citizen's basic rights, leading this House to discuss principles which I consider important, such as those of non-violence, the right and the categorical imperative not to kill, and a different idea of defence, national defence or territorial defence.

I will try to give a fuller explanation of what I mean tomorrow morning when we give our explanations of vote, but right now I should like to say that this motion for a resolution by the European Parliament is a clear statement and, I trust, will give a clear indication, to all Member States, including my own country, which — although it has had a law on conscientious objection since 1972 — is preparing to review this law because of its obvious limitations which have not allowed it to work properly.

The first point is the fact that conscientious objectors are no longer considered deserters, not even from a cultural point of view. Instead, they are citizens who are claiming that their attitude is totally legitimate since it depends on their religious or philosophical reflections and opinions, which cannot be evaluated by any committee. To my mind, this is one of the most important aspects to emerge from this report, namely, that it wholeheartedly supports the idea that no adjudicating committee is competent to judge the validity of a moral or philosophical concept or opinion no matter what it might be.

The second point is that civilian service must not be a kind of punishment, as if the conscientious objector were a shirker and not just a citizen who happens to hold different opinions.

Those are the two most significant points — to keep it brief — in this report, which is why we are in favour of it, as I will explain tomorrow morning.

¹ Deliberations on petitions by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions: see Minutes.

Mr Eisma (NI). — (NL) We shall be giving our wholehearted support to Mrs Macciocchi's excellent report. We might seem to be duplicating the work of the Council of Europe, in particular its Resolution 337 of 1967 and its Recommendation 816 of 1977. This latter recommendation proposes that a right of conscientious objection be included in the Convention on Human Rights, a point which is echoed in paragraph 8 of the motion for a resolution before us now. But while the Council of Europe can do no more than issue recommendations to its member governments, the Community institutions have more power. At least, I assume they do, and for that reason I should like to ask the Commission's representative in this Chamber in what way pressure can be put on the Member States to ensure that this resolution becomes national policy. We are afraid that the instruments available may extend to nothing more than the cautious formulation 'emphasizes', 'calls on' and 'supports' in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of the motion for a resolution. Clearly, any amendments seeking to dilute these particular paragraphs — such as Nos 7 and 8 tabled by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase — will not meet with our approval. We shall, however, be supporting those amendments which seek to clarify the issue, that is, Nos 14, 15 and 17 tabled by Mr Pannella and Mrs Bonino, No 20 tabled by Mr Vandemeulebroucke and Mr Capanna, and also the constructive Amendment No 18 tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt.

Mr President, I should like to conclude with a general remark. It is not just a coincidence that all the amendments we shall be voting against have been tabled by Greek, Italian and French Members. Incidentally, there are a number of Italian amendments which we shall be voting for, and let us not forget that Mrs Macciocchi is herself Italian. The fact is, though, that Greece, Italy and France are the very three countries in the Community which have received an unfavourable mention in this respect in Amnesty International's annual report for 1982. We would not deny that the situation has improved recently, nor have we forgotten that history has taken a completely different course in Greece and Italy than in, say, Denmark or the Netherlands, and that the mentality and traditions of those countries are very different. Nonetheless, I would address an urgent appeal to the Members from those countries to support Mrs Macciocchi's motion for a resolution. In any community, Mr President, there will always be certain elements who will have to make sacrifices in the interests of the Community as a whole, and the European Community is no exception here.

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — (NL) Mr President, the question of conscientious objection is at one and the same time a very old and a very new problem. Old, in that on several occasions in the past people have refused to take up arms against others because they thought that they would thereby be coming into conflict with their own consciences. Some of these have even been prepared to go so far as to sacrifice their own lives on the issue.

In the Member States of the European Community, of course, those people for whom the question of whether or not to become a member of the armed forces is a new problem affecting themselves have no reason to fear such dire consequences. Our countries respect the rule of law and all have governments which respect and protect human rights. Nonetheless there is — as the various resolutions on which the Macciocchi report is based clearly demonstrate — every reason to devote attention to the rights of conscientious objectors in our own Member States and in this Parliament elected by the people of Europe.

The main reason — as Mr Eisma pointed out just now — is that, in some of our Member States, people are still being kept in prison because they are conscientious objectors. Amnesty International has named France, Greece and Italy in this respect. Another reason why this problem deserves our attention is because the relevant legislation in our Member States is so divergent that any legislative harmonization in this respect would be welcomed by the people of Europe as a contribution towards improved European cooperation.

Any discussion of matters relating to individual consciences is bound to be a hazardous undertaking; after all, what precisely do we mean by a matter of conscience? All too often, people tend to associate matters of conscience with a belief in a superior power prescribing a certain code of behaviour at any given time — and I myself belong to this group — but all too often, the implication is that believers have a prior right to appeal to their consciences. I utterly reject this kind of attitude, which is to my mind an arrogant one.

For the purposes of this debate, I shall stick to Amnesty International's definition of a conscientious objector as a person liable to conscription for military service who, for reasons of conscience or profound conviction arising from religious, ethical, moral, humanitarian, philosophical, political or similar motives, refuses to perform armed service or to take any part whatsoever in wars or armed conflicts. The characteristic feature of a decision of conscience is that only the person appealing to his or her conscience can say when that moment has arrived. It therefore follows that it is, by definition, impossible to keep a check on who or what has given rise to the decision. This point is made in Mrs Macciocchi's motion for a resolution, and my group wholeheartedly supports paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution, in which that point is made.

In our countries too, Mr President — nay, in our countries in particular — which are built on the foundation of democratically enacted legislation, we must allow freedom of conscience and guarantee the individual's right to appeal to his own conscience. We democrats in particular must appreciate that no legislation enacted by human beings can ever overrule an individual's personal convictions, whether or not we

Van den Heuvel

agree with those convictions. Democracy itself is in grave danger if democracy as an institution is granted such absolute powers that individual liberties are thereby placed in jeopardy. There is no way of scrutinizing a person's conscience, and conscientious objectors must not be punished by being made to do alternative service lasting more than the normal period of military service. Anyone who advocates such a course, Mr President, is not taking the question of conscientious objection seriously. The report before us now, which emphatically defends these views, deserves this House's support, and I am grateful to Mrs Macciocchi for all the work she has put in on the report.

Mr Gontikas (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, I wish to express my profound opposition to Mrs Macciocchi's report. This is both my personal opinion and that of the Group I represent.

I should like to begin by emphasizing that the report was unable to give an 'objective' definition of a conscientious objector and the elements which comprise his beliefs. As a result, since we do not have an 'objective' definition of conscientious objection, we cannot adopt the report and ask for it to be applied throughout the Community. It is not feasible to base the right to conscientious objection merely on a declaration by the interested party, because a whole variety of motives can be masked by such a declaration.

Secondly, the report evokes the principles of democracy as a basis for the right to conscientious objection. On the contrary, it is my belief that this principle compels us to acknowledge the unavoidable need for military service. I think that it is inadmissible for some members of a society to be responsible for its defence while others draw advantages from this without having contributed anything. Thirdly, this report, which aims at standardizing the status of conscientious objectors throughout the Community does not take into consideration the particular requirements of each of these countries where defence and strategy are concerned. Nor does it consider to what extent some Member States can afford such a luxury. Fourthly, and more specifically, Law No 731 of 1977 accords some possibilities to conscientious objectors on the grounds of religious belief. In such cases, conscientious objectors do military service which is twice as long but without bearing arms.

To conclude, Mr President, I should like to specify that, not only should conscientious objection *not* be recognized by the European parliament, but, on the contrary, people who refuse to perform their military service ought to be considered beyond the pale, by their own choice, since they have refused to participate in the most vital matter of their country's survival and safety.

Mrs Macciocchi (S). — (FR) That smacks of the colonels!

Mr Gendebien (CDI). — (FR) Having only a few moments to speak, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should first of all like to remind Mr Gontikas in passing that the play *Antigone* was written by a Greek ...

I should also like to point out that the main virtue of European civilization is that it has always acknowledged the absolute supremacy of the individual's right of conscience over the rights of the State. I would say to those who think that the system could be abused — which rarely happens — that democracy has a duty to run certain risks. That is why I will be voting in favour of Mrs Macciocchi's report and I should like to congratulate her once again on her work.

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I want to begin by announcing that I will be voting in favour of Mrs Macciocchi's motion for a resolution, even though I feel obliged to express certain reservations.

This right is henceforth sanctioned as a principle in many countries and to step backwards would be unthinkable, nor do I want to do so. I also reject the dangerous parallels made with the right to abortion.

The problems raised by the application of conscientious objection nowadays stem from the fact that the picture has changed.

This is 1983, ladies and gentlemen, and I find it short-sighted and a little hypocritical to tackle the question of conscientious objection only from the angle of the individual's freedom of conscience, as if we were still in the 18th century.

Conscientious objection has changed in terms of numbers (in Italy, the numbers have gone up from around 100 in 1973 to nearly 18 000 in 1981 and to over 20 000 in 1982 — and Mrs Veil's passionate speech cannot sweep away these facts) but it has also changed in terms of its cultural meaning. Requests for exemption are no longer motivated by a particular religious belief, but by an active militancy and political choice which is not always tied up with a religious desire to combat violence. This is not meant as a criticism: this desire is still respectable and may even be fruitful, but it remains a matter of conscience. Nevertheless, it is very difficult to control it with the outdated legal instruments of individual conscience which respect it for what it is, as this debate has shown and as paragraph 3 of Mrs Macciocchi's motion for a resolution confirms. This question calls for new instruments to solve new problems; it requires new analyses along the lines of a whole policy, not just in the area of defending human rights. In saying this, I do not wish to pre-judge the outcome either negatively or positively. I just want to deliver this debate of ours from the hypocrisy of repeating things which run the risk of making it difficult to apply the law when, every year — and I

de Biase

fully understand why this should be so, — an extra 10 000 young men ask to be exempt.

I have no illusions concerning the fate of my amendments, which were an attempt to ask this House to go into the matter more deeply. It is easier to pretend that things are simple than to face them for what they are. This applies both on the left and on the right and I believe that neither side of this House has really tried to understand the meaning behind my amendments.

I am however convinced that we will have to return to this topic out of respect to the young people who want recognition for their rights and because we have a duty to be honest with them.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

9. ERDF

President. — The next item is a joint debate on two oral questions, with debate (Doc. 1-1048/82: 1-1049/82) to the Council:

- by Mrs Boot, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), Mr van der Vring, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Harris, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Cecovini, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mrs Ewing, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, and Mr Kyrkos, on Council decisions concerning the amendment of the ERDF Regulation:

Subject: Council decisions concerning the amendment of the ERDF Regulation.

On Thursday, 22 April 1982, the European Parliament delivered its opinion on the Commission's proposal for the amendment of the above regulation. In general, Parliament approved the Commission's proposal, viz.:

- geographical concentration,
- the concept of coordination,
- gradual transition to the financing of programmes,
- an increase in the non-quota section,
- integrated programmes,
- the granting to the Commission, rather than the Council, of the power to take decisions concerning the non-quota section.

With regard to these proposals, can the Council:

1. reveal what stage has been reached in the decision-making process;
2. describe any difficulties created by each of the proposals;
3. state whether, in the meantime, other proposals have been considered;
4. indicate on what date the new regulation will be adopted?

— by Mr De Pasquale, Mr Harris, Mr Hutton, Mr Muntingh, Mr K. Nikolaou, Mr Pöttering, Mr J. D. Taylor, Mr von der Vring and Mr Ziagas, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on the amendment of the regulation establishing the European Regional Development Fund:

Subject: amendment of the regulation establishing the European Regional Development Fund.

The Council has still not adopted 'guidelines' for initiating the conciliation procedure with the European Parliament on the revision of the regulation on the European Development Fund (ERDF).

- (a) Does the Council not consider that in this respect it has failed to fulfil the obligations it set itself in the regulation?
- (b) Does the Council not consider that this delay is seriously prejudicing the improvement and development of Community regional policy, the implementation of which greatly assists in alleviating unemployment in the Community?
- (c) What is the precise timetable which the Council intends to establish for adopting its guidelines in connection with the amendment of the ERDF regulation, with a view to opening the conciliation procedure requested by the European Parliament?

Mrs Boot (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, Mr Secretary of State, ladies and gentlemen, it is in itself an unsatisfactory state of affairs when, as today, we have to table an oral question and a motion for a resolution — which we shall be voting on tomorrow — regarding the decision-making process within the Council. We have become somewhat impatient about the Council's failure to reach a decision on the review of the Regulation, which is why all the political groups in this House have appended their signatures to this oral question. I was pleased to hear this week that when Mr Genscher presented his programme he not only explained the broad sweep of his policies, but also devoted some attention to the Community's instrument in the field of structural policy, i.e. the Regional Fund. What he said was that the main aim of his efforts at reform would be to concentrate the resources available to the Fund. After all, it is only by concentrating these resources on the regions which are really worst affected that we can set out to reform the Fund in a meaningful way.

Boot

In my view, the Commission's proposal for the reform of the Regional Fund is a new step towards the formulation of a European regional policy worthy of the name. What such a policy in fact amounts to is a Community approach to regional problems, bearing in mind the fact that these problems — i.e. the major economic disparities between the various regions — often have very different causes. Sometimes they are the result of historical circumstances going back hundreds of years; sometimes it is because the regions are on the periphery of the Community; and sometimes it is the result of agrarian depopulation or urbanization. Most recently, though, the regions worst affected have been downgraded to an extremely weak status as a result of national economic policies.

Mr President, I should like to make the point that regional policy is essentially one aspect of general economic policy, which explains why any shifts which take place in the national economies have major repercussions on regional policy too. Comparative study shows that a regional policy based on investment incentives stands or falls with the general level of investment in the national budgets. The upshot is, Mr President, that specific measures designed to aid ailing regions will meet with relatively little success unless there is some assurance that economic trends keep pace with those of the Community as a whole, an illustration of this being last week's devaluation of the drachma.

If the Common Market is to continue to function effectively, it is vital that the macro-economic differences between the partially integrated national budgets — i.e. integrated as regards the private market sector, but not as regards the public sector — are kept as small as possible. Regional policy as a Community policy must be much more effectively integrated into an overall, coordinated macro-economic plan for the short term and, in particular, the medium-to-long term. I have the utmost confidence that the German Presidency — which I think shares these views — will ensure that the Commission's proposals in the field of concentration, coordination and programme financing will be implemented over the coming six months, bearing in mind the possibility of attaching certain conditions to these measures.

Mr De Pasquale (COM). — (IT) Once again, Mr President, our committee is forced to raise the serious problem of delays on the part of the Council of Ministers in adopting the new regulation for the Regional Fund. Already as long ago as February 1979, the Council undertook to take special note of Parliament's guidelines in any new Fund Regulation. Article 22 of the Regulation even specified a time limit of 31 December 1980. In other words, we are already two years behind and even today there is no hope of any immediate outcome.

We have been informed that only on one point — that of geographical concentration — has there been an

intermediary proposal put forward by the Danish President, but as far as we can tell, even this point is still all at sea. There is a grave danger that the entire period will pass with nothing being concluded, and we should all concern ourselves with averting this situation.

Since we were worried by this prospect, we tried to question the German Presidency and I also sent a message to President Genscher before his speech that he gave the other day.

The questions we asked are quite straightforward: firstly, does the German Presidency intend to do all in its power to reach a positive conclusion before its mandate runs out? Secondly, when will the concertation procedure we requested be set in motion? All that we got by way of reply from President Genscher was that a reform of the Regional Fund was on the agenda. But we had been aware of this for the last nine months. What we wanted to find out was what we didn't know, namely, how many months longer it would still remain on the agenda.

It is a fact that a reform of the Regional Fund is not one of the four priorities singled out by the German Presidency. So, as far as we can tell, the Council does not in fact think that there is any great hurry.

Mr President, it is totally unacceptable that the Council does not want to realize that this financial instrument must be renewed without losing any more time; it must be given new scope and powers to boost a strategy of development in regions which are structurally weak and in decline. We cannot just sit back and surrender to the idea that this Fund should carry on paying out partial refunds without any guarantee as if there were no tomorrow. The most devastating effects of the current crisis are felt in the weakest regions and on the weakest markets and we cannot afford inertia. On the contrary, the Community's regional policy and its instruments must be renewed and they must be adapted as far as possible to the new problems and the new imbalances provoked by the present recession in the European economy.

In this situation, which is provoking countries within the Community to devise their own breakaway forms of stimulation, which are disruptive of the whole, it is essential that an effective instrument be provided at least to encourage Member States — if not to oblige them — to implement more coherent and less disorganized regional policies. These are all long-term problems which just cannot be brushed aside.

Lastly, it should be borne in mind that the proposal on which the Council has put the brakes is a responsible undertaking, and by no means something dashed off at a whim by us. The Commission and Parliament worked hard together on it, using our experience, and taking as our starting point a coherent, organic and realistic solution which would promote the Com-

De Pasquale

munity's regional policy in our present conditions. This is a political fact which is highly significant. We cannot allow the Council to wipe it all out and content ourselves with being merely a talking shop.

That is why we have appealed for cooperation — with as much openness as possible — rather than conflict, with us all adopting different positions.

Mr President, we want collaboration to continue effectively on the basis of open questions and first of all, we want the Council to play its hand. Let there be no illusions that, with a topic such as this one, Parliament can be forced to make do with sham consultations! The Commission should be on its guard against accepting, behind Parliament's back, compromises which are incompatible with the overall project that we have designed together.

President. — Before calling Mr Schlecht to reply on behalf of the Council, I should like to compliment him on being here to speak to us at such a late hour, and I am sure that those Members of Parliament who are here now will join me in welcoming him.

(Applause)

Mr Schlecht, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have a great deal of sympathy with the two questions under consideration here, and also with the impatience which has just been voiced, and with your desire to steer the reform of the Regional Fund in the right direction and to conclude this reform as quickly as possible.

The Council has studied the Commission proposals thoroughly, but the reforms proposed by the Commission are generally so extensive that it is not possible to conclude negotiations on this in a short time. For this reason I would ask you to show some understanding on your part for the fact that my answers to the two questions will not be as concrete as you hope.

The original Commission proposal of October 1981, the European Parliament Resolution of April 1982 and the amended Commission proposal of September 1982 do in fact principally concern the six fields mentioned by Mrs Boot and the other Members. Consultations are continuing in the Council, so unfortunately I cannot say when the draft regulation will finally be submitted to the Council.

As the Council President informed the responsible committee of the European Parliament already in November last, the greatest problems arose with regard, on the one hand, to the problem of geographical concentration and, on the other, to the increase in the non-quota section. The question which arises here is to what extent the Commission proposals can be met

on two points, namely the limitation of the quota section funds to the four least prosperous, structurally weakest Member States as well as to Greenland and the French Overseas Departments, and secondly that of the increase in the non-quota section resources from 5 to 20% of the Fund.

But other aspects raised by the delegates are also creating problems for some delegations.

As regards the timetable for finally adopting the regulation, this will depend on the Council's consultations. Account must be taken of the fact that the European Parliament in its resolution requested the application of the conciliation procedure to this issue. I assure you that the Council will also take this seriously.

In points (a) and (c) of their oral question Mr De Pasquale and the other Members raise in particular the problem of the timetable for consultations on the Community's regional policy. Here it must be emphasized that the reform of the ERDF represents a very complicated measure requiring a very thorough examination of all aspects of the problem. I have already asked you to appreciate the fact that because of this the Commission proposal submitted on 29 October, which provides for a really thorough reform of the Fund, could understandably not be adopted in time.

As regards the fear expressed in point (b), namely prejudice to the whole European Regional Policy, it must be pointed out that, despite all the problems connected with the delay, the ERDF is functioning as before and its budget appropriations continue to increase on average proportionally more than the Community budget as a result of the efforts of the two bodies making up the budget authority. In these circumstances there is no serious prejudice either to the development of the regional policy or to the fight against unemployment, to which in any event Community bodies accord priority.

I can assure you that the German Presidency will do what it can to make progress with this third regulation, and I reserve the right to return to this topic again during this debate.

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — *(IT)* I should like to begin, Mr President, by thanking Mrs Boot and Mr De Pasquale for the support which they have once again given to the Commission's proposals on a new regulation for the Regional Fund. In so doing, I realize that they have expressed an opinion which is widely shared in this House, just as we have seen on previous occasions.

The President of the Council has correctly described the state of negotiations within the Council. I should like to say a few words on the Commission's position in these negotiations. I will not dwell on a description of the Commission's proposal, nor the reasoning

Giolitti

behind it, which were the subject of a long and constructive debate in this Parliament last April, at the end of which the majority — as far as I recall — gave its support to these proposals. They were subsequently modified in order to incorporate the essence of requests formulated by Parliament. The main stumbling-block — as the President of the Council has recalled — was the concentration of the section divided into national quotas and the increase in the so-called 'non-quota' section.

Nevertheless, a certain amount of consensus was reached at the European Council held in London in December 1981. We are forced to acknowledge, however, that the intentions stated at that time were not translated into deeds and that within the Council itself the very principle of concentration became a bone of contention. What had happened? What happened was this: the special political climate that took a hold on the Community in 1982 mingled with the grave economic crisis and its repercussions on national budgets which had the effect of making people adopt rigid positions, in turn creating serious tensions over amounts of money which were actually quite small. I can understand some of the motives for this behaviour, but at the same time I have to point out that there is a contradiction when people complain of the need to adopt *ad hoc* measures to rebalance the Community's budget and, at the same time, they reject the reform of policies which could contribute to this result, and do so even when the suggested reform is rational and corresponds to the needs of the community as a whole.

What is the Commission's position now? I feel that it is my duty to state — even though I believe that Parliament has grasped this point perfectly — that the main purpose of the proposals was not that of strengthening financial transfers to benefit less prosperous countries, laudable as such an aim might be. What we are seeking is a whole package of changes to make the Regional Fund more effective and better equipped to tackle the most serious regional problems — in all their diversity — besetting the Community. Concentration, increasing the non-quota section, greater emphasis placed on problems of conversion in declining industrial areas, the switch from financing single projects to that of whole programmes, the favouring of integrated operations, support for the idea of promoting regional development locally, the adoption of more flexible and more efficient procedures and the coordination of regional and national policies: all these are parts in a unique and coherent whole. The essential point for the Commission is to go forward. We maintain that our proposals are valid and that that is the aim we must pursue. We are, however, ready to look for solutions which will enable us to reach the aforementioned objective gradually. In order to take account of everybody's problems and sensitivities, these solutions will not comprise — at the beginning, at least — the exclusion of any Member State from the section divided into national quotas. Progress must however be made with respect to other aspects of the

Commission's proposals, particularly where the size and role of the non-quota section is concerned. Significant progress must in any case be made with respect to the concentration of the 'below quota' section which is a necessary correlation to building up the 'non-quota' section and the importance which this section must assume to tackle problems of industrial decline in the regions.

That explains why the Commission welcomed with interest the efforts made by the Danish President to reach a compromise. I can guarantee this House that with the support of the German President — and I am sure we will get it — as just promised by his representative, the Commission will step up its efforts to reach a solution before six months are out.

The fact that the Commission does not intend to give up its own objective is, moreover, confirmed by its having submitted recently to the Council and Parliament a new series of action programmes in the non-quota section for a total value of 700 million EUA two-thirds of which are destined to support reconversion in all Member States which have areas affected by the crisis in the steel and textile industries. These proposals are already in line with the new regulation.

What the President of the Council has just said, Mr President, is perfectly true, namely that, even in the absence of decisions, the Regional Fund continues to operate and its appropriations continue to go up, although they remain — I am afraid to say — unsatisfactory, given the extent of our problems. I would add that a reform of the Fund remains vital and urgent. The widespread nature of the crisis is creating a climate in the Community and Member States which threatens to put regional problems into the background in a certain way. I hope you will not mind, Mr President, if I mention in my usual blunt way an example of this trend which I was unfortunate to observe in this Parliament when it took its decisions for the 1983 budget.

The true situation is different. The crisis is aggravating the traditional regional problems and is creating new ones. In reality, it is the regions in trouble which are bearing the major burden of the crisis, including where unemployment is concerned. The Regional Fund is the Community's main instrument for helping manufacturing industries to adapt to new economic and industrial realities. To strengthen it is therefore an urgent task, not just in the interest of some Member States but in order to benefit the entire Community.

Mr Nikolaou (S). — (GR) Mr President, it is common knowledge that over the last ten years the regional imbalances between the Member States have increased dramatically, and this fact emerges clearly from the Commission report on the Mandate of 30 May.

Nikolaou

After the accession of Greece, in particular, the difference in GDP *per capita* between the richest region of the Community, Hamburg, and the poorest region, Thrace, increased to a ratio of twelve to one. Our fundamental belief is that combating the regional imbalances through convergence of the economies of the Member States is one of the main objectives of the Community and should be given immediate priority. Attempts to change the role and the nature of the Regional Fund with a view to pursuing other, similar aims at Community level — such as combating unemployment — are in our view shortsighted and dangerous, because they take no account of the in any case minimal cohesion between the rich and poor countries and regions of the Community. If there is to be any reconciliation of views between the Council, Commission and Parliament, with a view to overcoming the problems, it must become accepted that the Regional Fund was not set up to help the rich and developed countries to overcome their present economic and structural difficulties. Essentially, it represents a counterweight to compensate for the negative consequences — for the poor regions and countries — of accession to the Community. The problem of regional imbalances became more acute after the accession of Greece, and the forthcoming accession of Spain and Portugal will make it even worse, with the result that the restructuring of the Regional Fund will become a matter of the very survival of the Community. I am not talking about any old restructuring. For the Greek Socialists restructuring means strengthening the quota section of the ERDF, and not reducing it, and it means increasing the funds available for infrastructure investment, which is essential for promoting the productive investment in the industrial sector which is so necessary if we are to escape from the present vicious circle of economic crisis.

Mr President, it is the Regional Fund which can contribute most to combating unemployment. I repeat, the Regional Fund and not the Social Fund. Whereas the Social Fund simply alleviates the problem of unemployment, the Regional Fund represents a means of reviving the regions — a genuine force for combating unemployment.

As regards the proposals for an increase from 5 to 20% in the non-quota section, we believe that they are unjustified and would serve only a small number of regions in the developed countries. I would point out, for instance, that the second package of measures proposed under the non-quota section of the ERDF does not contain a single item for Greece, despite the fact that that country is facing serious problems in many sectors such as textiles, shipbuilding and steel. In these same sectors, however — and I say this without envy or rancour — countries like France, Germany and the United Kingdom will be receiving most of the funds under this section.

Mr President, I should like to finish by emphasizing that it is essential to accelerate the process of revising

the Regulation governing the Regional Fund in the spirit evoked by both Mr De Pasquale and Mr Giolitti. Furthermore, we call upon the Council to finally lay down the guidelines we need if we are to respect in full the fundamental principle of bringing the economies of the Member States of the EEC into alignment — a principle which will eventually have to be implemented in practice at some stage.

(The speaker continued in German)

Mr President-in-Office, I listened carefully to what you said. You are, of course, not responsible for what your predecessors have done, and you yourself have expressed your firm intention of taking up the matter. You have not yet been able to give us any clear indications, but I am prepared to accept that you are determined to bring this matter to a positive conclusion during your country's Presidency.

(Applause)

Mr Ingo Friedrich (PPE). — *(DE)* We all know that the substantial income and structural disparities between the various regions of Europe represent a major challenge to European policy. We know also that the European regional policy is one of the principal sources of hope for many Europeans, particularly in southern Europe, but also in Ireland and Scotland, who look to the EEC and to the European Parliament via the Regional Fund for an improvement in their often hopeless personal situation. This bolstering of the poor regions of Europe is also of real interest to the rich regions, because this will create internal EEC markets, which are important for these richer regions.

The European Parliament has repeatedly and energetically worked to improve and develop the regional policy, the last occasion being, as Mr Schlecht mentioned, in April 1982. At that time it voted very clearly for an extensive reform of the Regional Fund Regulation in force.

In so doing we fully recognize that a geographical concentration of resources, which are in any event limited and far too scant in view of the magnitude of the task, is entirely appropriate. We were gratified to see that the new President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Genscher, has already approved some of the principles formulated by us. We are dissatisfied, however, with the fact that since April 1982 the Council has taken no action on this extremely urgent issue, and we wonder why the Council has not yet adopted the principles on the future European regional policy — in particular the transition to programme financing and the increase of the non-quota section — which were approved by Parliament by a large majority. We also ask the Council if it is prepared to implement the amendments to the Regulations requested by Parliament.

Friedrich

I would like to make the following urgent appeal to the Commission. In doing so I speak as a German Christian Democrat and not as the spokesman of my group. We German Democrats accepted the geographical concentration of European resources with a heavy heart and with regret and misgivings — the result being that structurally weak regions in Germany, and my constituency of Middle Franconia is one of these, will henceforth receive almost no funds from the Regional Fund.

If, however, the Commission were now to begin, as I have heard it is planning today to prohibit the *Länder*, for example my *Land* of Bavaria, under Articles 92 ff from providing national assistance and resources, we will, of course, have to gradually withdraw our support.

The Treaties of Rome have been in force since 1957, and what has been legal up until now cannot simply become illegal overnight! One cannot and should not, under the banner of fair competition, suddenly put a stop to any additional regional structural policy on the part of States or *Länder*. A new lawsuit before the European Court of Justice on this question must be avoided. For this reason we say 'yes' to the concentration of European resources from the Regional Fund on the really important problem areas but 'no' to the prevention of a meaningful complementary regional structural policy at Federal and *Land* level.

Mr Harris (ED). — Mr President, could I first of all join you in thanking the Secretary of State for coming here at this late hour and for being here, and also in thanking the Commissioner for his opening remarks.

I think, Mr President, that the Minister did gauge accurately the feeling of the House, which is one of deep frustration over the delays in implementing the reform of the Regional Fund. After all, we must remember that if we had kept to the original target, the new measures would have come into force two years ago in January 1981. For various reasons there were delays in introducing the proposals, but certainly no delay was caused by the considerations in this House. Under the chairmanship of Mr De Pasquale, the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning dealt with the proposals as quickly as possible and gave its opinion in this House in April of last year. Since then it has seemed to many of us that the whole matter has gone underground and disappeared from view. Therein lies the danger, because I am afraid, Mr President, that many people in the regions and in the poorer countries of the Community have been setting great store on the reform of the Fund. They are asking us what on earth has happened to this new regulation which we expected would have come into force a long time ago.

Quite frankly, the elected Members of this House have had great difficulty in answering that question.

We have had to say that we don't really know what is happening inside the Council of Ministers. Now I understand — because I am a politician, as everyone else in this House is a politician — that of course national interests do come into play inside the Council of Ministers' working groups. These are understandable; perhaps we have just had an example of a constituency interest and, of course, we are all interested in protecting our own constituencies and in protecting our own national interests.

For those reasons, therefore, I am a little unhappy with the final words of Mrs Boot's resolution, which she has put before the House to wind up this debate. I hope she will see fit to delete them. I don't think they add much to it. However, I should like to make one thing perfectly clear. My group is fully behind the move initiated by Mrs Boot and by the chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and designed to throw the strength and pressure of this Parliament behind the move to get a decision inside the Council of Ministers.

So, Mr Secretary of State, I am sure you will return to the Council with this simple message — that the regions of Europe are looking to the Council to put an end to the delay, to come to a decision on this matter and to implement the reforms put forward by the Commission and wholeheartedly endorsed by this House.

(Applause)

Mr Cecovini (L). — (IT) On several occasions when I have spoken in this House, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have stated that there is no future for the peoples and nations of Europe without European Union. This opinion is widely shared, yet we are all convinced that no union is possible as long as the economic disparity between the various components of Europe continues to widen which, unfortunately, is still happening.

Reform of the Institutions and the attribution of real decision-making powers to Parliament are obviously the two main goals towards which we are all working with hope and determination. But these goals are still far off and in the meantime, in the opinion of many, we are not doing all that we could with the instruments that we already possess. Nor are we doing enough to prepare new and more suitable instruments.

Foremost among these is the new regulation of the Regional Fund, approval for which is sought in the two oral questions. Why is the Council dragging its feet over providing us with this indispensable tool to relaunch the regional policy? It is not enough to cry out that we need a regional policy, something concrete has to be done to produce one.

This is the precise viewpoint of the proposal of 22 April 1982 which, among other things, seeks to

Cecovini

increase the non-quota section from the 5% decided on in its time experimentally to 20%, which is much more realistic even if still inadequate. We must keep this viewpoint in mind when we read Article 29 of the proposed regulation in which, for the first time, integrated operations are raised to the level of a legal institution, since there is provision for projects under this rubric to be given priority with respect to funds and preferential rates, whether within quotas or outside them. Even more important, in my opinion, is the unwritten desire implicit in such an institution, to confirm the Community's power of initiative whenever such initiative is lacking in the Member States.

An example will help us to comprehend the significance of the proposals. The combined effect of two of the principles which operate today — national quotas and geographical concentration of funds — has meant that in Italy only the South can benefit from Regional Fund appropriations. This is a situation which penalizes regions which enjoyed a certain amount of development in the past but which are nowadays characterized by serious problems of unemployment and industrial and commercial decline.

This is the case of Trieste, for example, which is in just as explosive a situation as the better known ones of Naples and Belfast. An explicit request for regional aid in the form of an integrated operation has been made, but has not been officially put forward by the Italian Government on the pretext that the Council has not yet approved the new regulation of the Regional Fund.

That is why, in my capacity as a signatory to Oral Question No 1048 on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and as a member of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, which submitted the other oral question, both of which have produced the motion for a resolution, I am asking Parliament to approve the motion for a resolution and I am asking the Council to behave in accordance with the expectations of the peoples of Europe and of this Parliament which is their legitimate representative.

Permit me once again to insist on the absolute need for the non-quota increase I have just mentioned to be managed by the Commission and not by the Council, since the latter would only give rise to national egoism again. According to the Treaty it is the Commission and not the Council which is competent for management. It is time to return to this established practice. We in the Liberal Group set great store by the European outlook of the German President in the same way that President Thorn can count on our total support in backing up the Commission's powers.

As Members of this Parliament we declare ourselves ready to take part in a procedure of concertation which, in line with the statements just issued by Commissioner Giolitti, are geared to relaunch regional policy as one of the most effective weapons to combat the crisis. For the time being, we hope that the Council

will do its duty by passing as quickly as possible this new and eagerly awaited regulation.

Mr Gendebien (CDI). — (FR) Mr President, there is absolutely no reason for the Council's delay on this matter which is of such concern to us.

On the one hand, the national governments are concerned at the increase in unemployment; on the other hand, they are neglecting to improve the effectiveness of an instrument to combat this very unemployment. The fact is that the regional concept is popular in Europe, as is the concept of a Community regional policy — which in any case meets a real need. But what is being done in the way of decisive measures to tackle the growing regional imbalances? The sad list of traditionally underdeveloped regions is being joined by a new sad list of regions with old-established industries which are now being rocked by what is euphemistically called restructuring. This is the case in the steel-making regions such as Wallonia, where the workers are on the verge of revolt. Are the powers-that-be waiting for social unrest before they take action?

And now the Community is proposing a further 35 million tonne reduction in crude steel production capacity over the next few years. It is quite clear that this is going to affect employment in these steel-making regions.

Faced with this situation, the Commission — and it must be congratulated on this — is proposing an increase in non-quota measures and the implementation of special reconversion programmes intended to benefit these steel-making regions in particular. This is the essential accompaniment to the Commission's own restructuring policies. This idea must therefore be pursued, and I am sure the entire House agrees on this point.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is only one example to illustrate the urgency of the situation. We insist that the Council do its duty, and we are sure that the Minister — for whose presence here today we are grateful — will convey our feelings to his colleagues.

Mr Eisma (NI). — (NL) It is a distressing fact that, since 22 April 1982, when Parliament expressed its opinion on the reform of the Regional Fund, no decision has been forthcoming from the Council. And the situation remains distressing after the answer from the German Secretary of State, because a Council which, on a number of occasions over the last nine months, has indicated that the employment situation is its major worry ought to realize that this Fund is a particularly appropriate instrument for a Community employment policy. But now the Council is procrastinating on the reform of the Fund, the effect of which would be to make it more effective in helping to allev-

Eisma

iate the unemployment problem in the most backward parts of Europe. The point of this debate is not to go into excessive detail on the substance of the proposed reform of the Regional Fund. That being so, I should just like to say that I hope that the principles of concentration and the non-quota section will be respected when the decision is actually taken.

Finally, I should like to ask the Council to give consideration to the national administration of resources from the Regional Fund. Too much money from the Fund is still being used in place of national resources, although the Regional Fund is supposed to be of a complementary nature. We shall have to take steps to ensure that the Community can keep a closer watch on how regional aid is used, so that the Fund itself is put to more effective use.

Mr O'Donnell (PPE). — Mr President, I too would like to join with my colleagues in thanking the Secretary of State for his presence here this evening.

The questions which are the subject of this debate serve to highlight the worry, the disappointment and indeed the impatience of Members from all sides of this House at the delay by the Council in giving the green light to the new guidelines and regulations for the European Regional Development Fund. Down through the years this Parliament has continuously and consistently called for the formulation and implementation of a coherent and realistic European regional policy. Our hopes of having this objective realized were raised following the publication in 1981 of the new proposals and guidelines by the Commission. Subsequently, the De Pasquale report was endorsed by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and later enthusiastically welcomed and approved by the European Parliament.

The delay by the Council — which indeed the Secretary of State has acknowledged — in making up its mind about this vitally important issue is causing grave concern to the Members of this Parliament, particularly to those of us who have had experience of working in depressed areas and those of us who are particularly interested in regional policy. Through the medium of the initiative taken by Mrs Boot and Mr De Pasquale, we appeal tonight to the German Presidency to do everything possible to expedite the resolution of the differences which have delayed the implementation by the Council of this new regulation.

Commissioner Giolitti referred to the various elements contained in the new package of proposals. He referred to the concentration of the Fund in areas of greatest need, the formulation of integrated development programmes and operations and the vitally important factor of the coordination of the various EEC instruments with national aids. I regard the concept of multiannual integrated development programmes, specially designed to develop all the

resources of a region, human as well as physical, through the coordinated application of the various Community and national aids, as being the only realistic and feasible formula with any hope of solving the growing and very alarming regional disparities which are a marked characteristic of this Community. They are sorely needed at this time of very severe economic recession, which is having serious repercussions on the economies of all our Member States with particularly disastrous consequences for Europe's poorer regions.

I join with my colleagues in supporting the initiative taken by Mrs Boot and Mr De Pasquale in appealing to the Council for a speedy resolution to whatever difficulties might have arisen. The new instrument and the new proposals offer the first real hope of finding a solution to the growing disparities in this Community.

One final point: I understand that there are differences of opinion in the Council regarding the question of integrated operations. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposal for an integrated operation in relation to housing in Belfast has not been proceeded with. Perhaps the Secretary of State would comment on the situation in Belfast before this debate concludes?

(Applause)

Mr Simpson (ED). — *(DE)* Mr Schlecht, together with my colleagues I should like to thank you for your presence here so late this evening.

(Applause — the speaker continued in English)

The failure of the governments of the Member States to take the necessary action to introduce the new Regional Fund is yet another case of delay and inability to act by the Council, which in the present situation is stultifying not merely the introduction of new policies but also the updating of existing policies.

I represent in my constituency of Northamptonshire the steel town of Corby, where in 1980 5 500 men were laid off and at present several hundred more are being laid off from the tube works there. Corby benefits from the Regional Fund and to date has had about £ 5 000 000. But the delay is causing concern for the future of Corby and there is also concern about the levels for qualification — the proposals to change the qualifications in the Commission's proposal would mean that Corby would no longer qualify if the third level, which in the United Kingdom is the county level, were applicable. They would have to take their luck as a possible black spot, although their percentage of unemployment is over 20% in a county whose average is about the national average of 11%.

If I might just permit myself, Mr President, one comment. The United Kingdom is one of the countries whose regions will benefit from the new proposals. It

Simpson

is not untypical that here tonight we see no United Kingdom Labour Members of the House who represent, in fact, many of the areas in the United Kingdom that will benefit. It is ironic perhaps that they are prepared to give more support to the women of Greenham Common, witness the earlier debate, than they are to their own constituents.

Finally, Mr President, the Regional Fund is one of the newer funds which deals with unemployment, the biggest scourge in the Community today, and it is intolerable that the Council continues to ignore the call of Parliament and the Commission and that there should be such long delays in the adopting of the necessary legislation.

President. — I call Mrs Boot to introduce her motion for a resolution winding up the debate.

Mrs Boot (PPE). — (NL) In introducing my motion for a resolution, I should at the same time like to reply in some measure to what was said by the Under-Secretary of State and by Mr Giolitti. Beginning with our motion for a resolution, we think it is high time some kind of decision was taken. Indeed, under my breath, I am tempted to say: any decision, just so long as something is decided. We cannot persevere any longer with a regulation which is, strictly speaking, no longer in force. From what we read in the press and according to what we have heard from Mr Genscher himself, the elections in the Federal Republic of Germany will have no effect whatsoever on the German Presidency. On the contrary, it is claimed that the elections will guarantee continuity of policy and of the European spirit. We therefore thought that, if there was to be any chance of achieving conciliation, the joint opinion of the Council must be known to us by, say, 1 May, so that a final decision can be taken by 30 June. I would point out that it is not in itself essential to set in motion the conciliation procedure, because if Parliament finds the Council's joint opinion acceptable, there will be no need for conciliation.

As regards the final paragraph of the motion for a resolution, I should like to point out that Mr Harris has said that he has some doubts regarding the final clause stating that 'Parliament expects the interests of the Community to prevail over those of the individual Member States'. What this amounts to is in fact precisely the same as what you will often find in connection with economic measures, i.e. that they should be in the interests of what is the subject of the regulation. In other words, if we are talking about transport, then any such measures must be in the interests of the transport sector. What we have here is a Community measure, and we are thus dealing with the Community's interests. It is quite possible that the measure in question — a payment from the quota or non-quota section to a particular Member State — can rightly be regarded as being in the interests of the Community. I

would therefore call on the House to reject Mr Harris's amendment when it comes to the vote tomorrow, on the grounds that his amendment is not European in spirit.

The Secretary of State replied to the first two points in the Commission's proposals regarding concentration and the increase in the non-quota section. In fact, he did not have a very great deal to say, just that the matter was a complicated one and that there was a difference of opinion between the various delegations. Mr Giolitti expressed his indebtedness to the Danish Presidency for what it had achieved, although I must say that we noticed very little of it. During the Danish tenure of the Presidency, there was not one single debate of principle in the Council — only a mid-term procedural discussion. That is precisely why we initiated this debate. Our questions were originally tabled in October, and had the effect of at least exerting a little pressure on the Danish Presidency, because the Danish President of the Council did not know how soon he would be expected to make a statement at the meeting of the committee in November.

I have therefore no real idea, Mr Secretary of State, of the intentions of the Council, and perhaps you would be so kind as to let us have your personal views on the other matters mentioned, that is to say, the financing of programmes, the granting to the Commission of the power to take decisions concerning the non-quota section and the important question of coordination. After all, judging by what Mr Friedrich said, there appears to be some misunderstanding on this point. I believe that the Community's regional policy is supposed to be complementary to national policy, but as I said in my previous speech, it is far more important for us to harmonize global economic policy at Community level. It is a fact of life both at Community and national level that, when global economic policy is in decline, regional policy measures have no effect either. I am therefore particularly pleased that you have come today, because you are qualified to talk about macro-economic policy. Unfortunately, Mr Nikolaou is no longer here; I had intended to draw attention to the illogicalities in his speech, where he referred to the unfavourable consequences of Customs Union, but at the same time called for the convergence of national economies.

Mr De Pasquale (COM). — (IT) Mr President, on behalf of the committee I should like to say that this debate has gained in importance through the presence of the Minister, whom I wish to thank. It was also appropriately timed, coming as it did at the start of the Presidency of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The reply given to us by the President-in-Office was provisional, and we neither expected a definitive reply nor were we in a position to expect one. The political aim of the committee was precisely to underline the importance of this matter, which we consider under-

De Pasquale

rated, and to underline it at the start of the German Presidency, so that the Presidency could have adequate time to prepare its measures, as has been promised by the President-in-Office.

I should also like to thank Mr Giolitti for his presence and his remarks. We on the committee have signed, and will be voting in favour of, the motion tabled after Mrs Boot's question, since we feel that this vote must be considered essentially as an encouragement to the Council.

I should like to stress the conciliation aspect. Perhaps Mrs Boot should remember that conciliation is required when the Council is trying to shrug off Parliament's decisions. This is the meaning and content of the interinstitutional agreements on conciliation.

Of course, if the Council approves the Commission proposal and Parliament's amendments *in toto*, no conciliation will be required. However, since I do not believe that this is likely, Parliament must make sure it is involved in effective conciliation, so that it can defend the opinions it approved by such a large majority. On the whole, therefore, I feel that this debate has been of undoubted value.

Mr Schlecht, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) Mr President, you have had a very serious debate here on European regional policy, and in view of the gravity of this debate I feel I have a duty as representative of the Council and the Presidency, despite the late hour, to make a few concluding remarks and provide some answers.

Firstly, I should like to express my thanks for the many suggestions, proposals and thought-provoking comments made today, as indeed in previous Parliament discussions. I would like to assure you that the Council will take these suggestions very seriously.

Secondly, the Council is fully aware of the major significance of the further development of the European Regional Fund, particularly against the background of the overall economic situation and the gloomy employment situation in our countries. We must indeed in such a situation make every effort to promote investment and thereby permanent jobs.

In this context the Regional Fund has its own very important contribution to make. It has been stated repeatedly today that regional policy must be considered as part of general economic policy. On this point the debate also produced full agreement.

Thirdly, the main task is therefore the efficient use of the resources of the Fund to improve the employment situation in the structurally weakest regions of the Community. Efficiency means mainly geographical concentration of the Fund's resources on the weakest regions. In my opinion efficiency also means concen-

trating on using the Fund, for example, to promote investments which best serve the objective of job creation.

In its efforts to arrive at solutions as quickly as possible the German Presidency will give precedence to these priority tasks. After prior consultations with the responsible Commissioner, Mr Giolitti, I myself will give an account on the progress of negotiations and further proceedings to the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning in Brussels on 28 January. I consider that it is important to try first of all to eliminate the biggest obstacles to agreement in the Council, and these are the fixing of quotas, the question of concentration but also the question of the 'non-quota' section.

Programme financing would also be useful, and the whole thing must of course take place in the framework of an effective coordination of regional policy as part of overall economic policy.

It is of prime importance that we reach agreement on and solve these priority problems, and it is with this objective that we will tackle the negotiations with a sense of commitment. There are still some unsolved problems, there are still some conflicts of interest.

Permit me now in two sentences to depart from my role as objective Council representative. Firstly, concentration means of course geographical concentration. If some are to receive more, then something must be taken from others, at least relatively speaking. Unfortunately, that is not always very popular, particularly before elections.

Secondly, the increase in the non-quota section. This is obviously only meaningful — and this is the only objective that can make it worthwhile — if this non-quota section is used as emergency aid in places where there really is an emergency and if this instrument is not used to bring about by the back door a return to the initial positions.

In spite of this we will enter the negotiations in committed fashion with the said objective, but we shall also dilute our enthusiasm somewhat. Thank goodness that it is not possible in the framework of democratic and, above all, European decision-making processes simply to come forward with a pat solution at the Council table, nor is it possible to simply cut the Gordian knot. In short we must both try to reach an understanding, to find compromises. In conclusion I should like to assure you that the Presidency will work towards this end. Again, thank you for your suggestions and the encouragement you have given us today but also for the pressure you have brought to bear in this direction.

(Applause)

Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. If we are going to take a vote, I simply

Kellett-Bowman

want to ask whether an explanation of vote will be permitted.

President. — You can give an explanation of vote tomorrow morning.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED). — May I put my name down for that, because this is the most important matter that has come up before this Parliament for a very long time?

President. — We are voting now only on the proposal to have an early vote. Your name will be entered and you can give your explanation of vote tomorrow morning.

We will now vote on whether to hold an early vote.

(Parliament adopted the proposal to hold an early vote)

The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

10. *Parliament and discharge for 1980 — Discharge to the Commission on the implementation of the budget for 1980 — Embargo on exports of cereals to the USSR in 1980 (continuation)*

President. — The next item is a continuation of the joint debate on the Key and Battersby reports (Docs 1-760/82 and 1-1003/82).¹

Mr Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* Mr President, this item was included on the agenda for November but was postponed. For the rest, I do not know why it was postponed since we have not discussed it in the meantime in the Committee on Budgets and the rapporteur, Mr Key, has had nothing to add. There may be a few Members who can remember that discharge was to have been given in the spring but was then postponed on the grounds that the Committee wanted answers from the Commission on a few points. We have now had these answers, but in the meantime a highly disturbing situation has come about as regards the financial affairs of our own Assembly. Officials are being moved around, the press are publishing deplorable stories concerning payments to members and the Court of Auditors is issuing a provisional report on this question. Naturally, these questions must be looked into more closely and the enlarged Bureau has in its wisdom appointed private companies for this purpose. However, we can well expect the Committee on Budgetary Control to be informed about what has hap-

pened and of ways of avoiding such an unfortunate situation in the future.

In its exclusive right to give discharge, Parliament has a political tool, which it used last spring to wrest a few satisfactory answers from the Commission, and I find it only right and proper that this tool should also be used *vis-à-vis* the administration of Parliament itself. I think, therefore, that we should give discharge to the Commission but postpone the discharge in connection with Parliament's own accounts until the Committee on Budgetary Control has received the information it has asked for and which it needs if its work is to have any meaning. We are not here just to pick on the Commission but, I would have thought, also to see to it that our own house is in order. There can be no doubt that the somewhat easy-going, to put it mildly, methods with which we are now familiar in our own administration were also applied in 1980, and we would be a crowd of spineless wretches if we failed to use the tool at our disposal. We owe it to ourselves to find out what real problems there were in Parliament's administration and what was just malicious gossip. For this reason I have tabled amendments to the effect that the discharge of Parliament's accounts should be postponed until the various outstanding questions have been fully looked into and the Committee on Budgetary Control informed of the results. I would call on the Members of this Parliament to set aside any political considerations which are totally irrelevant to this matter and, for the sake of our own reputation, to vote in favour of my amendments. No one should ever be able to accuse us of pointing a finger at others whilst covering up our own shortcomings.

Mr Mart (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I am bound to make a preliminary remark on the way in which this debate has been organized.

It is a pity that the decision on the 1980 discharge has been held up for two months and could not be taken last November. It is a pity because of the importance of this decision, but it is particularly regrettable in view of the circumstances which led to the delay. The pressure exerted last November to defer the debate constitutes a disturbing precedent.

Be that as it may, the discharge for the 1980 budgetary year has given rise to an intense dialogue with the Commission, during which fundamental problems affecting the Community have been dealt with. Thanks to the hard work and perseverance of the Committee on Budgetary Control and of its Chairman, Mr Aigner, considerable progress has been made. Mr Key's report, and in particular the resolution attached to the discharge decision, outline this progress. The Liberal Group especially welcomes the Commission's statements in support of reinforcing the Community's financial autonomy and the mechanisms of own resources.

¹ See Wednesday's debates.

Mart

As regards exports of agricultural produce to the USSR, our group is pleased to see that the Commission now considers it possible and appropriate to strengthen these legal and administrative instruments so that a better check can be kept on such exports. But in addition to these improvements, to which must be added those concerning accounting, the Social Fund, etc, we would stress the progress made with regard to the institutional importance of the discharge procedure. I should like to take this opportunity of drawing attention to the decisive role played by our colleague, Mr Irmer, who is not here today, in helping to a great extent to make the discharge procedure the instrument of political supervision which Parliament now possesses. Over the last few years we have defined the legal significance of the procedure, the compulsory nature of the remarks included in the discharge and its importance for accounting purposes. This year the progress we have made has been just as considerable. Thanks to Mr Irmer's initiative, we have obliged the Commission, by deferring the discharge, to carry out a certain number of reforms. Thus the discharge is becoming an instrument of the Community's legislative process.

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to ask all our colleagues to look more closely at the practical as well as the institutional possibilities offered to them by budgetary control and the discharge procedure.

Mr Marck (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, Mr Schön has already expressed the opinion of the EPP Group on the Key report. It is now my job to do the same for the Battersby report, and the first thing I have to say is that the EPP Group will be supporting the report and the motion for a resolution and rejecting the amendments.

The Battersby report essentially reflects the conclusions drawn very authoritatively by Mr Aigner. There have in the past been obvious shortcomings with regard to the embargo on exports of cereals to the Soviet Union from the point of view both of the information made available to the European Parliament and the implementation of Parliament's resolutions. It is essential that lessons be learnt in this respect for the future. We can all agree on the need for greater transparency in the way the embargo works, more effective monitoring, improved coordination in sales policy — including the conclusion of long-term contracts — and equal treatment of all countries with which we have trading relations, and bearing in mind our export refund policy. That does not mean, though, that we should work out cumbersome administrative procedures which would have the effect of hampering or even paralysing the flow of trade. That is a point I should like to discuss in a little more detail, and ask the Commission to say precisely where it stands.

Over the coming years, the European Community will have to export substantial quantities of agricultural

products, including — whether we like it or not — to state-trading countries, and in particular the Soviet Union, where the demand for our products will remain high for reasons of which we are well aware. Should the Commission introduce cumbersome procedures, we shall be faced with the same kind of situation we have experienced over recent weeks with regard to butter exports to the Soviet Union. The flow of exports will dry up, and we shall have to look around for other openings, which will mean that it will be impossible to achieve the aims proposed by the House. It therefore follows that there is no point in reducing the export subsidies to the Soviet Union to zero and at the same time allowing the very same products to finish up in the Soviet Union anyway via satellite countries like Rumania and Bulgaria, which enjoy more favourable trading conditions with the Community. On this point, I should like to ask the Commission in a personal capacity whether it regards the system of public tendering for export subsidies as sacrosanct, and whether it would not be just as reasonable to consider the system of prior determination, given the necessary control guarantees.

I should like to state in conclusion that we are in favour of a realistic, transparent and financially acceptable policy with the right degree of flexibility and capable of maintaining the essential export flow of agricultural products from the Community.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, we are faced today with a constitutional issue between Parliament and the Commission. It concerns, on the one hand, the deplorable and indefensible failures of the Commission to carry out instructions on export policy in 1980 and, on the other hand, the misleading and deceitful attitude adopted by the Commission when Parliament was questioning the Commission on its performance in export sales.

The indictment of the Commission is clear: the Aigner report and now the Battersby report from the Committee on Budgetary Control make it abundantly plain that the Commission was in serious breach of its responsibilities. Notwithstanding Parliament's adopted resolution of 15 February 1980 on exports to the USSR and the Council's instructions of 15 January of that year regarding sales to the USSR, i.e. to keep these to normal levels, the Commission cocked a snook at both institutions and at the freedom-loving and hard-pressed taxpayers of Europe and sold by value nearly four times more agricultural produce than normal. Butter and butter-oil exports doubled; wheat flour exports leapt from nil to 330 000 tonnes; sugar exports increased by 376 %; soya cake rocketed to 3 600 %. What an indictment of the Commission's non-performance!

In the meantime, close to the end of 1980, Parliament was told that huge sales to the USSR were just a newspaper story, that normal levels of sales would not be

Hord

exceeded, that the denials of huge sales had been repeatedly made and that it was beneath the dignity of this House to have a solemn debate on pure rumours.

So rather than admit or defend the failures, the Commission chose to chastise Parliament for doing its job. Even the former President Jenkins personally said to Parliament that traditional levels would not be exceeded. He said it was a policy to which the Commission would stick.

Since then the Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control has investigated the situation and found it to be even worse than we first feared. What was the response of the Commission? To shrug their shoulders and talk about the current year's export levels. They tried to suggest that Parliament's figures were wrong until it was proved that these were based on the Commission's own figures. We had no admission of fault, no withdrawal of criticism of Parliament for carrying out its responsibilities, just a hint that things should get better in the future.

What is crystal clear, Mr President, is that Parliament's inquiries and investigations have been completely justified by the facts. I would like to pay tribute to Mr Aigner and the Secretariat for their efforts.

What is also evident is that the Commission stands indicted for its failure to obey the Council's instructions. It is also to be adjudged guilty of misleading and deceiving Parliament. These are the acts which would normally, I believe, Mr President, warrant a censure motion, but as there is now a new collegiate Commission body, it is my hope that Parliament will express its dissatisfaction with the former Commission, in the interests of maintaining the dignity of this institution, by supporting the Battersby report and the amendments tabled in mine and other colleagues' names.

Mr Martin (COM). — (FR) Mr President, nine months after the vote in the House on the Aigner report on the sale of agricultural produce to the USSR here we are dealing with another report on the same subject, and it is even less acceptable than the first one. People are obsessed about it. Can we not find something better to do in this Parliament than have endless debates on matters which have become the pet subject of the Committee on Budgetary Control? It is right for the Committee to play a part in monitoring the use of Community funds, because that is its job. But it is not right for it to be gradually transformed into some kind of super Court of Justice.

After Mr Aigner here is Mr Battersby unleashing the mob of legal experts, who go over the top whenever they get on to the subject of the socialist countries. As for the facts, they just ignore them or twist them. And they juggle with the figures to suit themselves. They find any pretext to develop their tactics left over from the cold war and to jeopardize the principles of inter-

national trade between countries with different social systems. Mr Battersby, like Mr Aigner before him, again accuses the Commission of not being thorough enough in observing the embargo which was the idea of the Americans.

The fact of the matter is that the figures show otherwise, but no one is so deaf as the person who does not want to listen. During the embargo the Commission did not issue a single export licence for wheat, the level of refunds dropped and less butter was exported. During the same period the United States sold butter to Russia *via* New Zealand. The Commission enforced a stricter embargo than the Americans themselves because it was extended to cover other products — butter, beef and poultry — even though these products did not represent traditional items of American trade. This is an undeniable fact and it is a matter of regret to us that at the time the Commission and the Council kowtowed to the Americans so willingly.

Even though the efforts of Mr Aigner and Mr Battersby are not based on any serious argument, they have unfortunately produced results and the Commission has fallen into the trap. This explains why it is making every effort to stop butter exports to the USSR. As we feared, the tendering system which was so painstakingly worked out was totally ineffective and not a single tonne of butter was sold. But an operation of this kind to clear stocks is vital if we want to stop market prices from collapsing. The United States was not slow in taking advantage of the opportunity offered them to negotiate the sale of thousands of tonnes of butter to the Russians. If milk producers have problems during the present year, all those who support or endorse the Aigner-Battersby plan will be directly to blame. At any rate, in the campaign over the 1983-84 farm prices we certainly shall not be lax in warning producers to reject this plan as well as the Commission proposals for a reduction of the intervention price for milk. For the present, we want the ban on butter imports from New Zealand to be maintained for as long as there are no actual exports to the Soviet Union.

(Applause)

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, as I have very little time, I will make a brief comment on the Battersby report. It is not often that I take the opportunity to defend the Commission, but on this occasion I think the Commission needs to be defended.

I have never heard such rubbish as I have heard in this House tonight. People are complaining because the Commission tries to do what it was asked to do a few years ago, which was to keep products moving. And the very people who criticize it now for keeping the products moving are the first to criticize it when stocks begin to pile up and we have to pay increased sums of taxpayers' money to store the agricultural

Maher

produce. We cannot have it both ways: I praise the Commission — in view of the constraints which were put upon them — for keeping the products moving.

Mr Battersby, I always thought you were a sensible man, but I am beginning to change my mind about you. Surely you know that if you begin to pile up large stocks of products, you are immediately putting yourself into a buyers' market: they know then that you have the product and they will wait until you have more of it, so that they will get it at an even lower price. Therefore, the refunds have to be higher in order to dispose of the stocks.

Anyway — and what nonsense this is — we still export industrial products to Russia. There is not a word said about that.

I could also make another point. We talk about the winds of change. Where are the winds of change coming from Russia? They are still in Afghanistan. They are still behind the oppression of the Polish people. They are still persecuting the people of their own countries who dare to say a word against the régime. Where are the winds of change? But now it is all right to export. Now it is all right to buy gas from them. It is fine now. It also suits the Americans, Mr President, when the change comes, to supply them with wheat. A few months before that it was all wrong.

I would like us to be consistent in our approach to Russia and to stop all exports, industrial as well, and also credits to the Russians designed to aid industrial exports. Let us be consistent at least!

I would appeal to Mr Battersby particularly.

As I said, I thought he had some common sense and some knowledge of business. For God's sake, Mr Battersby, don't try to mix politics with commerce, because in that way in fact you destroy trade. Let the traders get on with the job and keep the politics apart!

Mr Clinton (PPE). — Mr President, I am sorry to have to say what I am now going to say about the Battersby report, because Mr Battersby is normally both reasonable and objective. This report in my view is neither reasonable nor objective. My assessment of the Commission's management of the embargo is that it was over-scrupulous in its performance, and I hope to establish this before I finish speaking.

Most of the exports that took place during that period were on foot of licences issued prior to the introduction of the embargo, and the remainder were exports over which the Commission had no control whatsoever because they took place without refunds. Would anybody in his sane senses suggest that traders should be forced to break contracts entered into before the embargo decision? We cannot have one view on contracts entered into in relation to the

famous pipeline and another on exports of agricultural products. There must be some consistency in the way the Community acts and reacts.

In the case of wheat, the Community issued no export licences during the entire period of the embargo. No licences were issued during 1980 for exports of barley to the USSR. The embargo in the case of barley was therefore fully observed. The exports of animal feedingstuffs were so insignificant as not to be worth mention. Protein exports — referred to by one of my friends here on the left — get no refunds whatsoever, and any reference to them is totally irrelevant.

In the case of butter exports for the whole of the embargo period, that is from January 1980 to April 1981, these represented an annual average of 75 000 tonnes as compared to the 135 000 tonnes exported in 1979. In this case, as in the case of other products, we can take it that at least some of this quantity was exported on the basis of licences issued prior to the embargo. In any case, it is difficult to understand why an embargo should have been placed at all on butter exports to the USSR, since such exports could not in any way be considered, in the words of the decision, 'as replacing directly or indirectly deliveries to the Soviet market'. The fact is that the United States had no trade in butter with the USSR and did not include butter among the items in its original embargo. Some Member States in the Community are quite irrational about exports of butter to Russia but have a quite different attitude to imports of butter into the Community, which is already over-supplied.

Paragraph 6 suggests a permanent extension of the tender system, which is not appropriate to the milk sector where products in many cases are not uniform and vary from one Member State to another. Such a system gives rise to serious difficulties for small traders. We in Ireland had established a worthwhile trade in butter to Russia, but that trade has been killed because of the tender system and because refunds are not allowed to operate in the normal way.

We are simply crazy not to allow normal development of the Russian market. We are going to lose it, if we have not already done so. This is not the Commission's fault but the fault of this Parliament and the fault of some Ministers in the Council. The reality of the situation is that the Commission have done their job too well and too scrupulously. If they had managed the market according to their own judgement, the Community would have been saved a lot of money and the only remaining market and outlet for butter would still be available, at reasonable returns to the Community.

In conclusion, Mr President, it is quite disgraceful to see this House and what should be a serious discharge report being used to fire the first shots in the forthcoming British general election. This applies more

Clinton

than to the amendments tabled by Mr Hord and others than it does to the report itself.

Mr Aigner (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control. — (DE) Mr President, at the close of this debate I should like principally to thank Parliament for permitting us to postpone discharge last year. Everybody who has followed the debate with the Commission — and our rapporteur will confirm this — knows that this postponement was a great help to the Commission. The Commission made considerable concessions which it might not otherwise have made. First of all therefore we would like to thank the majority of Parliament for supporting us at that time. Special thanks are due to our two rapporteurs, above all our colleague Mr Key, who — and I do not say this just out of politeness — prepared this discharge policy with great political understanding and above all great perseverance and determination — after all, that is what politics is all about.

On the Battersby report I should like to say the following: the last speakers in this debate, whom we have just heard, represent a small minority in this Parliament. They appear to be totally ignorant of the true political purpose of our work. Why? It was our task to examine the Commission's policy to determine if the declarations made to Parliament also reflect its political will. And here I can state that this was not the case, not because the Commission did not wish it, but because the instruments necessary to carry out this policy were not mobilized in time, with the result that the political will of the Commission, the Council and Parliament simply could not be carried out.

For this reason I make the following request to the Commission: when such a political will is formulated, then the instruments must be made operational. It suffices to listen to the American President when he said three days ago that it would take nine months before an embargo become effective. Now you see the result, it is our own fault for creating a faulty instrument. Mr Narjes, you must try to prevent your political will from being sabotaged by the machinery of your officials. Now I know that that is putting it very strongly, but that is the truth as it emerges from our analysis. Mrs Boserup quite rightly said that nothing had actually happened and she did not understand why discharge was postponed by one month. I don't understand it either. The background to the postponement is that the President held the view that the substance of paragraph 6 of the resolution contained something resembling a judgement. This is not the case.

We are granting discharge only for the rendering of accounts and the political will. If later a fact should emerge, indicating budgetary infringements or even criminal acts, this discharge will not of course affect the political or disciplinary judgment. Thus discharge is not a legal judgment excluding any further discussion of new facts.

Nobody from the Committee on Budgetary Control is opposed to agricultural exports to the Soviet Union. If

there is no embargo, when trading is normal, I'm the last person opposed to such exports to the Soviet Union. If, however, we know that we have a potential buyer, he does not need to be highly subsidized and should pay the normal price. We have had a situation where thousands of millions — that was not this last time — were given in special concessions. Nobody can claim that that is a healthy policy.

It is a pity, Mr Maher, that you did not follow our discussion in detail. I am opposed to arguing about sales policy here publicly in the market place. One can only get the highest price if one has a sales strategy. This requires a certain confidentiality as well as flexibility, which has not been adequately displayed by the Commission to date. I welcome the fact that there has been a good deal for argument about this within the Commission. I no doubt have the support of the House when I say that it is better for us to spend a hundred thousand more and use the surplus agricultural products for internal measures and assistance and social measures than to bow to a policy of blackmail by the Soviet Union and virtually throw away hundreds of thousands. This is the alternative we face. It is in this light that I ask you to look at this debate and our decisions. I should like to say one further word about the agenda. I greatly regret — and I am gradually beginning to doubt the intelligence of the Bureau — that it was not possible to discuss the only legislative act which this Parliament has power to execute, namely discharge, at a time other than after 9 p.m. or on the last day. That is simply intolerable, and I therefore move that the appointment of a new member of the Court of Auditors in particular should be dealt with tomorrow morning as the first or second item, because otherwise we will not have the required majority to execute a legislative act of this kind. After all, we have been fighting for years gradually to acquire the right to appoint Commission members, but if we treat our rights as we have been doing, I am beginning to doubt whether we have the political will to do so.

President. — The joint debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

Mr Aigner (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control. — (DE) I have proposed a motion. I request that you now take a vote on whether we can begin the debate on the appointment of the new member of the Court of Auditors directly at 9 a.m. and subsequently take a vote on it.

President. — I had hoped that we might be able to deal with that matter at about three minutes to midnight, but we have overrun our time. It will be the first item tomorrow morning immediately after the votes.¹

(The sitting was closed at 12.10 a.m.)

¹ Agenda for the next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX

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 'fisheries'

- HELMS (Doc. 1-1108/82/rev.)
- PERY (Doc. 1-1116/82)
- LORD O'HAGAN (Doc. 1-1119/82)
- LE ROUX (Doc. 1-1123/82)

replaced by Amendment No 1 (Gautier) which was ADOPTED.

*
* *

EWING MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1132/82 'fisheries'): REJECTED

*
* *

ISRAËL MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1104/82 'Attempt on the Pope's life'): REJECTED

*
* *

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'SECRET SERVICES'

- Antoniozzi (Doc. 1-1113/82)
- Bettiza (Doc. 1-1115/82)

replaced by the Didò and Gawronski amendments which were ADOPTED.

*
* *

FERGUSON MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1118/82 'Prague declaration'): ADOPTED

*
* *

**LANGES MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1112/82 'Nicaragua'):
ADOPTED**

*
* *

**THEOBALD-PAOLI MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1117/82 'Jews in
the USSR'): ADOPTED**

*
* *

**LUSTER MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1124/82 'Namibia'):
ADOPTED**

*
* *

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'NATURAL DISASTERS'

- CINCIARI RODANO (Doc. 1-1099/82): ADOPTED
- DE LA MALENE (Doc. 1-1103/82): ADOPTED
- BARBAGLI (Doc. 1-1109/82): ADOPTED
- BARBI (Doc. 1-1110/82): ADOPTED
- SIMONNET (Doc. 1-1131/82): ADOPTED

*
* *

**DE PASQUALE MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1121/82 'Mediterranean
programmes'): ADOPTED**

*
* *

**CHRISTOPHER JACKSON MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1145/82
'car industry'): ADOPTED**

*
* *

**MÜLLER-HERMANN MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1146/82
'Automobile market'): ADOPTED**

*
* *

VON WOGAU REPORT (Doc. 1-960/82 'Intra-Community trade'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was:

— IN FAVOUR of all the amendments.

Explanation of vote

Mr Leonardi (COM). — (IT) Mr President, in this explanation of vote I want to say that we have voted in favour of so many of these amendments because we have always been in favour of abolishing obstacles to trade and facilitating trade within the Community. I think, however, that the time has now come for us to realize that the problem is not so much one of fighting obstacles as of making up our minds to adopt the sort of policies that will prevent the obstacles from arising. Otherwise, we run the risk of continuing to vote in favour of measures without obtaining the results that we hope for. We shall be committing ourselves to a labour of Sisyphus. What we must do is thus prevent obstacles from arising, and not run after them subsequently attempting to abolish them: everyone knows that it is much easier to create an obstacle than to abolish it.

For this reason we have voted in favour of all the proposed measures. Nevertheless, we should like to draw your attention to the fact that we believe that the only way out of the present situation is to create Community policies which aimed precisely at preventing obstacles to free trade from arising, and which will promote intra-Community trade. As for customs checks within the Community, we must make up our minds to implement reforms, while making a clear distinction between internal customs checks and external customs checks, because otherwise our common market would not be able to function. If these internal checks are eliminated, many obstacles will not even be able to arise, because there will be no basis for them. In other words, reform of internal customs checks and a clear distinction between those and the external customs checks.

Finally, we wish to say that the development of the internal market — and this is something we must realize — really cannot be promoted by protectionism with regard to the outside world. The only genuine protection we can offer the internal market is to improve our competitiveness. Only in that way will we improve and protect our internal market, not by erecting protectionist barriers against the outside world: such measures are reactionary and only hamper economic development.

*
* *

ROGALLA REPORT (Doc. 1-976/82 'turnover'): ADOPTED

*
* *

WELSH REPORT (Doc. 1-968/82 'border controls'): ADOPTED

*
* *

HAAGERUP REPORT (Doc. 1-946/82 'European security'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was:

- IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 17, 34, 35, 36, 39 and 43;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60/rev., 61/rev. and 62.

Explanations of vote

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to make one or two brief comments on the amendments I have tabled. Having been born as an economic Community, our Community is gradually taking on a political dimension, which is precisely one of the aims that we have established for it. This being so, I think that the notion of basing the security of Europe for the foreseeable future purely on the protection of the United States is unacceptable.

The European Community must start to give some thought to the question of ultimately providing for its own security in an autonomous manner.

It does not come within our remit, in this House, to discuss purely military questions. Nevertheless, I attached some importance to tabling there three proposals, all of which are in keeping with the idea of a more sharply defined identity for Europe:

- the coordination of our views on the international disarmament negotiations, in particular those at Geneva or Madrid, in order to prevent us from being divided by external manoeuvres;
- the strengthening of our industrial cooperation, where such cooperation will help to increase our independence, in the field of high technology and armaments;
- the promotion of cooperation with the Western European Union's Parliamentary Assembly, so as to bring the military and the political dimensions of our security closer together.

I should like to thank all those members of this House who believe that Europe must cease to be a mere issue over which the super-powers squabble, a pawn even in the conflict between them, and who have given their support to these amendments.

Mr Bournias (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, European political cooperation and European security are one of the major issues — if not indeed the major issue — at this moment of global crisis. This global dimension is to be found in the introduction and detailed explanatory statement, and the rapporteur Mr Haagerup was deservedly applauded for his painstaking efforts.

Even such points as the interpretation of the peace movements in Europe and America, which are in many respects being manipulated for various reasons — one of them being the policy of the Trojan Horse, which the Soviet Union is implementing in Europe — are examined with the seriousness they deserve.

For these reasons, and because the motion recognizes the need to maintain close links with the United States and Canada, which I consider to be the most reliable safeguard for European security, I will unreservedly vote in favour of the motion for a resolution.

Mrs Charzat (S). — (FR) Mr President, Mr Haagerup's report on European political cooperation and security has the merit of tackling a fundamental problem that concerns the future of the Community from the point of view of its security. All the same, although it has been redrafted, paragraph 5 of the Haagerup report still establishes a connection between European political cooperation and the Atlantic Alliance. In my opinion, however, the Member States of the Community, which are all equal amongst themselves, need wider autonomy in industrial, economic and political matters. That is why I, as a French Socialist, shall vote against this report.

Mr De Goede (NI). — (NL) Mr President, we take the view that NATO membership is still the best way of guaranteeing security for the countries of Europe and we feel that the European contribution to the alliance should be stepped up in view of the increased political, economic and military significance of Europe *vis-à-vis* the United States and the increasing differences in approach to international problems. As we see it, an increased

European contribution would be in the interests of the cohesion of the NATO alliance since a joint European approach is more likely to encourage the United States to pay greater attention to specifically European security interests than a fragmented approach on the part of the individual Member States. In our view, European Political Cooperation, extended to cover security and defence matters, would be the most suitable forum for the coordination and joint formulation of this European contribution to NATO. However, we would not wish to go further than the rapporteur, i.e. we are not in favour of reviving the European Defence Community. Rather, we are in favour of a European branch being set up within NATO by means of extending and institutionalizing the European political system.

Certain parts of the report are certainly open to criticism, as is the fact that neither the report nor the resolution commit themselves specifically on many questions. Nevertheless, we feel we should support this report and resolution as a modest step in what we regard as the right direction.

Mrs Poirier (COM) — (FR) Mr President, once again, by rejecting constructive amendments, this Parliament has lost a perfect opportunity to commit itself clearly to peace and disarmament, whereas this morning, by unanimously adopting the Fergusson resolution, it had evinced some openness of mind. By reaffirming its support for a system of common defence which is not provided for in the Treaties and its commitment to a military alliance which fetters nine out of ten of the Member States of the EEC with the insane American armaments policy this Parliament will remain outside the powerful movement in favour of peace and nuclear disarmament which is shaking our continent to its core, and which constitutes a source of hope, in our opinion, particularly in Germany. The responsible attitudes adopted by the nations of Europe in favour of life and against nuclear arms, the associations which have been set up over and above political, social or religious differences to defend the future of man, have found an echo even within the walls of this House in the form of the proposals put forward by the Group of European Parliamentarians for Nuclear Disarmament, to which I consider it perfectly normal that I, as a Communist, a woman and a mother, should belong.

The real security of all the peoples of Europe lies in abandoning all forms of nuclear missiles, in negotiating the disarmament of the military blocs and in doing so with the firm will to succeed. Imagine the effect the outside world of political initiatives intended to achieve such aims — the aims of reason — if they were to be launched by our Parliament! Unfortunately, the resolution which has been submitted to us today is not of this kind and we shall vote against it.

(Applause from the Communists and Allies Group)

Mr McCartin (PPE). — Madam President, I shall abstain in the final vote on this resolution for the reason that Ireland is not a member of NATO. I believe therefore that I have no mandate to vote for a coordination of the political and economic policies of this Community with those of a military alliance.

The attitude and actions of the Soviet Union and the instability of many strategic regions in this world, especially in the Middle East and Eastern Europe, give Western Europe no reason to be complacent about its defence and security. It is therefore necessary for Western Europe to provide for its defence with whatever military means are considered essential. It is obvious that the member countries of NATO cannot afford to pursue economic and political policies which are even sometimes in conflict with their own military strategies. It is reasonable therefore to assume that economic, political and strategic policies will be pursued in some sort of harmony. However, it seems to me that to propose a formal coordination of these policies requires a new treaty.

The position of Ireland as of now is that we are militarily a neutral state. This is not because of any lack of goodwill on the part of our government or our people towards neighbouring countries which are partners in this Community. However a major factor in unifying the Irish people behind this policy is the outstanding problem of Northern Ire-

land. If this problem were resolved, I believe that the Irish people could at least review the situation.

Mr Wieczorek-Zeul (S). — (DE) Ladies and gentlemen, I will vote in favour of the Haagerup report. It is of course disappointing that the clear wording on the recognition of the peace movement by the majority of Parliament has not found clearer expression, and there are undoubtedly other points that could be criticized. However, for the first time this Parliament recognizes the existence of an independent European security interest which differs entirely from that of the USA and realizes that we Europeans must find an organizational structure in which to represent our interests *vis-à-vis* the USA. There is a divergence of interests between Western Europeans and the USA, which has become very evident in recent weeks and months. The Europeans are of the opinion that security also includes political and economic cooperation with Eastern Europe. The Americans hold the view that security is a military issue and military rearmament is the logical consequence of this. The Europeans are concerned to avoid any regionalization of a nuclear war or any nuclear war at all. We know from circles in the American administration that a regional atomic war in Europe is regarded as conceivable. I quote Collin Gray: 'Victory is possible' in a nuclear war.

The effect of this is that many Europeans regard the principal ally as a potential danger, and I believe that this report gives Western Europeans the opportunity to formulate and express this clearly. It is on the basis of this fundamental strategic consideration that I vote in favour of the report.

Mr Glinne (S). — (FR) Madam President, the Socialist Group will vote for the report as it stands, for three reasons.

First, because it makes no recommendation regarding the setting up in the near future of new Community institution to deal with the Community's security worries. These worries are to remain for the present the responsibility of the Member States and the Community itself, acting through the institutions that make up the Community as it is at present, and, in particular, within the framework of European political cooperation.

The second reason for our favourable attitude is that Amendment No 28, which was tabled by our friend and colleague Mr Plaskovitis and which was previously tabled as Amendment No 47 in the Political Affairs Committee, has just been adopted by the House; the adoption of this amendment was of vital importance for our overall assessment of the report.

Thirdly, since the text of the report was submitted to us, and at the request of our friend and colleague Bruno Friedrich and others, a reference to the role and the importance of the various peace movements in the debate on European security has been inserted into Mr Haagerup's report, and similarly into other passages in the report, with the result that the concept of security has been closely associated with that of peace, for which we offer our congratulations to the author and to all those who contributed to the report.

Mr Nordmann (L). — (FR) Madam President, the great merit of the report before us is certainly to be found more in the explanatory statement than in the motion for a resolution; there is no doubt that in the case of a subject of this kind one tends to opt for middle-of-the-road solutions in order to garner the largest possible amount of support. All the same, taken all in all, the motion for a resolution has the merit of defining in reasonable terms the European Parliament's attitude with regard to security. That is perhaps more important than the various, numerous and sometimes major reservations which we might be tempted to express with regard to such and such a point, particularly concerning the perhaps somewhat too neutral reference to neutralism and pacifism, which these days make not for security but, on the contrary, for insecurity and constitute a threat to the security of Europe because of the spirit of a latter-day Munich agreement which these movements are encouraging on our Continent.

That said, in spite of this reservation, the quality of Mr Haagerup's report merits our approval.

Mrs Castellina (CDI). — *(IT)* Mr President, this statement is only the first of a series which will be made by my colleagues, all members, like myself, of the Group of European Parliamentarians for Nuclear Disarmament; it is a statement in which we are sure we are expressing the views of the Italian Peace Movement, of which I consider myself an activist.

I shall vote against the Haagerup resolution, because I consider that it is one of the most fraudulent and dangerous texts ever drafted by this Parliament. It is fraudulent and dangerous because it begins by talking of autonomous European security and then, on the contrary, goes on to open the way to a policy which will be not simply even more closely modelled on that of the United States, but which may well make Europe terribly insecure — as is evidenced by Points 5, 6 and 7 moreover — given that, in essence, it accepts the NATO rearmament plan and consequently the installation of Pershing and Cruise missiles. These weapons reduce us to the status of mere subordinate pawns of American policy, which, at the present time, is the main cause of the risk of war. The only real security for Europe consists of a policy of disarmament, accompanied by strict autonomy with regard to the two power blocs and a different relationship with the Third World.

Mrs Lizin (S). — *(FR)* Madam President, as a member of the Group of European Parliamentarians for Nuclear Disarmament, I shall vote against the Haagerup report for three reasons. This does not mean that I cannot offer my congratulations to Mr Haagerup for having provided us with a framework within which to debate security problems, now and in future.

First of all, I should have liked a few words of encouragement for those amongst the general public in Europe who have given overwhelming evidence of their desire for peace and their rejection of the arguments of those who are pushing us towards war, including, as we have heard today, some Members of this House.

The Belgian peace movement, which has organized one of the biggest demonstrations that have taken place in Europe, is preparing another demonstration of the same kind for next autumn and it will show that European public opinion is even more aware of the importance of this debate.

My second reason is that I should have like Mr Haagerup's report to refer explicitly to the subject which is occupying everyone's attention in Europe today, namely the siting of missiles within the boundaries of Europe, and I should have liked him to indicate where he stands with regard to the major decisions that will be taken in 1983 on Europe's attitude to this question, on the need for us to be actively involved in a debate that concerns us very directly and the need for the voice of peace and negotiation to be heard.

My third and last reason is that I should have liked the report to say something about the negotiations which are taking place right now in Geneva, and the importance of organizing a genuine dialogue on the proposals which have been put forward by both sides and, in particular, on the most recent proposals from Mr Andropov. In themselves, these proposals are neither less nor more acceptable than the American zero option: they constitute a point of departure towards an equilibrium which should be somewhere in between. An abrupt and unjustified rejection of these proposals is contrary to our own interests and, Mr Haagerup, we should have taken advantage of this opportunity.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, as a member of the Group of European Parliamentarians for Nuclear Disarmament, I shall be abstaining on the Haagerup Report, which, I admit, does have some positive aspects, but whose negative aspects I cannot overlook.

Amongst the positive aspects, there is the rightful recognition of movements which voice the desire of our peoples for peace and the definition of a European security policy.

I regret, however, that Europe's role in security matters should be embodied in an alliance in which the involvement of Community seems confused, uncertain and in any case subor-

minated to a great power, and that it should not be embodied in the other opportunities for peaceful and constructive dialogue that are available to the Community, in order to meet the requests and the demands of young people, women and all people of goodwill.

My abstention is also motivated by the fact that one or two amendments against the installation of the new missiles have been rejected. I am referring to Comiso in Sicily, which is supposed to receive these new missiles which cause harm even before they have been installed. The gardens and vineyards of Comiso are already starting to be invaded by property speculators, while the farming community of Comiso will shortly be transformed into a service economy living off the army. The Mafia has also arrived, bringing bereavement, destabilization and fear.

There is, however, one other question. Who is the target for these missiles at Comiso, in the heart of the Mediterranean? Are these defensive or offensive missiles?

We must, therefore, generate some form of political and moral pressure in order to achieve genuine security in Europe, a security which will accurately reflect what the peoples of Europe really want.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Lomas (S). — Madam President, I too belong to the group of parliamentarians against nuclear weapons and I, too, shall vote against.

This is another attempt to involve the Community in defence matters and, even worse, to link it with NATO, a dangerous development for which it has absolutely no competence. In any case it makes no attempt to analyse seriously the overriding problems of how to rid this planet of nuclear weapons and how to keep the peace. President Reagan has said that it would be possible to limit a nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union to the territory of Europe. Robert McNamara has said that sooner or later, deterrents will fail. If we stick to our policy of first use of nuclear weapons, which is NATO policy and will become ours if we link with NATO, western civilization will presumably be destroyed. So, we are being asked to risk European destruction, to cut back on workers' living standards, so that in the name of so-called security we can pile up more and more weapons of death, when both sides already have ten times more than enough to destroy each other completely.

I hope this dangerous report will be rejected.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* I am now called on to vote here and I will do so both as an active member of the group of Parliamentarians who advocate nuclear disarmament and as representative of Denmark's Socialistisk Folkeparti which, ever since it was set up, has worked for unilateral disarmament in our country. Nothing is further from our minds than to try and force our country into a so-called common security policy. This would be flying in the face of the conditions stipulated for our membership of the European Community. Mr Haagerup knows as well as everyone else in Denmark that security has nothing to do with Community cooperation but his unremitting efforts in the Political Affairs Committee have now obliged us to deal with the matter in this House. Our reaction is quite simple. I intend to vote against because I am a Socialist, because I am an active protagonist of disarmament and am surrounded by other like-minded persons in this House and because I remain true to the conditions for Danish membership. You may well get your joint gunpowder and cannons, but I can assure you that the Danes will have no hand in the matter.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — *(NL)* Madam President, as an active member of the peace movement in my country, which is known as the Interkerkelijk Vredesberaad or Interden-

ominational Peace Council, I was very interested to see what the rapporteur had to say about the peace movement in his report. I am forced to conclude that it would not appear from the explanatory note that he has understood very much of what is going on. He speaks about volatile public opinion and the difficulties in connection with the deployment of nuclear weapons. Indeed, Madam President, we are fighting against nuclear weapons, but why? Because we want to be able to go on living and we want future generations to have a chance of survival too. This does not make us part of a 'volatile public opinion'. We are simply people who no longer wish to leave the future of our world to those wielding power. We want to take the future into our own hands and as I see it, the Haagerup resolution is far from what a resolution on European Political Cooperation and security should be. The fact that I will vote for it nevertheless is due to the respect which I have for the cooperative and inventive manner in which the rapporteur has sought to find a compromise which would be widely acceptable. It was particularly the adoption of the Plaskovitis amendment after paragraph 2 which decided me. The rapporteur has, I think, at any rate succeeded in avoiding worse things.

Mr Griffiths (S). — Madam President, I am a member of the group of parliamentarians who are against nuclear weapons. I come from Wales, the country which was the first to declare itself nuclear free. I also believe that it will be found, if the record is checked, that I was the first Member of this Parliament to make a public declaration in this Chamber against nuclear weapons. That was in October 1979 in a debate held very late on Thursday night.

I would have liked to have found some way to vote for this report, because it did seem to be edging towards an independent Western European strategy. However, I cannot do that, because the report seeks to emphasize a link with NATO. It deals with matters which are not a part of the responsibilities of this Community and for that reason also I could not support it.

Furthermore, I cannot support the report because of the way in which it seems to encourage even closer relations with America at a time when the Americans seem to be planning for the possibility of a nuclear war restricted to Europe, when they are escalating the nuclear arms race by trying to introduce the MX missiles and when within the last 24 hours, President Reagan has sacked one of his advisors on Russian affairs because he is considered to be soft on the Russians.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Viehoff (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, as a member of the group of Parliamentarians who advocate nuclear disarmament, I should like to explain why I intend to abstain from voting on this report. The purpose of armament is defence, but the defence of what, at what price and by what means? We cannot find a solution to the problem of unemployment, the entire Western economy is threatening to get out of joint as a result of the massive investments in nuclear weapons, there is considerable social unrest, young people are increasingly rejecting politics, their views are moving more and more to the right and fascist tendencies are now clearly in evidence in Europe. If one also considers the fear of nuclear war which many people feel and our inability to solve the problem of poverty in our own countries and hunger in the world, you get a nice picture of society today. As I see it, the peace movement, which is dismissed by many politicians as a disorganized bunch of people who do not know what they are talking about, has finally reacted very sensibly to the fatal nuclear arms race which has got completely out of hand and from which nothing good can come. I had hoped that this report, to which there were a vast number of amendments along the right lines, would have taken on a form that I could wholeheartedly support. However, I cannot do that now and I will therefore abstain, not only because I find that ...

President. — You have exhausted your speaking time, Mrs Viehoff.

Mr Albers (S). — *(NL)* I too am one of the members of this Parliament who takes part in discussions aimed at averting the danger of nuclear weapons and I am glad to belong to

this group. I understand that there are a number of members who can hardly take any interest in this since they probably think they have a monopoly on common sense in this matter. However, I am afraid they may well have a rude awakening in store for them.

I have listened with great interest to this debate and have come to the conclusion that we have made a number of unfortunate mistakes in the voting. I regret that paragraph 5 has been retained even in its revised form following the amendment by Mr Haagerup. However, I regret even more the fact that the amendment tabled by Mr Vandemeulebroucke and Mr Capanna on the establishment of nuclear-free zones was rejected by a large majority. If this amendment had been adopted, I would have been able to vote in favour of the resolution. Now, unfortunately, I must abstain.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I too, as a member of the Group of European Parliamentarians for Nuclear Disarmament, shall abstain on this resolution. I find it impossible to vote in favour, because — in spite of the numerous attempts by left-wing members to eliminate it — paragraph No 5 has been kept and the other amendments, also tabled by the left, have not been adopted. There is no doubt that Paul Warncke, who was the head of the American delegation to the SALT II conference, would be ill at ease here, after having said, on 11 November last year at Columbia University, that if it had not been for the peace movements in Europe and the United States the Geneva negotiations would never have been opened.

By abstaining, therefore, I intend to stress that I am not in favour of this report, but at the same time I am not against the idea of closer cooperation in Europe, of a European foreign policy, which, on the contrary, I have always supported and which I hope may be based on a new conception of security and will take account of the demands that have been made by the nations of Europe, by the workers, by young people, by the churches and by persons of diverse political and religious opinions who have demonstrated, who have committed themselves to peace and who are struggling in readiness to face even imprisonment, like the Greenham Common women and the people at Comiso. In other words, in the two countries, Italy and the United Kingdom, where reckless and hasty governments have decided before any other governments in Europe where the Euromissiles will be stationed if the negotiations fail. The peace movement in Italy and in Europe is against all missiles — Cruise missiles, Pershing missiles and SS 20s — and calls for vigorous, rapid and serious negotiations aimed at obtaining balanced, progressive disarmament. Too many financial and human resources (scientists, for example) are wasted in this crazy arms race, whilst the economic crisis and unemployment call for investment and the Third World is languishing in underdevelopment.

Mrs Dury (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I too am a member of the Group of European Parliamentarians for Nuclear Disarmament. I should like, first of all, to say that the many hours given up by thousands of men and women in order to demonstrate their concern, to voice their protests and to show their determination to create a better world are deserving of a few minutes of the time of a few members of this Parliament. What is more, I think that these problems are also connected with the world economic system, which we should like to make more just and more equitable. The arms race fills us with terror, all the more so as the dangers for us in our world are real. Hunger, unemployment, tensions resulting from the struggle for influence amongst the super-powers — these are also dangers that may lead to war. Our responsibility as Europeans is a double one: we must promote disarmament and we must create the right conditions for peace. We are demonstrating our determination to disarm — because we think that it is better to be armed with political determination — and to create a world of peace and justice for everyone.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Kirkos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, both as a representative of my party and as a member of the independent peace movement in Greece and of the anti-nuclear group in the Parliament, I shall be voting against Mr Haagerup's motion for a resolution. At this moment a hope is emerging in Europe under the pressure of a broad mass movement which transcends ideological barriers. This voice should be heard in our Chamber and

deserves greater respect. Mr Griffiths, not one but two of Mr Reagan's collaborators were dismissed, and both were known as hawks. However, it appears that the arch-hawk himself is turning against the other hawks. Europe should not become so intimately linked with a view which is dictated by the hawks from the other side.

The anti-nuclear movement is linked with the demand that Europe should make its own choices and we should all help to achieve this. I think that there is a common basis even with those colleagues who will today be voting in favour of the Haagerup motion. On the basis of whatever positive features this motion contains — and it does contain some — even greater pressure should be exercised. However, there are some who, while expressing their support for this popular movement, wish to strangle it, and we have just heard some of them speaking. Ladies and gentlemen, I think that we should listen to the authentic voice of this movement and that we should open up new roads in this Parliament as well.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Clwyd (S). — Mr President, I too speak as a member of the Group of European MPs for Nuclear Disarmement, as a member of CDN Cymru (the Welsh Anti-nuclear Alliance) and representing the only declared nuclear-free nation, Wales, in the European Community.

I stand, Mr President, to salute the women of Greenham Common, their courage and determination, ...

(Applause)

... who for over a year have kept up a continuous picket outside the base in protest at the British Government's intention to site 96 cruise missiles there later this year. These women started out from Wales. And I had the honour of speaking to them when they started out on their march.

A few weeks ago, 30 000 of us, all women, linked hands in silent protest around a 9-mile perimeter fence around the base.

(Applause)

Were it not, Mr President, for such direct action — even more positive on the continent than in Britain — there would hardly have been a debate.

Now the doctrine of 'no first use' has been forced on to the NATO agenda. The NATO Supreme Commander has been forced to offer a non-nuclear defence strategy as a possible option. If people were not willing to demonstrate and suffer for their beliefs, Mr President, I doubt if even these gestures would have been made.

(Interruptions. Calls of "Time, time!" from the European Democratic Group)

Getting rid of the bombs is ...

President. — Mrs Clwyd, your speaking-time is over.

Mrs Clwyd (S). — Getting rid of the bombs is a political struggle and only the Labour Party in Britain offers any serious ...

(Uproar)

President. — Mrs Clwyd, your speaking-time is really over.

Mr Van Minnen (S). — *(NL)* As a member of the group of the Members of the European Parliament who are opposed to nuclear weapons and also as an ordinary peace activist, I should like to give an explanation of vote.

Clearly, many of our colleagues here today would appear to feel justified in being irritated at the amount of their time we are taking up. These, I think, are colleagues who would most prefer to shoot us peace activists out of this chamber by cruise missile without more ado. It is true that our explanations of vote are taking more time than a cruise missile takes to get to its target once it has been launched, and at the same time, these new tactical nuclear weapons go so fast as to break the record for the time taken to give even one single explanation of vote in this House.

However, it is not only their speed which is devastating, and this is the danger which Mr Haagerup has completely glossed over in his report, i.e. the danger of the quick and easy use of what are known for the sake of convenience as 'tactical nuclear weapons' but which in reality must be regarded as forming part of the arsenal of 'conventional weapons' — certainly in the eyes of the 'conventional generals' for whom it is made even easier by virtue of these tactical weapons to think about conducting a war. The Haagerup report is full of these false bottoms, as it were, these pitfalls. The peace movement is disparagingly referred to as a 'threat to European security' and this Parliament has also refused to improve it by means of an amendment. I therefore intend to vote against this report.

Mrs Buchan (S). — I shall vote against this resolution because I have to live with myself and I have been a unilateralist for twenty years. Coming to Europe as I do, seeing what I did not see twenty years ago, I welcome now a peace movement, a movement on its feet in Belgium, Holland, Italy and everywhere else. And I shall therefore keep faith with myself.

I live in and I represent the city of Glasgow. I represent a city which is 15 miles from the present Polaris Base. And I am even closer to the proposed American base for Trident which is proposed for Clydeside. I know only too well the way that the presence of such a base affects every aspect of one's life, whether, as I was, you are young and with children when the base arrived, or now middle-aged and with grandchildren, as I am. Therefore this affects every aspect of your life — even if you have to shout against illiterate Tories as you do it. Therefore at every chance you declare your opposition.

I keep faith with all those who, like Michael Foot, John Collins and everyone else, set out for Aldermaston twenty years ago.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

Sadly, John Collins has died during the last week, but Michael and many other thousands are still there. And I am still there . . .

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

Vote against the resolution! Vote for life! Vote against Haagerup!

(Applause from the left)

Mr Bøgh (CDI). — *(DA)* I am speaking as a member of the Danish group known as 'Kristne for Nedrustning', or Christians for Disarmament, and on the occasion of the referendum in Denmark in 1972 we were given firm assurance that our membership of the European Community did not have any implications as regards defence policy. These were such fine promises that no decent Danish politician can renege on them, and for this reason it is totally unacceptable that a Danish representative of one of the parties which made these fine promises in 1972 should be acting as rapporteur in an effort to introduce defence policy into the European Community, and it is doubly objectionable that this should be taking place in the underhand manner with which we have become familiar, whereby people first of all speak about their respect for the Treaty of Rome and then step right outside it by bringing in defence policy. I would recommend to Mr Haagerup that he go home and read the New Testament story about the brother who said 'yes' to everything but then simply went and did the opposite. The Danish voters have been deceived here and for this reason I will fight tooth and nail against this report and what the hawks in this House hope to get out of it. For the time being, I will do this by voting against it and I call on all right-thinking compatriots in this House to do the same.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Boyes (S). — Mr President, I usually play little games with the little boys on the opposite side, but I think tonight it is far too serious. Speaking as the chairman of the Group of Euro-MPs for Nuclear Disarmament, I only wish they had been here in this Chamber to hear the last 16 or 17 contributions, and I only hope they will devote a little time to reading what the people have said over the last 30 minutes or so.

I also represent the majority of people in Britain who are opposing cruise and Pershing missiles being stationed in our country.

(Interruptions from the European Democratic benches)

But we are not only opposing them in Britain, we are opposing them in every other country where they are meant to be deployed in 1983.

I shall vote against Mr Haagerup's resolution, because he has not recognized the danger or the urgency of the period in which we live. The year 1983 threatens to be the most dangerous year that humanity has ever faced. When we get the destabilizing Pershing IIs, when we get the nonverifiable cruise missiles stationed on our soil, we must say as loudly as possible, firstly, that we support all those who are opposing them and especially the women at Greenham Common who have given a tremendous lead to all of us . . .

(Applause)

. . . and secondly, we must say why it is a danger. Pershing II missiles and I want to make . . .

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

I oppose all missiles . . .

(The President again urged the speaker to conclude. Continuing interruptions from the right).

. . . my children wherever the missiles come from and the only policy that can help to save . . .

(Mixed reactions)

Mr Schinzel (S). — *(DE)* On a point of order I should like to say that it is very depressing to see how few adherents of the peace movement there are in the Conservative and Christian-Democratic Group.

President. — That has nothing to do with the Rules of Procedure.

Mr Fergusson (ED). — Mr President, I think — keeping quite calm about all this — there must be some way of distinguishing between an explanation of vote and a political speech. I could suggest to you that . . .

(Protests from the Socialist Group)

President. — No, Mr Fergusson, we cannot start that debate now. You asked for the floor on a point of order. I was under the impression that you wanted to react to Mr Schinzel, which you are not doing.

Mr Kallias (PPE), in writing. — *(GR)* Mr President, I will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution contained in the Haagerup report for the following reasons:

1. Because it would be inconceivable for the European Economic Community not to be able to concern itself with its security, on which depends not only its existence as a Community but also the existence of each of the Member States which belong to it.

2. Because for the Community to shirk a discussion of its security would mean evading a fundamental debate on the major issue of peace and would restrict it to expressing wishes in this respect. However, it would be naive for the Community to show such unconcern.

Peace depends on mutual sincerity and this cannot be supervised without a supervised balance of forces. In ascertaining this balance it is necessary to include not only strategic, but also conventional, forces, as well as the distance from the sources of supply to the border or the likely front line.

3. Because I believe that the European Community, after the planned reform of its institutions, should acquire not only political authority but also — by degrees — independent powers in the field of defence.

Only in this way can the Community fully accomplish its tasks and fulfil its peaceful and stabilizing mission.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (CDI), in writing. — (NL) I intend to abstain from voting on the entire resolution since the report fails to take account of the fundamental option for a peace policy, since security is discussed in the narrow sense of the word and since no mention is made of trade in armaments.

I must also excuse my colleague Mr Mario Capanna for his absence today, in spite of the fact that he was very active in the preparations for this debate. However, his mother died yesterday and his place was with his family.

*
* *

HABSBURG REPORT (Doc. 1-656/82 'Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania'): ADOPTED

Explanations of vote

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) Mr President, I shall not exceed my speaking time. I simply wanted to say that I am not at all surprised that the motion for a resolution — on which the report that is before us now was based and in which the element of exaggeration is only equalled by the provocative intent — should have been tabled by Members of Parliament whose constant, and I might even say pathological, preoccupation has always been to exhibit on every occasion their hostility to the countries of Eastern Europe. Similarly, I should not be very surprised if one day the author of this report, whose propensity to call the frontiers that resulted from the last World War into question increases day by day, should suggest that we should raise a European Army in order to help to reestablish the Holy Roman Empire of his remote ancestors.

But what is really shocking is the fact that there should have been a majority of Members of the Political Affairs Committee prepared to take part in such an exercise. Although the European Parliament has all too often adopted resolutions which undermined its credibility, I did not think there was any need to go even further down that road. All the evidence suggests that this Assembly is split between those who want a Europe of confrontation and those who believe that the Community's best hope of credibility lies in patiently looking for opportunities for cooperation.

Mr Hahn (PPE). — (DE) As probably the only Member of this House who was born in Estonia, whose ancestors lived in the Baltic countries and who visited these countries as

recently as last summer, I would like to express my special support for this motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

I should like to thank the European Parliament for expressing an opinion on this question. We discuss infringements of human rights throughout the world, while here in Europe on our very doorstep there is an example of colonialism which is a result of the Hitler-Stalin pact.

(Applause)

I know that there are many representatives from Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania present here at this moment, that they are looking on and are grateful that they have an advocate in the European Parliament, which states clearly to the whole world that people in these countries are being denied self-determination and independence. We hope that the United Nations will take up our resolution and bring this question before the Decolonization Sub-committee.

(Applause)

Mr Adamou (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, I think that out of respect for this House we should not be discussing Mr Habsburg's document, because what he has written on the situation in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania is a fairy tale for small children.

The Soviet Union, which last month celebrated its 60th anniversary, is the first multinational state — the stupid may laugh — to be constituted by the free choice of many nationalities on the basis of equality, without pressure, violence and bloodshed.

(Violent protests from the right and centre)

The Baltic peoples have historical links with the Soviet Union. We remember that when, in July 1918, the counter-revolutionaries attempted to overthrow the Soviet regime and shelled the Kremlin, it was a regiment of Estonians which defended the revolution and Lenin's government.

(Violent protests from the right and centre)

The unity of the peoples of the Soviet Union proved indestructable during the frightful experience of the Second World War. Nationalism, chauvinism and racism are products of the capitalist world. For 15 years the British have been shedding the blood of the Northern Irish. The Basque patriots are being treated in the same manner. In Belgium the Walloons and Flemings have not succeeded in becoming a nation in 60 years. In Turkey the executioner of the Turkish people, Evren, is attempting to exterminate 8 million Kurds. The Zionist fascists Begin and Sharon aim to wipe out the Palestinians by genocide. In the United States 25 million negroes and millions of coloureds, such as the Puerto Ricans, are being persecuted, tormented and murdered. In Mr Habsburg's own country tens of thousands of West Germans are deprived of a living as a result of the notorious 'Berufsverbot' because of their political convictions, while over three million foreign workers — known as 'Gastarbeiter' — are subjected to harassment and humiliating discrimination. Mr Habsburg, who is still living in the age of his illustrious forebears, has lost all sense of reality.

(Protests from the right and centre)

The Bureau should have protected him from ridicule. We simply wish to express our regret and we will vote against his motion.

(Applause from various quarters)

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 14 JANUARY 1983

Contents

1. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> <i>Mr Moreland; Mr Griffiths</i>	290	5. <i>Noise emissions from helicopters — Report by Mrs Squarcialupi (Doc. 1-982/82):</i> <i>Mrs Squarcialupi; Sir Fred Warner; Mr Davignon (Commission)</i>	300
2. <i>Votes:</i> <i>Mr Forth; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Barbi; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Barbi; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Patterson; Mrs Veil; Mr Aigner; Mr Arndt; Mr Herman; Mr Rogers; Mr Marshall; Mr Battersby</i>	291	6. <i>Foie gras — Report by Mrs Pruvot (Doc. 1-686/82):</i> <i>Mrs Pruvot; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Spencer; Mrs Poirier; Mr Eisma; Mr Simmonds; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Fergusson; Mr Collins; Mr Richard (Commission); Mrs Pruvot; Mr Spencer; Mr Enright; Mr Spencer; Mr Nord; Dame Shelagh Roberts</i>	301
3. <i>Appointment of a member of the Court of Auditors — Report by Mr Aigner (Doc. 1-1125/82):</i> <i>Mr Aigner; Mr Kellett-Bowman</i>	293	7. <i>Reform of statistics in the Community — Report by Mr Newton Dunn (Doc. 1-744/82):</i> <i>Mr Newton Dunn; Sir Brandon Rhys Williams; Mr Richard (Commission)</i>	307
4. <i>Exploration for mineral raw materials — Report by Mr Schinzel (Doc. 1-974/82):</i> <i>Mr Schinzel; Mr Petronio; Mr Rogers; Mr Herman; Mr Moreland; Mr Papantoniou; Mr Harris; Mr Davignon (Commission); Mr Rogers; Mr Papantoniou; Mr Schinzel; Mr Papantoniou; Mr Rogers; Mr Papantoniou; Mr Welsh; Mr Schinzel; Mr Papantoniou; Mr Rogers; Mr Møller; Mr Welsh; Mr Papantoniou; Mr Nord; Mr K. Fuchs</i>	294	8. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	309
		<i>Annex:</i> <i>Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mrs Théobald-Paoli; Mr Saby; Mr Alavanos; Mr Hord; Mr Tyrrell; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Wurtz</i>	310

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

Mr Moreland (ED). — Mr President, page 50 of the minutes, detailing the amendments to the von Wogau report, says: 'After paragraph 8: Amendment No 15/cor., by Mr Moreland: adopted', and the same with Amendment No 16.

I should point out that I tabled these amendments on behalf of the Committee on Transport and not in a personal capacity. I think that the Minutes should be amended accordingly.

(Parliament approved the minutes)

Mr Griffiths (S). — Mr President, I wonder if you could either confirm or deny a rumour I heard last night that the July and September part-sessions will be held in Luxembourg.

President. — Mr Griffiths, the enlarged Bureau always makes proposals to the House, which then ratifies its decisions. I can tell you that I have nothing to propose at this particular moment.¹

2. Votes²

Commission proposal for a regulation (Doc. 1-1061/82: Act of Accession of Greece) (Procedure without report)

Mr Forth (ED). — Mr President, I wonder if you could guide me on this. Could you tell me the basis on which something like this, which looks to me to be rather an important matter, comes before us to be dealt with 'without report'? At what stage does the House have the facility to consider such a matter?

I, as a Member, know nothing about this. I am being asked to approve it. Can you just tell me who has, on my behalf, looked at this? Is it the Committee on Agriculture, or who is it?

President. — It is the competent committee that has looked at it. I suppose, though I am not sure, that it is the Committee on Agriculture which has decided that it could be done without debate. The members of your group in that committee will know about that.

Macciocchi report (Doc. 1-546/82: Conscientious objection)

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President, concerning the vote we are about to take on conscientious objection, I wish, on behalf of the Socialist Group, to ask for the procedure under Rule 71. We are of the opinion that this vote should not lead to a fortuitous result, and I therefore ask that you establish, for this vote, whether there is a quorum.

(The quorum was verified)

President. — I have to tell you that there is no quorum and that therefore the vote on the Macciocchi report is deferred to the Monday of the next part-session.

Mrs Macciocchi (S), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, I am very sorry about this, because you knew very well, having been requested several times, that this vote ought to have taken place during the sitting in which the report was presented. Yesterday was chaos. We were left to kick our heels between one report and another, three times breaking off the report on conscientious objectors. You knew very well, Mr President — I am sorry to have to make the reproach — that a good many people and all the press staff were awaiting the outcome of this debate, just as you knew that on Friday morning the Chamber would be largely empty and it would be difficult to achieve a quorum. I appreciate that you have a keen political flare, but precisely because it is so keen, you should realize how ridiculous it is for a Parliament to have to wait until the following month in order to register its opinion on so vital a question as conscientious objection.

I therefore protest in the strongest terms at the way in which the Chair conducted the Assembly's proceedings yesterday.

President. — Mrs Macciocchi, if everyone yesterday had respected the speaking-time laid down, we could have voted on your report then.

(Applause)

Mrs Macciocchi (S), rapporteur. — (FR) I took the floor and you interrupted me, Mr President. I would have expected you to subject the others to the same treatment.

Mr Barbi (PPE). — (IT) There were more than thirty ridiculous explanations of vote.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) Mr President, I ask Mr Barbi to withdraw the word 'ridiculous'...

Mr Barbi (PPE). — (IT) ... not just ridiculous but utterly ridiculous, because certain demonstrations can degrade this Parliament!

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) Mr Barbi, I think you must have slept pretty badly last night if you go on making those totally gratuitous remarks; you will remember that there were bishops at the demonstrations, with whom you have a lot more to do than us.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Mr President, quite a different complaint. I am not quite sure how this quorum is called for. You said that Mr Sieglerschmidt had done so on behalf of the Socialist Group, but my Rules say, 'A request on behalf of a political group is not

¹ For items concerning membership of committees, petitions, and motions for resolutions under Rule 49, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

² See Annex.

Patterson

admissible'.

Do you have some other written evidence that the requisite number of people asked for the quorum?

President. — Mr Patterson, of course one can have a count, but when a request is on behalf of a group I think it is a waste of time. Of course if it is really wanted it can be taken, but in this case we can be sure that the number of persons required to justify the request was present and therefore I do not see why they should have to stand up.

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) Mr President, I find it curious that a member of the Socialist Group should complain of this request for a verification of the quorum, since it was that very group that had asked for it.

Now there are quite a lot of us here in the Chamber for a Friday morning. I am quite aware that there is the right to ask for a verification of the quorum; all the same, that a member of that same group should be surprised at the result, when there are many of us here this morning and we could perfectly well have proceeded to vote, that I find remarkable.

(Applause from the Centre and the Right)

Mr Aigner (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, the best way of verifying the quorum is to use the electronic voting-machine. I have my doubts as to whether your count is really reliable.

President. — The Committee on the Rules of Procedure has studied this question and forbidden the use of the electronic voting-machine for the purpose of establishing a quorum, and its decision has been approved by the House in plenary sitting. I am therefore doing no more than observing a decision taken by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and confirmed by the Parliament.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, I am sorry, but Mrs Veil has misunderstood the point of the complaints made by Mrs Macciocchi and also on behalf of my group, which is that the vote did not take place yesterday, not the request just now for a verification of the quorum. The blame for this lies on us all, not just the Chair. All of us yesterday exceeded our speaking-time: if everyone, including the rapporteur, had kept to it, the vote would have taken place last night.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, the situation is changing rapidly: if we made a count now, perhaps we should have a quorum.

President. — Mr Herman, the Rules do not allow it. The quorum has to be verified when the request is made.

Boot motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1147/82: ERDF)

Mr Rogers (S). — Mr President, this is probably the only place in the world where people can make politics out of a full stop at the end of a sentence.

Could you inform me on one thing? If you say a quorum is not established on one issue, how can you proceed to vote on another issue? If a quorum is not present, it is not present. We just cannot go on voting.

(Protests)

Mr President, I am just as fed up as other people, but, on the other hand, there are reports that we are supposed to discuss. If there are not enough people here to vote, then we cannot vote. We cannot pick and choose what we want to vote on. Either we are quorate or we are not.

President. — Mr Rogers, as I said, one establishes a quorum at the moment it is asked for, and it is relevant to a specific point.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Mr President, on a point of order, is it not unfortunate that a former Vice-President of this House still does not know the rules under which this House works?

(Protests)

President. — Mr Marshall, that was not a point of order.

Battersby report (Doc. 1-1003/82: Embargo on agricultural exports)

Preamble, before Recital A: Amendment No 1

Mr Battersby (ED), rapporteur. — I believe that the report, as already amended and approved in the Committee on Budgetary Control, is sufficient for the purposes of this House. I personally do not consider that the amendments being voted on today add to the substance of the report. However, the committee has not had the opportunity to consider them and having expressed my personal opinion, I leave the decision on all these amendments to the wisdom of my colleagues.

3. Appointment of a member of the Court of Auditors

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Aigner, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Con-

President

trol, on the opinion of the European Parliament on the appointment of a member of the Court of Auditors (Doc. 1-1125/82).

Mr Aigner (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, by letter of 22 October 1982, the Danish member of the Court of Auditors, Mr Johansen, has asked the Council to release him from his duties as a member of the Court with effect from 1 April 1983. Pursuant to the Treaties, the Council wrote to the European Parliament on 8 December 1982, asking for its approval of the appointment of Mr Brixtofte, the Danish Government's candidate.

You are aware that for many years we have insisted on this coparticipation for extremely important political reasons. The justification *par excellence* of the parliamentary system lies in its function of translating the political will of the majority of the electorate, expressed through free elections, into political decisions. The investiture, for a limited period of time, of a government or other persons invested with powers of decision, their surveillance and, if necessary, their dismissal are among the inalienable functions of such a parliament, and for this reason alone we shall persist in claiming this right with regard to the investiture of members of the Commission.

I come back to the Court of Auditors. At its meeting of 10 January, your committee had an exhaustive discussion with the new candidate, Mr Brixtofte, from which it gained the impression that, as a future member of the Court of Auditors, he has especial qualifications to offer, particularly as regards the auditing of the Communities's own resources. It was even suggested in the committee that his career so far has been so well designed to bring him to the European Court of Auditors that he must have had this in mind from the day of his birth.

He was born in 1922. After studying at Copenhagen University and taking his degree in law, he was active for a while in the legal profession before being made Secretary at the Danish Audit Authority. After working from 1960 to 1964 as an auditor with NATO, he took over, until 1974, a division in the Danish Audit Authority. In 1977, he was made deputy Crown Auditor of the Danish State.

He gained a wider experience of European affairs at the European Centre for Medium-term Weather Forecasting — I hope this, too, will be a useful qualification for the Community — and at the European Laboratory for Molecular Biology in Heidelberg.

If I may briefly recall the history of the European Court of Auditors, it was initiated and brought to fruition by this Parliament in the face of opposition from most Member States. In 1977, five members were appointed, by lot, for a period of six years and four members for four years, this overlapping of periods of

office being intended to assure the continuity of the Court's work.

In 1981, Parliament recommended that the first four of these mandates to lapse be prolonged, and in October of this year the six-year mandates will be coming to an end, so it is already time to initiate the procedure, both in the Council and in Parliament, for making new appointments.

I urge the Council to ask the Parliament for its opinion in good time, so that the proposals can be thoroughly examined and any queries settled. For us, this procedure is not purely formal: it is our means of ensuring that the highest possible degree of competence is recruited for the European Court of Auditors. The previous procedure, especially as regards communication with the Council, was here particularly unsatisfactory. Because of the unique legal position and constitutional structure of the Court and of the control exercised by Parliament, which makes us an object of envy for almost all the national parliaments, it behoves us to aim for the highest standards. This particularly applies to the auditing procedure — for example, the special *ad hoc* reports which are asked of us, which can be regarded as a kind of cross check.

To sum up, your committee, after careful consideration, has found that Mr Brixtofte offers the best possible qualifications for occupying this post. The committee therefore proposes that we adopt the Council's proposal. There are no objections to Mr Brixtofte's appointment, and the adoption of the motion for a resolution will enable me, on Parliament's behalf, to offer our sincere congratulations to the new member of the Court of Auditors and express our hopes of fruitful cooperation. When the proper moment comes, I shall then have the grateful task of thanking the present member, Mr Johansen, on this departure for his helpful collaboration with the Budgetary Control Committee of this Parliament.

Mr Kellett-Bowman (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of this group, I unreservedly support Mr Aigner's proposal that Mr Brixtofte's appointment be endorsed by the House. Europe will continue to be well served so long as such admirable people come forward to sit on the Court of Auditors.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

4. Exploration for mineral raw materials

President. — The next item is the report (Doc 1-974/82) by Mr Schinzel, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on

¹ For the vote, see Annex.

President

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-556/81 — COM(82) 415 final) for a regulation on loans for projects covered by exploration programmes for non-energy mineral raw materials within the territories of the Member States.

Mr Schinzel (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to make a few very brief remarks on the report now before us. We know from previous debates that the European Community depends on imports for 70–100% of its raw materials, since we now have few resources of our own on which we can still draw. We must therefore do everything we can to promote the exploration and also the responsible exploitation of our own resources of raw materials.

This high degree of dependence on external sources of raw materials also reflects the exposed position of the European Community as a highly industrialized region: hence the importance for the Community of developing a common policy on supplies of raw materials.

It is not enough just to coordinate national programmes. For a joint raw-materials policy, we naturally need to know, first of all, what reserves are still available in the Community and then what our needs will be in the foreseeable future provided that, on the one hand, the economic and political situation remains unchanged and, on the other, greater account is taken of present ecological requirements by saving on raw materials and promoting recycling as an alternative.

This report is based on a Commission proposal designed to improve and facilitate exploration and promote exploitation of the Community's own resources of raw materials. This aim has our backing, even though the programme is an extremely modest first step and serves as an indication of how difficult it is to reach agreement on a joint raw-materials policy in the European Community.

However that may be, the committee was unanimous in wishing to encourage both Commission and Council to pursue this role further. It gave both the proposal and the report its unanimous approval and hopes that both Commission and Council can be encouraged to take practical steps towards a joint European policy on raw materials.

Mr Petronio (NI), draftsman of the opinion for the Committee on Energy and Research. — (IT) Mr President, the Committee on Energy and Research is of the opinion that the European Community, thanks in part to its own mining industry in Europe as well as in the rest of the world, is now able to procure the materials and minerals its economy requires. Furthermore, the most detailed surveys of mineral raw materials reserves

and resources give no grounds for concern over the scarcity or depletion of supplies before the year 2000.

Moreover, geological science can now make use of the newest techniques in the fields of photography, satellite pictures, chemistry, physics, magnetic fields and dynamics. All of this should allay our worst fears for the future. The fact remains, however, that the Community very much depends on third countries for obtaining supplies or building up reserves of strategic materials whenever there are unexpected shortages. These may indeed result from the depletion of resources, but may also be due to political or social factors or to speculative or financial activities. It is well known that raw-materials markets are very sensitive to economic and monetary pressures which make prices unstable and so have harmful effects on employment and the balance of payments.

Until now the Community energy deficit, which became tremendous after the massive rise in oil prices, has quite overshadowed the problem of non-energy mineral raw materials. Now, however, that policy on nuclear energy, energy-saving and the exploitation of alternative sources such as solar or geothermal energy and biomass has made European industry less dependent on oil and led to a relative fall in the price of crude, attention is turning towards the procurement, mostly from our own sources, of non-energy mineral raw materials. It is therefore important that the European Community should devote substantial sums of money to prospecting for its own non-energy mineral resources.

The scope of the regulation and of the proposed programmes is confined to operations on or below the surface of the land and has not included off-shore operations. Mineral resources from the seabed might well, however, be a major source of self-supply for the future.

The Committee on Energy and Research is agreed on these general observations but has expressed differing views on the Commission proposal. Several members argued that present expenditure is derisory and would have to be multiplied a hundred-fold in order to produce satisfactory results. This is because large sums would be needed even to begin exploiting the opportunities offered by modern geological science. The expenditure would, however, be worthwhile if it went not to industry but to the universities, geological institutes and public bodies. Moreover, it has been clearly shown that there is little to be gained from financing the various multinationals that operate in the sector. On the other hand, other members of the committee and Commission representatives suggested that the sum allocated could be seen as an initial financial move in this field and that if the mining industry rose to the challenge by showing real interest in the venture, the sum might then be increased right away. And the finance would be reserved primarily for drillings.

Petronio

Furthermore, it was noted that although it seems inappropriate to draw up a binding list of priorities, the Commission appears determined to concentrate its efforts on a number of strategic raw materials. As regards off-shore research, the Commission expressed keen interest in the subject and promised to compile a special file.

These were the opinions expressed in the discussion in the Committee on Energy and Research. I trust I have conveyed with clarity and, above all, with objectivity — even if only in summary form — the gist of this question.

Finally, the present Schinzel report, amended with the agreement of the rapporteur, incorporates various wishes expressed by the Committee on Energy and Research. I foresee favourable views and, doubtless, votes — including, obviously my own — and I hope that many objections will be dropped in the light of the new points introduced in the Schinzel report and accepted most helpfully by the rapporteur, and that this will provide the impetus for a genuine European policy on the supply of raw materials.

Mr Rogers (S). — Mr President, the Socialist Group supports the report, subject to some amendments that have been tabled. As has been said by the previous speakers, the report itself proposes minor changes to the Commission text. The motion for a resolution approves the initiative as a first step towards a supply policy in mineral raw materials. Also, it further underlines that the aid set aside should only be used for exploratory purposes.

However, we would like to emphasize that this is only a first step in the right direction and it is an extremely small step. I think it is becoming increasingly obvious that many more mineral raw materials are assuming strategic importance, not necessarily because of their scarcity but simply because of the problem of security of supply and often rapidly changing political situations. Unfortunately, investment and therefore activity in this area is largely dominated by multinational companies which are interested only in low-risk and high-return projects. This usually means that investment and development takes place in countries outside Europe, simply because Europe as an area is geologically well known and most of the minerals that are available have already been exploited. I think it is important to point out, in view of what Mr Petronio said, that all the geologists and all the geological techniques in the world cannot produce minerals. They can only find them. If they are not there, then you can put in all the resources you like, but you simply will not have any minerals to exploit.

However, this heavy dependence on external sources may create severe problems for our industry in the future. Therefore, it is vital that indigenous possibilities should be fully explored. National governments

and the Community should be prepared to spend more money in this direction, but, as I said, it is obvious that the projects that will be submitted under these proposals will generally be in the high-risk category. For this reason I think that we ought to be careful in assessing the value of this programme in the future by not necessarily looking for a high degree of success. I think we should at this stage recognize that there will be very limited success.

The Commission is to be congratulated on the framework that they are proposing. I think some of their suggestions are excellent. Some minor amendments have been tabled which we will be supporting, but I do hope — and I am pleased that the Commissioner is here today to listen to the debate — that there will not be delays in the processing of applications for grants under this regulation. I would like to congratulate the Commission on this initiative; I am sure it will serve the European raw materials scene well.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our group is in favour of this initiative of the Commission for reasons that are self-evident — that is, Europe's extreme dependence on other sources for its supplies of raw materials.

In our view, every effort to reduce this dependence is to be welcomed. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has, however, tabled some amendments designed to promote a broader approach and eliminate discriminations resulting from too narrow an interpretation of national legislation. We do not want to see any countries excluded for nationally inspired motives. This was not clear in the Commission proposal. I think our group has given its support to changes designed to make the application of this regulation truly European.

For the same reason, we are opposed to Mr Papantoniou's amendments. It is not that we would make any discrimination to the detriment of the public sector, but nothing in the draft regulation is said against this sector. Consequently, there is no necessity to introduce a phrase saying that everyone is to be treated on the same footing: the fact that this is not stated signifies that they are all on the same footing. In contrast, Mr Papantoniou, in some of his other amendments, would accord a privileged status to the national State and its policies on mining and raw materials supplies, and this is the reason why our group will not be supporting Mr Papantoniou's amendments.

I would sum this point up by saying that what is important in this regulation is the manner of its application. I have in mind the way one is sometimes led to modify a programme for reasons quite independent of the wishes of entrepreneurs and due to circumstances which are sometimes distinctly fortuitous. In this connection, the Commission should, in our view, avoid displaying too much bureaucracy but rather maintain a

Herman

broad view of the flexibility which is needed if firms are to succeed.

Another important point we wish to emphasize is the need to encourage, and therefore subsidize, not the exploitation but that phase which is most a matter of chance — that is to say, the drilling, for that is the stage where the uncertainty and the risk are greatest. Consequently, it is the drilling that needs to be aided: once it is over and has left a glimpse of reasonable prospects of exploitation, the aid is no longer necessary. The taxpayers' money must be kept for the most useful projects. This goes without saying. We hope the Commission will apply this regulation in this spirit.

Mr Moreland (ED). — Mr President, like previous speakers, my group supports the Schinzel report and in general terms supports the Commission's proposals. Equally, we support some of the reservations that have also been expressed, with the exception of the remarks from Mr Rogers about multinationals, which are the usual codswallop we get on that subject from that side of the House.

(Interruption by Mr Rogers)

I will not be diverted, Mr President, towards Mr Rogers's subject. I would only say that multinationals do a certain amount of exploratory work which costs them a lot of money on which they get very little return.

But let me come back to the main point of this proposal. We support it, but, as I said, we equally support some of the reservations, particularly that made by Mr Herman just now — that there is a need to concentrate at the bottom end of the programme, at the exploratory stage. We would like to see the funds at that particular end of it.

Secondly, Mr President, as is perhaps indicated by the amendment from my group, we are concerned about the advisory committee in the proposal, which again seems to be an advisory committee made up of civil servants from the national governments rather than of experts. Indeed, we suggest that this is another way in which the Council may have unnecessary control over the programmes, whereas what we are looking for is good technical advice on the way in which the programme will be managed.

Finally, Mr President, as I say we have reservations. I personally wish that the Committee on Energy and Research could have had this particular proposal, because although it is about non-energy minerals, it does come under that committee in its research capacity and would be, normally, the type of programme handled by it. We had a number of detailed criticisms and proposals which we would have liked to have fed in had that committee been given time. So I would suggest to the Commission that there are various

details in some parts of this proposal which they should look at again.

In general we welcome it, although I must emphasize to the Commission that the real answer to the problem is not necessarily within the Community. It would be wishful thinking to say that we shall find those minerals within the Community. The real answer is, of course, diversity of supply so that we can move away from countries with political difficulties from which we get our supplies, such as South Africa and Turkey and so forth. It is diversity that is the real answer, not necessarily exploration within the Community.

Mr Papantoniou (S). — (GR) Mr President, the Commission's proposal for a regulation on Community loans for exploration programmes for non-energy mineral raw materials is undoubtedly a positive step towards ensuring fuller exploitation of mineral resources within the territories of Member States. It does, however contain certain points which might lead to problems in its implementation, and it is advisable, therefore, that these be re-examined. I am referring chiefly to the points touched on in the amendments I have tabled, which have the support of the Socialist Group.

The first point concerns the need to make it clear that Community assistance may be sought by both private and State undertakings. Mr Herman was right in saying that the proposal for a regulation does not discriminate in favour of the public sector. However, the thinking behind the proposal for a regulation seems to refer only to private undertakings, and I cannot see how he could find it objectionable if it were to be explicitly recorded in the text that State undertakings may draw on these Community loans.

The second point is that the assent of the government of the Member State in whose territory the raw material is situated must be made an essential condition for the provision of loan funding so as to ensure that exploration programmes do not run counter to the mineral resource programmes of Member States and that due account is taken of the needs of the Community and of its priorities such as, principally, the protection of the environment.

A third point is that State agencies of the member country in whose territory the raw material is situated must be exempted from the restrictions on the disposal of the results of programmes, because it would be absurd for the government of a country not to have full and reliable information on the situation obtaining in the strategically important mineral resources sector.

Finally, I should like to point out that the Commission's assertion in its communication to the Council, with reference to the absence in Greece of a framework for promoting mineral resource exploration, is mistaken and must be corrected. Greece does indeed

Papantoniou

have State agencies charged with specific exploration programmes, and the development of these programmes is now being stepped up considerably.

I should like also to announce that I withdraw my Amendments No 6 and No 8 and that during the voting I shall propose that linguistic alterations be made to my other amendments in order to facilitate an accurate rendering of the Greek legal terms in the other languages, in view of the fact that there are some translation problems. I take this opportunity to request the correction of a translation error in Article 6 (4) of the Greek text of the proposal for a regulation, to which Amendment No 6, which I have withdrawn, referred. Specifically, the word 'metapieimenon' (manufactured) should be replaced by 'epexergasmenon' (processed).

Mr Harris (ED). — Mr President, representing one of the oldest non-energy mining areas in the world, Cornwall, I naturally warmly welcome the Commission's proposal and the Schinzel report.

Any one who has visited my constituency, probably on holiday, will have been struck by the fact that on many hills there are the remnants of the old mining industry — the engine houses, the mineshafts — they are all over the county. But what they will not realize from that superficial impression is that there is considerable interest, renewed interest, in exploring and reopening some of these mines, because, of course, modern technology has meant that what was uneconomic in the last century or the beginning of this century suddenly has new relevance. And I can tell the Commission that already their proposals have sparked off some interest in Cornwall. Naturally, I hope Cornwall will be one of the candidate areas for this form of assistance; but of course the danger is, as has been emphasized in this report, that the money available is really peanuts.

The Commission's own explanatory memorandum points out that the 10 million ECU over the four-year period could really only help about three or four projects a year, and my fear is, as always with this type of scheme, that expectations will be built up to a point where they cannot be realized. I am wondering just how many applications the Commission thinks it is going to receive for this money. I hope, therefore, like everyone else, that the scheme will be extended, that this indeed is just the first step along the way.

I hope too, in the initial stages, that companies, particularly small ones, will not be asked to put in detailed applications if most of those applications have absolutely no hope of being considered. A lot of resources can be wasted in drawing up applications when at the end of the day only a handful of them really have any chance of consideration. So I hope the Commission will be flexible, that in the initial stage they will not ask for too much detail with the applications, that they will then sift out the ones which they think really do

have a chance and then go back and get a lot more detail so that they are obviously putting the money into schemes which do have a reasonable chance.

I also have some reservations about paragraph 6 of the Schinzel report, which says that the money should go only on the drilling side of schemes. I wonder indeed whether it might not be better to have some of the money go on the initial exploration. I personally think that we should be pretty flexible, certainly in the initial stages of this scheme, until we see how it is going to work out.

With those remarks I give both the Commission's proposals and the Schinzel report my backing.

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, the Commission is grateful for the backing given to this proposal by the Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and its Committee on Energy and Research. I can therefore confine myself to the questions that have been put and comment on the amendments.

First point. It is clear that 10 million ECU spread over four years is not an extraordinary amount. I should like to tell the Parliament that, if it should consider these loans inadequate, it would always be possible, since this is non-compulsory expenditure, to increase them. The Commission, however, would not favour such a course for the moment. We have noted that increasing these sums is not one of Parliament's priorities and have consequently decided to make a first experiment and adapt the programme accordingly: I think that is the way we have to look at it. Since we do not know whether this sum of 10 million ECU will be enough for the four years, we shall consider, during the first or the second year, what further activities need to be encouraged and what additional sums could be asked for in view of the fact that there is no longer any ceiling.

Second point. In the main, I share all the views that have been expressed this morning on the need to adapt our management to the objects we are pursuing. We shall bear this in mind — and, incidentally, this is more easily done under a programme designed to encourage projects than under a definitive programme, which of course, has to be subject to rather more precise technical and legal regulations in order to give everyone a proper chance.

As regards the amendments, I would say that the Commission accepts Amendment No 1, by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, and will modify the regulation accordingly. On Amendment No 2, I would say to Mr Moreland that I do not want to accept it, even though I am in agreement with what he is proposing. The reason for this, as we have made quite clear in our discussion with the Council on the subject, is that we are not prepared to accept a com-

Davignon

mittee unless it makes some contribution to the business of management. We do not want a committee of officials delegated by their national administrations, who would only want to check whether the distribution key was in their favour or not. On the other hand, we do need in this committee two types of experts — experts in research and exploration and experts in supply policy. I can therefore assure Mr Moreland that I shall do my best to prevent the institution of a committee composed of persons without these qualifications.

I can, however, accept Amendment No 3, by Mr Papantoniou, on the understanding that where we speak of companies constituted under public or private law we mean firms. There can be no question, in this project, of allowing the place of firms to be taken by governmental agencies: the Commission has no reason to grant them assistance, but that we should aid firms constituted under public law is a perfectly normal thing to which we have no objection at all.

Amendment No 4 is unnecessary, Mr Papantoniou, and so I do not accept it. The procedure envisaged is that whoever sends an application to the Commission must, at the same time, inform the State in which the exploration project is to take place. In this way, the information will reach the Commission and the State concerned simultaneously, and from that moment on everything will proceed according to the principles which normally apply under the legislation relating to exploration in that State.

With regard to Amendment No 5, I think the wording will have to be changed a little, since it speaks of '*promoteur privé ou public*', which is not very clear.

As for the other amendments, we should not be prepared to follow them.

That, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, is what I wanted to say. I thank everyone for the support that has been given, and would say to Mr Petronio that the research programmes to be instituted under the framework programme, programmes which will be concerned with this kind of problem, not on the supply side but on that of research, will give us occasion to return to these matters as he indeed wishes.

Mr Rogers (S). — Mr President, I do not want to delay matters. As Mr Papantoniou said, there are some linguistic problems relating to the amendments. Some of them in fact do not make sense in English. Now we did discuss this yesterday and I wonder at what stage it would be appropriate to do this — as each amendment comes?

President. — The debate is closed. We shall now proceed to the vote¹.

¹ See Annex.

Draft regulation, Article 2: Amendment No 3

Mr Papantoniou (S). — (GR) I should like to propose some linguistic improvements with each amendment. May I begin, Mr President?

President. — No, Mr Papantoniou. Linguistic changes can only be made to the amendment in the original language, after which the translations into the other languages are revised accordingly. Unless we confine ourselves to the original version, we may spend hours discussing the changes to be made.

Mr Schinzel (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, the English version of Mr Papantoniou's amendment is meaningless, whereas I can support the German version.

President. — The original version is the Greek one. Does it have to be changed?

Mr Papantoniou (S). — (GR) It will have to be changed so as to make it easier to arrive at precise translations in the other languages. One can choose other Greek terms which will make the sense clearer, and these are the improvements I was hoping to make.

President. — Then you will propose them in Greek and the other versions will be adapted accordingly.

Mr Papantoniou (S). — (GR) Very well, Mr President.

Mr Rogers (S). — Mr President, this is the one issue which is contentious, because in English the amendment, which may be alright in German and Greek, says: 'with a legal person constituted under public or private law'. Now I am open to correction from some legal experts on the Conservative benches, but in Great Britain, as I understand it, there is only one law which constitutes public and private companies. Evidently, this is the sense behind Mr Papantoniou's amendment. So it is not just simply a linguistic matter, it is also a matter of different legal systems in the different countries. What we would be anxious about, as British representatives, is that both public companies and companies that are private and not State-owned should be eligible to apply...

President. — No, this is not a legal problem but a linguistic problem. I think everybody has understood what Mr Papantoniou means. The German version does not create any difficulties, but the English does. The meaning of the original Greek text has come over

President

clearly in the interpretation but not yet in the translation. The translation has to be adopted.

IN THE CHAIR: MR NIKOLAOU

Vice-President

Article 3: Amendments Nos 4 and 5

Mr Papantoniou (S). — (GR) Mr President, Amendment No 5 does indeed stand in need of the linguistic alteration indicated by Commissioner Davignon. Specifically, the phrase '... stous idiotikous ei demosious foreis' (to private and State bodies) should become 'stis idiotikes ei demosies epicheiriseis' (to private and State undertakings).

This alteration will render the text clearer and more conformable with the legal terminology of the other countries.

President. — I see that the rapporteur and the Commissioner agree.

Article 6: Amendments Nos 1, 6 and 7

Mr Welsh (ED). — Mr President, the English text is written in such a way that it would appear as if the last two indents of this article should be taken out. Now we do not want the last two indents taken out and we do want to vote for the amendment.

Could we ask Mr Schinzel therefore to confirm that in the German text the last two indents are retained?

Mr Schinzel (S), rapporteur. — Yes, they are retained.

Mr Papantoniou (S). — Mr President, I withdraw Amendment No 6, but I am not withdrawing Amendment No 7 to Article 6, which still stands.

Now I wish to make a small linguistic correction, again on No 7, because it does not make any sense in English. I will now speak in Greek so that the interpreters can make it clear to everybody.

(The speaker continued in Greek)

Mr Papantoniou (S). — (GR) In Amendment No 7, in the phrase 'demosia ypeirisia tou Kratous melous' (State agency of the Member State) the word 'demosia' should be deleted to give 'ypeirisia tou Kratous melous', which is rendered in English as 'agency of the Member State'.

Motion for a resolution, paragraph 7: Amendment No 9

Mr Papantoniou (S). — (GR) Mr President, here too I wish to make a linguistic alteration in order to facilitate the accurate translation of the text into the English, because the present translation is not satisfactory. Where the amendment refers to 'demosies ypeirisies tou Kratous melous' (State agencies of the Member State), the word 'demosies' should be deleted to leave 'ypeirisies tou Kratous melous', which is rendered in English as 'agencies of the Member States' or 'State agencies'.

Mr Rogers (S). — Mr President, these linguistic alterations are really leading to an awful lot of confusion. Mr Welsh said he really did not know what it meant.

What is meant — and I think Mr Papantoniou has to make this clear — is that the information should be available to organizations like the geological surveys in the country concerned. I know that that is what it is. However, it is not spelt out, and as a result there are people voting against it because they feel that it is something quite exceptional. There are government departments which are responsible, like the Department of the Environment and the Geological Survey. This is what Mr Papantoniou means when he talks about State agencies. It is a very unfortunate word to use in this context, because he really means the responsible government departments.

If you ask Mr Papantoniou, I think you will find that is what is meant by his linguistic alterations. I cannot see why the Conservatives should vote against.

Mr Møller (ED). — (DA) On a point of order: it is now the fourth or fifth time that we are told that an amendment has to be changed because it contains linguistic errors. It is quite conceivable that linguistic errors may occur, but when they do, the amendment cannot be put to the vote. When we vote on an amendment, we do so in the form in which it is presented to us, and if the wording is not correct, then the amendment has to be dropped.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Mr President, we all want to get on with the vote, and I do think that it is wrong for Mr Rogers to try to restart the debate. If he wants to know why we are against these amendments, I will tell him outside afterwards. It is perfectly clear to us.

While I have the floor, might I ask you to confirm that you did put the motion for a resolution as a whole to

Welsh

the vote and that it was adopted, because I do not think it was?

President. — Mr Papantoniou, could you explain the meaning of the suggested improvement to your amendment once more?

Mr Papantoniou (S). — (GR) Mr President, I think it is absolutely clear. It refers to State agencies in the Member States in which the programmes will be operated. These agencies should be exempted from all restrictions concerning knowledge of the results of exploration programmes undertaken, because it would be absurd for the government and State agencies of a country not to be acquainted with the situation pertaining in their country's mineral wealth sector. I think the matter is quite clear-cut and that we should adopt the amendment as it stands.

President. — Anyhow, the Chair notes that this is a substantive point and not merely a linguistic clarification.

Mr Nord (L). — Mr President, I do not want to be unfriendly, but it is a good old parliamentary habit that Members stand when they address the House. I can imagine that somebody might be forgetful of it, but I think that the presiding officer should then gently remind them of it.

(Applause)

Mr K. Fuchs (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, under what Rule are you allowing a debate to take place during the voting?

President. — You are quite right, Mr Fuchs, we shall now proceed to the vote.

5. Noise emissions from helicopters

President. — The next item is the second report by Mrs Squarcialupi, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. 1-982/82), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-653/81 — COM(81) 554 final) for a draft directive on the limitation of noise emissions from helicopters.

Mrs Squarcialupi, rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, this report has followed a rather chequered career by going backwards and forwards between the Commis-

sion and the Assembly in rather disorganized fashion when in fact it was not expected to encounter any obstacles.

This document deals with the level of noise produced by an ever more common and useful means of transport, the helicopter. The International Civil Aviation Organization has decided to limit noise 'at source' and, therefore, the noise heard on the ground by requiring a noise-level certificate for helicopters designed since 1 January 1980 and, in the case of new models, designed and produced after 1 January 1985.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection greeted the Commission's proposal with enthusiasm. Everyone is aware from daily experience of the damage noise causes to body and mind, whether it shows itself in the deterioration of human relations, physical and emotional stress, permanent impairment of hearing, or disorders in the cardio-vascular system, respiration, the digestive tract, the eye and the reproductive organs.

Enthusiasm for this directive has, however, been dampened by the intervention, albeit indirect, of the President of the United States, no less, who is wiping out all that has been achieved by the Americans in environmental protection and therefore in protection against excessive noise. While we were discussing the document, the United States notified us that it did not intend to adopt the norms of the ICAO, just as they have gone into reverse on other norms for noise regulation. As a consequence, European helicopter manufacturers would seem to be quite unequal to American competition, which is able to produce at lower cost. Furthermore, European firms always seem to be up against technical difficulties in ensuring, for example at the experimental stage, lower helicopter noise-levels and also in carrying out their tests. The directive under consideration did not, perhaps, fully evaluate the cost-benefit ratio.

These are some of the reasons for this directive's long and complicated career, reasons which have led to the request that it should not enter into force in the Community Member States before it does so in exporting third countries. In short, we are waiting to see what the United States will do.

This is the background to the little bit more noise we shall have to put up with, not least because of the American Government's reluctance to tackle environmental and noise-level problems. The one amendment to this directive, proposed by the Committee on the Environment, is in the rapporteur's opinion acceptable.

Sir Fred Warner (ED). — Mr President, our rapporteur has had an extremely difficult time with this report, and I really do thank her for her patience and tolerance. The report had to go back to the Com-

Warner

mittee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for the reasons she has described: I think she showed a most masterly grip of the situation and has now brought it back to us in a very acceptable form.

As she has pointed out, there are really two conflicting principles involved here. One is the question of noise, and I know that Mrs Squarcialupi herself has suffered dreadfully from the noise of helicopters operating in the region in which she lives. I personally suffered another damage the other day when all my laundry was whisked off the washing line by a helicopter descending over my back garden.

We cannot allow manufacturers to overlook the requirements of the environment; we cannot allow industry to go ahead regardless of the welfare of the population in areas where their industries operate. But equally, we cannot put our industries totally at risk. The requirements of combining low noise with absolute safety in a helicopter do require modifications which would cause it to operate at 15% less than its normal efficiency. If the Americans did not follow suit, then we should find the European helicopter industry in danger of disappearing altogether. It certainly could not compete. It is indeed jolly lucky that we still have a European helicopter industry. The challenge from the Americans has been so severe, and it is now developing even more severely.

I believe that the helicopter industry is an example of an industry which is particularly able to survive only as a European one. The firms concerned are too small to challenge the Americans on their own, and it is only as a European industry, in the long run, that we shall see helicopters survive. We must do nothing to put them in jeopardy. I therefore believe that the report in the form that Mrs Squarcialupi has brought it back will protect the interests of European helicopter manufacturers, and I hope that we can all agree to put pressure on the US Government so that one day the Americans and the Europeans can together produce quieter helicopters.

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) I should like to say straight away that the attitude of the Commission has nothing to do with whether or not I personally have had to suffer recently from the noise emitted by helicopters . . .

I must make quite clear — and I think this will not be a surprise to Mrs Squarcialupi — that we are not in a position to accept the amendment proposed by her committee, which would make the date of entry into force of this directive dependent upon external circumstances. We feel we cannot accept a situation that is legally obscure.

Moreover, precisely because we in the Community have an efficient helicopter production, we are inter-

ested in developing techniques which will give our manufacturers an advantage over their competitors. This particular matter does not fall directly within my competence, but in industry generally we are concerned to find that standards are often imposed upon us from outside, with the result that we have to make good the technological advances made by others. We also have to pay close attention to the decisions and recommendations of international organizations.

The third consideration preventing us from reacting favourably to this amendment now is that we want to avoid the adoption of divergent attitudes by the Member States of the Community. Helicopters are not produced in all the countries of the Community, and those countries that do produce them might well adopt an unfavourable attitude to a directive on noise, while those that do not might adopt it. We should then be faced with problems of the internal market, with all their consequences.

I shall, of course, convey Parliament's decision to my own institution, Mr President, but I did want to make the Commission's position quite clear before Parliament made up its mind.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

6. Foie gras

President. — The next item is the debate on the report by Mrs Pruvot, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on goose-cramming to produce *foie gras* (Doc. 1-686/82).

Mrs Pruvot (L), rapporteur. — (FR) I shall be very brief. I wish to say straight away that I refuse to expatiate on the views that have been expressed — in writing or otherwise — on this subject, views which can only excite derision.

I also refuse to dwell on the *pot-pourri* which is Amendment No 1, tabled by my British Conservative colleagues, for whom I have the greatest respect and understanding. I cannot allow myself to be persuaded that the high price of *foie gras* constitutes an insult to the millions of people who are suffering from hunger throughout the world. I ask my British colleagues, do they regard the production of Rolls Royce, of which the price per kilogramme is undoubtedly even higher than that of *foie gras*, as an insult to poverty in the world?

I will simply repeat what is contained in the motion for a resolution — that is to say, that goose-cramming is

¹ See Annex.

Pruvot

neither inhuman nor cruel but simply the exploitation of a bulimia which is natural in these birds. I would also stress that if our colleagues' amendments are adopted, this would be a serious threat to some 20 000 small-scale family farms situated in the most disadvantaged regions of France.

In conclusion, Mr President, I express the hope that my colleagues will follow me in deciding that there is no reason to ban cramming and, above all, that there is no justification for asking the Commission to draw up Community legislation on this subject.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the manufacture of *paté de foie gras* has been thoroughly considered by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. We had before us a report of the Council of Europe, which we could not afford to ignore entirely, and this prompted some of my colleagues to abstain in the vote on this report by Mrs Pruvot, although many of our proposed amendments, which were virtually identical with the Conservative Group's Amendment No 1, were rejected.

In the meantime — that is, between the approval of the report in committee and its presentation here in Parliament — international animal welfare associations have put it to us very emphatically that the Council of Europe report was adopted without any prompting on their part and does not have their backing. This puts us in a very different situation, since I, for example, would never have abstained but would have voted against this report if we had received this document earlier.

We therefore find ourselves in a rather difficult position, and I for my part can see only two possible solutions. One is that the rapporteur refers this report to the committee so that we can discuss the document from the International Animal Welfare Association; the other is that I, at least, support the Conservative Group's amendment, in which case I would ask for a separate vote on paragraph 2.

I therefore ask you, Mr President, to settle the question of a reference to committee before doing anything else.

One final word, Mr President. I do not think it good that a parliament that has dealt so exhaustively with the question of baby seals — a question which is very close to my heart and on which I voted with the same enthusiasm as I still feel for Parliament's decision — that a parliament, that is to say, should devote itself so wholeheartedly to the problem of what is going on in a distant continent but overlooks what is happening at home.

I therefore urge the rapporteur to ask for a reference to committee. Otherwise, I shall proceed as I have indicated.

(Applause)

Mrs Schleicher (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall confine myself to three points. Having closely examined the motion for a resolution submitted by our British colleague, Mr Caborn, the committee, with three abstentions, unanimously adopted the report by Mrs Pruvot. This report has my group's backing.

Secondly, what we are dealing with is a special way of fattening fowl in France. Fattening generally is today usual with all animals meant for human consumption, and it is inconsistent to put the fattening of geese and ducks into a different category from that of other animals. Discussions of this question have so far produced only ideological, not objective arguments.

Thirdly, the consequence on the ideological plane is that we must become vegetarians. I can only ask what the champions of plant protection would have to say. I personally — and probably most other people too — would not be particularly pleased at the prospect of being fed only artificially or synthetically.

My group is also opposed to the Spencer amendment, whose author, as he stated in this House on 17 June 1980, himself comes from a family engaged in poultry-farming. It really is rather obvious that certain interests are trying to dictate to French poultry-farmers. After all, about 20 000 farms are concerned.

It seems to me to be a double ethic. So far as I am concerned, whoever here in Strasbourg wants to make an ethical problem out of *foie gras* is lacking in a sense of humour.

(Applause)

Mr Spencer (ED). — Mr President, I want to clarify one thing. This is not a group amendment on behalf of my Conservative colleagues. Most of my Conservative colleagues regard *paté de foie gras* as an essential part of the lifestyle of capitalism and will have nothing to do with bringing its abominable production to an end.

(Applause)

This is merely a personal campaign, because I am personally repelled by the unnecessary nature of the suffering involved.

I would reply to Mrs Pruvot, whom I hold in the greatest respect for her views on external trade, that I do not see any parallel between this matter and the production of a Rolls Royce. Rolls Royce, as it happens, is produced near my constituency and, as far as I know, there is no cruelty involved in the production of a Rolls Royce.

(Applause)

There is a spectrum of attitudes on this subject. There are those who maintain that there is no cruelty

Spencer

involved and say, in fact, that the geese enjoy it! The geese enjoy the confinement, the tube thrust down their throats and the degradation of the liver. I don't think I need bother to speak to them. Then there are people who deny that there is any suffering and cite the Council of Europe report. Well, I also have a clear statement from the European Animal Welfare Groups that they contest the findings of that aged and somewhat biased report and ask this Parliament to look again at the evidence in its own right.

Thirdly, there is a group who are more frank. They admit that suffering is entailed, but they claim that the suffering is of an acceptable level and that it is justified by historical and cultural factors. I know that *foie gras* has been produced here since Roman times. I am a great admirer of Roman culture, but just because the Romans crammed their geese to produce *paté*, we do not have to follow them in everything. Bear in mind that they also force-fed their lions on Christian martyrs! We do not carry that forward into this century.

(Laughter)

One century's commonplace is the next century's barbarity. That is what we mean by the advance of civilization.

I am going to appeal to you today to vote for all or part of Amendment No 1. I am going to ask the President to take Amendment 1 in two parts. I would like a separate vote on paragraph 3, which is the operative part of the amendment. This paragraph would call on the Commission to end the derogation on unhygienic slaughtering. If he does that, it will allow those colleagues who are placed in a difficult position by having supported this in committee at least to put on record their support of the opening indents and the first two paragraphs, which condemn this as an inhuman and probably unacceptable practice, but to hold back, if they must, from the operative paragraph 3 that would end this practice.

I accept that for the 20 000 people concerned this would be a disastrous and sudden termination of their employment. These things must be done slowly. Public opinion must be allowed a chance to develop. It is my hope that the more the consumers of *paté de foie gras* become aware of the suffering entailed, the more they themselves will choose something else from the great cuisine of France, so that slowly *paté de foie gras* will 'wither on the vine'.

Mrs Poirier (COM). — (FR) Some years ago, the producers of *foie gras* were subjected to violent attack by the Commission, which, on the basis of sanitary regulations, wanted to abolish slaughtering on farms and do away with local markets. Thanks to their own mobilization and our support, producers and producers' organizations forced the Commission to beat a retreat, thus safeguarding the essential principles of this form of production.

Having thus been checked, the Commission offensive was carried over to this Chamber. Producers were accused of torturing animals, cramming was branded as inhuman and intolerable. In 1974, the Council of Europe adopted a report compiled by a committee of animal welfare experts, which, after due enquiry, rejected all these accusations as being without foundation.

The arguments we are hearing today from our distinguished British Conservative colleagues are ridiculous. Perhaps this is a form of English humour which is inaccessible to me ...

(Laughter)

... but I do not believe that these arguments are entirely naive. In fact, on a pretext of Community harmonization, they are aimed less at the cramming procedure than at the line of production itself, for in France, particularly in Aquitaine and the departments of the Landes, which are the main producers, it is mainly the peasants who carry on this traditional cramming of geese and ducks to produce *foie gras*. Their continued existence is an obstacle to the policy, imposed by Brussels, of eliminating small and medium-scale farmers.

The report from the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection takes this situation into account and offers us a realistic analysis of the problem. We agree with its conclusions as regards the rejection of any Community harmonization in this field. Nevertheless, we have tried, in a constructive spirit, to enrich it with a number of amendments. We have emphasized the economic importance of the production of *foie gras* inasmuch as it makes possible the survival of thousands of family farms and helps to keep many people employed in regions that are disadvantaged as it is.

It should also be stressed that the consumption of *foie gras* is increasing in the Community and throughout the world. Our British colleagues, who affect to be disgusted and are waging war against this form of production, will be interested to know that our exports of *foie gras* to Great Britain increased by 115% in 1981. This growing demand has to be met by an increase in production in the regions that are traditionally the most suitable; but in return, producers must be offered remunerative prices, and this requires greater protection against imports by raising customs duties. At the same time, research into questions of genetics, the reproduction and feeding of geese and ducks must be taken further.

The Commission could have done better than contribute to the destruction of our regional riches. Instead, it could have encouraged research work which has already been begun, in particular in France.

For our part, we shall make a point of informing small-scale producers of this debate, particularly Mr

Poirier

Spencer's speech, which we have appreciated at its true worth. If necessary, we shall rouse them to resist, as they have already done, this threat to a form of production for which our countryside is renowned.

(Applause)

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, the thrust of Mrs Pruvot's report is that goose-cramming is by no means a form of animal maltreatment but merely a friendly exploitation of the animal's natural gluttony. The cramming is carried out — and here I am quoting from the explanatory statement — by 'a person who exercises care and attention in helping the animal by hand to swallow exclusively maize-based food'. How nice that such an attentive person should help the animal by hand to swallow food! Evidently, despite its gluttony, it is unable to do this for itself. During the preparatory period at least, account is still taken of the animal's anatomical features — that is to say, the greatly developed gullet and crop. During the actual cramming period, however, such account is no longer taken, as we all know.

Mr President, this strikes me as a particularly disgusting form of animal torture. It is understandable that this apparently occurs only in the most backward regions of the Community. I admit that the bio-industry is just as repugnant in the less backward regions and that there are many other instances where animals are mistreated to titillate the palate of the gourmet. We are against those as well; but what we have in front of us now is the Pruvot report, and this we do not support. Those farmers who engage in goose-cramming will just have to switch to something else, if necessary with the help of the Regional Fund.

Mr President, we often disagree politically with our Conservative colleagues, but today we make an exception. We heartily support Mr Spencer's Amendment No 1. All other amendments, Nos 2 to 9 inclusive, which in one way or another extol goose-cramming or at any rate defend it, will not receive our support.

Mr Simmonds (ED). — Mr President, as a signatory to the main amendment and also as a rearer of stock, I am considerably disquieted by a number of the expressions contained in the report before us.

The first one is 'bulimia' — not a word that I use in everyday conversation, but according to my learned neighbour Dr Sherlock, it means perverted appetite. Not an expression that I would like to use in connection with the rearing of stock.

The second word that I take exception to is the word 'exploited'. Certainly in English that implies a degree of force and of cruelty.

The third word that I take exception to is the word 'cramming'. Once again, that implies force and cruelty.

May I assure Mrs Schleicher that as a farmer I know of no other animal that is crammed: every other farm animal's appetite is normal and is not stimulated in an artificial way.

Now we are told in paragraph 6 that cramming is an artisanal occupation. The same expression is applied to the matador in a bull fight, but neither skill is other than an unnecessary manifestation of the worst in human nature.

I now turn to the rapporteur, Mrs Pruvot. I note from your report, Mrs Pruvot, in paragraph 6 that a goose is fed some 800 grammes of food and that is not held to be abnormal. Well, Mrs Pruvot, I will vote for your report if you will agree to consume in one meal the same quantity of food in ratio to your body weight as is crammed into the unfortunate goose. Now, without wishing to be ungallant in assessing Mrs Pruvot's weight, I suggest that the equivalent weight of food would be approximately 7.2 kilos or 16 lbs of spaghetti.

(Laughter)

Furthermore, Mr President, I will offer to help Mrs Pruvot in the feeding of it to her.

(Laughter)

Mr President, there may be plenty to laugh about, but I have yet to hear a goose laugh and that is why I am signatory to this amendment.

(Applause)

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, in the Capitol the geese saved Rome from the Gauls, who were the ancestors of our present French partners in the Community, and who stand accused in this Chamber of a heinous crime: cramming geese. In order to thank these fabled geese, I have sought to make my contribution to improving this resolution without having the possibility — I confess — of hearing the opinion of the geese.

In the first draft, the report said that the geese liked being crammed, and that they positively loved their crammer-torturers. In the report tabled by Mrs Pruvot, I am glad to say that some of these touches of humour have been removed. The document is a balanced one. Cramming may not cause the geese any suffering but merely create a lassitude — the same lassitude that we feel in this Chamber when we hear a speech that we do not very much like — and there are many such speeches.

But in this Parliament we have realized that if we want to get ourselves talked about, we must talk about animals: yesterday it was baby seals, today it seems to be geese. If, with an eye on the European elections, we

Squarcialupi

took drastic measures against goose-cramming, if we decided to ban it, and with it *foie gras*, we would capture the interest of the entire press. Just think of it: people would come from all over. Everyone who eats *foie gras* would come and listen to us debate this subject.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope this does not happen and that reason will prevail. The geese might be happy not to be crammed, but the thousands of French breeders and the millions of *paté de foie gras* connoisseurs in all countries would not be so pleased. I say this although I must confess that I myself do not like *foie gras*. I could therefore express indifference, but I do not wish to put personal considerations before more serious arguments. Let us consider that whilst geese are made to eat by force, there are so many people round the world who get very little to eat.

Let us be serious, ladies and gentlemen, let us consider serious problems, let us put aside a few things that may bother just a few geese and let us seek to devote the best of our political capacities to serious topics, to true human topics, to topics which do credit to our Parliament rather than discredit it, which is what some decisions might do.

(Applause)

Mr Fergusson (ED). — Mr President, I think Mrs Squarcialupi is absolutely right. This debate, this very enjoyable debate, has become so ridiculous that I think I shall just sit down.

(Laughter and applause)

Mr Collins (S), Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. — Well, first of all can I say that that last contribution is the least ridiculous speech Mr Fergusson has made to the Parliament for a very long time.

I must also say that I was fascinated by Mrs Poirier's statistics. She told the Parliament that exports of *foie gras* to the United Kingdom have increased quite remarkably in recent times. I can only point out that this is yet more evidence that life under the Conservatives is bad even for geese.

But, as chairman of the committee, Mr President, I am really concerned about the consistency that this Parliament shows over the problem of cruelty to animals. I must point out that not so very long ago this Parliament was campaigning against the killing of baby seals, in spite of the fact that we were told that there were economic considerations that must be brought into the argument. The Parliament took a very proper moral stand and said that in spite of these economic considerations the unnecessary slaughter of baby seals in Canada should be brought to an end.

I point this out to the Parliament so that when it does come to exercise its vote in a few minutes it will bear that in mind.

I would simply say that in English we have a saying which is: 'What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander'.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, as somebody has just said, this has been a somewhat enjoyable debate and I suppose that it has. On the other hand, I think it is the Commission's duty to try and take the issue seriously and to give the Parliament a considered view.

We have looked at such evidence as exists and I am bound to say that such evidence as exists is basically the report of the Council of Europe in 1974.

Now, what does the evidence amount to, Mr President?

First of all, geese are grazing birds and thus normally have a large intake of low-energy food. As I understand it, cramming entails giving a similar quantity of high-energy food which is so dense that it cannot be swallowed without some assistance. The argument with regard to cruelty must thus revolve around two issues: first, the ethics of feeding in this way, in other words artificially feeding and fattening either birds or animals; and secondly, whether the methods actually used in this case are such as to inflict pain or distress.

As far as the ethics of this are concerned, I find it very difficult to see how one can distinguish between the ethics of artificially fattening a goose and the ethics of artificially fattening cows, chickens or any other of the animals that we normally eat in our daily diet.

If there is nothing wrong with the ethics, so to speak, of the artificial nature of the feeding, the issue has to be considered, it seems to me, on the basis of one simple question: does the method used in that artificial feeding cause unnecessary pain or distress? And I have to say to all those who are so anxious in this matter that such evidence as is available is against them. The main body of evidence, as has been said in this debate already, is the report of the Council of Europe in 1974. And, with great respect, it really is not good enough for somebody in 1983 to get up and challenge the findings of an expert committee of the Council of Europe in 1974 on the basis that the Welfare Association now do not accept the findings of that report. If there is evidence — and there is serious evidence and there is considered evidence — then, with great respect, I think it is the duty of those who are putting the case for banning to produce that evidence, not merely to say that they disagree, in rather blanket terms, with the evidence which has been produced on the other side.

Richard

I must say to the Parliament, therefore, that in view of the findings that are available and in view of the evidence that is available, the Commission can see no reason to interfere with the industry either in terms of prohibition or in terms of harmonization of methods in the various regions concerned.

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now proceed to the vote.

Mrs Pruvot (L). — (FR) Mr President, I should like to ask whether we have a quorum for the vote.

(The verification of the quorum took place)

President. — A quorum is not present. Consequently, the vote is postponed until the Monday of the February part-session.

Mr Spencer (ED). — Point of order, Mr President. In view of that quorum vote and in view of the extra information given by the Commission, would the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection consider receiving further evidence from the European welfare groups between this part-session and the February part-session of Parliament?

President. — Mr Spencer, your point of order is not concerned with the Rules of Procedure and therefore the chair makes no reply.

Mr Enright (S). — Mr President, I would like to move formally that this sitting be suspended forthwith and ask for a recorded vote on that motion.

President. — Colleagues, are there at least 10 Members who support the adjournment of the sitting?

(More than 10 Members stood up)

I must therefore ask one Member to speak in support of the motion and another to speak against.

Mr Spencer (ED). — I assume you would like me to speak in support, Mr President, and I shall do so. Mr Enright has demonstrated a sensitivity and an awareness of the political issues in the matter we have been debating that I am entirely in support of. He is fully aware that this matter went through the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection with only partial consideration. I do not blame the committee for that: we have new information. Therefore, presumably, he wishes us to suspend this

sitting in order to allow tempers to cool, passions to quieten ...

(Laughter)

and extra information to be consumed or crammed in the period between now and the next sitting. I hope the point I made earlier on — perhaps a slightly fatuous point of order — will be taken that the Environment Committee might consider taking evidence from the Euro-welfare groups to see if they have anything more up-to-date than 1974, and I entirely take the Commissioner's point.

For all these reasons, I think it would be helpful if we now had a vote to ascertain who is in this room at this particular moment.

Mr Nord (L). — (NL) Mr President, I am amazed at Mr Enright's proposal. He has so little respect for this Parliament that he did not even find it necessary to explain why he should propose that we suddenly bring this part-session to an end. Twice this morning a request has been made to verify the quorum, and in one of them Mr Enright himself was concerned.

Those who are not prepared to collaborate and now feel frustrated are manoeuvring into a position where they can tell us to go home and scrap all the remaining items on the agenda. We have asked for a verification of the quorum for the item we have just finished debating; apparently, we have no quorum. It is not the custom in this Parliament to try to get one's revenge by having all the remaining items removed from the agenda. I ask Mr Enright to withdraw his proposal; if he does not, I ask the Parliament to reject it.

(Parliament rejected Mr Enright's proposal)

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President, may I ask for your advice as to what is the proper procedure? When Mr Enright moved that the House should adjourn, you very properly ruled that it required 10 Members in support. It was some considerable time before 10 Members of this House were reluctantly persuaded to their feet. Could I ask you to say whether the Rules state how long a president is to wait for the requisite number of Members to be on their feet? If the Rules are silent on this point, will you refer the matter to the Bureau for a ruling, please?

(Applause)

President. — Dame Shelagh, many Members rose without my being able to decide whether they wanted to leave or to support Mr Enright's motion.

7. Reform of statistics in the Community

President. — The next item is the debate on the report by Mr Newton Dunn, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the reform of statistics in the Community (Doc. 1-744/82).

Mr Newton Dunn (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, I am grateful to colleagues that they voted to keep the sitting going.

This is not such an exciting subject as the last topic, but it is probably more important to the running of the Community.

(Applause)

In April 1981, the Socialist Group tabled a motion that the present Statistical Office of the European Communities be transformed into an interinstitutional body under the joint administration of other Community institutions. This would represent a change in status, for the present Statistical Office is a section of the Commission and answers to the Commission. The Committee on Budgets examined the arguments for and against this proposition and went to the trouble of seeking the opinions of other Community institutions on the point.

The principal arguments *in favour* of making the Statistical Office into a separate body were the following:

1. The continuing growth in the Community's need for statistical information, which threatens to lead to the creation of separate statistical departments in each institution, justifies that a separate body should be built up; otherwise we shall have duplication and waste.
2. There have been suggestions from some quarters of the Community that the present arrangement — the Office being a section of the Commission — is unfavourable to other institutions and over-favourable to the Commission.
3. A separate body could be endowed with greater powers to collect and harmonize information *vis-à-vis* the Member States.
4. There are precedents for greater independence, notably among some of the national statistical offices in the Member States and indeed among other Community bodies, such as the Office for Official Publications.

So there were quite strong arguments in favour of a separate body. The arguments *against* a separate body were the following:

1. The creation of a separate body at this time would increase Community spending on new offices, new equipment and new supporting staff, and that would be inappropriate at a time of financial stringency in all Member States and indeed in the Community.

2. The Commission has accepted publicly its shortcomings in the provision of statistics to other institutions, and has already publicly undertaken to give higher priority to providing this information to other institutions. The Committee on Budgets applauded this promise, hopes that it will be adhered to and indeed that greater priority will be given to printing and disseminating the information as well.

3. The opinions of other Community institutions were largely in favour of retaining the *status quo* at the moment. These opinions are set out in full in the explanatory statement accompanying the motion for a resolution.

The committee therefore decided unanimously that the time was not ripe for any such change as had been proposed and that the Statistical Office should continue for the present to answer to the Commission. However, the committee is aware that the Community continues to evolve and change, and it feels that the proposal for a separate body should be kept in mind; hence its request, in paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution, that this question be reported on by the Commission in 1985.

During the committee's investigations, a number of other important points concerning statistics emerged, and it would be sensible to report on them:

1. Every few years the Commission publishes a programme of work, the latest one being the Fifth Statistical Programme for 1982-84. The Committee on Budgets considers that the Parliament should in future be asked to give its opinion on this programme, which it has not been up to now.
2. The committee was strongly against the formation of separate statistical departments within other Community institutions. I have already indicated how the committee feels this would be wasteful and the duplication unnecessary.
3. The committee wants to see statistics from Member States compiled on a more uniform basis and a greater degree of regional disaggregation of statistics in future. Indeed — and this should be music to most colleagues' ears — it would like to see statistical information presented separately by parliamentary electoral regions once the uniform electoral procedure is in place.
4. The committee believes that Members of this Parliament should be allowed direct access to the Statistical Office instead of having to go through a formal channel of communication in order to extract statistical information.

Mr President, I note that no amendments have been tabled to the Committee on Budgets' report and therefore I hope that the House will feel able to support it unanimously.

Sir Brandon Rhys Williams (ED). — Mr President, before I begin I would like to declare an interest in that a relative of mine by marriage is currently concerned with the Commission's technical work in the provision of statistics. But my remarks arise from my work as a member of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs during the past ten years, and I think Members will see that they are consistent with opinions I have expressed in Parliament on earlier occasions.

I would like to congratulate my friend, the rapporteur. The report is convincing on the need to coordinate the statistical work of the Community and make the data available more readily within the institutions. Attention is also drawn to the need for Community statistics to be readily available to Members of Parliament, and I am sure that everyone in this House will readily agree with that.

I would like to emphasize the need for reliable, comparable, up-to-date information on the performance of the Community's economy to be more readily available as a background to business decisions. Businessmen need to be able to take long-term decisions with the reasonable confidence that they will prove right. Their confidence in their judgment is improved if they know that they can rely on their market information. Ambitious entrepreneurs need the support of reliable, up-to-date data. In the United States, information on such things as housing starts, stocks, automobile sales, hire-purchase figures, banking aggregates, etc., are published as a regular Federal service to business. The Community needs the equivalent of our national trade journals and employment gazettes which would present in comprehensible form, readily available to business decision-takers, the monthly movements in the main investment, production, export and import and employment figures of the Community as a whole, with appropriate regional analyses.

Of course, we have an admirable service from newspapers and journals, but the Commission could organize the immense amount of official information which is available to national and Community institutions and put it to public use.

It is not only in the private sector that there is a need for much more reliable and up-to-date information. Within the public sector of our economies in every Member State, big decisions also have to be made which could be much more soundly based if we could reduce the reliance that our public servants have to place on guesswork and could build logically on a known and widely-shared basis of fact.

I would like to go still further. I think that the Commission ought to produce a regular statistical gazette providing a measure of informed comment on the trends which are shown by the figures. I know that forecasting and analysis of data can be a dangerous exercise, but somewhere in the Commission there

ought to be an element which is making a thorough-going and competent assessment of the significance of long-term trends as indicated by movements in the basic Community statistics.

Some years ago, I recall that a proposal was made for a Community long-range economic studies institute. I was the rapporteur when this recommendation was considered in Parliament, and as far as I recall, Parliament was in favour of the idea. It is one more of the suggestions which have never been followed up — as far as I know. Maybe, on reflection, we would say that it is not necessary actually to set up a separate long-range forecasting institution to study Community statistics, but I would like to have confidence that somewhere within the Commission there is indeed a professional group who have a clear idea where present trends are taking us in the long-term and are making this information known to our decision-makers. At present, I do not have the confidence that such a group exists.

The only point, therefore, where I disagree with the report is in its paragraph 5, where the Commission is given until 1985 to assess the future statistical needs of the Community. In the present economic situation, we cannot afford to wait so long. I hope the Commission will return to the subject early in the current year.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, may I say that this has been a brief but, I think, extremely interesting and valuable debate.

I start off by saying that the Commission is pleased the House has been given the opportunity of discussing this question and, more particularly, the role of the Statistical Office within the institutional framework of the Community.

May I say a word right at the outset to Sir Brandon Rhys Williams, who made a speech containing a number of very interesting points. What he called for — and I took it down — was an assurance that somewhere in the Commission there were people who were seriously considering 'where present trends are taking us in the long-term'. There are certainly people considering them. The trouble is that it is very difficult to get unanimity among the people who are considering them, whether in the Commission, outside the Commission, in Member governments, or in newspapers, as to where present trends are going to take us in the longer term. I can only say to him that certainly within the Directorate General of the Commission for which my colleague Vice-President Ortoli is responsible, this is precisely the work that is being carried on there.

As to the other points that he made, again, I must say I found them extremely interesting. They are ones which I know the Commission will wish to consider, particularly the point as to whether or not one should be developing a greater sense of urgency — I think

Richard

this was what he was calling for — in relation to the operation and the future of the Statistical Office.

There is no doubt that, in comparison with other Directorates General of the Commission, the DG which comprises the Statistical Office has a special role and a special function in relation to the other Community institutions. As stated in the Commission's own Manual of Procedures, 'the primary role of the Statistical Office is to provide the various institutions of the Community with the statistics required for formulating and monitoring Community policies', and I am extremely grateful to see, in Mr Newton Dunn's report, the very positive comments expressed by all the institutions on the service provided by the Office.

I turn now to the various specific suggestions and recommendations made. We agree with the Committee on Budgets' conclusions that the Statistical Office should remain a Directorate-General of the Commission rather than be constituted as an inter-institutional body, and we agree with that conclusion for much the same reasons as set out in the report itself. I would, however, say in this regard that the Commission has always been anxious to provide this Directorate-General with a political stimulus in keeping with its special role rather than, as might be inferred from a casual reading of paragraph 1 of the motion for a resolution, catering to the purely administrative aspects of providing a statistical service. I think it has to be more than that, and I therefore find myself in agreement with what Mr Newton Dunn was saying this morning.

Referring to the request in paragraph 4 of the motion that Members of Parliament should have access to the services of the Office, we think this highly desirable. In consultation with the secretariat of Parliament, we hope to initiate new procedures in the near future to ensure that each Member can have easy and direct access to the Office's data.

I would point out — and this is relevant, I think, to the dissemination of statistics — that the Parliament's secretariat in Luxembourg in exactly the same way as the Commission's departments, has direct access to the computerized statistical data-base known as 'Kronos'.

There are plans for this to be made available here in Strasbourg also very soon.

The motion speaks of a need for a 'greater degree of regional disaggregation of statistics'. I should like Parliament to know that Eurostat is at present completing the setting up of a data-base of the most important statistical information on population, jobs, unemployment and production for about 740 administrative districts in the Community. I think this will provide a degree of — it is a horrible phrase, but I think it is fairly clear what it means — that regional disaggregation in the collection of statistics which the resolution calls for.

Finally, I turn briefly to the extremely important point of trying to ensure the development of a unified European system of statistics. A great deal remains to be done, but while this is true there has, I think, been some encouraging progress in this sphere over recent years, mainly as a result of the very close system of consultation and corroboration which has developed between the Statistical Office of the Community and the Member States' national statistical offices — for example, the use of uniform definitions, classifications and nomenclatures for statistics on foreign trade and industry and the joint organization of major surveys of agricultural and industrial structures, as well as of wages and of labour forces.

By way of conclusion, might I thank Mr Newton Dunn for his very useful and constructive report, which the Commission feels to be an excellent basis upon which to discuss this important issue in the future.

President. — The debate is closed¹.

8. Adjournment of the session

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned².

(The sitting closed at 11.55 a.m.)

¹ For the vote, see Annex.

² For items concerning membership of committees, motions for resolutions entered in the register under Rule 49, time-limits for tabling amendments, forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting, and dates for the next part-session, see the Minutes.

ANNEX

Votes

This annex indicates rapporteurs' opinions on amendments and reproduces the texts of explanations of vote. For further details of the voting, the reader is referred to the Minutes.

COMMISSION PROPOSAL FOR A REGULATION (Doc. 1-1014/82: Importation of hemp-seed) (Procedure without report): APPROVED

*
* *

COMMISSION PROPOSAL FOR A REGULATION (Doc. 1-1061/82: Act of Accession of Greece) (Procedure without report): APPROVED

*
* *

MACCIOCCHI REPORT (Doc. 1-546/82: Conscientious objection): DEFERRED TO THE NEXT PART-SESSION

*
* *

BOOT MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1147/82: ERDF): ADOPTED

Explanations of vote

Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED) (*in writing*). — The debate we held late last night was one of the most important, if brief, debates we have had for many years, because it is of vital importance not only to the underdeveloped regions, but to the developed ones too.

It does no good to the cohesion of the Community to have disparities increasing as they have done over the past few years of the recession.

As far as the weaker regions are concerned, it is crucial for their economic recovery that we get these new guidelines agreed at the earliest possible moment so that the Regional Fund can be brought up to date to help meet the serious problems facing many areas.

The Commission have played their part in bringing in new guidelines and in altering them to meet the wishes of the Parliament expressed in the debate as long ago as last April.

It is now up to the Council to act to show that it really cares about the plight of the citizens of the poorer areas of the Community and is prepared to take action to help them.

Mrs Théobald-Paoli (S) (*in writing*). — (*FR*) At the end of this debate on the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), I wish to explain the background to my vote, which is the fact that the ERDF absolutely must take account of the labour situation in the

regions of the Community, particularly those showing what I would call a deceptive prosperity.

The criteria used for the appropriation of funds must be based on an analysis of the facts in the regions. Seemingly more prosperous metropolitan cities must not be a pretext for classifying their countries as 'rich' or mask the impoverishment, for example, of a hinterland with agricultural problems or of a mono-industrial coastline at the mercy of competition from Asia. Such is the case of my own region, with the fine name of Provence-Alpes-Côtes d'Azur, and the city of Toulon, whose blossoming out, notwithstanding the presence of geographical and human resources, has to wait until given the necessary aid.

For all of us, the fight against unemployment is of the first importance; nevertheless, it is as well to recall the realities that have to be borne in mind when creating fresh employment. With this aim in view, I have just tabled a motion for a resolution under Rule 47.

There have, of course, been many debates on the European Regional Development Fund, but many others will have to follow. Our task must be to adapt in depth the ERDF, now more than ten years old, to the realities of the 80s.

KEY REPORT (Doc. 1-760/82: Discharge for 1980): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke *against* all the amendments.

*
* *

BATTERSBY REPORT (Doc. 1-1003/82: Embargo on agricultural exports): ADOPTED

Explanations of vote

Mr Saby (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as I have already had occasion to say in the Committee on Budgetary Control, Mr Battersby's report has a polemical aspect which we find regrettable. One part — paragraphs 6 to 9 — looks to the future and envisages measures designed to ensure greater cohesion within the Community, but the first part, in our view, strikes a regrettably polemical note. Nevertheless, we shall vote in favour.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, I believe that the motion for a resolution contained in Mr Battersby's report on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control is not so much concerned with technical control as with chiefly attempting to lay down policy directions on trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union, directions which we consider particularly negative.

I think that both Mr Battersby and the Committee on Budgetary Control, and likewise the whole of the European Parliament, since here we so often speak about the United States, should take a lesson from the way President Reagan threw into the rubbish-bin the earlier decision by President Carter for an embargo on wheat exports to the Soviet Union. Seen from this angle, the motion is particularly negative, especially for our country, which has large exports of agricultural produce to the socialist countries, and we shall therefore vote against it.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, there is no bigger issue, I submit, that serves to undermine support for the European Community than the subsidized exports to the USSR by the European Commission. I am just sorry that more people did not feel able to support the amendments. At the time of the Russian invasion of Afghanistan, the Commission was instructed not to increase sales to the USSR; but not only did the levels of sales go up,

they went up four times, and this at a time when the defenceless Afghans were being plundered and murdered by the might of the Red Army. That war, Mr President, still goes on. The Commission repeatedly told Parliament that export levels to Russia were not being increased, but we have now seen that this House was deceived.

The explanatory statement in the Battersby report is a clear indictment of the serious failures of the Commission. It is, however, to be regretted that the motion for a resolution which accompanies it does not reflect the gravity of the failures of the Commission set out so clearly in that explanatory statement. Nevertheless, with some diffidence, I shall be supporting the Battersby report.

Mr Tyrrell (ED). — Mr President, it was naturally with some satisfaction that I read the Battersby report, which bore out the charges that I and certain other Members had been making in 1980 and 1981 to the effect that not only were sales far in excess of those for the previous three years, but also that the House was being given wrong information about those sales. It was nevertheless with something like despair that I heard Mr Dalsager in the debate on Wednesday replying on behalf of the Commission: there was a lamentable lack of realization of the gravity of the charges that the Committee on Budgetary Control has established.

There has still been no explanation as to why the Commission should have willingly and voluntarily divested themselves of the power to control sales by abolishing the tender system in June 1980. There has still been no explanation as to why they did not reduce the rating to zero at the beginning of the year instead of the end of the year. There has still been no adequate explanation as to why the House was on so many occasions given such misleading and inaccurate information during 1980.

I, for my part, greet the Battersby report with satisfaction, but when Mr Dalsager says that he hopes that this is an end of the matter, I can only say it will only be an end of the matter when the Commission face up to the gravity of the position.

*
* *

AIGNER REPORT (Doc. 1-1125/82: Court of Auditors): ADOPTED

*
* *

SCHINZEL REPORT (Doc. 1-974/82: Mineral raw materials): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke:

- IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3 and 5; and
- AGAINST Amendment No 4.

Explanations of vote

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — Mr President, I did not wish to speak in the debate, because I hoped that my point of view would be adequately covered, but I must now, in supporting the Commission and Mr Schinzel, say that it is because of the vital importance of trying, however expensively, to move towards Community self-sufficiency in the strategic raw materials for defence and industry. I think particularly of steel alloys. The threats to the supply-lines of Europe are posed by Soviet imperialism. The long sea-routes referred to by Mr d'Ormesson and Mr Diligent, from Southern Africa, need to be emphasized again and again. We must consider the powerful Soviet navy in the Indian Ocean. We must consider the unaccountable boycott of the South African Simonstown naval base and the Cape of Good Hope itself. We must consider that a lot of these sea-routes pass through oceans that are not covered by the NATO sphere of action.

So let us pass, by a big majority, these proposals, knowing their likely benevolent effect on the security and defence of Europe.

(Applause)

Mr Wurtz (COM) *(in writing)*. — *(FR)* Mr President, the proposal before us seems to us to be positive, for we consider that the Community can play a constructive part, complementary to that of the Member States, in aiding the search for non-energy minerals in countries of the Community — a contribution, that is, to the efforts now being made to reduce the dependence of Member States on outside sources for supplies of raw materials. True, the Community's financial means offered will be limited, but will nevertheless provide a degree of participation and an element of guidance which we welcome. We shall therefore be voting for Mr Schinzel's report. We have also voted in favour of the amendments proposed by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and by Mr Papanтониou to improve the text.

*
* *

SECOND SQUARCIALUPI REPORT (Doc. 1-982/82: Helicopters): ADOPTED

*
* *

PRUVOT REPORT (Doc. 1-686/82: Foie gras): DEFERRED TO THE NEXT PART-SESSION

*
* *

NEWTON DUNN REPORT (Doc. 1-744/82: Reform of statistics): ADOPTED

**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-agents / 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

Underagentur.
Europa Bøger
Gammel Torv 6
Postbox 137
1004 København K
Tlf. (01) 15 62 73
Telex 19280 EUROIN DK

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger
Breite Straße
Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (0221) 20 29-0
Fernschreiber:
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

GREECE

G.C. Eleftheroudakis S.A.
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
GPO Arcade
Dublin 1

or by post
Stationery Office
Dublin 4
Tel. 78 96 44

ITALIA

Libreria dello Stato
Piazza G. Verdi, 10
00 198 Roma
Tel. (6) 8508
Telex 62 008
CCP 387 001

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
Télex PUBLOF - Lu 1322
CCP 19 190-81
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

H.M. Stationery Office
P O Box 569
London SE1 9NH
Tel. (01) 928 69 77 ext 365
National Giro Account 582-1002

Sub-Agent:
Alan Armstrong & Associates
Sussex Place, Regent's Park
London NW1 4SA
Tel. (01) 723 39 02

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
Télex 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-agent:
Librairie Payot
6, rue Grenus
1211 Genève
Tél. 31 89 50
CCP 12-236

SVERIGE

Librairie C.E. Fritzes
Regeringsgatan 12
Box 16356
103 27 Stockholm
Tél 08-23 89 00

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**European Community Information
Service**
2100 M Street, NW
Suite 707
Washington, D.C. 20 037
Tel. (202) 862 95 00

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd.
2182 St Catherine Street West
Montreal
Québec 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 1982/1983: ECU 49.10 BFR 2 000 IRL 33.60 UKL 29 USD 57

Single issue: price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

ECU 14,70 BFR 600 IRL 10 UKL 9 USD 18



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

