

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-300

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1983-1984 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 6 to 10 June 1983

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 6 June 1983	1
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Tribute, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 2 — Speaking time, p. 5 — Action taken on the opinions of Parliament, p. 6 — Votes, p. 6 — Lead in petrol, p. 7 — Shipment of hazardous wastes, p. 16 — Annexes, p. 21.	
Sitting of Tuesday, 7 June 1983	30
Approval of the minutes, p. 31 — Welcome, p. 34 — Decision on urgency, p. 35 — Community youth — European Foundation, p. 36 — Welcome, p. 54 — Memorandum (Greenland's withdrawal from the EEC), p. 55 — Elections 1984 (Declaration by the Council), p. 65 — Right to vote and stand for election, p. 70 — Votes, p. 77 — Malta, p. 78 — Question Time, p. 80 — Annex, p. 93.	
Sitting of Wednesday, 8 June 1983	98
Decision on urgency, p. 100 — Williamsburg Summit, p. 101 — Shipment of hazardous wastes (continuation), p. 110 — Ethyl alcohol, p. 116 — Agricultural incomes, p. 128 — Topical and urgent debate (objections), p. 132 — Question Time (continuation), p. 132 — Agricultural incomes (continuation), p. 146 — Fruit and vegetables, p. 153 — Votes, p. 158 — Statement by the President, p. 160 — Votes (continuation), p. 163 — Agenda for next sitting, p. 163 — Annexes, p. 165.	
Sitting of Thursday, 9 June 1983	182
Approval of the minutes, p. 184 — Special part-session, p. 184 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 186 — Community's internal frontiers, p. 208 — Family policy, p. 218 — Seeds, p. 227 — Milk and milk products, p. 228 — Horses intended for	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

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

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

Contents (*continued*)

slaughter, p. 230 — Application of the Rules of Procedure, p. 231 — Votes, p. 233 — Horses intended for slaughter (continuation), p. 234 — Common commercial policy, p. 237 — Transport infrastructure, p. 244 — EAGGF appropriations, p. 252 — Automobile industry, p. 256 — FAST, p. 258 — European scientific and technical strategy, p. 261 — Annex, p. 263.

Sitting of Friday, 10 June 1983 271

Approval of the minutes, p. 271 — Votes, p. 272 — Fruit and vegetables, p. 273 — European scientific and technical strategy (continuation), p. 275 — Development, p. 277 — Oil refining, p. 283 — Amendments to Regulation 67/67, p. 284 — Adjournment of the session, p. 291 — Annex, p. 292.

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 6 to 10 June 1983 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 184 of 11 July 1983.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 6 JUNE 1983

Contents

1. <i>Resumption of the session</i>	1	<i>Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Prout; Mr Sieglerschmidt</i>	6
2. <i>Tribute</i>	1		
3. <i>Agenda</i>		7. <i>Lead in petrol — Report (Doc. 1-279/83) by Mr Ceravolo</i>	
<i>Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Veil; Mrs Vaysade; Mrs Scrivener; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr Collins; Mr Johnson; Mr Pearce; Mr von der Vring; Mr Bangemann; Mr Klepsch; Mr Patterson; Mr Sherlock; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Dalsass; Mr Griffiths; Mr von der Vring; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Seefeld</i>	2	<i>Mr Ceravolo; Mr Beazley; Mr Gallagher; Mr Collins; Mr Alber; Mr Sherlock; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Gauthier; Mr Eisma; Lord Douro; Mr Calvez; Mr Pearce; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	7
4. <i>Speaking time</i>		8. <i>Shipment of hazardous wastes — Report (Doc. 1-370/83) by Mrs Van Hemeldonck</i>	
<i>Mr Patterson; Mr Pearce; Mr Bangemann; Sir Fred Catherwood</i>	5	<i>Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr I. Friedrich; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr I. Friedrich; Mr Donnez; Mrs von Alemann</i>	16
5. <i>Action taken on the opinions of Parliament</i>		<i>Annexes</i>	
<i>Mr Glinne; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Fernandez; Mr Narjes; Mrs Fuillet</i>	6	<i>Mrs Pantazi; Mr Del Duca; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Patterson; Mr Pearce; Mr Provan; Mr Collins; Mr Geronimi; Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Lalor</i>	21
6. <i>Votes</i>			

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

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 20 May 1983 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Approval of the minutes — Implementation of the Rules of Procedure — Motion for a resolution (Rule 49) — Petitions — Transfer of appropriations — Authorization to draw up reports — Referral to committees — Documents received — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council: see the minutes of this sitting.

2. *Tribute*

President. — I should like to pay tribute to Mrs Louise Weiss.

(All the Members present rose)

She was the oldest Member of our Assembly. She died at the age of 90 years, but we all recognized in her the qualities which make youth such a splendid thing: enthusiasm, a love of ideals, particularly that of liberty, an abhorrence of prejudices and a smiling willingness to help in every good cause, which impressed all who had the privilege of knowing her.

She lived a long life, and right throughout that life she was a fighter. The causes she championed were extremely ambitious: the emancipation of women and the achievement of union between the peoples of Europe.

President

The success of her work as a journalist and writer needed no laurels to gild it. Nevertheless, her election to the European Parliament in 1979 was without doubt a kind of symbolic consecration for her, because ever since the end of the First World War she had determined to 'point the human spirit towards better solutions than bombs and bullets'.

The achievements of one who had always fought to bring about a better world culminated in the crowning joy of the latter years of her life, namely, her election by universal suffrage to the European Parliament, a parliament that could embody the aspirations of men and women from its ten member countries. The death of Louise the European — this is how she styled herself when writing her own epitaph — has brought to all of us a moment of deep emotion.

I hope that this moment will be for all of us an occasion to gird ourselves to face the enormous difficulties that lie in our path today and to take up once more the task — which is far from being accomplished — of uniting the peoples of Europe in the preservation of their identity. The former difficulties can undoubtedly be overcome if we are prepared to bring enough resolve, energy and material sacrifices to the task. The second task calls for a more deep lying commitment and a degree of spiritual force that is difficult to measure.

Louise Weiss' life and work were a mighty impulse launching her fellow Europeans along the right path. Let us pay tribute to her clearness of mind and to her beautiful spirit that might serve as models for all of us to imitate. Let us keep her memory green.

(The House stood and observed a minute's silence)

3. Agenda

President. — At its meeting of 18 May 1983 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to you.

At their meeting this morning the chairmen of the political groups instructed me to propose to the House a number of changes to the agenda.

On *Monday's* agenda :

— the Legal Affairs Committee asked that the report (Doc. 1-117/83) by Mrs Vayssade, the vote on which is down on today's draft agenda under No 97, be referred back to committee.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, it is undoubtedly a very fine thing that we can vote during Monday's sitting on the motions for a resolution on which discussion has been closed; however, we are faced with a hundred or so amendments, some of which require careful thought. I therefore consider that it would be more reasonable to allow Groups and individual Members the time to assess these amendments.

President. — Mrs Squarcialupi, it is true that there are sometimes problems on the Monday, but if you want to change the way things are done, you have to submit your request one hour before the beginning of the sitting. The only request that has been submitted to me is that from the Legal Affairs Committee.

Mrs Veil (L), chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee. — *(FR)* Mr President, the report was discussed at the last sitting, and after the discussion Commissioner Burke said that a number of amendments put forward by the Legal Affairs Committee could not be considered, and that if they were to be adopted the draft directive adopted by the Commission would be very different from what had been proposed by the Legal Affairs Committee. There was almost nobody remaining in the Chamber when Mr Burke said this. Mrs Vayssade, the rapporteur, asked Mr Burke to express this point of view again today, before the vote.

Finally, the Legal Affairs Committee considered that it was undoubtedly preferable for Mr Burke to be heard in committee so that we could study Mr Burke's proposal there, and that a final vote should only be taken on this question when the Commission had, if necessary, been able to prepare new proposals.

Mrs Vayssade, (S), rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, I will only confirm what Mrs Veil has just said, with a reminder that, in the case of this report, all the amendments except one — a rare occurrence — come from the Legal Affairs Committee, and it therefore seems to us more effective, for Parliament as a whole, to allow the Legal Affairs Committee to review this question with the Commission, so that a text can be prepared that will be easier for Parliament to vote on.

(Parliament decided to refer the Vayssade report back to Committee).

President. — Still on Monday's agenda, I have a request from the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) that the report (Doc. 1-371/83) by Miss Hooper, which is entered on today's draft agenda as Item No 111, be referred back to committee.

Mrs Scrivener (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I think that this report must in fact be referred back to committee because the vote in the Committee on the Environment did not take place entirely as it should; because, in addition, the text is quite incoherent, and because there is no point in presenting such a text to Parliament without having revised it. You are aware that these texts concerning the environment are particularly complex. They can very rapidly become unintelligible, which is what would be the case here. In addition, therefore, to reasons regarding form and procedure, there is thus a basic reason justifying this referral back to committee.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — (DE) Mr President, I am totally opposed to this proposal. I would like to remind the House that this report was on the agenda once before, on 10 March 1983, and that it was referred back to committee. It is not my place to comment on the logic of the report as it stands at present, but I would like to comment on the reasons why some members want to have it referred back to committee. Parliament ought not to respond to the type of massive lobbying that has gone on in the case of this report by giving in to it.

The Environment Ministers will be discussing this important subject next week, and they are waiting for the European Parliament's decision. We must vote on it today; there is no reason whatsoever for not debating the Hooper report.

(Parliament decided to refer the report back)

Mr Collins (S). — I wonder if we could have some clarification on this, Mr President, because normally, as I understand the Rules — although I do not have my Rules with me at the moment — there is a time limit set for a committee to report back to the plenary. I wonder if you could enlighten us as to this time limit. It seems to me to be significant.

President. — When a report is sent back to the committee concerned, Mr Collins, it is up to the committee to decide when it should be reintroduced.

Mr Johnson (ED). — Mr President, will you clarify that the delay is merely intended to enable the text to be put in order and the amendments to be properly prepared. Would you clarify that that is the only reason it is being referred back?

President. — Correct, but I cannot decide what the time limit should be. That is up to the committee.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Before you leave Monday's business, I would like to express considerable disquiet about the time available to us for the Ceravolo report. There are many views on this subject, both in my group and across the House, and the way it is working out I will not be able to speak on it because of the allocation of speaking time in my group. Yet it is in my constituency in the UK that 3 000 people stand to lose their jobs because of this regulation. I therefore propose that some means be found to extend the speaking time, either by letting the debates continue over until tomorrow or by switching speaking time between groups so that those of us that have a direct constituency interest in this have a chance to put their point of view forward. Otherwise it makes a mockery of Parliament.

President. — I do not think we have arrived at that point yet.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, Monday's agenda, includes two other reports to be

followed by a vote. We may have to continue debating one of these on Tuesday, in which case I would like to make it clear that the note 'to be followed by a vote' does not apply and that any reports that cannot be debated on Monday will be voted on at the next available opportunity.

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) Mr President, I disagree with my British colleague's proposal. I don't know whether you will put it to the vote, but if his own group is unable to allocate him any speaking time on a subject of such importance to his constituency, why should he expect other groups to? His group apparently doesn't regard the matter as all that important! Incidentally, this just goes to show yet again that the British electoral system is in need of reform; then he wouldn't have these difficulties.

(Applause)

President. — With regard to Tuesday's agenda:

— I have a request from the Political Affairs Committee that the debate on the Schieler report (Doc. 1-160/83), entered as Item No 118, be held over until Thursday.

(Parliament agreed to this request)

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Could you please tell us when this report will be debated on Thursday?

President. — At 3 p.m.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Mr President, when Mr Pearce, my colleague, asked you about the Ceravolo report you said we had not come to that yet. I was wondering whether we can now come to it because Mr Bangemann chose to make a party political point about a serious procedural problem. It is because the proposal in front of us allocates speaking time by days and not according to the Rule 65 by debates that we arrive at the situation where a large number of important debates have to be crammed into this Monday...

President. — Mr Patterson, may I ask you, as I have already, to wait a moment because the allocation of speaking time generally comes at the end, after we have fixed the agenda because then we know better how to go about it. So we will come back to that point and if you then raise your hand you will be called to speak.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — If I could follow up Monday's agenda and refer to the Van Hemeldonck report which I am sure a majority of this House would like to see helped through the Parliament to help the meeting of the Environment Ministers later this month. But is the material — as I think Mrs Squarcia-lupi feared — ready for us to proceed both to debate and vote upon this tonight? I am sure it is the wish of the House so to do if we can.

President. — Yes, it seems that everything is in perfect order for consideration of the Van Hemeldonck report today.

Still on the *Tuesday* sitting :

— At 3 p.m. the Council intends to make a statement on the date of the 1984 European elections and on the right to vote. This statement will not be followed by a debate.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — My group would rather like to make room for a debate under Rule 40 because we do not like the idea that the Council comes out with something and no one can comment upon it at all. It may be that no one wants to comment and that it is absolutely clear. But until they make a statement we do not want to say that we have no comment to make on the statement. We would just like to make the time available.

President. — You are fully entitled to invoke Rule 40 for that purpose, so I have to accept your request.

The oral question to the Council by Mr Maffre-Baugé, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the regulation for fruits and vegetables originally included in the Colleselli report, has now been transformed into an oral question to the Council because the Council was not able to reply during the Colleselli debate. I hope there are no remarks on that proposal.

Wednesday :

The European Democratic Group demands the withdrawal of the second Dalsass report (Doc. 1-240/83) on ethyl alcohol, Item No 92.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — Mr President, I would not like to say to colleagues in this Parliament that our group demands anything. We simply put the case to our colleagues. We do ask them to consider the Dalsass report and see whether it could not be postponed, first of all because we understand from the rapporteur that he did not feel that there was any particular urgency. That was the reason it was postponed until this time. If it was not urgent last month, it is not all that urgent this month.

Secondly, we do also understand that there are some-substantial legal objections by the Legal Affairs Committee which we feel should be discussed further by the Committee on Agriculture before this is brought up.

Thirdly, we would like to make time for a debate on the Williamsburg Summit. We do think that that is urgent and if this takes two hours to vote — as we understand it will — we think that that two hours would be better spent on the Williamsburg Summit which matters a great deal more to anyone than the Dalsass report.

President. — Thank you Sir Fred. But if you do not actually demand it, it will simply remain on the agenda, I understand.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — Mr President, we would like to propose in a polite way to colleagues that this be removed from the agenda not to make a demand. That is all.

Mr Dalsass (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I don't know where Sir Fred got the idea that I do not feel there is any urgency about my report. I would have liked Parliament to have debated it in March, but it was unfortunately postponed at the Conservatives' request. I agreed at the time because I wanted it to be referred back to the Legal Affairs Committee. In the three months that have elapsed everyone has had time to read it. There is no reason why we should not vote on it now and I would greatly appreciate it if we could.

It will not take long to deal with the amendments ; all but five of the 119 proposed amendments have been reviewed by the Committee on Agriculture, so they are now clear. Please can this item therefore be left on the agenda ?

Mr Griffiths (S). — Mr President, I would like to speak in favour of referral back of the Dalsass report particularly in view of the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee. The Legal Affairs Committee has looked at the Commission's proposals and the amendments to the Dalsass report and they have said that is still not a legally acceptable proposal.

What I would like to see is the rapporteur of the Committee on Agriculture, the draftsman of the opinion for the Legal Affairs Committee and the staff of the Commission meeting together to hammer out this problem, so that a report can come to Parliament which is within the legal terms of the Treaty. I think it is ridiculous that we can be voting on the Dalsass report when one of Parliament's committees says that it does not have legal validity.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, if I understand Sir Fred correctly, he is not demanding that the report be referred back but merely asking other members of Parliament to request its referral back, which no one has done. Please could we therefore get back to the agenda ?

(Parliament rejected the request by the European Democratic Group)

President. — Still on the *Wednesday* sitting : at 9 a.m. the Commission will make a statement on the outcome of the Williamsburg Summit. This statement will be followed by a debate which will last a maximum of one hour.

An oral question by Mr Møller, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on protectionist measures taken by Sweden has been converted into a question to the Commission for Question Time and will be taken as the first of the questions to the Commission.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — I was wondering, Mr President, following the remarks of Sir Fred Catherwood, whether or not there would be an opportunity to debate the Williamsburg meeting and its outcome. It looks as though our agenda is so full that we shall not have time to do it, which I regret deeply.

Have you got a proposal to put before the House, Mr President, as to how we can encompass that particular objective? I hope you have.

President. — Sir James, I made a proposal, which has already been accepted, that Mr Thorn would make a statement on Wednesday morning at 9 a.m., followed by a debate with a maximum speaking-time of one hour.

(The President read the changes to the draft agenda for the Thursday and Friday sittings)(1)

Mr Seefeld (S), chairman of the Committee on Transport — (DE) Mr President, item No 67 on Thursday's agenda is Mr Martin's report on a pilot infrastructure programme. A little further down, item No 132 is Mr Vandewiele's report on the funding of a fixed link across the Channel. Since this is a related topic it might be a good idea to debate it immediately after Mr Martin's report. Mr Vandewiele is in agreement with this suggestion, by the way.

(Parliament agreed to this request and adopted the draft agenda thus amended)(2)

4. Speaking time

President. — Pursuant to Rule 65 of the Rules of Procedure, I propose to the House that speaking time be allocated as set out in the Bulletin.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Mr President, I would oppose that proposal as far as Monday is concerned. I will explain to you why. Rule 65 of the Rules of Procedure says that speaking time shall not be divided up by days but by debates. Now it is convenient on most days to divide the day up broadly between the groups and allow them to decide how to allocate their speaking time for the debates. This goes badly wrong on Monday when, as today, we have controversial items on the agenda like the Ceravolo report. It means that the groups are put under pressure on these matters. In this case my group has only 7 minutes to allocate among highly contentious and important matters. The fact that we have tabled 34 amendments to the Ceravolo report indicates that it is a controversial item. I would suggest that it would be much better if the Bureau actually adhered to the Rules of Procedure and allocated speaking time by debate when it comes to Monday.

(1) See Minutes.

(2) Deadline for tabling amendments: see Minutes.

I would suggest, in fact, that the speaking time provided for Monday's agenda be allocated *in toto* to the Ceravolo report and that if it is not possible for groups to use up their speaking time today, they be allowed to continue tomorrow. In other words, I propose that Mr Pearce's suggestion that the debate be allowed to carry over to tomorrow be adopted. I think my proposal is more in accordance with Rule 65 of our Rules of Procedure and certainly more in accordance with having a proper debate on what is an important and controversial matter.

President. — Mr Patterson, I would like to make a number of observations. First of all, the agenda for the rest of the week has been accepted. That means that the groups have agreed to the reports proposed by the enlarged Bureau for today's, tomorrow's and the other agendas.

Apart from that, we have removed from the agenda the vote on the Vayssade report as well as the Hooper report. That means that, as against what was originally decided, there is now additional speaking time available. Whether you get it from your group or not is your problem, not mine. I think that is the way to solve this problem. In the light of the decisions taken there is sufficient speaking time for the reports now on our agenda, and I would not propose any other allocation than the one provided for at the moment.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, I suppose you are saying that the speaking time allocated to the groups in the draft agenda would be increased to take up the time saved by the absence of one of the votes and by the fact that Miss Hooper will not be making a rapporteur's statement.

I support what Mr Patterson said. Further, I must just say to Mr Bangemann, in view of what he said about me, that the virtue of our electoral system is that we are able to support local interests in a way which his system denies to people from his country, and I intend to exercise that right.

President. — Mr Pearce, first of all, as we have deleted a few reports, the rapporteurs need less time because there are fewer of them. The Commission also needs less time, so as a consequence of our decision, the original speaking-time of 60 minutes will be increased to approximately 90 minutes. That means that you have 50% more time than originally proposed, so there is no difficulty at all.

Mr Bangemann (L). — Mr President, I wanted first of all to address a general remark to the Honourable Member from Cheshire West, because I do believe that he is wrong. The present system gives every group the opportunity to choose freely between the items on the agenda. If we were to allocate speaking-time on each item we should force a group to speak on issues which perhaps were not important to that

Bangemann

group. So his group has the opportunity to choose the Ceravolo report and to use all the speaking-time of the Conservative Group for that issue.

Secondly, I am not against representing local interests and issues. All I was saying, my dear colleague, was that if you do not succeed in convincing your group that your local interests are so important that your group has to give you some speaking-time, why do you expect others to do so? This was my point, and I believe that it is right.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — I simply wanted to say that the position of our group was, as explained, that we thought that the total time allocated to these reports was rather short and we much appreciate the fact that you have extended it. We see no reason why Mr Bangemann should bring electoral systems into it except that his party is about to be defeated on Thursday.

(Laughter and applause)

5. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament

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

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, with regard to urgent aid granted in cases of disaster, the text received from the Commission is very laconic: 'Nothing to report'. Now, several countries and regions in the Community have been hit by very serious flooding, not only on the occasions that we have discussed — that is to say, at the time of the April and May part-sessions — but again subsequently. I should therefore like the Commission to tell us something more about this.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, if my interpretation is correct, the statement to which my colleague Mr Glinne objects relates only to decisions on amounts and not to the circumstances. I am perfectly willing to ask the people concerned to review the way in which these circumstances have come about.

Mr Fernandez (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, on 24 May I sent a letter to the Commission regarding the flooding in the Burgundy region and requesting urgent aid. The European Parliament also adopted a resolution on this subject during the May part-session. Since then, the situation has become even worse, especially for the farmers. My question to the Commission is as follows: has the Commission granted this urgent supplementary aid, as provided for by the Regulations of the Community?

⁽¹⁾ See Annex II.

Mr Narjes. — Let me assure you that you will receive a written reply.

Mrs Fullet (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should also have hoped the Commissioner could draw up for us a list of the stricken regions, since it seems to me that since the last part-session, new areas have been hit. Out of fairness, I should like all regions to be included in the distribution of funds.

President. — As we always have rain, I think that it would be better to wait for the Commission's written answer on this subject.

6. Votes⁽¹⁾

SECOND PROUT REPORT (DOC. 1-1180/82 — CONSUMER CREDIT)

President. — I would remind the House that in its sitting of 11 February, having adopted the amended proposal for a directive on the harmonization of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States on consumer credit, the directive which was the subject of the Prout report, Parliament decided, on a proposal from the rapporteur, to hold over the vote on the motion for a resolution until such time as the Commission would have delivered its opinion on the amendments made by Parliament to this directive.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, I have pleasure in informing the House that the Commission has accepted all Parliament's amendments with one exception, and that relates to the legal form of the method of calculating the annual interest rate laid down in Article 1, paragraph 2 (d). We hadn't settled this question because it was going to be reviewed by legal experts who have now established that, contrary to the opinion on which Amendment No 2 is based, a Commission decision is out of the question, and that a directive would be legally in order.

Their explanation is that the proposal on consumer credit is designed to harmonize Member States' legal and administrative provisions, and as such has to be based on Article 100. The only legal instrument provided for by this article is the directive; anything else is out of the question.

If the powers for calculating the annual rate of interest are really to be assigned to the Commission, our legal services say, this can only be done on the basis of Article 100. In other words, the annual interest calculation method also has to be established by a directive.

⁽²⁾ See Annex I.

Narjes

I wrote to the committee chairman, Mrs Veil and Mr Prout on May 30 saying that the Commission did not yet wish to commit itself regarding the legal form of the method of calculating the annual interest rate. This question has now been answered for us by a statement from our legal services. Let me emphasize that we are in complete agreement concerning the desirability of settling this matter.

The Commission's concrete suggestion for this part of the directive, i.e. Article 1, paragraph 2 (d), is, and I quote: '*Within one year after the adoption of this directive the Commission shall establish a uniform method*'. There would not otherwise be any changes. Measures would also have to be taken to ensure that Member States adopt this method. Article 6, paragraph 3, would have to contain a clause to this effect, such as: '*The annual rate of interest and the annual rate of charges referred to in the previous paragraph shall be established in conformity with the method laid down on the basis of article...*'. This is our only amendment, and we are compelled to make it for legal reasons, I must stress again.

Mr Prout (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, I am afraid that both Commissioner Narjes and myself have been put in an impossible position. At the time we discussed these amendments with the Commission in the Legal Affairs Committee last month, the Commission was of the opinion that a Commission decision under the Directive would be legally in order. Both of us have learnt this morning that the Commission legal services have now changed their mind.

Now in my view the substitution of a directive for a Council decision would substantially reduce the harmonizing effect of this directive and would also contradict the intention firmly expressed by this House at the time we voted on the amendments. It is therefore with great regret, Mr President, that I must once again ask you — this time under Rule 36 (2) — to remit the matter to the Legal Affairs Committee where we would wish to debate with the Commission legal services their interpretation of Article 100.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President, while being in favour of referring this matter back to committee, I would like to add that it is regrettable that the Commission could not come up with these finer points of legal detail during the lengthy deliberations, which went on for many months, instead of after Parliament had debated the matter. I agree to the report's being referred back but expect the Legal Affairs Committee and the Commission to put a proposal before Parliament in the near future so that we can vote on it at last, this issue being an important one for consumers.

(Parliament agreed to the request for referral back to committee)

7. Lead in petrol

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-729/83) by Mr Ceravolo, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on lead in petrol.

Mr Ceravolo (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, this proposal, on which I am reporting to the Assembly on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, may be considered exemplary. In fact, both Parliament and the Council are called upon to recognise a problem concerning health and the protection of the environment, as having precedence over other special considerations.

In regard to this problem there is recognition first and foremost that a state of danger exists to public health. I do not think there are any doubts about this, and this fact underlies all the directives that have so far been approved by the European Parliament, as well as the legislative measures that have been adopted by all Member States.

Every time an effort has been made by law to reduce the lead in petrol there has been this awareness of the very harmful effects of lead in the blood. In the United States, also, and in Japan, where there is a decided move towards lead-free petrol, they are aware of the health risk that lead presents. Some people may say that in Japan and the United States the reasons are of a technical nature, but it is still true that, indirectly, the point from which it all began is to do with health. The technical considerations may spring from a concern to avoid the damage caused to petrol filters by the lead in the petrol; but the filters were fitted for the very reason that atmospheric pollution, in some Japanese and American cities, had already reached intolerable levels, so that, in the end, these 'technical' reasons still owe their origin to a concern for public health.

The investigation carried out by the Ispra Centre, which is quoted by many of those who are against the call for a reduction in the lead in petrol, was carried out as part of the biological monitoring of the population against the danger of Saturnism and, at best, left things pretty well where they were before. At all events it recognises that the lead content of motor vehicle exhaust gases accounts for 30 % of the lead in the blood: about the remaining 70 %, nothing is said. We know, however, that sufficient research was not carried out, since the lead falling in rain could, through the intake of food and drink, also account for the remaining 70 % of the blood lead level.

At all events, the medical profession throughout the world is now very worried, and this concern has recently been increased by the publication in Great