

Annex

Official Journal of the European Communities

No 246

October 1979

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1979-1980 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 22 to 26 October 1979

Maison de l'Europe, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 22 October 1979	1
Resumption, p. 2 — Membership of Parliament, p. 2 — Political groups, p. 2 — Welcome, p. 2 — Petitions, p. 2 — Documents, p. 3 — Text of treaties, p. 5 — Referral to committee, p. 6 — Authorization of reports, p. 6 — Urgency, p. 6 — Order of business, p. 6 — Speaking time, p. 9 — Amendments, p. 9 — Procedure without report, p. 9 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 10 — Freedom of trade, p. 10 — Convergence in economic undertakings, p. 22 — Urgency, p. 30 — Next sitting, p. 31 — Annex, p. 32.	
Sitting of Tuesday, 23 October 1979	33
Minutes, p. 34 — Urgency, p. 35 — Decision on an early vote, p. 42 — Urgency, p. 42 — Development of air transport, p. 43 — Question Time, p. 58 — Votes, p. 62 — Urgency, p. 65 — Inland waterway vessels, p. 65 — Road transport of goods, p. 69 — Urgency, p. 78 — Implementation of the 1979 budget, p. 79 — Harmonization in social legislation, p. 94 — Urgency, p. 97 — Next sitting, p. 97.	
Sitting of Wednesday, 24 October 1979	98
Minutes, p. 100 — Documents, p. 100 — Membership of Parliament, p. 100 — Urgency, p. 100 — Political cooperation, p. 107 — European monetary system, p. 117 — Question Time (resumption), p. 128 — Votes, p. 142 — Urgency, p. 143 — Political cooperation (resumption), p. 143 — Agenda, p. 182 — Urgency, p. 182 — Committees, p. 182 — Next sitting, p. 183 — Annex, p. 184.	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

Appearing at the same time as the English edition are editions in the five other official languages of the Communities : Danish, German, 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 : *(DK)* for Danish, *(D)* for German, *(F)* for French, *(I)* for Italian and *(NL)* for Dutch.

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

Contents (continued)

Sitting of Thursday, 25 October 1979 185

Minutes, p. 187 — Documents, p. 187 — Agenda, p. 187 — Decision on early votes, p. 188 — Urgency, p. 189 — Harmonization in social legislation (resumption), p. 191 — World hunger, p. 208 — Appointment of Secretary-General, p. 211 — Question Time (resumption and conclusion), p. 211 — Votes, p. 217 — World hunger (resumption), p. 217 — Welcome, p. 234 — World hunger (resumption), p. 234 — Committees, p. 247 — Urgency, p. 247 — World hunger (resumption and conclusion), p. 248 — Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia, p. 274 — Fisheries policy, p. 286 — Seeds sector — Market in rice, p. 301 — Wines originating in Tunisia, p. 304 — Wines originating entirely in Greece, p. 305 — Damage by hurricanes David and Frederick, p. 307 — Next part-session, p. 309 — Organization of the budget debate, p. 309 — Next sitting, p. 310 — Annex, p. 311.

Sitting of Friday, 26 October 1979 322

Minutes, p. 324 — Documents, p. 324 — Petitions, p. 325 — Procedure without report, p. 324 — Urgency, p. 325 — Decision on an early vote, p. 327 — Votes, p. 327 — Disaster in Orkney and Shetland, p. 333 — Torture of children, p. 335 — Ad hoc committee on women's rights, p. 338 — Violation of press freedom in Malta, p. 343 — Arrest of six Czechoslovakian citizens, p. 346 — Control of agricultural expenditure, p. 348 — Agenda, p. 350 — Votes, p. 350 — Community funds and sale of surplus sugar in 1979, p. 352 — National contributions to budgetary expenditure, p. 354 — Tribute, p. 354 — Personal statements, p. 355 — Committees, p. 355 — Next part-session, p. 355 — Minutes, p. 355 — Adjournment p. 355.

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 22 to 26 October 1979 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 289 of 19 11. 1979.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 22 OCTOBER 1979

Contents

1. <i>Resumption of sitting</i> <i>Point of order: Lord Harmar-Nicholls</i>	2	15. <i>Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament</i>	10
2. <i>Membership of Parliament</i> <i>Mr Glinne</i>	2	16. <i>Freedom of trade in the Community — oral question with debate (Doc. 1-288/79): Mr de Ferranti, author of the question</i>	10
3. <i>Political groups</i>	2	<i>Mr Davignon, member of the Commission; Mr Moreau, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr von Wogau, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mr Møller; Mr Leonardi, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Nyborg, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Debré; Mr Hord; Mrs Boot; Mr Turner; Mr Patterson; Mr Davignon; Sir David Nicholson</i>	12
4. <i>Welcome</i>	2	17. <i>Economic convergence — financial situation — oral questions (Docs 1-383/79 and 1-385/79)</i> <i>Mr Ruffolo; Mr Giavazzi; Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Castle, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Notenboom, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Sir John Stewart-Clark, on behalf of the European Democrats; Mr Bonaccini, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Nord, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Deleau, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Bersani; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Griffiths; Mr Natali; Mr Didò</i>	22
5. <i>Petitions</i>	2	18. <i>Urgent Procedure</i>	30
6. <i>Documents received</i>	3	19. <i>Agenda for the next sitting</i>	31
7. <i>Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council</i>	5	<i>Annex</i>	32
8. <i>Referral to Committee:</i> <i>Mr van Aerssen</i>	6		
9. <i>Authorization of reports</i>	6		
10. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	6		
11. <i>Order of business:</i> <i>Mr Kirk, Mr Bangemann, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the European People's Party (CD); Mr Bangemann; Mr Sieglerschmidt, draftsman of the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee; Mr Notenboom, Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Budgets; Mr Klepsch, Mr Chambeiron, Mr Pelikan</i>	6		
12. <i>Speaking time</i>	9		
13. <i>Time limit for tabling amendments</i>	9		
14. <i>Procedure without report</i>	9		

IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

(President)

(The sitting was opened at 5.25 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 28 September 1979.

I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls on a point of order.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — Madam President, on a previous occasion I mentioned the importance of keeping to our timetable. I have been approached by many colleagues from many groups this afternoon asking if I would once again draw your attention to the fact that we should have started at five o'clock, and it is now 25 minutes past five.

(Applause)

Madam President, it is not to you personally that I am making these comments. The last time this happened, it was because groups were claiming your attention. Groups should claim your attention before the starting time. Our particular group, which had many important things to discuss, interrupted its meeting in order to get here on time. It has been suggested it might be the Bureau. If it was the Bureau, the Bureau must respect the convenience of all colleagues. It was then suggested it may be your advisors. Well, your advisors really must do as you tell them, Madam President, and you must tell them to brief you in sufficient time to enable you to keep to the timetable. Otherwise it makes nonsense of the sort of work we want to undertake.

(Applause)

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament is a difficult parliament and has to face numerous problems. The President and the Bureau are responsible for ensuring that our business is correctly discharged. It was in order to avoid an incident which could have cost us many hours during sittings that the Bureau has been meeting for more than 15 minutes. The late start is therefore due not to any fault on the part of my colleagues nor to the inefficiency of the President but to the desire to ensure that our work was carried out in an orderly fashion.

(Applause from certain quarters)

2. Membership of Parliament

President. — On 28 September 1979 the Italian authorities informed me that Mrs Maria Antonietta Macciocchi had been appointed Member of the European Parliament to replace Mr Sciascia.

I welcome our new colleague and remind the House that, pursuant to Rule 3 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, any Member whose credentials have not yet been verified takes his or her seat provisionally in Parliament and on its committees with the same rights as other Members.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Madam President, the one o'clock radio news bulletin announced that the French Council of State had just given judgment in the matter of the appeal, lodged by the French Socialist Party after the elections of 10 June, against a controversial decision concerning one of the seats in this Assembly. Are you aware of these developments?

President. — I heard the news indirectly. As soon as we have been informed officially we will take appropriate action.

3. Political Groups

President. — I have been informed :

— that Mrs Macciocchi has joined the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, with effect from 8 October 1979, and

— Mr Pannella has resigned from that group with effect from 9 October 1979.

(Laughter — applause from certain quarters)

4. Welcome

President. — I welcome the delegation from the Inter-parliamentary Organization of the Association of South East Asian Nations, led by Mr Polnikorn, which has just taken its seats in the official gallery.

We welcome this first official visit of ASEAN to the European Parliament and hope that the contracts established and the work of the delegations augur well for the future development of collaboration between the two parliamentary institutions.

5. Petitions

President. — I have received the following petitions :

— from Mrs Josselin and others, on the political situation in Chile ;

— from Mr Borgetto, President of the Hôtellerie de Plein-air du Var, on the erection of lightweight holiday cabans and residential leisure parks ;

President

- from Mr Lachmann and others, on the right of foreign residents to participate in the direct elections to the European Parliament;
- from the citizens of the Montemaggiore Belsito (Province of Palermo) on a commission of enquiry on the water shortage;
- from the Argentine Commission for Human Rights, on the seizure of ex-deputy Armando Daniel Croato.

These petitions have been entered under numbers 10/79, 11/79, 12/79, 13/79 and 14/79 respectively in the register provided for in Rule 48 (2) of the Rules of Procedure and, pursuant to paragraph 3 of that same rule, referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

6. Documents received

President. — Since the adjournment of the session I have received the following documents:

(a) from the Council, requests for opinions on the following Commission proposals:

- regulation amending for the second time Regulation (EEC) No 222/77 on Community transit (Doc. 1-372/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs as the committee responsible and to the Committee on External Economic Relations for its opinion;

- directive amending, as regards credit insurance, first Directive 73/239/EEC on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the taking-up and pursuit of the business of direct insurance other than life insurance (Doc. 1-373/79)

which has been referred to the Legal Affairs Committee as the committee responsible and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for its opinion;

- regulation laying down special measures in respect of olive-oil producer organizations for the marketing year 1979/80 (Doc. 1-374/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for its opinion;

- I. a regulation amending Regulations (EEC) No 1508/76, 1514/76 and 1521/76 on imports of olive oil originating in Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco (1979-1980)
- II. a regulation amending Article 9 of Regulation (EEC) No 1180/77 on imports into the Community of certain agricultural products originating in Turkey (1979-1980)

(Doc. 1-375/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible and the Committee on Agriculture, the

Committee on Development and Cooperation and the Committee on Budgets for their opinions;

- regulation implementing Articles XVIII and XXIII of the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the North-West Atlantic Fisheries as regards the scheme of joint international enforcement (Doc. 1-376/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture;

- directive amending Council Directive 78/25/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the colouring matters which may be added to medicinal products (Doc. 1/389/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection;

- regulation on the granting of assistance for the exportation of agricultural products which may benefit from a special import treatment in a third country (Doc. 1-391/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and the Committee on External Economic Relations for its opinion;

- decision introducing special aid for small and medium-sized industrial enterprises in Portugal (Doc. 1-392/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible and the Committee on Budgets for its opinion;

- regulation concerning assistance from the Guidance Section of the EAGGF in respect of emergency measures to reconstitute the agricultural areas of the French overseas departments damaged by hurricanes 'David' and 'Frederick' (Doc. 1-400/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and the Committee on Development and Cooperation and the Committee on Budgets for their opinions;

- directive amending Directive 64/432/EEC as regards tuberculosis and brucellosis (Doc. 1/406/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture;

(b) from the committees, the following reports:

- report Mr Baudis, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-272/79) for a directive laying down technical requirements for inland waterway vessels (Doc. 1-380/79);
- report by Mr Albers, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-255/79) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 3164/76 on the Community quota for the carriage of goods by road between Member States (Doc. 1-381/79);

President

— report by Mr Dalsass, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-278/79) for

I. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2358/71 on the common organization of the market in seeds and Regulation (EEC) No 950/68 on the Common Customs Tariff

II. a regulation supplementing Regulations (EEC) Nos 1347/78 and 4/79 fixing, for the marketing years 1978/79 and 1979/80 and 1980/81 and 1981/82 respectively, the amounts of aid granted for seeds

(Doc. 1-396/79);

— report by Mr Colleselli, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-313/79) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1418/76 on the common organization of the market in rice (Doc. 1-397/79);

— report by Mr Martinet, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-267/79) for a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of a Community tariff quota for wines from fresh grapes and grape must with fermentation arrested by the addition of alcohol falling within heading No 22.05 of the Common Customs Tariff, originating entirely in Greece (1980) (Doc. 1-399/79);

— interim report by Mr Lega on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Docs. 201/79, 202/79, 212/79) for regulations amending the Staff Regulations of Officials and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Communities (Doc. 1-401/79);

— report by Mr Battersby, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposals from the Commission to the Council for

I. a regulation laying down certain measures for the conservation of fishery resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of a Member State and fishing in international waters in the North-West Atlantic (Doc. 1-262/79)

II. a regulation allocating among Member States certain catch quotas for vessels fishing in the regulatory area defined in the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the North-West Atlantic Fisheries (Doc. 1-268/79)

(Doc. 1-402/79);

— report by Mr Kirk, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-281/79) for a regulation on the conclusion of an agreement between the European Economic Community and the Swedish Government relating to certain measures intended to promote the reproduction of salmon in the Baltic Sea (Doc. 1-403/79);

— report by Mr Nord, on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, containing urgent proposals for amendments to certain of the European Parliament's Rules of Procedure (Doc. 1-404/79);

(c) the following oral questions with debate :

— by Mr Ruffolo, Mr Ripa di Meana, Mr Dido, Mr Walter and Mr Lezzi, on behalf of the Socialist Group, to the Commission on the document on convergence drawn up by the Commission for the Council at the request of the European Council (Doc. 1-383/79);

— by Mr Pininfarina, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Commission of the European Communities on harmonization of the Member States' policies in the field of social legislation (Doc. 1-384/79);

— by Mr Klepsch, Mrs Cassangmagnago Cerretti, Mr Verger, Mr Bersani, Mr Diana, Mr Giavazzi, Mr Narducci and Mr Filippi, on behalf of the Group of European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), to the Commission on the Communication from the Commission to the Council on the financial situation (Doc. 1-385/79);

— by Mr Gremetz, Mr Pajetta, Mr Vergès, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Denis and Mr Ferrero, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, to the Commission on emergency aid for Vietnam and Cambodia (Doc. 1-386/79);

— by Mr Ansquer, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats to the Commission, on the relationship between the European Monetary System and the international monetary system (Doc. 1-387/79);

(d) for Question Time on 23, 24, and 25 October 1979, pursuant to Rule 47A of the Rules of Procedure :

— oral questions by Mr Cottrell, Lady Elles, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr Paisley, Ms Clwyd, Lord O'Hagan, Mr O'Connell, Mr O'Leary, Mr Radoux, Mr Adam, Mrs Lizin, Mr Roudy, Mr Davern, Mr Sarre, Mr Buchou, Mr Cronin, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor, Mrs de Valera, Mr Ansquer, Mrs Ewing, Mr Schwartzberg, Mr Poncelet, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Debré, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr C. Jackson, Mr Seal, Mr Leonardi, Mr Provan, Mr Møller, Mr Glinne, Miss Brookes, Miss Quin, Mr Hutton, Mr Curry, Mr Patterson, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Seefeld, Mr Key, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mr Blaney, Mr de la Malène, Mr Maffre-Bauge, Mr Ceravolo, Mrs Castle, Mr Bange-mann, Mr Irmer, Mr O'Connell, Ms Clwyd, Mr Schwartzberg, Mr Poncelet, Mr Flanagan, Mr Spicer, Mr Davern, Mrs Ewing, Mr Prout, Mrs Desmond, Mr Møller, Mr Kavangh, Mr Patterson, Mr Geurtsen, Miss Hooper, Mrs Scrivener, Mr de la Malène, Mrs Lizin, Mr Schwartzberg, Mrs Ewing and Lord Bethell (Doc. 1-405/79)

(e) the following motions for resolutions :

— by Mr Ceravolo, Mrs Squarcilupi, Mr Bonaccini, Pursuant to Rule 25 of the rules of Procedure, on the right of migrant workers to vote and to stand for election (Doc. 1-382/79/rev.)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee as the committee responsible and to the Legal Affairs Committee for its opinion;

President

— by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Bersani, Mr Narducci, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Michel, Mr Spautz, and Mr Luster, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), Pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the arrest of six Czechoslovakian citizens (Doc. 1-388/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee ;

— by the Committee on Development and Cooperation on hunger in the world (Doc. 1-393/79)

— by Mrs Bonino, Mr Capanna, Mr Coppieters, and Mr Pannella, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the Geneva Appeal and the suspension of work on breeder reactors (Doc. 1-394/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Energy and Research as the Committee responsible and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for its opinion ;

— by Mrs Bonino, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the general review of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament (Doc. 1-395/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions ;

— by Mr Caillavet, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on compensation for damage caused by farming disasters (Doc. 1-398/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

— by Mr Cariglia, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on food aid for Cambodia (Doc. 1-407/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation ;

(f) from the Committee on Development and Cooperation

— a motion for a resolution on hunger in the world (Doc. 1-393/79)

(g) from the Council, the draft general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1980 prepared by the Council (Doc. 1-378/79) ;

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

and

the tables of the staff complements of the European Centre for the development of vocational training and the European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions for the financial year 1980 — Addendum to the draft general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1980, prepared by the Council (Doc. 1-378/79/Add.) ;

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

(h) from the Court of Auditors, a report on the revised Joint European Torus (JET) statements for 1978

which has been referred for information to the Committee on Budgetary Control and the Committee on Energy and Research ;

(i) from the Commission

on 11 October 1979 :

— a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 26/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the General Budget for the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 1-390/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

Since the proposed transfer concern expenditure not necessarily resulting from the Treaties, I have consulted the Council on behalf of Parliament in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Regulation.

7. Text of treaties forwarded by the Council

President. — I have received from the Council certified true copies of the following documents :

— agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the Swiss Confederation on the extension of the Community network for data transmission (EURONET) to Switzerland ;

— agreement between the European Economic Community and the People's Republic of Bangladesh on trade in textile products ;

— agreement between the European Economic Community and the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka on trade in textile products ;

these documents will be deposited in the archives of the European Parliament.

8. Referral to Committee

President. — The motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-310/79), receipt of which was announced at the sitting of Monday, 24 September 1979, and which was referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as the committee responsible has now also been referred to the Committee on Agriculture for its opinion.

Moreover,

— the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-322/79/rev.), receipt of which was announced at the sitting of Tuesday, 25 September 1979,

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-327/79/rev.), receipt of which was announced at the sitting of Monday, 24 September 1979,

— motions for resolutions (Doc. 1-355/79 and Doc. 1-358/79), receipt of which was announced at the sitting of Thursday, 27 September 1979,

President

which had all been referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation as the committee responsible and to the Political Affairs Committee for its opinion, have now also been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations for its opinion.

I call Mr van Aerssen.

Mr van Aerssen. — (D) Madam President, I should like to refer to the Rules of Procedure and the motion for a resolution tabled by the Group of the European People's Party on the continued development of the legal foundations of the European Community and specifically the directly elected European Parliament as a constituent assembly. From the minutes we see that it was decided at the last sitting to refer this motion for resolution to the Legal Affairs Committee as the committee responsible and to the Political Affairs Committee for its opinion. I think there is a mistake here; if I remember rightly, the intention of all the groups had always been that the Political Affairs Committee should be the committee responsible and the Legal Affairs Committee should be asked for its opinion. I should be grateful if you could clarify this.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — The Bureau will take a decision on the matter.

9. Authorization of reports

President. — Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Rules of Procedure I have authorized

- the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to draw up a report on the multiannual programme for the implementation of the customs union,
- the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning to draw up a report on the fourth annual report (1978) of the European Regional Development Fund (COM (79) 349 final),
- the Committee on Transport to draw up a report on the objectives to be pursued in the long term and the measures to be taken to promote or partial integration of railway undertakings at Community level (COM (79) 205 final).

10. Urgent Procedure

President. — I have received from the Council a request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the Commission proposal for emergency aid from the EAGGF Guidance Section to reconstitute the agricultural areas of the French overseas departments damaged by hurricanes 'David' and 'Frederick' (Doc. 1-400/79).

The reasons for the request for urgent debate are set out in Document 1-400/79/Add.

I shall consult Parliament on this request at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

I call on the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the committee responsible, to state the views of his committee at that time.

I have also received a request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the following motions for resolutions:

- by Mr Didò, Mr Vetter, Mr Moreau, Mrs Lizin, Mr Delors, Mr Ruffollo, Mr Lezzi, Mr Ferri, Mr Sarre, Mr Zagari and Mr Coffa, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the directive on shorter working hours (Doc. 1-377/79/rev.)
- by Mrs Ewing, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on compensation for the disaster affecting Orkney and Shetland agriculture (Doc. 1-408/79),
- by Mr Sarre, Mr Jaquet, Mr Didò, Mr Estier, Mrs Charzaw, Mrs Cresson, Mrs Fullet, Mrs Roudy, Mr Motchane and Mr Loo, on the torture of children (Doc. 1-407/79),
- by Mr Provan, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on sheepmeat (Doc. 1-410/79).

The reasons for these requests for urgent debate are set out in the documents themselves.

I shall consult Parliament on these requests at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

11. Order of business

President. — The next item is the order of business.

At its meeting of 9 October 1979 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda, which has been distributed (PE 59.778/rev.).

I would draw the attention of the House to the following:

- Mr Beumer's report on turnover taxes, (No 71) has been withdrawn from the agenda because it was not adopted in committee;
- the Committee on Agriculture has asked for the report by Mr Kirk on the reproduction of salmon in the Baltic Sea (Doc. 1-403/79) be placed on the agenda for this part-session.

This report could be debated jointly with Mr Battersby's report on the North-West Atlantic fisheries (Doc. 1-402/79) on Thursday, 25 October.

I call Mr Kirk to speak in favour of this proposal.

Mr Kirk. — (DK) Madam President, we in the Committee on Agriculture have asked if this report can be dealt with now because time is running short. It concerns an agreement between the Community and Sweden on measures to promote salmon stocks in the Baltic. It does not present any problems itself, but in view of the Community's relations with Sweden we wish to ask the House urgently to agree to deal with it now so that the payments referred to in the report can be implemented, since Sweden is insisting that the

Kirk

Community should give a definitive answer on the report.

President. — I put to the vote the request to place on the agenda of Thursday, 25 October 1979 the report by Mr Kirk, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on certain measures intended to promote the reproduction of salmon in the Baltic Sea.

That is agreed.

The report will therefore be placed on Thursday's agenda for joint debate with Mr Battersby's report.

I have received from Mrs Flesch, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, a proposal, pursuant to Rule 12 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, withdrawing from the agenda, where it is entered as Item No 70, the interim report by Mr Lega, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities (Doc. 1-401/79).

I call Mr Bangemann to speak in favour of the proposal.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, I should like briefly to explain the proposal that has been made by Miss Flesch on behalf of my group. What we have here is an interim report by the Committee on Budgets on a very important aspect of the Staff Regulations, and I feel that so important a matter, which of course also affects the climate of industrial peace in this institution, should not be debated without a thorough prior deliberation. We quite see that the Council or the Commission may have a good reason for wanting to speed things up, but they should not be speeded up to the extent that decisions are taken which overlook legal questions.

The Legal Affairs Committee of this House, Madam President, has let it be known in an official letter that it was not able in the short time available to look into the serious legal problems connected with the amendment of the Staff Regulations. The Legal Affairs Committee has therefore requested that it be given time to discuss the matter and to deliver an opinion, because we are concerned here not simply with budgetary questions, not simply with questions to do with the Staff Regulations, for which the Committee on Budgets is responsible, but also with legal questions. In the interests of industrial peace and to allow these legal questions to be discussed and the whole matter clarified, my group requests the withdrawal of this interim report, because it might result in the adoption of positions which we would have to amend again later for legal reasons. As I have said, this is also the view of the Legal Affairs Committee and, as far as I know, of the Staff Committee. We really should not rush such matters. There is no sense at all in doing that, and I therefore call upon the House to agree to the motion by the Liberal and Democratic Group that this item should be withdrawn from the agenda.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Madam President, while I quite understand Mr Bangemann's reasoning, I am bound to say that this extremely ticklish problem could significantly impair the proper functioning of the Community institutions and could even lead to serious social unrest. I would stress in particular that this decision could have serious repercussions on the normal operations of the Community institutions.

President. — I shall now consult Parliament on the request to withdraw the interim report by Mr Lega from the agenda.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, I would ask you to hold this item over until Parliament's next normal part-session, in other words until the November part-session, after the budget debates, otherwise I cannot agree to this request. But if there is so little time available, there will be an opportunity for the Legal Affairs Committee to deliver its opinion by then.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) It will be no problem for myself and my group if the Legal Affairs Committee has had time by then to deliver its opinion. I should therefore like to modify what Mr Klepsch has just said as follows: I have no objection to our deferring the subject until the November part-session provided that the Legal Affairs Committee has delivered its opinion by that time.

President. — I call Mr Sieglerschmidt.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — (D) Madam President, as draftsman of the Legal Affairs Committee's opinion I have to inform you that the Legal Affairs Committee will not be meeting again until 20/21 November, that is after the November part-session. For purely technical reasons it is therefore impossible for it to report to Parliament by that time. I am very sorry, but — if I may say this as draftsman, Madam President — it would be extremely difficult not only to draft the opinion in the short space of a few weeks but also to discuss it in a proper manner in the Legal Affairs Committee. It would be unfair, I feel, to expect it to do so.

President. — I call Mr Notenboom.

Mr Notenboom. — (NL) Madam President, as vice-chairman of the Committee on Budgets I should like to point out that this is only the interim report. The Committee on Budgets made do with an interim report precisely because of the difficult questions

Notenboom

involved. It is not, then, a final report. Perhaps the Legal Affairs Committee and the House might like to take that into account. It is very important that the debate on this interim report should not be delayed too long.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) I agree, provided we decide to have the debate in December.

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — (F) Madam President, I should like to stress the magnitude and gravity of this problem. I have had an opportunity to examine the documents we have received, and I speak here as one who has worked in the civil service. I have to tell you that the matter is far from simple, and that is why, even if we agree that something must be done, we must act responsibly and circumspectly. I therefore support the withdrawal of the report from the agenda of this part-session.

President. — I put to the vote the request to withdraw the item, on the understanding that the report cannot be considered until December, by which time we shall have the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee.

The proposal to withdraw the item is adopted.

I call Mr Pelikan.

Mr Pelikan. — (F) Madam President, I merely wish to draw your attention and that of the Assembly to the fact that — in defiance of the wish expressed in its July resolution — the political trial of the activists of the human rights movement in Czechoslovakia, Charter 77 and the committee for the defence of unjustly persecuted persons opened at 8 o'clock this morning. They all face the possibility of sentences of three to ten years. May I ask you, Madam President, if, in accordance with the wishes of this Assembly, you could this very day despatch a telegram to remind the Czechoslovak authorities of Parliament's resolution. I realize that it is not likely to have much effect, but I do believe it would be a symbolic gesture worth making to reassure these people, who are also Europeans, that they are not forgotten and that we are with them.

(Applause)

President. — On 25 July I forwarded the resolution adopted by Parliament to all the Foreign Ministers of the Community. I do not know what action was taken, but I can assure you that the resolution was forwarded to them without delay. I shall of course

accede to your request by again appealing to the Foreign Affairs Ministers to intervene with the Czech authorities.

The order of business will therefore be as follows:

This afternoon:

- Procedure without report
- Statement by the Commission on action taken on the opinions and proposals of Parliament
- Oral question with debate to the Commission on freedom of trade in the Community
- Joint debate on the oral question with debate on convergence and an oral question on budgetary questions, to the Commission.

Tuesday, 23 October 1979

10 a.m. and 3 p.m. until 8 p.m.:

- Decision on urgent procedure
- Possibly, continuation of Monday's agenda
- Seefeld interim report on air transport services
- Baudis report on internal waterways navigation
- Albers report on carriage of goods by road
- Oral question with debate to the Commission on the implementation of the Community budget for 1979
- Oral question with debate to the Commission on social legislation

3 p.m.:

- Question Time (questions to the Commission)

3.45 p.m.:

- Voting time

Wednesday, 24 October 1979

10 a.m. and 3 p.m. until 8 p.m. (possibly until 9 p.m.)

- Statement by the President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers on political cooperation (followed by debate)¹
- Oral question with debate to the Commission on the European Monetary System
- Oral question with debate to the Commission on emergency aid for Vietnam and Cambodia

3 p.m.:

- Question Time (questions to the Council and to the Foreign Ministers)

4.30 p.m.:

- Voting time

Thursday, 25 October 1979

10 a.m. and 3 p.m. until 7.30 p.m. (and 9 p.m. onwards)

- Motion for a resolution on world hunger
- Joint debate on the Battersby report on fishing in the North-West Atlantic and the Kirk report on the reproduction of salmon in the Baltic Sea

¹ Pursuant to Rule 47 (1), fourth subparagraph, of the Rules of procedure, Oral Question Doc. 1-294/79 on European political coordination is included in this debate

President

- Joint debate on the Dalsas report on seeds and the Colleselli report on rice
- Filippi report on certain wines originating in Tunisia
- Martinet report on certain Greek wines

3 p.m.:

Question Time (questions to the Commission)

3.45 p.m.:

- Voting time

Friday, 26 October 1979

9 a.m.:

- Procedure without report
- Possibly, voting time
- Possibly, continuation of Thursday's agenda
- The LEGA interim report on the Staff Regulations of Officials has been withdrawn from the agenda
- The Beumer report on turnover taxes has also been withdrawn from the agenda
- Oral question without debate to the Commission on agricultural expenditure
- Oral question without debate to the Commission on sugar surpluses
- Oral question without debate to the Commission on national contributions to Community budgetary expenditure

End of sitting

Voting time.

Are there any comments?

The order of business is agreed.

12. *Speaking time*

President. — Pursuant to Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure I suggest, on the proposal of the enlarged Bureau of 9 October 1979, to allocate speaking time for the debate on the statement on political cooperation as follows:

Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation	60 minutes
Author of oral question (Doc. 1-294/79)	10 minutes
Members	240 minutes
	broken down as follows:
Socialist Group	55 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (CD Group)	53 minutes
European Democratic Group	35 minutes
Communist and Allies Group	28 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group	26 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats	18 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members	15 minutes
Non-attached Members	10 minutes

Total: 5 hours and 10 minutes.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

For the debate on the problem of world hunger I have received from the Group for the Technical Coordina-

tion and Defence of Independent Groups and Members a proposal requesting the following allocation of speaking time, which differs from that contained in the draft agenda:

Commission	45 minutes
Author of the motion for a resolution	15 minutes
Members	360 minutes
	broken down as follows:
Socialist Group	63 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (CD Group)	62 minutes
European Democratic Group	49 minutes
Communist and Allies Group	43 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group	42 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats	37 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members	33 minutes
Non-attached Members	30 minutes

Parliament must vote on this proposal without a debate.

I put the proposal to the vote.

The proposal is adopted.

For all other reports and motions for resolutions on the agenda

I propose to limit speaking time as follows:

- 10 minutes for the rapporteur and for one speaker on behalf of each group,
- 5 minutes for all other speakers.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

13. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

President. — I propose to fix the deadline for tabling amendments to all the reports and motions for resolutions already placed on or which might be added to the agenda at 6 p.m. on the day preceding their discussion.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

14. *Procedure without report*

President. — Pursuant to Rule 27 A(5) of the Rules of Procedure the following proposals from the Commission to the Council have been placed on the agenda for this sitting for consideration without report:

- proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of a Community tariff quota for fresh or chilled tomatoes falling within subheading ex 07.01 M of the Common Customs Tariff, originating in the African, Caribbean and Pacific States and in the Overseas Countries and Territories (1979/1980) (Doc. 139/79)

President

which has been referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture for its opinion ;

- proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive amending Directive 76/630/EEC concerning surveys of pig production to be made by Member States (Doc. 196/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

- proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive amending Directive 72/461/EEC on health problems affecting intra-Community trade in fresh meat (Doc. 1-260/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection ;

- proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive amending Directive 77/99/EEC on health problems affecting intra-Community trade in meat products (Doc. 1-263/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection ;

- proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive amending Directive 77/97/EEC on protective measures against the introduction into the Member States of harmful organisms of plants or plant products (Doc. 1-279/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

I would remind the House that unless any Member asks leave to speak on these proposals, or amendments are tabled to them before the opening of the sitting on Friday, 26 October 1979, I shall, at that sitting declare the proposals to be approved pursuant to Rule 27 A(6) of the Rules of Procedure.

15. *Action taken by the Commission on the opinions and proposals of Parliament*

President. — The next item is the communication from the Commission on action taken on the opinions and proposals of Parliament.¹

I note that there are no requests to speak on this item.

16. *Freedom of trade in the Community*

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-289/79) by Mr David Nicolson and Mr de Ferranti, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, to the Commission :

Subject: Freedom of Trade within the Community

The Commission addressed a letter to the governments of the Member States on 6 November 1978, concerning the rising tide of restrictive and protectionist measures applied by the Member States and national public authorities. At that time the Commission was investigating over 400 cases of the barriers to the free movement of goods, which the Commission described as representing only the tip of the iceberg. Among the examples of restrictive measures quoted by the Commission in the letter were :

- (i) Documents (licences, certificates of origin, technical verifications) required for imports and exports.
- (ii) National rules laying down technical and quality conditions to which the import and sale of products on the national market are subject.
- (iii) The fixing of maximum or minimum prices for certain products.
- (iv) Checks at frontiers which are often excessive and without justification.
- (v) 'Preferential systems' in favour of national industry in the field of public contracts.
- (vi) Charges having effect equivalent to customs duties and fees for checks.

1. Will the Commission state what has been the response of each of the nine governments to its letter ?
2. Can the Commission confirm that it is capable of ensuring that the articles of the Treaty concerning the free movement of goods within the Community are being strictly applied ?

I call Mr de Ferranti.

Mr de Ferranti. — May I thank you, Madam President, for having postponed the debate on this important subject from rather late at night in September to this more prominent time on a Monday, and at the same time thank the Commissioner who stayed late with us that night and fully agreed that it was right, in view of the importance of the subject, for it to be debated at a more appropriate time.

My colleagues and I, Madam President, felt that there was no need, in this debate, to put down a motion for a resolution. We felt that, if there was to be a resolution, there would clearly be unanimity in this House on the desirability of freedom of trade. What we did feel, though, was that there was a very real need for this Parliament to be aware of the political significance and the political importance of the subject, and to take as profound interest in the many detailed aspects of the subject before the House.

¹ See Annex.

de Ferranti

One needs a parliament whenever there are issues where the interests of the majority need to prevail, but also where the rights of the minorities also need to be respected. One can only understand such a portentous statement if one considers the particular measures in detail. One can only understand many of the aspects of the free working of the market if one looks at some of the detail; and this, I would suggest, is one of the difficulties of this subject: as soon as you mention a detail, it sounds trivial, it sounds non-political and unimportant. But it seems to me that it is that very detail which actually affects people in the Community and affects our constituents.

May I, therefore discuss such a detail? May I take the directive on cosmetics, which is now in operation in the Community? In this case, the majority of people throughout the Community now benefit hugely from the simplification that has followed the cosmetics directive. There is now a single positive list of the ingredients which can be used in cosmetics; there is a single negative list of those which cannot be used. There is a single procedure for testing and labelling — instead of nine different sets of procedures. That must be worthwhile, and indeed the Commission advises that the saving to the consumer throughout Europe amounts to more than 200 million units of account — a very significant benefit to the majority.

However, obviously there were minority interests that had to be considered. Companies have to adjust to more open competition; they have to change their products according to the new requirements; they have to change their labels; they need time. Consideration must be given to the views of the minority. Inevitably, the minority are in quite a strong position. In minorities, nobody really likes change; and therefore the majority has to pay attention to the details of these cases in order to make sure that progress does indeed take place.

I think it is often not appreciated what very high stakes we are playing for in this whole area of the removal of technical barriers to trade and freedom of trade. Applying the 200 million u.a. that is being saved through the cosmetics directive to all the sectors in the Community it adds up not just to a very great deal of money, it adds up to a lot of job security as well. People can have that much more confidence that their firm is going to remain competitive and their job will still be there. Without this Community-wide home market, many firms would be uncompetitive in the world market. And not only they, but also the small firms that supply them, could well go out of business without it. In the European home market, freedom of trade in the Community is the key to productivity and to raising living standards.

However, the great benefit to the majority does lie in the smooth working of the market, and I think it is important, bearing in mind how unpopular many

harmonization measures have been, to recognize that it is the market — the internal market — that matters, and avoid going forward with those proposals which are in fact based on a minority interest, whether a national or other minority interest. For instance, the proposal on doorstep selling does not in fact help the manufacturer's efficiency, or the job security of people in industry at all. We must, whilst naturally retaining our interest in freedom of trade, be extremely cautious that we do not adopt harmonization proposals which merely give the common market a bad name.

Many of us in politics inevitably do not have a great deal of daily contact with the detailed commercial and industrial situations which lie behind so many of these proposals. We get our papers for the plenary session, there are a number of items with complicated if not incomprehensible titles, and we think to ourselves: 'These are just technical matters, they are not of any great importance', and put them on one side. However, I think now, with a directly elected Parliament, we will find more and more representations being made to us from firms who do have a real and urgent problem to which they will want solutions in this area. In the United Kingdom we have our own constituencies in which we are going to be getting — and are getting — many direct representations from firms about the problems they are encountering. We are, all of us, visiting companies within our constituencies, and talking not just with management, but with the shop floor and with the workers' representatives as well. They are taking a keen and real interest, and I suggest that, over the years, those items on the agenda will become more and more significant and require more and more attention from this Parliament. But, Madam President, there is a great danger that, as we become better informed on these subjects, we shall tend to find that it is our own national interests that are informing us. We shall be constantly getting the impression that every other Member State in the Community cheats on almost all these subjects. Furthermore, the press will tend to confirm this impression: whenever they can find an illustration of one or other Community country behaving badly, even if it is just a rumour, they will blow it up in the newspaper and say: 'There you are, we told you so'. That is always the problem with the Community. I believe therefore that we should be very much on our guard to make sure that when we study these problems in depth, we understand every national point of view and every pressure-group's point of view, that we understand the problem in as much depth as we possibly can.

For example, in my own constituency I have a company that makes forklift trucks. There is a proposal now before the Community institutions that these forklift trucks should only be fitted with detachable fuel tanks. Now that fact can be blown up by the

de Ferranti

newspapers — and it is by my local papers — as representing a barrier to trade deliberately put up by another Member State. But when you enquire into the matter, you find that in a pragmatic way it is being handled fairly sensibly. Yes, there is a danger that it will be used as a barrier to trade, but in fact it is not being handled at all badly; a Community directive is going through, and if one looks at that carefully one can see that a solution can be found. And a solution is more likely to be found if everybody involved in that decision-making process knows that at the end of the day this Parliament is going to take a detailed and careful interest in these matters, and if these are shortcomings the subject will be properly aired.

So the message is, we must have proper information so as to understand all countries, all points of view. After all, there is a very elaborate decision-making process in action here. We have the Committee of Permanent Representatives, we have national trade associations, we have European trade associations, we have the Commission, we have national governments, we have the Council, we have employers' organizations, trade-union organizations, consumers, farmers — it is a great world of its own that goes churning on. When I sat as President of the Economic and Social Committee, I could see very well that if this Parliament had shown itself really interested and knowledgeable about the details, it would have helped everybody involved in the details of framing these kinds of decisions.

So, Madam President, what can the Parliament do in detail, how can we actually tackle the problem? The most important thing, probably, is to stop discussing how we are going to do it, and actually get on with it. Individual Members of Parliament who are interested in the subject should understand the details of the particular questions that come before them, and use the normal procedures of Parliament to further progress. But above all, I think the Parliament as a whole, in plenary sitting, must recognize the political importance that is attached to this by people throughout Europe. The five years for which we have been elected will go past very quickly, and if we have not produced results in this field over those five years, we shall find it more than difficult to justify our re-election.

IN THE CHAIR: MR VONDELING

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, *Member of the Commission*. — (F) Mr President, I believe it is particularly appropriate that a question of this sort should feature so early on our

agenda since it directly concerns something that the Commission believes should be one of this Parliament's top priorities.

We are faced here, as Mr de Ferranti has illustrated very well, with a problem of fundamental importance. But it is a problem, by virtue of its precise and technical nature, that is exceedingly difficult to grasp and to present.

It is easy to be cynical about the efforts made to remove trade barriers and to give, particularly to the very small firms, the sort of security they need to be able to benefit from the advantages the internal market offers them. I mention the very small firms because the very large ones are better placed, where necessary, to produce a range of models to comply with the different specifications they may come up against here and there. Small firms find it very difficult to do this without their costs soaring and come up against virtually insuperable development problems.

The second point I wish to make — and Mr de Ferranti did refer to it — concerns the extent to which the Commission is able to ensure the proper functioning of the internal market and that the directives we have passed are applied in the way we intended they should be when we formulated them. By this I mean that we cannot entertain a situation where some countries apply the directives in good faith while others profit by them whilst at the same time in some cases protecting themselves against their application. This poses two questions.

In the first place, I firmly believe that the Commission must give high priority to controlling the internal market, as the need arises, by initiating such actions, negotiations and discussions as may be required to ensure that the provisions of the Treaty are implemented.

Let me give you an example of what the Commission is doing. In 1977 we dealt with 65 instances of irregularities in the internal market, 100 in 1978 and already in the first six months of 1979 this figure has risen to 112. This is not to say that the number of infringements is sharply rising but that we are better able to respond to them. The 112 cases I referred to are not cases brought before the Court but simply 112 instances in which we are seeking a constructive solution through discussions with Member States, taking full account of political, social and regional realities. As a matter of fact, of the 100 cases we dealt with in 1978 only 15 ended up before the Court, the others being resolved amicably.

Now I would ask you to listen carefully to the other point I wish to make. If a firm should complain to any Member of this Parliament that it is not finding the outlets it expects on another market or that it feels that directives are not being complied with, I would

Davignon

like that Member always to ask this question first: Has the firm put its case to Brussels and is it prepared to lodge an official complaint?

You see, it is all too easy to complain about our lack of efficiency and failure to act when, on the other hand, you have a number of firms who are happy to grouch but are not prepared to get involved in proceedings because they do not want to prejudice their relations with the authorities of the given country. There is no getting away from the fact that if we are to be responsible for seeing that the provisions of the Treaty are strictly adhered to — and we are doing this now as best we can, bearing in mind that we do not get to know about all the infringements and we do not have inspectors scouring the Community — we must be given every assistance to enable us to ensure the proper functioning of the market.

In fact, just as important as our responsibility for seeing that existing directives are applied with a sound understanding of the market is the need to be able to adapt these various directives quickly. For this reason we have put before Parliament a new procedure which would facilitate faster technical updating. Coming back to the example given by Mr de Ferranti, fork-lift trucks will not always be as they are now and it is up to us to make sure that our directives keep pace with advancing technology. To this end we have introduced a less cumbersome updating procedure which circumvents the present lengthy and arduous one. I believe it was a positive step forward that Parliament gave its approval to the Commission's approach in this matter in the course of the debate on construction materials. Equally important is that we should be able to anticipate changes. That is why I have made known to the Legal Affairs Committee — and I reiterate it now — the grave concern with which the Commission views the rash of legislative decisions taken unilaterally by a number of bodies. If we are not careful, such rules could become a dangerous barrier to internal trade since it is precisely to these new materials, in the field of which there is the most innovation, that we should be looking for expansion and for the growth of the Community. We are currently holding talks with the Member States and with the professional organizations CEN and CENELEC on this subject and it is our intention to put forward at the beginning of next year a set of rules so that, on the one hand, we can be seen to be confronting the situation and not allowing standards to be imposed on us from outside and, on the other, to ensure our success in eradicating this insidious form of protectionism, manifesting itself as a war of standards inside the Community.

Mr President, we have before us a difficult and complicated technical assignment and it is one that deserves the political support of our Member States and of Parliament. If the internal market is to function well and commercial operators within the Community are to be able to make their investments with confidence,

then what is needed is the political will to enable us to take the necessary decisions in good time, whether to correct anomalies or in anticipation of new problems that may arise. Without the political will we cannot hope to overcome all the technical problems that we frequently come up against. This same political will is required to explain the advantages of these measures and to prevent easy ridicule from obscuring these advantages.

I come back to the same example: Some people in Mr de Ferranti's country have been worried by one of our harmonization measures relating to lawn mowers. It would be easy to joke that Europe is expending its energies on lawn mowers rather than looking after the big problems of money, world famine and so on. But, clearly, the Community must find time for both kinds of problem. You may be amused to know that, as a result of all the provisions that existed in the Community, the only lawn mowers allowed to move freely within the Community were those manufactured in the United States! Not a single lawn mower of European manufacture could move freely in Europe. If that is not a situation that needs to be put right, I don't know what is. Let us not imagine that by implementing the directive on lawn mowers — and the day is not far off — we shall have set Europe to rights, but we shall have made a useful and important contribution to the organization of the internal market. I believe we must view this problem in the proper perspective: It is neither spectacular nor insignificant.

If the internal market cannot be made to function properly, then the necessary support for innovations, for industrial security and industrial development, and our scope for formulating a realistic external policy will be adversely affected. Occasionally, the end justifies our concentrating on tiresome technical problems in order to ensure that our directives combine good sense with expediency.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Moreau to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Moreau. — *(F)* Mr President, the question tabled by Mr de Ferranti and Mr Davignon's remarks lead us to reflect on three points at issue. It is true to say that underlying the technical problems posed by Mr de Ferranti's question are some highly political problems with an important bearing on the future of our European Community.

In my view, the stakes in this game are not just technical but also very much political. We certainly agree that there are today a variety of obstacles to trade — perhaps they are even on the increase — and that the internal market might not be quite as one would have wished.

Moreau

But let us understand what this means in practice. If we look at the Treaty of Rome we find that one of its aims is to establish a true customs union. Well, what do we see today? One of the examples given by Mr Davignon just a moment ago is an illustration of what I am trying to say: that, in the final analysis, it is the products from outside the Community, particularly those of the multinationals, that are dominating our internal market and enjoying the protection of various Community regulations.

Our understanding of a proper customs union is that it should be based on political, commercial, monetary and economic policies. What we see today, however, is that this customs union has become a kind of free-trade area in which the multinationals have been allowed to impose their own rules and have even succeeded, in some sectors, in totally dominating the market.

This is not the way for us to remove the existing barriers to trade. Personally, I think that the extension of the present somewhat haphazard form of free trade within the Community must inevitably lead to a certain amount of protectionism. In view of this it seems to us essential that the Commission and the Council think again and come up with proposals for putting into effect a practical plan that will give the Community full control over its own internal development. At the moment there is no plan or, if there is, it is a private plan formulated by corporations and, particularly, by the multinational corporations.

We should like the Commission and the Council to offer to discuss with us a number of aims. For our part, we have four in mind, namely, employment, a more vigorous regional and social policy, an energy policy and a policy for controlling the multinational corporations. In joining this debate we could not be content with placing constraints on the Member States without also setting them some objectives. Our objective is simply to build an Economic Community within the framework of the Treaty as it stands and as we all accept it.

President. — I call Mr van Wogau to speak on behalf of the Group the European Peoples' Party (CD Group).

Mr van Wogau. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, when the customs union between the countries of the European Community entered into force, many citizens of the Community were glad and thought there would now be no customs officials and no customs posts at the Community's internal frontiers. This expectation, as we all know, has not yet been fulfilled. There are still customs officials, there are still customs posts. The only difference is that they no longer deal with customs duties, they create other bureaucratic barriers to trade which today hamper the

functioning of the common market. We must make one thing quite clear; more than two decades after the conclusion of the Treaties of Rome the situation in Europe still conflicts in very many ways with the spirit and the letter of those Treaties.

(Mixed reactions)

and we are still a long way from a genuine common market. We have been given examples: the technical standards used to create artificial barriers to trade in Europe, the disadvantages suffered by firms in neighbouring countries in the fixing of prices, which are controlled by the public authorities, and the bureaucratic manner in which certain checks are made at the internal frontiers of our European Community. I should like to give a very small example of what is a very important matter for us on the Upper Rhine. If a craftsman from one side of the Rhine accepts an order from the other side, he must first list all the tools he intends to take with him. He must state clearly where he intends to do the work, and then afterwards, when he returns, he must be able to prove that he has really brought all the tools back with him. Such bureaucracy, with all the paperwork it entails, naturally results in such orders not being accepted, and this is preventing the emergence of what the authors of the Treaties of Rome wanted, namely free competition in the countries of the Community and in our common market.

I should like to add a few remarks on this subject. Free competition is not a matter which was invented for the pleasure of politicians, nor was it invented to keep lawyers occupied, because lawyers already have enough to do. It is a regulation instrument designed to endure that the citizens of our Community receive better and cheaper supplies of goods and services. And this is the basic question when we are discussing technical barriers to trade, which may sometimes appear rather too technical and petty, and when we read about them in the press.

I should like to refer to another aspect. The barriers to trade that exist here are particularly serious for small and medium-sized undertakings, and I am grateful to Mr Davignon for referring to this. A large undertaking can handle such things more easily because it has the apparatus to brush them aside and to deal with the paperwork, whereas for small and medium-sized undertakings such things are real barriers to trade and prevent them from joining in the competition in the Community on an equal footing. This, then, is a further reason why it is particularly important for Parliament and the Commission to take action in this area.

(Loud applause)

I feel there is another very important aspect for us as Members of the first directly elected Parliament. We must strive after goals which cannot of course be

von Wogau

achieved in the first term of this Parliament. We are all aware of this. But we must also realize that in five years we must face our constituents and be able to say we have achieved something here, even if the progress has been limited. That too is very important for us. Non-tariff barriers to trade offer a good opportunity in this respect. We can make Europe's frontiers easier to cross. We can achieve something here, because we can use the Treaties of Rome as a lever to make real progress in this field. This is a great opportunity for us as a Parliament, and we must seize that opportunity.

We must of course realize that the question of barriers to trade is an immensely complex one. The question before us now refers to four hundred cases, which represent only the tip of the iceberg. That is why we must make absolutely sure that we organize ourselves properly as a Parliament in order, on the one hand, to avoid losing ourself in detail and in some cases becoming the object of ridicule and, on the other hand, to ensure that we make real progress in this field in the foreseeable future.

President. — I call Mr Møller.

Mr Møller. — (DK) Mr President, what do ordinary citizens in Europe call the European Communities? How do people speak of the European Communities to which this Parliament belongs? They call it the Common Market. At least in my country they speak of the Common Market. The aim, when the six States came together, was to create a free market, a common market, where trade could be carried on across the national borders, free from all import duties, restrictions and red-tape. This is the first and main task which our citizens believe should be carried out within the Community framework. Unfortunately, we seem in many respects to have been moving in the opposite direction in the last few years. National subsidies and trade restrictions have multiplied at a rate unheard of before. This may be due to the critical situation following the rise in oil prices. The result, anyway, is that trade within the Communities is stagnating. The development of the market which should be the central force in our country's economy is grinding to a halt; while the volume of internal trade measures as a proportion of overall exports increased sharply up to 1976, it has remained static at around 51—52% in the last two years. This can certainly be attributed in part to what has been called hidden protectionism.

Let me give one example, without offence to any one particular government. I must, however, name one: the French government. The French government is introducing a number of technical requirements for tower cranes; the same requirements for those made in France as for those made elsewhere. So far, so good: but now comes the point. The cranes have to

be approved by two different offices — one for French cranes and one for imported cranes. While the office for the French cranes was set up immediately, the office for approving cranes imported into France has still not yet been set up, although it is now a year since the rules were introduced. The result is naturally that all foreign manufacturers are being kept out of the French market and are therefore losing the business they have built up over many years, and when the office is eventually set up they will have to start all over again from scratch to establish themselves in the French market, with all the cost involved in building up their business and making a name for themselves. This is typical; there should be a clear legal basis for a single procedure.

Let me give another example, even more grotesque. The Commission has 400 cases under investigation at present, but it has only seven people dealing with this matter out of a staff of 2 350. That seems ridiculous for this is the most important field of all if we are to achieve an internally free common market here in Europe. Therefore, the Commission must see what can be done about this and report to this Parliament on how it is tackling the problem.

President. — I call Mr Leonardi to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Leonardi. — (I) Mr President, my colleagues have mentioned a number of different forms that existing barriers to internal trade can take. Commissioner Davignon also reminded us, quite rightly, of certain dangers — for example, the standards laid down by professional organizations — and stressed the need for a political will to back our actions.

I should like to mention for the benefit of newcomers to this Parliament that the previous Assembly debated this issue on several occasions and indeed there is in existence a report compiled by Mr Nyborg two years ago which made many of the points that have been repeated here today. In the meantime there has been no improvement in the situation. This leads me to say that, aside from the need to introduce appropriate technical provisions — the Commission has always shown itself willing to do this much — it is also necessary to appreciate that the problem of internal trade barriers is indicative of a much more serious situation which, far from improving over the last few years, has in fact worsened. The barriers to internal trade derive in particular from the fundamental fact that the inequalities between our countries and between the regions of our Community, instead of decreasing, have actually increased. This has led to growing recourse to protectionism and defense measures. It seems to me that if we want to see an improvement in internal trade and if the Community is to regain its position of some years ago, when the growth in internal trade was

Leonardi

increasing at almost double the rate for external trade — and this is surely essential for the development of our Community — we have no alternative but to tackle the fundamental problem of the unbalanced development in our regions.

We must remember that over the last few years the Community as a whole has had to cope with external problems, for example the problem of oil, and it has had to respond to this problem in different ways for individual countries. This external threat did not help to shape common international policies, for example in the field of energy. On the contrary, the need to respond to an equal threat in a variety of ways inevitably led to differences between the Member and provoked the flight to protectionism so much deplored by all.

This is all I wanted to say because, however much importance we may attach to harmonization on a technical level and to specific provisions, we must also grasp that unless the Community succeeds in bringing about a qualitative change from a simple form of customs union to one in which common policies are shaped so as to enable all our Member States to face together a common external threat and thereby also help to break down internal differences, we are bound to see an almost irreversible trend towards protectionist technical standards.

We must realize that while for many years the development of the Community was useful and beneficial to all, this is now no longer true. For this reason, some countries or individual professional organizations have resorted to these restrictive practices that we all condemn.

I wanted to make these observations because I believe it would be unthinkable for us ever again to follow a course which we have already been down once and which, however important, provides no solution to this problem that is indicative of much more serious problems.

President. — I call Mr Nyborg to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Nyborg. — (DK) In view of the fact that technical and administrative rules can present a much more serious barrier to trade than customs duties ever did and that it is very difficult for the Commission, too, to get these barriers removed, perhaps I may be permitted to refer to an example that I have already used in your present, Mr Davignon, in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

I am referring to the well known doors made in Denmark, 'Jutlandia' doors. It has taken the firm more than three years to get these doors approved and it was not until the factory itself had set up its own testing centre corresponding to that in the recipient country that the goods were approved. You can imagine what that has meant in time, nervous strain

and money. And the worst thing of all, the most discriminatory aspect, is that no test was required for locally manufactured doors in the country concerned. This example shows the sort of difficulty involved, and very few small and medium-sized undertakings are able to overcome these administrative and technical barriers, as you yourself, Mr Davignon, have said.

I know that the Commission will tell me that such manufacturers can simply explain their problem to the Commission, which will then try to help them. I am quite sure that you, Mr Davignon, believe that in all sincerity, and I am also quite sure that you are seriously engaged in the task of eliminating these barriers, but — if you will forgive me for saying so — that is not enough. For, after all, only a tiny proportion of cases ever come before the Commission.

Another idea on which I should be glad to hear the Commission's views is that the Court of Justice has made a substantial contribution to the enforcement in practice of the rules on competition laid down in the Treaties. The question is whether the Commission should not try more actively to involve the Court of Justice in the fight against technical and administrative barriers to trade. Would it not be reasonable to get the Court to recognize, on the basis of specific examples, that the conduct of the Member States in this matter constitutes a violation of the spirit and the letter of the Treaty.

Mr Davignon, all of us in this House know how difficult it is to resolve this problem. We all know, too, how important it is that it should be resolved. We know that the Commission is fully aware of the difficulties, but, as I said before, that is not enough. The firm I have referred to visited the Commission in Brussels and, I am sorry to say, it turned out to be a pure waste of time. The Commission said it needed more examples of infringements and if possible complaints from other firms in other countries before it could take the matter up. But this is contrary to the assurances which the Commission has given this Parliament previously. If it had been a case of murder, it could hardly have said, go away and kill some more people and then we shall look into the matter. Problems will not be solved just by debating this here in this House and receiving assurances from the Commission.

If this task is to be carried out properly, the Commission will have to employ new methods. I suggest two: an information campaign could be launched for the benefit of undertakings and a complaints office sent up and new test cases brought before the Court of Justice. Whether these measures are the right ones or what other ones should be considered, is not for me to say today, but I should be glad to hear whether the Commission does not agree that the machinery for dealing with the problem needs expanding.

President. — I call Mr Debré.

Mr Debré. — (F) Mr President, the question put down by our two colleagues indeed concerns a matter of prime importance and really deserves more time than we can give it this evening, touching as it does the very heart of the problem of Parliament's powers and, as someone said a moment ago, the very heart of the problem of the Common Market.

I shall confine myself to two general observations.

The first is this: Unless the Council of Ministers and the Commission of the European Community adopt a more modern view of the world economic situation we are bound to see the growth of national protectionism. It could be said that the world political and economic situation in the 1960s justified a lowering of frontiers within the Common Market. In the last few years we have become involved in an economic war and this war is certain to go on for some years yet. The United States are becoming increasingly protectionist, as is Japan, not to mention the Communist countries and the countries of Africa and Asia. Faced with this trend, rather than adopting an aggressive posture in international discussions we pursue a policy of continually lowering the tariff that gives customs protection for the Common Market. We should not be surprised, therefore, if this totally unrealistic attitude, so completely out of touch with the facts of present-day life, is translated here and there into a resurgence of national protectionism. I deplore it as much as the speakers before me, but we must not close our eyes to the main factor responsible for it.

The problem is exacerbated by the fact that certain fraudulent practices are not being suppressed with sufficient determination. I refer in particular to the growing traffic in goods produced in Eastern Europe, Asia or Africa but labelled as coming from one of the Community countries and being illegally introduced into Community warehouses, either direct or through the ACP countries. I am sorry to say that unless we review the Community's general trading policy and see things in clearer perspective, then we must expect to see a growth of indirect national protectionism.

The second observation I have to make is as important as the first. The Common Market is not intended simply to provide for free trade within the Community. No less important is the notion of Community preference, so that the application of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community cannot be regarded solely as a precursor of free trade. Community preference is not a principle just of our agricultural policy, in fact, the value of the Common Market is directly linked to the acceptance of the principle of Community preference just as any other economy in the world today gives preference to its own manufacturing industries. That is why I have been so much in favour of according a special status to European companies that are funded by European capital and employ European technology. Such companies would

enjoy a privileged position in the Common Market, within the frontiers of the Community, in contrast to subsidiaries or companies whose capital and technology are predominantly of extra-European provenance. Community preference must, however, take a variety of things into consideration. For example, it must respect existing industrial and agricultural structures and, in certain cases, such as mountainous regions, there are essential products that cannot be abandoned. So, Community preference must take all such social realities into account. But there is one further reality it must take into account; where a country has put a great deal of effort into investment or research, either in the public or private sector, it is unacceptable that this effort should be undermined by competition based purely and simply on technology or research originating outside Europe. In other words, Community preference, which is a fundamental principle of a meaningful Common Market, must take social, political and even scientific aspects into consideration.

In conclusion, I submit that a purely commercial outlook is incompatible with our idea of fruitful cooperation between the peoples of Europe in this important domain. I hope that this subject may be debated more fully and that in the course of such debate the two observations I have made may be taken into consideration.

(Applause)

President: — I call Mr Hord.

Mr Hord. — Mr President, fellow Members, the fundamental aim of our Community must clearly be to advance the free trade area of the Common Market which embraces 260 million people. One might say, Mr President, that this is our birthright. But what we find is that the Community is overwhelmed and obsessed by agriculture. As we know, three-quarters of our budget is devoted to agriculture. 92% of all workers in the Community are non-agricultural, and time and time again we find there are technical barriers which prevent that overwhelming majority from maintaining and expanding their trade. One could almost say that industrial trade is declining as fast as agriculture is advancing. It is receding because of technical barriers, because the Common Market, Mr President is not working.

Now, of course direct elections mean that we, the Members of the European Parliament, are closer to our constituents, and I believe that one of the most important roles that we Members can play is to help employers to take advantage of the opportunities offered them. I have heard recently of a family brewery which was able to engage in trade with a Member State. The trade flourished for a year until suddenly they had to withdraw from that trade because of a technical objection.

Hord

Now Commissioner Davignon suggests that they should themselves lodge complaints, but these are small undertakings which do not have the time, the energy — or the money for that matter. What they are going to do is withdraw from the market and become cynical about the Common Market and feel, as so many do, that it is a failure.

Again if we look at the EEC public purchasing directive we find that one Member State, the United Kingdom, is responsible for 83 % of all these advertisements. Is this really the way our Community should promote itself? I must say, Mr President, that I deplore the failure of this House to set up a separate committee for the internal market and I believe, as Mr Debré was saying earlier, that this subject is of such importance that we ought to review the decision taken by the Bureau and ensure that a separate internal market committee is set up, if for no other reason than to protect our free trade birthright.

President. — I call Mrs Boot.

Mrs Boot. — (NL) Mr President, Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased that Mr Davignon has said that the removal of technical barriers to trade is very important for the smooth functioning of the Common Market. He said that twelve to fifteen of the one hundred and twelve cases investigated last year had been referred to the Court of Justice. One of the most important of the Court's judgments this spring was in the Cassis case, in which new criteria were established for measures having an effect equivalent to a quantitative restrictions on imports. I should like to ask Mr Davignon, who referred to the possibility of new rules being announced next spring for tackling covert protectionism, what conclusions the Commission has drawn from the new criteria in what was surely a very important case before the Court of Justice. Secondly, I would ask him what the Commission plans to do now that it has drawn these conclusions.

President. — I call Mr Turner.

Mr Turner. — Mr President, I very much agree with Commissioner Davignon that this is an important matter. He has, in fact, been very helpful to us in the Legal Affairs Committee already, and I should like to be helpful to him if I can.

This problem of non-tariff barriers is, as Mr de Ferranti says, entirely one of details, for that is exactly what all business is about and it is only politicians who deal in generalities. What I think very important is that we must have understandable procedures which businessmen understand and have confidence in. I would suggest that there are three main issues that worry the public.

The first problem arises where there is a muddle in the regulations which leads to things looking clearly

unfair and unreasonable to businessmen. I would just give one example of this, and it is the curious one of VAT on bloodstock, i.e. on racehorses. According to a certain Regulation 803/68, Article 20, the French are still allowed to charge VAT on very valuable racehorses as if they were dead, because they did so in 1968. Well, that was ten years ago, and it seems unreasonable. I think it probably is very unreasonable, certainly the people in Newmarket think it is unreasonable, and I would like to know what one can do about it, because this is the sort of problem that brings the EEC into disrepute.

First of all one needs to have a means of identifying those problems. We have the Davignon committee which does this to a certain extent, but on a rather grand scale, and I think we need something more detailed. One needs to be able to point out problems like this quite easily to the Commission. Having done that, I would suggest that the Commission should establish the pros and cons of the particular case, send them to all concerned and then have a debate on the matter. I would also suggest to DG III and to Mr Davignon that DG IV's procedure in this matter might be helpful. They have a debate of all interested people, for instance, on block patent licensing exemptions. The pros and cons have been worked out on paper, they are debated and all who take part in the debate feel that they are really taking part in the deliberations of the Commission. So I suggest that procedure for the first sort of difficulty, that is, where something has clearly gone wrong and there is a muddle in the regulations.

Now, the second problem that the public is worried about is that of the uniform application of existing regulations. Commissioner Davignon dealt with this. It is the problem of policing regulations in an equal way throughout the whole EEC. For instance, customs formalities are said to be different from one country to another and slaughterhouse inspection is said to be different from one country to another. I would suggest on this point that in many cases the businessmen concerned in all the countries concerned are quite able to submit to the Commission an agreed statement on the different procedures used in different countries. They can submit an agreed statement, and the Commission can then give a ruling on which is the right procedure. In the few cases where there is dispute as to what actually happens in the port of Harwich as compared to the port of Rotterdam, for instance, or the abattoir in Aix as compared with one in Holland, the Commission can look into the case more closely, I would suggest this solution for the second problem.

The third problem is, of course, the backlog of urgent harmonizations. What should we harmonize next? There I think the Commission should be guided by the priorities established by the Member States. If six

Turner

countries say one thing is very urgent, that should be taken before other less urgent matters.

President. — I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, my predecessor in this debate has spoken about the importance of this subject to businessmen; I want to come back to the importance of this subject to the general public. During the European election campaign meetings, people would always ask: 'How can you encapsulate very quickly what the Common Market means? I would always tell the story, which may be apocryphal, of how, when customs posts were being re-established between France and Germany in the fifties, students from both sides came and tore them down and said: 'We are not going to put up with this ever again.' And the next question from my audience always was: 'Where are the customs posts now then?' And I had to say: 'They are still in place.'

Now, our question today refers to checks at frontiers, which are often excessive and without justification — I think that is putting it very mildly. What would count as non-excessive checks in a common market where there is supposed to be complete freedom of movement of persons, services, capital, and goods? Indeed, one has the impression, if one knows the story of *Alice through the Looking Glass*, by Lewis Carroll, of being in the same situation as Alice and the Red Queen — we run faster and faster in order to stay in the same place. No sooner do we abolish tariffs and various forms of protection, than more forms of protection and technical mechanisms grow up in their place. Indeed, to take another analogy, just as in the legend of the Hydra, the more the Commission and the Community cut off heads in the form of protectionist measures, two heads, in the form of two protectionist measures, grow in their place.

Why is this? Well it is true that we are in an era where national protection is growing, and I support the Commissioner when he says that the harmonization of lawn mowers is so often misunderstood. People ask why the Commission is harmonizing noise levels on lawn mowers. The answer is usually because, if you get below the surface something like this, you find a national protectionist measure right underneath trying to break up what was previously the harmony of a uniform market.

But there are also other measures which do not come from protectionism but from the sheer inefficiency of bureaucracy. In our last part-session in September, we had a very short debate on the advisability of a European passport. Why, people were asking, do we have our passports checked at all? But this is just the tip of the documentation iceberg, is it not? The whole idea of having so many documents to move goods around what is supposed to be a uniform market is, to the

members of the general public, absolutely absurd; and, indeed, all sorts of measures derive not from any ill will, but from the inefficiency of our bureaucracies. Sometimes, when I am asked if I am in favour of the retention of national sovereignty, I say: 'If, by national sovereignty you mean the apparatus of state bureaucracy which has been built up over the last 30, 40 or 50 years on our continent, then I am for the abolition of national sovereignty' — and most members of the general public would go along with that.

While it is not strictly speaking, a matter of a technical barrier to trade, the following example is a very good illustration of this kind of bureaucratic muddle. It concerns a constituency case which came to my notice last week. It concerns workers employed by a British firm on a construction site in Germany who, because of the inability of the British Department of Health and Social Security and the German authorities to arrive at a satisfactory method of insuring them under their social security schemes, are now totally uninsured. It all goes back to some meeting which is supposed to have taken place in the course of July or August. This is indeed a technical barrier to trade, in the sense that a service industry is trade. It is this kind of thing which brings the whole Common Market into disrepute. If we really want to be taken seriously by general public, let us get back to the simple ideals of those students in the 1950s who tore down those customs posts.

To conclude, I wish Mr Davignon every success in his endeavours.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I would like to comment briefly on what has been said so far.

The problems raised seem to fall into two categories. The first is to do with the impression that the Common Market is not living up to expectations. I have in mind here the examples given just now relating to frontier check-points and so on. There is undoubtedly a need for us to be seen to act and to act positively to promote and encourage trade, for example by the introduction of measures relating to free movement and duty exemptions. This is a political problem and here I feel that the receptivity of Parliament to the aspirations of the citizens of Europe should, in many ways assist us in our efforts to persuade Member States to do away with those measures that have been dictated more by tradition than by necessity.

The second category of problems touches, as some speakers have suggested, upon the very nature of the Common Market. The Common Market is not a free-trade area — indeed, it is the very opposite of a free-trade area. The essence of the Community can be

Davignon

defined as the product of the common rules that govern it and of the common objectives that inspire it. I agree with all those who have said that the way in which we set about breaking down the barriers to trade was not an example of art for art's sake, nor was it a theoretical objective chosen at random. In fact, it was dictated by the need to achieve carefully defined objectives relating to employment and to the development of small and medium-sized undertakings. Let me say to Mr Nyborg and Mr Hord that when we ask for specific examples and precise details of problems that arise we are not making an empty gesture. I can tell Mr Nyborg, in the specific case of the doors, that I have here a reply dated 19 October from the firm that approached us for help and which informs us that it has now resolved its problem and concluded a satisfactory deal — and all this without it having to experience any of the obstacles or difficulties that have been referred to. So you see, his visit was not wasted at all.

I wish to say to Mr Hord that it is up to the Members of this parliament to persuade their constituents not to adopt a cynical attitude and to explain to them that it is possible to find a quick and positive solution to the problems that arise.

Mr Debré raised two fundamental questions which could by themselves be the subject of much broader treatment, but for the time limits imposed on us in this debate, touching as they do upon the consistency and indeed the very objectives of Community policy. It is true — and I would be the first to admit it — that the rules of the game have changed. What we have tried to do at the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva is to define these new rules relating to standards and to all negative and discriminatory trading practices. We are not blind, nor are we naive and we are perfectly well aware of what is going on. There is no question at all of our being the mugs of the game. This is something we shall have to come back to again in greater detail.

I come now to the second question, that of Community preference, and I would say that it is harmonization that we expect will provide assistance to those working inside the Community by defining the conditions in which they can make best use of this Common Market. Under the code we discussed in Geneva it was agreed that we will hold talks with other countries, as appropriate to determine whether there is a sufficient degree of reciprocity in our commercial arrangements and to decide on what could best be done to ensure that those that import our goods can enjoy the same advantages we enjoy, in exchange for similar advantages for us in the markets of these other countries. And if I mention the Japanese situation I know precisely what I am referring to. The essential element of Community preference, therefore, is a set of specific and clearly defined rules

which must be supervised and enforced on the basis of a detailed economic plan in which social and regional aspects are taken into due account when priorities are being set.

May I make just one last observation, Mr President, on how these problems should be handled in future. I should be loath to see internal market problems dealt with exclusively in a committee for the internal market for the simple reason that these problems concern the very heart of Community life. We have been quoted the example of VAT on racehorses. We have asked the governments of France and Ireland for clarification because it seemed to us that the law was being incorrectly applied. When we ask ourselves, year by year, what needs to be done at Community level so that, as Mr von Wogau and other speakers have said, the citizens of Europe can see a positive and visible improvement in their situation, we are talking in terms of tax legislation and of strictly political problems. In considering the two categories of problems we have to distinguish between those with residual difficulties from past legislation and those that may arise out of future legislation.

I should like, in a few words, to reply also to Mrs Boot concerning the ruling given by the Court on Cassis de Dijon. This is a highly significant judgement in view of the way in which it highlights two very important things. The first is that it is quite legitimate to give consideration to local and regional specialities and to dispel once and for all the notion that the European ideal is going to be attained through a mindless standardization that makes no allowances for our combined heritages. We do not want a Euro-bread or a Euro-beer, or what have you. All that the judgment of the Court did was to recognize the legitimacy of protecting at national level certain products of a special and typical nature, making the point at the same time that, to the extent that these products were legal and licensed in other Community countries, they should be able to move freely and without obstacle inside the Community. The answer is that there is only one Cassis de Dijon, but that Elsinore Cassis, if it ever existed, could also move freely. Such is the nature of the Community.

I think it is important for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to get together with the Legal Affairs Committee, firstly to decide how they are going to supervise the work and, secondly, to satisfy themselves that the programme for customs union provides for satisfactory and positive progress in implementing relevant measures. In the course of discussions which will necessarily involve the Committee on External Economic Relations we shall need to formulate certain fundamental questions, such as: Is the Community's internal legislation adapted to the situation in which it is applied, on other words,

Davignon

can we be sure that we are legislating on tomorrow's problems and not simply on the mistakes resulting from yesterday's legislation?

That is what is at stake in the internal market and in the Common Market. The stake is doubly political: political at the level of the citizens of the Community and political as regards the capability of the decision-making bodies of the Community — Parliament among them — to play their part. We must be sure that our policies for the future are sufficiently flexible and yet detailed enough to anticipate problems and to make of the Common Market the indispensable reality we want it to be. We have to decide that what we want is a growth economy and not a purely defensive economy to shield us from those that are better organized than we are, for that would be a defeatist attitude. The Community is a symbol of hope. If we are to give positive proof that we intend to fulfill our promises, then we must organize ourselves accordingly.

President. — I call Sir David Nicholson.

Sir David Nicholson. — Mr President, when Mr de Ferranti introduced this debate, he said it was a subject of major political importance, and how right he was. Surely, therefore, we should give it the priority which it deserves; we should recognize this importance because if we from this Parliament cannot give a lead in this area, then I fail to see how we can make a contribution to leadership anywhere.

Mr Debré said quite rightly that freedom of trade is the very heart of the Common Market, and yet the barriers are increasing, not decreasing. This is of concern not only to the consumers, whom we sometimes do not think enough about but also to employees in whole industries because of the future of those industries. We have seen what has happened in Europe to the motor-cycle industry. Which industries are going to be attacked next? Is it going to be cameras or data-processing? And this does not only apply to goods in the manufacturing industry; it applies in other areas such as insurance, credit facilities, and so on. We shall never in the longer term be able to compete with the United States and Japan unless we have a real common market which works. So therefore I submit that we need a major initiative at this time.

We have a changing scene, and there lies the danger. In the face of the growth of technical barriers and creeping protectionism, I believe we should review our organization as well as having the political will to do something about it. I think we have got to increase the horsepower behind the Commission and make it clear to them that we wish to support them in doing something in greater depth, something constructive in this area. Of course we have to reduce the bureaucracy

at customs points, but also we must think about our organization for the harmonization of standards. We have a European Standards Institute, but it has no powers and very little money. It is an unofficial body.

The Commission itself has only a tiny staff available to deal with the question of standards, and yet this is a technical subject which does require specialization, recruitment and development over a period of time. Surely instead of continually cutting down our budgetary items for industrial expenditure, we should consider putting a little money into this vital area. Again, the chambers of commerce are large, they are well organized they are consulted by the Commission. There is a European Committee of Chambers of Commerce. They are very interested in the matters relating to free trade; why could they not help investigate the complaints, submit the cases and carry out some of the work to help an overburdened Commission in this vital area?

It is a subject of some gratification that the Commission is considering a simplified procedure for harmonization, and I hope that in due course the Council will approve their proposals for implementing directives with the help of an advisory committee — this was debated in the Parliament some time ago — but I would like to know what is happening now to the report commissioned by the special committee and what progress is being made. I agree with Mr Debré that this is far too big a subject to be dealt with in this relatively short sitting.

President. — The debate is closed.

17. *Economic Convergence — Financial Situation*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on two oral questions with debate to the Commission:

— Oral question (Doc. 1-383/79/rev.) by Mr Ruffolo, Mr Ripa di Meana, Mr Didò, Mr Walter and Mr Lezzi, on behalf of the Socialist Group:

Subject: The document on convergence prepared by the Commission for the Council at the request of the European Council

The European Council, following the debate on 'convergence' held during its meeting of June 1979 in Strasbourg asked the Commission to submit a reference paper to the Council of Ministers on the financial consequences for each country of applying the Community budget system, on the economic, financial and social effects of participation in the Community for each of the Member States and on the problem of the Community's own resources.

The European Council felt that once this document had been submitted to the Council each Member State would be able to put forward its opinions and requests. In the light of these comments the Commission would then put forward proposals to the European Council in time for its next meeting in Dublin.

President

— Oral question (Doc. 1-385/79) by Mr Klepsch, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Vergeer, Mr Bersani, Mr Diana, Mr Giavazzi, Mr Narducci and Mr Filippi, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group):

Subject: Communication from the Commission to the Council on the financial situation (1)

At its meeting in June 1979 the European Council instructed the Commission to draw up a document on the 'financial consequence of applying the budgetary system on the situation in each Member State, especially in 1979 and 1980. The study will have to take into account the economic, financial and social effects of each Member State's participation in the Community and the Community nature of the components contributing to the formation of own resources'.

This document, which is already being examined by the Council of Finance Ministers, should enable the Commission to submit proposals to the forthcoming meeting of the European Council in Dublin, scheduled for November.

1. Does the Commission not feel that, given the importance of this subject, the European Parliament should be informed of the principal points which the Commission intends to develop?
2. Would the Commission not consider it useful to consult the European Parliament immediately on those points, seeing that the next meeting of the European Council is due to be held in November?

I call Mr Ruffolo.

Mr Ruffolo. — (1) Mr President, the question we have put down, which has the support of the entire Socialist Group, relates to two political problems of tremendous importance. The first is the contents of the proposals the Commission is preparing to submit to the forthcoming European Council in Dublin on the so-called problem of convergence, as requested by the European Council in Strasbourg. The second is Parliament's role in relation to this problem, to these proposals and, more generally, to the European Council itself.

Let me first say a few words about the first problem.

The problem of convergence is a matter not entirely devoid of ambiguity. The need to reduce inequalities between the Member States by strengthening the economies of the less-prosperous ones had already emerged at the European Council in Bremen in the course of discussions concerning the launching of the European Monetary System. It was recognized then that there had to be a convergence of national economic policies before this could be achieved and that consistent Community policies would be needed to help reach this objective. At subsequent meetings of the European Council, that is after the meeting in Bremen, this very important commitment somehow

sank into oblivion and into the forefront came another problem — a fundamental problem, certainly, but a specific one nevertheless — that of the imbalance between the contributions that each country makes to the Community budget and the benefits they get in return.

The reference paper the Commission was asked to prepare following the European Council meeting in Strasbourg in fact confines itself to this problem alone. Mr President, the Socialist Group has made known its views on this problem very plainly. In the debate a spokesman for the Group will reaffirm our strong conviction, which we have already declared publicly, that the present imbalances are an intolerable burden for some countries, particularly the United Kingdom, and must be corrected as a matter of urgency.

However, we cannot allow the much broader problem of convergence to be reduced to just this one aspect of it. It will become evident very soon that these imbalances are a source of concern not only with respect to the Community budget but also because of the way in which the common customs tariff and the common agricultural policy will affect the balance of payments position of each of the Member States. The consequences of these imbalances will certainly be far more serious than the Commission's reference paper suggests. More importantly, the problem of convergence cannot be reduced to a simple matter of the debits and credits of individual States. The Community must not, of course, be a *marché de dupes* in which the burden of contributions falls on a few, but neither must it be treated as a public company from which everyone expects a fair return.

Since we may properly speak of Community convergence, it would be as well first of all to define the objectives of Community action, to coordinate the national economic policies of the various countries towards these objectives and also to introduce a measure of consistency into the Community's policies.

Well, Mr President, there is nothing of this in the Commission's so-called reference paper and, presumably, there will be nothing of this in the proposals the Commission is preparing to submit.

One cannot help wondering, therefore, precisely what will be the orientation and the policies behind the proposals put forward and the decisions taken in Dublin on such fundamental issues as the size and structure of and the national contributions to the Community budget, issues, incidentally, that fall within Parliament's jurisdiction but on which it has not yet stated its views.

Ruffolo

And now comes the second point I want to put to this House. Who is going to take these decisions and under what procedure? Mr President, even this problem is riddled with ambiguities. Let us take a quick look at the procedure established by the European Council in Strasbourg. The Council instructs the Commission to prepare a reference paper, the Commission duly prepares this paper and the Member States — the Member States, mark you — air their views at the Council of Ministers. On the basis of the guidelines set by the Member States the Commission comes up with some proposals. To whom? To the European Council. The European Council then takes decisions.

Two significant points immediately emerge from this. The first is that the political function of the Commission is undermined, for it ends up as nothing more than a research body of the European Council, with the additional role of mediator between the positions of the Member States. This is a serious debasement of the Commission's political and dynamic function to a purely technical function. The second point to emerge is even more important and concerns the role of the European Council and indeed the role of Parliament itself. In fact we are faced with two possible alternatives: either the European Council is to act as a Council of the European Communities at its highest level — obviously — in which case it should take decisions within the context of the procedures governing relations between Council and Parliament, under which provision is made for prior consultation of Parliament itself; or it is to act as an authority having precedence over the Council of the European Communities, in which case, if it does not wish to be left out of the European Council's strategic decisions, Parliament must seek to establish direct and precisely defined relations with the European Council.

Mr President, I am quite unable to make head or tail of the subtle legal arguments that have arisen over the nature of that new international phenomenon, the European Council. However, my political instinct tells me that the second alternative is the most realistic. From its inception the European Council has preferred to act as if it were a political super-ego of the Community rather than as its instrument within the Treaties. I have to say also — and this is a personal opinion — that I regard this as anything but a negative development, in a certain sense, inasmuch as it has helped us to look at and resolve problems that would otherwise have got bogged down in the machinery of the traditional Community institutions.

The European Council is thus a new political reality. But set against it is another new political reality in the shape of a democratically elected Parliament. It is a reality which the European Council cannot ignore. I believe it would be a grave error to ignore it. I believe

that this Parliament cannot and must not allow itself to be pushed into the political sidelines or to accept a subordinate role in the future. Whoever believes otherwise is also committing a grave error and, if it were allowed to happen, there would be nothing left for us to do but to give our apologies to the hundred million people who took the trouble to elect a democratic Assembly and to settle into the more modest role of advisers to the King, and second rate ones at that.

However, Mr President, I believe that Parliament should turn this incident to its advantage and use it as an opportunity to deal constructively with the problem of its direct links with the European Council — better to do it quickly, decisively and clearly than to let this problem drag on throughout a whole legislative period like a running sore.

President. — I call Mr Giavazzi.

Mr Giavazzi. — (I) Mr President, as is stated in the question tabled by my Group, the Council asked the Commission to ascertain the financial consequences for each Member State of applying the budget system, to consider the economic, financial and social effects of participation in the Community for each of the Member States and, finally, to consider the Community aspect of the elements that contribute to the formation of own resources. Such an investigation is concerned, therefore, primarily — but not solely — with the criteria for determining the budget, secondly, with the economic and social aspects of relations between the Member States and the Community and, finally, with the problem of the Community's own resources. Now, we must not forget that all this constitutes an essential preliminary to the European Council meeting in Dublin and meanwhile Parliament is preparing — because that is its institutional function — to approve the Community budget for the financial year 1980.

All this cannot and must not come about without Parliament being allowed to exercise its inherent right — not secondary, not derived, but inherent right — of intervention unless it wishes tacitly, but just as surely, to abdicate its legal and solemn right to have a say in the problems of building the Community's economy. If we refer to the text of the Treaty establishing the Community we see that one of its principal aims is the harmonious development of economic activities (Article 2). This is reaffirmed in the resolution of the European Council of 5 December 1978 setting up the EMS, in which the avowed overriding concern was to accelerate convergence between economic policies with a view to achieving greater stability. With major policy decisions of this kind we have in fact succeeded on a number of occasions in the past, albeit not without difficulty, in gaining acceptance of the principle that Parliament must be consulted.

Giavazzi

Now, the analyses the Commission was asked to provide — some are completed, some are still in preparation — are intended essentially, even if perhaps not quite adequately, to provide details and guidelines to help lay down the requirements of a policy better geared to achieving the stated objectives of convergence, equilibrium and greater stability. It is impossible to predict Parliament's reaction to the 1980 budget proposals until it, too, has had an opportunity to evaluate these details that the Council will be examining and discussing in their decision-making process. Parliament must be given that opportunity, both before and after the forthcoming meeting in Dublin, to express its considered opinion on the Community guidelines, to launch a full debate. And, given the subject-matter and the imminence of the Dublin meeting, the urgency and importance are obvious.

Mr President, before I conclude I should like to stress again that, unless this happens, any decision taken will be incomplete in that it will not have taken account of the views of Parliament for which purpose it was elected by the peoples of the Member States, not simply to be a consultative or advisory body. I say this not to confuse or encroach on the specific jurisdiction of national governments, or other Community bodies, but simply to make it clear that Parliament cannot be left out of the process of shaping the economic and social policies of the Community. Moreover, it must be allowed to participate in this process as of right and not as a concession. If the question I have tabled helps in some measure to throw some much-needed light on the subject, it will not have been tabled in vain and will allow Parliament to take a further step towards fulfilling the role expected of it by ourselves and by those who have entrusted us with this responsibility.

President. — I have ten speakers on my list and we must conclude this item by 8 p.m. I must therefore propose, with regret, to limit speaking time to three minutes per speaker.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (1) Mr President, we are especially grateful to Mr Ruffolo, Mr Bersani and Mr Giavazzi for putting down this oral question, because it gives us an opportunity to clarify the Commission's position. I should like first of all to ask Mr Ruffolo to forgive me if I reply on this problem from a strictly institutional standpoint. In fact, neither of the two oral questions raises any doubt as to the merit of the proposals to be presented on the subject of convergence.

As far as the problem of relationships is concerned, I should like to remind you that, at the Paris Summit of December 1974, the heads of government — and I am quoting directly from point 3 of the final communiqué — decided to meet accompanied by their Ministers for Foreign Affairs as the Council of the Community for the purpose of political cooperation. The term 'European Council' has gained common usage but it has no basis in any official text. When the European Council is dealing with Community affairs it is acting as the Council of the Community, as provided for in Article 2 of the Merger Treaty. The Council is composed of representatives of the Member States and each government sends one or two delegates. There is nothing original in this idea, which emerges very clearly from the Council's statements themselves, for example from the Council's reply to Mr Guerlain's Written Question No 293/76 (Official Journal of 15 November 1976): In Article 152 of the Treaty it is quite explicitly laid down that the Council may request the Commission to undertake studies for the purpose of achieving common Community objectives. The request to draw up an objective document, called a reference document, on the problems referred to in the Strasbourg communiqué is not therefore out of the ordinary. Similar requests to undertake studies have already been made in obligation to comply, while reserving its right and duty subsequently to formulate proposals.

To Mr Ruffolo I wish to say that the Commission certainly does not believe that it is regarded or used as a research, secretarial or political advisory body. The Commission is aware of its role and its duties. At the sitting of 19 July of this year the President-in-Office of the Council informed the European Parliament of the discussions concerning the problems of convergence in the Community and of the requests made to the Commission. The Commission itself submitted the reference document it had prepared to Parliament on 17 September. The topics discussed at the European Council in Strasbourg and set forth in the reference document have been the subject of numerous discussions at Community level in connection — as Mr Giavazzi reminded us — with the setting up of the European Monetary System and also since its introduction. The relevant parliamentary committees were kept regularly up to date throughout 1978. The discussions at meetings of the Economics and Finance Council of 17 September and 15 October 1979 were held in the context of this long series of discussions. At the European Council meeting in Strasbourg the Commission was asked to submit proposals for the forthcoming meeting of the European Council in Dublin in the light of views expressed by the Member States and in the Council. The Commission expects to submit a preliminary report in early November. The contents of this report are still under discussion in the Commission and it is therefore not possible to disclose what they are. As soon as the text of the report has been approved by the Commission it will

Natali

be forwarded to the Council and to Parliament, which should enable the latter to arrange a debate in good time. In any case, let me assure Parliament that the Commission will work out its own proposals quite independently, in the general interest of the Community and with due regard to Article 2 of the Treaty. Throughout all the discussions the Commission has maintained and will continue to maintain complete freedom of thought and action.

President. — I call Mrs Castle to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, your sudden decision to curtail our speaking-time emphasizes the relevance of the point in the question tabled by Mr Ruffolo on behalf of the Socialist Group, calling for a full debate on the crucial topic of the sharing of the financial burdens inside the Community, and I must say that the Commission's reply, seems to me at any rate, totally unsatisfactory. We managed to extract from the Commission, a long time after it had appeared in the press, the reference document which showed how serious the imbalance is in the financing of the Community as regards both the raising of revenue and the distribution of expenditure. Now we have to decide what we have to do about it. What we are saying is that the Commission should have produced that document to this Parliament for debate before it went to the Council of Ministers. The Commissioner shakes his head, but why be so coy about a document that has already leaked fully to the press, as all Commission documents do long before we ever get them in this Parliament?

There is a full account in the London *Financial Times* of last Friday of what this second precious secret document is about — the proposals that are going to be made by the Commission for rectifying the imbalances to which we have all referred tonight. Indeed, I have obtained a copy of the document, and I am prepared to photostat it and circulate it to Parliament, since the Commission is not prepared to do so, because I think it is a farce, the way we are always kept in the dark about matters which are central to the whole life of the Community. For what could be more important than the question of finances? A budget, you know, does not only deal with expenditure, it also deals with the raising of revenue; yet last Friday, when the Budget Committee made a formal request for the Commission's proposals to be released to it for consideration, it was refused, and now we are told we have to wait until November, until the Commission has made up its mind.

This document contains a lot of information, a lot of alternative proposals; that we ought to be debating; and we are, after all, the custodian of the political conscience of this Community. Why cannot we have a say at a formative stage as to how the Community's

burdens are to be distributed? As the Socialist Group said in its statement last week, the situation is totally unacceptable at the present time. The distribution of contributions within the Community is grossly unfair to those with lower levels of GDP, and indeed, in its first reference paper, the Commission spelt out the situation as far as the United Kingdom is concerned. It admits that the United Kingdom's share of the budget will rise to 20.5% in 1980 — one-fifth — while her share of expenditure will fall to just over 10%, giving her a net deficit, an excess of contributions over receipts, of over £1 000 million next year, making her the largest contributor of any member of the Community, thought in terms of national wealth Britain comes seventh among the Nine.

This I must point out, is bound to exacerbate the economic divergencies inside the Community. The Community spends a lot of time talking about its intention to redistribute resources from the stronger to the weaker, from the richer to the poorer; but in practice it does exactly the opposite, and that is the crisis situation it faces at the present time as far as the United Kingdom's contribution is concerned.

Mr President, you have curtailed the debate, I hope that this Parliament today will decide that a fuller debate with the Commission will be demanded, and obtained before it takes its proposals to the Council of Ministers.

President. — I call Mr Notenboom to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Notenboom. — (NL) Mr President, we are talking about two documents, the analysis and the proposals. We already have the analysis, and we will be receiving the proposals. We have the analysis because the Committee on Budgets asked for it. So we have the document, but we had to ask for it.

Now we are rightly asking for the proposals. We must have them in good time. The Treaty requires the Council to request our opinion. Mrs Castle is wrong in this respect; it is the Council that must ask us for an opinion. But if the Commission expects the Council not to consult us on certain subjects, it must ensure that Parliament receives the document before the Council discusses it or perhaps takes decision. There may be very little time, but we may still have the opportunity of holding a debate. Parliament should be involved, since we are concerned with the tax burden, the structure of the budget, the Community nature of possible proposals for amendments and so on. These are all matters on which Parliament's voice is indispensable. Surely now that it has been directly elected, it need not wait until decisions have been taken; it must discuss them beforehand. On that, I feel, we all agree.

Notenboom

This sort of question, however important it may be, should not really be necessary. In matters of this kind we should always be able to count on the Commission to let us have the documents in good time. Then this sort of question would not arise in the future. When the European Council takes decisions of a legal nature, they must first be discussed in Parliament. But even if the European Council takes decisions of major importance which are imperative but do not have a legal content, which frequently occurs — the financial mechanism has also surprised us — Parliament must first be given an opportunity of debating them.

I am referring, therefore, to procedure, not to content. I shall not speak about the content.

My only objection is to the reference to problems of convergence. As Mrs Castle has rightly said, we are dealing with the redistribution of finances. Convergence is something completely different. Convergence is the coordination among the Member States of their solutions to the social and economic problems, the aim being to achieve Economic and Monetary Union. That is convergence! Tax burden, wage trends, budgetary deficits, financing of budgetary deficits, these social and economic quantities must be coordinated, and the transfer of appropriations may be a precondition for this, and this precondition must be met. But that in itself is not convergence, that is redistribution, which we need in the Community.

President. — I call Sir John Stewart-Clark to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Sir John Stewart-Clark. — Mr President, I was returned to this Parliament to do two things: first, to work through Parliament for a stronger and more coordinated European Community and, secondly, to fight for those people in Britain, the electors, who returned me. Today, I must therefore talk about the latter subject, and talk indeed from the point of view of Britain.

In 1980 the United Kingdom will be the largest contributor to the Community budget, even though she is seventh out of nine in *per capita* GNP. The net contribution forecast will be 1 800 million units of account, making her, after Germany, the largest single contributor to the budget, with France in balance and the Netherlands a net-recipient to the tune of 400 million units of account.

There are reasons for this. The system of revenue raising is biased against importing countries, against those with comparatively higher percentage of their GNP in consumer spending. Expenditure, 70 % of which goes on agriculture, is an expression of the Community's policies. Because the UK has the smallest percentage of population in agriculture, she gets very little back from the budget. Indeed, by 1980 the United Kingdom will provide 20 % of total contri-

butions but she will receive back only 10 % of total expenditure. Maybe Britain should have joined the Community earlier, but I ask colleagues to recognize that fairness is essential for ongoing solidarity. With a population of 55 million it augurs badly for Britain if such a sizeable number bears a grudge against the Community because of high budget contributions. And this, Mr President, is certainly the case today. I therefore want to see a change in Community legislation under Article 235. The Commission must put forward as a matter of urgency a fairer basis for assessing contributions.

The Commission must adopt a new financial mechanism. Up until now existing institutions of the Community have not sufficiently addressed themselves to the problem of allocating contributions. Both Parliament and Commission have known of this problem, and yet little has been done to change the situation. Maybe Parliament has considered this a problem too hot to handle. Now the Commission has been asked by the Council to go more closely into the economic, financial and social effects of each country's membership, and it should proceed forthwith. We must also recommend a more equitable system of levying budget contributions. And, finally, let us decide that these matters can be, and should be, largely influenced by this Parliament, where there can be proper debate between Parliament and Commission rather than seeing a two-sided discussion between the Council and the Commission. That is not acceptable.

President. — I call Mr Bonaccini to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Bonaccini. — (I) Mr President, we share the feelings and anxieties over the institutional issues expressed in the question put down by Mr Ruffolo. If I understand him correctly, Mr Natali is saying that he believes that there is no justification for regarding the Commission as a virtual irrelevance. Well, if the Commission is happy to believe this I do not think that the same can be said for Parliament. In fact, we reject the premise on which its assertion is based and simply note the sad series of events that have led to this state of affairs.

Given the importance of the problems and the ridiculously short time allotted to them, I have to say that any hope (or delusion) that we may have had that the process of economic development would automatically bring with it a better distribution and use of resources in the various regions have faded with time. We cannot therefore for the life of us see how the Commission can continue to insist, as it does in the notorious Document 462, that the budget, while having only a limited effect on the redistribution of resources, should help gradually to accelerate the

Bonaccini

economic convergence of the Member States. The contradiction and the illogicality of these statements are manifest.

Furthermore — as I am sure I have no need to remind you — we are going through a period of stagnation, of low growth in the gross domestic product. The Community is unable to maintain the level of employment or to offer job opportunities to masses of women and young people. Employment statistics show this up very clearly and place a crushing burden on the Community and on the national governments. And this is why — seeing that monetary agreements are making it increasingly difficult to take any remedial steps by adjusting exchange rates — it is so important both to eliminate those distortions resulting from badly formulated common policies which tend to compound inherent structural distortions and to provide adequate financial resources to remove the structural obstacles to convergence.

We too express the hope that, with a view to the forthcoming summit in Dublin, Parliament may be able to give formal expression to its desire to see this policy of convergence pursued in the context of a plan, of which full employment would be the central objective. We must resist any convergence of the European economy towards a level of low employment, for it would then be the only form of convergence that we would see in the present period. The repeated failures of the Tripartite Conferences and of the recent conference of the *Comité de l'emploi* and the protracted discussions on such topics as the distribution of labour have led us to share the anxieties expressed by the European Trade Union Confederation and by so many other national trade union organizations.

We therefore propose that Parliament should either now, or perhaps at some opportune time, open a full debate and stimulate political interest in this subject of employment, turning a particularly attentive ear to the European trade union movement.

President. — I call Mr Nord to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Nord. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to make two brief comments on behalf of my group, the first on the institutional aspect of the problem that we are discussing this evening, and the second on the question raised by the first of whether the budget contribution of a country which considers its net payments to be too high can be reduced. As regards the first question, it is obvious from the powers conferred on the Commission by the Treaties and from the relations between the Commission and Parliament that the Commission should discuss policy with Parliament at a stage at which such a discussion can still have an effect on what the Commission will propose. This is particularly so in this case, since the

Commission is well aware that Parliament is very interested in this subject. Almost all the groups referred to this point during the very first debate on the 1980 budget. Almost all the groups referred to this point during the very first debate on the 1980 budget. I am all the more convinced that I am right when I hear Mr Natali say that the document the Commission will be preparing will definitely be of a political and in no way of a technical nature. If this is so, it is even more obvious that the Commission should discuss a matter of this kind with Parliament. I can but hope that this discussion takes place and that next time we do not have to wait so long and do not have to ask, either. It should not be necessary to ask for something which should in fact be a matter of course.

My second remark concerns the distribution of burdens under the Community budget. My group feels that it is not right to assume that each country should get back at least as much as it has contributed. This is a book-keeper's attitude, as it were, and we do not accept it. In an assessment of the advantages and disadvantages a given country has through belonging to the Community, the budget should not be the only criterion. An imbalance may of course occur, but we must not close our eyes to the lack of balance in the Community's policy as a whole and concentrate solely on Community revenue and expenditure. Those who complain about a lack of balance in the Community's present budget must call for more than a mere agricultural policy in the Community. They should be calling for a balanced general Community policy that results in the convergence we want and in a fair distribution of burdens. But they cannot disagree with other policy lines after complaining about a lack of balance.

President. — I call Mr Deleau to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Deleau.— (F) Mr President, may I express my gratitude to the authors of the questions for giving the House an opportunity to hold this debate. The European Council which met in Strasbourg last June instructed the Commission to draw up a document on the effects of participation in the Community for each of the Member States and on the Community nature of the components contributing to the formation of own resources. It seems that the purpose of this document is to allow the Member States to express their opinions and to put in their claims. If that is indeed the case, Mr President, it means that any consultation of Parliament will be belated and ineffectual.

I should like to make a few brief comments. In the first place we deplore the irregularity of the procedure that has been followed and the apparent reluctance to consult Parliament.

As for the substance, this notorious document attempts first of all to dispose in just a few paragraphs

Deleau

of all the economic, financial and social effects of each Member State's participation in the Community but offers no positive opinions or conclusions. For example, the analysis of the effects of the common agricultural policy gives more prominence to its shortcomings than to the benefits it offers to producers and consumers. Does the fact that there are imperfections in a particular policy mean that we should call into question the fundamental principles of the Community? One wonders, therefore, why the Commission did not see fit to develop this first part and give it more solid substance.

The second part of the document deals with the Community nature of the components contributing to the formation of own resources. Here the Commission's observations are more precise, but their conclusions are ill-considered. There are some substantial differences between the present contributions of the Member States and what they would be if they were based on their share of the Community's gross national product. These inconsistencies could be serious enough to impair the proper functioning of the Community. In absolute terms they are most unfavourable to the United Kingdom, but in percentage terms the situation is somewhat different.

In dealing with the subject of VAT, the Commission accepts that this is the most efficient way for the Member States to contribute to the Community budget. It does also make the point that there is an unsatisfactory relationship between the proceeds from VAT and a contribution based on the GNP of each Member State, but in its reference document the Commission emphasizes that VAT is a tax on their consumption and as a result two factors are left out of the reckoning, namely, investment and the trade balance, which are taken into account when calculating the GNP. According to the Commission this difference has the effect that those States which at a given moment have a low level of investment and/or a deficit trade balance have a high VAT assessment relative to their GNP contribution — and vice versa. This is true for the United Kingdom, for which the VAT and GNP percentages are, respectively, 17.36 and 16.04 %, or a difference of 1.32 percentage points. This difference is not, by itself, sufficient reason for revising the system of own resources. On the other hand, the own resources effectively deriving from customs duties and agricultural levies do not properly reflect the potential contributions of the Member States. Let me quote some figures: the Community's share of France's customs receipts comes to 15.10 % as against a GNP of 24.36 %, while for the United Kingdom these figures are, respectively, 26.7 % and 16.04 %. Where agricultural levies are concerned, the extremes are to be found in France and in the Netherlands.

While emphasizing the inequity of the system by which Member States contribute to the formation of the Communities' own resources, let us not forget the

essential purpose of the Community, which is to develop intra-Community trade and thereby to consolidate economic and monetary union. At best one could make provisional adjustments that would help to reduce some of the more obvious disparities. Any steps taken by the United Kingdom's partners along these lines must not, under any circumstances, contain concessions that could prejudice the unity of the Community and its future.

Mr Bersani.— (I) Mr President, our discussion this evening is indeed of the very greatest importance, not least because it concerns this Parliament's role and responsibilities, in its relations with the other institutions. As many of my colleagues have quite rightly said, the fundamental problem of convergence is a truly crucial one, all the more so when we think of the subject of this debate. Convergence, the development of the Community towards greater integration, is at the very heart of Community problems in a financial and economic sense, but also—and above all in a political sense.

Unfortunately, if we look at the situation and take it right back to its beginnings we find that there is cause for serious concern. Commissioner Natali has presented us with some proposals that we might after all agree to, given that during the November part-session Parliament should be given an opportunity to examine the Commission's proposals in advance of the meeting of the European Council. This will be the proper preliminary to a decision by that meeting on essential matters which unquestionably come within our sphere of responsibility. It would be quite unthinkable for all the Community institutions to discuss, to consult, to exchange opinions with each other, to hold dialogues with the national governments and to work out decisions while Parliament is left in the dark, in the end merely looking on and eventually being faced with a *fait accompli*.

I believe, therefore, that after today's debate we must be allowed at the November part-session to examine the proposals and state our views on the problems.

Obviously this is not the time to look at the substance of the problems. However, I do think that it is the right time to take stock of the situation and see where we are heading. In reality, at the same time as we are promoting convergence we are accentuating divergences and instead of consolidating the Community we are creating conditions that may put at risk the process of unification. From this point of view the cases of Italy and the United Kingdom are specific aspects of a much more serious and central problem which I believe we shall have not merely to act upon, but act upon with a full awareness of our responsibility.

Mr Chambeiron.— (F) Mr President, the document prepared by the Commission — and thanks to the Commission's French department we have had a look at the position of each Member State in relation to the

Chambeiron

Community budget — does help to bring to light some of the existing and growing disparities within the Community. The figures contained in the document are interesting, to say the least, and even if they are not complete enough they are a mine of information. As this debate does not directly relate to the substance of the document I shall confine myself to just a few observations.

The first observation I have to make concerns the expenditure on the common agricultural policy. It has often been suggested that it is the major agricultural countries of the Community that get most out of the CAP — that is, France and Italy. Well, the figures prove otherwise. In the first place, as we must know, it is the Federal Republic of Germany that is the main beneficiary of EAGGF appropriations, receiving 25 % of the total for 1980 compared to France's share of only about 20 %. But that is not all. We need of course to relate the expenditure on agriculture of both these countries to the value of agricultural production and to the number of farmers. What does this give us? Let me give you just a few essential findings. The favourable position enjoyed by Germany is seen in even clearer perspective when we see that in agricultural production she is only third in the Community, well below France and Italy. And so the German farmer gets on average twice as much EAGGF money as the French farmer. If I now apply the same approach to the United Kingdom, I find that the British farmer, too — though to a lesser degree — receives more from the EAGGF than his French colleague. Perhaps some people will be amazed by these figures, but certainly not the French farmers who have seen their revenue fall for the sixth consecutive time. The figures are revealing and also help to destroy the myth that France is the main beneficiary of expenditure under the common agricultural policy. I am sure my friend Pierre Pranchère will have occasion to come back to this in the course of the budget debate.

My second observation concerns the contributions of each of the Member States. The United Kingdom is in fact asking for a reduction in her share. I would suggest that if her share is relatively high, it is merely the result of her purchases from outside the Community which of course result in customs duties and agricultural levies. So, to grant the United Kingdom a special subsidy would be tantamount to encouraging her and others to buy outside the Community. In fact, the frontiers of the Nine are too restricting for the multinational corporations which are spreading themselves over the entire globe. Naturally enough, they want to see all obstacles removed, including tariff barriers and quota restrictions. If this were to happen it would serve only to increase the burden of taxation through an increase in the rate of VAT or through some form of Community tax. In fact this is just what the recent GATT agreements negotiated by the Commission have led to.

My third observation is to do with convergence.

It seems to me that the term 'convergence' is a solecism because in reality what we are witnessing is not convergence but divergence of the economies of the Member States. And not surprisingly, for this is the natural consequence of imbalanced development which, in turn, is the inevitable result of domination by economic and financial powers. Despite what the Treaty of Rome promised, the gap between countries is widening. The promises of today are just so much pie in the sky, thanks to a Community dominated by big business.

These are just a few of the points arising out of the Commission's document.

President. — I call Mr Griffiths.

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, colleagues, I will be very brief because time demands it, although I will only be brief in the knowledge that this House is bound to debate this subject again within the next month.

How roles are reversed, Mr President! How the world has changed! We in Britain, the villain of the Community, late to enter, slow to make any real progress with Community action, now find that we are playing the leading role in the Community in the area that matters most, that of finance. I would not believe that there can be any doubt — for once the bare statistics are more revealing than anything seen in *Playboy* magazine. The case for Britain cannot be disputed; the case for Italy cannot be disputed; there is no need to argue about it. Anybody who cannot see the need for change is a political pygmy, and by resisting that change, can only expect to see an end to a Community which is growing and cooperating in Europe. It will be a disaster if change cannot be made.

I will just say three things briefly — not about the great amounts Britain is paying in; not about the little that Britain, or any other country, is taking out, but about the three ways in which the Community's budget is financed: customs duties, the agricultural levies and the 1 % of VAT receipts. I would ask this House to consider that all three of these are inadequate for any future Community budget, not because the budget needs to be expanded, but simply because these are just not good enough.

Let us look at customs duties and agricultural levies together very quickly. Both, I believe, are unhelpful to the development of world trade: both can hit very severely countries overseas which need funds far more than we do. As far as VAT is concerned, can we, as we move into a recession, as we move into an age of diminishing natural resources and raw materials, envisage a situation where consumer spending is

Griffiths

going to increase and allow VAT revenue in our budget to increase? I do not think we can.

I think we as a Parliament have got to look at this problem carefully and ask the Commission to look for better ways of financing the Community's budget, ways which will be fair to all countries of the Community, ways which will ensure Community cooperation in the future.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (1) Mr President, I should like very briefly to clear up a couple of points. Listening to the debate I got the feeling that some of the discussion is premature and some of it comes too late.

We have been asked to reply to two questions, one from Mr Ruffolo and one from Mr Klepsch and others. Both questions specifically ask what procedure the Commission intends to follow with regard to its document and to the proposals it is about to lay before the Council. We have already given our answer and also our assurance that, as soon as it has been finalized, the Commission will forward the document to the European Parliament. That, then, is our reply to the questions put to us.

In the course of the debate, Mr President, one or two Members have referred to an earlier document, the so-called reference document. This document was forwarded by us to Parliament on 17 September and it seems to me therefore that to be discussing it now is a little late. Others have made comments on the proposals that we shall be presenting. I wish to say to Mrs Castle in particular, whose remarks concerning the future document appear to be based on certain leaks in the Press — which I deplore — that the proposals have not yet been examined by the Commission and have therefore not yet been adopted. Mrs Castle is probably referring to suggestions contained in a number of English daily newspapers concerning certain working hypotheses. As soon as the document has been approved by the Commission we shall, as I say, forward it to the European Parliament. I do not think I can say anything beyond that, Mr President. As you and the House will be aware, it was not intended that today's discussion should extend to such matters as the correcting mechanism, convergence or VAT, which certainly have no place in a debate that, as I said before, was simply intended to establish what procedure we intended to follow.

I think I made myself clear when I said that the procedure the Commission intends to follow will, as is right, allow Parliament to express its opinion and offer its suggestions before any final decisions are taken.

Mr Didò. — (1) Mr President, I accept that Mr Natali was right in saying that the questions put to the Commission concerned the method of presenting the

proposals and not their merit, for clearly this is something that deserves very much wider debate. I also accept Mr Natali's assurance on its behalf that the Commission intends to assert its political independence and his promise to submit the Commission's proposals to Parliament in good time.

I must say nevertheless that in reality, as an institution, it is the European Council that is doing the asserting in the matter of European integration and it is the Council that is assuming the burden of making the final decisions and shaping Community policy. Faced with this reality, of which we take note without expressing our judgment, we claim, as Parliament, the right not only to be informed but also to participate in the drawing up of all proposals emanating from any institution, *de jure* or *de facto*, that has any part in running the European Community. As a defence against this new reality we have decided to state the following principle: the European Council must establish direct links with Parliament. It is for this reason that we have decided to end the present discussion by presenting a motion for a resolution in which we formally request the Commission to submit to Parliament in good time the proposals that will be made to the European Council in Dublin and in which we also request that the President of the European Council or his appointed delegate consult Parliament about the decisions adopted at the Dublin meeting to enable Parliament to discuss them and to express an opinion on them.

President. — I have received from Mr Ruffolo, Mr Ripa di Meano, Mr Didò, Mr Walter, and Mr Lezzi, on behalf of the Socialist Group, a motion for a resolution to wind up this debate, with a request for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 47 (5) of the Rules of Procedure (Doc. 1-412/79).

I shall consult Parliament on this request at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

The debate is closed.

18. Urgent Procedure

President. — I have received a motion for a resolution tabled by:

Mr Kirk, Mr Caillavet, Mr Nyborg, Miss Brookes, Lord Douro, Mr Olesen, Mr Hutton, Mr Dalziel, Mrs Martin, Mr Haagerup, Lord Harmer-Nicholls, Mr Harris, Mr Hord, Mr Buchou, Mr C. Jackson, Mr Forth, Mr Deleau, Mr Patterson, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Miss Roberts, Sir Brandon Rhys Williams, Mr Sherlock, Sir Fred Warner, Mr Howell, Mr Simpson, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Hopper, Sir David Nicolson, Mr Moreland, Miss Hooper, Sir Henry Plumb, Mr Price, Mr Purvis, Mr de Pasquale, Mr Johnson, Mr Seligman, Mr John M. Taylor, Sir Peter Vanneck, Mr Tuckman, Mr John D. Taylor, Mr Vandewiele, Mr Pearce, Mr Prag, Mr Moorhouse, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mr Simmonds, Mr Lima, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Beazley, Mr Provan, Mr Newton Dunn, Lady Elles, Mr

President

Møller, Mr Curry, Mr de Courcy Ling, Mr Battersby, Mrs Cresson, Mr Adonriino, Mr Damseaux and Mr Geurtsen with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on fisheries policy (Doc. 1-414/79).

In accordance with Rule 14 (1), second subparagraph, of the Rules of Procedure, I shall consult Parliament on this request at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

19. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, 23 October 1979, at 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. with the following agenda:

10 a.m. and 3 p.m. until 8 p.m.:

- decision on 6 requests for urgent debate,
- decision on the request for an early vote on a motion for a resolution,

- Seefeld interim report on air transport services,
- Baudis report on inland waterway vessels,
- Albers report on the carriage of goods by road,
- Oral question with debate to the Commission on implementation of the 1979 budget of the Communities,
- Oral question with debate to the Commission on social legislation,

3 p.m.

- Question Time (questions to the Commission)

3.45 p.m.

- Voting time

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 8.30 p.m.)

ANNEX

Commission action on opinions delivered by the European Parliament at the September part-session

1. As agreed with the Bureau of Parliament, the Commission informs Members at the beginning of each part-session of the action it has taken on the opinions delivered at the previous part-session. The memo in question also indicates what progress has been made on each item before the Council.
2. At its September 1979 part-session the European Parliament delivered four opinions on Commission proposals to the Council in response to Council requests that it be consulted. In four cases the Parliament delivered (no-report procedure) favourable opinions on:
 - (i) the proposal for a regulation on exceptional food aid in the form of pig-meat for the Republic of Malta (PE 204/79) (COM(79) 257). The regulation has been adopted by the Council.
 - (ii) The proposals for
 - a regulation on dried fodder
 - a regulation on standard production aid for dehydrated potatoes (PE 218/79) (COM(79) 340).These regulations have been adopted by the Council.
 - (iii) The proposal for an amendment to the Common Customs Tariff in respect of wine (PE 1/256/79) (COM(79) 368).
The regulation is about to be adopted by the Council.
 - (iv) The proposal concerning sparkling wine produced in the Community (PE 1/261/79) (COM(79) 374).
The regulation has been adopted by the Council.
3. In the September part-session the Commission told Parliament what assistance it had granted Cambodia. Supplementing the 4 million EUA emergency plan, the Commission has just adopted a food aid project involving 5 000 tonnes of rice, of which 3 000 tonnes are to be distributed by the WFP, and 2 000 tonnes through the Catholic Committee against Hunger and for Development. The relief operations were put under way in early October.
4. In two resolutions the European Parliament came out in favour of assistance for the earthquake victims in Central Italy.

In response to this appeal the Commission decided on 3 October to grant 1 million EUA in emergency aid to Umbria for the disaster-stricken communities. The Community aid has been paid into the account of the Relief Coordination Committee under the Prefect of Perugia.

The President of Parliament was informed of this decision on 10 October 1979.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 23 OCTOBER 1979

Contents

1. Approval of the minutes: <i>Mr Gillot; Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Gillot; Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D); Mr Lezzi; Mr Gillot; Mr Hord; Mr Notenboom; Mr Bangemann; Mr Klepsch; Mr De Goede . . .</i>	34	<i>Mr Key, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Hoffmann, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D); Mr Moorhouse, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Cardia, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Baudis, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Dalziel; Lord Bethell; Miss Brookes; Mr O'Donnell; Mrs Cluyd; Mr Martin; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Burke, Member of the Commission; Mr Seefeld</i>	44
2. Decision on urgent procedure: <i>Mr Ligois; Mr Combe, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Didò, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Frischmann, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D); Mrs Ewing, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D); Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Sarre</i>	35	6. Question-time (Doc. 1-405/79) <i>Questions to the Commission</i>	
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Collins</i>	39	<i>Question No 1, by Mr Cottrell (H-84/79): Transportation link between the mainland of Europe and Great Britain</i>	
<i>Mr Collins; Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D); Mr Provan, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Buchou, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Pranchère, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mrs Castle, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Bangemann, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Democratic Group</i>	39	<i>Mr Burke, Member of the Commission; Mr Cottrell; Mr Burke; Mr Patterson; Mr Burke; Mr Seefeld; Mr Burke; Mr Boyes; Mr Burke; Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Mr Burke; Mr Moreland; Mr Burke; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Burke; Mr Jackson; Mr Burke</i>	58
<i>Procedural motion: Lord Harmar-Nicholls</i>	41	<i>Question No 2, by Lady Elles (H-88/79): Parking concessions for the disabled throughout the Member States</i>	
<i>Mr Kirk; Mrs Leroux, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group</i>	41	<i>Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission; Lady Elles; Mr Vredeling; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Vredeling; Mr Albers; Mr Vredeling</i>	61
3. Decision on a request for an early vote: <i>Mr Lezzi, on behalf of the Socialist Group</i>	42	<i>Question No 3, by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (H-92/79): Code of Conduct for companies with subsidiaries, branches or representation in South Africa</i>	
4. Urgent procedure	42	<i>Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul; Mr Davignon; Mr Seal; Mr Davignon; Mrs Baduel</i>	
5. Community contribution to the development of air transport — Interim report by Mr Seefeld on behalf of the Committee on Transport (Doc. 1-341/79) <i>Mr Seefeld, rapporteur</i>	43		

<i>Glorioso; Mr Davignon; Mr Radoux; Mr Davignon; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Davignon; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Davignon; Mrs Lizin; Mr Davignon . . .</i>	62	<i>Group; Mr Helms, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D); Mr Moreland, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Carossino, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Nyborg, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Paisley; Mr Flanagan; Mr Burke, Member of the Commission; Mr Albers</i>	71
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Welsh</i>	64		
<i>Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Davignon</i>	64		
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Spicer</i>	64		
7. Votes			
<i>Ruffolo et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-412/79): Economic convergence: Amendment to paragraph 1:</i>		11. Urgent procedure	78
<i>Mr Bersani, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D); Mr Didò</i>	65	12. Implementation of the 1979 budget — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-307/79):	
<i>Explanation of vote: Mr de la Malène . .</i>	65	<i>Mr Notenboom; Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Colla, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Aigner, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D) and as chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control; Mr J.M. Taylor, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Baillot, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Ansquer, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Tuckman; Mr Gouthier; Mr Normanton, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research; Mr Balfe; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Notenboom</i>	79
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	65		
<i>Seefeld interim report (Doc. 1-341/79): Community contribution to the development of air transport</i>		13. Harmonization of Member States' policies on social legislation — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-384/79)	
<i>Adoption of resolution</i>	65	<i>Mr Pininfarina; Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission</i>	94
8. Urgent procedure	65		
9. Directive on inland-waterway vessels — Report by Mr Baudis on behalf of the Committee on Transport (Doc. 1-380/79):		14. Urgent procedure	97
<i>Mr Baudis, rapporteur</i>	65	15. Agenda for the next sitting	97
<i>Mr Albers, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Hoffmann, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D); Mr Cottrell, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr. Burke, Member of the Commission</i>	66		
10. Regulation on the Community quota for the carriage of goods by road. — Report by Mr Albers on behalf of the Committee on Transport (Doc. 1-381/79):			
<i>Mr Albers, rapporteur</i>	69		
<i>Mr Gabert, on behalf of the Socialist</i>			

IN THE CHAIR : MRS DEMARCH

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 10 a.m.)

President.— The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments ?

I call Mr Gillot.

Mr Gillot — *(F)* Madam President, the latest monthly supplement to the bulletin published by the Commission Information Service, entitled 'The Community in October', contains absolutely outrageous comments on certain French members of this Parliament and goes on to cast equally outrageous aspersions on the proceedings of the French Parliament and the actions of its members. Is it part of the duties of the Commission's information staff to launch these attacks against the Parliamentary institutions of a Member State and to use the Commission's budget appropriations for this purpose ?

The forthcoming debate on the budget will give us a chance to deal with this kind of attitude. It is vital for the future of Europe that a relationship of trust, based on respect for the institutions of each Member State, should be established between the sovereign national Parliaments and the various organs of the Community. The deplorable behaviour to which I have drawn attention is unlikely to contribute towards establishing this relationship. Madam President, I beg you to let the responsible authorities at the Commission know about this and to exert all your influence and authority to ensure that these activities cease and that disciplinary measures are taken against those responsible for a statement which is more like a libel than a piece of information.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.— *(I)* Madam President, I heard what Mr Gillot said, but I am unable to give a satisfactory reply, because I do not know what document he is referring to. However, I assure him that I will get all the necessary information and, if we find that there has been any slight on Parliament, we shall take appropriate steps.

Mr Gillot. — *(F)* That is no answer !

President. — Mr Gillot, the question will be gone into.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, I should just like to make a statement on the minutes. My group does not share the President's view that Parliament's decisions, for example, on the question raised by Mr Pelikan can only be forwarded through the Foreign Ministers. My group feels that as in the past, when Parliament takes a decision on such matters, it must forward it directly to the relevant authorities in our name.

(Applause)

President.— The matter will be referred to the President.

I call Mr Lezzi.

Mr Lezzi — *(I)* I should like to thank Mr Klepsch for the suggestion he has just made and give my full support to the course of action he proposed and which the Chair must carry out by dealing direct with the competent authorities and not with the Foreign Ministers. It would be interesting to know what reply the Foreign Ministers gave to the President of this House when she sent them her inaugural message of solidarity. I believe Parliament would welcome some information on so important a subject.

President. — I am asked by the President's Office to tell you that this has been done inasmuch as a telegram has been sent to the embassy.

I call Mr Lezzi.

Mr Lezzi — *(I)* Madam President, I should still like to know, even if not at this particular moment, what attitude the Foreign Ministers adopted to the line taken by Parliament on this ticklish subject.

President.— An answer to this question will be given later.

I call Mr Gillot.

Mr Gillot — *(F)* Before the end of yesterday's sitting, which was coming to a conclusion with oral questions with debate Nos 54 and 55, at about 19.45 hours, the speaking time of those listed to speak was suddenly reduced from 5 minutes to 3 minutes, which represents a 40 % reduction in the time allowed. This is quite unfair to speakers at the bottom of the list. It is the business of the Chair to conduct the debate in such a way that every speaker has exactly the same amount of time ; otherwise the same groups will always suffer because they come in towards the end of the debate.

President. — Mr Gillot, the Chair put a proposal to this House on this point last night, and there were no objections.

I call Mr Hord.

Mr Hord. — On that last point, Madam President, it seems to me even more pertinent that we should start our proceedings on time. By virtue of our starting twenty-five minutes late yesterday, the speakers in the last debate were penalized. I think that adds credence to the point of order that was raised by my colleague, Lord Harmar-Nicholls.

President. — I call Mr Notenboom.

Mr Notenboom. — (NL) Madam President, you rightly say that the House did not oppose Mr Vondeling's proposal. Mr Vondeling had to ensure that the sitting ended at 8 p.m. That is what we all wanted. There is no objection to that. But in future the Bureau should remember how little speaking time is available. We should not have a situation in which the speaking time of the last speakers on the list is reduced. That is what Mr Gillot means and I agree with him. So there is no objection to speaking time being reduced, as that may be necessary, but the last speakers on the list should not be the only ones to suffer.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, I propose that we discuss this question in the enlarged Bureau along the lines that — if the House agrees — a *roulement* is simply introduced into the order of speakers. After all, it is quite clear that a given political group should not always be allowed to begin the debate if we want to prevent a situation in which the last speakers suffer a disadvantage. And there will always be a disadvantage, regardless of whether or not there is enough time, because speaking at 8 p.m. is, of course, a greater disadvantage for everyone than speaking in the afternoon or in the morning. I would therefore ask the House generally to accept this idea and that we propose in the enlarged bureau that these debates be conducted in future in such a way that the political groups take turns to provide the first speakers. That is the simplest solution. I would also remind Mr Hord of the President's statement yesterday that there was a very good reason for the delay yesterday afternoon; the chairmen of the political groups discussed ways and means of ensuring that this week's debate would proceed in a reasonable manner. So the twenty minutes taken up by that discussion yesterday were very well spent.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — Madam President, I should like to make one thing quite clear: the speakers whose

speaking time was reduced yesterday evening were not group spokesmen but second and third speakers on behalf of groups. The group spokesmen all had their full speaking time. To that extent what we are now doing is a kind of shadow-boxing, and I would urge that we do not now invent problems which do not in fact exist. But I fully agree with Mr Bangemann's proposal that this question should be discussed by the enlarged Bureau.

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Madam President, Mr Klepsch says that there are no problems, but I share Mr Bangemann's view that there is a problem, and I should like to support his suggestion that there should be a better rotation of speakers. Hitherto the non-attached Members particularly have been entered at the end of the list of speakers, especially in important debates. It must be clear to everyone that when there are 10, 20 or 30 speakers, attention, particularly that of the media, begins to wane towards the end of the sitting when there are still a number of Members on the list of speakers.

When the problem is then intensified, as it was last night, when the last speakers were given less than they had originally been allocated, then I agree with Mr Bangemann that this question must be clarified.

President. — That is a matter which concerns the organization of our debates. It will be taken into consideration by the enlarged Bureau.

Are there any other comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. Decision on urgent procedure

President. — The first item on the agenda is a decision on various requests for urgent procedure.

We begin with the Council's request concerning the proposal for a regulation in respect of emergency measures to reconstitute the agricultural areas of the French Overseas Departments damaged by hurricanes 'David' and 'Frederick' (Doc. 1-400/79).

I call Mr Ligios.

Mr Ligios. — (I) The Committee on Agriculture has decided to meet tomorrow and examine and, I imagine, approve, as requested, the Council's proposal for a regulation on the EAGGF contribution for reconstituting agricultural infrastructures in the overseas departments devastated by the two cyclones 'David' and 'Frederick'.

President. — Does anyone else wish to speak ?

I put this request to the vote.

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this proposal for a regulation be entered as the last item on the agenda for Thursday, 25 October, and to this end request the Committee on Agriculture to submit a report as soon as possible.

We proceed to the *motion for a resolution: Directive on shorter working-hours (Doc. 1-377/79/rev.)*

I call Mr Combe to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Combe — *(F)* Madam President, the Liberal Group is unable to support this motion for a resolution although we are basically in agreement with what it seeks to achieve. The underlying problem, that of employment, is a serious one on which all of us here have definite views. It would be a great pity, however, to discuss the question in a hurry, as has been proposed, and to leave everything to the Commission and the Council despite the fact that, as members of this Parliament, we have our own views to express. As far as I and the Liberal Group are concerned, we should prefer our colleagues not to press for urgent debate but to agree on arrangements for a full-dress debate on this issue and on the equally important one of unemployment during the three part-sessions between now and the end of the year. A reduction in hours of work is necessary; in my line of business, it has produced good results and I must have a chance to say so. This could be supplemented by other changes which could be equally beneficial. On behalf of my group, I repeat that many of us are in favour of doing something but not in the way proposed.

President. — I call Mr Didò, author of the motion.

Mr Didò — *(I)* Madam President, I feel I ought to explain the reasons for urgency. I do not intend to go into the merits of a reduction in working hours but I must remind you that the European Council of 12 and 13 March this year asked the Commission to carry out a study on the subject. The Council of Economic and Finance Ministers also considered the subject on 14 May. Finally, the Standing Committee on Employment on 22 May resulted in the undertaking by the Council of Ministers to reach a definite decision on the length of the working week before 1 December. Provision has been made for the commitment to be honoured by the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs at their meeting on 22 November. Moreover, during all this time, there have been a number of meetings between the Commission, the employers and the unions and also between the social partners themselves. The Commission carried out exhaustive

studies on the subject and there is general agreement on their value.

At the present juncture, the situation will remain static unless there is a concrete proposal by the Community institutions which can be used as a basis for a specific directive which, with the help of the negotiations between the social partners, will introduce a reduction in the working week and the working days per year, with concomitant attention to employment, and will do so with due regard to the need to proceed in stages and to the facts of the local situation in the various sectors and countries.

Because of this, the meeting of the Council of Ministers on 22 November, a week before the Dublin Summit, is of crucial importance. That is why we are requesting urgent debate on our motion for a resolution, which virtually commits the Commission to produce concrete proposals based on all that has happened in recent months and on the views expressed by the Council of Ministers and the European Council. In present circumstances, a reference back obviously implies opposition to a reduction in hours of work. We must all bear this in mind when it comes to the vote.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Frischmann to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Frischmann — *(F)* I merely want to emphasize that my group accepts the urgency of the need to discuss the problems of reduced working hours without delay. In view of the unemployment which is so widespread in all countries of the Community, the whole trade union movement and all those entitled to speak on the subject are agreed that a reduction in hours of work is one of the quickest ways in which we can create jobs, in conjunction, of course, with adequate investment and an increase in purchasing-power, which will give an immediate boost to output. Another reason why the subject must be treated as one of urgency is the promises made about it, especially during the European election campaign. The situation which is developing from day to day requires those promises to be kept and this Parliament to discuss those questions which are of such importance to the working men and women of our respective countries. Obviously, however, this means something more than waiting for proposals from the Commission and calls for early action to achieve the 35 hour week without loss of pay, the fifth shift for shift-workers, an additional week's holiday and a lower retirement age.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D).

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Madam President, I should like to oppose urgency for three reasons that I can give on behalf of my group. Firstly, we feel this subject deserves to be discussed by Parliaments' appropriate committees. Some of these committees have already begun this work. We feel that the appropriate committees should draw up and submit their opinions after a careful study.

Secondly we will have this subject on the agenda for the November part-session, when we will be discussing the situation in the steel industry.

Thirdly, we feel that this subject deserves better than to be treated as an also-ran on this week's agenda; it is so important for it to be debated fully in this House.

(*Applause*)

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The adoption of urgent procedure is refused.

Pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

We proceed to the *motion for a resolution: Compensation for the disaster affecting Orkney and Shetland agriculture (Doc. 1-408/79)*.

I call Mrs Ewing to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Ewing. — Madam President, fellow Members of Parliament, these islands are very, very much on your periphery. They suffer from remoteness, they are both archipelagos and have all the problems of distance and freight charges. This is not just a matter of farmers complaining, because, of course, farmers always complain about the weather. This is a real calamity situation where cattle have hardly been outside for two successive years, and the winter is ahead again.

The sums I have mentioned in my explanation are documented in detail by the National Farmers' Union; I am not throwing out a figure. The figure can actually be substantiated and has been, farm by farm, in the islands. The position is that normally they grow their own feed stuffs, because freight is impossibly expensive. This has failed for two successive years. They face total uncertainty; farmers are selling. The whole economy, particularly in the Orkneys, is based on farming; there are no alternatives.

I would also say to you that there is a precedent in the case of snow damage last year. Snow is perhaps more dramatic than two successive failed harvests; you see it falling, it is very dramatic and sudden. What has really happened in these islands, however, is far worse than the snow damage last year, which was accepted as a suitable object for Parliament's assistance. For these reasons, therefore, I would say that time is of the

essence, as the winter is ahead, another one of the long dark winters in this faraway place which is looking to this Parliament for assistance.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak against the request.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Madam President, this is not an emergency, but what is undoubtedly a lamentable situation in the applicant's constituency. I feel that this matter should be discussed in the Committee on Agriculture and the appropriate bodies. But I see no reason why we should today declare it a matter of urgency, and I therefore propose that the request be rejected.

President. — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne — (*F*) We are always ready to support proposals for action when catastrophes occur. This is clearly a case in point so we support the request for urgent debate.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this motion for a resolution be entered on the agenda for Friday, 26 October.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

We proceed to the *motion for a resolution: Torture of children (Doc. 1-409/79)*.

I call Mr Sarre, author of the motion.

Mr Sarre — (*F*) Madam President, this is the Year of the Child and it seemed likely to pass unnoticed, because nothing was being done until the publication a few days ago of the report by Amnesty International, the human rights organization which gave us proof of its vigilance only a short while ago. Its latest report, which it regards as one of the most horrifying it has ever published, must command the immediate attention of this House. It is, indeed, a terrifying indictment: children in prison for years, children tortured in the Argentine, children taken away and disappearing in Uruguay and Bolivia. There is no end to the catalogue of abominable and indescribable crimes. It is a matter of urgency for this House to speak out against them in the name of Europe, for what is the point of drawing up indictments and condemning these crimes if all we do is keep quiet. We have no right to remain silent, that is why...

President. — I am obliged to suspend the proceedings.

(*The sitting, suspended at 10.35 a.m. because of an accident in the public gallery, was resumed at 10.45 a.m.*)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

There was an accident in the public gallery. We hope that there will be no lasting ill effects for the victim.

I apologize to Mr Sarre for interrupting him and ask him to continue.

Mr Sarre — (F) Madam President, I was saying that we have no right to remain silent and that is why I urge the House to support the request and to consider this draft resolution during the current sitting without getting bogged down in references back to committee which could, surely, not be justified in this case and would be nothing less than deplorable.

President. — I call Mr Collins on a point of order.

Mr Collins. — Madam President, this parliament has often debated questions of human rights, and in the unfortunate circumstances surrounding the illness of the gentleman in the public gallery, we saw a basic human right being infringed — that is to say the right to be ill in private; because where help should have been offered, one of the first things that happened in the public gallery was that a press photographer rushed round and took a photograph, thus keeping help away. I would like to know whether the Parliament is able to indicate to that photographer that his behaviour is quite reprehensible and quite unforgivable and quite unacceptable, and whether this Parliament can take action to suspend that photographer from activities in this Chamber.

(Applause)

President. — I think it should also be stated that the victim of the accident received immediate first-aid treatment from a doctor who was present in the Chamber.

I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D).

Mr Klepsch. — (D) I should like to speak in favour of the request for urgency. The content of the motion for a resolution speaks for itself, and I cannot imagine there being a Member of the House who does not completely agree with it. On the other hand, I should like to say something, Madam President, which we should take into account for future debates in the House. It should be decided whether we should adopt the urgent procedure for any subject which represents an observation on a general situation. If we do this, we will ultimately so overload the agenda that there can be no proper debate on those subjects. I therefore recommend that Parliament's Bureau discuss the question of the number of matters for which the urgent procedure can be adopted in this House.

On the matter itself I should just like to say that there is one thing about the explanatory statement that I do not like; it is not true to say that this House has in

the past ignored the torture, murder and ill-treatment of children. Quite the contrary; this very case of the murder of children in Bangui has occupied the House, and I should like to protest against the impression that this House is indifferent to the death and murder of children. I repeat, therefore, that we agree to the request for urgency, even though we do feel that we should not leave it at a general statement, as is the case here.

(Applause)

President. — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this motion for a resolution be entered on the agenda for Friday, 26 October.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

We proceed to the *motion for a resolution: Sheepmeat (Doc. 1-410/79)*.

I call Mr Provan to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Provan. — Madam President, we feel in our party that this is a matter of urgency, because we as a Parliament must support the legal position. Since 25 September, when the European Court of Justice delivered its pronouncement on sheepmeat, we have done nothing about it in this Parliament. We must maintain international law, and we as a Parliament must, as a body, be seen to be standing on the side of justice in Europe.

The French skeep-producers, we realize, have a problem. We want in fact to assist the French to have a proper discussion so that we can come up with a sheepmeat régime. Our farmers in the United Kingdom, however, have a major problem now. The difference between the French and the British position is quite plain, to my mind. The French are worried about a position that might develop, whereas we are facing disaster in the United Kingdom sheep-producing industry now. Our returns are between 20% and 30% down, and this cannot go on. We must, as a parliament, implement international law; otherwise we face the extreme consequences of grave disaster for the Treaty of Rome itself. I urge this Parliament to allow an urgent debate on this matter.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Buchou to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Buchou. — (F) Madam President, my group is against the request because the House fully discussed the subject of sheepmeat during the last part-session, when every aspect was covered, including the effect of the judgment of the Court of Justice which was

Buchou

handed down during the sitting. And we have taken decisions on sheepmeat on two separate occasions.

It is now for the Council of Ministers, in the light of Parliament's views, to resolve the issue in accordance with the principles of the Treaty of Rome. As there has been no new development, the resolution does not warrant urgent debate.

President. — I call Mr Pranchère to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Pranchère. — (F) Madam President, the Communist Members of this House call for the rejection of this request for urgent debate, which has been made by the European Democratic Group for reasons which must be obvious. We do so on the following grounds.

It represents a serious challenge to the French sheep-farming industry. The matter was debated, at our request, on 26 September and I do not intend going over the whole ground again. All we want to do, as French Communists, is to reiterate that we have no intention of allowing the 150 000 sheep farmers who are essential for the survival of less favoured regions to be sacrificed.

The removal of the guarantees received by our sheep farmers would result in a reduction of between 30 % and 40 % in current prices on the market for the sole benefit of the seven UK-based import-export multinationals who would swell their profits by wiping out French lamb. The disastrous effects of their plans are intolerable in what is a deficit production area in France and the Community. Half the sheep farmers of France would be simply obliterated and join the ranks of the unemployed. The other half would opt for re-deployment, almost certainly in milk and milk products.

We said virtually all we had to say on 26 September and we hold the same view today. This problem should not, in our view, be dealt with and settled by reference to a supranational body but by the power of the French Government to safeguard the national interests of France, which do not conflict with those of the sheep-raisers and consumers of the Community.

This is what a deputation of 70 French Communist deputies, senators, local councillors, mayors and farmers told Mr Méhaignerie, the French Minister for Agriculture, in Luxembourg on 15 October. We noted that although, last June, he had accepted the Owen draft resolution proposed by the Commission, he had retreated in face of the impressive demonstrations by the French farming community and in face of our own firm stand. We shall not relax our efforts to ensure that the French Government fulfils its responsibilities and uses its right of veto to enable the French sheep-farming industry to survive and develop. So we urge you to reject this request for urgent debate.

President. — I call Mrs Castle to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Castle. — Madam President, I wish to oppose the request for urgent debate on behalf of the Socialist Group.

(Protests)

Whatever Mr Provan may have said, it is quite clear to anyone who reads this resolution carefully that it goes a very long way beyond the question of the European Court's ruling, and the vagueness of its wording when it refers to an undefined sheepmeat régime, to undefined financial aids, shows that it is not appropriate for a quick *ad hoc* debate here but should be returned to the Committee on Agriculture for study in depth.

I am in no way condoning the unilateral interpretation by the French Government of its legal obligations as a member of the Community: if the rules apply to any of us, they must apply to all of us until they are changed, and that is a principle that I would support; but I do accept that the French sheep-farmers have a problem, and I want to help them as I want to help all those with social and economic difficulties with which we are concerned. The French problem arises from the fact that the price of mutton and lamb in France is something like twice what it is in the United Kingdom, and that is why the imports from Britain cause such difficulties. But, Madam President, it is clear that the British housewife has a case as well, and I want to help her. The resolution refers vaguely to solving the French problem by introducing a sheepmeat régime without specifying what is meant by this. Does it mean the sort of régime we have had for other products, with a common price fixed at the highest level to cover the most costly producer and enforced by keeping out cheaper imports or by import levies on such sources of vital supplies for Britain as New Zealand lamb? This would help the British farmer, but it would not help the British housewife, who would, if such a régime were introduced, see mutton and lamb almost disappearing from her dinner-table as beef has almost disappeared at the present time. These are important matters, it is important how we reconcile these conflicting interests. I want to find a solution in support of the consumer as well as the producer, and that can only be studied in depth.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Bangemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, let me first make a remark on the Rules of Procedure, which I am prompted to do by the statements made by the two previous speakers, the representatives of the Communist and Allies Group and of the Socialist Group; the question of urgency must not lead to a debate on the subject itself ...

(Applause)

Bangemann

... and I would ask you to ensure in future that speakers do not speak to the subject itself. I will, of course, refrain from doing so as well.

Let me explain, on behalf of my group, the two reasons why we do not consider the adoption of the urgent procedure necessary. Firstly, we find it self-evident that a judgment of the Court of Justice should be respected. We cannot discuss that here either as a matter of urgency or as a matter of non-urgency. Secondly, we feel that at the last sitting we not only debated this question thoroughly but also took decisions which could solve all the problems broached here. For these reasons my group is opposed to urgency.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, I wish to support my honourable friend's proposal that the matter should be dealt with by urgent procedure. Like the leader of the Liberal and Democratic Group, I am astonished at the direction the speeches have taken. We have been virtually embarking on a debate on this matter. Certainly the speeches of Mrs Castle and one or two of the other Members have been on the substance of the matter rather than on the question of whether it deserves urgent debate or not. I do not wish to quarrel with Mrs Castle; she has got away with it, but I hope she and others won't get away with it again; but, in point of fact, there is a very good case, as my honourable friend put to the House just now, for considering this matter by urgent procedure.

The Court decided during our last part-session, Madam President, that in point of fact one of the countries, France, was contravening the Treaty of Rome. France has refused to accept that ruling. Now we did not have a debate during last part-session on what was going to happen or what has happened after the ruling of the Court. This is a new element, which has arisen since then. It is unfortunately the case that the government concerned, the French Government, has decided to ignore the ruling of the Court, and that, I submit to the House, cannot be accepted. We have got to take a decision on this.

It is true that next Monday the Council of Agricultural Ministers is going — we hope — to reach conclusions, but it is surely up to this House to indicate to the Ministers how it feels about this issue; whether we think the Court's decision should be upheld by the member governments. And I submit to the House that it is crucial to the future of the Community that, as in the past so now and in the future, the Court's rulings should be adhered to by the Member States. There is no question that we, on this side of the House, wish to penalize the French farmers or the British housewife. Mrs Castle knows that full well, that that is not the purpose of the debate. But it is essen-

tial — and that is what our motion sets out — that the French Government should not be allowed the latitude to decide what form of subsidy is required to help the French farmer during the interim period before the Commission comes forward with positive sheepmeat proposals. And it is most certainly not for this House to put forward the proposals on sheepmeat on a Community basis. That is for the Commission, and I am quite certain that the Commission will put forward these proposals as they have done in the past and that the next lot will be better than the earlier proposals.

Therefore, Madam President, I believe that this matter is urgent and that this House should inform the Council of Ministers how it feels about it. There is a desperate need to ensure that the Community's laws are upheld and its customs continued. Therefore I submit to the House that there is a case for urgent debate, and I hope that the House will accept that this is the case and decide in favour of urgent procedure.

(Applause)

President. — I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls on a point of order.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — Madam President, in view of the way that this debate has developed, ought not the Presidential Chair to use the special powers it has to give guidance, because the comments that have been made, which have had nothing whatever to do with the case for urgency, mean that a message will go from this Assembly which will give a completely wrong impression. Whatever doubts there may have been before this debate started as to whether it warranted urgency or not, in view of the previous debate we have had on this matter, the misrepresentation as to what this resolution is supposed to mean is such that we ought to have the debate now, so that it can be clearly seen what is behind it and what the real message is. I would have thought that some guidance and influence from the Presidential Chair are called for to ensure that proceedings are fair and proper.

(Applause)

President. — The Rules of Procedure have been strictly applied — more particularly Rule 14, to which I would refer you.

I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote. The request is rejected. Pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

We proceed to the motion for a resolution: *Fisheries policy (Doc. 1-414/79)*.

I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk. — *(DK)* Madam President, I wish on behalf of the sixty Members who have tabled this request to ask the House to agree to deal with this matter by

Kirk

urgent procedure. It is only too apparent to us that neither the Commission nor the Council, in the three years which they have had to establish a common fisheries policy within the Community, have been able to do so. It is only too apparent to us and to the Community's fishermen that the situation which is developing at present is highly critical and may become extremely so for the Community if no steps are taken to deal with it from the political angle. I believe this Parliament must take the initiative and get these questions discussed and thereby bring pressure to bear on the Council and the Commission, so that the situation can be brought under political control in the very near future. I am very much afraid that, if the situation is allowed to continue as it has in the last three years and the Council and the Commission go on beating about the bush, the Community will no longer be able to answer for the consequences. As we can see from the motion, sixty Members from almost all the Member States have asked for urgent debate and I would request on their behalf that this be done, if the House agrees, by dealing with this subject on Thursday before other debates on fishing I refer to the question of the Community's relations with certain third countries.

President. — I call Mrs Leroux to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Leroux. — (F) Madam President, last month I requested an urgent debate on behalf of my Group to discuss the plight of Breton fishermen who are being constantly harassed by vessels of the British Fleet. Another ship was stopped this week.

We had noted that the House as a whole had rejected the Communist Group's proposal. So we say once more that these totally unwarranted challenges must stop, that the Community regulation must be applied and that the grievances of the Breton trawlermen must be covered in the discussions which will take place at the forthcoming Council of Ministers in Luxembourg.

I would remind you that hundreds of sea-going fishermen displayed their anger in Paris less than three weeks ago. If there is a debate we shall reflect that anger. We shall, accordingly, vote in favour of the request for urgent debate.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this motion for a resolution be entered on the agenda for Thursday, 25 October.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

3. Decision on a request for an early vote

President. — The next item is the request for an early vote on the *motion for a resolution: Document*

on convergence drawn up by the Commission for the Council at the request of the European Council (Doc. 1-412/79).

I call Mr Lezzi to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Lezzi. — (I) Madam President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I should like to support the request for urgent debate on the grounds described by Giorgio Ruffolo and other colleagues who have taken part in the debate. I may be pushing against an open door; if so, I shall be delighted. I should like to pay tribute to the wisdom of the Bureau in responding favourably to the request for inclusion in the agenda of the Ruffolo document and the Klepsch, Cassanmagnago, Bersani etc. document. Our debate on these papers was at a high level and all who took part fully supported the decision of the European Parliament, pending an enlargement of its powers, to safeguard those which it already possesses and those of the other Community institutions.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The request is accepted.

The vote will take place at voting-time this afternoon.

4. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received, with a request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure,

— a motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Bangemann, Mrs Barbarella, Mrs Bonino, Mrs Boserup, Mrs Buchan, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mrs Castellina, Mrs Castle, Mr Chambeiron, Mrs Charzat, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mrs Clwyd, Mrs Cresson, Mr Damette, Mrs Dekker, Mrs Demarch, Mrs Desmond, Mr Fanti, Mr Ferrero, Mrs Focke, Mrs Fuillet, Mrs Gaspard, Mrs Gredal, Mrs Groes, Mrs Herklotz, Mrs van den Heuvel, Mrs Hoff, Mrs Hoffman, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mrs Leroux, Mrs Lizin, Mrs Macciocchi, Mr Piquet, Mrs Poirier, Miss Quin, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Salisch, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Weber, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, and Mr Wurtz, on the setting up of an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights (Doc. 1-415/79);

— a motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Debré, Mr Lalor and Mr Nyborg, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the increase in oil-prices (Doc. 1-417/79).

The reasons supporting the requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

The decision on the adoption of urgent procedure will be taken at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

5. Community contribution to the development of air transport

President. — The next item is the interim report (Doc. 1-341/79) by Mr Seefeld, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on

the memorandum from the Commission on the contribution of the European Communities to the development of air transport services.

I call Mr Seefeld.

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to make a few comments on the Commission's memorandum in my capacity of chairman of the Committee on Transport.

These remarks are in no way intended to anticipate the committee's opinion. We shall have an opportunity in the Committee on Transport of carefully analysing the committee's memorandum. We shall discuss the memorandum with the Commission and then submit to the House a report which can form the basis for a thorough debate on the fundamentals of a common European air transport policy.

I should like to stress that I am very happy to see the Commission at last finding the courage to draw the Council's attention to its responsibility for air transport in Europe. As we all know, the proposals the Commission put forward in 1972 and 1975 were given a very cool welcome by the Council. It cannot of course be said with any certainty whether the chances of the Council taking decisions are greater today than they were four or seven years ago. But I hope they are.

The Council admittedly adopted a list of priorities in 1978, and this is to be found in Annex I to the memorandum. It is important to mention this, ladies and gentlemen, because otherwise this list of priorities exists only in the Council's secret archives or as a press communiqué, but not as an official Community document.

But this list merely reflects the priorities which the Council wanted the Commission to adopt. But priorities such as problems facing the European air transport industry are in no way included in this list. The list refers to rescue operations, to investigations into the cause of accidents, but it does not, for example, refer to the really burning issue of light safety and makes no mention at all of Eurocontrol. The list refers to legal questions connected with competition, but says nothing about the urgent and topical question of fares policy. The list refers to the right of establishment, but not to bilateral agreements on landing rights, which in my view are among the most important facts of life in air transport. The list refers to noise pollution, but not to the problem of using, for example, transport policy and industrial policy means to find its feet.

Some see in the list of priorities drawn up by the Council in 1978 the intention to keep the Commission occupied so that it does not have time for the really important issues. I am glad that the Commission has not given in but has submitted with this memorandum perhaps not a full proposal for a common air transport policy but at least a fairly complete review as a basis for a debate. In addition to its courage to start again I should like to see the Commission showing more self-confidence in this matter.

In point 8 of the memorandum, the Commission refers to the limited nature of its experts knowledge and of the possibilities open to it. It says it is afraid of being accused of a lack of expert knowledge. At several points of the memorandum the Commission expresses itself in a very tortuous manner, for example in point 38, where it says that the trend towards the removal of what is known as the fifth freedom conflicts with Community thinking. Why does the Commission not make it quite clear: it is one of the Community tasks to achieve greater freedom in dealings between the Member States?

The Commission is a political body, it does not need to be a council of experts, and if it does not have specialized information, it should ask the governments or those who can provide such information. It has a political duty and if it does not succeed in submitting a perfect proposal in time, it will get into difficulty.

Ladies and gentlemen, in this question of air transport the Commission would have gained in self-confidence if it had sought even greater support from this European Parliament. It is perhaps a sign of a diplomatic attitude that since direct elections and the arrival of new Members in this House, the Commission has not taken it for granted that Parliament will stick to its earlier opinions, but it could have enlisted greater support from Parliament for its intentions.

In point 2 of the memorandum, the Commission refers to the reports drawn up by Mr Noè and Mr Corrie, former Member of Parliament, on air traffic control and competition, i.e. two aspects of the overall problem. Point 86 of the memorandum reveals that the Commission was impressed by the major hearing held early this year on the initiative and under the chairmanship of my predecessor, Lord Bruce of Donington, and it evidently hopes that the Council will also be impressed.

But then in point 2 the Commission rather condescendingly says: 'in the European Parliament there is growing awareness of the importance of developments in this area.'

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as chairman of the Committee on Transport I cannot proceed without commenting on this. It would be unfair to all

Seefeld

parliamentarians who have looked into transport questions before us. It is not true to say that the Commission has actively pushed ahead with the European air transport policy or that awareness had slowly grown in Parliament: precisely the opposite is the case. The elected representatives of the European peoples have from the outset seen in air transport an opportunity for close cooperation, and I feel there must be cooperation if, for example, we intend to face the tremendous competition from the United States.

Ladies and gentlemen, our Parliament called for a common air transport policy in 1960, and our Parliament laid down the general basis for such a policy in 1972/73 in a report drawn up by Mr Noè. This basis was affirmed in a resolution to which the Commission has not even referred in its memorandum. Since 1973 Parliament has repeatedly cited the Noè report, which has formed the basis for the debates of recent years. For many of its proposals the Commission would have had Parliament's support, and — you have my assurance — it will, of course, continue to have that support.

Madam President, Mr Burke, I should like to say at this juncture that you, Mr Burke, have submitted a courageous memorandum. After a first reading, I feel it would form a satisfactory basis for a new basic report. I am happy to hear that we of the Committee on Transport will be discussing with you all the problems involved, and we will draw up a report which, I hope, will provide a new stimulus for a European air transport policy. I welcome your intention, Mr Burke, to examine the present practice of bilateral agreements; I welcome the emphasis placed in the memorandum on the connection between air transport and aircraft construction. But I should like to say to Mr Burke and the other gentlemen from the Commission that simplification of formalities, technical standardization, standardization of working conditions, and mutual recognition of the qualifications of flight and ground staff are all very well, but other organizations are also looking into these matters. I believe there are a number of questions on which we should concentrate rather more: we must state our views on a better network of air routes, we must find out how fares can be reduced. We want greater productivity, we want European aviation to maintain and improve its place in world transport. We want safety through improvements and greater cooperation in the field of flight safety.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I feel that the review of European air transport policy the Commission has submitted to us is a good one. From my first reading of it I see only one omission. In the past the European Parliament has called for the whole air transport system to be treated by reference to the four cornerstones of the industry: firstly, the airlines; secondly, the aircraft; thirdly, flight safety; and

fourthly, the airports. The airports, Mr Burke, are mentioned only briefly and out of context in the annex to the memorandum. I am sorry if I upset you by referring to this omission from your paper.

Madam President, I should like to conclude by saying that I feel this is a favourable time to make a start on a European air transport policy. A great deal is being done in the USA. IATA is facing major problems. Present aircraft will soon be replaced by a generation of quieter, more economic, safer and more productive aircraft, and the Commission should derive greater self-confidence from this. It will, I am sure, have the full support of the directly elected Parliament for its initiatives. So saying, I should like to congratulate the Commission once again on its initiative, and I hope that in future it will get rid of some of its complexes and demonstrate greater courage of its convictions. In Parliament, Mr Commissioner, you will find approval and assistance, because we want to join with you in seeking ways to establish a better policy in the field of air transport.

Thank you for the work you have done so far, and I look forward to the discussion in Committee.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Key to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Key. — Madam President, the Socialist Group, while congratulating the Commission and the Commissioner on drawing up this excellent memorandum for Community action in the field of civil aviation, is well aware of the pitfalls which beset anybody who seeks to be a designer of cheap fares. I think we have to look very carefully at the American introduction of rapid deregulation, and learn from their experience and their problems.

Although the Commissioner has given serious thought to this, and as thoroughly researched many issues, many gaps remain, as our chairman indicated. However, the Socialist Group are proposing how some of these gaps can be avoided in practice. We suggest that the committee should hold public hearings and receive evidence and advice from everybody with experience in this field, be it national or private operators, be it the business traveller or the holidaymaker, or even a Member of this Parliament, be it pilots or air-traffic controllers. All are in a position to give us important information.

Our group's fundamental aim in the field of civil aviation is to provide a service — a service to the public as a whole, recognizing the traveller as an individual, and not treating him as an encumbrance or merely as a paying machine at the mercy of the operators. This means we must reject both crude and inflexible nationalistic protectionist policies, which have abounded in these last few years, and also the *laissez-faire*, free-market buccaneers who have entered this field, and

Key

who just seek a quick profit, regardless of the long-term costs to the consumer and, indeed, to society. We must ensure a true balance between these two philosophies for the consumer.

Secondly, we believe that those employed inside the industry must be consulted at every stage, for without their cooperation and expertise the would-be architects of a cheap-fares policy are bound to make costly errors. Any attempt to reduce the cost by the lowering or the non-application of safety standards must be resisted totally by this Parliament and by the Commission. Indeed, we must seek to raise these standards, as the memorandum states.

Thirdly, as Socialists, we believe in a fully integrated transport policy. This means we must seek the most suitable mode of transport and have a deep respect for the wider interests of our economies and of society. We must consider the impact on the environment, we must consider the impact on regional policy, on the regions of our Community. Above all, as we are all well aware, we must be very concerned at levels of energy consumption and seek energy conservation. Just as no man is an island, neither must the airline operators be allowed to exist as a law unto themselves and make any decision they want. Many of their actions, it can and must be recognized, may be highly detrimental to people. Indeed, anyone who lives in the flight-path of an international airport is quite well aware of the problems.

Although the Socialist Group are counselling caution and seeking balance, we do recognize only too well the great frustrations, annoyances and injustices now being doled out to all airline travellers, including Members of this Parliament. We all know that you need a mind composed of silicon chips if you are to ascertain what is the best and most economical way even of trying to come to Strasbourg this week. Indeed, the tariff permutations are totally incomprehensible to the average layman. All of us know the frustrations of delays; we have all heard the excuses over the tannoy systems in airports: they are incomprehensible in one's own language — how must they sound to the foreign traveller in a foreign airport? Surely modern technology and good progressive management could make life more simple and more comfortable for the consumer.

The Socialist Group is therefore convinced, Madam President, that with our basic principles, and with more advice and understanding, we can in the Community devise a policy which will serve the public in the widest sense, giving them a good service at a realistic — but reduced — price.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Hoffmann to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D).

Mr Hoffmann. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European Peoples' Party would like to congratulate Mr Burke on the memorandum on the development of air transport in the Community. On behalf of the passengers, airlines and their employees we support you in your endeavours to facilitate intra-Community air transport. In this respect I can assure you, I can assure the Commission of my group's full support.

Aircraft overcome frontiers, transport people in the European Community from one place to another and thus contribute to the improvement of mutual understanding. I would even say that it is largely thanks to air transport that this Parliament is able to work. The changes in this sector must therefore be carefully observed, because it forms part of a world-wide system and therefore requires a circumspect approach.

The Commission itself points out that harmonization of air transport must develop gradually from inside. Sudden changes must be avoided; time is needed to allow adjustments in the various systems. My group feels that the consumer should be charged a reasonable price that takes account of the economic stability of the airlines. We call for a reduction in the airlines' operating costs and an increase in their productivity. And my group calls for social progress and the elimination of difficulties in choosing an occupation as a means of safeguarding the interests of those employed in air transport.

But when we get down to basics in all these considerations, protection of the environment, flight safety, infrastructural questions and the interests of the population as a whole must not be overlooked. And I feel we should not hold out hopes to the citizens of the European Community that there will be an early reduction in fares. Some members of this Parliament look full of expectation to the development of civil aviation in the United States and to the low fares that have merged there since price fixing was abolished. But the high passenger-seat ratios the American airlines enjoy conceal the fact that these airlines were again in the red in the last quarter of 1978 and the first quarter of 1979.

The necessary investments in flight safety — and I am thinking here in particular of modern and at the same time non-polluting aircraft — are not being made and must therefore be left to the future. Added to this there is the present wave of mergers in America. Less attractive airlines are closing down, and many different airlines have already announced increases in fares. This surely shows that the trend must be carefully observed and if necessary corrected.

The consumer is undoubtedly pleased when an American airline offers to fly him from Washington DC to New York for \$21. But then we must ask the American airline why, for example, the fare for the

Hoffmann

same distance, from Berlin to Nuremberg, is \$75.50, or 360 % more. We must also ask why it costs \$21 to fly from Los Angeles to San Francisco as against \$89.50, or 470 % more, for the short flight from Berlin to Munich. The answer given to these questions about differences in fares in the United States and Europe is that it is more difficult to use aircraft to capacity because of the existing ban on night landings in Europe. This results in higher flight safety costs, higher social charges, higher landing fees and higher clearance fees, and of course fuel prices are higher in the Community. I feel these questions should be examined, and I believe the Committee on Transport will be looking into them.

The European Parliament, the Commission and the Council must realize that high-speed air links for business trips cannot be simply combined with the exacting requirements of present-day mass tourism, for example. The citizens of the Community quite rightly expect to be able to fly cheaply to any country in the Community for their holidays. For this, my group feels charter flights are the proper instrument. Changing things so that the regular airlines cater for this market as well and possibly oust the companies now active in that field would not be in the interests of the citizen, of the companies or of the workers.

My Group is in favour of competition between the Community's airlines. But before there can be real competition, the Community must take a number of important steps to ensure equal conditions of competition. We therefore call on the Commission to take the initiative at several levels without delay. Firstly, there is harmonization of tax legislation in the Community, and above all turnover tax, income tax, corporation tax, depreciation and investment concessions; secondly, harmonization of the provisions on subsidization; thirdly, harmonization of customs procedures, because unfortunately we still have in the Community an internal customs procedure. I am referring to the simplification and standardization of official passenger clearance procedures and not least to the improvement of civil and military flight safety, particularly with a view to the expansion of Eurocontrol. These are among the obstacles in the path towards genuine and unrestricted competition between the airlines in the Community. If these questions are not settled, it will surely be impossible to establish a Community air transport policy.

Efforts to achieve a common air transport policy must take due account of the bilateral system that has developed throughout the world. The policy of bilateral transport agreements has so far prevented the State-trading countries from gaining a footing in the Community's air transport market with dumping prices, which for years have had a disastrous effect on

the Community's undertakings and their employees in the sea transport, road transport and inland waterway sectors. The Community's policy must therefore aim at the harmonization of air transport conditions in the interests of the consumer, the airlines and their employees and also at protecting the European air transport industry from instructions by the State-trading countries.

If, Mr Burke, we agree on these objectives, we shall be able to cooperate and you will have the full support of my group.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Moorhouse to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Moorhouse. — Madam President, Members of Parliament, I am very glad, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, to support the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Transport, of which I am particularly happy to be a member. It also gives me great pleasure to be speaking in front of a British Member of Parliament, Mr David Mitchell, who is an Under-Secretary of State at the Department of Trade and as such much concerned with air transport services within the EEC as well as having a special responsibility for small businesses.

I think the memorandum from the Commission sums up very well the feelings of many members of the Committee on Transport, and we would like to congratulate the Commissioner and his staff on producing an overall plan for Community action in the civil aviation field. I think it is now up to us in the Committee on Transport and in Parliament to help push the boat along. There is certainly a need for that, as the whole situation bristles with problems and anomalies galore. Air fares on scheduled routes, as has already been said, are far too high; there is a lack of real competition; scheduled passengers are no longer getting a fair deal within the Community.

I think it is also unfortunate that civil air transport has not been getting the attention it deserves in political circles in recent years, or indeed in any year. It is a badly neglected subject, even though it is something which affects the lives of millions of our fellow citizens within the Community, whether as holiday-makers, people visiting friends and relations, businessmen, government officials or politicians like ourselves. All these other good people are our constituents, and they are looking to us, their directly elected representatives, to help give them a fairer deal. It is an increasingly important issue, not least in the United Kingdom and in Denmark, but, I strongly suspect, also in every other single EEC country, ranging from places like Shannon to Strasbourg, from Inverness to Palermo.

Moorhouse

It is somewhat odd, in a way, that holidaymakers are probably getting the best deal. One can, as you know, take a package holiday to almost anywhere: Corfu, Majorca, Las Palmas — you only have to name the place, go by air charter, stay at a luxury hotel, all for less than an ordinary return air fare. I said, 'oddly enough', but in fact perhaps it is not so odd. The reason, I think, is rather simple: it is that there is real competition in the holiday field. Airline operators and travel firms are free to compete and offer the best terms — and they do so.

If we turn to the scheduled sector, as we have begun to hear this morning, and know perfectly well ourselves, the story is not only rather different, but very different. The scheduled services within Europe have been built up by the great national aircarriers. I think they have done a great job in many ways over the years in creating a network of services on the main arteries of our continent. Indeed, I was proud to be a project engineer myself with BOAC in my early career, and help do just that. But the national aircarriers have been fortunate enough to enjoy a monopolistic position, and they have been protected, as has already been indicated, by national barriers and bilateral agreements. As my honourable friend for London North-West, Lord Bethell, implied when the House last met, the whole thing smacks of a cosy relationship between governments and national aircarriers which is not always in the best interests of air travellers. I should like to give a few more examples of fares which are too high, following what Mr Hoffmann said. Why is it, for instance, that the normal airfare from London to Paris is as high as £ 95 return, that from London to Copenhagen is £ 208 return, and from Paris to Copenhagen, in sterling, is £ 273 return — that is, for no more than two, or three, or four hundred miles — when one can fly from London to New York, a distance of around 3 000 miles, for as little as £ 70 single, and from London to Los Angeles, a distance of 5 180 miles, for £ 94 single — these last two by the now legendary Freddie Laker, the independent airline operator? I see, incidentally, that in the *International Herald Tribune* today there is an article: '1980 — Age of the Bargain Basement in the Sky — Dawn of Cheaper Tickets on Europe's Main Routes.' That, I think, sums up what we are here to try to achieve. Before I leave air fares: it is hardly believable, but according to the magazine *Business Traveller*, the cheapest way of travelling between London and Copenhagen is via New York.

(Laughter)

I shall repeat that: the cheapest way of travelling between London and Copenhagen is *via* New York, subject to one or two limitations. It is no wonder, Madam President, that some people think European airfares are a rip-off — I do not pretend to know how that would translate into other languages, but those of

us who speak English know that phrase very well — 'a rip-off'. I would add for good measure that air fares in the United States are generally about half air fares in Europe for the same distance.

Now, if there are any airline representatives in the public gallery behind me at this very minute, I have no doubt they are looking at each other and saying: 'We have got to educate James Moorhouse, he has got to learn that one cannot compare the United States with Europe — thins are quite different over there'. I would say in return: 'Maybe so — but also maybe not'. I think they still owe us an explanation for these differences and discrepancies in fares. I am sure we are all ready to listen, but as Mr Key and Mr Seefeld have indicated, we shall be looking at this whole issue very closely in committee, and I hope indeed that we shall decide to hold public hearings.

Now, specific proposals are made in the document by the Commission, and time will only allow me to touch on one or two. In particular, I should like to single out their proposal to develop new cross-border services connecting many more regional centres in the Community countries. One of the problems among many we face is that air services are too concentrated on the capital cities. — London, Paris, Brussels, Copenhagen, Rome — and I appreciate that my Scottish friend will want to throw in Edinburgh for good measure, and perhaps I should say Dublin as well. These are the routes which are subject to bilateral agreements and governmental restrictions. Why do we not, within EEC Policy, backed up by competition policy, encourage the opening up of far more services between regional centres? We have, on a deregulated basis maybe, services between Toulouse and Bristol — I feel sure the Mayor of Toulouse would support that, and the Mayor of Bristol too, if he were fortunate enough to be a Member here; between Antwerp and Marseilles — the Mayor of Marseilles, I know, is a Member here, and would support that, I feel certain; between Rotterdam and Luxembourg; between Esbjerg and Nice. If there is a demand, there should be the freedom so to do. And should we not include Strasbourg in all of this?

(Applause)

Mr Key has touched on this issue, and quite rightly. The air services in and out of Strasbourg are so inadequate that some British and Danish Members are obliged to fly into Frankfurt or Basle to get here at all. Indeed, I would go further and say that unless the air services here are much improved — and soon — we really cannot make Strasbourg our place of work, especially in winter.

We warmly support the general terms of the Commission's document and approach, while naturally reserving our right to study it further. In the European Democratic Group on this side of the House, we are committed to introducing further competition within

Moorhouse

the EEC and to reducing air fares. We are very glad that the Commission is helping through its memorandum to point us all in the right direction.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Cardia to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Cardia. — (I) Madam President, as Italian Communists, we fully understand the reasons for the decision to refer to committee the memorandum on air transport services and for the decision of the Committee on Transport to give this important document the most searching examination at a later date with a view to submitting a detailed report to the House, thus ensuring that the subsequent debate is fuller and more productive of results. As just suggested by a Socialist colleague, I hope the Committee on Transport will do this at a meeting open to the public and after the most exhaustive investigation of the facts.

We are, accordingly, deferring our comments on the substance of the memorandum until it is dealt with in committee and, subsequently, in the general debate in the House. But I should like to make one or two remarks.

The decision of the Commission to map out for the first time (though, if the Commissioner will allow me to say so, in somewhat general terms) a Community policy on air transport, after more than twenty years' almost complete absence of activity by the Council on a topic of such importance and difficulty, can, as someone has already said, only be regarded as a step forward. As Mr Seefeld so shrewdly observed, this is not to any appreciable extent due to the new authority, the new and growing authority, which this Parliament is acquiring and is likely to go on acquiring in consequence of its election by direct universal suffrage. We must bear in mind that, through the appropriate committee, the Parliament previous to this one undertook that, after the election by universal suffrage, it would consider whether, under Article 175 of the Treaty establishing the Communities, an action should be brought before the Court of Justice against the Council of Ministers for its failure to take action concerning the transport sector and for the infringement of the Treaty arising from such failure to act. As you will recall, the Treaty prescribes a common transport policy, in conjunction with a common agricultural policy, as an essential condition for the harmonious development of the Community.

I imagine also that the decision of the Commission was appreciably influenced by the conclusions reached in Mr Seefeld's report of 28 November 1978, in which the Parliament

... impresses urgently on the Council, the Commission and the public that, unless the Community succeeds in the very near future in establishing an intra-Community

common transport system and makes itself, capable of effective action in the field of transport *vis-à-vis* the outside world, it will be beset by grave dangers that will undermine its entire economic position.

What was said about transport in general applies with even greater force to air transport and to the aerospace and aeronautical industry which forms its indispensable base. Civil aviation is one of the most vital elements of the infrastructure necessary for the peaceful unification of Europe and of the world; it is in the van of scientific and technological progress; it is the essential instrument and pre-requisite of the economic development of the Community and of the world. Nor should we forget that it is also a sector subject to continuous and rapid technological change. This applies in the case of air carriers, who face tremendous problems arising from the introduction into service of the airbus and other types of aircraft in which the European production industry specializes; it applies equally to aircraft control, take-off and landing systems and to ground safety techniques.

For example, United States airports are about to install the 'micro-wave landing system', the very latest development, which will make it possible to guide an aircraft down and land it in any weather conditions, however bad. On the other hand, some major airports in the Community, such as Linate, in Italy, which I quote because I am an Italian, are still equipped with the old ILS, the second-class version at that, under which take-off and landing are impossible for days and weeks during the winter, with consequent heavy loss and interruption of the Community's highly complex network of services.

However, instead of trying, as it is now doing, to exorcise the Commission's document by subjecting it to lengthy examination, the Council of Ministers should get a move on and, without delay, draw up a positive directive on the whole subject of air transport in the Community. It should do so giving special attention to the variety of carriers and the tariff structures which, as Mr Moorhouse reminded us, were raised again this year to an unconscionable extent whereas they should be in process of being gradually reduced. The directive ought also to cover safety and air traffic control systems as well as the working conditions of flight and ground staff.

I should like to hear the views of the Community Commissioner for Transport on the subject of tariffs and the possibility of Community measures for them to be progressively reduced. I cannot emphasize too strongly that action must be taken to set up a standardized and sophisticated Community-wide network of services and to ensure that the Member States adopt a common front in their dealings with other States.

Subject to these reservations, the Italian Communists will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution before us. In so doing, it will emphasize the need for

Cardia

Parliament to make, as a matter of urgency and after a full report from the competent committee, a thorough and searching study of the memorandum from the Community Executive. In our view, it is neither brash nor premature, as Mr Hoffmann seemed to imply by his appeals for caution and time for consideration; on the contrary, the document is rather vague when it comes to solving the problems involved and, if the Commissioner will allow me, has appeared rather late on the scene.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Baudis to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group.

Mr Baudis — *(F)* Madam President, the Liberal and Democratic Group looks forward with enthusiasm to studying the memorandum submitted by the Commission because it is, without doubt, a valuable working document which enables us to identify and examine the difficulties of the present situation in air transport.

It is worth recalling that these difficulties were the subject of consideration by the Council of Ministers for the first time in June 1977. At the suggestion of Great Britain, all the Member States declared that they had in principle agreed to consider what role the Community could play in this field even though carriage by air had not hitherto been covered by the common transport policy. The EEC Treaty made its inclusion subject to a unanimous decision of the Member States. In actual fact, no action was taken. The Commission (and, in particular, Mr Burke, who deserves to be congratulated on it) seems at last resolved to get something moving in the Council of Ministers with a view to improving air transport in the Community.

The question of safe flying has received far too little attention in this context because it is absurd for Europe to use separate safety systems operating on different principles. I assure Mr Moorhouse, who made a most interesting speech, that I would welcome a regular service between Bristol and Toulouse, not to mention better connections with Strasbourg. He also referred to the exploits and miraculous achievements of Mr Laker, whose private company has such a flair for publicity. But I do not believe Mr Laker will give us Bristol-Toulouse; he is more likely to give us London-Nice, London-Athens or even Paris-Agadir and that's the trouble.

The national airlines are, of course, always under pressure to use their money to cover losses on certain scheduled services from the profits made on others. This happens in the case of regional services which they are forced to operate as the result of environmental considerations. This question of balancing losses against gains is a very big one; it raises a fundamental

issue for the European Community since the profits from some intra-European services which (it has to be admitted) are in a relatively sheltered position, must be used to offset the loss on external services such as those on the North Atlantic or South-East Asia routes.

That is the real difficulty of protecting the interests of European airlines in terms of the North Atlantic. We all know that the European carriers are fighting an unequal battle against the American companies because the Europeans' costs and internal market prevent them from achieving the same level of competitiveness as the Americans without neglecting their obligations as public transport organizations or, as I said just now, resting content to skim off the flow of traffic from the busiest routes.

In South-East Asia, European airlines face savage competition from cut-price operators in more and more areas.

Although there is a lot to be said for the policy of competition incentives and tariff changes which might result from the memorandum, the need to harmonize the conditions of competition does not merely mean measures operative in Europe alone; it also means machinery for the protection of the European flag elsewhere because, in its absence, Community action will make it more difficult for our companies to balance their accounts.

This machinery would have to be based on the prohibition to some extent of tariffs which are consistently lower than the normal European cost price in order to prevent air transport from becoming, like some other transport sectors, a service which is both Community-aided and State-aided.

Subject to these safeguards, one can only welcome the constructive tenor of the Commission's proposals. It would be fine to work out a programme and time-schedule and use them as a basis for the harmonization of conditions of competition, both internally and externally. Within the Community itself, steps should be taken to bring the terms and conditions of service of staff, especially flight staff, into line with each other and to standardize safety regulations. In its dealings with the outside world in this field, the Community must get its opposite numbers to accept that competition shall be on equal terms. Finally, at a later stage, the provisions in the memorandum relating to the possibility of new points of access to the market could be put into effect without endangering the principle of equality of opportunity.

At the same time, it is up to the airlines to work out cooperation agreements on the lines of ATLAS because they may prove to be of the utmost importance in getting good results on a European scale, including economies which will benefit staff, users and the public as a whole.

Baudis

The Liberal and Democratic Group expresses its gratitude to the Commissioner, Mr Burke, and, for the reasons I have explained, it will vote in favour in order to create the best conditions in which a detailed report can be drawn up on the contribution which the European Communities can make to the development of air transport services.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Dalziel

Mr Dalziel. — Madam President, my honourable friend and colleague, the Member for London South, has referred to the problems which many of us face in coming here — to this city. I can endorse all he has said, and wish to add that, although my case is not exceptional, it takes me at least nine hours to travel from Edinburgh to Strasbourg. Although not unbearable, in hours wasted at airports or in aeroplanes it is considerable. I would point out that I represent a constituency which included a capital city, a major centre for industrial, and indeed commercial and professional interests whose natural outlet is Europe.

The present air-transport situation does nothing to bring us closer, either myself or my constituents, to the feeling of belonging to that same Europe as those colleagues from Paris, Copenhagen or Rome, and it certainly does nothing to encourage firms to think of Europe as a natural market, all the advantages for secure jobs that that means. I feel sure that many colleagues will know Edinburgh, a capital city and an area as close to the central theme of Europe's history as any. Yet as of today, to go by air to Edinburgh to any other capital city in Europe almost inevitably means going through London.

What I hope we are trying to do here in the city of Strasbourg is to make Europe a smaller, more easily understood concept than the bureaucratic monster it has become to so many people, particularly in my country. A sensible development of air transport services can help us in our task. A new deal for the air traveller, as outlined by the Commissioner in London earlier this month, and by Mr Seefeld, is now overdue. Such a new deal will, I believe, make Europe come alive again for all the 260 million citizens. By developing cross-border regional services such as, for example, between Edinburgh and the capital of Belgium, both areas will gain a new dimension. By encouraging new operators with the right kind of aircraft to exploit existing routes, the consumer will enjoy a much larger choice at a lower price. One important side-effect will be that, at no extra burden to the budget, this movement of people whether of businessmen or holidaymakers or people looking for

jobs in another Member State, will help the building of a much stronger regional Europe — something which all the subsidies, all the grants and all the loans will never achieve.

I said earlier that those of us from Scotland who travel to the Continent always seem to end up at London Airport. It is worth remembering that, by 1981, London Airport will reach the saturation-point of 30 million passengers per year. If we continue without a more competitive and developed air policy, we shall be adding to the problems of one of the world's busiest airports, and to the misery of the millions who live underneath its flight-paths. All this is at a time when alternative airports exist to take the strain off London and achieve a degree of regional decentralization.

Of course, we in Scotland are grateful for all we have so far received from the Community, and long may it be so, but what we need now is for the major centres of population in Scotland and elsewhere in the UK to be allowed more direct flights, greater competition between carriers and much better schedules so that we can feel closer to our European colleagues. Madam President, without cheaper air fares, less regulation and more air services, the vital job of building Europe will be even more arduous.

(Applause)

President. — I call Lord Bethell.

Lord Bethell. — Madam President, for many years I have been a believer in the closer unity of the peoples of Europe, to quote the words from the preamble to the Treaty of Rome, and it seems to me that this debate touches that objective most closely. It has been, after all, in the past generation that ordinary people living on ordinary incomes have, for the first time, been able to travel to Europe on holiday, or in the course of their business and the result has been a tremendous boost for European understanding. I therefore make no apology for bringing a certain philosophical, European, element into this debate. It is important that the people of Europe should be allowed to travel, and at a price which the ordinary person can afford. I therefore welcome the initiative taken by the Commission in pointing out some of the deficiencies of the present set-up of airline fare structures. They are right to indicate that the most serious barrier to the free movement of people and goods throughout the Community is the high cost of the normal economy fare. Both in this Parliament and in the previous Parliament, many glaring examples have been given of the high cost of scheduled air services. Mr Hoffmann quoted some earlier in this debate; my honourable friend, Mr Moorhouse, quoted others. The

Lord Bethell

differences are really quite startling. It is possible, for instance — I have done so myself — to buy a ticket London-Rome-London for £94 or about \$200. These tickets can be bought over the counter in any travel agency. But if one buys a proper ticket, a scheduled ticket according to the rules laid down by governments, according to applications submitted by IATA, the cost of the ticket is \$600 — three times the price that can be obtained in an unofficial travel agency. There are also, of course airlines that violate the spirit of IATA regulations: it is possible for instance to fly London-Rome-London by Japan Airlines, for the same \$200: one-third of the scheduled fare. It is unofficial, it is irregular, Japan Airlines will probably deny that they do it — but they do do it, and those of us who have any sense make use of the facility which they provide. And quite right too!

It seems to me that this whole problem is based on the idea that fares must be proposed by a central cartel, IATA, and approved and laid down by government-to-government decision. In this year of 1979, I submit that this is a wholly inappropriate way for important matters of trade between our Community Member States to be decided. It is not only inappropriate: I would suggest, Madam President, it is also illegal. It is, I know, the view of the lawyers of the governments of many Member States that certain of the provisions in the IATA cartel and the government-to-government arrangements are illegal, under Article 85 of the Treaty of Rome. I could point to paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) in this regard. This article prohibits any concern from directly or indirectly fixing purchase or selling prices, or any other trading conditions; it prohibits the sharing of markets or sources of supply; it prohibits the application of dissimilar conditions to equivalent transactions.

I must say I look forward with some interest to a case which may very soon be brought before the European Court of Justice by Sterling Airways, a Danish company, claiming that in fact there is a violation of the Treaty in the application of these rules, in particular by Scandinavian Air Services, which has, for some extraordinary reason, a monopoly on routes coming out of Scandinavia which is to last until 1995. If that is not a barrier to trade and a violation of the Community's competition policy, I don't know what is.

Since this question has been raised a number of times in this House and elsewhere, the airlines have been coming forward with a few ideas. I welcome these ideas, just as I welcome the Commission's report although, I don't myself feel that either goes quite far enough. The changes proposed by various airlines fall, I believe, into the category of the cosmetic. I should like to see a much more imaginative approach to the problem of the high cost of travelling from Member State to Member State. Cheap stand-by-fares are surely

something which could be brought in without causing economic problems for the airlines, and without disrupting the great and important network of services that has been built up very excellently by the large airlines in the past. I would suggest that the whole problem of expensive air services is not really helped by the structure of the large IATA network, which has its headquarters in Geneva, whose Director-General is paid at the rate of \$ 308 556 a year tax-free, with other salaries in proportion, and which submits, after discussion between the major airlines of Europe, applications for fares which are really beyond the means of the normal traveller.

Madam President, I will conclude by emphasizing the importance of this matter, not only to trade, to transport to tourism, but to the future unity of Europe, and by indicating how much I welcome the Commission's report, I very much hope they will press forward most vigorously with their proposals, as they have indicated they will do. I hope they will not delay, but will press the Council for action, and that the Council will take action *vis-à-vis* the airlines and *vis-à-vis* IATA, so that the consumer, the traveller in Europe, may benefit.

I will conclude by quoting the words from the introduction to the Commission's report: 'The time is ripe for the Community to move forward with a series of initiatives'. The Council has the power to do this, under Article 84 (2) of the Treaty, and I submit that it is high time that it did so.

(Applause)

President. — I call Miss Brookes.

Miss Brookes. — Madam President, Members of Parliament, I thank the Commission for the memorandum. However, it is important that all local and regional airports — particularly in Wales and with special reference to Hawarden Airport in North Wales, which is in my constituency — should be given special consideration by the Member States and the Commission. The main international airports, for example Manchester and Heathrow, are used to full capacity for all air traffic of all types. Therefore the load should be spread to alleviate the pressure, and regional airports should be used. The encouragement to smaller regional airports such as Hawarden, and to many other areas that have small airports or airstrips for expanding landing and take-off, can play an important rôle in the life of the Community.

Regional airports and landing-strips are often located in areas of unemployment, again such as North Wales. For instance, in North and Mid-Wales the local airport can become the vital link for the expansion of industry and the tourist trade, thereby furthering employment. The encouragement and

Miss Brookes

expansion of regional airports would give greater incentives to European and other world industries to come to North Wales and other Welsh areas on a direct air route. Small airports can provide better personal services to trade and passenger traffic. A local airport or airstrip is usually strategically situated on the edge of a vast rural area, industrial or holiday coastal belt, as in North Wales and on the Isle of Anglesey. The airport can open up new traffic routes and provide a transportation service to areas that are not serviced by motorways or main rail links, thus opening up new traffic routes for the servicing of factories, and tourist enterprises, creating employment and speeding up cargo and passenger traffic. These factors are essential to the encouragement of new jobs in whatever industry. With the changing aircraft technology a local or regional airport can give the necessary impetus to set up private enterprise and smaller airlines, thus creating competition which automatically gives a better and greater service to the customer who after all, in any enterprise is the most important person.

I ask the Commission to be ever mindful of the need for rural and regional air-links particularly Hawarden, which could give a blood transfusion to Mid- and North Wales, and indeed to Welsh air traffic, and create a service for industry, trade and tourism, and generate new jobs and enterprise in the corresponding areas.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr O'Donnell.

Mr O'Donnell. — Madam President, as one who has for several years been involved, both directly and indirectly, in aviation affairs in my own country, I welcome the Commission document. Indeed, it affords me very great personal pleasure to congratulate my former Irish Government colleague, Commissioner Richard Burke, on his initiative and enterprise in producing this new document on air transport, which not merely provides a very valuable basis for further study and discussion but, most significantly, adds an entirely new dimension to the hitherto uninspiring and unimaginative approach by EEC institutions to transport matters. The case for a more liberal European aviation policy is very compelling: the scope for rationalizing, reorganizing and expanding European air services and networks is enormous, as indeed is the scope for developing new ones.

However, in our enthusiasm for creating a new air-transport era in Europe, we must be realistic. Two fundamental facts must be recognized before we can tackle the exciting challenge of formulating an appropriate Community policy on air transport. The first is that a completely open-skies, free-for-all, deregulated

aviation policy is simply not on, either now or in the future. The second is that the present protectionist, restrictive, IATA-dominated European aviation policy, under which national governments are more concerned about protecting the interests of their own national airlines than meeting the legitimate public demand for better, more flexible services at lower costs, is no longer acceptable.

However, between these two extremes there is a huge grey area where the scope for Community action is enormous. In my humble opinion, the challenge facing the Commission and the Community at this stage is the challenge of creating a new framework under which national and privately-owned airlines, scheduled and charter operators, can, in a spirit of goodwill and under acceptable rules of fair competition, efficiently provide the range of better and cheaper air services for which there is a growing demand from the people of Europe.

Time does not permit me to go into many of the details contained in the Commission's memorandum. There are a few aspects, however, of general aviation policy to which I would like to refer. I believe that the Commission, in its deliberations the future development of air transport, must take particular note of the role of aviation in regional development. I entirely agree with my British friend who referred to the fact that many operators, independent or otherwise, appear to be concentrating on the capital cities of Europe. I believe there is tremendous scope for the development of services into regional airports. I would point out that in my own constituency we have a large airport, Shannon International Airport, and the scope for developing scheduled and charter services from Europe into that airport are enormous. I believe that air transport can play a vital role in the economic and social development of the peripheral European maritime regions.

A second question that interests us in Ireland, one which has been the subject of much controversy down the years, is the question of bilateral air agreements. This will have to be reconsidered.

The third and final point: I was absolutely delighted, when I read the Commission's document, to find reference to a category of air travellers who have been overlooked by the airlines indeed by both scheduled and charter operators. I refer to those who have been described in the Commission's document as visiting family, relatives or friends. As an Irishman, I am very conscious of the fact that there are over 1 million Irish-born people resident in the UK, and a further 2.5 million of Irish descent who go to their homeland for their annual holidays and who stay with their own families or with their relatives or friends. Present travel and tour packages do not cater for this type of traveller. I respectfully request that, whatever policies

O'Donnell

are ultimately evolved, the Commission will place special emphasis on this special category.

(Applause)

Ms Clwyd. — Colleagues in all parts of the House have spoken of the various hurdles and anomalies which confront the unsuspecting air traveller in Europe. It was, in fact, another Member who informed me that it was, for example, possible to obtain air tickets to my various destinations at half the cost of the air fare quoted to me by travel agents, provided I knew the appropriate initials to whisper in their ears. There are indeed several ways of obtaining cheaper tickets if one has a travel agent ready to acquaint one with the various backdoor methods. These, however, do not apply. I am told, if one cannot fly directly to these destinations. From several regional airports — and several colleagues have touched on this point — for example from my own regional airport, the Cardiff-Wales airport, there are no direct flights to any of these destinations and therefore no cheap fares — a great disincentive to those wishing to use their own regional airports. It is not surprising, then, that the already congested airports become even more unpleasant for passengers to use.

There are further disincentives for an expansion of flights from regional airports. For example, the charges levied by the UK Civil Aviation Authority on carriers using smaller regional airports are sometimes four times as high as those levied at the main airports. There should, I suggest, be some attempt to equalize those particular charges. Tomorrow the UK Civil Aviation Authority will be holding public hearings into applications by several independent airlines for new routes between more than 20 UK provincial centres and more than 60 Continental destinations. Without these independent airlines, many of us could not travel at all from our own regional airports. These applications are an attempt to obtain a breakthrough in cheaper air fares in Europe, an area where up to now progress unfortunately has been very slow. Some countries in Europe, Madam President, are undoubtedly dragging their feet, and this is where the Community should be able to press reluctant governments and reluctant airlines to speed up their action on cheaper fares and to provide more and better air services so that the traveller in Europe can be offered a fairer deal.

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — *(F)* Madam President, the Commission's plans for the integration of air transport on a Community basis are, in the view of the French

members of the Communist and Allies Group, unlikely to develop this sector in accordance with the needs of the world today. On the contrary, from more than one point of view they are likely to do harm.

In the first place, they will be bad for employment. According to the Commission's Report, the productivity of civil aviation must be improved by encouraging competition between the airlines, and, according to the Report, this is to be done by reducing operating costs, which is the same as saying the wages bill. The plans will also mean redundancies and this is unacceptable.

They are just as bad for workers' rights. The Report states that steps must be taken to harmonize staff conditions of service throughout the Community but that it has to be borne in mind that these rights and safeguards are of less value in some countries than in others, which affects the conditions of competition and makes air services in the Community less 'competitive'. The logical conclusion of the Community plan is that harmonization is to be based on the lowest common denominator. This is not acceptable, either.

The plans are even worse for those who use air transport. While it is essential that the airlines should be financially viable, the means to be adopted to make them so can only be condemned. I referred to redundancies and the standardization of workers' rights and conditions on the basis of the worst of them but side by side with this, it is suggested that airlines making a profit shall receive preferential treatment. It was in the sacred name of profitability that, with the blessing of the Ministry of Transport, the board of Air France announced its intention to discontinue the service between Corsica and the mainland next November and the profitability argument also explains why there is still no progress on reorganization of the regional network in the Caribbean.

There will, at the same time, be an inevitable reduction in the quality of the services provided, especially if, as the Commission proposes, restrictions are placed on State subsidies to help the airlines meet their public service obligations. We cannot accept that.

There is another fundamental and vital reason why we cannot endorse the Commission's plans; this that they seek to deprive the States of their prerogatives and sovereignty. What they are trying to do now in the case of civil aviation, they will try to do tomorrow in the case of all movement by air. This impinges too closely on the security of the States and their defence for us to think twice about it: we reject outright these integration plans for the Community because their immediate effect would be to dismantle France's public air transport services and to undermine the hard-won rights of the workers and the independence of our country.

Martin

While I am on this point, I would like to pay a tribute to the splendid campaign conducted by the 27 000 employees of Air France, our national airline, in defence of their standards of living and working conditions and, at the same time, in defence of State enterprise and the public service. The fact is that, there must be other ways of developing the air transport sector. We must leave the national airlines alone, improve the lot of the workers and, above all, abandon austerity policies which weaken their purchasing power in every country and hamper the development of air transport. It is all very well saying that everyone should be able to travel by air but this is sheer humbug if the harsh truth for millions of workers is that Governments devalue their pay and social security benefits and increase the taxes and the other burdens which fall on families. Travel by air is a very distant prospect for the 7 million unemployed in the Community, for the victims of the reorganization plans for steel, and for all those who do not even have enough to eat!

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Buttafuoco.

Mr Buttafuoco — *(I)* Madam President, on behalf of my colleagues of the Italian right, I should like to say how much we appreciate the importance and the wide-ranging nature of this debate. It shows Parliament's increasing awareness of the importance of transport policy, because it is no good having an integration policy for agriculture, industry and the various sectors involved in the process of unification unless there is an integration policy for transport. Hence the need and value of a special Committee on Transport, separate from the Committee on Regional Policy.

Of the various modes of transport (by land, sea and air), the last of the three is becoming increasingly important and essential for the development of communications and of all the other fields of activity which concern not only the European Community but the world community as a whole.

The various technical aspects of this important subject have been touched upon by everyone who has spoken in this debate. They all described the chaos which exists in regard to tariffs, the variation in costs and the differences in price between the countries of Europe, America and other continents. As we have recognized in the admirable motion for a resolution tabled by our chairman, Mr Seefeld, the time is now ripe for the Commission, as the wording of its memorandum confirms, to be able to move forward with a policy and a series of initiatives to secure standardization and harmonization of prices. Apart from purely economic considerations, other reasons, such as landing problems and variations in charter rates, may justify

the variation in tariffs. We must find out whether such reasons exist and see whether we can manage to standardize tariffs and, in so doing, make a crucial contribution to the development of national, international and inter-Continental traffic.

I agree with the speakers who said that speed, or rather, the need for quick transit demands absolute safety in flight. A lot has been said about the shortcomings encountered everywhere in Europe. Someone rightly referred to Strasbourg which, for anyone like me who makes the journey from faraway Sicily and back, means a long flight and makes safety a matter of personal concern. Apart from the recent disaster at Cagliari, I think we all have fresh in our minds the two catastrophes at Palermo, in 1972 and 1978, which were caused by lack of safety equipment. In spite of that, pilots are still obliged to make visual landings at Palermo Airport.

Finally, I should like to say a word about staff. Everyone recognizes that they are entitled to receive the just reward for their enormous responsibilities but everything should be done to ensure that the way in which these responsibilities are discharged is consistent with that reward and that there is no recurrence of events, like the recent occasion in Italy, when there was a possibility that the whole of our national airspace would be closed to traffic. There was, in fact, a total shut down for well over half a day and the confusion which arose over the distribution of responsibilities led to the much-discussed and controversial intervention of the Head of the State in order to avoid the worst.

Madam President, these are undoubtedly complicated questions but we believe that the Commission means to tackle them with firmness and determination, since it is by solving the problems involved that substance and shape will increasingly be given to the united Europe which demands the utmost devotion and dedication from us in performing our tasks.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Burke.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — Madam President, the number of speakers in this morning's debate and the commitment shown have convinced me of the correctness of the suggestion I made at the inaugural meeting of the Committee on Transport that from time to time transport items should receive fairly high priority on the agenda of Parliament; as one might say, using television language, prime viewing-time. I would therefore like to congratulate all those members of the Parliamentary committee, its chairman and other colleagues, and the Bureau who have in fact brought this about this morning.

Burke

The work of your predecessors in the Parliament has, of course, given us a very useful guideline for the development of our thinking on the important subject of aviation, and I hope to be able to build on this as our work progresses. We are, I hope, at the beginning of a new phase in our thinking, which should lead us, sooner rather than later, to form a clear view of what the Community's contribution can be in this sector and thus to specify action. In this connection I remind the House that the Commission's memorandum was accompanied by a proposal for instituting a consultation procedure covering Member States' relations with international organizations, and indeed with third countries, in the civil aviation sector. This is one action which we believe should be undertaken straight away at Community level, since it is clearly necessary that Community policies in this field be integrated into the international system. I take this point, which was made by, among others, Mr Hoffmann. I would therefore recommend it as a concrete proposal for your consideration and support.

Now as far as the memorandum itself is concerned, I look forward to the further development of this debate and thank you individually for the views you have put forward here this morning. I, myself, and my staff will be available to you for any help we can give. I do not intend to go into detail on all the suggestions we put forward — in any event, many of them are not detailed at this point. I would like, however, to tell you some of the concerns which led us to produce the memorandum and which have been the point of departure for our thinking on aviation policy. As the debate proceeds over the next few months and years, it no doubt will become more technical. However, following the general trend of this morning's debate, I too would rather keep to the more political, general and indeed philosophical aspects and leave the technical matters for later.

We published this memorandum because we feel that Community action may offer a means of reducing the fragmentation of the world aviation system. This reduction of fragmentation could begin within the Community but could subsequently have repercussions outside. The effects would, in our views, be to stimulate innovation, reduce some of the cost elements in air transport, and open up new possibilities both for increasing operating efficiency and for developing new services. I shall return briefly to this point. We believe that it is now possible to liberalize the system not by revolutionary change but in an evolutionary way through the gradual introduction of a series of measures which take account of the particular characteristics of the air transport sector in the European Community.

As far as the timing of the document is concerned, I would give you five reasons why the Commission has put forward this memorandum. The first is quite simply that it seemed logical and desirable to follow

up the thinking which led the Council of Ministers to adopt a priority programme in June 1978. Now it is important to note that in adopting this programme the Council marked its agreement with the view that it is now time to examine the civil aviation sector in a Community context. This programme provides for the examination of nine important topics which are listed in Annex I of the memorandum. However, I would like to stress that this is only a basic framework and needs to be further developed in order to permit the creation of a comprehensive conceptual framework for Community involvement. Our memorandum therefore embodies and enlarges on this priority programme.

Our second reason lies in the evident and growing feeling among the travelling public and the press that the air transport market might, with benefit, be organized somewhat differently and give a better service to the public. This feeling is evidently shared not only by Members of this House, but also by a number of governments and a number of airlines. I know that you, honourable Members, are sensitive to these currents of opinion: may I assure you that the Commission is also sensitive.

Thirdly, by its very nature the European air transport sector is influenced by events outside our borders and outside our control. Policy options developed and applied in the USA during the last two years have substantially affected the economic climate in which European airlines, both state-owned and private, must operate. Whatever view we may take of the United States' deregulation, I suggest that we cannot remain unaffected by it. The Commission believes that it is time to consider whether and to what extent and in what form a Community policy response to changes in the world aviation scene might be appropriate.

The fourth reason, which was also mentioned this morning, lies in the fact that the Court of Justice ruled in 1974, and indeed reconfirmed the decision in 1978, that the general rules of the Treaty of Rome apply to air transport. The Commission is obliged to apply the rules. To do this, we need an appropriate policy framework. The suggestions put forward in our memorandum are intended to help us to define this framework.

There is, in my view, a fifth and very urgent reason for proceeding constructively and rapidly with this debate. That reason is the energy crisis which looms ever larger in our consciousness. Now more than ever before, we need to be sure that our air transport system, in common with all our other transport systems, is organized so as to give us the greatest possible return for the energy consumed. In this regard I should like to pay tribute to the efforts being made both by airlines and by aircraft engine manufacturers to achieve economies in fuel use. You will know that the use of liquid hydrogen as an aircraft fuel is currently being examined by a group in which the Commission participates.

Burke

I have gone into these reasons, Madam President, because I believe it is important that they should be borne in mind in the future development of this debate, as should also the particular geographical and technical characteristics of the air transport industry in this relatively small and densely populated continent. As always, we must ensure that action contemplated at Community level responds to the Community's real needs and takes full account of the Community's particular characteristics. The simple transposition to the Community of action which appears appropriate in other contexts would be a policy fraught with very considerable risks.

There is one respect, however, in which we can legitimately strive to reproduce within the Community operating conditions similar to those in the United States of America, where all operations within the confines of that continent, with an airspace vastly bigger than that of our Community, are domestic operations. Why, in our Community, with its customs union and its objective of bringing our peoples closely together, a point made by Lord Bethell in his contribution, should a flight from Hamburg to Paris continue to be considered as an international flight from a facilitation viewpoint? Surely we should be able to remove from intra-Community flights the customs requirements and other formalities which hamper operations and add to specific cost elements?

Now, this does not mean, I suggest, that we can forget the international aspects of air transport; our airlines have to fit into the worldwide system. It is for this reason that the Commission has proposed the institution of consultation procedures covering bilateral and multilateral contacts with international organizations and third countries.

In the memorandum, we have put forward what we consider to be an appropriate set of aims, given our Treaty obligations. We then have put forward a series of suggestions as to how these aims might be achieved.

It has been said to me that the combination of aims and suggested measures is substantially tilted in the consumer's favour. Madam President, this is true: I am also, as it happens, the Commissioner responsible for consumer affairs. In the Commission's view it is inevitable that this be the case. Air transport, like just any other transport activity, must be tailored to meet the needs of all categories of users. We do, however, clearly state that we need, and the transport users need, financially sound airlines to ensure reliable services in the long run — and here I take the point made by a number of speakers regarding the necessity to maintain a balance between the interests of consumers and the continued viability of our airlines.

For social and safety reasons, working conditions of all airline staff must be satisfactory. In this I would reply to Mr Martin, who attributes to the Commission

thinking which it should not be regarded as responsible for: it is not our view that we should have a deterioration in the conditions of airline staff.

For general reasons of public health and wellbeing, we must take account of the effects of air transport on the environment.

I believe that all of these necessary elements are found in our memorandum; but it is clear that there are many conflicting requirements and that there are no easy answers to the problems posed.

I would, if I may, briefly refine the aims we have set out into four operational objectives. The first is the development of a Community network unhampered by undue national barriers and giving efficient service to the different user-groups at prices which are as low as possible without discrimination. The present route network and tariff structure in Europe, which have been developed through bilateral negotiations, may not always be such as to allow airlines to make the optimum use of their fleets. (Here I take the point made by Mr Hoffmann about the competition from Eastern airlines. In that regard he will realize that in other areas, such as road transport and shipping, I have come forward with suggestions as to how to deal mainly with this alleged dumping on our markets.) Nor do they necessarily give the best result to the traveller. In an ideal world, we might have a more fluid system with greater exercise of freedom rights or more links, but nobody would suggest that this ideal route network could be put forward as an immediate policy objective for our Community.

The second operational objective is that of financial soundness for airlines, a reduction in operating costs and an increase in productivity. This, of course, is an objective shared by all our airlines and sought after longingly, may I say, in many cases by a number of our governments.

The third operational objective is to safeguard the interests of airline workers in the general context of social progress and in the reduction of obstacles to free access to employment opportunities.

The fourth, and not the least, objective is an improvement in living conditions for the general public, and this includes the concerns of those who live near airports and those of travellers. The ability to travel freely has come to be regarded as an important part of our living standard. Policy in relation to aviation should ensure that this facility of modern living can be availed of freely and comfortably.

The memorandum develops a number of ideas which could be pursued in order to achieve these aims, and I would draw the attention of the House to two main strands. The first is to try and improve the present system, particularly with respect to the structure of services and to opportunities for innovation in tariffs and services. The second is to increase productivity with a view to obtaining lower prices by adapting the

Burke

system in such a way as to give efficient airlines greater operating scope than they currently have.

The first of these measures aims at increasing flexibility in the market structure. We advocate a re-evaluation of the tariff structure in the Community and in this process the inclusion of a wider choice of low tariffs. A wide variety of low tariffs is in fact available at the moment but with the restrictions which have been mentioned in the debate.

Secondly, we would like to increase the possibilities for developing new scheduled services. In particular, we have in mind the development of new cross-border, inter-regional services, a point made by a number of very encouraging developments in this area in the recent past, but I give the example of the Manston to Rotterdam and Brussels service, the service between Cork and Rennes and, going outside the Community, from Bordeaux to Barcelona. In addition, we would like to see greater possibilities for 'new operators' to enter existing routes in the Community and offer services on these new routes. We suggest that, if the licensing authorities of the country of origin of the airline concerned are prepared to authorize the proposed service, the authorities of the country of destination should not, after a certain consultation period, be able to reject these services except on agreed, strictly operational, grounds. We also put forward a number of considerations concerning the improvement of conditions for establishing non-scheduled air services.

More generally, it seems to me that the development of greater flexibility in services, more rational route networks and greater competition in European air services will create the need for the civil aviation authorities in our Member States to adopt a new approach to licensing. I would argue that this new approach should be more liberal than most of those currently adopted. Equally, to give the kind of results which I believe are worth pursuing, it will be necessary to ensure that the decisions of different authorities are consistent and compatible one with the other. Some honourable Members will have seen press reports which give the impression that the Commission wished the Community to take responsibility for the negotiation of air traffic agreements. I want to state quite categorically that we have not made any such proposals.

May I now touch very briefly on the question of safety. I will say only a little about this, since it was so amply covered in the report on the Paris hearing conducted by the European Parliament earlier this year. There is a very real possibility that the growth of air transport may be limited by capacity and safety problems in air traffic control and at airports. Mention was made in the debate of some 30 million users of London Airport, to take one example, in the near future. Through a programme of studies, we hope to

identify the major areas which could be tackled. May I say, in case we are misunderstood, that in these areas we do not intend to repeat the work in ICAO, or indeed in Eurocontrol, but rather to draw on their experience and to supplement it wherever useful. I have pointed out in the past that the Commission itself has no staff or expertise in this technical operational area.

As far as airline operating costs are concerned, we propose a series of measures to simplify the formalities with which airlines must comply. This is very much in line with our general aim of further developing the customs union, of eliminating the obstacles to the free movement of persons and goods in the Community. We also suggest an examination of the harmonization of technical standards for aircraft.

Madam President, I have concentrated on outlining what we expect to be the more controversial aspects raised by our memorandum, and the reason for this is that we are entering new policy ground here. We are very concerned to ensure that we have the benefit of the widest possible range of views on these matters before proceeding any further, and we look forward to the debates which will ensue, both in this forum and elsewhere.

May I conclude by emphasizing that our memorandum is a discussion-paper. We are concerned with improving and developing an important segment of the total transport market; we want to identify areas in which Community action could make a useful contribution to the development of this sector, areas in which Community action could give better results than purely national action.

I thank the honourable Members for the contributions they have made. I have taken note of them and will use them in the further development of this debate.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Seefeld.

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (D) Madam President, I shall be brief. At the end of this debate, I should like to refer to the motion for a resolution, unanimously adopted by the Committee on Transport, in which we once again expressly welcome the fact that the Commission has drawn up a general plan for Community action in the field of civil air transport. We note with satisfaction that the Commission has undertaken an analysis of the present market structure and has made many suggestions in its memorandum on how the structure of this market could be improved, operating costs reduced and steps taken to the benefit of the staff, safety and international cooperation. We should also like to follow up the Commission's memorandum with a detailed report, which I hope we can discuss in the Committee on Transport very soon, so that the subject can again be debated in this House.

Seefeld

Madam President, allow me to say this to the many Members who have referred to air fares, and I think they will find it very interesting. Just recently the manager of a major European airline told me that his company alone has 48 000 different fares in its world-wide operations. I have come to realize that today the only people paying the full price are those who get it back from somebody else, those who are in a hurry and cannot therefore exploit the various advantages and those who are so naive that they do not find out exactly what is possible in this sector. What does this mean? Something must be done about this. I can assure the established airlines here and now that no European Parliamentarian wants to destroy them, but they should realize that they must reconsider their present attitude, because that is what is needed in this sector.

Madam President, winding up this debate, I wish to thank, with one exception, everyone who has expressed a positive view in this debate and attempted to master the problems with constructive contributions. We have received many useful pointers which we will discuss with great care. I should also like to thank the Bureau of Parliament and thus all those Members who agreed to 'give us after' so long a time another opportunity to report on questions of transport policy in considerable detail and without our having to work under pressure of time. To summarize, the memorandum is very largely endorsed by the European Parliament. We thank all those who have helped in the preparation of this memorandum and hope to achieve the success that we need in the interests of passengers, airlines and all those working in the air transport sector. I should like to end my brief remarks at the close of this debate by thanking all those who have spoken so objectively and fairly on an important aspect of European transport policy.

(Applause)

President. — I note that no one else wishes to speak.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

The debate is closed.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.15 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR GONELLA

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

6. Question Time

President. — The next item is Question Time (Doc. 1-405/79).

We begin with questions to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Mr Cottrell (H-84/79):

Subject: Transportation link between the mainland of Europe and Great Britain

Will the Commission make a statement on the desirability of linking the mainland, of Europe and Great Britain with a fixed permanent transportation link, such as a railway tunnel, and whether this would be a suitable project for Community financing?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The Commission has on several occasions, answered questions or made statements in Parliament on the matter of a fixed link between Great Britain and the Continent. A fixed link across the Channel could substantially improve communications between Great Britain and the rest of the Community, and so be of considerable Community interest. However, this would need to be evaluated, and an examination of a project of Community interest can take place only when a Member State submits it for consideration under the consultation procedure provided for in the decision of 20 February 1978. So far, no such projects have been communicated to the Commission. In order to allow a useful consideration of projects, it is important that they should be notified to the Commission at an early stage of their preparation. For the moment, I think it best not to pass any judgment on possible schemes until the main elements are known.

As for financing, honourable Members will know that the Commission has proposed a new system which is intended to apply, amongst other things, to projects designed to overcome physical obstacles to communications between Member States. The Council is at present considering the proposal for a regulation which would set up that system. If the proposal is accepted — and the Commission, with your support, is endeavouring to persuade the Council to do so — projects of Community interest will be eligible for aid. I remind honourable Members that the procedure to be followed will be: submission of projects by the Member States, proposal by the Commission, decision on financing by the Council,

I would not like to give the impression that this notification and evaluation procedure is a reason for not taking useful preparatory action. Quite the contrary. Thus, for example, thanks to the initiative of Parliament in enabling the Commission to obtain the necessary appropriations, we have commissioned a study which will use the subject of a fixed link across the Channel to illustrate how Community interest in transport infrastructure projects should be assessed. This study will help to evaluate the interest to the Commu-

Burke

nity of various alternative projects and will provide a useful basis for any opinion the Commission may have to formulate in the future on any project or for decisions on Community financial aid.

Furthermore, the Commission will certainly ensure that the question of a fixed link is not neglected, either by raising it for inclusion in the discussions of the Transport Infrastructure Committee or by including it in its reports to the Council on infrastructure questions. I think this is the best way of ensuring that the matter is pursued and that the Commission plays its proper rôle to the full. May I add that the Commission will welcome the interest and support of the Parliament on a range of intra-Community transport in infrastructure matters.

Mr Cottrell. — I thank Commissioner Burke for a very thorough analysis of the problems which we are faced with, problems which have been referred to in the past by Mr Seefeld, the chairman of the Committee on Transport, as the English equivalent of the Loch Ness Monster. We have been talking about a Channel tunnel for 160 years, and if this Community is to have any real meaning, then we are going to have a permanent fixed connection between Britain and the mainland of Europe. What disappoints me slightly in Mr Burke's statement is that he has failed to give any indication that the Commission is prepared to initiate policy where a Channel tunnel is concerned. There is a long history of unhappiness between the British and French governments over the link between Britain and France. Will he therefore say that the Commission is prepared to initiate policy in order to push the Channel forward as the main infrastructure project in transport a European policy?

Mr Burke. — I understand the interest which this project generates in the discussions of this House, but I would remind the honourable Members that in this matter the Commission is bound to follow the procedures which the Commission itself has suggested to the other institutions as the correct procedures to follow. In my reply, I pointed out that the sequence was: submission of projects by Member States, discussion of these, a proposal by the Commission followed by decision on financing by the Council.

It is not open to me to take any initiative in this matter, other than to say that the best thing that could be done at this point would be if the Council could adopt the third part of this composite proposal which we have put forward in recent years. The first part, the decision to set up the infrastructure committee, was taken in February 1978; the consultation procedure is in place the financing arrangement now awaits legislation by the Council. It is not open to me, in reply to the last supplementary, to take any further initiatives at this stage other than to have the matter studied with the help of parliamentary monies, which we have already done.

Mr Patterson. — While I appreciate that the Commissioner cannot make any judgment until applications are in, could I ask him about the criteria which will be used for allocating Community funds for infrastructure projects, and the scope of the projects which will be considered? He will be aware that there is considerable disquiet in the part of the Community that I represent, in Kent, about the possible consequences of a Channel link for the road and rail infrastructure which already exists, and it would be helpful if he could state that, when the Commission is considering projects it will not merely take the link itself as a basis for allocating funds, but also surrounding transport infrastructure, in particular the improvement of road and rail communications leading up to any possible Channel link.

Mr Burke. — In reply to the first part of the supplementary: the criteria are broadly described in Article 1 of the proposal for a regulation, which is on the Council's table. Broadly speaking, they are: projects on the territory of a Member State, the non-realization of which would create a bottleneck in the Community; cross-frontier projects which would not be deemed to be profitable when viewed from the economic point of view of a particular Member State; prospects of a socio-economic nature which would not be sufficient to motivate a government to undertake the execution thereof; other criteria mentioned in this particular proposal.

I would say that these are very broad objectives which would be further refined by reference to the study which we have undertaken with the Parliament's help at the request of the Council, the results of which we shall communicate to the Council in the December meeting, or at least later this year.

Mr Seefeld. — (D) Mr Burke, I believe I am right in assuming that you still feel that this link between Britain and France is important and therefore in the interests of a European transport policy. As this link must come eventually — as you have stated on various occasions and emphasized again today — could the Commission not make every endeavour to maintain contact with the two Governments concerned until they meet the criteria. In other words, do you yourself not intend to take action in this matter as part of your responsibility for establishing a European transport policy?

Mr Burke. — In reply to the chairman of the Transport Committee, I can indicate that I have in fact been in touch both with governments on an informal basis, and also with interest-groups who have particular projects to put forward. I am always available, as indeed are the other Members of the Commission with me, to receive representations in this regard. We

Burke

are looking forward to progress in this matter, and I can assure the House and the honourable Member that we do keep in touch. The most recent contacts, for example, were within the last couple of weeks. We are not, therefore, failing in our duty to receive representations. What I am trying to stress is that, under the legislation that we are projecting, it is not for me personally to take the initial formal move in these matters.

Mr Boyes. — The Commissioner said he would evaluate this project. He did not define what he meant by evaluation, and I am wondering if he will evaluate all aspects of the situation. For example, in the United Kingdom there is tremendous regional imbalance. In my area there is a tremendous shortage of work, whereas in the South of England there is a great deal of jobs. Would the Commissioner consider whether or not this tunnel might exacerbate the situation even further, creating greater regional imbalance? When he carries out his investigation, would he consider the views of trade unionists and the effects on the region?

Mr Burke. — Since the object of the exercise is to create a better system of communications between the countries mentioned in the question and since inevitably a greater greater trade spin-off would follow from better communications, there should be, even from this very link, an improvement in the economic situation of all the regions of the United Kingdom and of France. I would therefore think that there is nothing incompatible between what is proposed here and regional development as such. We keep all these things in mind as we evaluate these projects, and I certainly have had representations of the kind made by the honourable Member, made to me quite frequently in regard to this matter.

I would not like it to be understood, of course, that the Commission is limited to this one type of instrument. There are other instruments available to the Commission in respect of regional and other projects. So we will keep that in mind, but I think that, on balance, a link of this nature could be of benefit to the overall economic development of the countries of the Community.

President. — I ask both those who put questions and those who answer them to be as brief as possible.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — The Commissioner said that the Council is considering a proposed regulation to provide the finances for the vital research that would be necessary to evaluate the situation. Since it has been considering it since 1976, is there nothing the Commission can do to encourage the Council to give the necessary regulation approval, so that we can, at any rate, have the details that we would need before we can settle the principle behind this?

Mr Burke. — Briefly, I can assure the honourable Member that I am using every possible endeavour to see that this legislation is passed, and one of the ways in which Parliament has been able and can continue to be able to help is to see that under Item 3781 funds are made available for projects which could be envisaged under this particular type of operation.

Mr Moreland. — I understand that the Commission is about to publish a Green Paper on infrastructure, and indeed I think many of us had expected to have it this week.

Could the Commissioner tell us what place the Channel Tunnel takes in that document, what priority is given to it and whether there will be a full discussion of the Channel Tunnel in this Green Paper?

Mr Burke. — I have already outlined the steps by which any project deemed to be of Community interest can be processed through to realization. I, and the Commission, must take a neutral attitude to specific propositions that are of interest in this regard.

In regard to any possible discussion paper, I hope it may be possible to have a full discussion on this in the not-too-distant future, although I cannot anticipate when this may be.

Mr Berkhouwer. — *(NL)* I am pleased that this subject, which I have traditionally raised, is now being discussed. I should like to ask the Commissioner whether, in view of the fact that European finances have been used to build a bridge over the Bosphorus to join Europe and Asia, he does not find it strange that there are no European finances to be found, for example from European Investment Bank funds or through the issue of small shares as I once proposed, for the construction of a railway tunnel under the Channel, so that 'the British can no longer say, 'The Continent is isolated,' when there is fog over the Channel?

(Laughter)

Mr Burke. — I acknowledge, as indeed would Members of the House, the interest of Mr Berkhouwer in this particular project over the years. I would emphasize, as I have done already, that it is for the Member States most interested, in this case the United Kingdom and France, to make the initial moves in this regard. I await results.

Mr C. Jackson. — There is great anxiety in my constituency concerning environmental damage likely to be caused by the tunnel and its road and rail links. Is it — the Commissioner's intention that Community financial support for such projects will contain an element to minimize environmental damage?

(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)

Mr Burke. — The Commission is always aware of questions of environment, as can be seen from our various programmes in that area. However, I would emphasize that the Commission itself does not design any particular project, and therefore it is for the Member State or Member States in question to have regard to these particular factors when putting forward projects.

President. — Question No 2, by Lady Elles (H-88/79):

Subject: Parking concessions for the disabled throughout the Member States

Can the Commission state whether parking concessions for the disabled exist throughout the Member States, and, if not, what action will the Commission take to achieve this desirable object?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Although individual Member States of our Community have arrangements under which parking facilities are reserved for the handicapped, no provision has been made in the Community as such for the introduction of national arrangements in all Member States.

In my opinion this is indeed a deficiency. I have therefore asked my services to discuss with the representatives of the national organizations for the handicapped the possibility of making certain provisions of the type referred to in the question as early and as pragmatically as possible. I hope that this will clear the way for practical initiative on our part, partly because the United Nations intend to declare 1981 the year of the handicapped.

I therefore feel that we are able to give a positive answer to Lady Elles's question.

Lady Elles. — I hope the fact that everybody has disabled persons in their constituencies will not mean that they will all want to put questions on this particular item. In thanking the Commissioner for his helpful reply, may I remind him that there is the European Conference of Ministers of Transport, who have agreed that from 1 January 1980 there will be mutual recognition of parking badges for the disabled but that one Member State of the Community, in fact France, does not have a national scheme and has therefore not been able to ratify this agreement? Would the Commissioner therefore take all urgent steps to encourage that particular country to have a national scheme so that it may also ratify the agreement and so that the Community will be seen to be doing something for the disabled which, *grâce à Dieu*, would cost nothing to the Member States?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) Although I have been unable to consult my colleague Mr Burke, who has just spoken, I can definitely assure Lady Elles that I will contact Mr Burke in conjunction with the conference which, as she has said, will take place on 1 January 1980. As the question concerns the handicapped and therefore falls within my terms of reference, but presumably also concerns aspects of the transport sector, I will contact Mr Burke to see if the difficulties to which the honourable Member has referred can be eliminated. I cannot completely exclude the possibility that France is not the only country not to have a national scheme. According to the information I have, there are other Member States that do not have a national scheme of this type. There may well be many such schemes at local level, but not at national level. But I will also include that aspect in my deliberations on this question, which in itself can, I feel, be settled in a Community context if there is the necessary goodwill.

Mr Van Minnen. — (NL) What Mr Vredeling has just said sounds very promising and also very practical and perhaps I can give him a practical tip, because what we want are uniform rules for parking facilities for the handicapped in Europe like those governing normal traffic. I would therefore ask Mr Vredeling whether the parking scheme for the handicapped that has been in force in the Netherlands for several years might not point the way for other countries in Europe, perhaps through the use of a parking card of the type that has been introduced throughout the Netherlands.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) Shining examples will always be an inspiration to the Commission, and in this spirit I can assure you that we shall study the Dutch scheme as part of what we intend to do in this field.

Mr Albers. — (NL) Does Mr Vredeling share my view that it is very strange that, while various members of the European Democratic Group again and again refer to their own constituencies when discussing European questions, they are now broaching a subject that should primarily be dealt with by the Member States' local authorities?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) The honourable Member is quite right to refer to the need for the local authorities to take action in this sector. But I would hesitate somewhat to say that that would be enough. It seems to me that two requirements in this respect are coordination and mutual recognition. That was also the tenor of the question. Even though the matter has been dealt with at local level, an initiative should be taken to achieve the mutual recognition of certain badges on vehicles driven by the handicapped. More than a local or even national approach is needed here. The Community could take the initiative.

President. — Question No 3, by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (H-92/79):

Subject: Code of Conduct for companies with subsidiaries, branches or representation in South Africa

Has the Commission now received the reports from the Member States concerning compliance with the 'Code of Conduct for companies with subsidiaries, branches or representation in South Africa', adopted by the Council of Ministers on 20 September 1979? If so, do they contain any specific information, such as a list of individual companies, that would help to identify those firms that have failed to submit a report, and what action does the Commission propose to take?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) I must make abundantly clear what, in this field, comes within the province of the Commission and what comes under political cooperation. At present, the Code of Conduct, its application and the examination of reports which are received are dealt with under political cooperation, the Commission being, of course, present but not carrying any responsibility. It is, therefore, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs meeting in political cooperation who have to assess the results of the operation and to consider the reports submitted; the Commission despite the resolution adopted by this Parliament, has not been given any responsibility in the matter. Strictly speaking, therefore, this is not a Community matter.

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul. — (D) I must say, Mr Davignon, I find your answer extremely unsatisfactory, particularly with regard to the European Parliament's resolution of 26 April 1979, to which you yourself have referred. I would recall that the European Parliament called on the Commission at that time to assume responsibility for evaluating the reports submitted by the Member States and that this request was also directed at the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. This request by Parliament has not been accepted. But I believe it cannot be left at that, and I would therefore ask the following question: would you agree with me that the situation as you have just described it, which releases the Commission from responsibility for these reports and their evaluation, seriously undermines the purpose of this code and the obligation to submit reports, since very different procedures are applied in the various countries with regard to publication. Would you secondly agree with me that these reports should also disclose which companies are not observing the recommendations contained in the code for European companies operating in South Africa. In this context, I should like to refer to a report by a Catholic working party in the Federal Republic that West German firms are still clearly exploiting the regulations in South Africa and thus ignoring the code. In my opinion it is not enough for the Commission to say it is not its responsibility. I would expect the Commission to take new action and I would ask it whether it is not willing to

do something to help put an end to this political scandal.

(Some applause from the left)

Mr Davignon. — (F) I think we must be quite clear about the position, Madam. In its resolution, Parliament expressed the hope that when they meet within the framework of political cooperation, the Foreign Ministers would leave the Commission to take action as a body in a position to ensure coordination, obtain information and give its assessment of the way in which the measures voluntarily adopted by nine States are being applied. If the Commission had regarded itself as legally justified in taking action of its own accord, it would have done so. There is, accordingly, no room for doubt or misunderstanding on this point. But since the Treaty gives us no ground on which to take action, it is for the States to give us authority to take it. We are ready to undertake the task. If the States do not decide to give it to us, our legal position remains unchanged but we are not trying to dodge our responsibilities.

My reply to your question is, therefore, that the Commission is ready and willing to take on this task but that it cannot do so in the absence of a decision taken by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, the matter being one for political cooperation and not, strictly speaking, a Community matter at all. During tomorrow's debate you will be considering how political cooperation can be improved. In the Commission's view, there is everything to be gained by addressing this question to those who are in the best position to answer it.

Mr Seal. — Whilst I accept the point the Commissioner makes, I feel he might particularly help the work of the Committee on External Economic Relations if he were prepared to come along and discuss this matter with that committee, because there is no point in that committee's assuming some of the responsibility for EEC negotiations if the Commission is not prepared to discuss issues with them and give them up-to-date information on any particular aspect. Is the Commission prepared to come along and discuss the matter with that particular committee?

Mr Davignon. — (F) That goes without saying.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (I) I am grateful to Commissioner Davignon for his reply, which I consider satisfactory. The Political Affairs Committee has already questioned the President-in-Office of the Council in the political cooperation context. On this very important political matter — and I fully support the question put by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul — I do not think there is any reference back between the Commission and the Council. In my view, the responsibility belongs to the Council but I also believe that a Code of Conduct voluntarily subscribed to by Euro-

Glorioso

pean undertakings who are opposed to the principle of *apartheid* and pledge themselves to fight it and apply different rules in their South African branches ought to be observed; otherwise the principle of leaving it to the undertakings becomes hypocrisy and a provocation to the peoples of the African continent. I repeat: this is a political issue. I am sorry that Commissioner Cheysson is not here because he is fully aware of its magnitude.

A code which is voluntary assumes a considerable measure of good faith, and the trade unions went along with the idea of voluntary compliance with it, so I should like to know whether these reports were submitted. The Commission ought to be able to answer that one; if not, we shall have to ask the Council of Ministers.

Mr Davignon. — (F) The Commission is very conscious of the political implications of this question and it has said so publicly many times. Another thing: we always believe that when the Member States undertake to do something, steps must be taken to ensure that they carry it out. Again, because we belong to the special section of political cooperation which deals with these questions, we are in fact in possession of a certain amount of information which, as the previous question suggested, we are ready to make available to the appropriate committee of Parliament. I can say that, to date, three out of the nine countries have sent in a report, which means that six of them have not. For the reason I gave earlier, we are not in a position to require these six to publish a report. Unless the rules are changed, therefore, the position remains that the Commission has no power to insist that Member States carry out an agreement entered into within the framework of political cooperation.

Mr Radoux. — (F) Encouraged by some of Mr Davignon's statements, I should like to ask whether he would agree that a question like this has rather more to do with the Community's methods of working than with political cooperation and, in consequence, falls within the competence of the Commission and not of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

Mr Davignon. — (F) Mr Radoux knows that, not so long ago, I acquired some experience of political cooperation. There is no provision in the Treaty of Rome enabling us to enter into communication with a non-Member country on a commercial matter without specific authority to do so. When such authority depends on political rather than economic considerations, it is obviously for the Ministers for Foreign Affairs to give their opinion and views.

This is an area where the States must take action within the framework of political cooperation. As the issue involves non-discrimination in economic affairs within the Community, the Community must also be involved. If a Community rule is called for, it is for the Council to decide on one. On the basis of the

powers conferred on it by the Treaty, the Commission is unable to. This is an issue which must be handled by both the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and the Council, since the questions involved are not amenable to treatment exclusively by one procedure or the other.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (I) In all this to-ing and fro-ing of responsibility, why is the Commission giving only half the story? I fail to understand why 'only three countries' are mentioned without being named or why the answer is only to be in committee. Of course, the subject will be discussed by the Committee but as the House is now discussing it, the questioner should be given the information she is asking for. The Commission seems to be adopting a wholly negative attitude, despite the instruction which it received from Parliament and which it should be following out, albeit within the limits imposed by the Treaty. In conclusion, I should like to ask the Commissioner whether Italy is one of the six, or one of the three countries.

Mr Davignon. — (F) Not being in the habit of missing the point of questions, I must remind the honourable Member of its terms: 'Has the Commission now received the reports from the Member States . . .?' I said that the reports from the Member States are not addressed to the Commission. So my reply is that it has not received them.

The States which have, to our knowledge, sent in reports to the Foreign Ministers are Britain, Denmark and Italy. The Commission is also asked whether the reports can be broken down to show the firms involved and what action the Commission proposes to take. There are only three reports and they are not addressed to us. Rules have been laid down and they give the Commission no power to change them.

We must avoid creating a situation in which the impression is given that the Commission is not prepared to discharge its responsibilities. The Commission cannot assume responsibilities which the provisions of the Treaty do not confer on it. It would be wrong to pretend that the Commission can exercise powers for which there is no authority in the legal provisions on which all its actions are based. It is wrong to indict the Commission when it is discharging its responsibilities in full.

Mr Berkhower. — (NL) Would you agree that a European code of conduct for economic trade with South Africa can only be effective if the line recommended in that code is applied to all the countries adjoining South Africa, some of which according to recent reports have unfortunately been contravening, or at least not observing, the UN boycott on a large scale, and is the Commission aware of this situation?

Mr Davignon. — (F) The Commission certainly has plenty of information at its disposal and keeps in touch with the work being done under the aegis of the United Nations. But as I said just now, we have

Davignon

enough problems with the Member States without adding to them in the rest of the world, where we have even less authority than we have over the Member States.

(Laughter)

Mrs Lizin. — *(F)* I should like to assure the Commissioner and various speakers that a similar question has been addressed to the Ministers within the framework of political cooperation. I put it myself and it appears at the head of the list of questions for the Ministers. So we shall have a chance to discuss this point with the Council tomorrow.

As the Commission has no power to act in this matter, has it, in connection with other policies, where it has not been formally denied this power, considered reporting its conclusions regarding any information which reaches it about the Code of Conduct and about political cooperation, with specific reference to the installation of oil company branches in South Africa? Has it tried to use any information it receives in connection with matters which do not relate to general foreign policy but to energy policy?

Mr Davignon. — *(F)* We always study the information we receive. I am afraid, however, that a policy under which the Community purported to decide how resources should be invested outside its own frontiers would cause even more problems than those I mentioned just now.

President. — I call Mr Welsh on a point of order.

Mr Welsh. — Mr President, we have just heard Mr Davignon give the same answer in about eight different ways to eight different people on one question. There are 49 questions to the Commission on the order-paper; could we please do four of them this afternoon, because otherwise the work of this Parliament is going to be totally disrupted?

Mrs Squarcialupi — *(I)* Mr President, the briefest of questions. Does the Commission consider a breach of the Code of Conduct to be or not to be a distortion of competition?

Mr Davignon — *(F)* May I say that if I am giving the same sort of answer it is because of the sort of question I am asked. I cannot give different answers to keep the debate going.

(Applause)

To the question just asked, my answer is that we are worried about the possibility that failure within the Community to apply the rules agreed between the States may result in distorting competition and creating difficulty. That is why I said that, quite apart from our political anxiety concerning the policy of *apartheid*, the subject we are talking about raises specific problems in connection with equality of treat-

ment for companies in the Community. We are doing our utmost to ensure equality.

President. — The first part of *Question Time* is closed.

I call Mr Spicer on a point of order.

Mr Spicer. — Sir, I had intended to intervene before my colleague did. I must say that in five years in this Parliament we have achieved a record today by getting through only three questions. The fault for this, sir, lies both with the people asking supplementary questions — the number of such supplementaries and the way in which they are asked — and the way in which the replies have come from the Commission. Can I say to you, sir, that as far as our group and, I think, most Members here are concerned, when we have 49 questions down for reply, it is in your hands how many supplementary questions are called, and it is quite insufferable that we should have eight or nine or ten supplementaries on one question when people have other questions down. You can call only one questioner, or two or as many as you like and you have our full support, but if we go on like this, as has already been said, then *Question Time* becomes a farce: it was instituted in order to get questions answered. Now it puts a tremendous burden upon the Commission: they now have to provide written answers or these questions have to be put back again. As my colleague has said, it becomes a farce, and we really must move on. We will support your authority from the Chair: do please exercise it on our behalf.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — Mr Spicer, your remarks are absolutely right, and what you have suggested will have to be rigorously applied. *Question Time* must be developed to the maximum, but it will also be necessary that Members observe the request to limit the number and the length of their questions.

7. Votes

President. — The next item comprises the votes on motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

We begin with the *Ruffolo et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-412/79): Economic convergence.*

I put the preamble to the vote.

The preamble is adopted.

Before paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D) and adding the following new text:

Takes note of the promise by the Commission to forward the proposals which it is preparing for the Council of Ministers also to Parliament as soon as they are ready, and instructs the appropriate committees to submit a report on the matter in plenary sitting;

Mr Bersani — (I) Mr President, in view of the motion for a resolution drafted by Mr Ruffolo and the Socialists, my group has decided against tabling one of its own. However, it has drafted an amendment in the light of what has been said in the debate and of the undertaking given by Vice-President Natali. It is an amendment replacing paragraph 1 with a new text, which, I believe, is acceptable to Mr Ruffolo and the Socialist Group.

President. — I call Mr Didò.

Mr Didò. — (I) On behalf of the movers of the resolution, I accept the amendment which has been tabled.

President. — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.
Amendment No 1 is adopted.

I put paragraphs 2 and 3 to the vote.

Paragraphs 2 and 3 are adopted.

I call Mr de la Malène for an explanation of vote.

Mr de la Malène — (F) Mr President, I should like to say that my Group will abstain from voting. We consider paragraph 2 to be incompatible with the Treaty. The European Council is not a Community organ and, consequently, there can be no relationship between it and this Parliament. So we shall abstain without going into the merits of the question.

President. — I put to the vote, thus amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.¹

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Seefeld interim report (Doc. 1-341/79): Community contribution to the development of air transport*.

The resolution is adopted.¹

8. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received from Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, a motion for a resolution, with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the violation of the freedom of the press and private property in Malta (Doc. 1-419/79).

The reasons supporting this request for urgent debate are contained in the document itself.

The vote on this request will be taken at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

9. Directive on inland-waterway vessels

President.— The next item is the report (Doc. 1-380/79) by Mr Baudis, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council for a directive laying down technical requirements for inland-waterway vessels.

I call Mr Baudis.

Mr Baudis, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, the measures which the Commission of the European Communities proposes in its document meet the wishes expressed on several occasions by this Parliament. In several reports, Parliament and its Committee on Transport have called for the adoption by the Community of measures to improve the safety of waterways. I refer more particularly to the report which Mr Albers prepared two years ago and in which he urged the Commission to propose a series of uniform measures by 1 January 1980. The proposal for a directive is in three parts. The first contains a series of specific measures laying down the technical requirements to be observed in the construction and equipment of inland waterway vessels; the second proposes the introduction of a compulsory Community navigation certificate for issue to vessels built and equipped in accordance with the minimum safety requirements; and the third provides for the standardization of inspections and for the imposition of penalties for failure to possess a certificate and for non-compliance with requirements. It is clear that navigable waterways can be made reasonably safe on five conditions: the establishment of minimum technical requirements, the introduction of compulsory navigation certificates, the standardization of inspection procedures, the imposition of penalties for non-compliance and the availability of navigable waterways adapted to the demands made on them. The document in front of you contains proposals on the first four points referred to; it does not cover the adaptation of waterways.

Annex II contains a detailed list of the minimum technical requirements relating to the construction of vessels, their engines and the various types of equipment, including electrical and heating installations, steering gear and wheelhouse.

I ought to point out that, in drawing up these requirements, the Commission proceeded on the basis of the preparatory work carried out on behalf of the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine which, two years ago, introduced a regulation providing for the inspection of craft using the Rhine. The Commission also took advantage of the work carried out in the United Nations Economic Commission at Geneva. Moreover, in order to develop uniform proposals from the various solutions available, the Commission set up a working party composed of experts from the various Member States.

¹ OJ C 289 of 19. 11. 1979.

Baudis

It is worth noting that the Commission adopted an idea suggested by this Parliament, which was to differentiate between the various types of waterway. A provision to this effect is very necessary since it would be absurd to require all navigable waterways to observe the same rules. The minimum safety requirements must, accordingly, be adapted to take account of geographical location, physical dimensions and volume of traffic. In the Commission document, navigable waterways are broken down into three classes.

The Commission also leaves the Member States free to make separate provision for vessels making short journeys or local journeys confined to a restricted area or estuaries.

The Commission proposes that the certificate should be compulsory. It will be issued to vessels which meet the minimum safety requirements. Vessels laid down two years after the adoption of the draft directive will have to undergo inspection before being put into service. For other vessels, the Commission proposes a period of transition until 1 January 1990, which means that, if the Council adopts the proposal this year, vessels already in service must submit to inspection and obtain a certificate between 1 January 1980 and 31 December 1989.

Under Article 7 of the draft directive, precise reasons must be given for any refusal to issue or renew a certificate. Moreover, the national authorities must notify the party concerned of his right of appeal. In the event of major alterations or repairs, a fresh inspection must be carried out and, of course, the certificate amended accordingly.

Under Article 11, the competent authorities of the Member State may at any time verify whether the certificate is still valid and whether the construction and equipment of the vessel accord with the certificate. If the authorities find that there is no certificate or that the vessel does not accord with it, they may prevent it from proceeding. In that event, too, of course, reasons must be given for the decision.

The Commission document also proposes the appointment of a Committee, composed of experts from the Member States and chaired by a representative of the Commission, to be responsible for the adaptation of the technical requirements and of the directive itself to keep pace with technical developments.

The present draft directive does not apply to passenger transport or to the carriage of dangerous goods despite the fact that, as I must remind you, the Council asked the Commission to prepare similar measures for this type of traffic as well. I do not make this comment as a criticism of the Commission which, I recognize, has produced a document of substance but I am very unhappy about this omission. I urge the Commission to make suitable proposals as

soon as possible so that both types of traffic can travel in greater safety on our rivers and waterways.

So, for all these reasons, I ask the House to adopt the Report which I have the honour to present. In paragraph 1 of the motion, I congratulate the Commission on the measures it is proposing; in paragraph 2 I urge it to propose similar measures in the case of passenger transport and the transport of dangerous goods; and in paragraph 3 I move that the Commission's proposal be adopted.

President. — I call Mr Albers to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Albers. — *(NL)* Mr President, the Socialist Group has noted with satisfaction the Commission's proposal and Mr Baudis' report, and I should like to congratulate Mr Baudis on his work. We are happy to see that it will still be possible for this directive to enter into force by the deadline of 1 January 1980, that is if the Council takes a decision to this end at its December meeting. You will understand why I put it this way, because we are quite accustomed to Commission proposals that have found widespread approval in Parliament not always finding the same approval in the Council. We are concerned here with the improvement of safety on inland waterways. Not a new subject in itself. The Member States have their own legislation. Some Member States have legislation that is almost identical with that proposed here. In some respect there has already been a degree of harmonization, since the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine has been able to put its proposals into practice. It is nevertheless a good thing for the Commission not to sit still but to put forward proposals with the ultimate aim of uniform legislation being applied in all the Member States. This is all the more important since the proposal concerns not only the Rhine but also other waterways in the Member States of the European Community.

That inland waterway transport is extremely important is evident from the figures. Over 50 % of the trans-frontier carriage of goods in the Federal Republic, France and the Benelux countries is handled by inland waterway vessels. There are more than 30 000 of these vessels with a total carrying capacity in excess of 15 000 000 tonnes, and they transport more than 600 000 000 tonnes in the Member States over an average distance of 150 km.

We can expect more stringent requirements to be introduced in the near future with the object of conserving energy and protecting the environment, and more stringent requirements are likely to be necessary in inland shipping as well. It is therefore particularly welcome that thanks to the Commission's proposal we are now making a start on this, a start that can be adjusted to developments as time passes.

Albers

It is essential that the checks made to ensure this legislation is being observed should be as uniform as possible. We must, of course, prevent the recurrence of distortions of competition caused by indifference to the legislation, and we must prevent this legislation from creating new barriers between the Member States. Where possible, the attempt must be made to pursue as uniform a policy as possible towards these technical requirements.

As the rapporteur rightly says in his report, it is naturally essential for measures to be taken with respect to passenger vessels and to the transport of dangerous goods. There must in fact be no delay in this. Our group attaches considerable importance to the early submission by the Commission of proposals on this aspect.

Another point which is of particular concern to us and which was also mentioned in the Fuchs report, which we debated in May of this year, is infrastructure on inland waterways. With regulations to govern the vessels we can achieve a high level of safety, but it is, of course, quite clear that various requirements must also be made of the inland waterways themselves. As we all know, this aspect leaves a great deal to be desired, and it would be useful if the Commission could take some action in this connection. I am thinking in particular of the item entered in the budget for infrastructure. This need not concern bridges, canals or paths alone; it can undoubtedly be extended to include the improvement of inland waterways.

Another very important issue is, of course, the improvement of working conditions aboard vessels. I am happy to say that the proposal also covers this aspect. In this context it is extremely important that the Council should take a decision on the proposal that was submitted years ago concerning social rules in inland shipping. I know that the Commission has put forward an amending proposal, but Parliament and the Council must try to introduce an arrangement for working hour and rest periods as soon as possible in view of the constant increase in traffic on inland waterways.

Another point that plays a part in this is the reorganizing effect that these regulations may have. It is generally accepted that the inland waterway transport sector is suffering from overcapacity. The Member States have arrangements for the scrapping of vessels. We have a proposal for a laying-up system, which unfortunately was rejected by the Court of Justice. There must be a balanced and all-embracing package of measures, and the proposal now before us must be followed by others to deal with this overcapacity.

We must remember that the proposal we are now discussing will not become fully effective until 1990. It would therefore be particularly useful for a package of measures to be taken to reorganize inland shipping as a whole over the next 10 years or so.

I should like to close by putting two questions to the Commission. Will these technical regulations and requirements also apply to vessels from third countries? I am thinking here particularly of the increasing use of our inland waterways by vessels from the Eastern European countries. And the situation will become even more serious when the Rhine-Main-Danube Canal goes into operation. Will strict regulations also apply to these vessels?

My second question concerns the committee whose task it will be to adapt the technical regulations to technological progress. The 1980 budget reveals that a total of 20 committees are concerned with transport questions. We know that very little progress is being made towards the establishment of a Community transport policy. This prompts the question whether it is a good thing to set up yet more committees. Cannot the existing committee concerned with certificates for inland-waterway vessels take over the function of adapting the technical regulations? Is it necessary to set up an additional committee?

I hope I will receive a satisfactory answer to these two questions. Our group will in any case vote in favour of the motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Hoffmann to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D).

Mr Hoffmann. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party endorses the proposal for a directive on technical requirements for inland waterway vessels, and it supports the report drawn up by Mr Baudis. However, this proposal raises a number of questions which undoubtedly require further discussion. We maintain, for example, that this directive cannot apply simply to inland-waterway vessels. It should also cover sea-going vessels that sail on inland waterways, in other words such vessels should be required to satisfy the same technical requirements, they should be equipped with river radar and if they are carrying dangerous goods, they should also comply with the safety requirements of ADNR, the Agreement on the Transport of Dangerous Goods on the Rhine. We feel this is an important requirement, since otherwise we will be creating possibilities applicable to inland waterway vessels while ignoring other vessels that use our inland waterways. This cannot be in the interests of our safety provisions.

Secondly, I should like on behalf of my group to refer to a matter connected with this directive that is of particular concern to the Germans. In contrast to all the other Community countries, technical investigations are not made by the State in the Federal Republic but by the inland waterway trade cooperative. This is an independent organization of employers and employees. Some time ago a Commission proposal

Hoffmann

provided for the abolition of this organization. Fortunately the Commission dropped this idea again. We would therefore ask the Commission — and we would also and in particular ask the Council — whatever happens, to retain the present situation when it comes to a decision on this question, because we do not want unnecessarily to transfer to the State tasks which employees' organizations and employers are together able to perform independently.

(Applause from some quarters)

Allow me to refer to a third point. Mr Albers has already mentioned the Rhine-Main-Danube Canal and put a question to the Commission. I should not only like to put a question to the Commission, I should like to call on the Commission to take action. All the measures we have introduced in the inland shipping sector — scrapping measures, safety provisions or whatever it might be — are useless if we do not apply the same conditions to third countries, and I am referring here in particular to the Eastern Bloc States, such as Poland, the German Democratic Republic and others, which are already using the inland waterways of the European Community.

Competition will be totally distorted if we add more fuel to this fire. Our companies will go to the wall, their employees will lose their jobs, if we allow such things to happen, and the full force of this will be felt when the Rhine-Main-Danube Canal is completed in the 80s, and I do not believe that additional protocols to the Mannheim Act will help at all in solving this problem.

Mr President, as a trade unionist I always get rather annoyed when, as happened this morning, I hear the members of the Communist and Allies Group claim that they are virtually alone in representing workers' interests.

(Applause from some quarters)

All I can say in this connection is that that is eyewash. They should join with us in ensuring that in Danube shipping, for example, the same conditions are applied as in shipping on the Rhine and the other European rivers. My trade union has attempted for years to conclude a collective agreement with Bayerischer Lloyd, which has Eastern Bloc and German crewmembers working on the same vessel. We have succeeded in the case of the German crewmembers but the Eastern Bloc has so far refused to accept our proposals. So we send one sailor to the ball in a Sunday suit because he comes from the West, while the next has a hole in his trousers simply because he comes from the Eastern Bloc. I believe we simply cannot accept a situation of this kind. My group therefore addresses an urgent appeal to Parliament: fight with us to ensure that the Commission takes action in good time to prevent our getting into an intolerable

situation as regards competition, which could break the inland shipping industry and create unemployment in the Community.

President. — I call Mr Cottrell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Cottrell. — I want first of all to give my very warm support to Mr Baudis' report, which analyses very well the difficult technical aspects of the Commission's rather complex proposals. Secondly, I should like to say a few words on the specific situation of the United Kingdom inland waterways. I know that this may seem somewhat strange, because from a commercial point of view the United Kingdom has much less goods traffic being carried on its inland waterways. This is regrettable and ironical when one remembers that it was the United Kingdom which started in Europe the construction and commercial use of canals. Indeed, the only important inland waterway now being operated in the UK is the Manchester Ship Canal, and when we learn of such grand projects as the Rhine-Rhône Canal and the Rhine-Danube Canal, we are, I think, a little envious. The best we can do is to try and match this proposal with a Channel tunnel, which would be our most practical waterway connection with the rest of Europe.

(Laughter)

On the other hand, many of us in the United Kingdom would welcome an increase in European inland waterway traffic because of the specific qualities of this mode of transport, and here I refer more particularly to the low energy consumption and the absence of noise and pollution. There is now, I am happy to say, in my country a tendency to launch development programmes for our canals and rivers; and we must not rule out the possibility, given developments in sea-going barges, that we may yet see the Union Jack navigating the Rhine and, dare I even say, the Danube, giving us a direct interest in these technical proposals.

Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Commission to follow these developments very closely and to consider that all these matters, as other speakers have pointed out, fall within a potential common transport infrastructure policy, which would be greatly stimulated by these proposals and, dare I say once more, by the creation of a permanent link between the mainland of the Continent and the United Kingdom.

President. — I call Mr Burke.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I should like first of all to thank Mr Baudis for his report, an excellent report, and to thank the Committee on Transport for its favourable opinion on our proposal.

Burke

I think that we are all agreed on the need to provide for a high degree of safety in inland navigation. To achieve this, it is essential to introduce common criteria and, to this effect, to establish technical requirements that will have to be met by all vessels. Conformity with these requirements and the maintenance of the vessel in that condition will be checked during the inspection, which, I hasten to say, will be a genuine technical supervision that every vessel will have to undergo. A Community inland-navigation certificate for all vessels found on inspection to satisfy the common technical requirements will also be issued. This certificate is evidence that a vessel is not a danger to navigation nor to the persons on board and on that basis constitutes an authorization to operate freely on Community inland waterways.

The various contributions were very interesting from a number of points of view. I took particular note of the reference to the desirability of getting ahead with our infrastructure proposals, made particularly by Mr Albers and Mr Cottrell. My support for progress in the Community on transport infrastructure goes without saying.

A number of speakers asked if we could not do something for passenger transport as well as for the proposition before us here. We have concentrated on standards for cargo vessels and given priority to this. As a result we have, regretfully, not been able to go into the question of standards for passenger vessels. To be quite frank, given the very small number of people working in this area in Brussels, I do not envisage the possibility of looking into it in the immediate future. That is not to say that it is not important, but to tell you exactly where we stand in regard to the lack of personnel to do this important work.

In regard to the question specifically asked, one answer, I think, will go to Mr Albers and Mr Hoffmann, who asked if we consider that the technical requirements should apply to third-country vessels. Mention was made particularly of third countries, the answer is an unequivocal 'yes'; we want them to be covered.

On the second question from Mr Albers as to the setting up of a committee and why the existing committee would not do the job, I would explain that the Committee we propose, and which he questions, would have the specific job of reviewing the possibilities offered by technical progress in relation to the safety and equipment of vessels. This committee would advise the Commission on the qualitative improvements which could and should be made. This is a completely different task from that of issuing certificates and could not reasonably be done by the same group, and I would point out that such a provision is typical of technical directives.

In regard to the other questions asked by Mr Hoffmann in regard to the particular position in Germany,

I would point out that the Commission sees no difficulty here, provided the German Government delegates the authority to the association in question to carry out the work. As far as we are concerned, I am advised that that would be quite sufficient.

I would like therefore, in conclusion, to thank all who have spoken and to say that I look forward, given the difficulties of personnel in this area and the small numbers involved, to making some progress, but I cannot promise it in the immediate future.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time tomorrow.

10. *Community quota for the carriage of goods by road*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1/381/79) by Mr Albers, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 3164/76, on the Community quota for the carriage of goods by road between Member States.

I call Mr Albers.

Mr Albers, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this proposal is a simple and, in the context of the development of trade and transport, a very understandable one. It concerns the adjustment of the Community quota to the growth in transport possibilities and an extremely small additional increase, with the result that the objective set over 15 years ago of the gradual removal of the systems of bilateral authorizations can be achieved. Why was this objective set? Because the signatories of the EEC Treaty, determined to lay the foundations for ever stronger links between the European peoples, recognised that the removal of existing obstacles calls for concerted action in order to guarantee steady expansion, balanced trade and fair competition and because they wanted to contribute, by means of a common commercial policy, to the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade. These words in the preamble of the Treaty remove any doubts about whether it is the responsibility of the Community institutions or in their power to take steps to liberalize the transport of goods as far as possible. This obligation becomes even clearer from Title IV of the Treaty, that is Articles 74 to 84, which set out in greater detail how the liberalization of the transport of goods is to be achieved. Common rules are established for international transport operations to and from the territory of a Member State or over the territory of one or more Member States. Decisions in this regard must be taken unanimously until the end of the second stage and by a qualified majority thereafter. Mr President, these various stages were, of course, completed long ago, and yet.

Albers

some Member States still find opportunities to hold up decision-making connected with the common transport policy. And this also applies to the Community quota. The introduction of my report explains the origins of the Community quota and its development since the Commission submitted a proposal to the Council in mid-1963. As is usual, it was not until 1968 that a regulation was adopted. During this period the number of authorizations gradually increased from 1 200 to 3 122 as small percentage increases were made, always less than those proposed by the Commission. In 1975 all the delegations in the Council agreed to a 30 % increase. Then the Federal Republic opposed it on the grounds that the economic situation did not allow an increase. In 1976 the Federal Republic opposed it on the grounds that no progress had been made towards the harmonization of conditions of competition. In 1977 the Federal Republic opposed it on the grounds that the conditions of competition had not been sufficiently harmonized, that there was a conflict of interests with the railways and that most international traffic in the Federal Republic was transit traffic. At the time I received some support from Italy on the grounds that weights and dimensions had not been harmonized and that social harmonization had not progressed far enough (Regulation No 543/69).

Mr Burke has rightly pointed out in connection with the Council decision of November 1978 that the Community quota still accounts for a ridiculously small percentage of all road transport operations in the Community. The Commission's new proposal for a 20 % increase, if it is adopted by the Council, means that only 6 % of all transport operations between the Member States will be governed by the Community scheme. The Committee on Transport finds this situation extremely disappointing and alarming. The fact that a single Member State can hold up developments in this field for years by referring to its own transport policy objectives and the absence of decisions on other harmonization proposals in the transport sector leads one to ask, what use is the EEC Treaty now? Against this background Parliament can do little more than what it did last year and amend the Commission's proposal, which, as we know, was drawn up in anger, and so increase the number of authorizations by 100 % rather than 20 %. The arguments advanced by the President-in-Office of the Council during the sitting of 14 February of this year in reply to a question by Mr Seefeld that a larger increase than 10 % would overload the roads, must be firmly rejected, because in the number of bilateral transport authorizations, which has always been the object of the proposal. In contrast to previous years not all the members of the Committee on Transport supported the proposal for an amendment. They are evidently impressed by the objections raised by one Member State. I would point out in this connection that as rapporteur I too felt some hesitation when drawing up the report as to whether we, Parliament,

now an elected Parliament, should persist in our attitude or more or less give in as the Commission is doing. But the following considerations indicated that we should stick to our original line. When the Council meets in early December, the proposal we are now discussing will be joined by two others relating to the adjustment of capacity to the benefit of the goods transport trade: a proposal for a regulation aimed at aligning supply with demand by establishing Community standards for the issue of bilateral authorizations and introducing an arbitration procedure for the settlement of disputes, and a proposal for the introduction of short-term Community authorization. These two proposals should be weighed against the existing system of bilateral authorizations and Community authorizations, and it will simply help to make things clearer if Parliament again stresses the importance that is attached to the continued development of the Community system of authorizations and if it again clearly states how very closely it feels a system of this kind corresponds to what the EEC Treaty says. Some difference of opinion may remain during that debate about the allocation of additional authorizations — all on a linear basis or half on a linear basis and half on the basis of utilization. — but this is of no fundamental importance. It makes very little difference in actual figures. In this context reference should again be made to the opinion delivered by the Economic and Social Committee in September 1977 questioning the method of allocation among the Member States. It asked for more information on the operation of the Community quota but, despite this reservation, feels that this proposal can serve as a basis for a discussion in the Council and that its adoption would be a sign of the Ministers' willingness to retrieve the transport policy from the *impasse* in which it now finds itself. Things have not changed between 1977 and 1979: even then the Commission was proposing that the number of authorizations be doubled.

Finally, I should like to point out as rapporteur on this subject, with which I have been occupied for a number of years now, that there has always been a large measure of agreement in this Parliament with regard to the Commission's proposals for the doubling of the quota, and this was also the line adopted last year. Against this background it might be useful to remind the House what the President-in-Office of the Council of Transport Ministers said at the end of his statement at the meeting of the Committee on Transport on 25 October 1978: 'I always enjoy reading the speeches of the Members of the European Parliament, with whose theoretical objectives I can largely agree. For national policy it would however, be extremely useful if what the Members of the European Parliament proposed also had the backing of a majority in the national parliament concerned. Otherwise it is difficult to understand why, when the national delegations in the European Parliament wholly agree on a question, the member of the Council should be forced by their national parliaments not to agree as they had

Alberts

intended.' I quote these remarkable words although they may have lost a great deal of their significance now that there are very few dual mandates in this Parliament, because they were spoken by Minister Gscheidle, Minister of Transport of the Federal Republic, the country that has always adopted a particularly negative approach to wards the Community quota.

President. — I call Mr Gabert to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Gabert. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by thanking Mr Albers for his report. He has done excellent work in committee in the short time available. Nevertheless I feel I must make a number of fundamental political comments.

Although my group again supports — albeit with considerable reservations — the increase in Community quotas for goods transport as proposed by the rapporteur, it feels that these measures should be seen in context and in transport policy terms. Doubling Community quotas will undoubtedly increase the burden on our roads, unless bilateral quotas are limited at the same time, and I do not believe, Mr Davignon, that that is about to happen. We must therefore expect a doubling of Community quotas to increase the load on the road system in Europe. I would welcome it if you could say something about this and also about the Community's basic transport policy, Mr Davignon. Above all I feel that a transport policy must be comprehensive and that we should not be considering just one part of the transport sector, since transport policy also includes in particular the relationship between road, rail and inland waterway, a problem we have just discussed. It would be a good thing to hear something about the overall transport concept and about the development of transport in Europe.

Transport policy is undoubtedly very important for people in Europe, for the economy and tourism, but in connection with road traffic there are also environmental problems to be considered: noise, fumes, accidents and also the question of energy consumption. So when we are talking about transport policy — and particularly about the transport of goods — road transport cannot be seen in isolation. In addition, the Commission, as we know from the Committee on Transport, would also like to see the maximum weight of heavy lorries increased from 40 to 44 tonnes. This too will undoubtedly create further problems for our road system, and the subject must therefore be considered *in toto*.

I believe the aim of European transport policy must be to set priorities, and one of these — as the Socialist Group also sees it — should be to make the railway systems efficient and economical, in other words a transport infrastructure policy should be pursued.

Containers and piggy-back methods must be made technically possible and economically attractive. This line will, I feel, be forced upon us by future developments and public opinion.

Mr Davignon, as you know, Switzerland has already taken steps to reduce lorry weights in transfrontier transport operations and it also intends to take far more stringent steps. Transport policy must, in my opinion, set medium-term priorities. We must not take any action without having an all-embracing transport policy. That is what we expect of the Commission, and a plan of this kind will also be developed by the Socialist Group and put before this Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Helms to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr Helms. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my group, the Group of the European People's Party, I should like to say the following on the question of Community quotas:

It is inconceivable that a united Europe should not have freedom of movement in the transport market. We support the Commission in its intention to create a common European transport market with as much freedom of movement as is humanly possible. Greater freedom of movement in the transport market with more and freer competition within and beyond frontiers will increase the productivity of the transport sector to everyone's advantage. But if this is to be achieved, we must remove the distortions of competition which unfortunately continue to exist despite the efforts of the Commission and many other quarters. Even in road transport we have made no progress towards the harmonization of the conditions of competition. Admittedly we do have, where the harmonization of social legislation is concerned, regulations on rest periods and checks on this with tachographs. The extent to which these checks are made and the European legislation is observed, however, still leaves a great deal to be desired. Nor have we made any progress in the question of the European driving licence. Speed restrictions are yet another factor. As regards technical harmonization, we have a large number of regulations on many aspects of manufacturing specifications for road vehicles. But the most important decision where competition is concerned has not yet been taken: the decision on the maximum permissible weights and dimensions of lorries.

When it comes to tax harmonization, the Community has not even succeeded in harmonizing the basis of assessment of motor vehicle taxes. The Commission has not even thought about mineral oil tax yet. Although there is some hope that the oil crisis will get the discussion on mineral oil tax going, I cannot at the moment see any possibility of discrimination being eliminated.

Helms

Closely associated with tax harmonization is the question of charging for the use of infrastructures. In this I am going beyond the road transport sector and taking in competition between the various modes of transport. We want to see more competition and more commercial freedom for all transport undertakings. But free competition will not be possible until the major problem of charging for the use of infrastructures has been harmoniously included in the question of harmonization.

We must think of all these deficiencies, which the European transport policy has suffered for years, when we talk about the Community quota here. The Community quota was invented by the Commission — as the rapporteur has just said — to replace present bilateral quotas. Bilateral quotas are a permanent point of controversy between many Member States. So what we need is regularization of international road transport. The Council did not adopt the Commission's idea in 1968/69 but introduced the Community quota in addition to the bilateral quotas, at first as an experiment. In the meantime, this has become a permanent institution. It looks as if the Transport Ministers of the Member States would not like to be without their beloved annual squabble about the bilateral quotas.

We must ask ourselves, ladies and gentlemen, what should the Community do? It is tempting to raise the Community quota, which today accounts for only a small portion — perhaps 5% — of road transport between the Member States, to such an extent that the bilateral quotas become increasingly unimportant. But in view of the lack of progress in harmonization I do not see this as a practicable solution.

The Commission proposes a 20% increase corresponding to the growth in road transport. This seemed to us realistic, and we therefore endorsed this proposal. But we call on the Council to adopt this increase by the end of the year as proposed. Whether it is made on a linear basis, the method our British colleagues succeeded in forcing on us in the Committee on Transport or, as the Commission proposes, partly on a linear basis and partly on the basis of actual utilization, may not be so important. Here again, I tend more towards the Commission's proposal.

To conclude, I should like to say that we are able to agree to the adaptation of the Community quotas to the economic growth that has gratifyingly occurred in road transport despite the oil crisis. But we are unable to agree to the amendment that has been tabled by Mr Nyborg today. We feel that we must first have real progress towards harmonization in the goods transport sector. What might be termed accommodating decisions or confessions of faith are no longer enough in this House. We must at last take practical action and remove all distortions of and obstacles to competition. This directly elected Parliament can help to overcome

the stagnation in the Council's discussions and the delays that will soon become intolerable by making proposals of its own. We should not therefore, Mr Albers, give in.

In the Committee on Transport I suggest that within a reasonable period of 12 to 18 months — if you like, we can make it 12 months longer — we should submit our own proposals and subject these still outstanding questions to a thorough examination. With considerable satisfaction I am able to say in this short debate that the Committee on Transport agreed to give priority to such work and to consult experts so that we may put our own resolutions before the public and the Council after discussing the matter in detail.

Ladies and gentlemen, this would seem to me the only way of making practical progress. My group, the Group of the European People's Party, will cooperate constructively in this task, which we give the highest priority, to prevent our citizens suffering disadvantages in a common Europe.

President. — I call Mr Moreland to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, I congratulate Mr Albers on his report. This subject is complex and easily misunderstood, yet he has produced a report which is lucid, sensible and, indeed, courageous. It has the support of the European Democratic Group, and deserves the support of the whole Parliament.

Members will know that there are two distinct types of permit available to a road haulier wishing to travel across the Community. The first set of permits arose from arrangements made between two individual Member States. These bilateral permits form some 95% of the permits currently in use. The second set enables the holder to travel across the whole Community, and the Commission distributes a number of such permits to each Member State for distribution to hauliers. These are the permits we are discussing today, and they make up some 5% of the permits currently in use.

I stress that this discussion refers to only 5% of the permits, and, with respect to Mr Gabert, no one should be under the misapprehension that a doubling of the Community quota will pour more lorries on to our roads, or take a lot of traffic from the railways. A doubling of such a small number of quotas — 3 122 to 6 244 — is a drop in the transport ocean. Indeed, I note from the Commission's explanatory document that an increase in the Community quota may be used to replace some of the bilateral quotas.

Members perhaps should concentrate attention on the many frustrations caused by the bureaucracy of administering a quota-system where demand far exceeds supply. Members are welcome to see correspondence that I have received on this subject, including, I am sorry to say, the implication that big haulage

Moreland

companies have done better in some countries out of the system than small, but growing, haulage companies.

In addition to welcoming the doubling of quotas, the European Democratic Group welcomes the proposal to scrap the so-called 'utilization formula' determining the allocation of the quota between Member States. In this connection, we regret the Nyborg amendment. We believe that a linear expansion, i.e., doubling each country's existing quota, is preferable to using a bogus formula. In the past, the Commission divided the increase, allocating half on a linear basis and half on what was described as the use made of Community authorizations. Members many ask: Why half-and-half? Why not 75 % or 100 %, if there is to be a utilization formula? Surely one argues for 100 % utilization, or not at all. Someone, obviously, going for 50-50, wanted to play Solomon, and I hope that, in the vote tomorrow, Members will not follow, with respect, Solomon Nyborg.

The formula, if I may say so, lacks logic. If the formula lacks logic, it also lacked fairness. The word 'utilization' primarily relates to the tonnes carried per kilometre by the permit-user. The number and length of journeys play an important part in determining the result. In any formula based on the number of kilometres travelled, the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland do badly. The reason is simple; the reason is the sea. The permit-user from Germany can cover many kilometres a day: he can leave home in the morning, go through parts of Belgium and Holland, and perhaps be home for supper. No such luck for the UK or Irish permit-user. He has to sit on a boat for 4 or 5 hours: his total number of kilometres per year is inevitably smaller. Yet logically, the United Kingdom and Ireland, being, like Italy, on the outer fringe of the Community, have more need of quotas to cross more than one Community country than other member countries in the centre.

In case I sound unduly chauvinistic, I would ask Members to compare the Nyborg amendment with page 7 of the report. They will see that, if applied in 1981, the utilization formula also leaves Belgium, France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands with less than the average increase; and they would have cause to complain at that. For my final objection to the utilization formula is that it is based, not on journeys in 1979, not on journeys in 1978, but on journeys in 1977. It is three years out of date for the allocation for 1980. It is no wonder that the utilization formula has received a less than rapturous response in the past from the Council of Ministers.

I hope, therefore, that this Parliament will adopt the report tomorrow, which favours the linear increase. Nevertheless, I stress that a linear increase in quota must be considered as temporary. There is no magic in it. My purpose was to kill off the utilization element, but I also wish to propose that the Commission undertake a thorough assessment of the criteria

for undertake a thorough assessment of the criteria for allocating the quota, with suitable proposals before the 1981 allocation.

Mr President, as I said earlier, this is a complex issue. Some may argue, like my friend Mr Helms, that we should not proceed to increase the quota without taking other steps on lorry-weights, infrastructure, etc. Perhaps that challenge can be answered. Member States are taking action on uniform driverhours and tachographs. A Green Paper on infrastructure is expected any day. Our Committee on Transport proposes to examine the subject of lorryweights in depth. Transport is now a subject for prime debating-time in this Parliament. Transport policy is progressing, and now, perhaps, is an appropriate time to move faster on the liberalization of the Community quota, and to accept Mr Albers' excellent report.

President. — I call Mr Carossino to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Carossino. — (I) Mr President, when the Committee on Transport first considered the proposal for a regulation amending the Regulation on the Community quota for the carriage of goods by road between Member States, we expressed misgivings about the Commission's proposals to the Council. These misgivings arose out of a conflicting situation which we were called upon to resolve. There is the undeniable need which, with the full support of my Italian Communist colleagues and myself, has been repeatedly emphasized by this Parliament, for the Community to extricate transport policy from its present backward state and to take step to bring it up to date. No doubt the adoption of a Community regulation designed gradually to replace bilateral authorizations by Community authorizations would be an important first step towards the control of capacity and a more rational use of the various modes of transport. This naturally raises the question as to why we are not going ahead at a faster pace than that suggested by the Commission when it proposes to raise the Community quota for 1980 to 3 750 authorizations, an increase of 20 % on the previous year. In the light of these considerations, Mr Albers and the Committee on Transport have tabled a motion for a resolution under which the Community quota would be doubled by bringing it up to 6 244 authorizations, with an automatic increase of 25 % per year if the Council has not taken a decision. I must confess that this does not appear to me to be either very realistic or very logical. It does not take into account the conflicting situation, to which I referred earlier and which some speakers have already mentioned, concerning, in particular, the disparity between competition conditions in the Community, the consequence being that where, for example, in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, social legislation is exceptionally favourable, the carriers' operating costs are lower than they would be in Italy or Germany.

Carossino

Steps must also be taken, therefore, in the direction of harmonizing competition conditions by the adoption of Community legislation, especially in the technical sector, on industrial vehicles. Merely to remove the national quota restrictions would not result in liberalization but in new and greater distortion of the conditions of competition. Because of these conflicting elements, which cannot be ignored, it seems to us more realistic and reasonable to adopt a flexible attitude; in this way, we would avoid both too rigid an approach, which would merely compound the total stagnation in the transport sector, and too lax an attitude which would encourage premature action and would suit the game of those who are opposed to any advance in the Community's transport policy.

As Italian Communists, we have a comprehensive conception of transport policy. We believe that allowance should be made for the interdependence which exists between the various aspects of the integration policy and that this rules out unilateral changes. Because of this and despite the misgivings I have expressed, we feel able to support the Commission's proposal but we cannot go along with the conclusions reached by the Committee on Transport. We adopt this stance on the ground of clarity and consistency and remain firm in our determination to try and find the broadest possible basis of understanding between the political forces in this Parliament who, like us, want to promote the integration of the Community, in the transport sector and elsewhere.

IN THE CHAIR : MR ZAGARI

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Nyborg to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Nyborg. — (DK) Mr President, first I should like to congratulate my friend and colleague, Mr Albers, on doing a good job, as usual. At the same time, I regret that he has been forced in the committee to change his original ideas and principles regarding the allocation of transport permits. I shall come back to that shortly.

The main principle of a common transport policy must be the total liberalization of haulage firms as soon as that can be done. The use of quotas is unacceptable both at Community level and bilaterally and involves a lot of unnecessary administrative work. I accept the quota system as a temporary solution, but it is feasible only in so far as the Commission and the Council speed up the rate of increase by augmenting the yearly allocations of transport permits. If the number of Community hauliers with Community transport permits represent only a small percentage, this indicates that the quota approach is acquiring a

more permanent character without solving the problems. The argument often put forward by the Council, especially by the Germans, that an increase in the number of Community transport permits will create congestion on the road system is not acceptable, if only because the Community transport quota covers only a very small section of transport in the Community.

At the same time, we also know that people want to protect the public traffic sector, the railways, at the expense of the road haulage sector. The Council has never been particularly keen on increasing the quota of transport permits; but this Commission proposal for an increase of 20 % makes it clear that the Commission has also now adopted the Council's approach. This is extremely regrettable, because Parliament and the Commission always used to be able to depend on each other's support when we needed to get the number of permits doubled as quickly as possible. Presumably the Commission knows that it is psychologically easier to change a proposal for 20 % into a proposal for 10 % than to change a proposal for 100 % into one for only 10 %. Therefore, we in this Parliament are very sorry that the Commission has taken this line.

We can wholeheartedly support Mr Alber's proposal for an automatic increase of 25 % in the number of permits if the Council does not propose a different, larger increase. On the other hand, I must, as I said earlier, speak against the allocation proposed for the individual Member States in 1980. The allocation proposed by the Committee on Transport, which is based on a linear increase, is not particularly equitable. Since 1975, I have propounded the view that the degree of utilization of the permits allocated should be taken into account when allocating additional ones. The degree of utilization based on tonnes carried per kilometre is a better criterion, since it indicates the actual size of the requirement. But at the same time I must admit that both Ireland and England have certain problems utilizing the authorizations fully because of the sea-crossings entailed. This must naturally be taken into account.

Mr Moreland would have it that I am playing Solomon's game; but I can tell him that I prefer to work with the living rather than play with the dead; that I will leave to him. In an amendment to paragraph 6 in the motion for a resolution on Article 1 of the Commission proposal, I have proposed that the 1980 allocation be made on the basis of a 50 % linear increase and a 50 % increase in relation to the degree of utilization. If that is fifty-fifty, it is in order to take account of all aspects of the problem, including the effective utilization of the permits and I call on the House to vote for this amendment.

As one step on the way to greater liberalization in the transport sector, I urge both Commission and Council to accept Parliament's proposal for a greater increase

Nyborg

in the number of Community permits, not least in view of the unemployment situation. We need to bring our costs down so that we can increase our competitiveness on the world market. We cannot continue to allow restrictions to be imposed on the haulage sector to the detriment of free competition.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, I rise to support the report and also to point out to the House some factors which are relevant to discussion on the quota. The House would do well to keep in mind how this Regulation 3164/76 came into being. It came into being to establish permanently a system for the carriage of goods by road between Member States which before that had been only an experimental system. My colleague from the United Kingdom reminded the House that we are only at the moment dealing with 5% — a very small percentage; but the House would do well to remember the history that lies behind this quota system. In 1977, the Commission proposed the doubling of the Community quota — this, by way, was supported by the United Kingdom Government at the time — but the Council were only able to agree to a 20% increase. In 1978, the Commission proposed a 20% increase in the quota for 1979, but this was reduced by the Council to 10%. Then the Community quota consisted of 3 122 permits, of which the United Kingdom's share was only 355.

Now, under the present proposal of the Commission, the United Kingdom and also the Republic of Ireland will suffer, because if the quota is increased, as the Commission proposes, by 20%, the United Kingdom's share will increase only by 18% and the Republic of Ireland's by only 11%, while Denmark and Italy will get an increase of 25% and the Federal Republic of Germany one of 21%. So there is no doubt that there is a basic unfairness as far as parts of the Community are concerned, and I think that the House needs to keep that in mind.

I would like to remind the House that the carriers from Northern Ireland, though a very tiny percentage of the total in the United Kingdom, have the added difficulty of having to make two sea journeys — one to Great Britain and the other across the Channel to the Continent: that means that they are at a greater disadvantage, and I think the Commission should be reminded that special consideration should be given to them. This, of course, could also apply to parts of the Republic of Ireland. It is not for me to argue their case but I would draw the parallel between the two as we are dealing in this House with the whole Community.

I trust that the House will keep these things in mind when they are voting on this report tomorrow.

President. — I call Mr Flanagan.

Mr Flanagan. — Mr President, like the previous speakers, I also wish to join in the compliments to the rapporteur for his presentation of the report relating to the Community scheme for the haulage of goods, and to mention at the beginning that this scheme represents a major aspect of Community efforts to liberalize trade between the Member States. As has been pointed out, it allows hauliers to carry goods between all Member States, not only on a bilateral but on a multilateral basis.

It is quite clear from the debate so far that the same contentions which have arisen in previous years are equally present today and that therefore there is no real change on what has been a contentious issue up to now. Both Mr Paisley and Mr Moreland have argued very well the case for the Republic of Ireland as well as for the United Kingdom. They pointed out that the double sea-journey for hauliers from the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland and the single sea-journey between Britain and the continent, place those hauliers in quite a different situation to their counterparts on the Continent. Indeed, although there was a difference between Mr Moreland's approach and that of my colleague, Mr Nyborg, Mr Nyborg was himself kind enough to accept that we do have justification for our attitude: while continuing to argue the contrary point of view, which of course, is more suitable for a Dane, at least he was gracious enough to acknowledge that the situation does exist.

Basically it is now up to the House to decide whether the linear approach is or is not the fairer: from our point of view in the Republic of Ireland, it demonstrably is. This has been the argument of various Irish governments. I do not think there has been any change in attitude between the present government and its predecessor in this regard. I can only hope that Members of the House will recall that apart from the fact, which is indeed notable, that Mr Paisley and I should agree wholeheartedly, Mr Moreland agreed with the two of us and we agree with him, and realize that our view represents a fair cross-section of opinion in the House. I hope that the House will accept that the linear method is the fairer, as proposed by the report under discussion. As a corollary, naturally, I also ask the House to reject those amendments which seek to propose any alternative method.

President. — I call Mr Burke.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, your rapporteur has given an admirably clear and complete account of the history and development of the Community quota-system. The report identifies the advantages of the system and examines requirements for its future development with a view to making it harmonize with the principle of Community integration and respond to the needs which result

Burke

from the constant development of trade between the Member States. I therefore do not propose to enlarge on all these points, but would rather explain the motives which, as the rapporteur has observed in his proposals concerning the percentage increase in the Community quota for 1980, have prompted the Commission to appear rather timid.

For 1979, the Community quota increased to 3 122 licences. For 1980, the Commission proposes to raise it to 3 751. I draw your attention to the fact that the figures concerning the quota and the Member States' allocations which are mentioned in the original Commission proposal were calculated on the basis of 1977 statistics. The 1980 data that we now have in our possession will lead to some slight modifications. We have proposed a 20 % increase, on the basis of the development in trade, i.e. accepted figure of 6 %, the intensive use of Community licences, and the necessity to broaden a little the Community quota, which is proving to be one of the means of bringing about the optimum exploitation of road transport capacity.

It is true that we have in the past proposed increases of 100 % in the Community quota. We have not done so on this occasion, because we believe we must take account of the relatively restrictive positions of certain Member States. We must also bear in mind the fact that there exists a Commission proposal for a regulation adjusting the capacity for the transport of goods by road for hire and reward between Member States. This regulation aims to incorporate the system of existing bilateral agreements and to adjust them to the development of trade and to the demands of Community integration on the basis of standard criteria. For the present, however, bearing in mind its experience in the matter, the Commission believes it is preferable to aim for a limited but constant increase in Community quotas, rather than to propose a large and immediate increase which might lead to a stalemate in the Council. You have only to refer to your report to see that the position was stalemated until the relatively recent past.

I now turn to the rapporteur's remarks relating to the introduction of a provision for an automatic increase of 25 % in Community quotas when the Council has not pronounced before a pre-determined date. Such a provision was advocated by the Commission in an earlier proposal. The Council rejected it. The Commission has not this year reintroduced a provision of this nature, partly because the present regulation implies an obligation on the Council to pronounce each year on the adjustment of the Community quota, which was not the case beforehand. Over the years, we have adopted a flexible approach to this problem in order to make as much progress as possible, taking account of the political constraints imposed on us.

I listened very carefully to the contributions of the various Members to the debate, and one of the things

I found was that it was necessary to have a complete gamut of new proposals in regard to liberalization and harmonization before any progress could be made. Reference was made to weights and dimensions of lorries, to containers, to railways, to fiscal harmonization, to petroleum tanks and to a number of other matters. I would like to deal with this in reply, but first I would ask rhetorically the question: How is it that after 20 years of a common market, restrictions still exist on the transport of goods by road? To make this absolutely clear, I would point out that own-account transport of goods by road between Member States, which represents some 50 % of international road transport in the Community, is free from restriction on 60 traffic links out of 72. The Commission has proposed the freeing of all own-account transport, and the Council is at present studying that proposal.

As for hire-and-reward-traffic, the Commission has been trying for some years now gradually to remove the quantitative restrictions on the transport of goods by road between Member States. Unfortunately, we in the Commission have not yet been able to abolish all existing limitations. Some Member States are very reluctant when more flexible measures are proposed. In order to justify their attitude, they invoke road safety and congestion on their road network, the competition that these vehicles create with their railways, the energy crisis, environmental problems and what have you. However that may be, and however unpromising that situation may appear, the Commission continues its efforts to ensure that the road transport of goods can fully meet the needs of intra-Community trade.

The second theme arising from the contributions of Members which I would like now to deal with is the almost theological discussion which takes place whenever these matters are taken up between liberalization and harmonization. I agree that harmonization of the conditions of competition constitutes a major necessity in the common transport policy. The Commission cannot be accused of not having worked towards speeding up the process of removing differences in the competitive situations of the transport enterprises in the various Member States. In addition, we must not forget that a series of the measures concerning the harmonization of social conditions and in relation to state interventions are covered by the framework decision of 13 May 1965.

Notwithstanding this, we cannot make harmonization a prerequisite unless we wish to enter a vicious circle and block everything. I take the point made by one of the speakers, who spoke rather eloquently on this. As far as possible harmonization should be undertaken in parallel, and the transport economy should not suffer any real prejudice if liberalization sometimes advances more quickly than harmonization. The more one liberalizes, the more one will be ready to harmonize. I

Burke

would quote as proof the harmonization of vehicle taxation. No Member State is ready to subscribe to this until the others accept measures concerning access to the market. I would add that even those who subscribe to the harmonization as a prerequisite do not refuse alterations, even if insufficient, to bilateral quotas made necessary by increases in traffic between Member States.

I refuse to accept either thesis as a doctrine. It is necessary to advance on both fronts where possible, never losing sight of the fact that the general economy has requirements that disagreements at the level of the common transport policy must not neglect.

In order to clear up any misunderstandings, I would like to recall to mind that the quotas of Community licences which were allocated to the three new Member States already, to a large extent, take into account their geographical position. In this I listened very carefully to the contributions of Mr Moreland, Mr Paisley and Mr Flanagan. In fact, the quotas in relation to these countries, which were calculated using the same criteria that were used for the six original Member States, were by policy decision, increased noticeably by around 30 %, precisely in order to neutralize the effects resulting from their peripheral situation.

With regard to the distribution of additional licences, the Commission proposes to take account both of tonne/kms accomplished per Member State under Community licences, and of the number of licences which have already been granted to it. The Commission chooses this method because up to now it has enabled it to adjust to the different trends which are developing each time it is necessary to distribute licences. Some prefer a linear share, which is based solely on the volume of the quota which each Member State already has. Others prefer the distribution which only takes account of the utilization that each Member State has made of its quota. For the extra, this method takes into account the interests of the different Member States. Those who use their licences more intensively receive an incentive. Others who, owing to their geographical situation, are handicapped equally get something out of it.

I would also like to say that any suggestion that we are not busy dealing with the railways in a constructive way misses the point. In fact, I would hope with the active help of my services, to increase the attention which we are giving to this important aspect of the common transport policy.

May I also remind the House that the weights and dimensions proposal is before Parliament now for discussion.

Having said that, Mr President, I must reiterate the Commission's position, and with regret I must inform the House that it is not possible for me at this stage to

indicate any Commission support for the amendments.

President. — I call Mr Albers.

Mr Albers, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I should, of course, like to begin by thanking Mr Burke very much for the detailed reply he has given. I am sorry that, if Parliament should decide tomorrow to adopt my proposals, he cannot assure us of the Commission's support. But I would remind him of his own words. He himself said that the number we are talking about is ridiculously low. And 20 % of a ridiculously low figure makes another ridiculously low figure. There can be no disputing that.

I therefore fail to understand why Mr Carossino, the spokesman of the Communist and Allies Group, finds my proposals unrealistic. I think any deviation from twice the number is unrealistic if the idea is to replace bilateral authorizations by a Community system. And when he then said that certain Member States practice unfair conditions of competition in that their social conditions are so very different from those in Italy, for example — he referred to the Netherlands — I just do not understand him at all, because the social conditions under which our lorry drivers work in the Netherlands are, in my view, at present the best in the whole of the European Community.

I completely agree with the view expressed by Mr Helms on behalf of the European People's Party that the Committee on Transport must endeavour to work out a plan for total liberalization and harmonization, a question to which the Commissioner also referred. I completely agree with him on this, but it is wrong to assume that these Community quotas are simply added to the bilateral quotas.

The Commission's proposal and its explanatory memorandum state quite clearly that if the Community quotas are increased, the bilateral quotas should really be corrected. The Member States have control over this and I say this because I am sorry that unlike last year I am unable to find the full support of this Parliament for my proposal, which I also made last year and which was then adopted unanimously.

Mr President, I felt it necessary to say this once again, and I would add that I must advise against the adoption of the amendments tabled by Mr Nyborg. There is a great deal to be said for the arguments advanced by Mr Moreland and also Mr Paisley, that allocation according to utilization may give rise to unfair practices. We have a right to hear from the Commission next year how exactly Community quotas have been allocated. Pending more detailed information it would seem to me wiser to accept the proposal from the Committee on Transport that twice the number of authorizations should be allocated on a linear basis.

President.— The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote, together with the amendments that have been moved, at the next voting-time.

11. Urgent procedure

President.— I have received, with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure :

— a motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti, Mr Habsburg, Mr Klepsch, Mr Bersani, Mr Ryan, Mr Penders, Mr Nothomb, Mr Seitlinger and Mr Fischbach, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), on the situation in Malta (Doc. 1-421/79);

and

a motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Sarre, Mr Zagari, Mr Glinne, Mrs Castle, Mr Estier, Mr Arndt, Mr Motchane, Mrs Cresson, Mrs Fullet and Mrs Roudy, on the South-East Asian refugees (Doc. 1-422/79).

The reasons supporting these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

The vote on these requests will be taken at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

12. Implementation of the 1979 budget

President. — The next item is the oral question, with debate, by Mr Notenboom, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Dankert, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr J.M. Taylor, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Rossi, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr Ansquer on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Budgets, and Mr Aigner, chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control, to the Commission, on the implementation of the Community budget for the 1979 financial year (Doc. 1-307/79):

On 25 October 1978, during the budgetary procedure, the European Parliament adopted the following amendments which were not subsequently rejected by the Council. These amendments were therefore definitively incorporated in the 1979 budget when the President of Parliament declared the budget adopted in December 1978.

Pursuant to Article 205, the Commission should implement the budget accordingly.

Article	353	Public health studies and measures	50 000
Item	3544	Permanent inventory of sources of information on the environment	50 000
Item	3550	Consumer protection studies	50 000

	3552	Consumer protection and information measures	100 000
	3741	Harmonization of industrial laws	500 000
Article	379	Monitoring of freight markets	150 000
Item	3920	Implementation of the education programme	40 000
Article	550	Community measures in support of national regional policies	198 000 000 PA 380 000 000 CA
Article	560	Specific Community measures	35 000 000 PA 100 000 000 CA
Article	930	Non-associated developing countries	16 620 000 PA 50 000 000 CA
Item	2100	Rent (Bangkok and Vienna)	279 800 (blocked)
	2240	Data-processing	Remarks
	2243	EDP equipment	Remarks
Article	254	Measures for young people	85 000
Item	2720	Dissemination of information	Remarks
	3030	Housing for handicapped workers	85 000
	3052	Guaranteed income for workers undergoing retraining	token entry
Article	317	Community supervision of the application of agricultural rules	token entry
Item	3200	Hydrocarbons	4 000 000
Item	3240	Energy-saving programme	7 000 000 PA 16 000 000 CA
	3241	New sources of energy	9 000 000 PA 16 000 000 CA
	3362	Long-term forecasts and assessments	857 000
	3371	Coordinated projects	226 000

Since the debate on the 1980 budget will partly depend on how the 1979 budget is implemented, we should be glad if the Commission would answer the following questions :

1. How did the Commission utilize in the first half of 1979 the amounts adopted by the European Parliament?
2. How does it intend to implement the budget during the remainder of the year in the light of the decisions taken by the European Parliament?
3. Does the Commission regard the adopted budget as a legal basis for the utilization and expenditure of the appropriations?
4. Can it further state whether in implementing the 1979 budget it has experienced difficulties with articles and items other than those listed above?
5. Can it also give a progress report on the budgetization requested by the European Parliament of :
 - Euratom loans (Article 329),
 - Community loans (Chapter 42), and
 - the European Development Fund (Chapters 90 and 91)?

President

I call Mr Notenboom.

Mr Notenboom. — (NL) Mr President, it has become the custom in recent years for the debate on the budget for the next year to be preceded by questions to the Commission on the implementation of the current year's budget and specifically on those items entered in the budget at Parliament's request. The fact that Parliament forms part of the budgetary authority but does not yet have any legislative power, results in a situation in which here and there discrepancies occur between the budget as adopted and its implementation in respect of certain items where the Council, and sometimes the Commission too, feels that an entry in the budget is not sufficient to enable the Commission to spend the money, but that it must first take a legislative decision before the budget is implemented. This attitude is partly, by no means completely, but partly to blame for the inadequate utilization of budget funds, not to speak of the encroachment on part of Parliament's budgetary power.

In the past Parliament has used this budgetary power to introduce new policies into the budget and thus increase the European Community's field of activities. It is therefore important to ascertain whether the Commission has implemented these new policies. There can, of course, be other reasons for the money entered against certain items not being spent or only partly spent. In a large number of amendments Parliament made a change to the explanatory text in the first round last year to the effect that the entry of an amount in the budget represented sufficient grounds for the Commission to spend that amount. The Council then rejected this, and for reasons of which we are all aware, Parliament did not table these amendments again at the December part-session, because it withdrew all amendments except those relating to the Regional Funds, for the important reason that it wanted to demonstrate its power and did not want to see it interfered with.

The familiar magic formula is therefore no longer to be found in the text of the budget, but this does not, of course, mean that the Commission is not fully aware of Parliament's intentions. We are concerned here above all with the familiar complex of the budget on the one hand and with legislative power connected with the budget on the other. Parliament must not encroach with its budgetary powers on the legislative power of the Council, nor does it intend to do so, but the Council must not encroach on Parliament's powers with its legislative power or by not being prepared to exercise this legislative power.

It is therefore a three-cornered problem, as it were, involving the Commission, the Council and Parliament. Last year the conclusion drawn was that it would in fact be better if the Council also attended this debate after we and the Council have had discussions. But the Committee on Budgets had so much work early this year in connection with the supplementary budget and Parliament has meanwhile under-

gone such tremendous change, and there were also a few months in which no work could be done, so nothing has yet come of this. I find that regrettable. This was not intended. I hope therefore that next year this debate, to which everyone attaches considerable importance, can be a three-cornered debate, with the Council also involved. To this end we must make contact with the Council, and I hope that that will be done shortly. Last year Commissioner Tugendhat gave an extremely detailed reply to our questions, and we were very grateful to him. I hope that he will give us another detailed and satisfactory answer now. This is what we need for the important debates and votes we will be having in November. That completes my explanation on behalf of all those who have asked questions.

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, as Mr Notenboom said in his introduction, this is a debate that takes place each year, and it is, I think, now an important part of the budgetary procedure. Important, because obviously it is right that the Parliament should have a debate on the implementation of the budget before actually getting down to the major discussions on the forthcoming budget. It is important that people should see how we have progressed up till now, on the charge which we already have, before they make final decisions on the new responsibilities that should be laid upon us. The Commission therefore welcomes this opportunity, not only to show how it is discharging its responsibilities but also to remind the House of its constant efforts to achieve a full and transparent budgetization of all its activities.

There is only one problem about this debate, Mr President, and that is that it is so detailed and requires such very careful preparation and delivery that I am afraid I find that I have to stick almost entirely to a text in order to be quite certain that the accuracy of what I have to say is fully recorded in the *compte rendu*, so I hope the House will bear with me if what I say seems a trifle dry and if it is not as agreeable or as easy to listen to as one might like.

Before, however, getting down to the driest though none the less important details, there is one point which I think I should deal with at the beginning, and that refers to the third of the questions asked:

Does the Commission regard the adopted budget as a legal basis for the utilization and expenditure of the appropriations?

On this point, I do not think I can really do more than refer you to the statement I made a year ago; but it might be as well if I restated it, in view of the many changes that have taken place since then. To the Commission the budget, as adopted, constitutes the legal basis indispensable to the use and expenditure of appropriations. Without the appropriate budgetary entry, there can be neither expenditure nor receipts.

Tugendhat

However, this basis is not always alone sufficient. There are cases where the legal basis constituted by the budget has to be underpinned by separate legislative bases. The two instruments are complementary; one authorizes the allocation of appropriations, the other establishes the conditions under which they may be used. If one is lacking, the operation cannot legally be carried out. Indeed, your rapporteur, Mr Dankert, on the 1980 budget takes up a very similar position when he notes in his report:

Although ... the budget can be a sufficient basis for the authorization of expenditure, it is not possible to maintain that it is always a sufficient basis. Certain new activities, for which the Treaty has not provided the necessary powers, require a separate legal basis.

Now, clearly, there also cases where the appropriations are for the implementation of well-defined and specified actions of a limited nature, and in these cases, which our French colleagues refer to as *actions ponctuels*, the Commission uses the appropriations and incurs the expenditure in accordance with budgetary rules alone. Mr Bangemann, the rapporteur last year, sought to distinguish in the budget commentary between these two categories. The Commission welcomes this sort of constructive thinking on what is admittedly a difficult and contentious area.

The other point I need to make at the outset concerns something which Mr Notenboom himself referred to in his closing remarks, and that is the need to clear up the differences of interpretation which might remain in practice. Now, I think that the suggestion put forward by Mr Shaw, the rapporteur for the 1978 budget, to have a conciliation procedure on the interpretation of Article 205 should be taken up. The Commission has supported this initiative, and I am delighted to hear that it is once again in the forefront of the House's attention; I am sure that this is something which needs to be done.

Now to the detailed comments on the individual items. To begin with, I turn to the first two questions asked:

1. How did the Commission utilize in the first half of 1979 the amounts adopted by the European Parliament?
2. How does it intend to implement the budget during the remainder of the year in the light of the decisions taken by the European Parliament?

I shall try to answer both questions when I deal with each of the 23 budgetary items mentioned in the list. In respect of each individual item, I shall refer to the total amount entered in the budget and not only to the additional amount entered by the Parliament through various amendments to the Council's draft budget. This is because I believe, as I have said in the Committee on Budgets in other circumstances, that one cannot say that this portion of the amount is Council money and that portion is Parliament

money: once an entry has been duly recorded in the budget and the budget procedure has been gone through, it does not matter who voted the money: it is all there. You cannot say that one half of a can of milk belongs to one cow and the other half belongs to the other cow, and that you should take them each out separately: once the milk is in the churn, it is all the same. We certainly regard an entry in the budget as something which we should seek to the best of our ability to fulfil, and we do so without regard to whether the money was placed there in the first instance by one arm of the budgetary authority or the other: they are both equal as far as we are concerned.

I should also like to remind the House that four times a year the Commission publishes a report giving the exact state of implementation of the budget. The latest report, which is now about to be published, will give the situation on September 30, and it will, of course, be sent to the Parliament and to the Council. To honourable Members who have not been familiar with our procedures in the past, I would like to point out the importance of this report, which gives a running commentary on the extent to which we are fulfilling the tasks which have been laid upon us.

To take the various items in the order in which they appear in the budget — and there are a great many of them — I start with Item 2100: Rent. The amount of 279 800 EUA, intended for the new offices of the Commission in Bangkok and Vienna, has been distributed among various budget lines within Chapter 21, as was originally intended. Expenditure has been incurred and amounts have been paid according to the needs of these new offices. The opening of the delegation in Vienna was decided on 10 October 1978 and that of Bangkok on 20 November 1978. All the conditions were therefore fulfilled for expenditure to be incurred and charged against the 1979 budget. Both offices, I am happy to say, are now operational.

We come next to Items 2240: Operation of the computer centre, and 2243: Development of data-processing applications, which I shall take together. For these two items, the European Parliament, by amendment, added to the Remarks column that proceeds for re-use were estimated at 380 000 EUA for Item 2240 and 160 000 EUA for Item 2243. These proceeds arise from the SAFIA operation, which is a computerized system for allocating interpreters to the various meeting and conference rooms. This new system started operating in April 1979, but it is not yet working at full capacity. The receipts from the other institutions, including Parliament, are re-used to cover the rent of screen terminals and the programming work. The forecast amounts of 350 000 and 160 000 EUA can be confirmed as correct estimates. Approximately half of these sums have been ploughed in and re-used.

Tugendhat

Regarding Article 254 : Measures for young people, of the 360 500 EUA initially proposed by the Commission in its preliminary draft budget and finally reinstated by the Parliament, 354 000 have been committed and 342 000 have been paid to the Forum for Youth Affairs as intended.

Item 2720 concerns expenditure on information, publicity and participation in public events. The purpose of the amendment adopted by the European Parliament was to specify in the Remarks column of the budget that among the various activities to inform the public of the aims of the European Communities, particular stress would be laid on the activities of the European Social Fund. The information activities of the Social Fund are being intensified through the publication of articles and by introducing the Social Fund as a theme for conferences and visit programmes. It is also envisaged to publish a booklet on the Social Fund and to make a film about it.

Item 3030 concerns pilot housing for handicapped workers. Expenditure on these projects for handicapped workers has by now absorbed the carry-over of payment appropriations from the previous year. That was some 200 000 EUA, and a beginning has been made on utilizing the provision in the 1979 budget of 465 000 EUA, including the 85 000 added by the Parliament. As a result of the sizeable carry-over of unused credits and of the delays liable to affect construction projects which underlie the carryover, it seems possible that, in turn, part of this year's payment appropriation will be carried forward to 1980. On the other hand, the present forecast is that the 1979 commitment appropriations will be fully spent by the end of the year.

As a result of a parliamentary amendment concerning Item 3052 : Guaranteed incomes for workers undergoing retraining, this item now appears in the 1979 budget. It had not been proposed by the Commission in its preliminary draft budget, because the Commission thought, and continues to believe, that such expenditure is appropriate to the Social Fund. Since the Social Fund in fact makes a substantial outlay for the same purpose, the Commission does not believe it necessary to make a transfer to this line, which at present has only a token entry.

I come now to Article 317 : Community supervision of the application of agricultural rules. This item covers the cost of analyses and professional fees of experts engaged by the Commission to carry out enquiries and inspections in the Member States to verify that Community rules are being correctly applied. It appears with a token entry in the 1979 budget. Eight thousand EUA have been transferred from Article 315 and have recently been committed to cover the mission expenses of two independent experts going to Italy to check the storage conditions in 12 warehouses controlled by the Italian Intervention Board.

Item 3200 concerns Community technological development projects. On this line, 20 m EUAs have been entered in the 1979 budget and, taking into account commitment appropriations left over from last year, a total of 46 m EUA in commitment appropriations were available. Of this amount, 3.7 m have been transferred to other lines and 12.9 m have been committed. Of the remaining 30 m, 22.5 m will be committed very soon, as the Council has adopted the proposal put forward by the Commission for 24 new projects. The Commission therefore has every reason to believe that all the funds available will be committed by the end of the year. Payments will then be made in conformity with provisions in the contracts which necessarily means with certain delays following the commitment.

Item 3240 concerns the programme for Community energy-saving and 3241 the development programme for new sources of energy. By its amendments, the Parliament entered the amounts on the line instead of blocking them in Chapter 100 according to the Council's wish. For these two programmes very little has been committed in the first eight months of this year, because the implementing regulations were not adopted by the Council before 9 April 1979. It then appeared that the contracts thus authorized by the Council entailed expenditure slightly in excess of the available credits. The Commission therefore decided to reinforce the line by a transfer from Item 3200 of 1.6 m EUA to Item 3240 and 1.4 m to Item 3241. The Commission is about to conclude for these two items a first *tranche* of contracts, thus using up the total amount of appropriations which had been carried forward from 1978 to 1979 and part of the amount entered in the 1979 budget. The Commission thinks that by the end of the year the total amount of commitment appropriations should be used.

Item 3362 concerns long-term forecasts and assessments. Of the 957 000 EUA available in commitment appropriations, 272 000, i.e. 28 % have so far been committed. Of the 857 000 available in payment appropriations, 165 000, i.e. 18.6 %, have been paid. The Commission intends to commit another *tranche* of 220 000 before the end of the financial year.

This may sound insufficient, but the Commission is, however, not entirely to blame. The programme, which should have started on 1 January 1978, has been somewhat delayed, because the Council did not in fact adopt it before 25 July of that year, 1978. Further delays were then incurred in the allocation of temporary staff and in the setting up of the management committee. It must be pointed out that commitment appropriations for research programmes remain available as long as necessary. Unlike other appropriations in the budget, they are not automatically cancelled if not used, they can only be cancelled by a specific decision under the budgetary procedure.

Tugendhat

This is equally true for the following line : Item 3371, on the implementation of coordinated projects. Of the total amount of 226 000 EUA both in payment and commitment appropriations, 100 000 have been committed and 66 000 paid. The Commission will commit the entire amount before the end of the year.

I now come to Article 353 : Public health studies and measures, Item 3544 : Permanent inventory of sources of information on the environment, Item 3550 : Consumer protection studies and Item 3552 : Consumer protection and information measures. Thanks to the parliamentary amendments, the appropriations proposed by the Commission have been either maintained, as in Article 353 and Item 3544, or even increased, as with Items 3550 and 3552. The position on these items of a social nature appears to be broadly satisfactory. We expect the appropriations to be fully used by the end of the year, and the main reason for the limited take-up of funds at the half-year point in certain cases is that the relevant contracts have not yet fallen due for renewal.

Item 3741 deals with the harmonization of industrial laws. Of the total amount of 500 000 EUA, 90 % has so far been committed ; the rest will be committed in the next few months. Thirty studies will thus have been launched, the results of which are expected to be available by the end of the first quarter of 1980.

Regarding Article 379 : Monitoring of freight markets, on this line the Parliament last year reinstated the total amount requested by the Commission, i.e. 300 000 EUA, whereas the Council wanted to reduce it by half. Nearly 60 % of this amount has been committed. Further contracts for the monitoring of freight transport are now ready and will soon be concluded. As a result, almost the entire amount will be committed before the end of the year.

Item 3930 is expenditure on cultural projects. Of the total amount of 240 000 EUA, 100 % have been committed and 65 % have been paid.

I now come to the major item : Chapters 55 and 56, on the European Regional Development Fund. As far as the quota section of the Fund, i.e. Chapter 55, is concerned, it is anticipated that the commitment appropriations will, as usual, be fully utilized before the end of the year. As regards the payment appropriations, while there has been an improvement in the rate at which payments are made during 1979, partly due to the introduction of accelerated payments as provided in the revised Regional Fund regulation, it will not be possible to use all the payment appropriations entered in the budget before the end of 1979. That is why the Commission, when calculating the payment appropriations to be entered in the preliminary draft budget for 1980, took account of the fact

that appropriations amounting to approximately 200 m EUA were likely to be carried forward from 1979.

As far as the non-quota section of the Fund is concerned. I have to admit that the Commission has only just put forward the necessary proposals for the Council regulations which will permit implementation of Chapter 56 of the budget. This delay was due to the fact that the Commission, subsequent to the adoption on 6 February 1979 of the revised Regional Fund regulation creating the non-quota section, had to pursue a prolonged series of bilateral contacts with the Member States regarding the measures to be proposed. One should not expect the appropriations to be used before the end of 1979. This is, I confess, a rather unsatisfactory state of affairs, even if, I am bound to point out, these appropriations will not be cancelled but will be carried forward into 1980. So there is an unsatisfactory situation here. I hope I have done something to explain the reasons for it.

Article 930 concerns financial cooperation with non-associated developing countries. The Commission has always taken the view that this line relates to a Community policy which normally requires for its implementation a Council regulation. Until now, this regulation has not been adopted and has now been the subject of a conciliation procedure for several months. The Commission hopes that it will be adopted before the end of 1979. Even if this is not the case, however, a proportion of these credits will have been used before the end of the year on the basis of an *ad hoc* procedure by which the Council approves a list of specific projects to be financed. The Commission, for its own part, is ready to implement, in so far as it has processed the applications for funds which it has received from non-associated developing countries, and has just submitted its programme of action to the Council.

I have to point out that the present situation as regards the implementation of the cooperation policy with non-ACP countries and the present decision-making procedure, which, because of the absence of a framework regulation, is imposed on the Commission, is really most unsatisfactory. Because there is no regulation, the Council retains all the powers of selection and approval of the projects. Because the Commission has to prepare a full and detailed programme before it can seek the Council's approval, it follows that the programme is inevitably adopted towards the end of the year by the Council, which means that only part of the appropriation can be committed and hardly any payments can be made. The Commission, when it submitted its proposal for a Council regulation in February 1977, never thought that it would take such a long time for it to be examined and adopted. The Parliament adopted its opinion in April 1977, and in June 1978, upon receiving the Council's common approach, formally requested the opening of a conciliation procedure. A conciliation meeting actually took

Tugendhat

place on 19 September 1978. Since then, nothing has happened between the Council and the Parliament. The Council seems to have resumed its discussions at the level of COREPER, but the Parliament does not seem to have taken any steps to reopen the procedure. I hope very much that Parliament will take up this issue again in order to find a satisfactory solution as soon as possible, and I am sure that Mr Notenboom and I are in agreement on this matter.

That deals with that set of items. I come now to other lines in the budget where problems arise. The authors of this question also ask the Commission whether we have met any difficulties in implementing the budget in respect of items other than those listed. I would like to mention four cases where problems exist, mainly because of the failure of the Council to decide.

The first is Item 3201, which concerns exploration projects in the hydrocarbon sector. I will dwell for a moment on this, because I think it is a story which has some lessons for all of us. It is a general problem and it is worth bringing up in a general debate. In the course of discussions in the Committee on Budgets on the draft budget for 1980, considerable criticism has been levelled at the Commission for its apparent inability in the past to indicate whether in the forthcoming year it would be in a position to implement the credits it had, at an earlier stage in the year, proposed in the preliminary draft budget. This is a point which has run like a *leitmotif* through our discussion this year. The Commission has taken that criticism to heart, as indeed it should, and this year has made an effort to indicate clearly to the Committee on Budgets those lines, especially ones where large sums of money are involved, where we have doubts as to our capacity to implement and for what reason. So we have been asked the question directly, bluntly: Can you implement if you have the money? And we have sought to provide the answer. Of course, as I explained in the Committee on Budgets, the fact that we are not for some reason able to implement does not mean that the question has lost any of its political importance, or its political urgency, or that it has in any way ceased to be a political priority. We were asked direct questions about whether we could spend the money, whether it was worth your while therefore to reinstate it, and we sought to give as full and frank a series of answers as we could. Now, in the case of this particular item, exploration projects in the hydrocarbon sector, in 1978 the Commission entered into the budget 15 m EUA in commitments and 5 m in payments. Because the Council had still not adopted the regulation, put forward in 1974 and modified in 1977, there was no expenditure that year, and the money was carried forward to 1979. This year, the Commission has succeeded in spending this money, but only to the

extent of 3.5 m EUA, as a result of the adoption by the Council of an *ad hoc* regulation authorizing specific action in Greenland. The Commission intends to commit this amount, and pay 30 % of it as soon as the contract is signed.

As regards next year, when the Commission came to draw up the 1980 budget, it proposed 20 m EUA in commitment appropriations and 10 m in payment appropriations. It is now clear, however, that the Council will once again not adopt a regulation in time for significant expenditure of these appropriations to take place in 1980. In response, therefore, to Parliament's request for information on the likelihood of execution, the Commission made this clear in the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee has nevertheless restored the appropriation in full. There are other examples where this has occurred.

Now the general point which I want to make here is that if Parliament seeks to ensure that the Commission implements the budget which it has adopted, it must not set the Commission impossible tasks which run counter to the criteria for entering appropriations in the budget which the Parliament's own budget rapporteur has laid down. I have emphasized this point because I know there is great concern in the Parliament about implementation of the budget. Great concern was indeed expressed in the last Parliament, and I am sure that it is a matter of which we shall hear more in this Parliament.

I am very anxious that the Commission should implement the budget as fully as is possible in accordance with the responsibilities that are laid on us. I therefore welcome the request put to us by the rapporteur of the Committee on Budgets to state in clear language whether or not we can spend the money, and we have tried to answer the question as fully as possible. Indeed, I know that the rapporteur himself clearly explained in the committee whether he thought the money could be spent. On the other hand, Parliament has every right to disregard the rapporteur's advice, and, indeed, our advice: it has every right to insert items in the budget whether or not we have any chance of spending them. I think, it is important to make this point, because otherwise we shall subsequently be judged by criteria that we are unable to live up to. If our debate is to be on equal terms, then I think one has in the friendliest possible manner to make these points clear at the outset. That is what I am doing now. I believe that the Committee on Budgets and ourselves have a common interest in getting this matter right, and I hope we can work shoulder to shoulder in so doing.

How having made that general point on a specific item, I would like to take three items together: Items 3230, 3710 and 3750. With regard to Item 3230: Use

Tugendhat

of coal in power-stations, our proposal dates back to December 1976, so clearly there is a problem there. Item 3710 is technological research in the aerospace sector. A first series of projects was submitted to the Council in August 1967. In these circumstances, the Commission is inevitably now seriously considering whether it is sensible to pursue these proposals which have lain on the Council table for so long. Item 3750 concerns, as many Members will know, since it attracted a lot of attention in the House, measures on behalf of certain crisis-hit industrial sectors. The proposal for a Council regulation here was submitted in October 1978. Now all these lines have one common characteristic: appropriations were entered on them in the 1978 budget which if they are not used will be cancelled at the end of 1979. In order to salvage part of these appropriations earmarked for industrial restructuring, i.e. Item 3750, the Commission intends, as an exceptional measure and because the basic regulation stands little chance of being adopted before the end of the year, to submit to the Council a specific programme of action for the textile industry, and in particular for the synthetic fibres industry.

Mr President, I now come to the last of the major items under this heading, and the Social Fund payment appropriations. I need hardly remind Members that this is a field in which certain problems have been encountered in the past. The position regarding commitment appropriations is entirely satisfactory. The Commission approved the first series of applications for an amount of 150 m EUA on 15 June 1979, and the second series, adopted by the Commission last week, involved an amount of 620 m EUA, thus practically exhausting the total sum which is available.

The position regarding payment appropriations is, however, rather different. On 30 September 1979, 266 m EUA had been paid of the total amount of 827 m EUA available, including 300 m carried forward from last year. The second *tranche* of decisions having been adopted by the Commission in October, the corresponding applications for advance payment will not be received by the Commission before December 1979. We do not expect to receive them before then. Consequently, the rate of spending payment appropriations in 1979 is likely to show less improvement over 1978 than we had originally hoped. I have to point out in this connection that the implementation of the 1979 budget is affected by the payment backlog of some 300 m EUA which accumulated in 1978, mainly because Member States made very little use of the exceptional facilities they were offered under which they could have received up to 85 % of commitments in respect of operations carried out before 1978. Now, this is an important item in the budget, there is a lot

of money involved, and therefore I think it is worth considering this particular item and the reasons for it in some detail.

There are two outstanding issues on which I think the Commission's view and Parliament's view are very similar — at least our view remains unchanged and I hope and believe that Parliament's view remains unchanged. First of all, the budgetization of borrowing and lending operations. The Commission has always shared the concern which Parliament has repeatedly voiced on this subject. In June 1978, when the preliminary draft budget for 1979 was presented, the Commission put forward a proposal to the Council which, by modifying the Financial Regulation, would have had the effect of introducing into the budget for 1979 a special section reserved for borrowing and lending operations. This would have been clearer and more informative to the budgetary authority than the traditional annex, which records only the transactions already carried out. Although the preliminary draft budget for 1979 was prepared as if the proposal had met with approval, the Council could not come to a decision in time to use the new arrangement in its draft budget. This and the final version were therefore retained in the traditional form.

Although discussions on the proposal lapsed for a certain time, the Commission hoped that the Council might take a favourable decision in the course of this year. The preliminary draft budget for 1980 was therefore prepared as though this was already the case. Despite the assurance given by the Presidency that the discussions would be resumed in September of this year, they did not in fact take place. Therefore in 1980, as in 1979, the Council draft budget has retained the traditional form. The Council discussions were in fact not resumed until 17 October, and therefore it is difficult to envisage that a decision will be taken in time for the change to be made before the conclusion of the present budgetary procedure. I should like to stress the concern which the Commission feels over this matter and the extreme urgency with which we believe it should be treated. We believe that the reform which we proposed last year represented an important step forward. I know that at that time there were many in Parliament who believed the same thing, and I hope very much that we shall be able to make progress on this matter now with the enhanced effort that I hope will be put behind it.

Finally, something which certainly we hold very dear and to which we attach a great deal of importance: the budgetization of the European Development Fund. The Commission has for a long time proposed that the European Development Fund be brought within the budget. It has specifically renewed its proposal in connection with the negotiation of a new

Tugendhat

convention with the associated countries of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. I myself restated clearly the position of the Commission in my speech on the 1980 budget last July. Accordingly, the Commission introduced once again the framework necessary for including the new EDF in its preliminary draft budget for 1980; but it was again deleted by the Council when it adopted the draft budget on 11 September 1979.

Mr President, that brings me to the end of an extremely exhaustive list, and a list which it was no doubt a trifle exhausting to hear. What I have sought to do is, first, to answer the specific questions which have been put to us by the Parliament and, secondly, to draw attention to problems which were not put to us but which we felt in the light of your general approach you would like me to say a few words about. I have tried to explain why we have not always been able to commit or to spend as much as we would like, and I have also tried to emphasize the concern which I share with the Committee on Budgets of this Parliament, with your rapporteur and with, I suspect, a number of members of the Council, that we should ensure that, as far as possible, the budget represents not just that which we should like to do — it must represent that which we should like to do — but also that which we can do, so that we can be sure that money which is put into the budget can really be used. This in turn means that money will be available where it is needed. The worst thing that could happen is for one set of items to be deprived of funds because money has been earmarked in the budget for other items on which it cannot be used.

That, Mr President, is what I have tried to do and what I have tried to avoid. I now look forward to hearing the views of the House.

President. I call Mr Colla to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Colla. — (NL) Mr President, Mr Tugendhat, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group sees this oral question as a run-up to the debate on the giving of a discharge for the 1977 and 1978 financial years and the fundamental problems arising in connection with the actual spending of budgetary appropriations. But this request for a kind of interim report on the situation in 1979 is, in our view, prompted above all by a desire to prevent our November discussions on the 1980 budget from being pointless. I agree with Mr Tugendhat that we should avoid using the margin available to Parliament for appropriations which it is almost certain cannot be spent. And so I come to the first crucial problem, which also gave rise to this question. That, for example, a high percentage of a given appropriation is in fact spent is a good thing. But if it is not spent, not even a small percentage of it, a

percentage that would for all practical purposes tally with the increase voted by Parliament, then we are definitely on the wrong course because it means that Parliament's contribution is being lost. An examination of the items on which an explanation is requested gives us an opportunity to define a number of our ideas, our concern being specifically that the political and social options underlying the budget should be taken.

The first question on the situation in 1979 concerns a number of energy items and is certainly not unimportant when we compare the present situation with that in 1978, when no payment appropriations and hardly any commitment appropriations, or none at all, were utilized for the technical development of hydrocarbons, energy conservation measures and research into new sources of energy. The explanation Mr Tugendhat has given us and a number of developments in this sector have caused us considerable concern. I have the impression that, on the one hand, the Council is holding up the decision-making process with the procedure it follows and that, on the other hand, the volume of expenditure is in practice no longer fixed by the budgetary authority and that in fact increasing recourse is being had to a kind of compulsory expenditure. A tendency of this kind is all the more worrying when I realize there is a danger of this procedure being extended to other fields such as industrial policy and aid to developing countries.

Secondly, we consider it important for a few comments to be made on aid to developing countries. We see this as a touchstone of our willingness to pursue a proper development policy towards the non-associated countries. And the question is undoubtedly to what extent has a legal basis already been created for this, and I must say immediately that we cannot agree to proposals from the Council which would ultimately undermine the Commission's rights and means of exercising control. The Regional Development Fund shows that not only the figures are important. I have heard that Mr Tugendhat has been very generous in the figures he had submitted, but I believe that what lies behind the figures is of primary importance. And the questions I should like to ask concern the extent to which payment and commitment appropriations actually contribute to the levelling of the major differences between the regions and, secondly, the sharing of investments between infrastructure and industrialization. And above all — and I hear that the Commission has at last drawn up a proposal on this — what is the situation as regards the non-quota 5%? My group would like to see this question treated as matter of the utmost urgency because we believe that the non-quota portion is a very important regional policy instrument. Mr Tugendhat was rather vague about expenditure in a number of other sectors.

Colla

I am thinking of consumer protection, environmental problems, housing, handicapped workers and action in favour of young people. You have given us very little precise information on these questions, and I will tell you why we attach so much importance to them: this directly elected Parliament and the European idea must be able to impress themselves on public opinion through social progress in these sectors. It will not have escaped Mr Tugendhat's attention — and his statement confirmed this — that one of the key questions is, of course, whether the budget can be regarded as an adequate basis for the spending of appropriations, and we look forward with very great interest to the development of new ideas in this context. I must tell you, Mr Tugendhat, that we would very much like to study the system of *ad hoc* actions in depth, that we consider them justified and that the Commission can count on us in its efforts to implement the budget so that this does not remain a dead letter. Mr President, it goes without saying that we strongly urge the budgetization of Euratom loans, Community loans and European Development Fund loans. And as a newly elected Member of Parliament I am rather surprised that although this question was fully discussed some time ago in the excellent report by Lord Bruce of Donnington, we have still not made any progress at all. Particularly in view of the constant increase in agricultural expenditure and the pressure on non-compulsory expenditure we call for the budgetization of these loans. Above all we feel that their exclusion from the budget is an obstacle to effective and reliable democratic control by Parliament. Mr Tugendhat, you should not regard these remarks as a formal reproach but rather as an indication that this directly elected Parliament, in our opinion, must, can and will not be an academic institution, but one which defends its rights and one which will closely observe the implementation of the Community's budget.

President. I call Mr Aigner to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr Aigner. — (D) Mr President ladies and gentlemen, I am now speaking not only as the spokesman of my group but also as chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control. I would point out straightaway that in the latter capacity I shall have no competition at all, since the views of the Committee on Budgetary Control are exactly the same as those of my group.

As a result of my dual capacity I shall not require the full ten minutes. But first I should like to thank you, Mr Tugendhat, and the Commission, because I have the impression — one of the first tasks of the Committee on Budgetary Control being the verification of the implementation of the budget — that the

Commission has really endeavoured to implement the budget in accordance with the political will of the budgetary authority.

Although I have begun by thanking you, Mr Tugendhat, I must add a remark straightaway: you have not crossed the Rubicon. You have unfortunately said nothing about the real problem. What is the real problem? It was mentioned briefly by Mr Notenboom. This Parliament, together with the Council, forms the budgetary authority. But we do not have legislative power. The rights of Parliament's Committee on Budgets has a true political purpose only if these rights of Parliament are used to initiate new Community policies, i.e. if Parliament, which is able to take decisions by a majority, pushes through new policies in areas where the Council is unable to do so because of the blocking tactics of frequently a single Member State, because the Council is unfortunately still bound by the unanimity rule, if, in other words, Parliament succeeds in breaking through the Council blockade.

That is what we considered the object of our budgetary work to be in the old, non-directly-elected Parliament, and we did manage to achieve a good deal that would not have been possible without this budgetary right. That is the starting position. Now, of course, a conflict arises here. The Commission says: we have here a budget, the appropriations have been entered by Parliament but the Council will not create the legal basis for spending the appropriations, and the Council is the only legislative body. And so all our budgetary rights become virtually an absurdity. The budget cannot be implemented as the budgetary authority requires.

That is the real problem, Mr Tugendhat, and you must now take the plunge. I realize that you, and I am referring not only to yourself but to the Commission as a whole, are afraid of a dispute with the Council. But you will not escape the dispute with Parliament. You must choose which dispute you prefer to be exposed to, the dispute with Parliament or the dispute with the Council.

(Applause)

However, this Parliament has been given new legitimation by the elections and must also make use of it. And this Parliament has an instrument it can use against the Commission, one the Council does not have: we can send you home to contemplate what you have done wrong.

The Council cannot do this, but Parliament can. But Parliament must also have the will to use this instrument. And it can and must use it when really vital interests of the Community are at stake.

We have established, therefore, that we are in conflict with the Commission over the implementation of the budget. I should like to say this to the Council: when

Aigner

a budget has been approved — even if the nine Finance Ministers do not agree — and Parliament has adopted this budget, it must be implemented as it has been adopted, even if it has been adopted against the Council's will, because that budget has become legally binding.

Who, then, holds executive power over the budget? Unfortunately — and this is the strongest reproach I can address to the Commission — we no longer have a Commission which fights for its own rights, and after all under the Treaties — or at least this is the stated objective of the development of the Community — the Commission is primarily the executive. But unfortunately the Commission — and I must be saying this for the tenth time — is increasingly becoming the Council's secretariat. The time has come for you to stand up to the Council. That is why I feel we of the Committee on Budgetary Control should examine the whole matter in detail and then report to Parliament if we feel the Commission could have done more than it has. I admit that there has been an increase in the Commission's goodwill as regards the implementation of the budget. The presentation today is very different from what we had a few years ago.

Above all else we are concerned with two things. I have described one of the conflicts: legislative power. The second, Mr Tugendhat, is this: when you are implementing the budget, get away from those legions of national experts. You do not take a single decision these days without having consulted this, that and the other management committee, this, that and the other national body. Of course, coordination is necessary, but the responsibility and the decision is yours. Cut back this process of consultation. Get out once in a while. If you had been through the last election campaign, you would know what the greatest criticism of the European Community was, namely that the bureaucracy in the Community is gradually assuming frightening dimensions. Of course, people did not know that this is not the bureaucracy of the European Community at all, but the bureaucracy of nine Member States, which send all their legions to Brussels to defend national interests every time a unit of account is spent in an attempt to safeguard national interests down to the last detail. That is not, of course, the way to implement a budget as Parliament sees it.

That is one of the major criticisms. You must make a greater effort to force yourself into the role of the executive. I must tell the Commission, Mr Tugendhat, and you know this as well as we do, the rights of Parliament stand and fall with the Commission's ability to defend its own rights. If the Commission's rights are lost, we have lost 50 % of our own rights. So if you do not adequately defend your legal position, the legal position of this Parliament will also be weakened, and we cannot simply accept a fine report and say: well, there just happen to have been difficulties with the

administration of the appropriations, with the proclamation of the appropriations, and so on.

How can we solve the conflict caused by the fact that the Council is the legislative body and we only — I stress 'only' — have budgetary rights? As a lawyer, I should like to say the following, and you have confirmed this in committee: the approval and adoption of the annual budget is just as much a legal act as a regulation or a decision or whatever it might be. In other words, this legal act must also have its implications. If in the case of a given operation a further legal act is required and we feel the Council should take action, but it does not do so, then there is only one conclusion that I can draw.

Mr Tugendhat, if there is this conflict — the budget as a legal act, but no legal act from the Council — how can it be solved? The underlying idea of the whole Treaty, of the three Treaties of the European Community, is this: when two bodies depend on each other's cooperation, and one body does not pull its weight or does not want to act at all, the other body automatically assumes the creative power. If the Council is guilty of not implementing the budget because it has not taken the necessary legislative action, Parliament must have the political courage to take that action itself. That is a daring interpretation, I admit, but we do have the means to do it. We will ask the Commission to implement the budget as we have adopted it and then the Council can go to the Court of Justice and file an action against the Commission. That is the normal way to solve disputes between legal opinions. So let the Council go to the Court of Justice and sue the Commission and say: you are acting against the law. Then we will see who is right and who is really helping the European Community to achieve progress.

There is not enough time now, Mr Tugendhat, to refer to individual items, but I should like to say just one thing: in the draft budget for 1980 you have submitted to us an industrial policy programme in which you state specifically how appropriations will be utilized. What then is preventing you from implementing the budget in the textiles sector, the footwear industry, the ceramics sector, for example, for which you have fully developed programmes. As this budget has been adopted, you can implement it, regardless of whether or not the Council agrees. In 1980 we will really have to see, and I will close with this, whether you prefer to fight Parliament or the Council. The choice is yours.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr J.M. Taylor to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr J.M. Taylor. — Mr President, may I first congratulate Mr Notenboom on his introduction and Mr Tugendhat on the great detail of his reply. In the conclusion of his remarks he said that he hoped his

Taylor

presentation was not exhausting. May I say that it was extremely comprehensive and far from being exhausting. He took great pains to put the position to us as he saw it, and that is very much appreciated by this Parliament.

Perhaps I could also in passing say how much we appreciated the spirited speech from Mr Aigner and his references to the importance of the authority of the Court of Justice.

Let me say first, Mr President, that although the Community is rightly bound by the principle of annuality, the 1979 budget can be looked at in the light of preceding budgets and the forthcoming budget for 1980. To do so, however, gives rise to considerable anxiety, because a line drawn through successive agricultural budgets rises as a proportion of the total Community budgets is, of course, set to collide with the limits of the Community's own resources. It is no secret that this Parliament is intent on doing something about the first of those problems, whereas the second problem will be a matter for the Community as a whole. I hope, however that when we do consider the exhaustion of our resources, there may be some enlightened and original thinking that will get the Community off what I might call its three-legged stool and into the area of some new Community resources, which of themselves may go some way to remedying the lopsidedness and the unfairnesses inherent in the present Community budget.

Mr President, having said these things, may I content myself with three observations, two of which Mr Tugendhat has already touched upon? Firstly, it would be appreciated, I think, by many of us if at some stage the Commission could catalogue for us in a document those areas where he has experienced the greatest problems in implementing expenditure in 1979, together with a commentary on why he encountered those particular difficulties.

In the second place, cooperation with the non-associated developing countries is seen by many of us for various reasons to be critically important. There are the perfectly proper reasons of wishing to help those countries and also of wishing those countries to come into our markets, because many of them possess resources that we do not. The opportunity for trade is clearly of advantage to both sides. When, therefore, we heard the explanation from Mr Tugendhat as to why there had been a shortfall in expenditure on aiding those countries, we were disappointed, although it rang true. I wonder, therefore, if I could ask him whether at some stage, in the light of those frustrations, he could put forward some proposals as to what might be done in future to facilitate an area of expenditure that, I think, most of this Chamber considers a perfectly proper expenditure.

My final point, Mr President, is this: when the Commission puts in hand research and development

projects — and it does indeed put in hand such matters; we have seen a catalogue of some of them in the working-paper — would it take particular care to bear in mind — and if it has it in mind, would it continue to bear it in mind and possibly lend it a little emphasis — the desirability of using the expertise of organizations and individuals especially equipped with practical and operational experience? We look at all the problems for which the Community has no little concern and regard, the related problems of energy and transport, of the storage of electricity and the search for new transport systems that may be independent of oil and petroleum; those problems and those policies were all reflected in the preliminary draft budget from the Commission. Now, when the Commission is aiming researches in those important directions, would it please endeavour to eschew the academics wherever possible and concentrate on consulting those who have lost their innocence in such matters, if I may say so, those who are accustomed to meeting challenges in a practical way and overcoming them, those who by their nature and background are determined not to fail? Can we obtain our research as far as possible from the areas of practice and operational experience?

Mr President, with those remarks I would like to thank the Commissioner for his very detailed speech to us earlier in this debate.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Baillet to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group,

Mr Baillet. — *(F)* Mr President, this debate on the implementation of the Communities' budget for 1979 is taking place at the right time. As we approach the decisive stage of the budgetary procedure for 1980, it gives us a chance to recall the circumstances in which the budget was adopted last year and to learn some valuable lessons for the future.

While welcoming the debate, however, I do not share the misgivings of those who tabled the oral question, which was signed by every group except the Communist and Allies. Nor do I share some of the views advanced.

What are we talking about? the 1979 budget was declared adopted by President Colombo in circumstances of which we disapproved at the time. In passing and adopting that budget, Parliament was, in fact, acting *ultra vires*. Without going into the complexities of the budgetary procedure, I will merely remind you that the House exceeded its margin of manoeuvre in adopting an amendment on the Regional Fund. No one was under any illusion about it. The Press referred to what it called Parliament's show of strength. In the House itself, I remember

Baillot

Jacques Eberhard, for the French Communists, being alone in drawing attention to this high-handed act and denouncing it while other speakers made no secret of their determination to extend the House's powers.

Such determination is nothing new. It has been expressed in deeds in default of its expression in law. In budgetary matters, the powers of the European Parliament are laid down in the Treaty of Rome and the treaties of 1970 and 1975. We stand by these provisions for the prerogatives of our national Parliament, to which the Government is answerable for its policies. But, since 1975, all we have seen is the European Parliament nibbling away and *de facto* extending its powers. I will give two examples but there are no doubt many others.

To take the first: the proportion of expenditure on which, under the treaties, Parliament had the last word was originally very small. This was administrative expenditure. In practice, Parliament has managed to get a considerable increase in this proportion and intends to increase it still further at the expense of appropriations for the agricultural policy. Everyone realizes, of course, that the amendment passed by Parliament last year concerning the Regional Fund was a blatant expression of its determination to have the last word even more. A resolution passed by this Parliament says so in so many words, when it states that the European Parliament regards the European Council's practice of fixing appropriations to the Regional Fund as challenging Parliament's rights in a sector which at last has been acknowledged as belonging to the sphere of non-compulsory expenditure. It is clear, however, that this *de facto* claim has never been supported by an amendment of the Treaties.

Second example: in 1975, Parliament passed a resolution in which it asserted its sovereignty within its margin of manoeuvre. In 1977, it adopted a budget exceeding this margin without evoking the slightest reaction from the Council. In both these cases, there was a *de facto* extension of Parliament's budgetary powers and it took place with the tacit consent of the representatives of the States.

Thus, the national Parliaments are faced with a progressive erosion of their budgetary powers.

At one time, decisions were taken in Brussels by the Governments; then the European Parliament asked to monitor and, then, to take them itself. Mr Aigner's speech was very revealing on this point. We on these benches want to draw attention to these things because the man-in-the street is hardly aware of them. We shall do so here and when we meet our fellow-citizens and until there has been a change in the law, we shall insist on respect for the sovereignty of our national Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Ansquer to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Ansquer. — (F) Mr President, as happened last year, several groups have tabled an oral question on implementation of the Communities' budget for 1979. They have done so in order to find out what happened to the amendments passed by this House. When the budgetary proceedings are about to begin, it is necessary and proper for us to know how and to what extent the appropriations voted, wholly or in part, on the initiative of the House, have been or will be used.

The question has become a tradition. Quite apart from its particular context, however, it raises two basic issues: the function of the budget and its monitoring by Parliament.

The annual repetition of this debate means that the Commission's answers on these two questions cause less and less surprise. I should like to remind you of the position of the European Progressive Democrats in this matter. We believe that the budget should be the instrument of Community policy and a precision tool of the economy. It should, accordingly, show every operation and every expenditure by the Community, whether the information is given for guidance or, on the other hand, entered as a specific item.

As regards implementation of the budget and, especially, Parliament's monitoring of it, my Group considers that adoption of the budget means that the budgetary authority has appended its signature, that Parliament and the Council have approved its contents and that, in consequence, the budget must be implemented. On the question of the legal basis for expenditure, an area where we have not made much progress, my Group's position is clear: in the case of secondary appropriations or those allocated for individual operations, the purpose of which is clearly defined and identified, no further decision is required from the Council. This kind of appropriation does not require any special legal justification because the budget constitutes the legal basis for its utilization. That, in any case, has been the practice in recent years. On the other hand, in the case of an operation which involves a new policy, the budget is no longer a sufficient legal basis and the expenditure is conditional upon the adoption of an appropriate regulation. Nevertheless, if the Council has adopted the budget without making any reservations concerning the regulation, it is bound to adopt the regulation within the financial year concerned. This implies that the Commission has done the job of making a proposal, which is not always the case. It was the obvious value of having accurate information about the implementation of the 1979 budget and the desire for its contents to be transparent, especially where any allocation of responsibility is involved, that persuaded our group to associate itself with this oral question.

President. — I call Mr Tuckman.

Mr Tuckman. — Mr President, I have been listening to this debate with the ears of a complete newcomer, and there are a number of things which have struck me. It seems to me that these figures tell a story. They describe a conflict between three institutions which a complete layman — which I am not — would have thought were there to serve one purpose, and one purpose only. In actual fact, the constant theme is one of substantial conflict with Parliament. Sitting here, I sometimes wonder whether the Ministers who originally set it up knew what they had in mind, because I get the impression that we are not really wanted and it would be so much better if we were not here. I also got from Mr Tugendhat's statement, the impression: 'I'm being wooed: he wants me as his ally'. And he is making a very good job of it too.

I get slightly puzzled and worried when I consider that the Commission is so much more vocal and able to make a case than is the Council. To me the message of the Council — if there is one — has not come across at all.

I want now to talk to Mr Aigner in German. In fact he is not here, but he can read this in the Report of Proceedings.

(D) I liked very much what he said and how he said it. I liked it because it was interesting and lively and because this institution means something through him. But I am worried about one thing: if he now sends our friend, Commissioner Tugendhat, into battle, which battle will he choose: one he can win or one which he will lose?

(The speaker continued in English)

I am not one of those who want to go federalist, as I think a lot of the German delegation seem to be going. I think that goes very much further than our populations would want us to, and if we picked a quarrel which meant having to go the federalist way, I think we should lose. On the other hand, the contribution which I have heard from our Communist colleague represents a position that is so restrictive as to be an entire contradiction of what we are here for.

I like the way Mr Aigner wants to go, I like the fact that for once we seem to have a politician in the House who avoids being drab and factual and boring, and goes into something exciting, leading us into a kind of battle. My worry is: will he be choosing a battle where, if I follow him, I am going to get shot before I have even started?

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Gouthier.

Mr Gouthier. — *(I)* Mr President, the Italian Communists agree with the substance and purpose of the question before us. The debate gives us an opportunity to have a more general and comprehensive discussion on the budget since, in our view, there should be the closest possible relationship between a decision on a political activity and the implementation of that decision and of that activity, especially in the case of a new line of policy which, after a battle, Parliament has succeeded and is succeeding in embodying in the budget.

However, between such policy decisions and their implementation a period of time must elapse before the political decisions of Parliament can have any practical effect. On this point the careful statement by Commissioner Tugendhat provides us with plenty of food for thought. We agree that the question of monitoring the budget is not just a matter of checking the accounts; it involves delicate political issues, such as Parliament's role, powers and functions (which, in our view should be increased) and the relationship between the roles played by Parliament and by the Commission. We believe the Commission should be encouraged to make fuller use of its responsibilities and to take decisions firmly and openly in accordance with the policy lines laid down by Parliament.

That is the basic issue, politically speaking. Unfortunately, if we go further into what Commissioner Tugendhat said, yet another basic problem emerges. In the case of decisions which can be described as routine or administrative, the Commission acts at once but when it is a case of an innovative policy decision made by Parliament or which Parliament has managed to impose — I am referring to what was said in connection with the Regional Fund — we find that, as in the case of the budget, the decisions of Parliament take a long time to be put into effect.

We Italian Communists are not unaware of the responsibilities of the Commission and of the responsibilities and unsatisfactory role played by the Member States and we intend to give increasing attention to the process of monitoring the way in which the budget is implemented and to Parliament's supervisory role. We certainly do not see this role as primarily an accountancy one but as an essentially political function which is an integral element of Parliament's general political responsibility. The more Parliament's decisions are given practical effect and the more political words are converted into deeds, the greater will be the prestige of the elected Parliament, the greater will be its negotiating strength in its dealings with the Council and the Commission, and the greater its political clout in Europe.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Normanton.

Mr Normanton. — Mr President, although we are debating the 1979 budget, I should like to draw on my work as the rapporteur for the Committee on Energy and Research on the 1980 budget to add to what has already been said by my honourable friends in the course of this debate.

Perhaps at the outset — and this must obviously be a brief contribution — I may say that the energy elements of Community budgetary policy should be put into correct perspective. In a nutshell, the budget as an instrument of policy is about as relevant to the economic and political problems facing the Community as an aspirin would be to the miserable victim whose head rested on the block of *Madame la Guillotine*. Ironically, Mr President, the Community's head does, frankly, rest on the executioner's block, as far as energy — or the lack of it — is concerned. Yet the Council's budgetary proposals, year after year, have been no more relevant than that aspirin to sufficiently reducing or resolving the acute and still growing dependence of all nine Member States on imported energy supplies.

The Council's proposals for expenditure on the energy budget, in itself the very lifeblood of 280 million people, fail to recognize our economic and political vulnerability. Our dependence on imported oil, gas and uranium — and now, in these recent weeks, on imported coal as well — makes all other budgetary expenditure irrelevant. Yet within the Community we have supplies of an indigenous fuel — coal — sufficient to last for another two or three hundred years at least. The Committee on Energy and Research has again, as in the past, placed the very highest priority on the Commission's proposals for the use of coal in power-stations — Item 3230, to which Commissioner Tugendhat referred. We had hoped in 1979 that the Council would allocate financial aid to the stocking of coal. It was clearly desirable even at a time when stocks were high; but now, as the stocks are suddenly beginning to decline — indeed, to collapse — we are still not resolved to come forward with appropriate resources.

Our second priority as a committee is for new sources of energy, including geothermal and solar energy, gasification and liquefaction, and fusion. Yet when we analyse the appropriations earmarked for these new sources, we can only describe them as a mere pittance compared with the resources which would be necessary to make these desperately required supplies of energy available in the Community.

In the light of past experience, Mr President, my committee remains highly cynical, highly critical and highly sceptical of the Council in all its past handling of the energy policy in general, and of the budgetary aspects of it in particular.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Balfé.

Mr Balfé. — Mr President, I think that Mr Aigner, when he spoke, was in danger of leading us into a very dangerous situation, although it was a very interesting speech, as has already been said. He was, in effect, saying that if the budget is the only legal instrument of the Parliament, then anything that goes into the budget must *per se* be based on a legislative instrument — the budget — and therefore it should be implemented; Mr Tugendhat should go to court if it is not implemented, and he may as well be hung for a sheep as for a lamb.

This is not a very sound basis for attacking the Commission for not spending all its money. I thought that Mr Tugendhat put up a pretty good defence of his department, and since then we have heard a variety of opinions on the expenditure, including two very interesting — and, I would have thought, almost contradictory — points of view from the Communist party.

What I think we have to decide, quite simply, is the extent to which Parliament can put items in the budget, which are completely new, knowing when it puts them in that no legislative basis exists for them to be spent. I think that Parliament has to be well aware that the budget is open to criticism in as much as we put money in it with no legal basis for expenditure. The Commission is to some extent caught in the middle. It is caught between Parliament, which, as has been said, can dismiss the Commission, and the Council, which, as has not been said, in effect, both finances and appoints the Commission. That, I think, is why there are certain difficulties. Nonetheless, no satisfactory mechanism has yet been established, in my view, for monitoring the budget. Bearing in mind the many organizations I deal with, there are much more satisfactory methods of both looking after accounts and reporting to the respective bodies who are responsible for those accounts.

I was attracted by the suggestion that there should be a regular report from the Commission on areas where there is difficulty in implementing expenditure. I think that report could with advantage begin right at the preliminary draft budget stage, with the Commission saying quite clearly that if we insist on putting certain money into the budget, it might well be impossible to spend it. During the year there is certainly value in our being told regularly both how much money is being spent, under which subheadings, and what the difficulties are in spending the rest. I personally would also find it useful to know how much of the money which has been voted into various subheadings has either been transferred, as in the case of

Balfe

Chapter 100, or been applied elsewhere because it is impossible to spend it where it was originally placed. Maybe after some time in this Parliament it will become clearer to me how such things happen.

The final point I should like to make is that this question really marks the interim between the making of the budget and the discharge for the budget, which does, of course, lie completely at the discretion of Parliament. The important lesson, I think, that we should draw from this question though — and here I am really addressing the Parliament, rather than attacking the Commission — is that since it has been made clear that there are difficulties in implementing certain areas of budgetary expenditure, we really must bear this in mind when, next week and the week after, we sit down to look at the final shape we are going to give this budget. It is one thing to ask the Council and the Commission to be responsible, but it would be irresponsible of this Parliament to insist on placing sums in a budget which it has every reason to think it would be difficult, if not impossible, to spend.

Speaking in a personal capacity, and not on behalf of the Socialist Group, I do hope this Parliament will bear that in mind when it considers this budget, and will be especially careful of seeking to extend the influence of Parliament where no budgetary or legislative authority exists. Let us make sure that we have a job to do before we vote the money to do it.

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, you have particularly asked me to brief, and I will obey your injunction. However, that leaves me with the choice of either dealing very inadequately with the debate that has taken place, or else seeking to answer what seems to me potentially the most difficult and important aspect of it. I have chosen the latter route, and I would like to take up some of the points made by Mr Aigner. Unlike my compatriot, Mr Tuckman, though I have a Germanic name, I am unable to do it in his own language, but we have always managed to operate very successfully through the headphones in the past.

Now Mr Aigner posed the question in very stark terms. In the old days, in the 18th century, we had highwaymen in England, and when they stopped your coach they used to say, 'Your money or your life!' In effect it was my money or my life, in more ways than one, that Mr Aigner was demanding from me during his speech.

Now I must say that I do not see the evolution of the budget in the same way as he expressed it there. There is much on which we agree. I certainly support the view that it is right for Parliament to use its budgetary powers to the full. I absolutely support that view,

and I believe it is right that Parliament should be resourceful in finding new and perhaps ingenious ways of ensuring that its powers are applied to the full. I am sure that we would all agree that in the past it was not just a matter of there being more power in the Council than in the Parliament, but it was also a fact that the Council was perhaps sometimes more resourceful at finding ways of making use of its powers than was the case with the Parliament. It is right that both arms of the budgetary authority should be equally resourceful and equally vigorous in the application of their powers.

However, we must do this within the law, and that is recognized in your rapporteur's report. When I made my initial speech, and I will not bore people by repeating it, I specifically quoted the rapporteur's report in support of my contention that the budget is a necessary but not always a sufficient condition of implementation. You cannot spend money without it, but often you need to have a legal basis as well. This is not a peculiar, personal view of mine, nor even of the Commission's. It is a substantial legal point, and we in the Commission are bound to operate according to the law. We are the guardians of the Treaty, and if we are not the guardians of the Treaty, we are very little else. But the law should not be a strait-jacket, nor need the law be a strait-jacket. The law can be, and in our Community it should be, a flexible instrument.

It has demonstrated its flexibility in the past when the conciliation procedure, in which Mr Aigner has played a distinguished part, was devised — partly, I may say, by the Commission and Mr Cheysson, my predecessor, partly by the Parliament and Mr Spénale, who is unfortunately no longer here. The conciliation procedure provides an alternative to conflict and war. It does provide a machinery within the context of the Community whereby differences can be reconciled. It is often boring, it is extremely tedious, it is very lengthy, but then negotiation usually is, and it is usually the only way in which you can finally reach a solution.

Now I recognize, and I am sure that other people in this House who have participated in conciliation in the past would agree with me, that the Council has not always taken conciliation as seriously as perhaps one would like. There were times in the past when very few Ministers were present at a conciliation meeting when only the President-in-Office spoke and none of the other Member States. It has not always been a satisfactory machine. It has not always worked as it should though I have noticed that since this Parliament was elected the conciliation procedure seems to have perked up somewhat. When I was at the last conciliation procedure, at which Mr Aigner was also present and Mrs Veil led the Parliament's delegation, I

Tugendhat

noticed that it seemed to work a great deal more the way it should than it had in the past, and I think that the deepening and development of the conciliation procedure does provide a way of building up the Community — through creative tensions, certainly, but without actual war.

I recognize — and this is my own view — that sometimes conflict is inevitable, that sometimes war cannot be avoided, but I really do not think it is the best way to proceed. If the Commission is to maintain its credibility as an initiator and an executor, it does have to have the confidence, the absolute confidence, of both sides of the budgetary authority, of the Parliament and of the Council. It is true, of course, that the Parliament can sack us, and maybe the day will come when it does so. But it is also true that we have to work according to the law and with the confidence of both sides of the budgetary authority.

Clausewitz said that war is an extension of diplomacy by other means, and in a sense, of course, he was right. But the problem is that conflict often leads to a great deal of destruction, and we are in the construction, not in the destruction, business. We are constructors — all of us, Parliament, Council and the Commission. And I do not believe that European construction is such a strong thing at the moment that it can tolerate a great deal of conflict. Conflict may be inevitable, but I believe it is our duty to find ways of resolving these problems which do not involve conflict.

I believe that some of the ideas circulating now about devising new and interesting ways for Parliament to use its powers provide a very good example of how that can be done. I think the evolution of the conciliation procedure provides an example. I think the further deepening and evolution of it in the future provides a way forward, and I appeal strongly to both sides of the budgetary authority, to the Council even more than the Parliament — although the Council is somewhat absent at the moment — to take seriously what we already have at our disposal and to make it work. I believe that if we can take seriously what we already have and make it work, we find a way of developing the budget so that it is a better instrument for fulfilling Community policies and for fulfilling the will of the Community, and certainly for fulfilling the will of the people who sent Members from all parts of the Community to this House to build Europe.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Notenboom.

Mr Notenboom. — *(NL)* Mr President, I have another five brief comments to make in a few minutes. Firstly I should like to say that it was not our intention that, for example, Mr Spinelli should not be invited to sign these questions. We had to contact people in a great hurry after the meeting and he had already gone. But his French colleague is not among

the authors because his opinion differs from that of all those who have signed the questions.

I should now like to thank Mr Tugendhat for his reply to the questions, which again has been very detailed and clear. I also wish to thank those who have taken part in the debate. The Commissioner's answer was even more satisfying than last year. We have drawn somewhat closer together again.

The Committee on Budgets and individual members would do well to study this answer in depth. We are, of course, not in a position to draw our conclusions on each item at this stage, but they will be important for the debates at the coming part-session.

As Mr Tugendhat has said, Parliament, the Commission and the Council must speak one with the other. Perhaps the next debate can include the Council and perhaps there can be prior consultation. We must try to find a consensus.

If this is not successful, the House has heard from Mr Aigner what other course is possible. That is not the course we would choose but it is a course which, if Parliament has the courage and if enough Members are in favour, should be taken. The explanation of this possibility has livened up this debate a great deal.

Finally, Mr President, I note with gratitude that this is the first time that despite the late hour a debate of this kind has taken place with so many Members present. This is an extremely positive sign. It is not after all a matter for the budget experts alone, it is a matter for us all, and I am very grateful that so many Members have listened to the Commissioner and the other speakers. Only if Parliament has a strong, a large, a convinced majority in this matter, will it be able to exercise the powers of which almost all of us spoke with such conviction during the election period. These powers are not all written down on paper, some of them still need to be put into practice by a convinced Parliament. The very great interest that has been shown in this subject is perhaps an indication that there will be a development in this direction in the near future.

President. — The debate is closed.

13. *Harmonization of Member States' policies on social legislation*

President. — The next item is the oral question, with debate, by Mr Pininfarina, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Commission, on the harmonization of Member States' policies in the field of social legislation (Doc. 1-384/79):

The Commission is asked to report on the measures already taken, and currently in progress, to harmonize the policies of the Member States in the field of social legislation and to give its opinion on the present state of industrial relations, with specific reference to all laws relating to equal competition between undertakings and equality between workers in the Community.

President

One of the more obvious obstacles to real European integration is the often considerable disparity in legal provisions on labour relations between the various Member States. This problem has immediate effects on undertakings and workers in the Member States, since it places them on an unequal footing, with direct repercussions on competition and consequently productivity and working conditions; undertakings and workers engaged in the same activity are bound by different legislation according to their location. The efforts being made in every field to harmonize the policies of the Member States and the laws governing the life of European citizens should, in the questioner's opinion, be matched by more uniform European social legislation.

I call Mr Pininfarina.

Mr Pininfarina. — *(I)* Mr President, I raised this question because I think it is time we discussed the harmonization of legislation in the Member States governing the relations between employers and employed. It is a subject of great social and political importance and one of considerable interest to all who long for the day when Europe is really united.

In common with others, I am dissatisfied with the extent to which the Governments of the Member States allow the Community institutions freedom to act. I think the Community suffers from a lack of balance. However, Europe will not achieve unity merely by increasing the appropriations to the Regional Fund but rather as a result of efforts to harmonize practices and conditions inside our great Community and to generate a greater degree of equality between its citizens. I do not, of course, mean an oppressive and frustrating equality but equality of opportunity. Work still takes up most of a man's life and if the institutions of the Community are to have any impact on this basic fact of life for its citizens, this means working for a political objective based on human beings, a fundamental duty for anyone involved in politics.

The difficulty today is that employers and their workers have to operate in the context of legislation and of relations, institutional and otherwise, between social partners which vary enormously from one Member State to another. Given the same level of technical know-how and of human and financial resources, there is still a very great difference today between being an employer in Turin, Lyons, Manchester or Hanover, even though each of them manufactures virtually the same product and supplies the same market. Why should a Fiat, Renault or Volkswagen worker employed on the same work in the same kind of factory have to do his accounts on the basis of pension schemes, social security systems, pay structures and transfer arrangements which vary enormously? It is hard to understand why, for example, in

Italy workers are engaged by number and not by name, which means that a worker cannot choose which firm he has to work for and the firm cannot choose who is to work for it, whereas in other countries such official machinery for the direction of labour would be considered illegal. Of course, the whole question bristles with difficulty because it covers a wide area of responsibility, not least that of the social partners, each jealous of its independence and anxious not to lose any of its political power in the State.

The fact remains that this House is the proper place for the subject at least to be discussed and studied. It involves some of the basic principles of the Treaty of Rome: the maintenance of the competition rules as well as achievement of the aims laid down in Article 117, which affirms 'the need to promote improved working conditions and an improved standard of living for workers, so as to make possible their harmonization while the improvement is being maintained'.

In terms of advice and political authority, the European Parliament can do a great deal to identify the weaknesses of the various systems operated in the countries of the Community and help things to change. The objective should be to take the laws and regulations in the State where they have produced the best results and at least cost and apply them in all the States. This does not mean standardizing social policies but harmonizing them, in other words, placing them in a framework based on laws which are mutually compatible. The problem to be resolved is that of the efficiency of Europe's economic and social system and the way in which it compares with the efficiency of countries outside the Community, especially the United States and Japan. The well-being of the European economy and, for the employers and workers of the Community, equality of working conditions are the two great objectives which demand a policy of harmonization on the lines I have described.

I have looked into some aspects of social and labour legislation in the Member States; I refer, in particular, to the machinery for the provision of labour, the salary structures and the social security systems and I found that the differences between the countries represented here are sometimes very great indeed. I should like to hear the Commissioner's views on how they can be reduced. Arising from the action taken some years ago, what impression did the Commissioner gain from his contacts with the Governments and the social partners? To what extent do these differences arise from social, cultural and historical causes which are impossible to eradicate in the short term and to what extent is there any common ground on which to start the process of approximation?

Pininfarina

In view of the imminent and, of course, welcome entry of Greece into the Community and, later, that of Spain and Portugal, I think it would be unwise to change existing labour law so as to incorporate Community provisions before our three new partners make their entry. This would only add to the chaos and further complicate the problem.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that the situation calls for an energetic policy which is not confined to certain aspects, such as the question of a reduction of hours of work which, when viewed in isolation, loses much of its importance. Nevertheless, without being inconsistent, my Group proposed this morning that this important issue should be the subject of detailed consideration.

Recently, the Commission sent some welcome advice to Italy on the subject of the sliding scale, a device which it has not encountered in other countries of the Community and which is widely regarded as one of the causes of the high level of inflation in my country. Although the Commission's action is welcome, it is not much use if, like hours of work, it is taken in isolation. This reinforces my view that a political appraisal should be made of the whole question of harmonizing social legislation but the House must first of all undertake a thorough and well-researched investigation into the subject with the help of the social partners. A contribution from them which relates to their respective spheres of authority is, in my view, essential and the same applies to the Social and Economic Committee. I reiterate my intention to table, at the end of this debate, a motion for a resolution which takes account of what the Commission and other speakers may say.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Vredeling.

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. *(NL)* Mr President, there is very little time available to discuss this very important question, the harmonization of social legislation. I will begin by expressing my thanks to Mr Pininfarina for raising this matter with his oral question with debate. Policy in the field of social legislation is still very much in its infancy at Community level. The Treaty offers only an extremely weak basis for this, since it really only refers to the promotion of close cooperation among the Member States in social matters. On this narrow basis, we have achieved some advances under a social action programme adopted by the Council in 1974.

As regards social legislation in the narrower sense, there are a number of directives. One directive concerns collective dismissals. Another relates to the maintenance of workers rights when businesses change hands, and there are three very important directives on the equal treatment of men and women.

In addition, the Council is now discussing a framework directive on health protection and safety at the workplace. Also before the Council, and in its final stages there, is the directive on the protection of workers' rights in the event of the employer's bankruptcy. There is also a supplement to existing Community legislation in the field of the social security of migrant workers and a supplement for the self-employed and those not gainfully employed.

In addition, we are working on the development of the social content of the sectoral structural policy, beginning with the steel sector. As you know, an important proposal has been put forward on this subject, and it will be discussed by Parliament during the budget debate.

Then there is all the work that has been done on the free movement of workers. I would point out straightaway that the idea here is that the migrant worker moving from one country to another will enjoy the same social protection as the nationals of the Member State concerned. So that is somewhat different from harmonization of social legislation as a whole, it is concerned with the granting of rights to individual citizens, to the workers, and these rights still differ very considerably from one Member State to another.

The question by the honourable Member also refers to the effect of social legislation on productivity and conditions of competition. Mr Pininfarina referred to this in his presentation. I should like to make two comments. Conditions of competition and the like are in no way solely concerned with social legislation as such. The whole social policy should be discussed, including payment for work, including — as the honourable Member himself said — the topical issue of the redistribution of work. We are working on this. I do not feel that this is the time to go into this in great detail. Parliament will be receiving an important communication shortly. We are discussing this with the social partners, and very soon the Commission will adopt its position. I am hoping that this might even happen tomorrow and that the social partners can then be consulted in early November on the position we will submit to the Council. The redistribution of labour has facets that touch on legislation in the social field, an example being overtime. In some Member States overtime is governed by law, in others by collective agreements, but it does in fact affect the legislation. Permanent education, as we call it, is another aspect of this kind. Part-time work and flexible or early retirement are subjects with legislative aspects and thus come under this harmonization.

A second remark I should like to make on the honourable Member's question is this: he is aiming at equal conditions of competition, even as regards labour as a cost factor. I must admit that that has hitherto also been the main inspiration of the social policy in our

Vredeling

Community. The directives I referred to on collective dismissals and so on Treaty and are directed at making conditions of competition more equal. A very clear example to show how far we can take this is Article 119 of the EEC Treaty on the equal treatment of men and women. I was personally in at the start when the negotiations were taking place on Article 119, which was prompted by one of the Member States, France, because the situation there, and in the textile industry in particular, as regards equal pay for men and women was different from the situation in the other Member States. Here too the original motive was to achieve equal conditions of competition, but proceeding from that basis the Community developed a policy on the equal treatment of men and women which goes well beyond equal conditions of competition. This policy was rightly introduced and has rightly resulted in women having the social right to be treated in the same way as men. It can therefore be said that the process has been evolutionary, with the original object of equal conditions of competition developing into efforts to achieve a far higher and far better goal than the restricted goal of equal conditions of competition. The Commission would like to see the same evolutionary process occurring in other fields. But here too we have to deal with the Council, which is extremely conservative and hesitant in this area. We can give examples of matters which the Council does not usually discuss when we submit proposals, one being the question of illegal migration, which has been before the Council for so long without it being able to come to a decision. There are other examples. I could unfortunately give so many, but I will not.

I will confine myself to essential remarks on this subject. We must proceed from the idea of changing the philosophy, not from creating equal conditions of competition, even though that is, of course, one aspect of social policy. Social policy should be an object in itself and that is a somewhat broader framework than the criterion of creating equal conditions of competition. The Commission has already introduced this, when it submitted the document on monetary problems to the European Council. This document on the prospects for Economic and Monetary Union contains the main lines for our efforts to achieve better coordination, harmonization if you will, and equal rights in the field of social security. We are drawing up minimum criteria for social legislation which must be developed further in the future to encourage the harmonious development of the national social systems. We will be proposing Community arrangements in the field of labour law and indeed we have already done so in some cases. I have referred to the directives on collective dismissals, the equal treatment of men and women, industrial safety, the special programme the Council has adopted, safety and health at the workplace, the improvement of working conditions and so on. And we are now working on the question of the redistribution of labour, a subject we have raised at European level in

the Council. In our studies we have kept in close touch with the European trade union movement and with the European employers. We would like to arrive at framework agreements at European level in the interests of the further development of the redistribution of labour, without wanting to treat everything uniformly, but with the aim of bringing together the principal features of the redistribution of labour. In this we must, of course, cooperate very closely with the social partners. I agree with the honourable Member on that, and we are doing this. We have even had, for the first time in the history of the Community, when discussing this subject, representatives of the European employers' and employees' organizations around one table, and the discussions with these European-level groups will shortly be resumed in the presence of the Commission.

I agree with Mr Pininfarina: we must refer to a global approach to social security at European level. We are, of course, dealing with questions such as the financing of social security. That is one of the central issues. It must be considered when we speak about further progress towards Economic and Monetary Union. I would remind you that at one of the first meetings of the Heads of State or Government the then Chancellor of the Federal Republic, Mr Willy Brandt, now a Member of your Parliament, spoke of the development of the European Community into a social union, as he then called it. This is also what the Commission is aiming at. One of the most important questions in this is financing. Various interesting proposals have been put forward, for example the recent suggestion that the financing of social security should be based more on added value, a proposal that we shall take into account in our deliberations. There are major differences between the Member States on the extent to which social security imposes on national income. I have figures on this, which I will not give because time is so short, but from the multiannual estimates on the development of social security a number of conclusions can be drawn which show that there is no harmonization at the moment. As progress is made towards Economic and Monetary Union, the Commission must ensure that the dispute between 'monetarists' and economists does not recur. The 'monetarists' used to say first monetary and only then economic, while the 'economists' said first economic and only then monetary. The danger is that economic integration, or economic convergence as it is now known, will result in a similar dispute. I should like to warn against this from the outset. The policy of economic convergence in our Community which must follow the monetary movement that is now under way should from the start have an integrating social effect.

A difference between economic convergence and social convergence must not be allowed to occur. It should be one policy. The Commission is on the alert, all its members are working together, each in his own area of responsibility, to ensure that this happens. We will very shortly be having extremely important discussions on this.

President.— To wind up this debate, I have received, with request for an early vote pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure, the following two motions for resolutions on the harmonization of Member States' policies in the field of social legislation :

- that by Mr Pininfarina and Mr Bangemann, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-413/79/rev.); and
- that by Mr Peters, Mr Loderer, Mr Vetter, Mr Delors, Mr Puletti, Mr Didò and Mr Van Minnen (Doc. 1-423/79/rev.)

These requests will be put to the vote at the beginning of Thursday's sitting.

In accordance with the decision of 15 January 1979, the debate will now be suspended in view of the hour. It will be resumed at the beginning of Thursday's sitting.

14. *Urgent procedure*

President.— I have received a motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Maffre-Baugé, Mr Martin, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Demarch, Mr Pranchère, Mrs Leroux, Mr Fernandez, Mr Piquet, Mr Damette and Mr Wurtz, with request for urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the situation of wine producers and the consequences which the decisions of the Council will have for wine production in the Community (Doc. 1-424/79).

The reasons for the request for urgent procedure are contained in the document itself.

This request will be put to the vote at the beginning of tomorrow morning's sitting.

15. *Agenda for the next sitting*

President.— The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, 24 October 1979, with the following agenda :

10 a.m. and 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. (possibly until 9 p.m.):

- Decision on the adoption of urgent procedure for six motions for resolutions ;
- Statement by the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers on political cooperation (followed by debate) ;
- Oral question to the the Commission, with debate, on the European Monetary System ;
- Oral question to the Commission, with debate, on emergency aid for Vietnam and Cambodia ;

3 p.m. :

- Question-time (questions to the Council and the Foreign Ministers) ;

4.30 p.m. :

- Voting-time :

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 8 p.m.)

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 1979

Contents

1. Approval of minutes	100	
2. Documents received	100	
3. Membership of Parliament	100	
4. Decision on urgency		
<i>Mr Klepsch, Mr Glinne; Mrs Bonino; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Hoffmann on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Lady Elles on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mrs Roudy on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mrs von Alemann on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group</i>	100	<i>Mr Ansquer; Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Delors on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Herman on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mrs Poirier on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Damseaux on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Hopper; Mr Leonardi; Mr De Goede; Sir Brandon Rhys Williams; Mr Ortoli; Mr Ansquer</i>
<i>Point of order: Lady Elles; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mrs Squarcialupi</i>	102	<i>Point of order: Lord Harmar-Nicholls</i>
<i>Mr Debré; Mr Glinne; Mr Klepsch; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Pajetta</i>	103	
<i>Point of order: Mr Sutra</i>	104	
<i>Mr Sarre; Mrs Dienesch; Mr Berkhouwer on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mrs Poirier; Mr Sutra on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Diana on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mrs Barbarella</i>	104	
5. Statement by the President of the Foreign Ministers on political cooperation		
<i>Point of order: Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group</i>	107	
<i>Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers</i>	107	
<i>Point of order: Mr Paisley; Mr De Goede; Mr Spicer; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr O'Kennedy</i>	115	
<i>Mr Alber on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD)</i>	116	
6. European Monetary System and international monetary system — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-387/79)		
7. Question time (continued) (Doc. 1-405/79)	128	
Questions to the Council:		
<i>Question No 50, by Mr O'Connell: Youth employment</i>		
<i>Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council; Mr O'Connell; Mr O'Kennedy; Ms Cluyd; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Almirante; Mr O'Kennedy</i>	128	
<i>Question No 51, by Ms Cluyd: Cost of meetings</i>		
<i>Question No 52, by Mr Schwartzberg: Seat of the European Parliament</i>		
<i>Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Schwartzberg; Mr O'Kennedy; Ms Cluyd</i>	129	
<i>Point of order: Mr Spicer</i>	130	
<i>Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Balfe; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Paisley; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Radoux; Mr O'Kennedy</i>	130	
<i>Point of order: Mr Galland; Mr Denis</i>	131	
<i>Question No 53, by Mr Poncelet: Ratification by the US of the GATT multilateral trade negotiations</i>		
<i>Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Poncelet; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Welsh; Mr O'Kennedy; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr O'Kennedy</i>		
<i>Point of order: Mr Schwartzberg</i>	132	
<i>Question No 54, by Mr Flanagan: Infrastructural aid for Irish ports</i>		

- Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Flanagan; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Moorhouse; Mr O'Kennedy* . . . 132
- Question No 55, by Mr Spicer: Investment conditions for Community firms in the ACP States*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Spicer; Mr O'Kennedy* 132
- Question No 57, by Mrs Ewing: Hill farming in Scotland*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mrs Ewing; Mr O'Kennedy* 133
- Question No 58, by Mr Prout: Decision-making in the Council*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Prout; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr O'Kennedy* 133
- Question No 60, by Mr Møller: Workers' co-ownership rights and 'economic democracy'*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Møller; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr O'Kennedy; Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Mr O'Kennedy; Lady Elles; Mr O'Kennedy* 134
- Question No 61, by Mr Kavanagh: Situation in Cambodia*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Kavanagh; Mr O'Kennedy* 135
- Question No 62, by Mr Patterson: Draft directive on control of illegal immigration and employment*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Patterson; Mr O'Kennedy; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr O'Kennedy* 135
- Question No 63, by Mr Geurtsen: Proposal for a directive on product liability*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Geurtsen; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Spicer; Mr O'Kennedy; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr O'Kennedy* 136
- Question No 64, by Miss Hooper: Community exports to Portugal*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Miss Hooper; Mr O'Kennedy* 137
- Question No 65, by Mrs Scrivener: Meeting of the first Council of Ministers responsible for consumer affairs*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mrs Scrivener; Mr O'Kennedy* 137
- Question No 66, by Mr de la Malène: US oil imports*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mr de la Malène; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Seligman; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr von der Vring; Mr O'Kennedy* 137
- Questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation*
- Question No 67, by Mrs Lizin: South Africa*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mrs Lizin; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Spicer; Mr O'Kennedy; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Fernandez; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Welsb; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Denis; Mr O'Kennedy* 138
- Question No 68, by Mr Schwartzberg: Respect for human rights in Chile and arms sales*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Schwartzberg; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Balfe; Mr O'Kennedy; Mrs Lizin; Mr O'Kennedy; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr O'Kennedy*
- Question No 69, by Mrs Ewing: Release of Jewish political prisoners in the Soviet Union*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Mrs Ewing; Mr O'Kennedy; Mr Marshall; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr O'Kennedy* 141
- Question No 70, by Lord Bethell: Charta 77*
- Mr O'Kennedy; Lord Bethell; Mr O'Kennedy* 141
- Point of order: Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Spicer; Mr Denis* 142
8. Votes
- Baudis report (Doc. 1-380/79): Directive on inland waterway vessels*
- Adoption of the resolution* 142
- Albers report (Doc. 1-381/79): Regulation on the Community quota for the carriage of goods by road*
- Amendment to the proposal for a Regulation:*
- Mr Albers, rapporteur* 143
- Adoption of the resolution* 143
9. Urgent debate 143
10. Statement by the President of the Foreign Ministers on political cooperation (continuation of debate)
- Mrs Van den Heuvel on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mr Scott-Hopkins on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Pajetta on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Rey on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Lalor on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Coppieters; Mr De Goede; Mr van Miert; Mr Bersani; Lord Bethell; Mr Piquet; Mr Haagerup; Mrs*

<i>Hammerich; Mr Romualdi; Mr Cariglia; Mr Michel; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Paisley; Mr Hänsch; Mr McCartin; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Penders; Mr Gendebien; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mrs Buchan; Mr Zagari; Mr O'Kennedy, Presi- dent-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers . . .</i>	143	11. <i>Agenda</i>	182
<i>Point of order: Mr Spicer</i>	182	12. <i>Urgent debate</i>	182
		13. <i>Membership of committees</i>	182
		14. <i>Agenda for next sitting Mr Denis</i>	183
		<i>Annex</i>	184

IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received from Mr Filippi, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, a report on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 138/79) for a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for certain wines having a registered designation of origin, falling within subheading ex 22.05 C of the Common customs tariff, originating in Tunisia (1979/1980) — (Doc. 1-420/79).

3. *Membership of Parliament*

President. — Yesterday afternoon I received from the Foreign Minister of the French Republic the following telegram :

Following the decision of the Council of State delivered on 22 October 1979 on the announcement of the results of the election of Members of the Assembly of the European Communities by the Commission nationale du recensement général des votes, published in the Official Journal of the French Republic of 21 June, I am pleased to inform you that, in accordance

with the 'Liste socialiste avec la participation des Radicaux de gauche', published in the Official Journal of the French Republic of 24 and 25 May, Mr Edgar Pisani is listed as No 23 and is declared elected to the Assembly of the European Communities.

(Applause from the left)

I am also pleased to inform you that Mr Michel Debattise, whose election was announced on 20 June 1979 by the Commission nationale française de recensement général des votes, was appointed a member of the French Government on 22 October 1979 by the Decision published in the Official Journal of the same date and has decided, pursuant to Article 6 of the Act annexed to the Decision of the Council of the European Communities of 20 September 1976, to resign the seat which he gained in the election of 10 June last.

Consequently, and pursuant to the Act annexed to the abovementioned Decision by the Council of the European Communities of 20 September 1976, in particular Article 6, 7 and 12 thereof, as well as the French legal provisions in force, in particular Article 24 of the Law of 7 July 1979, I am pleased to inform you that Mr Olivier d'Ormesson is a Member of the Assembly of the European Communities.

(Signed) Jean François-Poncet.

We note these appointments.

Mr Pisani's credentials will be verified at the next meeting of the Bureau, it being understood that, pursuant to Rule 3 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, he will take his seat provisionally in Parliament and its committees with the same rights as other Members.

I congratulate Mr Pisani on his appointment and welcome him to the House.

(Applause from the left)

4. *Decision on urgency*

President. — The next item is the decision on the urgency of several motions for resolutions.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madame President, on behalf of my Group I should like to withdraw the request for urgent procedure for our motion for a resolution on the situation in Malta. I should like to regard it as a motion to be forwarded to the Political Affairs Committee so that a report can be tabled. We have so far not requested urgent procedure and want to continue in this position so that Parliament may perhaps become accustomed to not regarding every matter as urgent.

(Laughter)

President. — We shall begin with the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-415/79): Setting up of an ad hoc committee on women's rights.*

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Madame President, urgent procedure is justified by the fact that Parliament has been dealing with this question since July. Texts have been tabled by the political groups. You reacted favourably to the approaches made to you on the subject. I feel that now really is the time to decide. This is the aim of the motion, which enjoys broad political backing from all the political groupings represented in this Parliament. I would therefore urge all our colleagues, Madame President, to see to it that the wish which has been expressed very soon becomes reality.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino to speak in favour of urgent procedure.

Mrs Bonino. — (I) Madame President, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it politically very important that the European Parliament should take a decision at today's sitting on the urgency of setting up this *ad hoc* committee, which will obviously be for a limited time only.

I feel that this Parliament, which devotes so much time to other questions, can and must approve this request to set up an *ad hoc* committee to study the status of women in the Member States, and I therefore support the request for an urgent debate and trust that such a committee can be made operational as soon as possible.

President. — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen to speak against the request.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (NL) Madame President, I should like to speak against holding an urgent debate on this motion for a resolution, but I do so with a certain amount of difficulty, since in general I support moves to improve the position of women. I myself have often campaigned for them in the past. I have done so as a member of the Central Committee of the Netherlands Women's Council, as a member of the Netherlands Government delegation to the United Nations and in many other political and social capaci-

ties. Madame President, I mention this because I know only too well how much and how quickly undeserved labels can be stuck on people. Our Group was one of the first to table a motion in this Parliament on the status of women. In that motion, which subsequently obtained for us the support of the European Democrats, we asked for a general debate on the status of women to be prepared in the responsible parliamentary committees, and this motion has already been referred by the Bureau to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. The motion now before us in fact asks for exactly the same thing, i.e. a general debate on the status of women. Ladies and gentlemen, let us understand each other clearly. The preparation of this general debate has already begun. As far as that part of the motion if concerned, you are simply a little too late. The motion before us also asks for an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights to be set up, but a decision has already been taken on the *ad hoc* committee. The Bureau has already decided to set up such a committee as well as other subcommittees. There would be some point in a motion on an *ad hoc* committee if it laid down clearly its activities, responsibilities and composition, but this motion does not cover any of this. It is in fact an empty shell, seeks to lay down what has already been laid down and deals with nothing but initiatives which have already been taken, and we feel that for this reason this motion is superfluous and we shall therefore vote against an urgent debate.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — I call Mrs Hoffmann to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Hoffmann. — (F) Madame President, ladies and gentlemen, on 28 September the Communist Group tabled a motion for a resolution on the setting up of an *ad hoc* committee on the rights, equality and status of women in the countries of the Community.

We feel that anything that has to do with the life of women must have its place in the life of this Parliament, which can no longer content itself with fine words while the Community, as we know, flouts the Treaty of Rome. Women are fed up with the difficulties of life, the state of poverty to which millions of them are reduced and the discrimination of all kinds to which they are subjected, ranging from unequal pay to low pay, difficult working conditions, lack of promotion and qualifications, and the attacks on their dignity and freedom. They are fed up with never having any say in things and never having the right to speak. They reject all the forms of oppression which have always been their lot and which are being aggravated by the crisis, the austerity and the authoritarianism of the policies of the governments of the Community countries. They want their lives to change; they want to be heard and respected.

Hoffmann

Our move is also based on the desire to overcome stick-in-the-mud attitudes and not to allow the historical disadvantages suffered by women to be perpetuated. The Communist Group is determined to be the spokesman in this House of this great movement of women seeking change and of their boundless desire for equality.

To this end, our Group reiterates its request to Parliament, after the favourable vote by the Bureau on 9 October on this question, to speed up the procedure so that the *ad hoc* committee on the rights, equality and liberty of women in the countries of the Community can be set up.

We think that this committee must be given the task of examining, noting and studying the various aspects of the status of women in the Community countries. We women members of the Communist Group are ready to play our full part in the work of this committee. The range and variety of the problems involved seems to us ample justification for urgent procedure.

Parliament as a whole should be asked to deal with the conclusions of this committee as its work progresses, with a view to the practical improvement of the status of women.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

President. — I call Lady Elles to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lady Elles. — Madam President, I think it is worth reminding the Assembly with regard to the urgency of this matter, that the very latest case the equal Opportunities Commission brought before the High Court in the United Kingdom was in order to protect men!

(Laughter and applause from the European Democratic Group)

So that if there is any discrimination for under 50 % of the population, perhaps we shall be having a proposal next month to set up an *ad hoc* committee on discrimination against the opposite sex to my own.

(Mixed reaction)

So, Madam President, I would very warmly support the opposer to this motion. I would also draw to the attention of the member of the Communist Party who spoke that a resolution to hold a debate on the subject was in fact tabled on 27 September, the day before the date she referred to, by the European People's Party, together with supporters from this group.

Madam President, you will be aware, as Members of this House are aware, that of course there are many kinds of discrimination against different groups in society in the Community, as indeed outside it. But I do not think that justifies a specific, *ad hoc*

committee to deal with the problems of women. I would remind Mr Glinne, as chairman of the Socialist Group, that he had agreed to a socialist subcommittee on women within the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment of this Parliament. Either he agrees to stick by his arrangement or he doesn't. I therefore strongly oppose this motion for setting up an *ad hoc* committee.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — I call Mrs Roudy to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Roudy. — *(F)* I shall be very brief, Madame President, since we are not here to start a debate but to decide on the setting up of an *ad hoc* Committee on women's rights, i.e. an instrument which will begin by seeing to it that the directives are complied with.

Madame President, there is one directive in particular which is not being complied with, namely that on equal pay. This proves that the present instruments are not enough. The first task of this *ad hoc* committee, which is temporary and will not encroach on any of the existing committees' prerogatives, will thus be simply to ensure that these directives are complied with. It must therefore be set up as a matter of great urgency.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mrs von Alemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs von Alemann. — *(D)* Madame President, ladies and gentlemen, we are in favour of the setting up of such an *ad hoc* committee, since we believe that now is really the time to discuss matters concerning women and that there should be no dispute as to which subcommittee should actually discuss this question. I feel that it is a good thing to set up an *ad hoc* committee to draw up such a report of principle, and we support the idea.

(Applause)

President. — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure...

I call Lady Elles on a point of order.

(Loud protests and uproar on the left)

Lady Elles. — Madam President, if the Socialist Group had listened to your words, they would know that you said 'Vote on an urgent debate'. It is in fact on Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure. If they would listen to what the President of this Assembly said you said we would vote on urgent procedure. In fact, if you stick to your resolution, you are voting on Rule 25. Read your papers!

President. — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

Urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose to Parliament that this motion for a resolution be placed on the agenda of Friday, 26 October 1979.

I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (I) Madame President, I should like to raise a point of order. I should like to point out that it is rather unusual that a Member should be able to ask to speak during voting. Anyone who wishes to speak may do so before or after the vote, but not during it.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (I) Madame President, I appeal to your awareness of the problem. As a rule secondary problems are relegated to Friday's sitting. I therefore think that we should discuss this matter during Thursday's sitting instead.

President. — There are neither secondary nor priority problems. Friday morning is the only time when this motion can be placed on the agenda.

Are there any other comments?

That is agreed.

* * *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-417/79): Increase in oil prices.*

I call Mr Debré.

Mr Debré. — (F) Madame President, ladies and gentlemen, the request for an urgent debate on this motion for a resolution should arouse less passion than the last one.

Urgent procedure is justified because this very issue was referred to as urgent here in Strasbourg last July when the Heads of State and Government met to draw up regulations to control the free market in oil, and particularly the Rotterdam market. It was said at the time that this was a matter of urgency in order to achieve discipline on the part of the consumer countries, at least the European consumer countries, with regard to the producer countries. It seems that this statement of the intention to take a decision soon was simply noted in the communiqué.

In fact, what have we been seeing over the last few days? To explain the new increases, some oil-pro-

ducing countries are basing their arguments less on the fall in the value of the dollar than on the fact that on the free market, and in particular on the Rotterdam market, petrol is being bought for more than the prices laid down by OPEC.

In view of this, is it not a matter of urgency, in an assembly where so much has been said about the discipline of the consumer countries, and in our countries where we are so struck by the constant rise in prices imposed by the exporting countries, to see to it that a certain discipline imposes rules which prevent the exporting countries from taking advantage of the free market to justify new increases? The urgency of the matter seems to me to be self-evident.

President. — I call Mr Glinne to speak against urgent procedure.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Madame President, we are not convinced that this question must be made the object of an urgent debate. We think that a thorough, meticulous examination of it by the parliamentary committee responsible is the most appropriate course.

President. — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

The request is rejected.

Pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

* * *

President. — At this point we were to have voted on the urgency of two motions for resolutions on the events in Malta. I would remind the House that the chairman of the Group of the European Peoples Party (CD) has withdrawn the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-421/79).

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) I did not withdraw the motion for a resolution but only withdrew the request for urgent debate, which means that the motion for a resolution is now referred in the normal way to the appropriate committee.

President. — It therefore remains for us to vote on urgent procedure for the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-419/79): Violation of the freedom of the press and private property in Malta.*

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, I wish to move that this resolution tabled on behalf of my group should receive urgent treatment. It arises from the events which took place just over a week ago, extraordinary events in a state associated with this Community. I do not think we can let this go by without taking some form of action in this House. I do not need to reiterate the incredible and disgraceful events which took place in Malta on Monday of last week; they are quite clearly set out in the motion for a resolution. However, I believe that they do demand that this House should take action. There was a clear attack on human rights, there was a clear attack on the freedom of the press in this associated country. I do not believe that in those circumstances we in this House should let things go by without taking immediate action here to put forward our views and our feelings concerning this matter. That is why, Madam President, without further debate on this matter, I am going to ask the House for urgent treatment of this resolution.

President. — I call Mr Pajetta to speak against urgent procedure.

Mr Pajetta. — (I) I should simply like to state briefly not only that we are against urgent procedure but also that we find the proposal to discuss this motion very strange. I realize that Mr Scott-Hopkins is deeply concerned by the shots fired at the headquarters of *The Times of Malta* on 15 October 1979. But I also deplore the fact that acts of violence have been committed in an island which is just as near, if not nearer, to this Community and the United Kingdom and where events are taking place which should worry us even more than, or at least as much as, the shots fired at a newspaper office. When Mr Scott-Hopkins tables a motion calling for an end to the bloodshed in Ireland, I shall be prepared to discuss the matter with him.

President. — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

I propose that this motion for a resolution be placed on the agenda of next Friday 26 October.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Sutra on a point of order.

Mr Sutra. — (F) Madam President, I would ask you to take a fresh vote by sitting and standing.

President. — The result of the vote is already established.

* * *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-422/79): South-East Asian refugees.*

I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (F) There is urgent need for a debate, but the need for a decision is even more urgent. The seriousness of the situation in South-East Asia, particularly in Cambodia, demands that we take a wide-ranging initiative going beyond a resolution of principle or a vote for a million ECU to help the Khmers or their refugees. I am not disregarding such measures and consider them important, but we must be able to decide today to send a group of Members on mission to Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos and Thailand. These Members, in cooperation with the Commission, will have to be able to take all the necessary steps to ensure that aid in the form of medical supplies and food save the Khmer people and the unfortunate refugees, who are at present forced to leave their country, from genocide. What we need is not a symbolic gesture but practical and effective measures. Humanity cannot stoop so low as simply to watch and wait and to be content with a few emergency relief planes chartered by the Red Cross, and this is why, ladies and gentlemen, our Parliament of the European Communities seems to me to be especially well placed to take stock of the present situation without interference in the knowledge that only political negotiation will bring about peace. Unfortunately there seems no likelihood of such negotiation at the moment.

We must therefore go further and take a decision to save hundreds and hundreds of thousands of men, women and children.

I appeal to the conscience of the men and women in this House and urge them to see to it that an urgent decision is taken and that in the next few days we decide on the practical ways to take effective action.

President. — I call Mrs Dienesch to speak in favour of urgent procedure.

Mrs Dienesch. — (F) Madam President, I thought that we were to have a debate this afternoon on this question, the urgency of which is clear to everyone. This very morning an important French daily news-

Dienesch

paper carried the following headline: 'La grande indifférence des hommes finira par tomber sur les charniers et les camps de Malaisie'. (Man's great indifference will ultimately descend on the mass graves and camps of Malaysia.) If any problem is urgent, then it is this one. But should we start the debate immediately or should we wait until later in accordance with the fixed agenda?

President. — I call Mr Berkhower to speak against urgent procedure.

Mr Berkhower. — (NL) Madam President, my group is against the adoption of urgent procedure for this motion for a resolution, not because we do not consider the matter urgent but because this problem is already on today's agenda and is to be debated on the basis of the oral question with debate by Mr Gremetz and others on emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia. At the end of the debate on the oral question any group that wishes to do so can table a motion for a resolution with request for an immediate vote. And for that matter, we are also against the idea of sending a delegation. That is not all urgent. What the starving people really need is food and medical supplies, not talks with Members of the European Parliament. What is most urgently needed is for planes to take off immediately with food and medical supplies and not for European MPs to go there.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples' Party (CD).

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, I am somewhat surprised by the request for urgent procedure which has just been tabled, since a debate on this question already figures on this afternoon's agenda. My group has also tabled a motion for a resolution on the subject. It is normal practice in this House for amendments to a motion for a resolution to be tabled and everything dealt with together. But if the Socialist Group thinks that in this way it can claim after the event to have been the first to raise the question, I am afraid that in future we shall be swamped with requests for urgent procedure and the normal proceedings of this House will be disrupted. For this reason I would urge you not to adopt urgent procedure but instead to incorporate the point raised in this request in this afternoon's debate, for instance in the form of amendments to the motion for a resolution. It is ludicrous if we adopt urgent procedure in the morning when the matter is to be debated in the afternoon, and so I am against the request.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Madam President, I should just like to say to the House that the Socialist Group's

motion for a resolution is amply justified by its originality with regard to the other texts tabled.

In fact, this first paragraph of our motion asks for a Parliamentary delegation to visit without delay various countries in South-East Asia to study and propose, in agreement with the authorities concerned, the material and humanitarian measures to be implemented on the spot. I think that this amply justifies the tabling of a separate text from those which already exist.

President. — I put the request for urgent debate to the vote.

Since the result of the show of hands is not clear, a fresh vote will be taken by sitting and standing.

The request is rejected.

Pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

* * *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-424/79): Situation of wine producers and the consequences which the decisions of the Council will have for wine production in the Community.*

I call Mr Maffre-Baugé.

Mr Maffre-Baugé. — (F) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we feel that some of the recent decisions of principle by the Agriculture Ministers contain very serious threats.

In fact, no credible measure has been adopted for three years, and now plans for subsidizing grubbing up are suddenly being proposed instead of a thorough check on the areas under cultivation and a proper market organization. This policy is aimed especially at certain regions of France with considerable production potential as regards both quality and quantity, while the Community is about to take in Greece, Spain and Portugal. Can the Commission tell us what measures have been adopted to deal with a difficult situation? This year the European wine-growing sector has achieved a high level of production, and we can only cope with this if we take adequate emergency measures. Hitherto only uncoordinated and fragmented measures have been taken, while what we should have done was provide for genuinely rural production. It is particularly the small and medium-sized growers who are faced with increased difficulties which, for most of them, mean a precarious existence or even going out of business. It is as if the Commu-

Maffre-Baugé

nity regulations were intended to sweep the doorstep in preparation for the arrival of a new guest. The whole range of Mediterranean products are thus affected by a confused and entangled situation. Anger is mounting in the wine-growing regions of France, where important mass demonstrations are being planned. Are we going to examine the question too late? When fever pitch has been reached? Are we going to wait for anger to give way to reason, as happened three years ago after several people had been killed? Are we going to jettison whole regions in order to prepare the way for the accession of Greece, Spain and Portugal? Is this the Europe of hope which some make it out to be? To refuse to examine these questions without delay is to bury one's head in the sand, or, worse, to display deliberate intention in the form of a policy seeking to eliminate a part of the traditional French wine-growing industry. It is impossible to refuse a debate at a time when the first signs of serious social and economic difficulties are becoming apparent. To govern means to look ahead. We wanted an integrated common agricultural policy, and so we must accept the responsibility for it, without which whole sections of this policy would collapse.

This is why I request the examination of this resolution calling for regulations limiting imports and fixing the price of Italian wine, so that there is a guaranteed minimum price which allows a profit to be made and below which Italian table wines would not be allowed to enter France, so that control of wine production and trade is strengthened to prevent deflection of trade — is wine exported from Italy always Italian? — and so that the exchange parities between the green currencies, which are a constant source of difficulty, are harmonized.

President. — I call Madam Poirier to speak in favour of urgent procedure.

Mrs Poirier. — (*F*) Madam President, at their recent meeting in Luxembourg, the Agriculture Ministers adopted decisions of principle on restructuring — and in this House we know what this term means. These decisions affect 223 000 hectares of vines in my region of Aquitaine and Midi-Pyrénées. It is simply in preparation for EEC enlargement, particularly for the accession of Spain. And it is precisely the Rioja wines of Spain which will compete directly with the wines from my region. It spells death for an economic area where vines have been grown as the means of livelihood for 2 000 years, with all the know-how, industries and trade of the region geared to this high-quality production. What is affected here is a whole way of life, the human content of a region, our traditions and our particular way of thinking! Things must be seen for what they are! The Parliament and its Members must make a clear decision: do they or do

they not wish to defend the French wine-growing industry? Are they prepared to accept the disastrous consequences of enlargement, particularly with regard to the entry of Spain?

President. — I call Mr Sutra to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Sutra. — (*F*) I should like to speak only on the question of urgent procedure and not refer to the seriousness of the problem, since this has just been done.

Every year this problem is made worse in the wine-growing regions because the European Community is too late in tackling it. Every year it is March, April or May, when the wine growing year is too far advanced and the situation is already disastrous, before the Community starts to deal with the problem. The problem must be tackled now without delay. Let no one try to put us off with the argument that the subject needs to be debated thoroughly in committee, since the questions have already been raised in committee, the matter has already been referred to the committee and, in any case, a thorough debate will take place in committee. The entire Socialist Group asks whether it is possible to make the European wine problem the subject of a major debate — not a hurried debate on Friday morning or afternoon during the next part-session. I should also like to state — this time on behalf of the French Socialists rather than the Group as a whole — that all the French Socialists will vote in favour of urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Diana to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr Diana. — (*I*) Madam President, it seems to me that in cases like this we are often confronted with threats or angry action by those concerned. I think that this testifies to an irresponsible approach, particularly on the part of those political circles which whip up anger in certain regions, often deliberately. I am very familiar with the problem of wine and the problems involved in this wine regulation; in my country too, such problems are far from easy to solve. Nevertheless, in my view the measures called for in the motion, namely to limit exports from my country, cannot be a suitable solution to these problems, or at least are not the only solution, in view of the fact that in France the use of beet sugar is still permitted instead of the exclusive use of grapes.

I think that a problem of this kind, like other problems such as British sheep imports to France or dairy imports to my country from France or Bavaria — the latter adversely affecting our agriculture — need to be studied in depth. They should not be debated hurriedly in this House but should be carefully examined in the committee; responsible in order to arrive at more cautious solutions which are more

Diana

suitable for solving the practical, technical and economic problems without anyone resorting to demagogic tactics.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — I call Mrs Barbarella for an explanation of vote.

Mrs Barbarella. — *(I)* Madam President, I shall just state very briefly why we intend to vote against the motion. We believe that in this sector there really are very serious problems to be dealt with which as such, must be discussed in the appropriate places. A hurried debate in this House would not help to solve the problems of the European wine sector which can, in fact, only be solved by properly coordinating the development of Community wine-growing, i.e. by all the countries of the Community.

President. — I put the request for urgent debate to the vote.

The request for urgent debate is rejected.

Pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

5. Statement by the President of the Foreign Ministers on political cooperation (followed by debate)

President. — The next item is the statement by the President of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation on the subject of political cooperation. This statement will be followed by a debate which, I would remind you, will include the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-294/79) put by Mr Blumenfeld on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) to the Foreign Ministers.¹

I call Mr Glinne on a point of order.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the statement on political cooperation by the President of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation is without doubt one of the highlights of this session of Parliament. The statement we are about to hear from the President was preceded by a written communication, and the provisional text has actually been distributed. In order to ensure that the debate which will follow is as constructive as possible, I should like to ask the House whether we might deal with the next items on the agenda immediately after hearing the President and the author of the oral question, Mr Blumenfeld, and leave the actual debate till

this afternoon. In this way we could take advantage of the midday break to make a more thorough investigation of the reactions to this extremely important communication.

President. — I put Mr Glinne's proposal to the vote.

The proposal is adopted.

I call Mr O'Kennedy, to whom I extend a warm welcome.

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — Madam President, since Mr Blumenfeld's oral question is being taken together with the annual statement on progress in European political cooperation and since his question is a very broad one, I would propose with your permission first to reply on behalf of the Nine to his question and then to make my statement on the progress accomplished in political cooperation last year.

As the honourable Member will appreciate, the questions which he has put down are very broad in scope. Given the range of the questions, I feel it would be useful to begin by saying something briefly about the nature of political cooperation and the way in which it functions in practice. In the light of this I shall then deal in turn with the specific question raised by the honourable Member.

In view of the need for closer collaboration between the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation and the directly elected European Parliament and of the resolution on European Political Cooperation (EPC) adopted by the European Parliament on 18 January 1978, the Foreign Ministers are asked to reply to the following questions:

1. What have been the achievements of the EPC over the period of the last five years and what are the problems which the EPC faces in the near future both in the field of its institutional functioning and in the field of foreign policy in general?
2. In the light of the increased activity of the Foreign Ministers in the EPC framework during the last five years and of the extension of the scope of their work, will the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting in political cooperation now make new proposals to enable the directly elected European Parliament to collaborate more intensively with them in political cooperation matters?
3. In particular, will the Foreign Ministers study the proposals contained in the Parliament's aforementioned resolution on EPC — and especially that calling for the submission to Parliament of an annual written report on EPC — with a view to their early implementation?

¹ Subject: European political cooperation.

O'Kennedy

European political cooperation has a number of basic characteristics which give it its originality, differentiate it from the activities of the Community and determine the nature and scope of its content and achievements. First, political cooperation is a non-institutionalized intergovernmental arrangement. It flows not from obligations assumed under a treaty but from a political commitment by the nine Member governments to mutual information, consultation and, where possible and desirable, common action in foreign policy matters. Secondly, and precisely because it is an effort by the nine governments to coordinate their policies and work towards common positions, political cooperation must operate pragmatically and by consensus. It is a process which has grown and developed greatly, but the pace of its development cannot and should not be forced. Thirdly, it must be recognized that there are limitations to European political cooperation. Not every foreign policy issue is considered, and there are areas where the Nine have not taken common action.

Fourthly, the focus of political cooperation is outward and its field of application is essentially external. By this I mean that it is primarily directed to the relations which the Nine as such have collectively with the external world.

Fifthly, while its immediate and direct object is external in this sense, it is also true that the effort to work towards common positions on external issues has naturally had the effect over a period of time of promoting closer relations and better understanding between the Nine themselves. In this context it has worked to reinforce the internal instruments of liaison of the Member States, cooperation in the fields of protocol and communications and in creating a European judicial area.

Sixthly, the means available to the Nine, as they work towards common positions and common action in world events, are the normal instruments of diplomacy. That is to say, their positions are made known through public declarations and representations to other governments, as well as through concerted negotiation, common statements and coordination of voting positions in international bodies. I believe that it is necessary to keep these general characteristics of political cooperation in mind in considering the broad range of questions which the honourable Member has posed.

He asks first about the achievement of European political cooperation over the last five years. I think I should respond to this by pointing to two kinds of achievement. First, and most concretely, there is the fact that over that period the Nine have adopted common positions and taken common action in relation to those world issues where they are able to identify a clear community of interest. In this way, over a range of international problems, they were able to bring their considerable influence to bear in a manner consistent with the ideals and principles shared by the Members of the Community.

Second, and perhaps less immediately obvious, is the fact that the Nine, in operating these procedures of political cooperation on external issues, have by now developed between themselves the habit of consultation and coordination to such an extent that it has become almost a reflex. This habit of consultation within the Nine on international issues, together with other important developments, such as the establishment of the European Council which deals with political cooperation as well as Community matters, has meant a significant development in practice of political cooperation procedures. In this way the Nine are increasingly developing a capacity in the political cooperation framework to respond to, and on occasion to influence, world events through coordination, mutual solidarity and common action.

As was recalled by the European Council meeting in the Hague on 29-30 November 1976, this form of cooperation in the field of foreign policy must lead to the search for a common external policy. In speaking first of what I have called the more concrete achievements of political cooperation, I think it would be better not to try to list exhaustively every *démarche*, public statement or whatever, made over the past 5 years, but rather to identify the major areas where the Nine have taken common action. In any event, as the honourable Member is aware, successive Presidents-in-Office of the Council of Ministers, by means of the colloquies with the Political Affairs Committee of the European Parliament, provide, detailed and regular accounts of developments in the foreign policy activities of the Nine. I will confine myself to outlining in broad terms what I consider to be the main areas of achievement.

In the field of multilateral diplomacy the Nine have been notably successful in coordinating their efforts in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and its follow-up. They have also increasingly adopted common positions at successive sessions of the United Nations General Assembly and at other international conferences organized within the United Nations system or under its auspices. It is not always, of course, possible for the Nine to achieve a common position on every question arising in these fora, but they have developed habits of consultation which do lead frequently to common positions on major international issues.

The Nine have taken a particular interest in Africa and adopted common positions with a view to helping to achieve rapidly and peacefully the emergence of an independent Zimbabwe, as well as independence in Namibia. Moreover, the Nine have continued to call upon the governments of South Africa to abandon the policy of apartheid which has earned universal condemnation.

The Nine have also been interested in the issue of Cyprus and have consistently supported the United Nations Secretary-General in his efforts to get

O'Kennedy

sustained and meaningful intercommunal negotiations resumed. Recently, too, the Nine have expressed a united position in their efforts to alleviate the plight of Indo-Chinese refugees. These efforts included representations to the governments of the region, as well as concerted action at the United Nations meeting in Geneva on the refugee problem.

On the Middle East, the Nine have consistently supported, through a series of statements at the United Nations and elsewhere, the aim of a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement and they have sought to encourage progress towards it. In the Euro-Arab dialogue, the Nine have been pursuing with the countries of the Arab League economic, technical and cultural cooperation with the major objectives of promoting the development of the Arab region through combining European technology and Arab capital resources and labour and thereby strengthening the links between the Nine and the Arab world. With regard to other political issues and other areas of the world such as Latin America, Asia, Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean, the Nine in political cooperation regularly exchange views and coordinate their positions and, where it seems appropriate and desirable, convey their views and coordinate their positions and, where it seems appropriate and desirable, convey their views or make representations, as the Nine, to particular governments.

The second kind of achievement to which I have referred, the development to a high degree of the habit of consultation and coordination, is less easy to spell out in detail, but it is none the less very real. Indeed, it may in the long run be of greater significance than any specific common action or statement by the Nine on a particular issue, because it has the effect, steadily and over a period of time, of bringing the Nine into a closer relationship with each other.

Now I turn to the second and third aspects of the first question posed by the honourable Member. These focus on the future of political cooperation. By its nature political cooperation is a continuing and evolving process, and its achievements are incremental. I believe that the basic characteristics of political cooperation, as I have described them, should be maintained and that, as it operates in practice, political cooperation has proved to be a flexible and adaptable instrument. The Ministers of the Nine are confident that the existing procedures and arrangements can be adapted to the impending enlargement of the Community and they remain ready to consider in a pragmatic way, from time to time, how far this or other future developments may entail refinements or modifications of the existing procedures.

As to the future foreign policy problems with which political cooperation may have to deal, it is difficult to point to specific issues which are likely to arise, precisely because the concern of the Nine in political cooperation is directed towards events in the wider

world outside, and these, of their nature, are inherently difficult to predict. However, I believe it likely that the major issues confronting the Nine will continue to be those to which I have already referred. The honourable Member's second and third questions concern relations between the Ministers meeting in political cooperation and the Parliament, and I propose to take them together.

Members of Parliament will recall that the Nine have already agreed on procedures to associate the European Parliament with the process of political cooperation. The Luxembourg report states that, and I quote: 'In order to give a democratic character to political unification it would be necessary to associate public opinion and their representatives with it'. Furthermore, the Heads of State and Government, at their Conference in Paris on 10 December 1974, agreed that: 'In view of the increasing role of political cooperation in the construction of Europe, it is important to associate the European Assembly more closely with this work, for example, through replies to questions on the activities of political cooperation addressed to the Presidency by the Members of the Parliament.'

These commitments have led to the establishment of existing mechanisms which provide for developments in European political cooperation to be reported regularly to Parliament in replies to parliamentary questions, in the annual report on political cooperation and in the colloquies conducted by the President-in-Office with the Political Affairs Committee of Parliament. The Nine view the colloquies as providing an opportunity for a dialogue between the Ministers meeting in political cooperation and Parliament. The colloquies represent an effective means for the President-in-Office to convey information on recent developments in a frank and confidential way and for the parliamentarians to express their views on political matters. For the moment, the Nine consider that the existing mechanisms are adequate to ensure constructive dialogue with the European Parliament. Since European political cooperation is an evolving process, the Nine remain ready to adapt existing mechanisms if this should be necessary.

Mr President, before I turn to the speech on political cooperation, could I just mention one point. As I have indicated, the Presidency is very anxious to work fruitfully and in a spirit of cooperation with the European Parliament in this area, I would therefore have appreciated it very much if this morning, before this matter was raised of proposing an adjournment of the debate, the Members of Parliament had indicated that to me in advance, so that I would have been able to arrange my timetable accordingly. I did make a copy of my speech available to facilitate Parliament and I would have hoped that it would have been possible to let me know that this procedure was going to be proposed, which in fact does pose, I may say, rather personal difficulties for me at this stage ...

O'Kennedy

IN THE CHAIR : MR VONDELING

Vice President

President. — Could you please tell us at what moment your speech was available for the Members ?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I believe it has been available for the last two days. It was made available to the political groups on Monday afternoon, I understand.

(Protests from certain quarters)

Mr President, I feel it would be appropriate, against the background of my reply to the very wide-ranging question by Mr Blumenfeld, to turn now to my report on the main developments that have occurred in political cooperation since my colleague, Mr Genscher, spoke to the Parliament last year.

The Middle East remains an area of tension that is of concern to the Nine. The past year has seen some major developments in the region.

The outcome of the Camp David Conference led to the peace treaty, signed on 26 March 1979 by Egypt and Israel. Subsequently, divisions emerged among the Arab nations, and Egypt came under heavy criticism from the other Arab states. The Nine took the view that the Treaty constituted a correct application of the principles of UN Security Council Resolution 242, as far as Egyptian-Israeli relations are concerned. They took note of the will which the signatories of the Treaty had affirmed to consider it, not as a separate peace, but as a first step in the direction of a comprehensive settlement aimed at putting an end to 30 years of hostility and distrust. The Nine hoped that this will could be given practical effect through a comprehensive agreement in which all parties involved, including the representatives of the Palestinian people, would participate, and which the international community could endorse. In the aftermath of the peace treaty, there has been progress towards improved relations between Egypt and Israel, and there have been withdrawals of Israeli forces in Sinai.

Later when Israel stepped up attempts to establish settlements in the occupied territories, the Nine felt compelled, on 18 June 1979, to issue a statement deploring any action or statement which might constitute an obstacle to the search for peace. They expressed their opposition to the Israeli Government's policy of establishing the settlements in contravention of international law, and they rejected Israeli claims to sovereignty over occupied territories, since this would be incompatible with Resolution 242.

Most recently, during my address on behalf of the Nine to the UN General Assembly on 25 September last, I took the opportunity to repeat the general principles which the Nine have held for some time to be the essential basis for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. I stressed in particular the right of all states in the area to live within secure and recognized boundaries, and spoke of the need to respect the legitimate rights of the Palestinians, including the rights to

a homeland. I spoke of the necessity that these principals be accepted by all those involved — including the Palestine Liberation Organization—as the basis for negotiation of a comprehensive settlement in which all the parties will play their full part. In addition I referred to the question of Jerusalem, which will be a vital element in any overall settlement.

The tragic events in the Lebanon were viewed with the greatest concern throughout the past year by the Nine. We expressed on a number of occasions our commitment to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, most notably in a statement issued following our meeting in Dublin on 11 September last. We appealed to all countries and parties concerned to refrain from all acts likely to infringe the integrity of Lebanon and the authority of its Government. We also called upon all parties to give full assistance to the UNIFIL peacekeeping operation and to respect the decisions of the UN Security Council.

The Nine also considered other developments in the Middle East. I refer in particular to the February revolution in Iran and its aftermath, and the fighting between North and South Yemen.

I should now like to turn to developments in Asia, and particularly in South East Asia, which have occupied the attention of the Nine in recent months.

The Nine have been greatly concerned at the deterioration in relations among the states in South-East Asia following the Vietnamese-supported overthrow of the Pol Pot regime in Cambodia and the subsequent Chinese retaliatory invasion of Vietnam. Early this year the Nine made known their position, and appealed for the independence, territorial integrity and self-determination of both Cambodia and Vietnam to be respected. At their meeting last July, the Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN countries underlined their deep concern at the growing instability in Indo-China—which has also given rise to human suffering on a massive scale. The Nine have expressed the view that the resolution of political problems in the area must be based on an independent Cambodia with a genuinely representative government, free from any foreign military presence. Such a government should be able to maintain friendly relations with all countries of the region and benefit from international aid for reconstruction.

The Nine have also had to deal with the direct consequences of the conflict and unrest in the area, namely the large-scale inflow of Indo-Chinese refugees from Vietnam and Cambodia and the horrifying prospect of widespread starvation and famine in Cambodia.

As you will recall, I reported to you during the July part-session of the Parliament on the results of my talks with the ASEAN nations in Bali and on the initiative taken by the Nine to call for the convening of a conference under UN auspices to examine practical solutions to the refugee problem, particularly that of the 'boat-people'. At the UN Conference in Geneva

O'Kennedy

on 1 July, I made known the widespread concern of public opinion in Europe, including the concern expressed by the European Parliament, on the issue.

The Nine stressed their support for the basic principle of the right of people to leave their own countries and to return to them freely. No one should be obliged to leave his country through fear or compulsion.

The Community and the Member States have implemented programmes to relieve the refugee problem through financial aid to the UN High Commission for Refugees and acceptance of substantial numbers of refugees for resettlement. The effort made so far and the results of the Geneva Conference have had positive results, and there has been a marked decrease in the number of people leaving Vietnam by sea. The Nine continue to monitor the situation closely, including the follow-up action undertaken by the UNHCR and the UN Secretary-General on the efforts to implement the conclusions of the Geneva Conference.

However, even if the Vietnamese refugee problem has diminished, there remains the problem of famine and further tragedy in Cambodia. A high proportion of the population has already been killed as a result of the continuing conflict in Indo-China and the barbarous repression by the Pol Pot regime. Now the entire population of Cambodia faces widespread starvation while conflict between the competing Vietnamese-backed Heng Samrin regime and the remaining Pol Pot forces obstructs international humanitarian assistance. The Nine will support fully the urgent relief operations under way, and the Community is contributing to direct relief operations mounted by the Red Cross and UN agencies.

Mr President, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the numerous voluntary, non-governmental organizations and groups which have already mounted a significant aid effort.

The problem is not so much the mustering of sufficient international aid, but of actually getting it to those who need it because of the physical destruction of Cambodia and the obstacles encountered from both sides in the war there. It is our intention that distribution of aid be carried out as speedily and effectively as possible, so that it reaches all sections of the people of Cambodia.

The situation in Cambodia is desperate. It demands action on a unprecedented scale and a response that is not constrained or circumscribed by political preconditions. The Nine for their part are willing to join in any efforts which will achieve the basic humanitarian aims of saving the people of Cambodia from the fate which the wars and upheavals of recent years have brought upon them. The sense of urgency with which we view the problem is demonstrated by the action we have already taken and which is now under way. The issue of aid to Cambodia was an essential item at the informal meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Nine in Ashford Castle in Ireland last weekend. We decided

to ask our experts, including those responsible for disaster relief in our respective governments, to supplement our existing efforts with a coordinated programme of further action. These experts are meeting in Dublin in the next few days with a view to preparing additional urgent proposals on the coordination of humanitarian relief and on the most effective way to supply it. In the Community framework, following yesterday's Development Council which I attended, and where we discussed the issue further, I understand that the Commission will be presenting new proposals for a supplementary aid programme that will be considered urgently by the Council early next week. There is no question that the governments of the Nine, supported by public opinion in all of our countries, are determined to spare no effort to avert the human tragedy in Cambodia.

The relations of the Nine with the ASEAN group of countries continue to develop, not only in relation to the refugee issue, but to other issues as well. During my attendance at the conference of ASEAN Foreign Ministers in July, keen interest was expressed on both sides in developing our relations further, and we are pursuing our efforts to lay a secure basis for our cooperation in the future.

African issues continue to receive close attention in the discussions among the Nine in the political cooperation framework. The Nine have followed with interest and concern the many important developments which have taken place in the last twelve months; developments which have included renewed efforts to settle outstanding disputes, increased regional cooperation, and significant progress in human rights. The Nine have welcomed, in particular, the return to civilian rule in certain countries. They have reiterated their desire to cooperate to the fullest extent possible with Africa in promoting its economic development and their willingness to assist in any way they can in the common endeavour to reduce tensions and to assure the conditions for peaceful development.

The Nine remain particularly concerned with the situation in Southern Africa. It is evident that change in this part of the world, where racial discrimination is still applied, has become increasingly urgent.

The Nine have therefore emphasised their condemnation of the apartheid system in South Africa, which they totally reject. It is an affront to human dignity. By oppressing and exploiting the black majority, the South African Government is creating bitterness and tensions which jeopardize that very future which they seek to safeguard. If a dangerous situation is to be avoided, it is essential that all the people of South Africa be allowed to participate fully in the political, social and economic life of that country. In the past year, therefore, the Nine have continued to stress at the United Nations and elsewhere the need for change. The Nine are committed to using the collective weight of the Community to bring pressure to bear on South Africa for the ending of apartheid.

O'Kennedy

The Nine are implementing the Code of Conduct which, in a practical way, can help to bring about change in the area of labour relations and the work environment generally. Considerable progress has been achieved in the implementation of the Code, and it is envisaged that, when all the national evaluations have been completed, the Nine will consider the question of a joint evaluation of the results.

It is wrong as well as foolish to imprison and otherwise punish those who are working peacefully for justice and dignity. The Nine made a *démarche* to the South African Government in December 1978 in which they urged that all those imprisoned or restricted because of their beliefs should be released. In a statement last week on the occasion of the Day of Solidarity with South African Prisoners, the Nine appealed to the Government of South Africa to release, immediately and unconditionally, all political prisoners.

The Nine have continued to support the efforts of the UN-Secretary-General, the Five and the Front-Line States to implement the United Nations Plan for Namibia. On several occasions in the past year they have expressed their continuing concern about the situation. At the resumed 33rd session of the General Assembly in May, and on Namibia Day in August, the Nine expressed concern at the lack of progress and appealed to the South African Government to accept without delay the implementation of Security Council Resolution 435, and to permit the deployment of the UN Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG).

Following the renewed efforts to reach agreement, in my address on 25 September to the General Assembly, I expressed the earnest hope that all concerned agree to the very early implementation of the UN plan. Failure to implement the provisions of Resolution 435 would undoubtedly have very grave consequences for all concerned, especially South Africa. The Nine have followed the developing situation with regard to Rhodesia with particular attention and concern, in view of the suffering being experienced by all the people of Zimbabwe and by the people of neighbouring countries. In April, the Nine expressed their sympathy to the Zambian Government and to the victims of raids by Rhodesian armed forces, which they condemned. The Nine have consistently advocated a just and peaceful solution to the problem of Rhodesia. They therefore welcomed the understanding reached by the Commonwealth Heads of Government in Lusaka and the action of the UK Government in inviting the parties to attend the Constitutional Conference in London. The Nine are following closely developments at the Conference, and hope that it will be possible to reach a just settlement. In my speech at the General Assembly on behalf of the Nine, I reaffirmed the Nine's support for a peaceful settlement acceptable to all the parties involved on the basis of genuine majority rule.

In our preparation for the 34th Session of the UN General Assembly, which opened in New York on 19 September last, the Nine continued the practice of seeking to concert their views and of adopting common voting positions wherever possible. This process is of course continuing during the session which lasts usually until late December, and common statements on an increasing number of issues are being made by the Presidency on behalf of the Nine. The effectiveness of our cooperation in the United Nations has grown steadily over the years. Indeed, with each succeeding year, the scope of the Presidency's speech on behalf of the Nine is considerably expanded, illustrating the progressive development of European political cooperation.

The delegations of the Nine in New York have developed in recent years a practice of intensive cooperation at all levels of the work of the General Assembly to ensure the smooth coordination of our policies there. This has resulted in the Community being recognised by other countries as an influential entity on issues arising at the UN.

At the beginning of the Session I had the opportunity to address the General Assembly on behalf of the Community and to renew the commitment of the Nine to the United Nations as the 'centre for harmonising the actions of nations' envisaged by the UN Charter. I emphasised that the Nine were conscious of the need to come to grips, both with the problems of inequity in the world economy and with the need to resolve conflict and tension without resort to war. I also affirmed our full acceptance of the responsibilities that go with our economic weight, and our wish to develop with the rest of the world a relationship of friendship and cooperation that will take full account of the interdependent nature of our global society.

At the UN, the Nine also strongly supported respect for and observance of human rights. We believe that agreed procedures accepted by States under existing international instruments should be fully and effectively used. Further progress can be made, and the Nine will continue to seek support for proposals to promote respect for human rights and their implementation.

The process initiated by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is one to which the Nine have made a significant contribution. Indeed, the fact that the Final Act adopted by the Conference now plays an important role in intra-European relations is due in no small measure to the efforts of the Nine.

During the past year the Nine continued to consult and coordinate in promoting the continued and progressive implementation of all the provisions of the Final Act. In this connection we devoted particular attention to the human rights and related huma-

O'Kennedy

nitarian provisions, which are of particular concern to all of us.

In this context may I say that the continued repression of citizens, most recently with the trial of the Charter 77 dissidents in Czechoslovakia, simply because they insist on the rights to which they are constitutionally entitled, can only undermine, in the eyes of public opinion, the credibility of those governments who violate the pledges they have given to implement the Helsinki Final Act in all its parts.

(Applause)

We believe that this is an essential aspect of detente, and it is our earnest hope that at the next CSCE follow-up meeting, which is due to take place in Madrid in 1980, we shall be able to record further improvements in this, as well as in all the other areas covered by the Final Act.

Multilateral implementation of the Final Act was highlighted last year by the holding of two of the three expert meetings in the CSCE framework, which were agreed in the concluding document of the Belgrade follow-up meeting early in 1978. The Nine contributed actively to the work of both meetings, which dealt with certain aspects of the Final Act. The Montreux meeting from October to December 1978 pursued the examination of a generally acceptable method of the peaceful settlement of disputes, while the meeting held in Valetta in February and March 1979 studied the possibilities for concrete measures for cooperation in the Mediterranean. The Nine consider that both of these meetings made a useful contribution to the improved implementation of the relevant provisions of the Final Act.

The Nine are currently engaged in preparations for the Madrid meeting, which will open in November next year. We consider that a successful outcome to the meeting will give a significant impetus to the CSCE process, and we intend to make every effort to achieve this aim. We hope that the review aspect of the meeting will be conducted in a frank and non-polemical manner, and that the meeting will also discuss and adopt proposals for some concrete new measures to improve and strengthen implementation. We consider it essential that all aspects of the Final Act should be discussed thoroughly and in a balanced manner, and that no topic should be excluded. In order to prepare the meeting as thoroughly as possible, members of the Nine have started a series of bilateral consultations with other participating States. It is hoped that these consultations will contribute to a greater understanding among the participating States of our objectives for the meeting. In the course of the discussion, the Nine will of course stress their belief

that the success of the Madrid meeting will depend primarily on the extent to which the participating States will have put into effect the provisions of the Final Act before the meeting.

The problem of Cyprus continues to be a cause of concern for the Nine, especially in view of the close links which we have with the island and with the other states most directly involved.

When the 10-point communiqué agreed between President Kyprianou and Mr Denktash was published following their meeting with the UN Secretary-General on 18 and 19 May last, the Nine were hopeful that this heralded a breakthrough in the stalemate on the intercommunal talks which had existed for so long. In particular, we welcomed the commitment by the two parties to carry out intercommunal talks in a continuous and sustained manner, while avoiding any delay, and to abstain from any action which might jeopardize the outcome of the talks.

It was with considerable regret that we noted the suspension of the talks within such a short time of their resumption on 15 June. The Nine continue to believe that the best means for achieving a solution to the question are to be found within the framework of the intercommunal talks under the auspices of the Secretary-General, whose efforts to further progress between the parties concerned we have consistently supported.

Indeed, when the Secretary-General made a renewed effort to get the talks restarted in August last, the support of the Nine for such a resumption was communicated directly to all the parties concerned. We appreciate fully the difficulties facing those involved in this problem, but sooner or later a solution acceptable to both sides will have to be negotiated, if peace and stability are to be restored in Cyprus. The Nine hope that, in order to promote a resumption of the talks, both sides will adopt constructive and flexible attitudes.

The position of the Nine in relation to Cyprus will continue to be governed by an attitude of sympathy and impartiality, and I can only express publicly once more our hope that both parties will soon be able to find sufficient common ground to enable them to resume negotiations.

The promise manifested in the successful Fourth Session of the General Committee of the Euro-Arab Dialogue in Damascus in December last year has, unfortunately, not been fulfilled. At that session, after a frank and wide-ranging exchange of views on political and economic relations between the two regions, touching on all aspects of the present situation in the Middle East, and economic developments at both regional and international level, several proposals for joint cooperation activities, economic social and cultural, were approved.

O'Kennedy

Subsequent political developments, however, leading to a division among the member states of the Arab League, have put a brake on the momentum gained in Damascus, and in fact have brought activities in the framework of the Dialogue to a standstill in recent months. The position of the European side, however, in relation to the Dialogue remains as it has always been. This position, which emphasizes the importance of the Dialogue for relations between the two regions, and our desire to see the Dialogue continued with the Arab region as a whole, was again made clear following the Foreign Ministers' meeting in Dublin on 11 September. The Nine hope that the present difficulties will be merely temporary, and that in the near future we can look forward to progress in this unique relationship of friendship and cooperation with our partners in a region which is of great importance to Europe.

In the past, the relations of the Nine with the countries of the Latin American continent have not perhaps received the attention that they might have deserved. We Europeans have many traditional affinities with the area, and the prospective accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community will undoubtedly increase our links with this area of the world. We will continue to do what we can to strengthen those links in the future. In the context of our desire to develop further our relations with Latin America, the Nine sent a message of congratulation on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Andean Pact.

In recent months the Nine have given some attention to the situation in Central America, particularly in Nicaragua. During the recent conflict there, the Nine supported the establishment of political structures representative of the entire people. Since then, the Nine have expressed to the new authorities in Managua their desire to maintain friendly relations. The Community also has decided to contribute to immediate humanitarian relief and to provide aid towards reconstruction.

We also continue to follow closely human rights issues in Latin America.

The cause of international peace continues to be one of the most pressing concerns of the Nine. We consider that disarmament and arms control can make a very significant contribution in this connection. Disarmament is, of course, discussed in many fora. There are also important bilateral discussions, such as those which led recently to the signing of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty. The Nine welcome this agreement and look forward to its early ratification. We strongly hope that this will give a new impetus to the detente process, and that future SALT discussions will provide prospects for a further reduction of nuclear weapons. This is not, of course, a discussion in which the Nine have participated, but it is worth

recording that we have, at this year's United Nations General Assembly, stated our welcome for the agreement.

The General Assembly is a forum where the Nine have a particular opportunity to express their views on disarmament. In my address to the Assembly on 25 September I set forth the Nine's views on this important subject. Throughout the 34th Session of the General Assembly the Nine will continue to consult closely together on all disarmament issues in order to pursue the objective of arms reduction.

As you are aware, the European Council decided in 1977 that the Nine should study proposals for the creation of a European judicial area. These proposals are being pursued in the intergovernmental context of political co-operation. As a first step, the Nine are studying a draft convention concerned mainly with extradition, with broad application to cover criminal offences generally. The draft also aims to establish simplified procedures. Substantial progress has been made in the drafting of this Convention, and some outstanding issues are due to be examined by the Ministers of Justice in the near future.

As a second step, it is intended to study other matters in the criminal field which relate to the concept of the European judicial area. In addition, at your September session, my colleague, Mr Andrews, reported fully on the efforts of the Nine to open for signature as speedily as possible the agreement on the application among the Member States of the Community of the European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism.

Last year Mr Genscher informed the Parliament of the specific procedures to associate gradually the candidate countries (Greece, Spain and Portugal) with Nine coordination, with a view to their full participation in political cooperation once they become members of the Communities.

Both Portugal and Spain have been formally notified of the commitment to political cooperation undertaken by the Nine in parallel with the legal commitments arising from the Treaties. In the case of Spain, following the second Ministerial meeting in the framework of Spanish accession negotiations, which was held on 18 September last in Brussels, the Nine are to keep Spain informed of developments within Nine cooperation.

In the case of Greece, this process was taken a step further on 28 May last when Greece signed the Treaties of Accession to the European Communities. The Nine had agreed that signature of the Treaties should be marked by moving from an information to a consultation process in regard to political cooperation. In practical terms, this means that the Presidency has

O'Kennedy

the task of ensuring that Greece is kept informed of the decisions reached by the Nine in political cooperation, and also of conveying Greek views on the issues currently under discussion in the Nine. In addition Greece is also kept abreast of Nine coordination, both at the UN and other international organizations, and at meetings of the Ambassadors of the Nine in third countries. Mr President, I have reported on the principal themes that have been developed in political cooperation over the past year. You will have noted, I hope, that the Nine have intensified their cooperation in various areas and taken up new themes. This is the reality of how political cooperation develops. And while some of us may from time to time be impatient and seek evidence of more dramatic progress on major political issues, we must recognise that it would be a mistake to force a pace that, in the end, could not be sustained. Our method is to develop the scope for common action by a patient process of interaction and growth.

This is not to suggest that political cooperation lacks ambition. Indeed, its achievements taken as a whole are quite impressive. It is only when we look back along the path by which political cooperation has developed that we can appreciate fully the ground that we have covered since the process began in 1970. Neither is political cooperation prevented from developing further. Given the right set of conditions and when a common interest has been clearly identified, the Nine are ready to increase the scope of political cooperation.

Our generation faces a great challenge. History will show the day-to-day construction of Europe to be an event of enormous consequence. But is it not being accomplished with sudden giant strides, but rather through a steady series of measured realistic steps. From time to time, we will be able to consolidate our progress and announce major developments that can capture the imagination of our publics, but before this can happen a lot of groundwork is necessary. The message I would leave you with is this: all the time the evolutionary process is going ahead. Our publics increasingly expect the voice of Europe to be heard in international discussions, and the external world seeks in the Nine a coherent partner speaking with one collective voice. Thus, our work in political cooperation responds to a major imperative of our time, namely, the construction of Europe and its role in the interdependent world of today.

President. — Both the Minister and the Members of this House have a right to know what happened to the text of his speech. In this respect the Minister has gone somewhat further than his predecessors in that on Monday evening, via the Council Secretariat, he made two copies of his speech available to the chairmen of the Political Groups, including the

Group for Technical Coordination, and also to the vice-chairman of the Political Affairs Committee. This was the Council's business. I think it would be a good idea for the Bureau, and perhaps the Political Affairs Committee as well, to have another look at how best to proceed in the future. I call Mr Paisley on this same point of order.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, I wish to point out that neither I nor the other non-attached Members in the House received a copy of the speech. In view of the fact that the leader of the Liberal Group is at present responsible for liaison with the non-attached Members, it would be proper for him to obtain extra copies for distribution to the non-attached Members.

President. — I call Mr de Goede.

Mr de Goede. — *(NL)* Mr President, I greatly appreciate, of course, the fact that you intend to discuss this matter in the Bureau, but it is worth pointing out that if the President-in-Office of the Council makes a document available he should in principle make it available to Parliament as a whole and not just to sections of Parliament. I should thus like to ask the President-in-Office to help ensure that the proper procedure is followed in future, which means that the document must be available to Parliament and that Parliament's own services then see to it that copies reach all those who ought to receive them. It did not work that way this time, which is partly the reason why the President-in-Office has been the target of complaints at the way things have been done.

President. — I call Mr Spicer.

Mr Spicer. — Mr President, we are grateful, I am sure, for the information you gave us concerning the time at which advance copies of the speech were actually distributed to the chairmen of the political groups. If I had been aware of this earlier this morning, I would have raised a point of order when the chairman of the Socialist Group said that it would be impossible to hold a proper debate immediately after the speech. If the advance copies were distributed on Monday, there is absolutely no reason why we should not continue our debate now. It does seem to me that to break off the debate at this point and return to it this afternoon, thereby losing the continuity, is an incredibly inept way of conducting our business.

It is too late to do anything now. The House has voted on the matter, but I firmly believe that many people voted in ignorance of the true facts. If the chairmen of the political groups are not prepared to reply in a debate like this immediately after the speech has been made, then we really ought to go back and learn our business at our mothers' knees.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — I entirely agree with what my honourable friend has just said. However I should like to point out to the House, if I may, that the fact that the President-in-Office has had the courtesy to circulate copies of his speech does not detract from the fact that it is only a copy of a speech not yet delivered. There is no compulsion on the President-in-Office to distribute copies of his speech. We are talking as if it were a working document. It is not. He has had the courtesy to send round on Monday afternoon copies of what he hoped he was going to say this morning. I circulated them to those who were going to take part in the debate. Let us not refer to it as a document. It is not a working document. I thank him very much for his courtesy in making it available. It has helped us. But that does not change the situation.

Mr O'Kennedy, *President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.* — I appreciate what honourable Members have said regarding the distribution of copies of my speech. I made them available in order to facilitate the House, and particularly the chairmen of the political groups. I did not myself decide who should receive copies. I operated through the Parliament services, as you can well appreciate, Mr President.

I should like to make one last point. Some Members have pointed out that changes have been made in the speech since the copies were circulated. I want to assure the House that the only changes made were those which were necessary to update the original draft. When they look at the final text Members will see that the changes in question reflect very significant decisions taken by the Nine and by the Council, regarding Cambodia in particular. They were necessary changes and ones which had to be introduced within the last two days.

President. — Let me repeat that the points raised here will be discussed at a meeting of the Bureau in the near future.

I now call Mr Alber to speak in place of Mr Blumenfeld, who had tabled a question on the same subject.

Mr Alber. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party I should like, deputizing for Mr Blumenfeld, to set out the essential considerations behind our question. I do not wish, therefore, to comment on the foreign policy portion of the speech by the President-in-Office of the Council. We are asking for improved political cooperation, with particular regard to the involvement

of the European Parliament. It seems to me that the President-in-Office did not have too much to say on this point. He does, it is true, take a favourable view of associating Parliament with this process, but when he talked about association he was thinking more of the status quo and the procedures we have followed up to now, whereas we believe that in view of the new position of the directly elected Parliament these procedures must be improved and extended.

European Political Cooperation has developed from the Treaties of Rome and alongside them. I need only mention the Hague Summit of 1969 and the Davignon report of October 1970, with its sequel in the Luxembourg and Paris Conferences. European Political Cooperation has thus come to be a further pillar of the European Communities — as is only logical alongside the continuing integration in the economic and legal fields.

Today's question is not, however, concerned with political cooperation between the ministers — although this too could obviously be a subject for discussion. On the whole, this cooperation works well. It has also had a positive effect in particular cases. I would remind you only of the CSCE. There have been and still are, however, other points on which European coordination has been about as good as it was for the Children's Crusade to the Holy Land in the year 1212. And just as it is always a big strike in bowling when all nine pins come down, it would clearly be a major event in European Political cooperation if all Nine were to stand together. Unfortunately, this has often not been the case. Just as in antiquity it was always difficult to sail between Scylla and Charybdis, a number of governments find it difficult today to steer a course between human rights and opportunism or oil — and they deserve to be criticized for this.

In our view, European Political Cooperation must not remain a matter for the Foreign Ministers alone. As the name itself suggests, it is meant to have a broader scope, and if it is to be European it is only logical for the European Parliament to be involved as well. EPC is as yet a tender sapling which needs to grow. But this is not possible in the subdued light of the candles and log fires in the rooms where the Foreign Ministers meet over dinner; it needs the brighter, warmer light of democracy and parliamentary debate. EPC must involve both the Foreign Ministers as representatives of the national governments and the Members of Parliament as representatives of the citizens of Europe. It is a matter both for the Ministers, who are more concerned with coordination, and for the Members of Parliament, who embody more the idea of integration.

Up to now the European Parliament has been involved in three ways: once a year we have an oral

Alber

report from the President-in-Office of the Council, there are quarterly colloquies with the Political Affairs Committee, and Parliament itself can ask questions.

In our view this participation must be improved and extended, and this was the reason behind our three questions. These are concerned with what has been achieved so far and with future aims, but we also want to know whether the Foreign Ministers have any new proposals for improving cooperation, and thirdly we are above all keen to hear whether the Foreign Ministers are prepared to present Parliament with an annual written report and not just an oral one and whether they will examine and accept the proposals the European Parliament adopted in a resolution as long ago as January 1978. I am referring to the Blumenfeld report (Doc. 427/77). Let me just remind you of a few points we made then. One of Parliament's demands was to be informed of all foreign policy decisions. The Political Affairs Committee also wanted to be kept informed aside from these colloquies, which are only held every three months. The Foreign Ministers were asked to take account of the foreign policy guidelines adopted by the European Parliament. I have already mentioned the written report we asked for. A further point was that before the start of negotiations with third countries — and this naturally applies also to applicants for membership — there should be an orientation debate in the European Parliament. In addition, there should be discussion here on the essential political aspects of multilateral economic negotiations.

Ladies and gentlemen, all this was decided a year and a half ago. It is now about time we had a response. Unfortunately, however, this part of our question — it more or less corresponds to question 3 — has not been answered satisfactorily. As I said before, Mr O'Kennedy more or less accepted the status quo. We can only hope, therefore, that our proposals will finally be given consideration. This is not a question of increased powers for Parliament — a number of governments are in no position to agree to that — but of what the Presidents or Heads of Government of a number of countries have endorsed, namely the full implementation of the Treaties and of existing machinery. We should, indeed must, therefore, now take these governments at their word within the framework of EPC. The European Parliament is accountable to the citizens and voters of Europe, as it is from them that we now have our direct mandate. This alone is the basis for our unrestricted partnership and collaboration, with equal rights and status, in the field of European Political Cooperation.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is adjourned until this afternoon.

6. *European Monetary System and international monetary system*

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-387/79), put by Mr Ansquer on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats to the Commission :

Subject: Relationship between the European Monetary System and the international monetary system

While it was agreed at the meeting of the European Council from 5 to 7 December 1978 that the European Monetary System (EMS) had no chance of surviving unless the Community managed to establish a common policy in relation to the dollar, is the Commission aware that lack of confidence in the dollar has assumed such proportions that the quantities of dollars offered for sale far exceed the capacity of the market to absorb them without the increasingly reluctant support of the central banks of the major Western countries?

What action does the Commission propose to put an end to the disorder in the financial circuits which we have witnessed in recent weeks and which is detrimental to economic activity?

Does it not consider that a reform of the international monetary system must entail effective control of the market in Euro-currencies, the growth of which is proving particularly dangerous? Did the Community express a common point of view on this question at the meeting of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in Belgrade?

What is the Commission's position regarding the opening of a 'substitution account'? Does such an account not entail the risk of creating new special drawing rights (SDRs) which can only aggravate world inflation?

Lastly, how does the Commission explain the fact that the chaotic increase in interest rates has occurred without genuine consultation among the participants of the European Monetary System? Does it not think that it is precisely this rise in interest rates, in the Federal Republic of Germany in particular, that is responsible for the increase in pressure and speculation in regard to the 'weak' currencies and therefore for the first readjustment of the pivot rates of the European Monetary System?

I call Mr Ansquer.

Mr Ansquer. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for several months now national currencies and the International Monetary System have been in a state of crisis. Movements of capital have never been so widespread or so sudden in the money markets as they have been over the last few weeks. The monetary authorities seem powerless to deal with this situation, and the governments, for their part, have as yet failed to realize the significance of these movements. Whichever way you look at it, the situation is all the more serious since the slightest hint of an increase in the price of oil sends the dollar plummeting and provokes new demands for such an increase.

Ansquer

It was precisely to these fluctuations and uncertainties that the European Council devised a new strategy which, I quote 'aims to coordinate further our economic policies and actions in order to achieve greater stability'.

Now I don't need to tell you that we have not achieved this stability. For a start, we depend entirely on the dollar. At the moment, the dollar has fallen to its lowest level since October 1978, when the central banks of Germany, Switzerland and Japan provided the equivalent of some \$ 30 000 million to support it. Unfortunately, it would seem that their efforts have been in vain.

Even more serious, however, our exchange-rate policy today depends to a large extent on the fluctuations of the dollar, to the point where we have been forced to adjust for the first time the pivot rates of the European Monetary System. Although it is only a small adjustment — 2 % in the case of the German mark, 3 % in the case of the Danish crown — the measure has to a certain extent been imposed on us from abroad. Even so, it was good to see that the Community was not simply trying to reduce the fluctuations in exchange rates, as in the old 'snake', but also trying to improve the efficiency of the exchange markets. Use has been made of more effective measures such as short-term credits, medium-term assistance, the possibility of loans, and so on. All these measures undoubtedly come within the provisions of the agreement, and there have been no unilateral decisions as in the past. But what about the divergence indicator, on which the Commission placed so much faith? Has it worked successfully? If so, don't you think there should have been some other more realistic adjustments? Another cause for concern is that, as a result of this adjustment, the German mark is assuming an ever growing importance in the currency basket and in the European Currency Unit.

Similarly, how can we fail to be concerned when on this occasion it needed a plunge on the part of the dollar in one weekend to a regrettable historic low level before the Member States of the European Monetary System took almost immediate action? In a single day, on the Friday before the adjustments I have just mentioned, the Bank of France alone decided to spend \$ 200 million to prop up the parity of the franc. The European Monetary System is therefore threatened from outside and there is no evidence to suggest it will be capable of surviving the storms brewing on the world economic horizon. Excess dollars continue to be absorbed by the European monetary authorities, whether they like it or not, thanks to the cooperation provided by the European Monetary System. Speculative transfers of capital can be counteracted for a time, but at some stage the system could collapse like a house of cards. It would seem that it is not in Europe's interest today to systematically oppose United States policy. In the immediate future the best interests of the United States and

Europe lie in a new monetary organization allied to a policy of coordinated, resolute action by all parties. The last meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Belgrade did nothing to allay our fears on this point. The International Monetary Fund accepted the principle of a mechanism — the substitution fund — designed to absorb off part of the masses of dollars held by the central banks and thus stabilize the money markets. But our anxiety remains if all we do is replace the dollar with Special Drawing Rights, in which we have no great confidence. Does this not simply amount to putting back into circulation large amounts of currency badly needed — and constantly needed — by the United States to offset its trade deficit and its balance of payments deficit? This is the main problem when it comes to reforming the International Monetary System. And if the monetary policy of the industrialized countries had been more orthodox on this point, the oil-producing countries would have been able to invest more in our industrial conversion projects rather than buy gold or authorize short-term deposits in dollars. May be the present crisis would not be so grave. Europe's exchange policy will be doomed to failure unless it is backed up by a real monetary policy, with particular reference to controlling the creation of international liquidity.

As of this summer, this also applies to interest rates. In international monetary talks the main topic is the ominously steep rise in interest rates. The Federal Republic of Germany seems to have led the way in giving priority to the struggle against the pressures of inflation. Was this really useful? This attitude has probably complicated the issue of the European Monetary System, because the German mark and the high returns it offers naturally attract capital, and consequently the other currencies in the European Monetary System have been weakened. As far as we know, the decision to increase interest rates was taken without any formal consultations, and this is to be regretted. The European Monetary System has worked quite well up to now, because inflation rates in the different countries have tended to converge rather than diverge.

Is this pure chance? We hope not, but if in the future, each Member State were to pursue its own policy for tackling the considerable increase in the price of oil — and we do not know when that problem will be overcome — the European Monetary System could find itself in even greater difficulties. Under these circumstances, we must start taking things seriously, implement a common monetary policy, regulate the money supply in the individual countries and establish maximum and minimum growth rates for this supply. Negotiations should be opened with the United States and Japan to work out a new international monetary system which will be both firm and flexible, based on goods really required by industry and the public, by producers and consumers. Whether we like it or not, one of these

Ansquer

goods is undoubtedly gold. The new system should give gold the same priority as other reserves. In the long run, the Euro-currency market must be controlled somehow. The Euro-currency supply today stands at over 1 billion US dollars, equalling the money supply of the United States. This Euro-dollar market, a major source of inflation, must be controlled by methods available in our national banking systems. This is why we ask the Commission to put forward some proposals to this end, so that the Community can pursue at international level an effective and realistic monetary economic policy in the best interests of Europe and the rest of the world.

President. — I call Mr Ortoli.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, having listened to Mr Ansquer with great interest, the Commission can but share his fundamental concern. Indeed, the decision to set up a European monetary system was taken for the benefit of Europe, to provide a 'zone' of economic and monetary stability; but it was also taken to ensure greater calm after the confusion in the previous system.

That was my first comment.

My second preliminary remark will be very brief: even if the system functions perfectly in the Member States — and I shall discuss our exchange policy measures in a moment — this cannot, on its own, help us to overcome the major problems referred to by Mr Ansquer. National discipline — in particular the measures taken by the world's greatest economic power whose currency plays a major role in world trade, that is the United States — is an essential prerequisite for success. On this point, I can only echo the views expressed by Mr Ansquer.

With regard to the questions he has raised, I believe that a strategy is taking shape at Community level, as called for by the European Council resolution of December — a strategy whose practical features change with time — for in this field everyday reality is more important than regulations — but one which is becoming increasingly clear. I shall mention first intervention, that is the way in which the exchange-rate policy is developing in each Member State, and the willingness to harmonize policies, in other words to cooperate very closely on the measures initiated by the central banks. Since December, and especially since March of last year, when the system entered into force, it has become customary — not only as a result of good intentions, but because of the increasingly well organized machinery involved — for the central banks to consult one another on the day-to-day exchange-rate policy, which enables us gradually to eliminate the discrepancies which used to arise because, faced with the same problems, we all adopted

different attitudes. More generally, the exchange-rate policy, and especially relations with the dollar, have become constant topics for discussion at the monthly meetings of the governors of the central banks. Every month the governors of the nine central banks of the Community hold a meeting in Basle attended by the member of the Commission responsible for monetary affairs. We realize that a Community exchange-rate policy must gradually be established, and this subject will in future be dealt with as a matter of priority in our discussions, which I can assure you are becoming increasingly thorough. That was my first technical observation, as it were.

Secondly, we cannot remain indifferent to developments in our relations with the United States, to name but one country. I could also include Japan and all the other major countries in the world which help to shape the exchange market. Heaven knows, we have all felt the effects of the disruption which you were just talking about, but it is a good thing that, since last year, we have abandoned our familiar indifference to trends in the foreign international money market — although one is never completely indifferent in monetary matters. Two events should be placed on record: the first was the drafting of the decisions of last November; and the second, which took place while the International Monetary Fund was in session, took the form of a declaration of intent by the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve Bank to keep the dollar as strong as possible. Measures have been applied, in particular those decided upon in November, followed by those concerned with the control of internal US liquidity. The problem, as far as the American dollar is concerned, is of course an internal one: it involves pursuing policies which ensure that the dollar re-establishes itself through the sound management of the American economy, that is by a reduction in inflation; this is one of the benefits which we should be reaping today. This seems to me a very positive approach. People are now generally aware that monetary problems are common problems and that currencies, and therefore the various economies, are interdependent and that this interdependence extends far beyond the limits imagined or accepted only a few years ago.

Before turning to your question on interest rates, I should like to make a third comment on the attempts currently being made — alongside the efforts of a Community which wishes to increase in strength and is gaining greater control over its own foreign exchange policy — by some of our partners who wish to take a more active part in maintaining international monetary equilibrium.

You referred to two other kinds of problems, which I shall touch upon very briefly.

Ortoli

The first relates to the control of the 'Euro-markets' or 'Euro-currencies'. We should remember that whatever misgivings, criticism or uncertainty we may have expressed concerning these, they have provided a useful means of recycling some capital in quite a difficult period. At the same time, the continuous and, at times, uncontrolled increase in money supply through the Euro-markets should be kept under close scrutiny by the responsible monetary authorities.

We have not yet established a genuinely 'Community' position on this matter. Like you, I am convinced that we must find one; I can assure you that the Commission will support the view that no currencies can be excluded from the kind of regulations which we have in mind and which we all wish to apply to our own currencies; but the Commission does not intend to put forward legal proposals, as this would serve little purpose in matters which affect the activities and, to some extent, the sovereignty of the Central Banks, but will apply the increasingly effective machinery which is now being set up. We will thus inevitably achieve — and there are several ways of doing this — greater transparency, a better understanding of the situation — you are all aware of the problems we have had with consolidated balance-sheets — if necessary, the introduction of obligatory deposits for off-shore transactions, and a whole range of machinery at least partially resembling the existing national machinery. I believe these developments would be extremely worthwhile.

As for the substitution account, you pointed out that the decision on the principle of setting this up had been taken in Belgrade. But many questions still have to be ironed out before it can be introduced. One of the questions raised by one or two of the Member States concern the need to apply policies to avoid situations where the monetary reserves to be substituted are not immediately replaced by new liquidity. This is one of the question marks which is central to every analysis or assessment of the substitution mechanism. A number of other problems have also not been satisfactorily overcome, for example the problem of returns on funds lent, the transferability and liquidity of such funds, and the distribution of amortization charges. These are technical points, but they mean that we are not yet in a position to decide on the creation of a substitution account.

I should now like to wind up by discussing the more specific problem of the coordination of domestic monetary policies, a subject on which some questions were asked.

I repeat what I said on many occasions in the previous Parliament, namely that I do not think we can improve the EMS without considerably tightening our coordination of domestic monetary policies. There are certain general aspects to this problem, such as monetary expansion and the creation of liquidity. Objec-

tives which are increasingly pursued today, at least by those countries whose currencies have very firm domestic foundations. But this affects other aspects, in particular interest rates, which you referred to. Clearly, decisions taken in this field have a dual effect: they influence the running of the domestic economy and also be the currency's exchange position. The influence of major currencies cannot be easily prevented from spreading beyond artificial frontiers. I believe — and this is the position we have adopted — that major decisions on interest rates, and more generally those affecting the instruments for controlling liquidity, should be debated in advance in the context of the EMS. Such a debate should be held in good time and be effective, in other words it should provide an opportunity to express misgivings, to suggest alternative solutions and to take action. Decisions will therefore continue to be taken at national level for a long time to come, for such matters affect not only national sovereignty but also the independence of the national central banks, but they should be inspired by a desire to set up a European monetary system, in which everyone should participate.

Will the EMS be introduced gradually, contrary to the original intentions? Yes, and certain circumstances clearly suggest that the system is not just empty words but fulfils a fundamental need. My own view is that a strict code of practice will emerge under satisfactory conditions. I would stress that I have been arguing along these lines constantly, not only here, but with the Council of Ministers and at meetings of the bank governors. It is a view which I support with the utmost conviction.

Be that as it may, let us make a cautious appraisal of the movements in interest rates so far. I do not believe that the German attitude by itself, has triggered off a process leading to a state of confusion. Everyone agrees that external tensions have had fundamental bearing on this situation. But do not suppose that this invalidates my first argument — by no means: such tension in no way eliminates the need to coordinate our monetary policies closely, indeed rigorously. I think that this places the events of recent months in their proper context.

Is the system sufficient, or can we go further and create a fully-fledged new international monetary system now?

I am not sure that we will not have to go very much further than the system which we are building up at present. But I am sure that the Community, which is a great and powerful group of nations, is putting its affairs in order and is not contributing towards monetary confusion, since it is improving its own monetary stability. By virtue of its very existence, the Community is in a stronger position to discuss its problems with its partners, who should be involved in these problems — as they inevitably are — and who, above

Ortoli

all, should embark on a policy of greater mutual dependence and consultation, as advocated by Mr Ansquer.

Obviously, in both cases our success will depend to some extent on our courage and determination. But the line of approach seems clear to me.

Thirdly, we must examine ways — which are in my view necessary — of improving the supervision of international liquidity. I think this could prove to be a difficult process, partly because it poses very awkward technical problems. As I have told many of those who wonder whether such an undertaking is feasible, even though it may be necessary, we should not despair — we must do it. So we should not reject it out of hand by saying that in any case it won't work. We should examine the means and conditions whereby such an undertaking may be initiated.

Finally, the restoration of an improved monetary system — and there is no avoiding this — even if another general approach could be envisaged, must be based primarily on internal discipline in the Member States which can bring inflation down to a reasonable level and make our currencies appear convincingly stable to the outside world. For it is not enough to try to cure our instability by creating new machinery: a more fundamental approach has to be adopted. Our willingness to take action together is a very positive sign, simply because we will be able to achieve greater solidarity, avoid the discrepancies to which you drew attention in your question a moment ago, and thus achieve a greater feeling of corporate resolve and effectiveness. All this will clearly take time. The system is still in its infancy and will have to be developed. But we have made not a bad start, in fact I think we have done well, but we will have to work hard, adopting the approach which I have outlined, to ensure that our efforts are more amply rewarded.

President. — I call Mr Delors to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Delors. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would also like to echo the concern expressed by Mr Ansquer, though my analysis will no doubt differ from his, for two reasons. Firstly, at the time, I expressed very definite misgivings concerning not so much the principle of European monetary cooperation but the arrangements for implementing the EMS. So I did not expect the system to be outstandingly successful. However, the system, though not perfect, functions very well, for who would have thought that in six months it would have provided an oasis of internal monetary stability and withstood the turmoil outside? Furthermore, unlike Mr Ansquer, I believe that the recent internal adjustments were due more to differences in the inflation rates or to

misjudged initial ECU parities than to the onslaught of the dollar.

The second reason for this different analysis is, in my view, that if we confine ourselves to the narrow framework of the EMS, we cannot fully appreciate all the problems involved. What would we think of a country which based its overall economic policy solely on its monetary policy? Monetary policy is just one factor to be considered. That is precisely where the Community is going wrong.

With your permission, I should now like to make three comments in support of this view.

Firstly, a wave of speculation as intensive as that of 1973 has broken out in the West. Incidentally, there is a sharp contrast between the austerity preached to the workers and the huge profits reaped from speculation. And no-one can hold these in check. This wave has provided a kind of inflationary 'stimulant' which prolongs artificial growth. As we know, the only remedy we have been able to find is to increase interest rates in the hope that a return to positive interest rates, due allowance being made for increased prices, would enable us to counter this speculation.

Secondly, the West has been shaken — let us not delude ourselves — by a tremendous loss of confidence. We all know that oil prices have risen by 60 % since the beginning of the year. I do not underestimate the significance of this, but I will not allow myself to be hypnotized by increases in the price of oil, especially in view of the half-hearted attempts — to put it mildly — made by the Council to combat the energy threat, in particular by increasing coal production.

This loss of confidence is due to the extraordinary apathy of the United States, a nation which has pretensions to leadership, but which wants to enjoy the rights of leadership without ever submitting to its obligations. As long as the situation remains as it is and no firm steps are taken to change it, I do not see what we can do. Of course, I am well of the attempts being made by Mr Volker, the new governor of the American central bank, to try to restore order in his country. But the rot has already set in, not only in America's domestic policy, but in the huge mass of dollars which is the most widely used instrument of speculation.

Thirdly, the EMS can achieve some things but not others. Inside the zone it can produce results when there is a sharp rise or fall in the dollar; Mr Ansquer tabled his question while the dollar was very low, but if it shot up tomorrow, the EMS would be considerably disrupted. In this field, I should refrain from making prophecies.

I shall now wind up these brief remarks with the following three comments.

Delors

The first is simply this: I have always thought, and still think, that the measures accompanying the EMS are insufficient. People will reply, of course, that short and medium-term credits have been increased. But this is not enough, and although I appreciate the need for the unhurried progress advocated by Mr Ortoli, on the technical level, consultation on interest rates has not been adequate. The EMS has not been an unqualified success. Secondly, although the Commission's statements indicate that attitudes towards the United States have become firmer, they are still not firm enough. For this reason I regard the substitution account, under present circumstances, as a purely cosmetic operation which does nothing to remedy the lack of positive action on the dollar.

Thirdly, although inflation, along with unemployment, is now the major source of concern, I am worried about the lack of coordination as the countries of Europe go into recession in Europe. The November debate on the economic situation in 1979 and 1980 will, however, give us ample opportunity to discuss this matter and make proposals.

President. — I call Mr Herman to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr Herman. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like, on behalf of my Group, to emphasize the importance which we attach to the smooth functioning of the EMS. It is an essential prerequisite for the creation of a stable monetary zone, without which there can be no growth, prosperity or full employment.

We are also very conscious of the ingenuity of the system which, by means of a very subtle compromise, has succeeded in combining the advantages of the *numeraire* basket formula with the system of parities. It is a highly flexible system — this has been proved quite recently — which we feel creates solidarity among the Community Member States in that they share the risks associated with exchange-rate fluctuations. It is also undeniably beneficial as far as integration and joint policy making are concerned.

One of the significant aspects of the system is the creation of a divergence indicator. In this connection, provision was made in the December agreement, which was confirmed by that of 13 March of this year, for the system to be reviewed after 6 months. The Council duly met at the end of that period and considered the system sound, since it has maintained it. I would like to be able to share the Council's optimism when it notes that the divergence indicator has functioned very well.

What are the possible implications of the divergence threshold? These may be two-fold. Firstly, a warning

system would be set up to trigger off a chain reaction — the forms which this would take and the time-scale involved are not very clearly specified — with a view to avoiding the depletion of reserves so as to keep the exchange rates within the limits. If this is the purpose of the system, it cannot be said to have functioned well in the first eight months. Indeed, the 'exceptional' cases in which it was possible to reach these limits before the divergence threshold occurred very often. This happened in the case of the Belgian franc and the Danish crown and lasted several weeks. The 'exceptional' has therefore become the norm. I wonder, therefore, whether the mechanism is really working all that well.

Moreover, no provision is made for what should be done when the divergence threshold is reached, since everything is left to the discretion of the financial institutions and the governors of the central banks.

However, the system may have another implication which is not incompatible with the first: it is intended to help determine the central bank which has to take action. Here too, the system does not appear to have worked well, as some currencies — those with a low ECU weighting — have been forced to their limits, not through their own merits or those of any national policy, but because of the intra-limits intervention policy of those currencies with a high weighting in the basket. I feel that on this point the purpose of the system, which is to determine who has to take readjustment measures, has not been fulfilled. My Group and I are therefore not very satisfied with the way in which the divergence threshold mechanism operates.

I would also like to comment on the methods and procedures governing intervention. It was intended that the intervention procedures would operate in the currencies of the participating countries, hence the 'unlimited' credits. However, intervention within the limits has been carried out to an enormous extent in dollars, with the result that the ECU has not assumed its expected role, dollar interventions have cancelled each other out, and currencies with low weightings have been pushed to their limits.

Could the Commission not take the initiative in drafting regulations to determine the procedure for intervention within the limits. In particular, could it not stipulate — as I believe the European Council has suggested — that whenever dollars are bought or sold, 20% of the transaction should be deposited in exchange for ECUs.

Finally, it is intended to channel gold and currency reserves into the initial ECU Fund. Would it not be possible to make provision for other credits such as IMF reserves or SDRs, and to apply to the IMF for the status of third holder for the FECOM?

President. — I propose that the list of speakers now be closed.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mrs Poirier.

Mrs Poirier. — (*F*) Mr President, the question seems to suggest that the House is only just becoming aware of the dominant role of the dollar in the international monetary system and of the anarchy prevailing in it. However, the predominance of the dollar has been giving the United States monstrous economic and financial privileges for a very long time.

By issuing dollars, the United States has had no difficulty in offsetting its foreign trade deficit and in meeting the cash requirements of its multinationals, and has even provided backing for speculation on the financial markets. The inflation of the dollar has thus been having serious repercussions on the European currencies for a very long time! An increasingly large proportion of dollars is now in fact being absorbed by the central banks of European countries, where they form the basis of a whole range of inflationary financial operations designed to satisfy the ever growing cash requirements of the multinationals and financial groups. Thus, the excessive international supply of dollars is financing the accumulation of American capital, primarily in Europe, and provides fuel for speculation by the multi-nationals and, of course, for the imbalance which ensues.

The dollar is weakened by its inflation — not that this bothers the directors of the multinationals, whose products thus become more competitive. Obviously, the inflation of the dollar is, at the same time, damaging in the eyes of American big business, since it justifies the actions of the oil exporting countries, who are now legitimately trying to maintain their purchasing power, as the price of oil is calculated in dollars. It also poses a threat to the foreign investments of the American multinationals by making them more burdensome. In fact the system is so inconsistent and unbalanced that it is now just limping along — and when someone limps too badly, he is given crutches. That is just what the EMS is — a crutch, a breathing space to allow the massive supply of dollars, speculation and the financing of the multinationals and the financial groups to continue!

Similarly, the role of the IMF is to issue special drawing rights (the familiar SDRs), in which the dollar largely predominates, and thus to consolidate the position of the dollar by providing a broader base for issuing dollars and for external financing.

The EMS is a joint undertaking by all the Community Member States which is designed to consolidate operations in dollars on an institutionalized basis.

The other equally direct consequence of the system is that the dominance of the mark in Europe is now sanctioned and institutionalized. Thus, Germany's currency is also being strengthened to the detriment of the weaker currencies, which are unable to keep up with the mark, the value of which is constantly increasing.

That was why it was necessary to adjust the system recently by changing the pivot rates and revaluing the mark. Therefore the EMS in no way represents a beneficial search for a joint policy on the dollar. It confirms the economic and financial domination of some countries, namely the United States and Germany, and worsens all the imbalances affecting the other countries with more vulnerable economies. The workers also suffer, since inflation is constantly eroding their purchasing power, and despite all the lofty speeches the EMS also penalizes the developing countries, whose import bills are rising relentlessly. Crises are not countered by measures which exacerbate their basic causes!

So the EMS can never solve these problems; indeed, it can only aggravate them. We are perfectly aware that there are no easy answers to the crisis which has hit the international monetary system; but we, the French Communist and Allied Members, cannot accept a situation in which the fate of the French franc is decided in Bonn! We cannot accept a system which will increase France's trade deficit with the United States and Germany. In our view, therefore, any solution must provide for the safeguarding of the franc and the combating of a system in which, in the final analysis, the dominance of certain currencies is the root cause of imbalance and inflation.

President. — I call Mr Damseaux to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Damseaux. — (*F*) Mr President, the issue raised here is one of the most important in the economic field. When we once again find it justified and right that the Parliament gets an opportunity to discuss these matters, it is because our societies are continuously confronted with the full consequences of the insecurity and unrest on the currency markets. This causes some extremely negative effects for the competitiveness of our industries and our economic policy in general. Inequilibrium and unrest on this market will inevitably spread to the other currency markets. That is why the problem cannot be considered in isolation by the Community; one can of course deal with the problems on a more limited scale in for instance our own system, the EMS, but a permanent solution cannot be found without involving all Member States of the International Monetary Fund.

Damseaux

The reason for the lack of confidence in the American dollar is to be found in the fact there is a great need for a change of policy in the United States in several essential economic areas. I could just mention the lack of will to change and limit the American consumption of oil. This is a situation which not only affects the currency markets by a fall in the value of the dollar, but it also provokes a situation where there is a shortage of oil and therefore an increase in prices. We consequently find it is necessary to have a much closer coordination of policy between the European and the American authorities. A reduction of the enormous sums of dollars which float around in the world is necessary because they are the subject of severe speculations. This is especially our concern in Europe where most of the speculation takes place.

We do nevertheless have opportunities to influence our own situation. We have established a new system which is a great step ahead — but a system which must be fulfilled. In order to get this system to work, we must be willing to put nationalistic points of view aside and try to solve our problems together. It was therefore with the utmost concern that we followed the recent adjustments of the currency rates.

Adjustments are necessary as long as the national economic policies differ to the extent we know today. We must, however, be willing to understand that these adjustments are not the tool of the eight governments to improve their own competitive situations. Instead these adjustments must be seen as a way of materializing already existing economic conditions.

I cannot therefore avoid telling you how surprised I was to find that the Belgian franc did not become a part of this adjustment. It is obvious to everybody that the Belgian economy does not give any ground for a revaluation compared to any of the other currencies in the European Monetary System. And this is what actually has happened. While the German Mark has gone up, the Danish Crown has been devalued compared to the Belgian franc. I see absolutely no reason for this when I look at the statistics of the Belgian economy.

One cannot discuss monetary questions without including the very important question of the individual country's interest policy. Unfortunately there is today a tendency in many countries to work from a shortsighted and nationalistic point of view. Changes in the interest rate in one country frequently cause a chain reaction in other affected countries. It is obvious that we are now moving towards a level of interest in most countries which is completely unacceptable to the industries. The consequence therefore is a further strengthening of the recessive tendencies in the world economy, which we already see quite clearly in the United States. We would therefore like to stress the importance of coordination between the countries also in this field.

Today I feel we can say that the European Monetary System has been working successfully through these

first seven months. We must realize that we probably will not obtain a stable situation on the currency markets as long as the inflation rate in the United States is 13 % per year, in Germany 6 %. Mr President, we must go on thoroughly developing our own system, first of all because it is of the greatest importance to the Community, but secondly because a return to stable and normal conditions is not within sight for the world as a whole.

President. — I call Mr Hopper.

Mr Hopper. — Mr President, Mr Ansquer has asked us what action the Commission proposes in order to put an end to the disorders in the international financial markets. As Mr Ortoli has already said, the origin of this disorder lay in the United States' domestic market, over which the Commission has no jurisdiction and little influence. The Volcker package was a powerful dose of monetary medicine, which is already having a salutary effect. Since it was announced, the disorders in the exchanges have greatly diminished.

Disorder is now to be found in interest rates rather than in exchange rates. No doubt a new pattern of interest rates will emerge before long, as markets adjust themselves to new circumstances.

The questioner has suggested that someone should seek to establish an effective control of the Euro-currency market. I should like to ask, who should exercise this control, how is it to be exercised and why is it desirable?

Let us address ourselves to the nature of the Euro-markets. By definition, they are outside the direct control of the relevant national governments. A Euro-dollar is a dollar not on deposit in the United States. Euro-sterling is sterling not on deposit in London. It is therefore difficult to exercise any direct control over them. If you wish to influence a Euro-currency market, you must do so indirectly through the appropriate national market of which it is a function. There would be no Euro-dollar market if there was not an excessive supply of dollars in the United States.

In my opinion, the SDR will not aggravate world inflation. Central banks deposit United States dollars with the International Monetary Fund, which credits them with SDRs and redeposits the dollars in New York. If SDRs were money, then indeed the amount of money would be doubled; but is the SDR money? Is it liquid? Can you buy a cup of coffee with it or settle an international debt? The answer is no. It is doubtful whether the SDR is much more than a figment in the minds of central bankers.

Lastly, Mr President, I must disagree with Mr Ansquer when he says that the chaotic increase in interest rates was responsible for the revaluation of the German mark. The interest rates applicable to the weaker members of the EMS actually rose more than those applicable to the German mark. The German

Hopper

economy is the strongest in Europe, and from time to time this continuing strength must be reflected in the exchanges.

President. — I call Mr Leonardi.

Mr Leonardi. — (*I*) Mr President, when the Italian Communist Party announced its support for the creation of the European Monetary System, it was on condition that there be more effective control of our relations with other currencies, especially the dollar. Very little has been done in the meantime, however, while the situation has gone from bad to worse.

I want to ask the Commission to examine these crucial relations with other currencies — and not only with the dollar, as Mr Ortoli was quite right to point out — and to consider this a matter on which Parliament is to be kept constantly informed. We also have to be kept informed about the Eurodollar market, about measures which have been decided and about any measures which are being considered or mooted to control this market.

We have been debating this question for years, but the time has perhaps come when we should actually do something, since otherwise our European Monetary System will come to nothing. We must not forget that all the earlier attempts, from the Werner plan onwards — and Mr Ortoli is well aware of this — collapsed under the hammer blows of speculation from outside, with the dollar the main culprit. In my opinion, therefore, in view of the fact that a clear majority of us here supported the creation of the European Monetary System both then and now, the number one concern at the moment is our relations with other currencies, especially the dollar. I know, I am going to be told that all this is very tricky, because many of the measures involved affect national rights and obligations, but something at least can be done, if for no other reason than to inform the general public of the serious situation we have got ourselves into.

I need hardly point out that the difficulty of this situation stems from the fact that the Americans have manoeuvred and manipulated their own currency in order to solve their domestic problems at others' expense. This is no secret, but we have to make an effort to get out of this situation, and it was for this reason that the European Monetary System was created. There came a point when we decided it would be a good idea if, alongside the direct exchange rates of our currencies against the dollar, we had another system of Community exchange rates for our currencies, which means that we now have two systems. What we have to do is to strengthen our own internal exchange rates, and to do this we have to take a very careful look at the position with regard to the dollar.

I am going to wind up here because all the rest is self-evident. The problem is simply the action we have to

take. Although the issues at stake are extremely complex, we have to remember that this Community of ours has the major role in international trade, and that this gives it tremendous strength, because whoever has the leading role is in a position to control exchange rates, provided there is a desire to do so and especially if there is a common desire to do so. Of course, it is quite clear that more than action in the monetary sphere is required, and that economic action will be needed, too. We have to ensure that appeals for solidarity are not heard only when monetary action is required but also when there is a need for economic action to reduce disparities among the Member States. All these facts are known. The sole point that has to be remembered now is that the situation is extremely perilous because of the dangers threatening our monetary system. The events of the past should not be allowed to recur.

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (*NL*) Mr President, as Mr Ansquer rightly points out in his question, the European Council of December 1978 agreed that the European Monetary System had no chance of surviving unless the Community managed to establish a common policy in relation to the dollar. However, in order to avoid a possible misunderstanding I should like to point out that this alone will not be enough to safeguard the European Monetary System. I should like to remind you that previous monetary systems within the Community have also filled us with optimism, confidence and expectations which, however, were slowly but surely shattered. I am thinking here in particular of the 'snake' from which as time went on more and more Member States withdrew. We would, I think, be taking a somewhat one-sided view if we were to think that our problems will be solved provided we succeed in establishing a common policy with regard to the dollar. There is another side to the coin, i. e. our own monetary situation.

I should like to remind you once more of a number of essential conditions which must be fulfilled if the European Monetary System is to survive. Firstly — and this is a matter of considerable urgency as regards both the dollar and cohesion within the Community in the monetary field — the coordination mechanisms must, I think, be improved — certainly where monetary policy is involved — and, in addition, attention must be paid to the divergent positions of the central banks in the various Member States. I should be interested to hear what Mr Ortoli has to say on this point, since legislation and hence the position of the central banks differs from one country to another with the result that the amount of influence which they can exert is not the same in each case.

Secondly, as others have already pointed out, the European Monetary System must naturally find its own strength in improved coordination of economic

De Goede

policy, particularly as regards the inflation rates in the Member States which are still far too divergent. For example, the rate in the United Kingdom and Italy is around 15 to 20 % as against 4 to 6 % in the Netherlands and the Federal Republic. These differences can be absorbed for a very short time, but in the longer term this situation is obviously not tenable. This danger is at least as great as the current problems round the dollar. For this reason we need new agreements which will promote convergence without having deflationary consequences and I must say that, in my view, the Commission and Council have so far not conducted a satisfactory policy in this respect.

Finally, Mr President, there is I think, a need for greater coordination between the budgetary policies of the various Member States. Naturally, various things are already being done, but perhaps we should aim to include the entire public sector in this process. The debate with Mr Vredeling on this point has already begun — we started it yesterday and we will continue tomorrow — and it has already become apparent that in spite of the Community's twenty-five years of existence there are still major differences as regards economic and social policy. I shall also have to point out to Mr Vredeling tomorrow that despite the great respect which I have for him and his work I am nevertheless disappointed at the amount of progress which has been made up to now. It would be a good thing, in my view, if the budgetary balances and their consequences also received more attention. I think we must realise that it is not only our position vis-à-vis the dollar which is important, but also the cohesion within our Community itself and that, in the long term, certain conditions must be fulfilled if the EMS is to function effectively. I should like to conclude by reminding you once more of these conditions: better coordination mechanisms, convergence of inflation rates in the various Member States, greater approximation of the budgetary policies of the Member States and application of these policies to the entire public sector.

President. — I call Sir Brandon Rhys Williams.

Sir Brandon Rhys Williams. — Mr President, Mr Ansquer and his colleagues have performed a service for Parliament in tabling this interesting and topical question. In effect, it seems to me that the question they are asking is: should the markets control the central banks, or the central banks the market? That is certainly a topical question.

First, we have to acknowledge our limitations. We have to recognize that the management of US domestic policy is not in our hands. In the Community, we can only contribute effectively to world currency stability by bringing our own affairs into better order. The monetary authorities of the IMF Member States can, and should, do more in the

control of the offshore currency markets, like the Euro-dollar and Eurosterling markets, to ensure that prudent banking policies are followed by all the major operators. We cannot afford the waves of speculation and even panic which might be set off by another Herstatt or Sindona scandal.

It may well be possible to achieve a useful though inevitably limited result by persuading the holders of ultra-short-term US dollar securities to switch into longer-term assets under some form of substitution system sponsored by the International Monetary Fund; but the answer to my question whether the central banks should control the market has to be, no. The central bank cannot combat the forces inherent in the market's own movements, and it is futile to try, except for limited smoothing operations.

Of course, we may look back with nostalgia to the Bretton Woods era, when the national governments of the major countries entering world trade observed a set of rules which kept their currencies more or less in line with the United States dollar and maintained a stable set of exchange rates by the use of controls on capital movements; but we cannot now go back to Bretton Woods any more than we can readopt the gold standard as a set of rules which govern the exchange-rate policies of central banks. Market forces working on the ethnic paper currencies are now too powerful to be resisted, except in the very small economies which can shelter in backwaters away from the ebb and flow of world credit.

The European Monetary System has come to a point where it has to decide either to go forwards or to go backwards. It cannot maintain its creditability in face of the divergence in the rates of inflation of the component currencies. Either — and I include Britain in this analysis — we must work towards the creation of a united European market for credit or we must lapse, eventually, into chaos. The creation of a united European market for credit is not an unattainable ideal, although it obviously is not an immediately practicable one. The surrender of power by national central banks and financial authorities, either to world market forces in which the European Community countries, by virtue of the degree of economic integration they have already achieved, will tend to sink or swim together; or to a European federal reserve system as envisaged in the agreements setting up the EMS, which, unhappily, have made no progress; or possibly to a compromise which has still to be worked out in the light of experience, are not unrealistic policy choices. The creation of a single European market for credit is not an impossible target, but we have to approach it gradually by reasonable and politically acceptable moves. We must work together in the direction of national economic, budgetary and fiscal policy convergence, gaining strength all the time. Our national central banks and finance ministers have a duty to create the conditions in which businessmen

Rhys Williams

can take long-term investment decisions which prove right. That is the proper way to help free enterprise to overcome the present tendencies towards recession.

Britain has courageously announced yesterday the end of controls on capital movements. In so doing, the British Government is acting wholly and sincerely in the spirit of the Treaty, but it makes it even more difficult for Britain to join the European Monetary System. The daily movement of funds in and out of London is already on too vast a scale to be controlled by any reserve fund that can be assembled in the present circumstances; but there is plenty of room for closer cooperation. The European currencies will only come together into an exchange market time-zone of lasting stability when the national governments coordinate the policies which create the underlying economic and political conditions on which the currency markets constitute an hourly running commentary. It is so obviously in the interests of all our electorates that these conditions of stability should be created, that the European Parliament has a clear duty to press for the adoption of policies in each Member State which are united in obedience to the mandates of monetary integrity, banking prudence and political common-sense.

Western Europe cannot govern the world monetary system, but we can, and should, govern the national policies of Member States of the Community which will gradually enable us to develop our own. Exchange-rate policy, like all politics, is an art of the possible. We cannot control the markets, but if we look after our national policies the markets will look after themselves.

President. — I call Mr Ortoli.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, as it is already late, I shall not reply to all the speakers in detail, though I could perhaps pick out certain ideas which have been expressed and discuss them under three headings.

Firstly, are the accompanying measures sufficient? This question, though expressed differently, was raised by Mr Ansquer, Mr Delors and also by Mr de Goede. It is a fair question, and I believe that any development in our activities, especially as regards our internal monetary policy, is of vital importance. I shall come back in a few moments to a rather more specific aspect of the accompanying measures.

Secondly, attitudes to the dollar and to the United States are a major problem as far as the EMS is concerned. I tried to outline certain developments, both internal, namely the coordination of the intervention policies, and external, namely using our influence more effectively to make the United States realize the absolute necessity of interdependence. I want to make it clear to everyone that I attach just as much importance to this problem as those who have raised it in the most forceful terms. Success hinges on certain key factors; we must realize this and act accordingly.

Thirdly, the monetary aspect is not the only factor involved, and to divorce this aspect from other issues is fundamentally wrong. Although in our discussions we may — quite rightly, I feel — concentrate on one sector of economic policy and on Community measures with regard to the dollar, we should not ignore other basic prerequisites of success. A far greater degree of coordination in budgetary policy is essential if we are to achieve greater cohesion, even on the monetary level. But I am absolutely convinced that a more cohesive monetary policy must be accompanied by a far more concerted attempt to combat unemployment and restore a reasonable level of growth.

When I had occasion to present the EMS to the House, I pointed out that on the same day on which the decision was taken in Bremen to set up the EMS, it was decided — and I see a direct link between these two decisions — that concerted action would be taken to step up the fight against inflation and to improve growth and employment. I hope, therefore, that the inevitable false impression given by a debate on currency issues will not make us forget the complementary factors necessary for the success of monetary policy.

On this basis, I can now reply to the important questions raised. I agree with Mr Herman that the divergence indicator is not perfect. However, I think it has nonetheless provided an effective warning system; it is most important that, when things start to happen on the market, we should ask ourselves why and examine what decisions should be taken. If necessary, these should not be based on the conventional approach of relying on the intervention of the central banks. The root causes of the problems affecting the exchange market will have to be looked for at a deeper level. I will gladly examine his suggestions, especially those concerning the SDRs. With regard to the direct and indirect control of Euro-dollars, the question has been raised whether it is possible to take action on the market. Let there be no mistake, this is a serious question which cannot be answered by clichés or commonplace formulae. I am convinced that the approach whereby all Member States believe that while there is a money market, the public authorities nevertheless have a duty to regulate liquidity, is valid for all currencies, even if they are issued outside a recognized system. I am quite convinced — and this brings me to Mr Ansquer's question — that there is a link here with overall US policy, with overall policy on the dollar. I call upon everyone to act consistently. We must realize that taking action on interest rates, deciding on ceilings for money supply, controlling liquidity using the six or seven instruments available — even though these measures may take other forms and involve far greater difficulties — are equally justified when dealing with the other currencies not issued by the central banks.

President. — I call Mr Ansquer.

Mr Ansquer. — (*F*) Mr President, I think we are all aware that the nine Member States need to achieve harmonious economic growth and should be shielded against international monetary confusion which, as we know, is having serious repercussions, especially on employment. We should do our utmost — and this is one of our primary objectives — to absorb under-employment in Europe.

We therefore urge the Commission to learn from the monetary turmoil which is undermining the EMS. We also call upon it to improve the coordination of the policies on interest rates to avoid irregularities, in particular among the Member States with the weakest currencies.

Finally, we hope that the Community will draft concrete proposals for the effective monitoring of the Euro-dollar market, the chaotic development of which is hindering economic growth in Europe.

President. — To wind up this debate, Mr Ansquer, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, has tabled a motion for a resolution with request for an early vote pursuant to Rule 47 (5) of the Rules of Procedure (Doc. 1. 1-418/79).

The vote on this request will be taken at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

The debate is closed.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m. The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.20 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR JAQUET

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls on a point of order.

Lord Harmar Nicholls. — Mr President, has your attention been drawn to the comment made by the President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers this morning, when he very properly drew attention to the fact that by at the last minute altering the timetable of the agenda, we had given him a lot of inconvenience which may well have affected the contribution he could make to this very important debate?

I wonder if Madam President and yourself could give some thought in the future to seeing to it that when we have a timetable, we do keep to the timetable and to the agenda. It was very noticeable today that my colleagues on the other benches, who at the last minute made this suggestion to delay the debate on the grounds that they wanted to hear the statement

before they could comment on it later, were not in the House to listen to the statement so that really was not a very good reason. I do think it is important that when we have a timetable and an agenda, they should be adhered to both in the interests of Ministers who have to give a statement and of those of our colleagues who want to make a contribution.

(Applause)

7. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-405/79).

We begin with the questions addressed to the Council:

I call Question No 50, by Mr O'Connell.

Can the Council state what specific measures to combat unemployment, particularly among young people, have been adopted since the European Council in Copenhagen expressed the deep concern of the Council over the present high rate of unemployment?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — Mr President, I should say initially that this reply is somewhat longer than usual in view of the significance of the question.

The Council takes the view that the principal means of re-establishing a high level of employment is to promote conditions which would encourage economic growth in a situation of stability. At the same time it has considered specific measures in the employment field to be necessary in order to combat unemployment more effectively. It was with this in mind that last December the Council adopted two new types of aid extending the scope of the Social Fund to assist young people. Since 1 January 1979 it has been possible under certain conditions to obtain aid from this fund in order to promote the employment of young people under 25, who are unemployed or seeking employment, in undertakings exercising an economic activity or in projects which fulfil a public need. Furthermore, at its meeting of 13 May 1979 the Council invited the Commission to continue its studies and analyses on the adjustment of working hours and to submit proposals as and when appropriate.

At the meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment on 9 October 1979, the Commission submitted a communication on its progress in the matter, and the Council expects the Commission to submit concrete proposals in the course of the next few weeks.

Finally, possible Community measures to reduce the qualitative mismatch between supply and demand on the labour market will be examined in the light of the conclusions presented after discussion at the same meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment.

Mr O'Connell. — Could the Minister indicate how successful he believes these measures will be in combating unemployment?

Mr O'Kennedy. — The honourable Member will appreciate, I think, that, as I have indicated, in the first instance it is very much a matter for national governments to have their own employment programmes. In the second instance, even to avail of the facilities which were referred to in my reply, it is important that they would have the appropriate employment programmes and, of course, public sector programmes as well. The evidence so far from those States that are using this is that, in fact, it is quite successful. In view of the unemployment situation, particularly as it applies to young people, I think the Council recognizes that it is important to encourage all Member States to utilize this new instrument to the full.

Ms Clwyd. — Is the President-in-Office aware that Wales, which is one of the three poorest regions in the EEC, with a high percentage of young unemployed, has been excluded from the specific scheme he mentioned for the under-25s because of the Commission's habit of collecting youth unemployment statistics in June, when in some parts of the UK youth unemployment peaks particularly high in July and August. Is he aware of this anomaly? Does he intend doing anything about it?

Mr O'Kennedy. — While I can appreciate the honourable Member's concern, I think that she, too, perhaps appreciates that this is not a matter for the Council, but rather a matter for the individual State concerned. I can say, however, that what we might call a cyclical growth in unemployment in June or July, particularly after school leaving, is not peculiar to one Member State but is a pattern which you will find in many Member States. I am sympathetic to the problem the honourable Member has referred to, but I think she would appreciate that it is not a matter in which the Council has any responsibility.

Mr Almirante. — (I) Is the President of the Council aware of the serious unemployment among young people in Italy, particularly the south of Italy, which is on the increase partly because of the failure of a law which the Italian Government tabled and had adopted a good while ago?

I should like to ask whether the President of the Council feels that the proposed reduction in the Regional Fund, particularly with regard to the south of Italy, is justifiable in the light of this situation and how the Council of Ministers can accept the responsibility for something of this nature.

Mr O'Kennedy. — Once again I have to indicate that the actual application of this or any other programme in any Member State is, of course, a

matter, in the first instance, for the Member State to the extent that the problems are particularly chronic in parts of the Community. It does of course help to develop a sense of urgency on the part of the Council in coming forward with regulations and with facilities that can be used effectively within a particular Member State. But obviously I am not in a position to comment on the precise situation in Italy itself. I can only hope that this very significant decision on the part of the Council can be fully utilised in that area.

President. — Since they deal with the same subject, I call Question No 51, by Ms Clwyd:

Will the Council call on the Commission to draw up a report on the financial consequences of concentrating all meetings of all Community Institutions, and all staff of all institutions in one city?

and Question No 52, by Mr Schwartzberg:

Is the Council aware of the incredible waste of time and money resulting from the dispersion of the European Parliament's places of work outside Strasbourg, and does it not feel it is incumbent upon it to ask governments to remedy this state of affairs as a matter of urgency?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — It is for the governments of the Member States to determine the institutions' places of work by common accord. As my predecessors in the Council presidency have indicated in reply to various parliamentary questions, these governments do not at present propose to alter the provisions currently in force, either in law or in fact.

Mr Schwartzberg. — (F) Mr President, I should like to point out first of all that I am speaking in a personal capacity and make no claim to be expressing the views of the group to which I belong. However, I should like to inform the President of the Council that I am not satisfied with his answer in which he referred to the situation in law and in fact, since I have my doubts as to whether the current situation in fact is efficient and, in addition, whether it is legally justified?

Firstly, does not the present factual situation militate against efficiency in the work of this? In other words, can we go on in this way with Parliament dispersed over various cities with its Members condemned to travel back and forth from one place to another and unable to establish their secretariats, offices or assistants anywhere? Do we really have to go on like a band of strolling players?

Secondly, Mr President, is not this situation in fact at odds with the legal requirements?

It seems that the alternation between Strasbourg and another city has become established, as it were, as a gloss on the texts and agreements in force and contrary to the provisions contained in them. In your reply, you appeared to be referring to Article 216 of the Treaty of Rome which states that the seat of the Assembly is to be determined by common accord of

Schwartzberg

the Governments of the Member States. As it happens, on two occasions the Foreign Ministers have met and decided on Strasbourg as the seat for the Assembly, i.e. by a decision of 7 January 1958 and a similar decision at a later date. Does not the President of the Council think therefore that it is high time we stopped playing musical chairs and returned to the place of work which has been legally decided, i.e. Strasbourg, and I should like to ask him quite simply if he can undertake here today to include this question of the seat of the Assembly on the agenda for the next European Council meeting in Dublin.

Mr O'Kennedy. — I can only recall that it is for the governments of the Member States to determine by mutual agreement the institutions' places of work. Now, as the honourable Member has indicated, this of course is established by Article 216 which stipulates that this shall be determined by common accord of the governments of the Member States. I have to say that, so far, it has not proved possible to arrive at agreement on a common place of work as envisaged in Article 216 of the Rome Treaty. The questioner I believe will be fully aware that the present situation involves considerations other than purely financial ones or the ones he referred to. I do of course recognize that these considerations have for some time been and will continue to be of considerable interest to Parliament. My own personal opinion on this is not, I am afraid, of any relevance. I am bound by the provisions of Article 216, and by the terms of any agreement that can be reached in that context. As I have said, no such agreement has been possible.

Ms Clwyd. — The Minister, of course, has not answered my question. The decision to take the two questions together has prevented either one being answered satisfactorily. I would ask him to look again at Question 51: 'Will the Council call on the Commission to draw up a report on the financial consequences of concentrating all meetings of all Community institutions and all staff of all institutions in one city?'

May I remind the Council that the right to determine the permanently established seat rests with the Governments of the Member States. And while Article 216 of the Treaty, to which he referred, sets no time limit for a decision, the Governments are under an obligation to determine a seat within the meaning of Article 216 in a reasonable space of time. This obligation, Mr President, has not been fulfilled. Instead there have been decisions on the provisional places of work which are expressly not intended to determine the actual seat.

This Parliament is particularly affected by the fact that a seat has not been finally determined because it must at present carry out its activities away from the centre at which the executive is established. Does the Council believe it can countenance this situation in

the interest of efficiency, economy and the sanity of the various institutions? Does the Council not feel that this jaunting around between three centres is expensive and wasteful?

(Applause)

Mr Spicer. — Mr President, on a point of order. The institution of Question Time in this Parliament worked extremely well in the early days. But we are now moving into a situation where many Members who arrived as new Members are not asking questions. Members should put a question and then sit down. If they do not ask a question, will you please stop them and will you make quite certain that they do no more than put a question? You have our full support for this.

President. — I should indeed like to ask all speakers to put a brief supplementary question and then stop immediately.

Mr O'Kennedy. — As I have indicated clearly, this matter can only be determined by common accord of the Member States. Therefore in view of the fact that it has not been possible to reach agreement on the basis stipulated in the Treaty, I do not propose to ask the Council to ask the Commission to engage in the exercise that Ms Clwyd has requested.

Mr Balfe. — I am sure that in making any decision one of the factors that is most closely borne in mind is the cost. Is the Minister actually saying to this House that he is unwilling to commission a study of the cost of taking a decision? I am not asking what the decision should be, I am not prejudging it. Is he unwilling even to look at the cost? Is he saying they have no concern for money at all?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I am not saying anything about my willingness or unwillingness. I am talking about my capacity. It is not a matter for the Council to engage in an analysis of the financial implications of the location of the seat of Parliament. It is not a matter for the Council, and in these circumstances I have to abide by the strict limitations.

President. — I shall allow two further supplementary questions on this matter and then call the next question.

Mr Paisley. — Could I ask the President-in-Office of the Council whether the question of accessibility is not the main matter that he should be considering? Why should Members from the perimeter of the Nine find it impossible to get here for the beginning of meetings and have to leave before the end of the part-sessions? Surely the question of accessibility should be uppermost in his mind.

Mr O'Kennedy. — May I say to the honourable Member that, if I may speak personally on the ques-

O'Kennedy

tion of accessibility, it is a matter of active concern to every Member. I fully appreciate that it is a problem which concerns Members. But I have in reply again to indicate that, because of the considerations I have already referred to, it is not my function to have an analysis of this sort undertaken. If I may say so, the fact that the matter has been raised here on more than one occasion may in itself be of some significance.

Mr Radoux. — (F) Since we are still working with the system agreed on in 1965, i.e. that Brussels, Luxembourg and Strasbourg would be the provisional seats of the institutions, does not the President of the Council feel that the election of this Parliament by direct universal suffrage is a new element which is sufficient to warrant the Ministers finally getting round to taking a definitive decision?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I am afraid that I cannot give a definitive answer to the honourable Member's question. I do not think that the fact that this is a newly elected Parliament with additional Members changes the actual institutional agreement I referred to.

President. — I call Mr Galland on a point of order.

Mr Galland. — (F) Mr President, whilst fully accepting your right to limit the number of supplementary questions, I think nevertheless that it is essential that the Presidency should list the requests to speak in the order in which they are made.

I should simply like to point out that I asked to speak practically as soon as Mr Schwartzberg had begun to speak, long before Mr Radoux.

President. — I have the requests to speak listed in the order in which they were made. You are indeed on the list, but in sixth place.

I call Mr Denis on this same point of order.

Mr Denis. — (F) Mr President, in questions of this nature, which affect the work of our Parliament and the various countries present, this type of limitation is not in my view appropriate. I agree that everyone should simply put a question and not enter into a debate, but I think it is vital that Members should be given the opportunity to put the questions they feel to be necessary.

President. — According to our Rules of Procedure 'the President shall rule on the admissibility of supplementary questions and shall limit the number so that each Member who has put down a question may receive an answer to it.' This is far from being the case at the moment!

I call Question No 53, by Mr Poncelet:

Can the Council inform the European Parliament whether or not the rules stemming from the GATT Treaty and the provisions adopted by the GATT member countries in Geneva in July 1979 have been accurately integrated into American law (Trade Agreement Act)?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — The question raised by the honourable Member concerns one of the items to be examined by the Council on 29 and 30 October 1979, during its discussion on the final Commission report on the GATT multilateral trade negotiations — the MTN's — to which is appended a recommendation for conclusion of the negotiations. I am unable therefore at this stage to anticipate the conclusions of the Council on this item which is considered important by all the delegations.

Mr Poncelet. — (F) It is a question of what the United States understand by prejudice. What does the Council intend to do to ensure that the United States revises Section 771 of the Trade Agreement Act as regards the definition of prejudice within the meaning of Article 6 of GATT, which was discussed during the negotiations in Geneva in which the United States took part? I should point out straightaway that last July, following these negotiations, the United States Congress deliberately modified its interpretation of prejudice. The agreements signed are at this moment being infringed. The Council is aware of this. What immediate action does it intend to take?

Mr O'Kennedy. — As I have indicated the Commission will be reporting to the next Council meeting after which the Council will take a decision on this matter. I would expect that the Commission in its report will address itself, amongst other things, to the matter that the honourable Member has referred to. But as I have already indicated, it would be obviously inappropriate for me and far too premature to give any indications as to the possible outcome of this discussion in the Council.

Mr Welsh. — In view of his initial answer, will the President-in-Office of the Council undertake to place on the agenda of the Council discussion on GATT the question of a United States policy regarding control of oil prices which is giving their textile fibres manufacturers a significant competitive advantage and is seriously damaging the Community industry?

Does the President consider that US policy in this regard is in breach of GATT and will he, on behalf of the Council, accept the need for urgent action in the form of countervailing duties?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I would say to the honourable Member that the question which he has posed is not, in fact, relevant within the context of GATT. As a measure of the urgency which the Presidency ascribes to this matter, it has arranged for this matter to be placed on the agenda — I am talking about the GATT and the multilateral trade negotiations. The issue that has been raised by the honourable Member is not included within scope of these negotiations so that unfortunately, I cannot arrange to have it included since it is not appropriate to do so.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Bearing in mind the uncertainty that prevails in the textile industry throughout the Community regarding the period after 1982 when the multifibre agreement reached under GATT expires, has the Commission decided when it will set in motion the preliminary consideration of the kind of agreement which will succeed the present MFA, and will it persuade the United States to join in, since it has participated properly in the present agreement?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I think it is evident from the very manner in which the question has been posed by the honourable Member that that question should in fact be addressed to the Commission and not to the Council. It does not fall within the Council's terms of reference.

Mr Schwartzberg. — (F) Mr President, I should like to put forward a procedural motion which I tried in vain to put to you before. Since Members are required to ask precise questions, I think our Parliament has a right to demand precise answers from the President of Council. Unless I am deaf, he has not given a precise answer to my question regarding the inclusion of the question regarding the seat of this Parliament on the agenda for the European Council meeting in Dublin. I should be grateful if we could receive precise answers to precise questions.

(Loud applause)

President. — I call Question No 54, by Mr Flanagan :

Is the Council satisfied with the level of aid being provided from the EEC budget for infrastructural aid for Irish ports and what improvements could be made?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — The allocation of aid from the Regional Fund to the different types of project does not fall within the terms of reference of the Council. It is the responsibility of the Commission, which takes its decisions on the basis of requests submitted by the Member States, after consultation with the committee of the fund and, in certain cases, the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning of Parliament.

Mr Flanagan. — While appreciating the accuracy of the reply given by the Minister, I wonder would he be able to give me any information at all as to the actual amount that may have been expended for this purpose on Irish ports to date.

Mr O'Kennedy. — Speaking personally, I can say that the amount which has been allocated to Ireland in this area is of the order of £ 4.1 million.

Mr Moorhouse. — If I had been in Mr Flanagan's shoes I think I would have been rather disappointed by the somewhat negative type of answer which he received, because surely it is within the power of the Council to take some action to help forward projects

of this kind. Is it not a fact that the Council has denied the Commission and the Parliament the power to pass a financial regulation which would assist infrastructure projects of this nature? I think I am right in saying that we have had a negative reply from the Council since December 1976, or thereabouts.

Mr O'Kennedy. — I should tell the honourable Member that in fact there has been a regulation since 18 March 1979 which provides for aid from the fund for infrastructure directly linked with the development of industrial handicraft or service activities. The regulation in fact exists, there is no question of the Council in any way failing to provide a regulation. As to the other elements, I have to repeat that, impatient as the honourable Members may be — and perhaps, impatient as I might be myself — this does not fall within my terms of reference as President-in-Office of the Council, and I can't purport to speak on behalf of the Commission.

President. — I call Question No 55, by Mr Spicer :

Given the need for mutual confidence in relations between the Community and its partners in the Lomé Convention, is the Council satisfied that the results of negotiations for Lomé II will enable Community firms and the host states to successfully diversify the Community's sources of supply for minerals and in what time-scale will this development occur?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — The Second Lomé Convention includes a title on mineral products which was not in the previous Convention. The proposed system, which is to some extent similar to the Stabex system as regards conditions of implementation, and similar to the EDF procedures as regards financing of projects and programmes, will cover up to a special financing facility of 280m EUA copper and cobalt, phosphates manganese, bauxite and alumina, tin, iron pyrites, and thereafter iron ore, which is still provisionally included in the Stabex.

A second chapter concerns the development of the mineral and energy potential of the ACP States. It makes provision for technical and financial assistance by the Community, scientific and technical assistance projects, and assistance in the form of risk capital in the field of preparatory mineral research and investment. Furthermore, the European Investment Bank may commit its own resources on a case-by-case basis in accordance with its Statute in mineral and energy investment projects recognized by the ACP State concerned and the Community as being of mutual interest.

The intention of the parties is that this additional financing should reach 200m EUA. The Council can therefore express the firm hope that this connected series of measures will enable essential sources of supply of mineral products to be maintained and developed in the ACP States.

Mr Spicer. — May I thank the President-in-Office for that very lucid and very clear statement. But could I ask him this: the actual production of minerals within the Lomé states is one point, but the transportation of them is another; could he give me an assurance that the Council will spend some time looking at the problems particularly of Zaire and Zambia, in the transportation of their mineral wealth to ports of onward transmission to those countries that need it? Because quite honestly the situation at the moment, as he will know is impossible, and transportation can only take place through Rhodesia and South Africa.

Mr O'Kennedy. — The Council shares the honourable Member's concern, and in view of that there is an important element under Title III of the Lomé Convention concerning problems connected with the removal of minerals. Funds from the mineral fund may consequently be made available if problems were to arise in an ACP State with regard to the transport of minerals by normal means, for example transport to the sea, as in the cases he has mentioned.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 56 will receive a written reply.¹

I call Question No 57, by Mrs Ewing:

Will the President-In-Office of the Council make a statement concerning the crisis situation in the hill-farming industry in Scotland?

Mr O'Kennedy, *President-in-Office of the Council.* — At its meeting on 15 and 16 October 1979, the Council heard a very full statement on the situation in the hill-farming industry in Scotland. As the honourable Member will no doubt know, the Scottish hill areas are classified as a less-favoured area under Directive 75/268. Under the Directive, farmers in the Scottish hill areas benefit from a number of advantages, in particular the compensatory allowance paid per head of sheep and cattle. The maximum allowance is currently 20.3 EUA per livestock unit. But an increase in the amount is currently under discussion.

Earlier this year, the Commission submitted to the Council a proposal for the agricultural components of an integrated development plan for the Western Isles of Scotland. This forms part of the package of the structural measures currently under consideration.

The proposal I referred to is for a ten-year project to improve agriculture, encourage afforestation of marginal land and improve the marketing and processing of agricultural products. The estimated cost to the EAGGF is 50m EUA for the first five years.

¹ See Annex.

Mrs Ewing. — I am very gratified by the factual nature of the answer I have received. It is obvious that the Council is aware of the importance of this sector of the industry. Economically, it accounts for one third of the output of farms in Scotland, and socially it maintains population. And it is in a state of crisis. Will the Council therefore press the United Kingdom Government to use the powers that they have under their own legislation and on which they are dragging their feet, to improve the situation of these farmers — many of whom may go out of business, despite what the President-in-Office said in his answer — if the position is not improved?

Mr O'Kennedy. — Close neighbours though we are, I feel the honourable Member could accept that it is not my function to press the United Kingdom Government in matters of this sort, though I believe that in fact they have under consideration further instruments to avail themselves fully of the Council facilities that I referred to.

President. — I call Question No 58, by Mr Prout:

When will the Council implement the decision of the Heads of State and of Governments in Paris in December 1974 that a return should be made to decision making in the Council by unanimity and by majority voting as prescribed in the Treaties?

Mr O'Kennedy, *President in-Office of the Council.* — As indicated in previous replies to Parliament, the Council considers that the provisions of the Treaties which lay down that the Council shall act by a majority of its members or by a qualified majority do not prevent members of the Council from making every endeavour to reconcile their views before the Council takes a decision.

Mr Prout. — Since over 200 Commission proposals still await decision by the Council, and since the Community is now on the threshold of further enlargement, will the President-in-Office undertake to ensure that this matter is fully discussed, both by the Council of Ministers and by the European Council before the end of his presidency?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I may perhaps mention to the honourable Member that it is anticipated that the report of the Three Wise Men which will be coming before the European Council in Dublin will probably deal with this matter and also that the European Council will refer it to the general Council of Foreign Ministers. In that context I think the Council will take note of what the honourable Member has said and the other issues involved also.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — (D) Can the President of the Council perhaps explain why the Council always criticizes Parliament when it regards the latter's interpretation of the Treaties as too broad, but is nevertheless only too ready itself to put too narrow an interpretation on the provisions of the Treaties and indeed fail to apply what they actually lay down?

Mr O'Kennedy. — Obviously I cannot accept that the Council does not apply the Treaties fully, and equally I hope that we both, the Council and the Parliament, can accept that the Council does not approach the Parliament on the basis suggested by the honourable Member merely to criticize them when it suits the Council. I would hope that it has a better understanding and relationship than that.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 59 will receive a written reply.¹

I call Question No 60, by Mr Møller:

During Parliament's September part-session I tabled a question on the subject of workers' co-ownership rights and "economic democracy".

Is the Council, after its President's personal promise to ensure that the matter was discussed in the Council, now able to answer the Question?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — Insofar as the question relates to acts or instruments already adopted in the field referred to by the Honourable Member, the Council considers that these acts and instruments do not conflict with Article 222 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community. As regards the work in progress, the Council has not had an opportunity to examine the possible effect of this Article. Moreover, the Council would remind the honourable Member that it is the Court of Justice which is responsible for taking decisions concerning the interpretation of the Treaty.

Mr Møller. — (DK) Mr President, we in this House are obviously not perfect idiots, because nothing is perfect. I should therefore like to point out that I am of course fully aware that the Court of Justice is competent to take decisions concerning the interpretation of the Treaty of Rome and bears the ultimate responsibility. Nevertheless, on previous occasions when foreign policy was concerned the Council has criticized the Commission for overstepping the limits of its competence without waiting for a decision from the Court. As regards the matter in hand, the Commission has drawn up a memorandum concerning profit-sharing in companies, and as far as I can see this is connected with the transfer of ownership rights, which means that the memorandum constitutes a breach of Article 222 of the Treaty which indicates that the system of property ownership falls outside the Treaty. Am I therefore to understand from the Minister's answer that although action was taken vis-à-vis the Commission when foreign policy was involved, the Council has no wish to follow a similar course of action in this case, thus tacitly accepting the fact that the Commission is concerning itself with these questions. Can the President of the Council confirm this view?

¹ See Annex.

Mr O'Kennedy. — I would like to assure the Member, and all Members, that the Council is not interested in antagonism or asserting itself over one Institution or the other—there seemed to be some implication of that nature there. We are more interested, as I am sure all of us are in the various Institutions, in cooperation rather than in knuckle-rapping.

As I have said already, as regards the work in progress, the Council has not had an opportunity to examine the possible effect of this Article. I would like to say to the Member quite seriously that there was no implication on my part, in drawing his attention to the rôle of the Court of Justice, that this was something he did not know and needed my knowledge to convey to him. I thought it would just be useful to make the comment.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Would not the President-in-Office agree that if it is true that there is obligatory profit-sharing in companies in the Commission's memorandum and proposal, this is against Article 222 of the Treaty? Will he therefore take the necessary action to see that this is not promulgated and not forwarded to the Institution, as it is against Article 222?

Mr O'Kennedy. — The honourable Member will appreciate that the Council can only act on its own responsibility when undertaking its own obligations. It cannot at this stage comment on what may or may not be in the Commission's memorandum, but when the matter does come before it, the Council will take fully into account the implications of the Treaties and the rights of Member States in this area.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — Is the President-in-Office saying that whilst they recognize that there is a breach or may well be a breach, they are not prepared to do anything about it until the breach has been made an actual breach, whereas if they acted now they could prevent it going to a point where somebody is proved to be wrong in writing?

Mr O'Kennedy. — Could I say in reply to that question, and by way of clarifying my reply to the supplementary posed by Mr Scott-Hopkins, that while the memorandum has in fact been presented to the Council services, both the honourable Members would appreciate that this involves, on the Council's part, a lot of consultations with capitals before the matter can formally be presented to the Council with the full knowledge and information that they will require in view—as I think Members will appreciate—of the different traditions, the different structures, the different patterns of the Member States. The Council is engaged in that process, and as soon as it has been completed the views of Member States and the views expressed here will be taken fully into account.

Lady Elles. — If the Council does realize that this memorandum is contrary to Article 222, what action will the Council take?

Mr O'Kennedy. — It is a hypothetical question. I am prompted to give the obvious reply. When the matter comes to us, we shall deal with it on the basis of the examination and the discharge of our obligations.

President. — I call Question No 61, by Mr Kavanagh:

Have any measures been taken so far to provide aid to Cambodia in an attempt to alleviate the horrific situation there, where some one million people could be dead from starvation by December, unless international action is taken?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — At its meeting of 9 October 1979, the Council approved the 3-month emergency plan for the use of 4m EUA as aid to the people of Cambodia. This sum is intended for the purchase and transportation of products essential for the survival of the inhabitants—food supplies, medicines, medical equipment, logistic resources, crop-seeds, etc.—which the various agencies involved have said they are able to convey to the people for whom the aid is intended. The various agencies will build up their staff in Cambodia to supervise the operations and ensure that the aid actually reaches the needy irrespective of the authorities by which they are governed. The aid is intended for the 2 500 000 people it is possible to reach—some 2 200 000 *via* Pnomh Penh and 300 000 *via* the Thailand frontier under Khmer Rouge or Khmer Serei control.

I would also, in this connexion, refer to my statement this morning, in which I outlined the major efforts under way by the Nine, individually and collectively, arising out of the discussions at Ashford Castle last week-end.

Mr Kavanagh. — While appreciating the efforts that now are being made to alleviate the suffering in Cambodia, may I ask the President-in-Office, in view of the urgency of the situation and the likelihood of massive numbers of deaths between now and Christmas if aid is not distributed efficiently, how quickly this aid can be brought to the people of that country?

Mr O'Kennedy. — In reply to the honourable Member, I can say: as quickly as is made possible by the opportunities for distribution available to the Council. My reply is related only to the 4m EUA that are already available; but, as I think I indicated this morning in my address on political cooperation, tomorrow in Dublin our experts from the Asia group and experts particularly concerned with refugee relief problems will be meeting with a view to reporting to

the general Council next week. It is our expectation also that before that Council meeting next week the Commission will have very considerable further proposals, and it is the intention of the Council and also the Member States to act on those.

Finally, I want to repeat what I indicated on behalf of the nine Foreign Ministers after the Ashford Castle meeting, that the Community and the nine Member States are not concerned how the aid gets to the people for whom it is intended provided we can be reasonably assured that it gets to them: we are prepared to go into discussions with any government or any people who have influence or control in the area. I think that indicates the concern which the Council has, which undoubtedly this Parliament has and which, I think, the peoples of our Member States also have.

President. — I call Question No 62, by Mr Patterson:

Since October last year, when the European Parliament last debated the Commission's draft directive on the control of illegal immigration and illegal employment, it has been reported that further changes in the draft directive are being considered as the result of discussions in the Council. Is it therefore the intention of the Council now to consult Parliament again on this matter?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — The European Parliament was consulted by the Council on the original Commission proposal on the control of illegal immigration and employment, and it delivered its opinion on 15 November 1977. It was re-consulted by the Council on the amended Commission proposal and delivered its second opinion on 10 October 1978. At the present stage in the proceedings, the Council has not been seized of any amending proposal which would justify consulting the European Parliament yet again.

Mr Patterson. — I am happy to accept the Minister's assurances that no substantial amendments have been made to this draft directive since last October, but I am bound to tell him that this is not the impression gained by the representatives of immigrant organizations in the United Kingdom. Is he aware of the fact that so far no consultations have taken place with these immigrant organizations in the United Kingdom on this draft directive? It is the opinion, both of those organizations and of employers, that this draft directive could do untold damage to race relations in the United Kingdom and that if it goes through it could undo years and years of painful work in trying to build up good race relations in the United Kingdom. Before anything is done to amend the original draft directive, could this Parliament have another opportunity to debate it? This is a matter which, I think, is a matter of principle as well: if changes are made since Parliament's debate, Parliament should have another opportunity to see it.

Mr O'Kennedy. — I think the pattern of consultations so far between Council and Parliament indicates that the Council is quite ready to adhere to the understanding there is on the consultation procedure. As I have indicated, we have had reconsultation on an amended proposal. There is no further amended proposal before the Council at the moment from the Commission, and therefore I cannot now indicate that there will be any further consultation. I think the honourable Member would appreciate that the other matters he refers to are matters that would be appropriate for representations to, or consideration by, the United Kingdom Government, and I cannot presume to answer on their behalf.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (I) Whereas the previous Member to speak was clearly concerned about the application of the directive on illegal migration, we, who take a very different view of the matter, would like to know whether so far in the deliberations of the Council any States have opposed the application of this directive, which we await with great interest.

Mr O'Kennedy. — I think the honourable Member will appreciate that I cannot report here on what individual Member States say on any of a variety of topics which come before the Council. They have to be confidential. If the Member States themselves wish to publish the positions they take in Council, that is a matter for them, but it is not for the President-in-Office of the Council to report here, or elsewhere, on the positions taken up by an individual Member State.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — (D) If the Council does not envisage any further substantial changes, when can we expect this directive to come into force?

Mr O'Kennedy. — It is not a question of what the Council is doing or is not doing, it is a question of whether or not we are going to get an amended proposal from the Commission, and as soon as that does emerge, then the Council will take action accordingly.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Did I hear the President-in-Office correctly when he talked about getting an amended proposal from the Commission? If so, presumably, as a good parliamentarian, he will consult Parliament — won't he?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I think I have indicated already that the only circumstances in which there could be a re-consultation with Parliament would be in the event of there being an amended proposal from the Commission. I think perhaps the honourable Member's supplementary enables me to clarify that. Unless there is such an amended proposal, then the question of reconsultation would not arise.

President. — I call Question No 63, by Mr Geurtsen:

Can the Council state what progress has been made in regard to the proposal for a directive on product liability and when this directive is likely to be adopted by the Council?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — In the light of the opinions of the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee on the original proposal, the Commission submitted to the Council, on 1 October 1979, an amended proposal for a directive on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning liability for defective products. The amended proposal will be examined by the Council bodies. It is not possible at this stage to indicate how long these discussions within the Council will take.

Mr Geurtsen. — (NL) When debating the draft directive on limited liability, this Parliament stated that, in its view, it would be in the interests of the European consumer if this directive were adopted rapidly. Does the Council agree with this view, and is it consequently prepared to take a more rapid decision than usual on the amended proposal which it has in the meantime received from the Commission?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I do not precisely know what is the customary speed of the Council. I interpret from the honourable Member's suggestion that he thinks, whatever speed it is, it is a few knots too slow. On the other hand, I would like to indicate that we have only had this particular proposal since 1 October. The matter is being examined urgently, and it does involve, as the honourable Member will appreciate, consultation with Member States. I therefore do not think that speed is of such a consequence as to be a primary consideration when one has to engage in detailed consultations, which certainly we have not yet been able to conclude.

Mr Spicer. — Will the President-in-Office also give an undertaking that when considering this matter the Council will take due account of the views of the Legal Affairs Committee of this Parliament which reported very fully and gave its opinion on the product liability directive, and make quite certain that those views are understood within the Council.

Mr O'Kennedy. — I can assure the honourable Member that the views of Parliament will, of course, be taken into account.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (I) Does not the Council think that it would be advisable to adopt the directive on liability for defective products, which forms part of the first action programme on consumer protection, in view of the fact that the second programme is soon to come into operation? Would it not be sensible at least to have the first programme well under way or completed before moving on to the second?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I can only say that this seems to raise a much more general matter than that which arises out of this question.

President. — I call Question No 64, by Miss Hooper:

Will the Council confirm as soon as possible that Portugal may retain her tariffs on certain industrial products, in order to reduce her overall deficit with the Community?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — The Community concluded a free trade agreement with Portugal in 1972. In 1976, an additional protocol was added which provides for the possibility for Portugal to reintroduce customs duties for certain industrial products. The Portuguese authorities have, moreover, availed themselves of this possibility in 1979. Finally, early this year Portugal requested the negotiation of a supplementary protocol which should, amongst other things, provide for the freezing of the tariff dismantling in respect of certain sensitive industrial products on which duties still exist and the maintenance, after this year, of measures to assist emergent industries. The Council will discuss this subject at the end of this month.

Miss Hooper. — In view of the importance of enlargement to the Community, may I have the assurance of the President-in-Office that at its forthcoming meetings the Council will continue to support the policy of assisting Portugal to overcome its present severe economic difficulties in order to ensure its admission to the Community at the earliest possible date?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I can assure the honourable Member that the Council will be sympathetic in general terms, but I would also like to add that, during the course of my presidency, on behalf of the Council, I have myself visited Portugal and have had detailed consultations with the Portuguese Government. I am fully aware of the special economic circumstances there and of their Association Agreement with the Community, and I can assure the honourable Member that the Council are also equally aware and fully concerned.

President. — I call Question No 65, by Mrs Scrivener:

Some time ago the Irish Presidency announced its intention of holding a meeting of the first Council of Ministers responsible for consumer affairs.

Has it abandoned this plan? If so, why?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — The Council, while not excluding such a possibility, has not taken a decision concerning a meeting composed of ministers responsible for consumer affairs. I should like to point out, however, that the Council subordinate bodies are actively pursuing their examination of the issues of consumer information and consumer protection.

Mrs Scrivener. — (F) Is the Council in favour of organizing consultation between consumers and producers, which is vital if any progress is to be made? If by any chance it does take a favourable view of this idea, does it intend to take action so that this consultation will not remain merely a pious hope?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I think the honourable Member will probably be aware of the fact that however commendable this consultation between producer and consumer might be, it would not be a matter for the Council. It would probably fall more to the Commission to take account of these consultations, but I have no doubt that such consultations as would take place would be of interest also to the Council. The Council itself, however, has no function or authority to engage in or promote any such consultations.

President. — I call Question No 66, by Mr de la Malène:

How does the Council view the fact that the United States, whose oil imports are steadily increasing, is building up strategic oil stocks and thus putting abnormal pressure on world market prices?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — The question put by the honourable Member has not been raised within the Council. In any event the Commission carries out a regular survey of the oil market and reports from time to time to the Council on this matter.

Mr de la Malène. — (F) I regret that the Council is not concerning itself with the United States' oil import policy, of which we take a rather dim view. We are all aware of the import subsidies which have been decided upon but the fact that the United States is pursuing a policy of which we disapprove does not mean that we should not give an example. On the free market of Rotterdam, the various countries of Europe are unfortunately outbidding each other in such a way as to provide the OPEC countries with an excuse for regularly increasing their prices. I should like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council whether or not he agrees that it is vital that the problem of regulating the free oil market of Rotterdam should be included on the agenda of a future Council meeting, or perhaps of the next European Council. The future of the economy and of economic cooperation of the countries of Western Europe is at stake.

Mr O'Kennedy. — The honourable Member will be aware of the fact that the Strasbourg Council discussed this issue and that procedures have been introduced for surveillance in this area. In the meantime he will also be aware of the fact that at the economic summit the United States, in conjunction with the members of the Community, agreed to honour specific undertakings to limit oil imports, while at the follow-up meeting of Energy Ministers in Paris on 26 September that agreement was reiterated. I have no reason at this stage to doubt that the United States will not honour that commitment.

Mr Seligman. — I should like to say to the President-in-Office of the Council in support of Mr de la Malène that I understand that the USA are aiming at one year's strategic stocks, whereas Europe is only aiming at a matter of 50 or 60 days' stock. Is there not a strong case for the seven Tokyo powers concerting and equalizing their target stocks?

Mr O'Kennedy. — Following representations from the Community, the US agreed at the Paris meeting not to renew beyond 31 October of this year such provisions as the 5 dollars per barrel subsidy on middle distillates. The Community welcomes this. Furthermore, at the Tokyo Summit the United States gave an undertaking to limit oil imports between 1980 and 1985 to 8.5 million barrels per day. At Paris on 26 September the United States gave a further undertaking to limit oil imports for 1979 to 8.2 million barrels per day.

Mr von der Vring. — (D) Am I right in thinking that the President of the Council said the Council does not deal with every question put by a Member of Parliament, and yet the President of the Council is nevertheless giving answers to questions of this kind on behalf of the Council? Does not the Council take the view that a question in Parliament implies a request to the Council and an obligation on the part of the Council to deal jointly with the problem of answering the question.

Mr O'Kennedy. — What in fact I did was to convey to the honourable Members in reply to supplementary questions information which is already public arising out of the Tokyo Summit and the Paris follow-up-meeting. I did not undertake any other responsibilities.

President. — We now proceed with the questions addressed to the Foreign Ministers of the nine Member States of the European Community meeting in Political Cooperation.

I call Question No 67, by Mrs Lizin:

How do the Foreign Ministers assess the results achieved by the Code of Conduct for undertakings investing in South Africa, and what new measures are proposed in consequence as a means of condemning, specifically and more effectively, that country's apartheid policy?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — The Nine have specifically and unreservedly condemned the apartheid policy of South Africa on many occasions, most recently on 25 September. I stated in my speech on behalf of the Nine at the 34th Session of the UN General Assembly, and I quote: 'The Nine condemn and reject this system of institutionalized racism which is an insult to human dignity and which denies to the majority of the people the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms.'

The adoption by the Nine in September 1977 of the Code of Conduct for companies with subsidiaries,

branches or representations in South Africa followed a decision by the Nine to utilize the collective weight of the European Community to influence South Africa to abandon the apartheid system. In view of the scope and far-reaching application of the provisions of the Code, its implementation has, of course, been a major undertaking for all those concerned. The implementation of the provisions of the Code is carried out at national level and is therefore the responsibility of the Member States of the Nine. Some Member States have already completed and published their first national assessment, made on an annual basis, of the applications of the Code. Others have not yet reached this stage. Two of the Nine do not have any companies to which the provisions of the Code would apply.

When all the national assessments for the first year of implementation of the Code have been completed, the Nine will be in a position to consider whether to proceed, within the political cooperation framework, to a common evaluation of the results obtained and draw conclusions regarding the application of the Code of Conduct. The Nine will, of course, also be concerned with the results of the implementation of the Code of Conduct in its broader context, including its impact on South Africa with regard to the more general adoption of the principles contained in the Code and its effectiveness in promoting the changes in this field that the Nine believe to be necessary. While the Nine note the changes in the field of labour relations now being introduced or envisaged by the South African Government, they consider that the need for the Code of Conduct has not been affected.

I would conclude by quoting again from my recent address to the General Assembly of the Nine, in which I said: 'The Nine will continue their efforts to promote the process of peaceful change in order to bring about the ending of the system of apartheid and the establishment of a society with freedom and justice for all. They reaffirm their commitment to use the collective weight of the European Community to influence South Africa to this end.'

Mrs Lizin. — (F) Mr President, we have never disputed the fact that the Council has made numerous positive statements on this question. What we would like now is for the Council to indicate when it expects those Member States who have not yet reported on the application of this Code of Conduct to do so. Furthermore, can the Council tell us what it intends to do about the other measures, apart from the Code of Conduct, which have also been under discussion within the context of political cooperation for several years? Finally, since on 19 September the Foreign Ministers were very negative in their assessment of South Africa's attitude to the application of the conclusions of the Wiehahn and Rickert reports on labour legislation, what conclusions do the Foreign Ministers intend to draw from these negative opinions which have been transmitted by the Ambassadors of the Nine in Pretoria, and when do they intend to draw them?

Mr O'Kennedy. — First of all, I can say to the honourable Member that the Presidency in fact has asked the Member States of the Nine to furnish as quickly as possible to us the conclusion of their evaluations. The Presidency would certainly pursue these matters with a view to implementing a consistent policy of the Nine on this issue.

Secondly, as far as the impact of this on the policy of the South African Government is concerned, I think there is some evidence to suggest that in fact the new developments in the area of labour relations, to which the Code of Conduct is specifically directed, are, in some degree at least, a consequence of the application of the Code of Conduct of the Nine Member States.

Mr Spicer. — The President-in-Office has commented fairly favourably on some of the changes in South African legislation. Would he not agree that, although we all would approve of stick being used against the South Africans in terms of apartheid, there are occasions when a little bit of carrot would not go amiss either, and should we not give a little more credit to the changes that are taking place in South Africa, albeit too slowly for most of us in the European Community?

Mr O'Kennedy. — It is perhaps too early to say what the effect of some of the changes one has been notified of will be, but the honourable Member will appreciate that one can use all weapons of persuasion, stick and carrots, as appropriate. But he will, I think, equally appreciate that a system of society based on this kind of prejudice is something that is inherently different from any other kind of prejudice that the world knows at this time, and in the interest of the peoples of South Africa and of the development of understanding in southern Africa, it is to be hoped that the South African Government themselves will come to accept the standards that the rest of the civilized world believe should be applied.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (F) Recently, ten days ago to be precise, the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly adopted a resolution against apartheid and those companies which apply an apartheid policy in South Africa. Could the Ministers of the Nine take account of this resolution and consider what new measures could be taken against these companies? The resolution simply requests that apartheid should not be practised and that it should not be disguised by making a distinction between local populations and immigrant populations which is the latest invention of the modern version of apartheid.

Mr O'Kennedy. — I can assure the honourable Member that the Nine will take fully into account all resolutions of the Parliament on political cooperation, particularly in this area, I think I have indicated my readiness, on behalf of the Nine, to be fully apprised of the positions taken in Parliament, and also to take

them into account in formulating positions on the part of the Nine Member States.

The honourable Member also referred to the resolution of the ACP-CEE Consultative Assembly, and I can indicate that the Council of the Nine will take particular note of that resolution because of our very close relations with the ACP States.

Mr Fernandez. — (F) Could the President-in-Office name a company which has substantially changed its attitude in South Africa as a result of this Code of Conduct?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I think the honourable Member will appreciate that it would not be appropriate for me to identify any particular company or group of companies. That is a matter for the Member States themselves, and even had I the information available before me now, I would not feel authorized to disclose...

(Interruption: 'There aren't any!')

Mr President, may I just say that there are very many areas in which I, perhaps like this Parliament, wish that I had very much more authority to speak on behalf of the Nine governments in areas where I do not have such authority. I hope this Parliament can appreciate that I must recognize the limits of my authority, as well as the limits on the information which is available to me at any particular time.

Mr Welsh. — Could the President-in-Office of the Council tell us if the Ministers meeting in political cooperation have addressed themselves to the eventual possibility of sanctions against companies which do not comply with the code of conduct, and in that case have they considered how such sanctions could be applied in an evenhanded, fair and impartial manner?

Mr O'Kennedy. — The code is, in fact a voluntary code, the implementation of which is to be encouraged, and certainly supported, by the Member States. In so far as it is a voluntary code, there are no sanctions which could be applied to any failure to implement it. It is a commitment on behalf of the Member States, who themselves will use their persuasion and influence to ensure that companies operating out of their respective jurisdictions in South Africa would adhere to the principles that the Nine have clearly stated.

Mr Denis. — (F) Your replies so far have confirmed that, when it comes down to it, the Code of Conduct is simply an excuse for not taking the real measures which are necessary to combat apartheid and racist régimes. Can you, Mr President-in-Office, explain why this Parliament and its committees have repeatedly had to ask the competent bodies, i.e. the Council, the Commission and the Foreign Ministers, to report on the application of this famous Code of Conduct, and when precisely we will finally receive these reports?

Mr O'Kennedy. — When the Ministers have concluded their assessment on the basis of the evaluation I referred to already I will certainly be ready to inform this Parliament through the normal process of consultation and dialogue with the Parliament in European political cooperation.

President. — I call Question No 68, by Mr Schwartzberg :

Do not the Ministers think that the Nine should adopt a common diplomatic attitude towards the dictatorial régime in Chile, and do they not consider it regrettable that at least one of the Community States has adopted a particularly indulgent attitude towards this régime, thus appearing to barter respect for human rights for arms supply and military aircraft contracts ?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — The Nine have in recent years consistently adopted a common position at the United Nations on violations of human rights in Chile. During the XXXIII Session of the UN General Assembly the Nine expressed their concern at the situation in Chile, including the following specific aspects : the severe limits which have been imposed by the state of emergency upon the exercise of certain basic human rights ; the unresolved problem of disappeared persons, and the manner in which Chilean authorities are dealing with it, and the continuing restrictions on trades union activity. In regard to the question of individual diplomatic and commercial relations with Chile, this is a matter for each Member State.

Mr Schwartzberg. — (*F*) Mr President-in-Office, as you are no doubt aware, although most of the nine Governments take a rather hard line in their relations with the Chilean régime, there is nevertheless at least one which is quite indulgent, as shown by the reception given to the Chilean Foreign Minister in Paris, whose visit followed a major order for arms and military aircraft.

Do the nine Foreign Ministers intend to go beyond the stage of simply making innocuous statements, for example, at the United Nations and do something in practice particularly as regards economic and military relations with this régime, to demonstrate the fact that we all oppose it ?

Mr O'Kennedy. — The application of any position taken up by the Nine through the process of political consultation, which I referred to in some detail this morning, is a matter for each individual Member State. The Community as such has no authority to implement the understanding or the agreement reached by any individual Member State. I would suggest that where there is any question in relationship to this or any other area, the matter would be better raised in the Parliaments of the Member States.

Mr Balfe. — Whilst many of us accept that there is a strong national responsibility in this field, does not the Minister agree that, since the Community has made such a great play of human rights, the position of individual Member States would be strongly reinforced if the Council of Ministers, meeting in political cooperation, were to make clear that it would view with extreme distaste any move to recognize or legitimate the régime in Chile until the basic problems the Minister referred to, especially with regard to disappeared persons, etc., have been solved to the Ministers' satisfaction.

Mr O'Kennedy. — The Nine have taken a very strong and consistent stance on a diplomatic basis in connection with representations to the Chilean Government. This was the case as recently as the meeting in Dublin in connection with a hunger strike to express concern about the whereabouts of relatives of certain children. We also, as a consequence, issued a statement. So I can assure Members that, where the Nine is concerned, this position has been vigorously maintained wherever possible, I can only hope that our position will serve as a guide to Member States in the application of the understandings we reached together.

Mrs Lizin. — (*F*) Could the President-in-Office tell us whether it is true that following the visit by a British Secretary of State to Chile, the question of the harmonization of the diplomatic representation of each of the Nine in Santiago was brought up within political cooperation ? Is it true that this thorny question — after all, certain countries such as Belgium, have decided to withdraw their ambassador — has been postponed and will be discussed as part of an overall debate on relations with Latin America ? When will this take place and will this point be covered ?

Mr O'Kennedy. — I understand that this matter has been the subject of a separate question put down by another Member of Parliament. Consultations are already taking place with the Member States and once they have been concluded I shall be able speak here on the matter on behalf of the Nine.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (*I*) At its meeting in Dublin a week after the Foreign Ministers met in Political Cooperation, the Political Affairs Committee was surprised that all the Ministers had done was to ask the Chilean Government for a list of missing persons, I remember that I myself pointed out that Amnesty International already supplies lists and figures which are uncontested.

Do we want to go on condoning the Chilean régime and making the excuse that this is a matter for the individual Member States, or are there some Member States who are pressing within political cooperation

Glorioso

for Europe to adopt a common position against the régime currently in power in Chile?

Mr O'Kennedy. — The information to which the honourable Member referred was supplied by Amnesty International. The Nine have always taken account of that and other information.

The reference I made to the meeting of the Nine in Dublin concerned relatives of children who were at that time on hunger strike at the Danish Embassy. It therefore concerned missing persons not on the list available to Amnesty International. The position we took up then was in no way out of line with other information or with action taken elsewhere. It was directed to a specific problem. Incidentally, Mr President, might I say that I was glad to note that within a short time, — I am not, though claiming that this was a direct consequence of the position we adopted in Dublin, — the young hunger strikers felt that they could end their hunger strike and presumably were reasonably satisfied that the information they sought had been made available to them.

President. — I call Question No 69, by Mrs Ewing:

In view of the forthcoming SALT negotiations will the Foreign Ministers note with satisfaction the degree of liberalization shown in the release of many Jewish political prisoners recently by the Soviet Union, and use their good offices to express the hope that further steps will be made in this direction?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — The Nine have noted the release recently by the Soviet authorities of a small number of political prisoners including some of Jewish origin. However, they cannot regard this as representing a significant degree of liberalization. The honourable Member will be aware that these releases took place in the context of a bilateral exchange involving persons convicted of engaging in espionage activities in the United States.

Mrs Ewing. — As one of the many Members of the older Parliament who adopted a particular prisoner, whose prisoner has been released, and who has adopted another one, might I ask the President-in-Office whether he agrees that one of the things Parliament can do is to focus attention on specific cases. And could I ask the Parliament to look at the plight of Janko Grobermann whose family is in Israel and who was refused a visa because of military service. On the day he got his visa he was threatened and then held as a material witness against those who threatened him. At the trial he himself became one of the accused. The fact that he is now serving four years' imprisonment is a breach of the Helsinki Agreement. One of the practical things Parliament can do is, through its Members, to focus attention on specific instances. It does seem to help bring about the release of those concerned. I am sure the President-in-Office will agree with me.

Mr O'Kennedy. — This morning I spoke at length of the approach of the Nine to this element within the Helsinki process. I think that I clearly indicated there that we regarded the whole question of respect for human rights and fundamental dignities as being an essential element in the overall process. As regards the concern expressed by the honourable Member here publicly, and the European Parliament's concern, I am quite sure that such expressions of concern can have a significant impact.

Mr Marshall. — May I thank the Minister for his answer. The Russian treatment of political and religious dissidents is quite unacceptable to the majority of the Members of this House. The treatment of Soviet Jewry is, in the opinion of the vast majority of the Western World, quite intolerable.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — (D) Mr President-in-Office, are you prepared in due course to inform the Political Affairs Committee in detail of what action the Foreign Ministers actually take following our resolutions on such matters? Parliament is in fact in a somewhat difficult situation here, since, in my view, we adopt resolutions of this kind a little too often, and they all end with a plea to the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation to actually get round to doing something. It would, I think, be very useful if Parliament were informed — I realize this cannot, of course, take place on the floor of this House — of the possibilities actually open to the Foreign Ministers with regard to defending the interests of persons involved in cases of violation of human rights, in this case Jews in the Soviet Union.

Mr O'Kennedy. — As the honourable Member himself has indicated, it would not be possible to provide this kind of information and this consultation on the floor of the House. But let me say that, as I indicated to the Political Affairs Committee of this Parliament at the colloquium in Dublin, I am very anxious to have the fullest possible exchange of views during the colloquium between the Nine and the Political Affairs Committee and I hope that we will be able to go into these matters at these meetings.

President. — I call Question No 70, by Lord Bethell:

What action have the Foreign Ministers taken in the light of the European Parliament Resolution of 21 July concerning the arrest of 10 members of the Czechoslovak movement known as Charter 77?

Have they made representations to the Czechoslovak Government to express the deep concern of all Community Institutions on this matter?

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — The Nine learned with regret of the

O'Kennedy

arrests of members of Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia at the end of May. In the view of the Nine the action by the Czechoslovak authorities is not in conformity with the final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in which the participating States, including Czechoslovakia, committed themselves to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms and have confirmed the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties in this field. Accordingly, in political consultations within the framework of the European political cooperation, the governments of the Nine have individually made representations to the Czechoslovak authorities expressing their deep concern about the arrests.

Lord Bethell. — I welcome the President-in-Office's reply, and I am sure it will be welcomed unanimously by the House.

I wonder whether the President-in-Office is aware of the events of the past few days inasmuch as they touch this Community. The diplomatic representatives of Member States have been barred from attending the trial of the accused people, lawyers and friends of the accused from Member States have also been barred from the court, the Political Affairs Committee's rapporteur, Mr Hänsch, has been refused permission to enter Czechoslovakia to prepare a report on this matter, the wife of one of the main accused has been ejected from the court and arrested and, of course, savage prison sentences have been imposed upon the accused.

Will he now please undertake to consult with his colleagues with a view to communicating to the Czechoslovak Government directly and publicly the outrage felt at the imposition of these savage sentences, and will you, Mr President, request the Bureau of Parliament to communicate the resolution which was passed unanimously by this Parliament in July to the Government of Czechoslovakia and to publish in the record the reply sent to Madame Veil by the representatives of Charter 77? Will you please undertake to do that, Mr President?

(Applause)

Mr O'Kennedy. — It is clear from the manner in which the honourable Member framed his question that he is in fact aware that I have not of course had the opportunity of consulting with my colleagues in the Nine since the events which have occurred in the last few days. But let me say — subject to the opportunity I will have and will undertake to have — speaking in my own personal capacity and in the light of the events to which the honourable Member has referred, that I very much deplore the action of the Czech authorities in bringing six of the arrested Charter 77 signatories to trial. I learned last night that after court hearings of a most summary nature, during

which apparently the defence did not have an opportunity to present its case, the six defendants were sentenced. This sort of procedure is totally contrary to principles laid down in the Helsinki Final Act, and I feel sure that the Nine will make their views known in an appropriate way as a matter of urgency.

(Applause)

President. — I will forward Lord Bethell's request to the Presidency.

The second part of Question Time is closed.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — It is the practice of this House, Mr President, that where an oral question with debate is on the agenda of a part-session, questions on the same topic for Question Time are automatically considered jointly with it. Through no fault of its author, Question No 16 by Mr Kavanagh on the situation in Cambodia was taken during Question Time, although an oral question with debate on emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia is on today's agenda. I was wondering if the rule had been changed. If not, Mr Kavanagh's question should not have been taken.

It is a matter of importance to Members who have questions to know that that is definitely the President's ruling.

President. — The rule to which you refer has not been changed; the two questions were not addressed to the same institution.

I call Mr Spicer on a point of order.

Mr Spicer. — Mr President, very often in this House we give stick to the Chair. On this occasion you have dealt with 21 questions; we thank you very much indeed and we also thank the President-in-Office of the Council for the way in which he replied.

(Applause)

President. — I should also like to thank the House for its sense of discipline, which was a great help to me.

I call Mr Denis on a point of order.

Mr Denis. — (F) Mr President, I ask to speak on the last question and you immediately declared Question Time closed.

President. — I am very sorry.

8. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on the motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Baudis report (Doc. 1—380/79): Directive on inland waterway vessels.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

9. Urgent debate

* * *

President. — We shall now consider the *Albers report (Doc. 1—381/79): Regulation on the Community quota for the carriage of goods by road.*

We must first vote on Amendment No 2, by Mr Nyborg, seeking to reword Articles 1 (1) and (2) as follows:

1. The Community quota shall consist of 6 247 authorizations.

2. The number of Community authorizations allocated to each Member State shall be as follows:

Belgium:	673
Denmark:	514
Federal Republic of Germany:	1 167
France:	990
Ireland:	119
Italy:	968
Luxembourg:	168
Netherlands:	976
United Kingdom:	672

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Albers, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I already stated yesterday that I am against both amendments by Mr Nyborg.

President. — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote. Amendment No 2 is rejected.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution as such.

I put the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 5 to the vote.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 5 are adopted.

On paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Nyborg, seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

6. Considers it absolutely essential, therefore, that the Community quota for 1980 should be doubled and that the allocation should be made on the basis of a 50 % linear increase and a 50 % increase that takes account of the degree of utilization;

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

I put paragraph 6 to the vote.

Paragraph 6 is adopted.

I put paragraphs 7 to 9 to the vote.

Paragraphs 7 to 9 are adopted.

I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

President. — I have received from Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Habsburg, Mr Langes, Mr Bersani, Mr Narducci, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Michel, Mr Spautz and Mr Luster, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), a motion for a resolution, with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the arrest of six Czechoslovakian citizens. (Doc. 1—428/79).

This motion for a resolution replaces the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1—388/79) tabled under Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure.

The reasons supporting this request for urgent debate are contained in the document itself.

I shall consult Parliament on the urgency of this motion for a resolution at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

10. Statement by the President of the Foreign Ministers on political cooperation (debate)

President. — The next item is the debate on the statement on political cooperation. I call Mrs Van den Heuvel to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (NL) Mr President, on 15 November 1978 Mr Genscher, President-In-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, made the following memorable statement: 'Parliament is about to be transformed. Next year 180 million European voters are to elect their own parliament. The people in our countries will thus be involved in the process of European union and will be aware of their own collective responsibility for its progress.' We are all disappointed, of course, at the number of voters who cast their votes, but the current President-In-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation can — and I think he also shares this view — now address a Parliament of greatly improved quality. However, and I am sorry to have to say this, I see no grounds for concluding that either today or in the months in which this new Parliament has been in operation these Foreign Ministers have given any sign of treating this Parliament with which the people who elected us should be able to feel closely involved, in a way that is commensurate with the importance ascribed to this institution. Proposals which have been reiterated by Parliament on several occasions with a view to improving collaboration in the field of political cooperation are being ignored.

Today, the Minister has once again made his annual report to us orally.

¹ OJ C 289 of 19. 11. 1979.

Van den Heuvel

And although my Group basically appreciated Mr O'Kennedy's attempt in supplying the text of his speech — which gave rise to a discussion on a point of order this morning — to give Parliament some advance information, we were very surprised to hear Mr Scott-Hopkin's effusive thanks.

We feel it is going a little too far for a Member of Parliament whose wishes are persistently disregarded to be so grateful at the first small gesture the Council makes with regard to political cooperation. It was something, but it was far from enough, and I shall return to this point shortly. My Group takes the view that if the wishes of Parliament continue to be ignored we shall have to ask ourselves whether there is any point in future in having a debate in plenary session on political cooperation. The Ministers of the Nine who are concerned with political cooperation will have to realize that this Parliament, which is here by the will of the electorate, must be taken seriously.

It is not in the first instance we as Members of this Parliament but above all the voters who sent us here who have a right to expect that. Our dissatisfaction becomes even greater when we look at what Mr O'Kennedy actually said in his report. This comes down to little more than a reiteration of facts which were already known to every interested newspaper reader in the Community. In terms of an adequate attitude towards a fully-fledged Parliament, this report is in our view sadly lacking. And the question at issue here, i.e. European Political Cooperation, is sufficiently important for us to work out procedures by means of which we can develop meaningful cooperation between the Ministers of the Nine and Parliament. In the framework of political cooperation the Nine do after all make a clear stand on various occasions. Why then do the Ministers continue to refuse to cooperate properly with their citizens' representatives?

In their national parliaments, when they are confronted with demands and instructions from MPs the Foreign Ministers point only too often to the inter-governmental nature of political cooperation, which means they must be prepared to compromise in order to arrive at a unified stand by the Nine in external affairs — and I should like to see any national member of parliament deny this. However, attempts by the European Parliament to take over from the national parliaments at least part of this watchdog role have so far had precious little success.

Parliament's Political Affairs Committee, which has a particular responsibility with regard to EPC, is not kept informed either fully or regularly enough. When I hear Mr O'Kennedy saying that with a view to its impending accession Greece is being kept informed of decisions taken by the Nine in the framework of political cooperation, I cannot help thinking that the

Greek Government is already better off than the European Parliament or its Political Affairs Committee. The three-monthly colloquies decided on by the Council are, I am sorry to say, diplomatic lunches rather than meetings between government representatives and Members of Parliament. And the situation is getting worse rather than better. As the European Council takes over more and more tasks and decisions from the Council, the influence wielded by this Parliament gets smaller and smaller. The European Council never ever comes before Parliament to give an account of its work. And the artificial division that is still maintained between political cooperation and Community affairs does the rest. We had a good example of this in this Chamber yesterday when Mr Davignon had to reply on behalf of the Commission to questions on the Code on Conduct for companies operating in South Africa.

I should like, on behalf of my Group, to endorse what Mr Albers said this morning and stress once again what Parliament set out in the resolution it adopted on European Political Cooperation on 18 January 1978. You are familiar with the demands made then, which included the need for us to receive substantive and up-to-date information and a written report one month in advance of the debate on European Political Cooperation. It is high time the Ministers of the Nine put us in a position to do the work expected of us by the electorate. We have a few more suggestions to make for improving cooperation. We ask the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation regularly to send Parliament's Political Affairs Committee a provisional agenda before meetings of the Nine on European Political Cooperation and to provide this agenda with explanatory comments on politically important points.

That is surely feasible, since the Netherlands Foreign Minister recently gave the Standing Committee on foreign affairs in the Netherlands Parliament a similar assurance. We naturally appreciate that any such agenda can only be provisional that it may have to be amended later, but we should greatly like to receive this provisional agenda. We would ask Mr O'Kennedy to discuss with his colleagues how this agenda can be passed to us as quickly as possible, preferably early enough for it to be in our possession before the plenary session preceding the meeting of the nine Ministers, or in any case before the preceding meeting of the Political Affairs Committee. We would also suggest that the colloquy between the Ministers and the Political Affairs Committee should immediately follow the session of the Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

We should also like to see a similar procedure adopted for future meetings of the European Council. A motion for a resolution is to be put before Parlia-

Van den Heuvel

ment on behalf of my Group incorporating these proposals. Only if they are prepared to put Parliament in a position to do its work can the Ministers of the Nine show that their talk about the increased importance of Parliament is more than just lip service to the idea of a Europe with democratic institutions.

Just a few words, Mr President, on the situation in southern Africa. A few moments ago in Question Time we had a foretaste of the debate on this subject. In answering the questions put by Mrs Lizin or the Code of Conduct for companies operating in South Africa, Mr O'Kennedy made it clear that there was an increasingly urgent need for change in this part of the world, but it is no contribution to bringing about this change for the Nine simply to state the well-known fact that apartheid must be regarded as an unacceptable violation of human rights. If using the influence of the Community simply comes down to proclaiming a code of conduct for companies with leaves the companies completely free to comply with it or not, then the South African Government has for the time no reason to worry about pressure from the Community. We have always had grave doubts about the effectiveness of a code of conduct which depends on voluntary acceptance by the companies. We were, however, naturally prepared to be convinced that we were wrong. But from the reports on the operation of this Code, which was also discussed this afternoon it appears that our doubts were justified. Time and again it is apparent that it is impossible for the Nine to intervene in any way whatever. Sanctions are not possible, and there is little scope for speeding up the report procedure. A polite request is all that can be made, which is why Parliament is still uncertain as to when the results of operating this Code of Conduct will be known. The South African Government may have made a few cosmetic adjustments to give their State a somewhat better image, and some of our Conservative colleagues may have been impressed by this, but others in this Chamber know that, while cosmetic treatment sometimes seems to give results, in the long run it cannot, alas, hide the faults. Fortunately, it appears from the remarks made by the Commissioner responsible that the European Commission has at least realized this. As has repeatedly been pointed out this afternoon, it is now perhaps necessary and desirable for other measures to be applied on the part of the Nine with regard to South Africa.

Without beating about the bush, let me ask what in my view is the obvious question. Have the Nine in the meantime discussed the possibility of declaring an oil boycott against South Africa? Especially now that Iran has dropped out as a supplier of oil to South Africa, the South African economy is more vulnerable to an oil boycott than ever. This can thus be an extremely effective means of putting pressure on the South African Government finally to give up the

odious apartheid policy that it persists in following. I would remind the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation that the front line States have also repeatedly called for such a boycott.

With regard to the conference currently being held in London on the future of Zimbabwe, we should like to confine ourselves to saying simply that we fervently hope this conference will put an end to the oppression of the black majority in that country. We should have liked to see the Nine pursue a rather more active policy on this question. It must be said that the very terminology which Mr O'Kennedy saw fit to use this morning will itself not arouse much confidence in the attitude of the Nine among this black majority. In our view, talking about Rhodesia suggests too much that the Nine are on the side of the Smith régime. We would ask the President-in-Office to be rather more cautious in this respect in future.

Mr O'Kennedy gave us an optimistic message: the evolutionary process is continuing, the voice of Europe is making itself heard in international discussions and political cooperation is thus contributing to the construction of Europe.

It is almost a shame to have to put a fly in the ointment here. Voices, including collective voices from Europe, are only of interest if peoples can recognize themselves in what they say. In southern Africa this means if the Nine clearly and positively choose solidarity with the oppressed in that part of the world. In Europe itself this means equipping the representatives of the people not only with words but with power and influence. I look forward to what the Minister has to say in reply to this.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin with a word of thanks to Mr O'Kennedy, who has helped us in two ways. Although this was mentioned this morning, I should like to pay tribute specifically to the fact that this is the first time the President-in-Office of the Council has made his speech available to us a few days in advance, thus giving us the opportunity of speaking with a full knowledge of what it contains.

I should also like to thank him for the fairness with which he has dealt up to now with the Political Affairs Committee. Precisely because I am sure that he has kept the promises he gave to the Political Affairs Committee in Dublin with regard to passing on Parliament's proposals and wishes to the Council of Ministers, I find it sad — I can well understand Mrs van den Heuvel's comments here, and I think everyone will agree on this — that the specific propo-

Klepsch

sals Parliament made to the Council have not yet met with an even remotely specific response.

Since this now dates back to well over a year ago, I should like most emphatically to endorse the remarks made by my colleague Mr Albers this morning which have been supported by Mrs van den Heuvel. I would add, Mrs van den Heuvel, that I hear your Group is preparing a motion for a resolution on these questions. My Group is doing the same, and since we seem to be moving in exactly the same direction we ought to try to work out a joint text by tomorrow and also to involve the other Groups which share the same opinion.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the first time the newly-elected Parliament has been able to express its opinion on a statement from the relevant Council dealing with questions of European Political Cooperation.

We know, Mr O'Kennedy, that you are among those Ministers who want to be somewhat more open towards Parliament. You need not, therefore, feel yourself particularly affected by what I am going to have to say. However, quite apart from the complaints made by Mrs van den Heuvel, there is clearly some sense in our demanding a written report as the basis for a debate such as this. For a careful reading of the report on European Political Cooperation in the course of a year naturally raises the question of whether a number of points dealt with by the relevant ministers have not been presented to Parliament, or whether European Political Cooperation has perhaps paid no attention whatever to a whole series of important and fundamental questions.

We find it surprising that, despite the detailed and specific nature of the report before us there is nothing to be found in these 20 pages, for example, on relations with the United States. We are also surprised, of course, that there is nothing here about relations with the Soviet Union and that a number of important questions — for example, relations with Japan — are not mentioned at all. A lot of Members are wondering, like me, whether this means that the Council has not paid any attention to these questions. On the other hand, however, half a page is devoted to telling us about the favourable view the Council takes of Secretary-General Waldheim's Cyprus initiative. We are all thoroughly behind this initiative, and the statement made on this here on behalf of the Council closely reflects the views of the whole House. But in view of the questions not dealt with in the report this concentration on a number of limited aspects is remarkable. And when we hear that European cooperation is on the increase and that progress is being made in working towards harmonizing positions and formulating joint political standpoints, I am sorry to see that at the same time the central issues are evidently being ignored.

I would add that we also miss any information on fields where no progress has been made. If an annual report is to be complete we also expect to be told in what areas it has not been possible to reach agreement. Of course, we read about it in the newspapers, but it would still be appropriate for this House to be able to discuss these questions with you as well in the context of discussions on an annual report. I should thus like to say a few words, supplementing what Mrs van den Heuvel has already said, on the way this House sees itself.

I believe this directly elected Parliament has been elected by the citizens of the Community to represent and discuss their interests. That gives this Parliament a completely new quality. You are faced here today not with delegates from national parliaments but with representatives bearing a mandate from their electorate to enter into a dialogue with you for in the election campaign we all had to give a pledge that we would deal with these questions. It is no longer acceptable for the work of the Council with regard to European Political Cooperation to be subject to supervision only by national parliaments considering the national aspects. It is the duty of this House to discuss the Community aspects, which are indeed the real *raison d'être* of this cooperation, and to impress on you the views not just of the various political groups but also of the citizens of the Community. I think there is therefore an urgent need for relations in this field to be put on a new footing. It is up to you, Mr President-in-Office, to make it clear to the Members of the Council that this Parliament cannot tolerate any lack of respect for the mandate it has from the electorate.

(Applause)

We regard it as an essential part of our task to look to the interests of the Community, the Community aspects of policy, and to discuss them with you here.

What Mrs van den Heuvel said about the Blumenfeld question and Mr Alber's remarks and the arguments we put to you in Dublin mean that we want to see a number of improvements in this cooperation and this dialogue because we believe that we can provide support for your work and make it understandable for the citizens of the Community if we have a forum here in which it can be properly discussed. The Political Affairs Committee can be relied upon to observe the necessary discretion. It cannot be right for us to be informed in a colloquy after the event about things of fundamental importance for the Community and for us all; we must, on the contrary, particularly on essential and important questions, have the opportunity for an exchange of views and this must be before decisions are taken which are subsequently binding on us all. All this could perhaps be summed up as the need for orientation talks. In any case I think we are agreed that things cannot go on as they have up to now.

Klepsch

To take just one example. Although external trade policy, which is in fact a Community responsibility, has up to now been discussed very little in this House — and I am addressing myself here to the Commission, which has been able to do more or less as it pleased in this field, by which I do not mean to say that it has done a bad job — external trade policy is none the less quite inconceivable without external policy and therefore cooperation on external policy is inevitably very closely concerned with our relations with non-member States. Indeed, I would add that we cannot remain indifferent towards attempts to circumvent and undermine the principles of the common external trade policy by means of cooperation agreements and other modern innovations or practices. This means we cannot remain content with having drawn up a few standards of conduct. In saying this I also have at the back of my mind the idea that in any exchange of information or opinions with countries applying for membership or new member countries these principles must also be brought home to them at an early stage. A common attitude towards third countries is absolutely fundamental, and it is very difficult here to make real distinctions between the various possible fields of external policy. Therefore, Mr President-In-Office, it is advisable to find ways of cooperating more closely, on the lines of what we have proposed.

If I have concentrated on these basic remarks, this is because a number of my colleagues will be speaking later on other more detailed problems. I should like to stress, however, that we are most emphatically in favour of the basic principles you set out for our external policy. I naturally regard it as one of the Community's prime tasks not only to defend its interests *vis-à-vis* non-member States but also to ensure that the Community makes a contribution to preserving peace. We regard it as vital for us to base our conduct on the principle of solidarity with peoples and countries in distress, and it is quite right for us to see human rights and the defence of human rights as a matter for this House; the Council can rest assured that it will have the support of this House in all it does in this field. All the same, we feel we are given information a little too late and too sparingly, and in our view there is a need for a thorough revision of the practice followed up to now for cooperation between Parliament and Council. This does not require any change in the Treaties, simply good will on both sides. I should like to stress that it will be of benefit to the individual citizen in the Community, to the political groupings and above all to the Council if the public can see more clearly what decisions are actually being taken and if they can follow how the data and the proposed decisions are discussed with the political groups.

Let me repeat: it is bound to be unsatisfactory if members of the public in this Community have to get their information from the worthy newspaper corres-

pondents, sometimes — I should like to make this point quite clear — getting widely differing versions.

What we ask, therefore, is that you should grasp the hand we are holding out to you for carrying out our common tasks. Help us to ensure that, on the basis of the proposals we have put to you, which are undoubtedly capable of improvement, we take the interests of the citizens of this Community as the guiding light for the work of this House, both in the Political Affairs Committee and here in plenary session.

(Applause)

*IN THE CHAIR: MR PFIMLIN**Vice-President*

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, may I join the two previous speakers in thanking the President-in-Office for the fact that he circulated his speech? It was a courtesy which is much appreciated by this House, and I am glad we have been able to study this text since Monday evening.

I must agree with Mrs van den Heuvel on one thing, and also, with my honourable friend, Mr Klepsch, that the speech, which was well said and indeed was very agreeably written, really didn't contain very much, I regret that, as have my two colleagues who previously spoke. Indeed, I think the speech is more remarkable for what it did not say than for what it actually contained. I would join with both of them in saying that proposals have got to be made and I would go along with both of them, particularly with what Mr Klepsch has said, that in whatever resolution comes forward, we should try to be more positive. I do believe that we in this House, as representatives of the constituents who sent us here, have the right to consult with the President-in-Office before decisions are taken and to be in a position to convey to the President-in-Office and, indeed the Council the views of this House — it might be the Political Affairs Committee for that matter — concerning the issues which are facing us as Community or as nine nations.

I agree of course with the President-in-Office when he says that this political cooperation is a slow process. Of course it is, and if one tries to rush it too quickly then disaster may well strike; nevertheless it is better to go forwards, if I may say so, rather than backwards, which is rather the feeling I had from reading and listening to the agreeable words he said to us this morning.

Scott-Hopkins

I could not agree with Mrs van den Heuvel when she was talking about the situation in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. I think it is important that the Council should take an even-handed approach when dealing with an international matter where one of the Member States is in point of fact engaged in negotiations. If anything, I think the President-in-Office swayed the wrong way when expressing sympathy for victims of the raids of the Rhodesian armed forces. I am sure he would also if he had remembered to do so, have expressed sorrow as well as sympathy for the victims of the guerilla raids inside Zimbabwe-Rhodesia as well, because people have died on both sides of the border and we all wish to express sympathy for that. I think it is once again a question of being, as I said, even-handed, and nothing that is done at the moment should prejudice the very difficult negotiations which are going on at this moment in London. I was glad to hear from Mrs van den Heuvel, speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group, and also from the Minister that they wish these talks well. I hope we can therefore expect the support of the Council for the British Government's efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia.

May I just make one passing remark to Mrs van den Heuvel? There is no Smith régime in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia now: there is in point of fact a Muzorewa régime after the elections that took place recently.

Equally I think it is unfortunate that the President-in-Office did not elaborate a little more on the Council's position regarding South Africa. The suggestion which has come forward that an oil embargo should be considered or even imposed by the Community, by the Member States, to bring South Africa to its knees would be absolutely disastrous. The very people one wishes to help, the very people who are suffering by the policy of *apartheid*, would be the first and probably the only ones really to suffer, and that would be quite the wrong approach. Once again, I found it remarkable that the President-in-Office did not say more about what is going on in the Middle East and about the energy situation as well. He made no mention of the decision of the European Council on 12 and 13 March 1979 to accept the invitations of the Saudi Arabian and Mexican Governments to take part in consultations between oil producers and consumers. What is happening? Is there any positive progress here? After all, this is an incredibly serious situation. The income of the OPEC countries, as the President knows, is between 70 and 80 billion dollars, something like six times our Community budget. So here is certainly, I should have thought, the opportunity for an initiative: perhaps it has been taken, but the President-in-Office did not say anything about it or about what has resulted from it.

Then again, as my honourable friend Mr Klepsch said, very little has been said here by the President-in-Of-

fice concerning the Iranian revolution. Surely this is something which is of importance: the event came as a shock not only to the Western world but also to Iran's neighbours in the Middle East.

And surely we now have an opportunity to establish a more sensitive relationship with the Arab world by relaunching the Euro-Arab Dialogue. I am glad to see that the Minister mentioned that in positive terms in his speech; but should this not be of concern, not only on the economic cooperation level, but also on the political level? I know this has been looked at in askance in the past by ministers meeting in political cooperation, is it not worth while reexamining yet again? I should have thought this was an important step that might well be taken.

Another of the issues facing us is the resurgence of Islamic feeling and religious fervour throughout certain parts of the world, and I cannot help but wonder what steps the Ministers are taking in this. Are they sensitive to the really great depth of feeling which is being engendered in many countries? What help are we giving to these countries, who I believe, in the throes of their Islamic revolution, are looking for help and succour? At the moment I do not believe they have received as much as they might have done.

That leads me on to another problem which worries me intensely. There was no mention in the President's speech of the situation of one of the associate members of this Community, of Turkey. I am extremely worried about the situation of our Turkish colleagues. They are going through extremely difficult times, economically and politically, and I hope the President will be able in his reply to suggest something constructive that we in the Community can do. I believe they are looking to us in the Community for help; not only the business people, not only the politicians, but many levels of society in Turkey are hoping that steps will be taken by the Community to help them through these very difficult times. I do not need to remind the House or the President-in-Office of the great importance that country has, not only for us here in Western Europe but for the whole of Western civilization.

Again, as my honourable friend Mr Klepsch said, there was very little mention of developments between the nine member countries and China, and yet these developments are now taking place. Indeed, the party chairman and Premier of the People's Republic of China, Hua Guo-Feng, is here at this moment; he has been in Paris, he is going to London, he is going to Bonn. Surely some mention might have been made of the attitude of the member governments towards this development, which I am sure the House will welcome for the sake of the friendship and indeed the increased opportunities of trade between the nine member countries and the People's Republic

Scott-Hopkins

of China. I hope that something constructive can be said by the President-in-Office on this matter.

Whilst I am dealing very briefly with Far Eastern matters, I was very glad to see that parliamentarians from the ASEAN countries have been here listening to our debates for the last two days, may I ask the President-in-Office whether there is any difficulty about signing the agreement between the nine EEC Member States and ASEAN, because I had understood that it should have been signed by now, but this has not actually taken place. If there are any problems, please let us know here.

So, in conclusion, Mr President, I believe we have a unique opportunity in these debates concerning the political cooperation of the nine Member States, and in having the President-in-Office here, to put our views. The next year particularly is going to be vital to the political cooperation of our nine Member States, because it is without doubt a time when the United States of America — which was also not mentioned — is going to be taking a back seat. They will be in the throes of a presidential election — it is just beginning and whether one likes or does not like the present administration is neither here nor there, I do not believe they are going to be in any position to take a strong lead,

I believe this is up to us in the Community, and it is through the system of political cooperation that it can be done. So I hope that the Foreign Ministers, meeting in political cooperation, can start taking action, and when they do, I would say to the President-in-Office, before they come to final conclusions, they should come to this House. If they do not want to come onto the floor of the House, they should come to Political Affairs Committee, but at all events they should come to this House before final conclusions or decisions are reached because decisions must be taken and we must show that we are a force in the world. Our citizens demand it; we want to take part, to help — not to hinder, to help — the Ministers in coming to these conclusions.

So I would thank him in conclusion for coming here, and hope that in future it will be a little more constructive than it has been this time.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pajetta.

Mr Pajetta. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I too must thank the President for his statement. Politeness obliges me to do so, but I would ask Mr O'Kennedy to consider the fact that I never expected to have to associate myself, in my first

speech in this Chamber, not only with the words of our Socialist comrade Mrs van den Heuvel, but even with those of Mr Scott-Hopkins, with those uttered earlier by Mr Klepsch, and with the criticisms of the Council of Ministers' statement and attitude towards Parliament made by the German Christian-Democrat who spoke on behalf of Mr Blumenfeld.

At all events, we cannot conceal our dissatisfaction with this statement, which was mere optimistic phrasemaking and a commitment to nothing in particular, and which avoided the main issue, namely what the Community as a whole is doing rather than what the Nine talk about! Nor did it tell us whether there is a place in the Community's activities for a new commitment and a new task for Parliament. In this connection we for our part start from the conviction that all problems — without exception — with which we deal here are directly related to the foreign policies of all the countries of the Community. There is no trace of this in the statement which was delivered here. We are not trying to add foreign policy to our agenda under the stimulus of some utopian federalism or a costly and oppressive supranationalism. Not at all, but there are problems which are essentially of a foreign policy nature. First and foremost, it is necessary to define for all the others a framework within which we can usefully work.

We are dissatisfied because the tone of the statement was at once didactic and resigned, full of pious wishes and timid hopes. It also referred to the habit of consultation as a kind of reflex. But we want new initiatives, we want to participate in these initiatives, and we must say that the Community and Council of Ministers are even lagging behind other international organizations such as the United Nations, and above all are failing to keep up with the demands of the situation. To take an example close at hand, one of the problems facing us in this assembly is energy policy. We would remind you of the satisfaction we expressed when a joint declaration was made by the Nine in Copenhagen. It was said then that we needed a Euro-Arab Dialogue; on the other hand, it has been pointed out even by European politicians that there can never be a Euro-Arab Dialogue, indeed that no question of any kind can be discussed with the Arab countries, unless the Palestinian question is tackled.

I am pleased that a first timid step has been taken, Mr O'Kennedy; but since you quoted what you said at the United Nations, I cannot but ask you why, when you spoke so vaguely of the rights of the Palestinians, you did not use the term 'self-determination'. When dealing with the question which interests you most you spoke of a 'homeland'. My English is not good enough to appreciate shades of meaning, and I don't know if the Italian translation '*patria*' is the exact equivalent. But why dig up this term which recalls the Balfour Declaration? You should have had the courage to say something which would not cause diffi-

Pajetta

culty for the interpreters. Say a 'State for the Palestinians'— that's the correct expression. When you talk of rights say 'self-determination'. That is the term used not only by the non-aligned countries but also by the United Nations. The same holds good with regard to the PLO.

Why all this prevarication? Why not establish direct contact by listening to the PLO's views in the Political Affairs Committee or the Committee on External Economic Relations? They sit as a recognized organization in the United Nations General Assembly in New York. I mention this, Mr President, because we are about to negotiate with Spain on its entry into the Community, and because the Spanish Government has had the courage to invite Mr Arafat to visit Madrid. When we ask that a Community government — that of Italy for example — should do something similar, the reply is 'all the Nine must first agree'. So we are inviting Spain to join a Community which is already telling it: 'You have carried out your most recent act of national sovereignty, which is an example to others, but you would not have been able to do so if you had already been a Member of this Community'.

I don't think it is possible to take this attitude. I think we must act with some courage. I was pleased to note that Mr Cheysson met a representative of the Polisario Front in Algiers, although in Rabat he was obliged to say that this meeting had no political significance. Since I find it difficult to imagine that the importance of this meeting lay in economic, technical or scientific cooperation, I am pleased that it took place. A little courage would do no harm, and courage comes only if we back up what we say with a political will, which unfortunately is lacking.

With regard to the ACP countries, we achieved the insertion in a document of the principle that 0.7 % of the national product of the developed countries should go to the countries of the Third World. But have we done what is necessary? I have already said, and repeat here, that only three European countries have met this commitment of 0.7 % and — take note — the Netherlands is the only one of these which is a member of the Community. So Norway must be pleased that following its referendum it decided not to join the Community, and Sweden must be pleased that it is not a member. Mention has been made here of the problem of southern Africa, with which we are directly concerned, but have we a clear conscience? It is not a question, as the statement suggested, of condemning apartheid, it is a question of deciding what measures to take against it. I do not want to argue now with Mr Scott-Hopkins about the oil boycott. I simply want to ask whether the governments of the Nine can tell us what they have done to ensure that aid and arms do not leave the countries of the Community for those who are fighting against the guerillas in the name of apartheid.

Similarly, with regard to enlargement, we can take a long-term view only if we reject a neo-protectionist policy, only if we remember that there are other countries in Europe, and that there is another Community, known as Comecon.

I think that it is essential that this Parliament should press the Commission, Council of Ministers and governments to negotiate, to reject defensive positions, and to have the boldness necessary to safeguard peace and make it fruitful. All this is possible only in the context of détente, gradual and general disarmament, security and peace.

It has been said here that we wish to contribute to preparations for the Madrid meeting. Well, what do we mean by 'contribute'? We mean making Parliament and its committees into a place for encounter, dialogue and the search for convergence of views, and, finally, we mean urging the men and women of every European country to pursue those aims.

A few days ago I saw Chancellor Schmidt of the Federal Republic of Germany on Italian television, saying that this Parliament provides the Germans with a good opportunity to get to know Communists, as they have little knowledge of them at home. Here was a politician speaking in a relaxed and unprejudiced manner, and this is a recommendation which I think Chancellor Schmidt's colleagues and others ought to take up. That is why we think that in this search for dialogue, convergence and even disagreements — when the disagreements hinge on essential matters — we should likewise abandon attempts at propaganda and avoid turning this Parliament — as some have occasionally tried to do — into a place of debate and polemics on internal questions. That, Mr Scott-Hopkins, is why I was and still am truly amazed at the participation of Italian Christian-Democrats in the Maltese election campaign. I would have liked to hear a British Labour Member defending that country and its Labour Government.

Today we are faced with a serious situation. There is the danger of a rush to rearm, of an uncheckable escalation, but there are also new proposals and the possibility of opening negotiations. Well, we think it necessary to seize this opportunity for positive action. We should call for the ratification of SALT II, and we should be convinced of the necessity to negotiate at once and thus avoid compromising the future. That is why, I stress again, we are convinced that we should not fall into the trap of believing that it may be disastrous to interrupt the process of détente. We are preparing for Madrid. I mean by this that we agree that all three 'baskets' must be prepared and tackled, and when I say all three 'baskets', I mean that we Communists wish to be second to none in defending human rights, freedom of expression, and the free movement of ideas.

Pajetta

I am saying this today at a bitter moment for us. We have clearly expressed our condemnation of the Prague trial, a condemnation which we repeat here. We wish to say that we regard the sentence passed yesterday as unjust and oppressive. We reject any attempt to make political capital out of it, and any hardening of attitudes, but this sentence offends us as human beings and, allow me to say it, even more as Communists.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

We think it necessary to search rapidly for solutions to the essential problems. I would mention — without wishing to debate them now, but it is certain that the Political Affairs Committee will have to do so and that Parliament as a whole will have to return to these matters — the problems of Palestine, the Sahara, southern Africa and the Mediterranean, which must to some extent be seen also in the context of disarmament and general détente. These problems, which we as Europeans do not wish to consider in isolation, require a special effort on our part to achieve a policy which can and must be one of peace for all mankind.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

President. — I call Mr Rey to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Rey. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in speaking for the first time in this Parliament, I wish to begin by paying tribute to the work of the previous Parliament. I was continuously associated with its work over a period of sixteen years, from 1954 to 1970, as a member and occasionally as president of the special Council of Ministers of the European Coal and Steel Community, as a member of the Commission of the European Economic Community — the Hallstein Commission — and finally as President of the Commission of the European Communities. I witnessed the slow and patient rise of our Parliament, which in spite of its limited means was able to increase its political influence and gain a growing authority within the Community. It is right that today, this Parliament, at last elected by universal suffrage and with increased authority, should not forget the service rendered by the Parliament which preceded it.

The Liberal and Democratic Group attaches very great importance to the efforts made in the framework of political cooperation, and we listened with great interest to the detailed statement made by the President of the Council. I too would like to thank him for the courtesy he has shown to our Parliament and the efforts he has personally made in performing a task which is certainly one of the most difficult incumbent on the Presidency.

Our fellow-citizens are not always aware of the profound changes which are taking place on the international stage. Not so long ago, international politics was a matter for nation-states, which were felt to be

the final stage in international construction. Today, we are living in a world in which international affairs are gradually taking on a continental diversion. Although the General Assembly of the United Nations still contains over 150 States which are formally independent, in reality international affairs take place at the level of continents. North of the equator, there are Japan, North America, an increasingly integrated Europe, the Soviet Union and China. To the south, Latin America and Africa are slowly developing their continental institutions. Only southern Asia is still unaffected by this trend. It is remarkable that it should have been Europe, so divided by history, wars and different languages, which 30 years ago was the first to start along this road.

In this respect, our Community is in a transitional situation. Under the terms of the Treaties, there are certain fields where power no longer belongs to the Member States but to the Community Institutions. In particular, this is true of tariff negotiations (Article 113 of the Treaty), association agreements (Article 228 and 238), accessions (Article 237) and development (fourth part of the Treaty, which made possibly the very remarkable adoption of the Yaoundé and Lomé Conventions).

In the other fields, it is political cooperation which enables the Community to express itself and to demonstrate its cohesion to the outside world. That is why our Group attaches such importance to political cooperation, and I thank the President of the Council for having himself put this view so clearly in his statement. But I must voice two reservations. Firstly, Mr President, why did you not mention the problems on which disagreements between Member States have made it impossible to make adequate progress? A balance sheet has not only a credit side, but also a debit side. Was it not the disagreements among Member States which slowed down the work of the Belgrade Conference? Is not the same true of the North-South Dialogue, which you strangely omitted to mention? It seems to me that not hiding the disagreements would probably increase the chances of resolving them.

My second reservation is this: too often — and several previous speakers have expressed the same opinion — we have the impression that the attitude of the Nine is passive. To take an example, our governments reached agreement, and I pay tribute to them for this, on a joint attitude towards the conflict in the Middle East. They decided unanimously that peace in that region depends on a solution to the Palestinian problem. But what are they doing to further this policy? It is American statesmen or diplomats who try to negotiate the essential agreements. I do not wish to criticize them in any way, but I deplore the fact that it is not a European statesman, with a mandate from the Nine, who is making the necessary

Rey

efforts. Our Parliament already expressed this wish some time ago, and I regret that the statement which we have just heard is silent on this point. Mr President, at the beginning of this afternoon's sitting, several of your replies showed us that the Nine are still very far from pursuing an active policy. That is why our Group will support the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Blumenfeld, who earlier tabled a similar motion which the previous Parliament adopted.

However, I do not wish to end my speech on a pessimistic note. Genuine progress has been achieved in the field of political cooperation, and you were right to stress this. Moreover, in the Community field, in 1979 alone, indeed in the last six months, we have seen the conclusion of the Tokyo Round agreement, the setting-up of the European Monetary System, the signing of the accession agreement with Greece, and the election of our Parliament by universal suffrage, and in a few days we will see the signing of the Lomé II Convention. This is an impressive list. There can be no doubt that our Community is important and that it has a future, and it is with this confident affirmation that I wish to conclude.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Lalor to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Lalor. — Mr President, the coordination of Community positions on foreign policy has taken on a far greater degree of importance since the holding of the first ever direct elections to the European Parliament. I think this is particularly true as the views of both sides of Ireland, North and South, are reflected in the membership of this new Parliament.

It is important that the European Parliament, through the newly formed Political Affairs Committee, should be in a position from the very beginning to work as closely as possible with the EEC Foreign Ministers. To do this we must ensure closer cooperation within the EPC, its structure and its working. Over the coming years we must therefore strive to achieve continuity in our approach to foreign policy. We are in a position to do so. We can act as a link between each of the different presidencies of the EEC Council of Ministers. In our meetings we must try to adopt a role which will lead to a better understanding between the institutions in relation to the Community's actions in international affairs. It is important to bear in mind that our five-year mandate in the European Parliament will enable us to bring the continuity to EPC that I believe might otherwise be lacking. The activity of the Foreign Ministers in the EPC framework over the last five years has indeed increased. The need therefore for greater political cooperation between the Parliament's Political Affairs Committee and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs has increased accordingly.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank our Irish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr O'Kennedy, who as President-in-Office gave us an in-depth account of the most recent meeting he had with his fellow Foreign Ministers in Ashford Castle. This, I would like to add, was one of the areas where the Political Affairs Committee had called for improvement. Mr Blumenfeld's report on European political cooperation points out that the delays by successive Presidents-in-Office in informing Parliament of the results of the latest meetings of the Foreign Ministers had on occasions been measured in weeks. Clearly the recent meeting that we had in the Political Affairs Committee with the President-in-Office shows that the improvements that were sought are in fact taking place and that a lead has been set for future Presidencies.

Another point, Mr President, that I should like to take up is the constant need to be kept in touch with the thinking of the Council. The rapidity with which economic, social and political events throughout the world are taking place makes it essential for us to be kept up to date at all times. This, in the future, could involve the setting up of further meetings outside the normal arrangements for European political cooperation should events require them.

I would now like to refer back to one of the major criticisms made of European political cooperation concerning what was described as the paucity of information given to us in the past by the Presidency. The recent meeting which we had in the Political Affairs Committee with the President-in-Office was a very, very welcome development in relation to this situation. Mr O'Kennedy provided us with a very comprehensive picture of EEC political cooperation. It was agreed by the members of the Political Affairs Committee that Mr O'Kennedy had given a much more detailed account of the Foreign Affairs Ministers' meeting in Dublin than he had to the press. Previous criticism had stated that the Presidents-in-Office usually only reiterated what could already be read by anybody in the press. This more detailed account must be recognized as a further welcome development.

European political cooperation is important because it can lead to greater understanding between our EEC partners on foreign policy and to the eventual adoption of common positions on matters which are of concern to all of us, as, for example, the situation in Cambodia and the Lebanon. In this context I would also like to refer to the speech made by Mr O'Kennedy in September in New York at the United Nations. As President of the EEC Council of Ministers he presented the common position of the Nine in relation to the continuing problem in the Middle East. For the first time, he said, the nine EEC Member States had virtually recognized the Palestine Libera-

Lalor

tion Organization. These are major issues and as such are deserving of our individual attention.

Having said that I would now like to turn to the question of whether Parliament should be presented with an annual written report on EPC. Does it matter whether or not there is an oral or a written report? It could prove very, very difficult for each of the Member States to agree on the substance of a written report. It is quite likely that there could be more political substance in an oral report than in the annual written one. In the last two years the European Parliament has shown itself to be increasingly concerned with matters relating to political situations outside the Community. In 1977 there were 39 questions, while in 1978 there were 53. The subjects range from terrorism, human rights, refugees, slavery and the Euro-Arab Dialogue to relations with the USSR. Matters of such a serious nature cannot be discussed in isolation from the facts and from those who are acting on our behalf.

We have reached a very important stage now, a stage where the structural relationship between the European Parliament and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs has been improved. In the future, and in the light of the readiness and openness shown by the new Presidency, we can, I believe, look forward to a more active European political cooperation. It is a two-way development that the Parliament should be looking for in its relations with the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. The new Presidency is setting a good example for the future, but the Parliament, too, has its responsibilities. There were notable absentees from the Dublin meeting. How can we look for more intensive collaboration with the Ministers for Foreign Affairs at a future date, if we ourselves do not play our part? We must also adopt a serious approach.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, today's debate gives us an opportunity not only to comment on the President-in-Office of the Council's rather depressing speech, but also to give some thought — for the first time since the direct elections — to the European Parliament's own responsibility *vis-à-vis* the Community's role in the world. I wonder whether Mr O'Kennedy realizes that, in his 21-page speech on the situation facing Europe, he did not once mention the United States or the Soviet Union. Nor — and this was perhaps an even more striking omission — did he make any reference to the People's Republic of China, at a time when the Chinese leader, Hua Guo-Feng, is visiting a number of Member States, but not the Community as such. As we all know, however, China has for years been calling on the Community to play its rightful part in world affairs. These glaring omissions tell us a lot about how the Foreign Ministers, whom you are representing here today, view the Community's relations with the rest of the world.

More often than not, you and your colleagues completely ignore the Community perspective, and, all too often, determination and courage are conspicuous by their absence. We are told that the reasons for this are that the Member States, as a result of twenty years' integration, are at least on the way to creating some sort of economic entity, whereas the Community's relations with the rest of the world are still conducted in at least three different ways or at three different levels. First of all, there are the Community's external economic and commercial relations as such. These relations cover the whole world, and we all know that the Community is the world's largest trading bloc. But when Mr Haferkamp appealed before the Committee on External Economic Relations to give a detailed account of the Community's economic relations, he emphasized their purely economic nature and the absence of any political content. Moreover, the Community's policy in this field is presented as if there were no connection between it and our commercial and aid policy *vis-à-vis* the developing countries. Secondly, there is the foreign policy pursued by various Member States, which embraces such areas as aid, trade, arms sales and even — to this very day — military intervention outside Europe. The front page of today's 'Le Figaro' is a perfect example, and just one of many. Thirdly, we have the fine — but rather empty — words of Mr O'Kennedy on the convergence of the Member States' foreign policies, although this process has failed so far to produce a genuine Community foreign policy. This, Mr O'Kennedy, goes some way towards explaining why you refer to the Nine's concern about events in South-East Asia, but not at all to China. It explains why you refer — to use your own words — to '... using the collective weight of the Community to bring pressure to bear on South Africa for the ending of apartheid', but not at all to the export of German nuclear technology, which will enable the South Africans to build their own atom bomb. It explains why we heard no reference whatsoever from you to the collective weight of Western European companies bolstering up an economy which is the basis of apartheid. It also explains why you referred — and again I quote — to the Nine '... closely following human rights issues in Latin America', but made no reference at all to French and Belgian arms supplies to Latin American dictatorships or the supply of German nuclear reactors to Argentina, or the supply of nuclear enrichment technology to Brazil. Of course, Mr President, the European Community has a great deal of influence throughout the world. But the point is that this influence is exerted by the nine national governments. This House therefore regards it as a challenge to consider this policy as a whole; we regard it as a challenge to expose the underlying policy options, and to accept or reject them. This can be our contribution to the restoration of democratic control over what really goes on within the Community.

Allow me to comment briefly on our relations with the adjacent regions, by which I mean the rest of

Coppieters

Europe. Here again, we are faced with the same kind of schizophrenic situation. Talks were held recently between the Community and Comecon. Mr O'Kennedy referred to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and also — albeit not in so many words — to the question of human rights in Eastern Europe. So far, however, our governments have devoted very little attention to the specific cases of suppression of the most basic rights in Czechoslovakia. This may be because we prefer to look to our own affairs first. We heard from Mr O'Kennedy about the progress that has been made in defining that slippery concept known as 'l'espace judiciaire'. Only a few days ago, we witnessed an example of its premature application when the French authorities extradited an Italian citizen, Franco Piperno. The point is that we are abandoning one of the oldest basic liberties of the people of Europe, namely the right to political asylum. I feel that the Community should concentrate on creating a judicial area in which individual and collective liberties are given greater rather than less protection. Nevertheless, it is time the Community accepted its responsibilities here in Europe. It was a Member of this Parliament, Willy Brandt, who first made possible the German opening to Eastern Europe. Is it too much to expect a similar sort of initiative at Community level? It cannot be a matter of indifference to us what happens in Europe — and I mean the whole of Europe. But can we ever hope to make progress towards political unity so long as the Community remains firmly within the Americans' sphere of influence? The position of the United States as the guardian of Europe is never questioned, neither by the President-in-Office of the Council, nor by anyone else. If this House really wants to play its full part in international affairs, we must discuss such matters as whether neutron bombs or Pershing rockets may or must be stationed in Europe. It is by such debates that we should be establishing our position in world politics, and not by dint of cautious declarations made by Foreign Ministers donning their political cooperation hat for the occasion. Finally, Mr President, if this House formulates good and clearly expressed policies, but if at the same time we merely leave Mr O'Kennedy and his colleagues to carry out these policies, by way of the existing political process, we shall be failing in our task. We must take up the challenge of expressing our ideas on the European political system as a first step towards a broad European Federation, and these ideas must present us with genuine options as to the Community's role in the world.

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, as spokesman for my party in the Netherlands and here in this house, I can state quite categorically that we approve of the Member States trying to coordinate certain

aspects of their foreign policy. The European Community acting in concert can achieve more than the nine Member States acting in isolation. We have only to think of the Community's role in the Helsinki CSCE and the follow-up meeting in Belgrade, the code of conduct for companies from the Community operating in South Africa, declarations on the Middle East, on the Nine's representation by the Community in the UN on the proposals for the resumption of the North-South Dialogue and, there are many other examples which Mr Coppieters has just mentioned.

Another important factor is that the outside world expects a lot of the Community, more perhaps than the Community expects of itself. Secondly, we feel that the links between European political cooperation and the Community should be strengthened. This House should use every means at its disposal to give really discernible form to political debate in Europe. Questions which belong to the EPC sphere should not be left out of this debate; after all, there is no denying the intimate links between Community and EPC matters. Thirdly, there is talk year in, year out about setting up a secretariat to do the groundwork for EPC. At the moment, this work is being done by a separate, complex network of correspondents, and this places the Presidency in a difficult position. For practical reasons, we support the idea of setting up a secretariat although there are a number of conditions we should like to see fulfilled beforehand. In the first place, there must be an agreed form of democratic control of EPC. In the foreign policy sphere, the European Parliament must be given broader powers to complement those it already has, and these powers should be used to the full. Secondly, the Community aspect of foreign policy decisions must be assured, and the position of the Commission in EPC matters must be strengthened.

What, then, can the European Parliament do in practical terms? Let me suggest that, to begin with, the Presidency should report to the European Parliament on ministerial-level EPC meetings, and that these reports should be followed by a debate in this House. Secondly, the European Parliament should give its opinion more often than hitherto on international matters of current interest preferably after thorough preparation by the Political Affairs Committee. In this way we should at last lose our technocratic image and acquire a clear political role. Thirdly, we could have a general debate every year on European political cooperation, a sort of general review. Fourthly, in view of the fact that foreign policy is the EEC's responsibility, the European Parliament could request regular consultation procedures with the Council. I should like to hear what the President-in-Office of the Council has to say to these suggestions.

Finally, and within the framework of the EPC discussions, attention could also be devoted to some — and I would stress the word *some* — aspects of the Nine's

De Goede

defence cooperation. For instance, defence and armaments control can only be viewed and discussed as an interconnected whole. These two aspects form a logical part of the process of European unification, certainly in the long term, which cannot be restricted to economic and monetary, nor even to political, matters. Without seeking to reduce cooperation with our allies, the United States and Canada, European cooperation must be based on strengthening the European closer cooperation on defence matters between the nations of Europe is also important in view of the enormous potential for savings in this field. There are good prospects for a specifically European approach — integrated into a European industrial policy — to specific projects in such fields as the production and acquisition of equipment, research and development and logistics.

Mr President, I have only a few minutes left, and I should like therefore to conclude by drawing attention to the declaration issued by the Netherlands Government this afternoon on the judgments pronounced recently on supporters of Charter '77. Swingeing sentences have been passed on people who can be accused of nothing more than making use of their right to freedom of expression and freedom of conscience. The sentences are completely at variance with the Final Act of Helsinki, which was also signed by Czechoslovakia. I think this is something that should be stressed again here in this House, and I hope the Council will be commenting on this event, so that we can all express our abhorrence at these sentences.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Van Miert.

Mr Van Miert. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I must unfortunately begin by expressing my extreme disappointment at what the President-in-Office of the Council had to say about European political cooperation. Let me add that the blame lies not with you personally, Mr O'Kennedy, but rather with all your colleagues who sent you to give such a superficial report to this House. I have taken the trouble to compare your speech with what your predecessors said on similar occasions, and I must say that the report you gave this morning was even more trite than the previous years' efforts.

For instance, a striking feature of your report was the almost total absence of reference to the problem of human rights. This got much more attention in the past. I am thinking here, for instance, of the speech the President-in-Office of the Council to the United Nations on 26 September 1977. Since that time, this made problem has lost none of its dramatic impact — quite the opposite, in fact.

Another striking aspect of your speech was the way you almost totally ignore the problem of disarmament, at a time when we in Western Europe are

facing crucial decisions in this area. Mr Coppeters referred just now to this really glaring omission from your speech. Such matters as 'Theatre Nuclear Forces' fraught with political consequences for Western Europe and for the disarmament talks now in progress.

Mr Klepsch and other speakers have already noted other remarkable gaps in your speech, such as relations with the United States, China, Japan, Canada and so on, but I have the definite impression that the examples I have just given might well have something to do with the fact that some of our Member States have seen a change of government in recent years.

Before dealing briefly with certain specific points from your speech, I should like to make a few comments of a general nature on the way European political cooperation works.

It is a fact that European political cooperation has, since 1970, developed alongside and outside the formal treaty obligations on the basis of four principles, namely, the highly pragmatic nature of political cooperation, absolute confidentiality, the consensus rule and a clear distinction between EPC activities and Community activities as such.

The Blumenfeld Report of 13 December 1977 showed, moreover, that these EPC rules and methods are not extremely fragile, but have also reached their inherent limit.

The shortcomings of EPC are to be found first of all in the fact that the political procedures come under the auspices of the Foreign Ministers and their civil servants who — however strong their European convictions may be — are conditioned to defend national interests and objectives in foreign affairs. This makes it practically impossible to go beyond the decisions reflecting the lowest common denominator of national interests.

As a result, the exaggerated artificial distinction between EPC and Community activities has in the past given rise to absurd situations. Perhaps you will recall that, a few years ago, the Foreign Ministers met in political cooperation in Copenhagen, whence they took a plane to Brussels to continue their talks, this time as the Council of Ministers.

Although such nonsense occurs less frequently nowadays, the basic problem still remains in that the Community institutions on the one hand and EPC on the other hand all too frequently work in isolation, when convergence and reciprocity would be more useful. A number of examples have already been given, but I believe that Vietnam, Cyprus, European security and cooperation, Malta, ASEAN and Turkey are typical instances of cases where the necessary cooperation has not been forthcoming. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that instead of this artificial distinction what we need above all is more coordination and more cooperation.

Van Miert

It therefore follows that the EPC procedure is unsatisfactory and needs to be recast.

The artificial distinction between EPC and Community procedures must be broken down and the whole thing forged into a whole.

It is a fact that EPC is handicapped by a very unregulated and pragmatic approach, whereby everything depends on the President-in-Office of the Council. This means that there can be precious little continuity, and the thread has to be taken up afresh every six months. The situation here is even worse than with the European Parliament's nomadic existence. Somehow or other, we must create a better infrastructure without having recourse to a kind of *directoire*.

One thing we could do is to work towards a longer term of office for the Presidency and a division of responsibilities with the outgoing and incoming Presidents-in-Office of the Council: in other words, a sort of rotating troika.

Let me comment briefly here on the role of the Commission. Since 1973, the Commission has gradually become more and more involved in EPC — or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the Commission has been 'tolerated'. Indeed, the Commission's status in EPC activities seems to be more that of an observer than of a fully-fledged participant. The situation is that, although the Commission is now able to attend normal meetings of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, it is not yet entitled to attend the informal gastronomic get-togethers of the Political Committee, which appears to regard itself as a kind of 'holy of holies' to which the Commission can easily be denied access. Please do not get me wrong — I am not trying to make a case for informal gatherings of this kind, but the fact remains that delicate political questions are discussed on these occasions, and the Commission is left out in the cold.

The fact that the Commission is not represented in some of the EPC working parties results in absurd situations, such as the instance a year ago when the Commission was not allowed to attend the deliberations of the working party on Asia, at a time when the Commission was using those powers bestowed upon it by the Treaty to conduct negotiations with China and Japan.

In the meantime, there seems to have been some improvement as far as the working parties are concerned, although the fact remains that the Commission is still insufficiently involved in the

process of political cooperation. I would urge you, Mr O'Kennedy, to use your Presidency to achieve a satisfactory solution to this problem once and for all.

It is also regrettable that, as far as EPC is concerned, the Commission has no recognized right of initiative comparable with that based on the Rome Treaties. A right of initiative along these lines would enable this House to keep a better eye on what the Commission does and does not do in this area. I should now like to mention some points that troubled me as regards the content of Mr O'Kennedy's speech. I noticed, Mr O'Kennedy, that you added a few sentences to your prepared text on the political trial that is now taking place in Prague.

This is not the time for diplomatic niceties. I fail to see why the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation is unable to follow the example of the Italian Communists in forcefully denouncing these trials, which bear all the hallmarks of Stalinism. There can be no doubt whatsoever that trials of this kind are totally contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement. The disgraceful Prague trials must be clearly and categorically denounced by both the Foreign Ministers and the European Parliament and, on this point, I should like to congratulate the Netherlands Government on the attitude it has adopted in making it clear that trials of this kind may jeopardize the process of disarmament between East and West. Your speech, Mr O'Kennedy, appears to suggest that our Foreign Ministers have practically no interest in South America. It almost looks as though the Western European nations are too frightened of the large shadow cast by the United States to pursue a policy of their own. Is there really nothing worth saying about the potential for cooperation with that continent beyond sending a telegram of congratulations to mark the 30th anniversary of the Andean Pact? Is it too much to expect any reaction from our Foreign Ministers to the scandalous violation of human rights in Chile, Argentina, Uruguay and many other South American countries? You were rather more forthcoming about the situation in the Middle East, and — like you — we believe that the Community does have a unique role to play in this part of the world, based on the conviction, on the one hand, that the State of Israel must be able to exist within secure and recognized boundaries, and — on the other hand — that there must be a lasting solution to the Palestinian problem.

Instead of ignoring the PLO, we should therefore like to see a determined search for ways of getting talks moving and, on this point, I would draw your attention to the recent meeting in Vienna between Yassar Arafat, Willy Brandt and Chancellor Kreisky.

Van Miert

I am reminded also of the admirable efforts that have been made recently in this field by the Belgian Foreign Minister. Incidentally, Mr Dayan's resignation has cast an interesting light on what is going on in Israel at the moment.

To cut a long story short, what we are asking for is that Europe should take sensible initiatives rather than simply drag its feet on this matter, and we also believe that this will ultimately be in Israel's best interests.

Here, Mr O'Kennedy, I think I have touched on another weak point of EPC, namely its basically oral nature.

In 99 cases out of 100, when we are not standing helplessly divided and disorganized on the sidelines, we are left hopelessly behind by events.

In 1973, the Heads of State and Government issued a handsomely-worded declaration on the question of European identity. I would concede that a little progress may have been made, but, as far as EPC is concerned, this has been outweighed by the failures. Of course, Rome was not built in a day, but it is really high time that Europe got a bit further in establishing its own specific identity. We do not claim to be a new superpower, but neither do we want to become known as a 'lame duck', as is the case today. Our ambition must be to be an open, democratic Community, steering its own course *vis-à-vis* the two superpowers. We must be consistent, both home and away, in our commitment to peace, to the fight against hunger, development and cooperation, human emancipation, democracy and the protection of human rights, liberties and dignity.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Bersani.

Mr Bersani. — (I) Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, today's debate complements, in a sense, the one we began on Monday, when we considered the basic problems of the coordination of economic policies and the formulation of a coherent policy by the Community as such. In fact, the debate has very clearly shown that there is a fundamental difference between the growing process of economic integration and the mere juxtaposition of national foreign policies. Moreover, Mr O'Kennedy, you suggested this in the introduction to your speech, when you said that political cooperation does not amount to a common foreign policy, and that therefore substantial steps must be taken in that direction.

Well, I think that today's debate, like Monday's, leaves no doubt as to Parliament's attitude. Precisely because of the strength which it derives from direct elections, Parliament maintains that it is entitled to play a full

part in a dialogue which is not confined to the mere transmission of information after the event. It claims the right to participate actively in the creation of new perspectives and new ways forward. Of course, this will involve problems, if it is true — as you implied — that since the beginning of efforts to develop a cooperation policy there has been a gradual extension of the bodies which administer that policy. Today there are essentially four of them: the European Council, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting in political cooperation, the Political Committee, and the Committee of Permanent Representatives. However, with regard to relations between the Council of Ministers, the European Council and Parliament, there exists no body, no structure, and no proposal for an institutional solution. Moreover, Mr Van Miert has stressed that even the participation of the Commission in the work of the European Council is for the moment of a very pragmatic and limited nature, and must be regarded as completely unsatisfactory. However, the problem remains of how to develop a mechanism which will enable Parliament to establish a different type of relationship with the European Council with regard to political cooperation.

That said — and in my view it is one of the central aspects of today's debate — it must be acknowledged that while the statement we have heard provided us with a whole range of information and descriptions of current policies, many possible new developments remained obscure, and some very important aspects of the unified political strategy of the Community were ignored. The chairman of our Group, Mr Klepsch, has already mentioned the USA, China, the Soviet Union, Canada, Japan and so on. It is obvious that we expect these gaps to be rapidly filled in the near future. But, while it is true that the second aspect of the problem, on which the debate threw some light, is that of our participation in current developments going beyond the mere recording of what has occurred it is also true that in this delicate and important field of political cooperation we are in fact generally making steady progress. We are going in the right direction. We have many problems to solve, there are gaps, but the trend is certainly in the right direction. And it is in the right direction not only with respect to the major aims of cooperation, peace and détente which emerge from our overall assessment of political cooperation, but also as regards the gradual introduction of new elements which reflect our European position.

The problem of human rights — indirectly incorporated in the Lomé II Convention discussed yesterday with our fellow-parliamentarians from the ASEAN countries, and which Parliament is increasingly insisting should be really and effectively recognized at

Bersani

all levels of our political activity — confers a new and wider human significance on the whole network of our economic and political relationships. Mainly as a result of pressure from Parliament, a complex of other aspects and essential political factors is emerging. We must acknowledge that, whether one is talking about Czechoslovakia or about the problem of hunger, it is above all Parliament which is putting pressure on the other institutions to go beyond economic interests and political convergences and further those great ideals without which the cause of democracy and Europe's role would be seriously diminished.

To turn rapidly to a number of specific items, I would like to dwell briefly on the question of Lomé. Mr O'Kennedy, as you know the new Lomé Convention will be signed in a few days, next Tuesday in fact. Yesterday the Council of Foreign Ministers met, but it has not yet been able to reach agreement on the thorny problem of investments. I would like, also on behalf of many other Members, to convey to you our deep concern and to invite the Danish Members to do what they can to ensure that the intransigence of their Government on this final problem — out of the hundred or so which had to be solved — does not hold up an event whose extraordinary importance and great political significance we all understand.

With regard to Latin America, I too am convinced, like many other Members, that the time has come for the European Community to take clear initiatives. On the eve of the new agreement which is likely to be reached very soon with the ASEAN countries, and bearing in mind the many relationships which we are developing in other areas of the world, it is inexplicable that our approach to this area so close to us for so many reasons, is limited to a few timid and partial contracts, and that we have not dealt with the real problem, i.e. how to achieve an institutionalized cooperation which reflects our responsibility towards the countries of Latin America.

Considerations not only of bilateral relations between Europe and Latin America, but also of more balanced relations on a world scale, should encourage us to take steps to achieve this.

Turning to South-East Asia, we must hope that, following the discussions of the last few days the negotiations which have been going on for many months will soon be successfully completed. The geographical position of this cooperation area, the tragic and in many ways desperate situation of part of South-East Asia, seem to call for a response from the European Community in the form of concrete proposals and initiatives which may help to create opportunities for a new order in that area. We must provide aid, and we must provide it as efficiently as possible and in the largest possible quantities for people who are dying,

but there is no doubt that the problem is political. As Mr Rey suggested with regard to the Middle East, I should like to ask you, Mr O'Kennedy, and your colleagues to undertake an initiative which may help to create the climate for a political solution, without which we shall be continually faced with new problems and condemned to adopt a limited, partial and belated policy towards a tragedy which, on the contrary, calls for much more adequate and decisive measures.

(Applause)

President. — I call Lord Bethell.

Lord Bethell. — Mr President, in this our first full-length debate on political cooperation since direct elections, I would like at the beginning to quote a few of the words used in an audience granted by His Holiness Pope John Paul II to the President's predecessor, President Colombo, in which he said that our nine countries thus united in partnership will not, of course, forget that they alone do not constitute the whole of Europe; they will remain aware of their common responsibility for the future of the whole continent, a continent which, beyond its historical divisions, its strains and conflicts, has a deep sense of solidarity to which a shared Christian faith has largely contributed.

These sentiments are, I think, very deeply shared by the Members of this House and are particularly appropriate in a debate on political cooperation in Europe, and I am going to suggest that they can perhaps be seen as most closely relevant in the context of the preparations for the Madrid review of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe next year to which the President-in-Office, Mr O'Kennedy, referred in his speech earlier today.

I was encouraged by the President-in-Office's statement to believe that the Nine are indeed working together in cooperation to prepare for this conference. But I am hoping — and I propose to indicate how this could be done — that perhaps the minds of the Ministers could be concentrated during this important year of preparation leading up to the review that will take place a year from now.

I was here in this House, Mr President, when the agreement was first signed in Helsinki in 1975 and I must confess that I was at the time one of those who looked at it with a certain amount of scepticism, but I also looked at it with hope. I am something of a cynic in these matters. I did not think that because the Soviet Union and its allies had undertaken to allow freedom of thought, conscience and belief and had signed Article 7, Principle 7, of the Final Act, they were going to dismantle their State security apparatus. I did not imagine that because they had undertaken to

Lord Bethell

respect the territorial integrity of States, they would evacuate their troops from Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary, not to mention the three Baltic States. But I did imagine, I did hope, that some progress would be made on a number of provisions specifically referred to in the Final Act, such as free movement for journalists, access to newspapers and books across borders, a matter to which our Communist colleague, Mr Pajetta, referred in his eloquent speech earlier this evening, freer movement in other countries of Europe and reunification of families.

However, Mr President, I have to say that over these past four years very little progress has been made in these areas specifically provided for in Basket Three of the Final Act, and I do hope that the Ministers will take this on board and consider how some improvement can be made after the Madrid review. Why is it, to be specific, Mr President, that the chess grandmaster, Viktor Korchnoi, has to spend time and energy belabouring government after government, including that of his former country, the Soviet Union, in order to try and persuade the Soviet Government to allow his wife to come out and join him? Why are they not allowed to be together? And why may the mother of the famous ballet dancer, Rudolf Nureyev, not come out and see her son? She is very old. Why do they do these things, totally contrary to the agreement signed by Mr Brezhnev on behalf of his country? And when people such as Mr Yuri Orlov and Mr Anatoly Scheransky try to monitor these matters and control them and bring violations to the notice of signatory States, why are they arrested and imprisoned for up to seven years? These surely are matters that must be dealt with by the Ministers as a question of urgency if we are to see any future in the CSCE process.

On this same subject I should like to refer to two other parts of Europe, also signatory States. Why is it that Cypriots find themselves separated from their families contrary to various provisions of the Final Act, unable to join members of their families without abandoning their homes, their property, their orange groves, their belongings? Would it not be possible to allow reunification of families on that unhappy island? Also, a sight which I saw myself in Gibraltar in August: why is it that members of families in Gibraltar are unable to communicate with close relatives only a mile or two away across the isthmus in Spain, a border which is now totally closed and has been blockaded for some ten years? It is a very disagreeable sight, Mr President, to see people communicating with relatives across a gap of, say, 100 metres, shouting, giving news of their families, their friends, unable to talk in a normal fashion, let alone visit and see each other in a proper way, forbidden even by law to talk through megaphones or through portable

radios, shouting the news across 100 metres of land and held at 100 metres length one from another by steel fences. This is not in the spirit of Europe which is part of our heritage.

And so I rejoice that the Nine are, in the words of Mr O'Kennedy, making preparations for the Madrid meeting which will open in November next year. I hope that as this year continues, Presidents-in-Office will give us details of these preparations and indicate precisely what they are doing to prepare for Madrid, whether they are putting down amendments to the Final Act, whether they are proposing joint *démarches* to be presented in Madrid, what exactly they are going to do as the Nine, because we do know in this House that when the Nine speak as one voice they speak extremely loudly and extremely effectively.

One step forward in this area, I believe, was made yesterday in my country where exchange controls were removed for the first time. I would like to welcome that as a small step towards European unity. Sums of money can now be transferred freely into and out of the United Kingdom. This, of course, is just one small step in a very long road that we have to travel to reach our ultimate goal of European unity.

However, I am only speaking this evening, Mr President, in order to indicate that this goal of European unity, to which His Holiness referred in April of this year, must not be seen in future as a mere dream. We must not forget it; it is not wholly unrealistic. It is perhaps difficult to achieve in the very short term, but it must be an important long-term political goal of our Community and of this Parliament.

(Applause)

President.— I call Mr Piquet.

Mr Piquet. — (F) With your permission, I should like to make some remarks on the speech by the President-in-Office of the Council.

I should like to say first, or rather to repeat — for we French Communist Members are always saying this — that, in our view, cooperation is a very important factor in the life and development of our modern world. The many aspects of contemporary reality increasingly call for real cooperation on European and world scale. We are all familiar with the human and material factors, the economic and social factors which make this cooperation necessary — such as the internationalization of production, the proliferation of trade contacts, the problem of hunger in the world, which we are to discuss tomorrow, or the great problem of disarmament, peace and security. Indeed, this is a point worth repeating today: cooperation is a necessity for the peoples of the world, and hundreds of thousands — indeed thousands of millions — of people on the Earth put their hope in it.

Piquet

But the question I would like to put is this : does the cooperation over which you preside, Mr O'Kennedy, satisfy this need and this hope ?

In my view, the reply is basically 'no'. Your cooperation is a limited, stunted, mutilated cooperation. Why, you will ask. Simply because the guiding principle of your political cooperation is the search for increasing integration in the foreign policies of our respective countries, and is confined to the European Community.

It is this aim which leads to the paradoxical situation, in my view entirely unacceptable, that we are debating here today questions which are not the responsibility of Parliament and are neither covered by the terms of the Treaty of Rome included in the responsibilities nor of the European Community, whereas the French Parliament, which has sovereign power in this field, has not even been consulted.

I would further add, Mr O'Kennedy, that when challenged your experts often, or too often, take refuge behind the so-called confidential nature of these problems. This supranational integrationist practice would lead very rapidly, if we were not careful, to the formation of a Euro-Atlantic political bloc under American and West German influence.

For my part, I believe that cooperation is necessary and must be developed. But true cooperation is based on respect for independence, on non-intervention, on rights and mutual advantage. True cooperation can flourish only in the framework of a vigorous affirmation of the individuality of each country, with real national independence for all countries. This is not the way for our countries to take their rightful place in the work of cooperation and its essential development.

It is only by definite, dynamic action on the basis of our national potential, traditions and history, having regard to the political forces, that France can make a positive contribution or play a leading role in political cooperation with all countries. France, all non-Member countries throughout the world, and the process of cooperation in general can only gain by this.

Mr President, I should like now to move on to a question which is, in my view, decisive for Europe and the world, namely that of peace, détente, security and disarmament. We were entitled, in this World Disarmament Week proclaimed by the United Nations, to expect that Europe would make proposals and play its part. For we are living in a period in which man now has the terrible ability to destroy himself, not just as an individual, but as a species ; and the mass of ordinary men and women, the workers in our countries and those of the Third World, are already economically and financially the victims of the present colossal military arsenal.

It can never be repeated often enough that thousands of millions of dollars are wasted in this way to the detriment of the economies of our respective countries and at the expense of their people. The European Community, instead of giving consideration to proposals for gradual disarmament such as those put forward by the President of the Soviet Union, turns a deaf ear, whereas it could play a positive part in promoting realistic proposals aimed at a Europe of peace and security. If Mr Brezhnev's proposals do not suit us, why not make other, more substantial proposals on the same lines ? We have opportunities for this. This is not the place to go into these possibilities.

In conclusion, however, I would say that if we wanted to act in accordance with what has been said, here, perhaps we would then decide to stop immediately the sale of arms and military supplies to the various fascist countries — particularly South Africa — which were mentioned in the report we heard this morning. Why not make our own active contribution, under the United Nations, to the establishment of a real aid fund for developing countries — a fund which could be financed through the reduction of our defence budgets. And if only the President-in-Office of the Council showed a little interest, we could perhaps give him some more excellent suggestions in the same vein.

(Applause)

President.— I call Mr Haagerup.

Mr Haagerup.— *(DK)* Mr President, following on from what Mr Jean Rey has already said, I should like, without using up all our speaking time, to make a few remarks regarding, in particular, the institutional aspects of political cooperation, including those which do not directly involve this Parliament. As we all know, this is a field which is not covered by the Treaties and as such is not a matter for majority decisions but presupposes unanimity. As Mr O'Kennedy rightly reminded us, the Member States have undertaken to consult with each other with a view to arriving at a common position if possible. I should like to stress, in this connection, that it is vital that this consultation should take place at the earliest possible stage — ideally before the individual countries have adopted definitive standpoints. The trend towards exchange of views not only via meetings of officials and ministers, but also via telephone and Euronet, should be intensified, and, if possible, extended. The possibility of arriving at a common European position is in its infancy, and the more our Foreign Ministers get used to contacting each other, the more likely we will be to achieve our expressed aim of arriving at common European positions. In his answer to Mr Blumenfeld, Mr O'Kennedy said that consultation had almost become a reflex. This is an excellent way of putting it and it should indeed, I think, become a reflex.

Haagerup

I do not think that radical institutional innovations will be able to do much to further this process at this stage. In spite of certain practical problems, the principle of changing the Presidency every six months, which applies in the case of both cooperation under the Treaties and political cooperation, has nevertheless proved to be a useful system which, in my view, should be maintained. Abolishing this system, or supplementing it with some kind of director in which perhaps not all of our Member States would be represented, is not desirable and is politically unacceptable. On the other hand, it is perhaps worth considering whether or not it would be possible to reinforce European political cooperation by setting up a small international secretariat in Brussels, consisting of 20 or so officials on loan from the Member States for a period of a few years. This secretariat would be responsible to the Foreign Ministers taken as a whole in matters relating to political cooperation and would assist the country currently holding the Presidency. A secretariat of this kind would perhaps be able to ensure a greater degree of continuity in political cooperation and, by means of preparatory work, perhaps also improve the possibilities for the Nine to take certain political initiatives. As has frequently been pointed out, and as Mr Rey mentioned in his speech, political cooperation consists predominantly of reactions to events and it is much more rare that it takes the form of joint European initiatives, even if there have been a few under various Presidencies, including the present one. In addition, a secretariat of this kind might also be a great help particularly to smaller Member States, which can encounter staffing problems during their period of Presidency. However, I should like to stress that this should not affect the structure of political cooperation, but merely make it more effective and the secretariat should work hand in hand with the country currently holding the Presidency and not at cross purposes with it. Much has been said about not only the usefulness but also the necessity of a greater and more active role for this Parliament in political cooperation. We share these wishes and I should like to point out in particular that, from the institutional point of view, there is a weakness in the relation between the European Council and Parliament. This is not particularly or exclusively so in political cooperation, but the latter is indeed one of the fields in which the weakness is apparent.

The directly elected Members of the European Parliament provide both the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation and the European Council with increased possibilities for promoting a public awareness of political cooperation and hence for stepping up this cooperation. As many speakers have already pointed out, we should make use of these opportunities by involving Parliament, including the Political Affairs Committee, to the greatest possible extent in political cooperation. Having said this, I should like to add that, although we in Parliament would like to be

in a position to keep an eye on what is being done within the context of political cooperation, it is not our intention to impede the fruitful development of this cooperation in any way or at any level, including that of the officials. This is not primarily a question of Parliament's prestige, it is a question of facilitating the development of an increasingly *European* foreign policy. My Group is convinced that it is the wish of the vast majority in this Parliament to give the other Community institutions and the European Council all the help they need with a view to achieving this objective. We in the Liberal and Democratic Group are convinced that this directly elected Parliament has its own important role to play in the development of a common European foreign policy in an increasing number of fields.

(Applause)

*IN THE CHAIR: MR FRIEDRICH**Vice-President*

President. — I call Mrs Hammerich.

Mrs Hammerich. — *(DK)* Mr President, I should like to begin by saying that one cannot unfortunately always share the views of one's fellow countrymen, particularly in questions of this kind, where sovereignty is involved. Thus I must disagree completely with what Mr Haagerup has said. On the other hand, I wholeheartedly agree with Mr Piquet, who pointed out how vital intensive international cooperation was for peace and disarmament. However, I also share his view that the European Community might well be too limited a forum for international cooperation of this kind.

In a way, this debate should not be taking place at all, since political cooperation is not covered by the Treaties. Furthermore, Mr Blumenfeld's question cannot simply be regarded as a disinterested starting point for a debate, any more than any other oral questions with debate. There was naturally an ulterior motive, since this Assembly aspires to be more than a simple talking shop. What he has in mind is that the Foreign Ministers should authorize the European Parliament to participate more intensively in political cooperation. This question is simply yet another of the pleas for more power and authority for the Community and for this Assembly with which the air has been thick from the moment the newly elected Assembly first met.

There are calls for a bigger say in more fields. Typical examples include the debate on joint purchasing of arms, the debate on the combating of terrorism and international crime, and tomorrow's debate on a common social policy. And of course there is the

Hammerich

entire budget debate which is turning into a protracted tug-of-war between the Council and Parliament. The whole of today's debate then has been a plea for a strengthening of Parliament's role in the political field. If we in the People's Movement against the EC oppose the whole idea of increasing the powers of the European Parliament, this is because power does not appear out of thin air, but must be taken from somebody else. In the long run this would mean from the Council of Ministers, in which, however, right of veto exists which the small and weaker nations could theoretically use. However, in the long run it would also be the national Parliaments, including our own Folketing, from which the power was taken. This is not only a national surrender, but equally a surrender of democracy, as it would involve a surrender of the close democratic control which we believe in, and which we set much higher than European greatness, since this Parliament in fact operates a democratic smokescreen for certain undemocratic power structures, both formal and real.

Political cooperation lies outside the scope of the Treaties, which means that we Danes as a people have not had an opportunity to state whether or not we are in favour of a Community with a common foreign policy. Political cooperation within the Community does not officially exist, there is merely a form of casual cooperation between the nine Foreign Ministers, although this involves a vast machinery with the European Council at the head, and frequent meetings of Foreign Ministers, fixed routines of the officials, daily telex communications, etc. I am afraid, however, that in Denmark the idea of a common foreign policy for the Community is extremely unpopular in many quarters, but the debate on this question, the broad debate, can be avoided, since the whole area is kept carefully outside the scope of the Treaties. In the same way, the explicit promises our leading politicians made before the referendum on EC membership can also be disregarded. The authority of this Assembly in matters of foreign policy has been bestowed upon it by the European Council, a self-appointed body with no basis in the Treaties and with practically no democratic control — which is not very reassuring either.

Thus, there is in fact no democratic basis for discussing a common foreign policy. As we know from a statement by the European Council and from the Tindemans report and other reports on the European Community, the aim of political cooperation is that the Community should speak with a single voice. However, what this bombastic phrase really means is that certain people wish to take a major step towards a political union, which is precisely why we are against it. And why do we oppose European political union, why are we not enthusiastic about what some people refer to as 'European unity and greatness'? Because we are not interested in the European Community becoming a Great Power. We do not think that the big is necessarily better than the small. We do not

wish to be part of this Great Power, and why should we? Our reluctance is not only due to the fact that we would become simply an insignificant appendix to this Great Power, but also to the fact that we are concerned about something of vital importance, i.e. world peace. Yet another Great Power, an additional superpower, which hopes to establish a joint defence system and to be, as Mr Scott-Hopkins puts it, a force in the world, would do nothing to reduce international tensions or to promote disarmament.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank Mr O'Kennedy not so much for what he told us as for what — as has been pointed out — he could not or would not tell us, especially in connection with the problems which are of vital importance for the life and progress of our Community and for peace and security in the world. It has already been pointed out, for example, that he said nothing about relations with Russia, America or China, whose leader is in fact in Europe at the moment, and he said nothing about the energy problem either. This means, more or less, that he failed to mention the genuine, basic problems with which political cooperation should be coming to grips at the present time. Of course, in the few minutes I have left I cannot go into Mr Blumenfeld's question and the statement by the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. Consequently, I shall simply say that I share the view that political cooperation is perhaps one of the major paths which should lead the European Community towards greater unity. Only by harmonizing our foreign policies can we in fact hope to achieve a level of coordination and unity which has been lacking until now and respond to the desires and concerns of our voters, the people of Europe, who would like to see a definite move in this direction.

There has been a lot of talk about Africa in this Chamber, but there has been precious little mention, for example, of the fact that, apart from Africa's other problems, there is the problem posed by the presence of a fair number of Cuban troops whose activities are not known, although we can guess only too well what they are up to. It was quite right that we made a point of condemning apartheid and the policy of the Rhodesian Government during the debate, but even if I agree on the question of rights for the black majority, I must point out that there has been no reference to the rights of the white minority whose interests, whose liberties and perhaps even whose lives may be threatened if we do the wrong thing.

I am not going to speak further since my time is almost up. Let me just say that the world political stage at the moment is dominated by the serious problems of disarmament and security. In the in-trays of the foreign ministries of Europe there is a letter which Mr Brezhnev has sent to all the heads of govern-

Romualdi

ment of the NATO countries. I should like to know from the President-in-Office and from all of you here whether we intend to coordinate our replies to show that we are ready to defend our freedom and independence and to reject pressure from any source.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Cariglia.

Mr Cariglia. — *(I)* Mr President, Mr O'Kennedy, I realize that European political cooperation is something quite different from a European policy as such. However, in the period to which the President of the Council referred, the years since 1970, there has been some little progress which has barely outlined the concept of European policy, although it is not the European policy we were expecting. In the light of events, we cannot accept that all this is enough. There are a number of criticisms I want to make, which I hope will also be taken as suggestions.

Since 1970, the strategic pattern of world affairs has witnessed a steady decline of European presence in certain areas which must be considered vital from Europe's point of view. This is not to say that in Asia and the Middle East we have not played our part, but let me make it clear that in the Arab-Israeli conflict our presence — the presence of Europe — can be considered somewhat belated, to say the least. The oil crisis, which to some extent is a result of the continuing crisis in the Middle East, is not being tackled in a coordinated fashion by Europe. This is shown by the proliferation of bilateral agreements which the individual Member States of the Community have signed with the oil-producing countries.

In south-east Asia we have a tragedy of biblical proportions, and yet we cannot manage to coordinate humanitarian aid. This just goes to show that we are worrying too much about avoiding diplomatic incidents and that we are incapable of working out a Community plan to help the people of Kampuchea and Vietnam. In our view, a few tonnes of grain are not enough to save our consciences or to alleviate the plight of millions whom, as we have seen, no charter of human rights is capable of protecting.

Africa, Mr O'Kennedy, should be the Community's main trading partner. Unfortunately, this area is coming under increasing Soviet influence, the obvious aim of which is to sway attitudes towards Europe. This threat is being put into practice and is following a pattern which is all too obvious.

The response to development in Africa has been not so much a European policy as a series of initiatives by individual European States, such as France and the United Kingdom. Some of these initiatives have been clear others a little less so. Nevertheless, they tend to be a response to specific situations and provide no guarantee for the broadest possible just and peaceful

solution. If you ask me, Europe has still to work out the broad lines of a Euro-African policy to develop the association agreement to promote closer cultural ties and to create the conditions for more rapid growth with a greater willingness on our part to make some sacrifices.

The press has carried reports of a proposal by Mr Brandt, chairman of the North-South committee, for the creation of an international levy to provide finance for developing countries. If these reports are true, Mr O'Kennedy, I believe that it is an idea which deserves to be considered and gone into thoroughly, because it could lead to the idea of a European levy which would open a new chapter in the history of the association agreement with the countries of Africa.

Hitherto, Mr President, the European Community has endeavoured to respond to moves by others, albeit within the limits posed by political cooperation. I feel that the moment has come to propose a move of our own, going beyond our role as a trading power and adopting a more obviously political approach. This is an area where the Council of Ministers — I must confess — moves with exaggerated caution. If we could make up our minds to join our African partners in a series of important initiatives designed to narrow the development gap between us as quickly as possible, we should be setting a target for our young people and effacing — I might add — the image of a Europe of traders.

Finally, there is a point I should like to take up with Mr Piquet, who spoke earlier. In connection with the problem of armaments which was brought up, why do the Nine not point out to the Soviet Union that disarmament policy and respect for human and civil rights provide the one and only basis of a policy for peace and that the existence of freedom of expression in our countries is a guarantee in itself, more so than in authoritarian States, that weapons will be used for defence only? We hope that one day weapons will be abolished, but while they exist — and I say this in all truthfulness as a democrat and a socialist — no country in Europe or elsewhere has reason to fear a treacherous attack from us.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Michel.

Mr Michel. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after the encouraging words from the President-in-Office of the Council, can we have faith in political cooperation? I feel we have to test its credibility. We have heard the usual condemnations of apartheid, but what we have ask ourselves is how far we have got in applying the Code of Conduct which the Foreign Ministers of the Nine adopted two years ago, with specific reference to European firms and their branches or subsidiaries in South Africa.

Michel

The application of this Community code of conduct and the rigorous monitoring of its application are the real test of credibility, for us in the Christian-Democratic Group. There were questions on this yesterday and today. The answers we got from the President of the Council were couched in general terms, and were a statement of principle. But after all these statements condemning apartheid, what is needed now is some practical action. In our view, Europe is capable of exerting real pressure to bring to and end the systematic exploitation of twenty million blacks by the régime in Pretoria.

One way of exerting pressure is to implement fully this Code of Conduct — which was considered by Parliament in a report last April — even though it is unsatisfactory and deficient because it was drawn up in the first place without consulting those sectors of society which have inside experience of the shameful reality of apartheid. This ought to be pointed out. The time has come when the Foreign Ministers of the Nine must act and do a lot more than come up with generalizations and good intentions. But what exactly? They ought to set before this Parliament a fully documented report dealing, firstly, with the application of the code of conduct in the light of the annual reports prepared by European companies and their subsidiaries in South Africa, and with the various sections in these reports on wages, salary structures, the promotion of black workers, other social benefits and especially desegregation of workplaces. Secondly, the report should prepare the way for improvements to the present code, including a more precise definition of minimum wages. This improvement to the code could be studied together with the relevant social partners. I am thinking here of the Economic and Social Committee and the large international trade union organizations which are involved: the European Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the Organization of African Trade Union Unity, the World Confederation of Labour and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. Thirdly, we feel we should look into ways of tightening checks and the need for a compulsory code with penalties for European firms and their branches or subsidiaries which refuse to implement the code. Lastly, we feel that cooperation with the other industrialized members of the OECD should be encouraged, so that a similar code can be applied to their companies and similar anti-apartheid measures incorporated in a future code of conduct for the multinationals.

It is a shocking state of affairs, Mr O'Kennedy, that only three governments in the Community have so far produced a report on the application of the Code of Conduct by their own companies. These countries are Denmark, Italy and the United Kingdom. The other Member States have produced nothing. Furthermore,

Mr President, The Nine should add a series of supplementary measures to the code, in particular those proposed in my country by the Member of Parliament, Mr Philippe Maystadt, with the aim of banning ECGD support for investments and exports to South Africa. The nine Member States of the Community must work together to put a stop to guarantee arrangements of this kind and block the financing of South African industry by European banks.

You only need to look at the astounding statistics to see that 186 credit institutions in the Community lent South Africa several thousand million dollars between 1972 and 1979. In connection with these measures, I hope I do not need to add that there must be full respect for the embargo on the supply of weapons and nuclear equipment which could be put to any other than strictly peaceful uses.

Finally, if this area of political cooperation is to function, we consider it vital that the Foreign Ministers of the Nine seek the close collaboration of the Commission and its departments, so that the check on the application of the code of conduct can be carried out smoothly and on a Community basis, with the primary aim of avoiding any distortion of competition.

In closing, Mr President, I should like to mention another vital sector of political cooperation which should get our close attention, for from the social point of view it is one of the fundamental aspects of the North-South dialogue. I am referring to the introduction, at UN level, of an investment code for all the industrialized nations. The aim of the code should be the industrialization of developing countries on the basis of respect for the labour force and not — as is all too often the case at present — by exploiting workers in the most shameless fashion.

With regard to this, as far as it affects the Community, I have tabled a question to the Council of Ministers on the Commission proposals concerning the observance of international standards on working conditions, by the industries in developing countries which benefit from preferential or other arrangements to facilitate their exports to the Community. Here we are in the Year of the Child, and all the horror of the children and adolescents who are forced to work is made known to the world at large. According to the International Labour Office, more than 52 million children under the age of 12 are at work in industry, while more than 48 million are employed in craft industries. That means that more than 100 million children under 12 years of age are now working. In my opinion, we should continue our determined efforts in collaboration with the International Labour Office to put an end to this scandal. If you need any reminder of what a crucial problem this is, just take a look at the report by an ILO expert, Mr Breton.

Michel

The report states that only 20 of the 140 countries in the ILO have ratified Convention No 138, which lays down that the minimum age for employment shall not be less than the age of completion of compulsory schooling. Is it not a tragic state of affairs when you realize that the countries with child workers are those with the highest rates of adult unemployment? I raised this question with the representatives of the ACP States at the recent meeting we had in Luxembourg. In view of this shocking state of affairs, the Commission has put a number of concrete proposals to the Council seeking to make the granting by the Community of preferential and other arrangements dependent on the observance of certain standards for working conditions which have been worked out together with the ILO. Let me run through them quickly. Firstly, no child under 14 may be employed in industry and there is a minimum age for adolescents working at night or doing dangerous or unhealthy work. Secondly, work must be limited to a maximum of 48 hours per week. And thirdly, there must be absolutely no discrimination on racial, religious or any other ground when it comes to employment.

These are basic but inadequate standards. Personally, I feel that forced labour should also be rejected, and that the provisions I mentioned concerning children and adolescents should be extended to cover craft industries. The Commission's proposals have been on the Council's desk since November 1978, and there is no one who gainsays the soundness of these proposals. Parliament, too, produced a favourable opinion. But why has the Council taken no action? This lack of action by the Nine Foreign Ministers, together with the continued silence of the Council and the lack of any go-ahead for the Commission to do something effective, is quite unpardonable. Furthermore, it can only be to the detriment, not only of the future of the Community, but also and especially of a genuine policy of cooperation and development.

(Applause)

President. — I call Sir Peter Vanneck.

Sir Peter Vanneck. — Mr President, honourable Members, I propose to dilate for just a few minutes on the security aspects of political cooperation. The Irish Presidency, as we have heard, has reported on preparations for the next Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which is concerned, as my colleague Lord Bethell has emphasized, with the mechanics of relaxing tension between East and West. The complement of the Community's work on CSCE political cooperation is the defence potential of most Member States — but not of Ireland, although Ireland benefits from it. This defence potential is the Community's

bargaining strength in negotiations with the Soviet bloc. Just as the Community's position on human rights violations in the Soviet bloc must be consistent, so must the Community's defence equipment and manpower match the threat that would undermine human rights in the Community in the event of a successful Soviet attack. His Holiness the Pope's visit to Ireland, with its emphasis on the dignity of man and human rights, is thus a challenge to the Irish and all citizens in the Community to stand up and be counted in the challenge to our common security — as individuals, as families and as nations.

There are a number of reasons which may justify exchanges of view among the Community's Defence Ministers on specific problems in security matters and on European aspects of multilateral negotiations on security. In the latter case, clearly strengths and weaknesses of any one Member State affect other Member States. Thus, CSCE and other détente measures intimately affect the security of the Community — not only the frontiers of the Community, but its supply lines and the stability of its partners in the world.

President Brezhnev told his Warsaw Pact colleagues at a Prague conference some years ago that it was the Soviet aim to bring the West begging on its knees for raw materials. President Brezhnev's recent speech in East Berlin is confirmation that the promotion of revolutionary change in our countries is the Soviets' constant aim.

In the event of a Soviet attack on the Community's towns and cities, it would obviously be useful to know whether Ministers have considered the possibilities for common civil defence procedures in the Community. In the event of a devastating Soviet attack on Member States, what plans are there, I ask, for rehabilitation of Community citizens after the attack? Is there any coherence in Member States' plans to deal with the aftermath of a Soviet attack on one or several Member States, and what mutual assistance could Member States offer to one another? In the event of a successful attack on vital freight supply lines to our Member States, what contingency plans have been made to ensure basic fuel and food supplies to the Community's citizens? Those who heard President Brezhnev's East Berlin speech will know — and I say this to Mr Piquet, who of course is no longer here: his mind is made up, I must not confuse him with facts — that the Soviet Union is threatening Western Europe if any attempt is made to restore military balance between NATO and Warsaw Pact forces.

Europe has heard this sort of language before. Our constituents are concerned. They expect their elected representatives — of which I am proud to be one — to determine policies and actions which will secure

Vanneck

their destiny as free persons, as envisaged in the preamble to the Treaty and as foreshadowed in the unadopted Tindemans Report on European Union. Considerations of security and therefore, joint meetings of Member States' Defence Ministers are fundamental, I suggest most strongly, to any political cooperation. Do not, Mr President of the Council, only think of them as merely peripheral. They must be brought in with this Parliament's wholehearted support.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, I would like first of all to thank the President-in-Office of the Council for making available to me a copy of his speech. I also heard him deliver the speech and noted the places where he deviated from the script. I would like to put just three questions to the President-in-Office of the Council, of which I have given him prior notice.

Does he not remember that at its last plenary part-session this House passed a resolution in which it called on all member governments to intensify cooperation between their security services and police forces to bring to justice those responsible for violence and death at the earliest possible moment, urged the governments of Member States to move toward a common system of extradition in the fight against international crime and terrorism and requested the Foreign Ministers to report progress on these two matters? It seems from his speech that not much progress has been made. When he was in opposition, he is on record as saying he did not see any constitutional reasons for the Republic of Ireland not to sign the Convention on Terrorism of the Council of Europe. I would like to ask him therefore if he does not feel that now is the time for the Nine to adopt that Convention and for all to sign it and put it into effect.

Then I want to ask him a question about Rhodesia. I am very alarmed that he took time to condemn one section of the Community and did not condemn the acts of terrorism within Rhodesia. I would remind him that missionaries, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, have been massacred by terrorist groups within Rhodesia and that a Protestant Minister and a Salvation Army girl from my constituency of Northern Ireland were done to death. Should he not be evenhanded in his condemnation and also condemn terrorism within Rhodesia? I would like to take issue with him when he talks about genuine majority rule, because in Rhodesia today there is more of a genuine majority than in many other of the African States, and that happens to be a fact.

I would also like to take him up on the question of the PLO. One of his colleagues mentioned that the Nine had now virtually recognized the PLO. This

would be contrary to one of my parliamentary colleagues speaking in the House of Commons in regard to this matter, when he made it clear that the British Government was not prepared to go forward yet on recognition. Perhaps the President-in-Office could clarify those matters for us.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Hänsch.

Mr Hänsch. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like this evening to comment on what Mr O'Kennedy had to say about the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and in doing so, I should like to take up one of the threads Lord Bethell's speech, although the pattern I shall weave will probably not be pleasing to the honourable Member's eye.

As you yourself said, Mr O'Kennedy, the success of the CSCE follow-up conference in Madrid will depend largely on whether — and if so, to what extent — the signatories have respected and implemented the Helsinki agreements. It is important that this point should be made clearly at a time when we all still have in our minds the recent events in Prague, where Czechoslovak citizens are currently on trial for attempting to implement the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. Some of the verdicts have been pronounced today with prison sentences ranging from two to five years. This, to my way of thinking, is bound to be extremely detrimental to the process of détente in Europe. We would therefore appeal once again to the authorities in Czechoslovakia not to stage trials and pass sentences which are bound to arouse fears of a return to Stalinism and the Cold War. The fact, Mr O'Kennedy, ladies and gentlemen, that we are determined to press on with the policy of détente does not mean that we should refrain from condemning violations of human rights wherever they may occur in Europe. We shall always protest loudly and clearly against such violations. But let me say to all those people who perhaps think that the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference is now just another piece of paper, and that a policy of security and cooperation in Europe has failed, that they are wide of the mark. Let me point out to these people that you cannot, at one and the same time, reject the results of the Helsinki Conference and, in the same breath, demand that Czechoslovakia should respect these results and these agreements. Those of us who consistently advocated détente, peace and security in Europe did so in the sure knowledge that we were bound to suffer reverses and come up against all manner of obstacles and difficulties.

Let us not forget, ladies and gentlemen, that without the Helsinki Agreement, a lot of people in both Western and Eastern Europe would not today be benefiting from a wide range of practical and administrative

Hänsch

improvements. So I would say that, despite all the setbacks, we must continue along the road to *détente*, peace and security in Europe. I only wish that Mr O'Kennedy had expressed himself a little more clearly in his speech on the role of the European Community. In view of the weak leadership we can expect from the United States during the forthcoming presidential election campaign, in view of the changes which are bound to take place in the Soviet leadership sooner or later, and in view of the accelerating descent into crisis of many African and Latin American States I feel that you should have stated much more clearly that the Europe of the Nine is not only an oasis of stability in an unstable world, but that it should also be an active instrument for stability throughout the world.

You said, Mr O'Kennedy, that Europe is often regarded as a single entity by outsiders nowadays. Not as far as I can see! As far as political cooperation in Western Europe is concerned, at least, there are no grounds for satisfaction with our achievements to date. I regret that you failed here to outline any real identity for the Community in terms of foreign policy. What you had to say about preparations for the Madrid follow-up conference was both unclear and lacking in perspective, partly because you made no reference to Basket II, which is concerned with practical cooperation in Europe. As far as we are concerned, all three baskets — measures designed to increase confidence, practical cooperation and civil and human rights — must be given equal weight and equal importance; in other words, we want to see the second basket included in the preparations for the Madrid Conference; and not only do we want to see its provisions exploited to the full, we want to see a bit more packed into the basket besides.

A policy of confrontation would, in my opinion, bring to nought all the cautious but, none the less effective progress that has been made over the past few years, for instance — and this is something I should like to make quite clear, Lord Bethell — between the two German States and between the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland and the Soviet Union. It is simply not true that practically nothing has been done in this field in Eastern Europe since the Helsinki Conference. Of course, we realize that not enough has been done, but you cannot simply stand up and say that nothing at all has happened in this field. There is no realistic alternative to a policy of *détente*, peace and security, and this policy can only be persevered with if its scope is extended to take in the second basket, dealing with practical cooperation.

Mr O'Kennedy, we expect the Nine to persevere in their attempts to achieve some degree of cooperation

with the countries of Eastern Europe, for instance in energy policy, there is really nothing to prevent us from making quite sure that our own interests are not neglected. Western Europe is already too small an entity for the complexities of energy policy. Because of its sheer magnitude, the problem has long since ceased to be soluble on a purely Western European scale.

Let me give you another example of what I mean. The barbed wire fences, mines and barriers forming the border between Eastern and Western Europe are no obstacle for pollution of the air, the water and the land. Here again, our Community has become too small to tackle the problems of environmental pollution on its own. In its preparations for the Madrid Conference, we expect the Nine to investigate whether — and if so, to what extent — cooperation in the field of environmental pollution in Europe can be improved and extended. What I have just said about energy policy and environmental policy applies equally to cooperation in the field of transport.

Let me make quite clear, ladies and gentlemen, that the directly elected European Parliament is determined to make its presence felt in all questions to do with cooperation covering the whole of Europe, and that goes, for instance, for relations and negotiations between the Community and Comecon. It is time we stopped going round in circles in the negotiations on the outline treaty, so as to prevent damage being done to the whole policy of *détente*. We expect the dialogue between the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament on the future of *détente* in Europe to be intensified. After all, a policy of security and cooperation is a *sine qua non* for peace for the people we represent in this House.

This policy of security and cooperation is a glimmer of hope for all those who cannot be represented in this House, but who are none the less a part of Europe, its history and its culture.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr McCartin.

Mr McCartin. — Mr President, I should like first of all to thank the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers for his report this morning and to congratulate him on the spirit and extent of his remarks. In case this has not already been said on behalf of my group, I want to associate our group in Parliament with the people who condemned the trial and sentence of the civil-rights workers in Czechoslovakia and to say that my group at the moment are considering this position and will make a further statement containing the reasons for their attitude on the subject.

McCartin

The whole of political cooperation, to my mind, revolves around three sets of considerations. First, we have our common Christian and humane feelings of concern for our fellow man, which should impel us to involve ourselves actively in places like Cambodia and Central Africa, because the great sufferings and hardships which people in these areas must endure have come at some stage or another from the taking of wrong political decisions. Second, our efforts to achieve peace and stability will have the effect of generating trade and industry and contributing, of course, not only to a better world order but to our own greater well-being. Thirdly, of course, our assistance in the whole area of political cooperation will help to ensure that the expansion of totalitarian States, be it Soviet Russia or anywhere else, is better checked by a united effort on the part of the European Economic Community than by the fragmented efforts of individual States, who at worst are very often working against one another's interests and at best are not achieving the sort of results which could be achieved by united effort.

Listening to the President's speech this morning, I was struck by something on which I should like to make a brief comment. I certainly do not have the present President-in-Office in mind but rather refer to the attitude of previous Ministers and to our efforts in this Community. We have had no shortage of what I would call expressions of hope, we have had no difficulty in getting agreements to underline our concern, nor in noting the various reports that have been put before us. But the time has come when we must contribute something more than expressions of goodwill if we as a Community are to become a serious force with a real influence on the trend of events in areas of interest to us or in areas that need or have requested our help. I am not suggesting that we can bring the whole might of this economic Community, which is considerable, to bear on every issue in which we may become involved, but I would like briefly to make a case for such an involvement in a particular area of the Middle East, in the Israeli-Arab dispute, for here we have all of the three sets of considerations which I mentioned originally — considerations concerning peace, concerning our economic security and progress and concerning our security and the protection of our democratic system in this part of the world.

I should like here to dwell for a brief moment on this and to remind the President that intervention in a more serious way would be acceptable to both sides in this dispute. I should like to remind the President-in-Office that in his closing words to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe on 10 October, Mr Dayan, who regrettably is no longer a minister, used these words:

The people of Israel are confident that the peace process will eventually attract other Arab countries as well. We

expect Europe to encourage this process and also to seek to promote regional cooperation and to initiate economic projects of mutual interest to our area and the European States. One could envisage a kind of Marshall Plan to bring the example of European economic cooperation to the Middle East. This is a true challenge, the challenge of peace.

In the course of his address to the Assembly, the Egyptian Minister of State for Foreign Affairs said that Europe could play a special role in helping to solve the Arab-Israeli problem which would have three objectives: to protect the legitimate rights of the Palestinians, to allay the legitimate anxieties of the Israelis and to avoid aggravating dissensions between the Arab States. Further, the Minister favoured direct action in favour of the Palestinians on the West Bank and in Gaza to help them maintain their physical presence in the occupied territories and to preserve their national identity. Such action, coupled with continuing diplomatic activity, could lead the US and the Israelis to engage in a dialogue with the Palestinian Liberation Organization. In this way, too, the Palestinians and the Arab rejectionists could be induced to participate in a peace process launched by Egypt. On the other hand, Europe could give Israel international guarantees. The Minister went on to propose that Europe, through political parties and trade unions, who have contact with their opposite numbers in Israel, should interpret the situation of the Palestinians to the Israelis. In these ways, he suggested, Israel might be assisted to overcome their obsessions with security and their political isolation and find recognition of the Palestinian State. Finally, the Egyptian Minister proposed that Europe could play the part of a conciliator between Egypt and the rejectionist States.

It is interesting to compare the two approaches. The Israelis emphasized a European intervention in the peace process along economic lines, while the Egyptians preferred to envisage specific political action by the States of Europe. To which Europe are the two leaders referring? Mr Dayan appears to have the Community specifically in mind, because only the European Economic Community could propose solutions along the lines of the Marshall Plan. On the other hand, the Egyptian Foreign Minister gives no direct clue, but evidently the Community would wield greater influence than the Council of Europe through its economic power and its closer ties in political cooperation with the USA.

Having thus established the *locus standi* of the Community to intervene in the Arab-Israeli dispute as recognized equally by the leading representatives of each side, I would like to call the attention of the President-in-Office to the Parliament's resolution on the peace treaty and a Community contribution to a comprehensive peace settlement. This was adopted on 26 April, shortly after the statement of 26 March. The

McCartin

resolution is closely relevant to the statements of 10 October by the Foreign Ministers of Israel and Egypt. Firstly, the Parliament urged the Council, the Commission and the Community governments to intensify existing links between the Community, Egypt and Israel, both within a Community and a political cooperation framework. Secondly, Parliament proposed that more intensive cooperation be offered to those States in the area which were willing to participate in the peace process launched at Jerusalem by President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin in November 1977. In other words, Parliament was seeking to persuade Arab rejectionist States to become accepting States. Third, Parliament's resolution asked the Commission to bring forward concrete proposals to increase cooperation between the Community and both Israel and Egypt, as our contribution to the development of the region and in order to increase the industrial capacity of both those countries and diversify their economies. Thus, Parliament's far-sighted resolution anticipated by six months the respective approaches of Israel and Egypt in regard to Community participation in the process of peace.

The limits of the time available to me do not permit me to develop this theme of Community involvement in the peace process, and I would refer Members to the Blumenfeld resolution and to the debate of 26 April last. Meanwhile, I would direct the following questions to the President-in-Office. Have the Foreign Ministers considered the Parliament's resolution? If so, what action has been taken on it? If not, will they now consider it, along with the statements of Mr Dayan and the Egyptian foreign minister, with a view to taking action on them? Do the Foreign Ministers accept that there is a role both for the Nine and for the Community as such to play in assisting peace along the lines acceptable to both sides? Finally, will the President-in-Office agree that by interparliamentary contacts with both the Israeli Parliament and the People's Assembly of Egypt, the European Parliament could contribute significantly to advancing the cause of peace between Israel and Egypt?

In conclusion, I would like to say that we in this European Economic Community have succeeded in achieving a stable political situation for peace and harmony with its neighbours. Without seeking to apportion any blame, I would suggest that we have within this Community one situation where this is not the case, possibly in Northern Ireland. This Community can, and should, consider carefully the problems that are there. I do not want to make any particular reference to blame or go beyond saying that in this part of the European Community innocent civilians, soldiers and members of the security forces lose their lives practically every day, the region is retarded economically and development is prevented over a considerable area on either side of this border — an

area which has unequalled potential for tourism, for economic development, for agricultural activities, an area that is rich in undeveloped resources — and I would like to suggest that the Community should take a sympathetic look at this problem, because as long as this problem remains the governments of Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland will have to spend increasing amounts of money on the problem of security. In order therefore that we might better establish our own position in the world and set an example for all other nations which aspire to the sort of democratic system we recommend, for all those reasons I would suggest that this Assembly, the institutions of this Community, should offer their help in bringing about a solution. The people of my State have been grateful particularly to a former Prime Minister, Mr Heath, for the efforts he made and to our own representatives who drew up the Sunningdale Agreement. I am firmly convinced that if the British Prime Minister in office when this agreement broke down had had the support of the European Economic Community that problem might be solved today and might not be still with us to the extent that it is.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Tyrrell.

Mr Tyrrell. — Mr President and colleagues, to Mrs Hammerich and others who have doubted the legal validity of what we are doing today, I say: let us remind ourselves of the preamble of the Treaty, whereby the Member States resolved, by pooling their resources, to preserve and strengthen peace and liberty. Now we understand from the Council of Ministers that, since 1977, direct and concentrated action has been taken in the Council by Ministers meeting in political cooperation to translate that noble resolution from the preamble into practical deeds by the creation of a judicial area. On this, I am sure the House will wish the Ministers every success in their endeavour; because, in the final analysis, nothing is more vital or dear to the hearts of the peoples of all our countries than their peace and their liberty. These have been under brutal and increasing attack by criminals, operating usually across frontiers, and often between our Member States. It follows, of course, that nothing can be of greater concern to us, their elected representatives.

It was rather surprising, therefore, that in Written Answer 92/79 to a question by Mr Bordu, on 10 July 1979, the Council said they were unwilling to make available to us in this Parliament instruments pertaining to this subject, since the matters referred to do not fall within the competence of Parliament.

Mr President, I think perhaps the answer was given to that by Mr Gendebien in the debate in September when he said that the Parliament is automatically competent for any question considered by the

Tyrrell

Council. He pointed out that the fact that Lady Elles's oral question on extradition was accepted by the Council indicated that they thought so too, and I deduce from the fact that the President-in-Office included a section in his speech this morning on the judicial area that he now thinks so too. But Mr Andrews, in his reply to the last debate, did not deal with Mr Gendebien's remarks on that, so I would ask the President-in-Office when he replies: May we take it that he accepts that this Parliament is competent to discuss the judicial area?

If so, when are we going to see the draft instruments which the Ministers are at present preparing? When are we going to be put in possession of the information which will enable us to have an informed and sensible debate on the subject? What is the reason for secrecy? In the answer to the written question — and again in the speech this morning — there is reference to the judicial area being established in two steps.

The first step deals with extradition and, as I understand it, involves two different instruments. The question of extradition was fully debated in September, and I am not going to go into it again today, save to take up where we left off. The Minister then said that he hoped that the instrument for the agreement on the European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism could be signed by the Member States in October. October is nearly at an end. And I ask him: does he still hope that it will be signed in October? If not, what are the difficulties? The other instrument he referred to in his speech this morning is an associated extradition instrument. He said that the issues on it are complex, but that progress is being made. I ask him, what are the complexities? Tell us — we may be able to help. We may, with the wisdom assembled around our benches in this Parliament, be able to assist the Council. What are the complexities that are causing difficulty?

But I turn principally to what has been described by the Council as the second step. It was described in the answer to the written question by the Council in this way:

involves problems concerning mutual assistance in criminal matters, exchanges of prisoners, the transfer of proceedings in criminal matters, and the international validity of criminal judgments.

I very much doubt whether any of those Members who have stayed to hear this part of the debate are any the wiser: the words used by the Council are as vague as any that one could possibly imagine. Let me look at them again. The first one was: mutual assistance in criminal matters. Now what exactly is it that the Ministers are considering? I wonder whether that includes the formal taking of witnesses' statements in one member country for transmission to another. That would be a worthy goal, but it would present massive

practical difficulties in some legal systems including, I apprehend, my own. I hope that this phrase, 'mutual assistance in criminal matters', may include procedures for the compellability of witnesses — that is to say, providing a legal machinery whereby a witness who is resident in one country may be brought to another country for the purpose of giving evidence in a criminal trial which is proceeding there. A financial indemnity of course against loss would be necessary, but in working out such a procedure, any progress would be welcome.

Let me turn rapidly to the second head that the Council have mentioned. They say they are discussing exchanges of prisoners. I find this quite extraordinary concept. I cannot imagine any situation in which member countries should want to exchange prisoners, but I do wonder whether what they meant to say was 'transfer' of prisoners. If that is so, I apprehend that would mean that where a prisoner has been convicted and sentenced in one country, he may be transferred to his home country to serve his sentence. Now if the proposal is that it should be by force, then I apprehend it would be unacceptable. But if it were by consent of the prisoner concerned, then in my view it would be welcome. Because it is well known that it is a particular hardship on a prisoner to serve a sentence in a strange land — difficulties of communication with other inmates and with his prison guards; rehabilitation, if he cannot speak the language, becomes virtually impossible; he does not receive visits from his friends and his family; and he is unable to benefit from parole.

The third head that the Council have referred to is international validity of criminal judgments. That is easier to understand. A criminal judgment would strike either at the property or the person of the defendant. I would welcome provisions which enabled an order for a fine imposed on a defendant in one country to be enforced against his property situated in another country; that is not now possible. Similarly, an order for compensation to a victim of violence in one country should be transmissible to another country. But if it is also proposed that a sentence of imprisonment in one country should be automatically enforced in another country, then I can envisage enormous difficulties.

Mr President, I have, of course, been speculating. Will the Council please tell us what they have in mind? We are here on behalf of those who elected us to contribute to these discussions, and I echo what has been said by a number of previous speakers: please let us discuss these matters before a decision is taken, and not merely afterwards.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr van Minnen.

Mr Van Minnen.— (NL) Mr President, judging by the number of Members present here in the Chamber, I doubt if anyone would notice if I started speaking Sanskrit, although the emptiness of the Chamber was more than matched by the emptiness of the words that the President-in-Office of the Council thought he could get away with here. But his performance has already evoked enough censure here today and I should like to move on to take issue with him on almost the only aspect of his speech which he did deal with at some length, and in surprisingly specific terms at that — the European judicial area.

The fact that a large part of the Socialist Group have the strongest reservations and are deeply concerned about this depressingly earnest idea runs absolutely counter to the totally misplaced pride with which Mr O'Kennedy trotted out the results of this very policy: a draft convention drawn up by the Nine and an extension to the area within which each Member State's legal principles must be abandoned. I cannot warn too strongly against the institution of a pseudo-legal situation in which the extradition — to use Mr O'Kennedy's euphemistic turn of phrase — of suspects can be effected by way of a simplified procedure, at the behest of the French President, who came up with the idea on one of his off-days. This is the kind of thing that tends to go unnoticed to begin with, but when you do realize what is going on, the damage has already been done. It would seem then that, in the future, we shall proceed not according to the legislation of the individual countries, but to the mind-boggling idea that, as far as litigation is concerned, the Community of Nine is suddenly to be regarded as a full-scale legal entity, in which the exchange of suspects between, say, Paris and Bonn, or Paris and Rome, or Paris and Amsterdam, will be subject to no greater legal obstacles than the transfer of suspects from, say, one French *arrondissement* to another or from one German *Land* to another.

As far as I am concerned, this is a criminal way of tackling crime, whereby no account is taken of the political factors which the suspect may have been motivated by; nor is there the slightest mention of the right to political convenience of those in power. It will just not do, and Mr O'Kennedy is being wildly over-optimistic, given also the objections that have been raised by a large number of right-minded legal experts. The aims of this European judicial area have nothing whatsoever to do with improving European security; nor do they serve to strengthen the rule of law — after all, this is founded on national legislation and national jurisprudence.

If the advocates of this European judicial area are intent on giving the impression that something is being done on paper for the freedom of the people of Europe — and this, after all, was one of the main factors in the direct elections — it is quite natural that

the people should regard their confidence in the legal system as being undermined, just at the time when confidence is so badly needed. There is enough uncertainty already in Europe and it would be the ultimate in cynicism if those institutions which are themselves constantly in default of the Treaties were now to devote all their energy to setting up a system which will be in an excellent position to take away our people's last vestige of confidence in the European Institutions.

In advocating the creation of a European judicial area, the Council is overstepping its authority both morally and in terms of the Treaties to such an extent that I can only advise the President-in-Office of the Council to see to it that the Council busies itself with its own affairs and concentrates its energy on coming to a decision at long last on the numerous proposals the Commission has put forward under the terms of the Treaties.

(Applause)

President.— I call Mr Penders.

Mr Penders. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to comment briefly on what Mr O'Kennedy had to say about the Middle East. Mr Rey tackled the same subject, and I can go along with a lot of the points he made.

Mr O'Kennedy has come in for a great deal of criticism today, but I for one entirely concur with the statement he made on behalf of the Nine in New York. I thought it was an outstanding piece of work, because — after a period of marking time in the development of attitudes to the Middle East — we have now moved another step forward, and that is something we should be glad for. I welcome the fact that the Community is prepared to develop its policy on the Middle East on a regular basis, although we must always make sure that a balance is maintained. This is something I shall be coming back to later.

The Palestine Liberation Organization must be involved in any discussions on a peace settlement because, without the PLO, peace in the Middle East is out of the question. That is something you will hear from any and every Palestinian mayor on the West Bank. Indeed, I would say that involving the PLO in these discussions and in the preparations for the creation of a Palestinian State is also very much in Israel's own interests. We are often told that a Palestinian State on the West Bank of the Jordan would jeopardize Israeli security. My own view is that we should be on our guard against anachronistic strategic notions. The State of Israel can only enjoy real security when it is accepted by its neighbouring states, and that is precisely what it should be aiming for. The PLO must be involved in the discussions, but this certainly does not mean that we are espousing their cause.

Penders

What we need is some objective thinking. All too often, the people who first of all went all out in their support for Israel are the same people who have now gone all out for the PLO. What we need is some hard-headed, solid work to establish contacts and give some impetus to this process. It goes without saying that the PLO must acknowledge Israel's existence. That is something which these contacts must establish. It is equally obvious, that, in the long run, we must see the disappearance of those provisions of the PLO Manifests which should, as a first step, be put on ice. This, too, is something that must come out of the contacts. Personally, however, I would prefer the PLO to renounce terrorism and condemn those acts of terrorism in which it was not itself involved.

I am not prepared simply to abandon the Camp David agreements, as is being suggested in PLO circles. Camp David was not a failure; it is simply that the process it set in motion is not yet complete. Camp David was a great step forward, but it was only a first step. The solution to the main problem — that of Palestine — still exists only in very vague outlines.

I think the Nine could have been rather more enthusiastic about the peace settlement between Israel and Egypt. There was more than a hint of imbalance in the most recent statements put out by the Foreign Ministers. And let me add that the Israelis are not making things any easier for us by their policy on settlements on the West Bank, which is serving only to hinder any solution to the Palestinian problem and holding up any progress towards an overall peace settlement on the basis of the Camp David Agreement.

Let me repeat that objective thinking is something we sorely need. I have heard talk here about the possibility of Mr Arafat being invited to speak in this House. Quite apart from the question of whether the Rules of Procedure would permit such a move — can we be addressed by guest speakers? — we also have to ask ourselves whether this would be a really effective European contribution to peace in the Middle East. I am sure that — particularly at the present time — it would simply be a cheap and dangerous stunt.

In conclusion, Mr President, I would say that I go along with Mr O'Kennedy's statement, except for what I said about the need to maintain a balance. Taking an objective view, I am in favour of the PLO being involved in any further discussions. The Camp David Agreement must be upheld and developed further. I would appeal to Israel to change its policy on settlements, and I would also appeal to the PLO to put an end to terrorism, and to the Foreign Ministers to develop their policy further.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien.— (F) Mr President, having to sit through this morning's proceedings in this Chamber was something of a chore. To be sure, the Minister himself does not bear the sole blame for this; the culprits are all our governments.

What we were hoping to hear was the outline of an imaginative plan and all we got was a certain feeling of resignation: Europe's place in the North-South Dialogue, or rather in the non-dialogue, the fight to eliminate inequalities among peoples, East-West détente and other major questions were barely touched on, I am sad to say.

However, the new Parliament has been unequivocal in expressing its dissatisfaction today. In contrast to this dissatisfaction on the part of Parliament, I get the feeling from the President-in-Office's statement that he was rather self-satisfied. Why did he not just tell us straight out on behalf of the Council, that we have managed to harmonize things in some areas while in others there are still problems and we have not yet been able to overcome our differences?

Let me give just one example. It is no secret that at a recent vote at the United Nations the Nine voted differently on the issue of accrediting the Cambodian delegation to the General Assembly, and the representatives of some Member States voted for the delegation of the former leader Pol Pot, who is considered by some to have been the chief instigator of the genocide of his people.

I was also disappointed in another area, and I could cite here the example of Latin America. To be sure, Mr O'Kennedy deserves credit for acknowledging in his speech that Europe has paid far too little attention to Latin America up to now. For my part, I think we should take a much more studied look at just what we can do to satisfy the desire in Latin America to increase their contacts with us and to shake off all vestiges of economic and political domination.

We are also disappointed by the faint-hearted and almost embarrassed references to the question of human rights, especially in Latin America. Instead of a strong and forthright statement about what is going on in Chile, Argentina, Paraguay or in Central America, there were merely a few passing references. In my opinion, when a people or a country casts off dictatorship and the shackles of oppression and starts along the path to democracy, pluralism and economic and social reconstruction, as happened recently in Nicaragua, we are far too cautious. Instead we should be committing ourselves. It is not enough just to

Gendebien

condemn dictatorships; we should be giving positive assistance to the countries which are fighting to throw off these dictatorships.

It is for the European democracies to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with these peoples, these nations, and with all those who want to change the world economically, socially and politically for the better.

This brings me, Mr President, to my conclusion, and I want to stress once again that if Europe wants its voice to be heard in the world, it must stand up for its identity and its independence. It must take a much more positive role in world affairs and not — as some would like — restrict itself to a purely regional role.

It must be admitted, however, after the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council, that we have little idea of what hope Europe can give the world. What message can we offer? I am afraid I cannot see any in this somewhat uninspiring speech we have heard.

I should like to think, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that Parliament itself will find the resolve to proclaim a more ambitious ideal, which will not be to promote a new form of European imperialism but to propose to the other peoples of the world a little more justice and fraternity, and thus bring peace and understanding among peoples a little nearer.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Ripa di Meana.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — *(I)* Mr President, I realize that anyone who has the difficult task of speaking to this Parliament on behalf of the nine Member States on the subject of political cooperation must be constantly tempted to resort to generalizations. Be that as it may, the speech we heard from the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr O'Kennedy, went beyond any acceptable bounds for vagueness and omissions.

I am forced to mention only five points, in order to keep within the few minutes at my disposal. The first concerns the trial in Prague of the Charter 77 and VONS activists. In his speech Mr O'Kennedy did no more than strongly criticize the government of Czechoslovakia, stating that the continued repression of human rights in that country undermined its international credibility. Instead of fanciful comments when the trial has already taken place, Mr O'Kennedy should be offering Parliament an explanation as to why there seems to have been no official or public representations by the governments of the Member States, to say nothing of representations by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, especially as in July this Parliament was unanimous in adopting a resolution calling on the Member States to approach the Czechoslovak Government in the hope of getting the trial suspended and the political prisoners freed, or in the hope at least that the press and foreign observers would be allowed to attend.

Secondly, the fact that the President-in-Office referred solely to Czechoslovakia among the countries of the Eastern bloc suggests that there is a dangerous tendency to regard relations with these countries as troublesome and therefore not feasible in the context of political cooperation. This over-simplified view of the problem, which tends to see the complex situation in Central and Eastern Europe in simple black-and-white terms, is wrong and should be rejected. It is quite clear that we have a direct and legitimate interest in not ignoring the important overtures and the notable requests, also voices by Mr Ceausescu himself, which we have heard more than one from Romania, and which extend beyond economic and trade cooperation. I mention Romania, but this is not the only case of an approval from the East which we are bound not to ignore.

Thirdly, there was not a word in Mr O'Kennedy's speech about Yugoslavia. I find this ridiculous. Here, too, any attempt to restrict relations to economic and trade cooperation is a short-sighted approach, and even irresponsible towards a country which is vital for Europe and which wields tremendous influence in many parts of the world, as we saw recently at Havana and as the turmoil among the non-aligned nations shows.

Furthermore — and this is the fourth point — apart from a passing reference to Cyprus, Mr O'Kennedy said nothing about what has been done — or rather, about what we ought to be doing — as regards political cooperation with Turkey, which is in the throes of a serious economic and political crisis. Apart from the support we ought to offer, it is in our own interest to help Turkey through its crisis.

Fifthly, with regard to Latin America, I think it is a disgrace that all we heard was a bit of self-criticism over relations in the past and that the only thing of note for the present is a telegram of congratulation on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Andean Pact. This is really not enough, Mr O'Kennedy. The lack of political initiative and of economic and trade agreements between the European Community and Latin America is the most scandalous and unpardonable gap in our whole system of external relations.

To sum up, I hope that on future occasions this Parliament is not simply going to be given written reports which are as evasive as this speech by Mr O'Kennedy. I also hope, particularly, that the Foreign Ministers are not going to give us a mere catalogue of what has been done or not done, but a clear indication of their future intentions and actions, forsaking once and for all the approach whereby political cooperation has been a belated response rather than a factor determining events.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Buchan.

Mrs Buchan. — Mr President and friends, today is United Nations Day. Funnily enough, I think this has been rather forgotten during this debate. Young people everywhere in the world have been asked to mark it. They, the young people, look to us, who are fortunate enough to hold elective office, to use every avenue open to us to right injustice. It is a big demand, but young people are right to make it. I was pleased therefore that Mrs van den Heuvel and my friend Mr Van Minnen, two Dutch Members of this House, spoke on the subject that they did, and that they touched particularly on the needs of Africa. It is binding upon us, Dutch and British people alike, to speak out with a moral force on African affairs.

I am concerned about the language that is used everywhere on the problems of Africa. Can I say to the President-in-Office, Mr O'Kennedy, with great Celtic sisterly affection: I want to refer you to page 10 of your own report, where you talk about 'Southern Rhodesia' and then 'all the peoples of Zimbabwe'. With respect, this is the dead language of British imperialism, and I really do not think that an Irishman should be the mouthpiece of that kind of language.

(Applause)

It raises great doubts in me as to who is advising the Nine on African affairs.

Friends, next year come the Olympic Games in Moscow, and there is the possibility that the young athletes of countries which welcomed the recent rugby team or 'token team' from South Africa may be excluded from these games. Let me say to people in politics this: There is no escape from moral outrage, nor should there be one. This of course means that people suffer who have nothing to do with the acts that are being perpetrated in their name.

I want to come to a much more important issue. I hope Mr O'Kennedy — confidentially or otherwise, but I would hope publicly — will lean on the other members of the Nine, because everywhere in the world the forces of the right, of the most bloody reaction, are on the march, especially in the United Kingdom. I refer to the abolition of United Kingdom exchange controls and would ask you, Mr O'Kennedy, to look at the Conservative newspapers from the United Kingdom. The *Telegraph* says: 'Swiss bank accounts and gold bars available to all!' Try telling that to the people of Soweto! Try telling that to the poor in Ireland, to the poor in Sicily and to the poor in the rest of the world! The *Daily Mail* says: 'At last the pound is free'. The pound is like any other currency. It is, of course, an instrument of capitalist investment and human rights are never allowed to

stand in the way when that investment has to be protected. This is the kind of thing we must take on board with some moral courage.

I assure you, as a campaigner for the African underprivileged for over 20 years, that if the pound is free, it is because it is free to enslave further to enslave the peoples of southern Africa and everywhere else. Because now you will see an outflow of capital — not, as Lord Bethell said, that capital will move in and out. What a child in politics he must be, what an infant in the ABC of economics, to think that capital will flow out! It will flow into the UK, into the London Banks and clearing houses; and it will flow out to bolster the South African régime. It will flow out to prop up the very situations that we are making these statements about here today.

Mr O'Kennedy, workers in the field of human rights in South Africa are unique. They call upon us to boycott — knowing that they themselves will suffer most from that boycott. They ask us to boycott sport — and sport is very important, it is the god before which the South African worships. If we isolate him in sport, then the true liberal, the true democrat, understands that the boycott hurts him; but he knows it is a powerful weapon.

If you are being attacked as you have been, — and you must be feeling pretty battered by now, I should think, — for the meaningless and anodyne kind of statements you have made, then I say to you: Respect that call; answer it; understand that those who will suffer most ask us most strongly for that boycott. They know that it is morally right, and if we respond by supporting it, by urging the different countries of the Nine to impose it, we in the countries of the wealthy Western world will earn the respect of the subject peoples of Africa today.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Zagari.

Mr Zagari. — (I) Mr President, Mr O'Kennedy, we have been left to turn out the lights in the Chamber. You are quite right, Mr O'Kennedy, to wonder what has become of all those who were pointing an accusing finger at you. Where are the chairmen of the groups? Well, if Sparta weeps, Athens has no cause to laugh. I say this because I am a wholehearted advocate of Europe and in complete favour of European unity.

You came here and you made your speech, Mr O'Kennedy. Everything you said, everything you did not say and everything you added orally to your report was greeted with criticism, all of it valid. What I want to know is how you think and what your feelings are. You are here as the spokesman for a Europe of national interests, for a Europe which is blind to the crisis around it, and for a Europe which is silent. The

Zagreb

fact of the matter is that, everywhere in the world, people are crying out for Europe — in Africa, in Asia and in Latin America. Wherever people are suffering they are appealing to Europe — and Europe is deaf to their call. There has been some progress in political cooperation — this was acknowledged by one speaker — but international affairs which affect our lives have moved even faster. Quite frankly, our political cooperation is trotting along in the wake of world events which require from Europe some radical decisions affecting our future.

As a result, Mr O'Kennedy, I do not want to add to the criticism which was made and which was all quite valid. What we must learn from today's debate is that political cooperation is in fact being discussed by a directly elected European Parliament which has the duty — not just the right — to ask for an overall global strategy to save Europe and others from a potential catastrophe. We are faced with a variety of challenges affecting the whole world: the monetary question with all its economic challenges; the energy problem, striking at the very basis of our way of life, and one of the sources of our wealth; the military challenge, to which we must not respond by sticking our heads in the sand. The fact is that the worldwide nature of these problems requires a worldwide response, and there was no hint of this in your speech, Mr O'Kennedy. You are not to blame, since you can only express the ideas of the other eight Foreign Ministers. The blame lies with the fact that, while the world is moving in large blocs, we are still moving as Italy used to. When the other nations of Europe had become unified, Italy was still a collection of mini-States, losing power and influence as time went by, until Metternich was able to say that we were only a geographical expression.

Europe, too, could become nothing more than a geographical expression, Mr O'Kennedy, unless it can respond to the challenges that history presents. It is not a fate we want, not because of any desire for power, but simply because the appeal to Europe is an appeal for a civilizing influence. If we are asked to stand up for human rights which are being violated all over the world, we must have the strength to respond. This strength will come from unity, from political determination and from the ability to surmount the minor issues which divide us and to respond to the appeals from outside.

Ten years ago China was undergoing a profound transformation. Ten years ago Chou En-Lai was already speaking of the need for a united Europe and Europe was eager with anticipation. But now that Hua Gu-feng has arrived in Europe there are signs of unwarranted concern. What is the reason for these signs, ladies and gentlemen? The sole reason is that Europe is not ready. We have listened passively to the appeal of history and have not come up with a

response. We have not been there at the turning-points in history with an important or decisive contribution. A policy for peace is not just a policy to defend the *status quo* and to appease our own consciences, but must also be the expression of a constant, worldwide commitment. *Détente* does not come from an agreement between two superpowers, but from the efforts of all those in the world who believe in the fundamental virtue of peace.

This is Europe's great opportunity, and it is up to us to develop a policy of *détente*. But when Madrid is mentioned and reference made to this important meeting to review the outcome of the Final Act of Helsinki, and of the meetings in Belgrade and Malta, all we do is hide our head in the sand and show that we are worried.

It is high time that Europe accepted the political responsibility incumbent upon it and surmounted its inherent diversities of opinion. We have to provide a constructive policy for peace and a forceful, worldwide response to the great issues of history.

Briefly, faced with the crisis of the polarization of power in the world and the critical relations between the two great superpowers, our only choice is between an upsurge of regionalism — which is in fact happening — or an even more uncompromising return to the cold war, and from there to open war. It is up to those in power to provide a suitable answer.

We at last have a Parliament elected by 150 million European citizens. It is from this legitimacy that the idea of political cooperation must draw new strength to offer a response — an active response, not a passive one — to the problems which arise and in those areas which, alas, the President-in-Office of the Council failed to mention in his speech. Mr O'Kennedy, in fact, made no reference to the United States, the Soviet Union or China. The challenge facing us is taking on what I might call planetary proportions. We have to respond to this challenge, and I feel that the President-in-Office should convey to the Council the opinions expressed by Parliament during today's debate.

President. — I call Mr O'Kennedy.

Mr O'Kennedy. *President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.* — Mr President, I would like to thank all those speakers who have contributed to this debate since it started some time after 10.30 this morning. As you will have been aware, I have had the opportunity of attending right through the debate to hear the contributions myself. As well as thanking those who contributed, I think I would particularly and with a certain degree of enthusiasm like to thank those who have waited until this point to hear the reply to the various questions that have been raised in the course of this long day.

O'Kennedy

Ideally I would have wished to have the opportunity of a respite for a few hours so that I could pick up all the various points that have been made with such enthusiasm and with such evident commitment and concern right to the end of this debate. I would only ask you to bear in mind that just as there are limitations in the area of political cooperation, there are also limitations on the human capacity. I will not be able at this point to reply in detail, within the time that is now available at this hour, to all of the points that have been raised, but I hope I will be able at least to convey to Parliament the manner in which I hope we can cooperate, learn from the experiences of today and other days to ensure that we cooperate more effectively and then try to see what gaps there may be in political cooperation, what gaps there may be in our procedures and, if I may say so, Mr President, with deference, in the procedures of this Parliament also.

I want to say in particular, as far as relations with Parliament are concerned and the approach of the Presidency to these relations, particularly in so far as it refers to political cooperation, that from the very first day I attended here I immediately signposted that political cooperation would be an area where I would, within all the limitations that there are, and there are limitations, do my utmost on behalf of this Presidency, and I hope as a precedent for the following Presidency, to establish proper, effective and understanding relations with Parliament. I had the opportunity, for instance, — I think it was on the very day after I attended here again the last time for the full length of one long day — to refer, in my address on behalf of the Nine at the Geneva Conference on Vietnamese refugees, with some degree of conviction and support for the position of the Nine to the fact that this newly elected Parliament on its first day had seen fit to pass a resolution on this area. I used that effectively not only to represent the voices of the peoples of Europe as expressed here, but also, as I hope might be noted, and I believe some will have done, to join together all voices, that of the Nine Ministers and this Parliament, on a matter in which we were concerned.

Secondly, in relation to the colloquy which I had with the members of the Political Affairs Committee in Dublin, I want to say that I ensured that that colloquy took place as soon as ever possible after the meeting of the nine Foreign Ministers, within two days, in fact, because I was aware that one of the complaints of Parliament had always been that you had to wait perhaps a week after you had read all about it in the newspapers. Therefore we did have an immediate colloquy. I have to say that from the views that were conveyed to me from that colloquy, not just in response to the questions and answers, but also informally by the chairman and the members of the Political Affairs Committee of this Parliament, we did establish a proper understanding. An earlier speaker here,

who in fact to my knowledge was not present at that meeting, referred to it as 'a lunch of diplomats'. It was not that, and perhaps if that honourable Member would check his sources before anticipating the nature of the understanding we were trying to establish, it might help to create a better possibility for future cooperation between us. We did make a number of suggestions to each other which I certainly will keep in mind, and I can assure those members of the Political Affairs Committee who are prepared to attend the colloquies that they will find the Presidency very ready to cooperate within this area.

I am sorry, of course, that I am replying so late. I had envisaged, as I am sure most Members of Parliament had, that I would be replying some time much earlier in the day, at 7.00 or 7.30. However, as you are aware, a motion was moved, without any notice to me or to many members of the House or to others for that matter, to postpone this. Therefore I find that things I would like to have addressed to the members who would have waited perhaps until 7.00 p.m., I now have to address to those few who have waited until 9. I would hope that before motions of that sort are moved in future, there would be perhaps some understanding of the consequences.

I understand that one of the reasons that prompted that particular motion was the fact (and this was touched on by some other speakers in the course of the debate) that the speech as circulated to the political groups was, in fact, changed. It is true that there were additions to the speech which were not included in the original text. One member in fact, suggested that there was a departure from the script. No, it was not anything like that. It was the simple fact that, and I want to say this very deliberately to this Parliament, since that speech was prepared, as it had to be, for circulation here on last Saturday and finally typed outside of office hours, there were very significant developments on Sunday at the formal meeting in Ashford Castle in Ireland. I took it on myself to include the new elements this morning, so that the Parliament would have an up-to-date position in relation even to developments since, and here were very significant elements that I touched on.

Surely no one will suggest that changes of that sort are designed in some way to take Parliament by surprise. I hope we can work on the basis that we are not always at odds with each other and confronting each other, but perhaps just allow on some occasions at least a basis of trust and understanding. If we are talking about political cooperation in external relations, it would be helpful, I think, that we also try to develop a degree of cooperation in our internal relations and between the institutions.

I would like to say first of all that European political cooperation is not the same thing as a common foreign policy. Therefore I would say to all of those

O'Kennedy

who have asked at various times during this day why the Nine do not take a decision, or why they do not take a decision on this issue or that issue, that there may be very understandable reasons why many of the Member States are not prepared to take common positions in certain areas. That is a reality that one has to accept.

But neither is it a common foreign policy for another reason, namely, that we do not as yet have an internal political union through which or on whose behalf you can express a common external foreign policy. A foreign policy, in the fullest sense of the word, is by definition the external expression of a political position taken up nationally or, as in this case, on behalf of a Community. We have not got to that point; hopefully we are moving towards it, but I think it is a little unreasonable to overlook the fact that we have gone so far since this process started in 1970. Political cooperation is only nine years old, and that is very young indeed in terms of the nations represented amongst the nine Member States of Europe.

We have made very significant progress. I repeat, in many many areas which I outlined here today. All of you will be very well aware that these nine Member States have had very different historical positions, very different political positions, across a whole range of areas, *vis-à-vis* the developing countries of today and many other issues, very different levels of influence and power. I think it would ignore the reality to assume that within nine years all of those differences of history and misunderstandings would suddenly merge in one single common position.

But having said that, let me say that what we are trying to do is to work towards the future, recognizing none the less the problems which we have inherited from our own past and from our relations with other countries. I should like to suggest a simple illustration, taken from today's proceedings, of the limitations on political cooperation. On one occasion today I spoke on behalf of the Nine and on another occasion I spoke on my own behalf — in the reply to, I think, Lord Bethell — on the Charter 77. The formal reply that I gave there was agreed by the Nine through the channels of consultation and communication that are required before I can stand up here and reply on behalf of the Nine. The reply was given on that basis. I wish to point out that when I replied to the supplementary question which of course was not a matter I could clear with the Nine, because the events occurred after the conviction of the Charter 77 group, I was speaking in my capacity as Irish Foreign Minister. I think I made that point very clearly. During the course of the debate some Members expressed considerable dissatisfaction that the Nine had not taken a stronger position, that, perhaps, I had not taken a stronger position. I can only reply that the procedure is already under way for the Nine to take a

position, but I cannot anticipate what the outcome of the procedure, which has only just begun, will be. This perhaps illustrates clearly some of the realities and limitations of the procedure which must be completed before one can stand up here and take a common position on behalf of nine Member States, state it firmly, adhere to it clearly and then say that binds all of us.

Of course there were areas we did not touch upon. Many Members mentioned these in the course of the debate. We did not touch on the United States. But if I may add a few areas, not mentioned, I would point out that I made no reference to Australia, to New Zealand, to Canada, or I think, to Japan. I believe I made no reference directly to the Soviet Union and I do not think I made a direct reference to China. But, if I may say so, there is, perhaps, a very good reason why I did not refer to these countries. One of the essential aims of political cooperation amongst the Nine is the peaceful resolution of disputes. What the Nine are trying to achieve in this area — maybe we should move further, and I note that opinions expressed in this Parliament today will help me, perhaps, to consider whether a new opportunity now exists to move beyond that area — is peace, which in this interdependent world is at risk. They are areas where in fact, for that reason, the Nine have taken positions and introduced positive elements. For that reason, following the normal procedures and within the framework of the limitations of personnel and also, of course, what Member States are prepared to concede in this area, we are working to this end.

But I would say that the fact that I did not refer to the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Japan, China, USSR, etc. is evidence of the fact that most of them are close friend of the European Economic Community and of the Nine. We cooperate and consult with many of these countries in the United Nations and in the other international fora in the process of CSCE. We have trade agreements and various other agreements with these countries. So perhaps we should analyse how we can come closer to them in terms of formulating common foreign policy. But I want to say that it is important that we recognize that the omissions pointed out a number of times today were not deliberate omissions in sense *sensu* gaps in the position of the Nine. They exist because we are working very closely with these countries in many other areas and they were not, quite frankly, germane to the report as a whole.

The question of a formal report to the Parliament, was touched on a few times during the course of this debate. Let me say that a formal report is not even available to the governments of the nine Member States for the very good and simple reason that by the time such a report is ready for publication it has, like my own speech this morning, to be updated within

O'Kennedy

the space of a few days. Such a report would perhaps by definition be obsolescent before it was completed and the important thing is that political cooperation deals with events as they occur. A report for the sake of form might be commendable in one sense. But I endeavoured to follow a middle course by circulating the copy of my speech in advance and this might be considered as tantamount to an advanced report to the political groups even though it was not a formal report.

As I said, the Member States understandably have different historical derivations, different historical associations so that some of them have, legitimately, for one reason or another, different current preoccupations in the areas of external relations. I would say to Parliament that this should be borne in mind when we feel a little impatient at the lack of a common position in a whole range of areas. We have to take into account sensitivities in certain areas. I do not wish to quote examples, but I think that those of you who have researched this field for yourselves will understand that many of the sensitivities are legitimate and that the Community must take account of them.

But I do want to say that in some areas the process of political cooperation is moving ahead of developments, even within the Community. A good example which illustrates this very clearly is the burning question of the refugees from Indo-China. The matter was originally raised by Foreign Ministers of the Nine; it was taken up and adopted by the European Council in Paris, and was pursued by me on behalf of the Nine at the Geneva Conference. From this followed — and I am glad to note this — a position taken up by the Community through the Commission on aid to Vietnam and Cambodia.

Last weekend again, at Ashford Castle in Ireland, we took up again informally, without any advisers, just the nine Foreign Ministers, a position which even these days, tomorrow and next Monday, will be translated into Community action, apart altogether from informing the actions of the nine Member States on this horrible problem of Cambodia. So if we look at some of the gaps, some of the imperfections and some of the restraints — and all three elements are there — I would only suggest to Parliament that they too might look — though I have become a little chastened about talking of the achievements of political cooperation after hearing many of the interventions today — that they too might look at some of what perhaps might be described as the developments rather than achievements that have occurred in the interrelationship between political cooperation and the Community.

Some people mentioned relations with the African States, and it was even pointed out that I did not touch on relations with the ACP countries in the course of my speech. Indeed I did not, for the simple

reason that this is a matter of Community competence. While I did not touch on it in this Assembly, I would like to mention that when rearrangements were made in the programme today, I did use the occasion to go out to the various representative committees on external relations and others under the Luns procedure and I went into great detail for one hour on the ACP countries with those committees, which are the appropriate forum to deal with the subject, as distinct from here, where we are holding a debate on political cooperation. So to those who may have noticed that gap, I would suggest that, while I quite understand that they thought it should have been mentioned, if they look at the record of the very detailed, and I hope useful, discussion we had under the Luns procedure, they will find that it is all there.

Others mentioned that certain things were said by Ministers in their own parliaments, and asked why we here cannot say the same things. Well, I would say that I, as Irish Foreign Minister, feel very free to express myself in my own parliament on a whole range of subjects from South Africa to the Middle East; I am obliged to do so in pursuance of our policies. Other Foreign Ministers may do so too, but that is not to say that I can come here on behalf of the Nine and assume that what I can say in my own parliament on behalf of myself and my Government I can say here on behalf of the Nine, and it is important that that fact be borne in mind. Because this is a European parliament, it is understandable that you may expect the Minister who comes here as President-in-Office to respond to you with the same degree of authority, with the same degree of consistency, as your own Foreign Minister does in his own parliament. Perhaps that is understandable, but it is wrong; because if this is a European, a pan-European institution, you cannot conclude from that that the treatment of all the areas that were touched on in the course of this debate derives from, or is based on, pan-European positions: it is not. I am pointing out simple realities that perhaps I myself would be happy to see included. I take the points and will bear them in mind, the areas that perhaps we should extend into; I have taken note of all of these, but I am speaking only in relation to what the reality up to the moment is. So we do not have a pan-European element, and where we don't have one, I am afraid that I as President of the Nine cannot represent one here.

I would like to make one final general comment before I touch on two or three areas of specific concern, one general comment in relation to this whole exercise; and that is that in some areas many Member States find that, in order to reach a common position, what one often has to do — I could take South Africa as an example without quoting Member States — is to move back from an advanced position

O'Kennedy

that you could take as a Member State so as to find a common position of the Nine which brings about greater weight, authority and effectiveness when a position is taken. That is not to say that you abandon your own position: some of the others will move forward to fall in line with that position. This reality, I hope, can be recognized: that when you have a common position of the Nine, it does not happen by definition that we all stand in the same line. Some move back a little to that common position, some move forward a little, but each of us feels free in his own independent position to still express that position; but finding a common position necessitates constant movement which sometimes, I think, is overlooked.

Now one final point by way of introduction which is important and then I shall deal briefly, Mr President, if I may — because I perhaps am trespassing on time too — with the other points, and that is that we also have procedures in political cooperation, internal in some cases, notably those for dealing with terrorism, the question of the *espace judiciaire* and the application of the European Convention, which I shall come back to and illustrate very briefly in a few moments. I just want to make one general point before I do.

One point struck me today which, I think, will be of significance to succeeding Presidents as they come here. I do believe frankly having heard what I have heard today, that we must urgently broaden the range of political cooperation. I will convey this back, I assure you, to my colleagues; but it would be helpful if, when the next President stands here, he got the same impression of impatience, of urgency. And one Member today — I have refrained from naming any Member so I will not name this Member either — mentioned that this Parliament could act as a link between the Presidencies, since each of us comes here for only 6 months. I think that is in a sense, a very appropriate point. Each President as he comes here should get the same response, the same kind of attitude; perhaps then he will begin to have a better common perception of what Parliament's feeling on all of this is.

A number of people touched on one matter, the North-South Dialogue, and asked why we did not go into it in detail here. Again this is because basically it is a matter for Community competence. Only yesterday evening, before I left Luxembourg to come down for this part-session, I was dealing with that very matter in a Community framework with the Development Council of the European Economic Community: it is not appropriate in this forum of political cooperation, but it is a matter of Community competence within the EEC.

Now for some brief comments on the geographical areas I touched on and some general comments on matters that came up. With regard to South Africa, I won't go back over the subject, but I want to stress

that the imposition of international sanctions is not a matter for the Nine, it is a matter for the Security Council of the United Nations, as you will be aware. When it is done then we will adhere to them, but it is not for us to impose sanctions. Within the limitations and possibilities open to the Nine, we are doing what we can together to promote urgent change in South Africa. Of course, the Nine, individually and collectively, participate in and promote efforts by the United Nations and the international community to bring South Africa, not, if I may say, to its knees but to its senses. That is the approach we have adopted in relation to the procedures as formulated. I want to say that in areas where perhaps we have not all of us taken up a position, many Member States have taken up very advanced positions, for instance, in relation to sport, which was touched upon here. That all do not as yet is perhaps, an indication of the room for improvement. Some Member States, and, if I may say so, Mr President, including my own, have taken up advanced positions in relation to sport and South Africa, or sport as an instrument of apartheid, and have done so at some considerable cost to certain tourist sectors, particularly in my country, that could very well have done with it. That we suffered that economic loss and the consistency which we try to follow there will be evidence of the commitment which many Member States have in this area.

In relation to some terms that were used in relation to Rhodesia and some comments that were made on them, I want to say to my Celtic cousin, who obviously felt that I perhaps had been influenced by certain imperialistic influences, that you will find that the term 'Rhodesia' is the term that is used in the United Nations to describe the territory we have been talking about now: that is the term that is used, and that is the term I used in that context. At this time, Zimbabwe is the term used in respect of the territory which we hope will become independent, and I use that term when referring to what happened later on. It may all seem too subtle, it may all seem ridiculous, but I am adhering to terms that do have meanings for people in Africa. When I say 'Rhodesia'. I am speaking about the United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia — not Zimbabwe; Zimbabwe will, we hope, be the State that will be free. I hope that explains the position.

A number of Members were concerned that in my reference to Rhodesia I was not even-handed in that I seemed only to criticize the security forces for the deaths they caused. If Members look again carefully at the text of my speech, they will find that in fact it was in respect of people who lost their lives in Zambia, a neighbouring country, or in other countries and who had in fact been under attack at the time that the Nine made a statement sympathizing with the Government of Zambia; it did not relate to developments within Rhodesia.

O'Kennedy

Now the point has been raised, however, may I say that I take the point that the Nine must of course be evenhanded. If there was an omission in not referring to both, I accept that, because we do equally repudiate, reject and deplore killing and violence of whichever sort. I now recognize that those speakers who touched on this enable me to clarify the position. It was expressed as it was because we did in fact convey a message of sympathy to the government of Zambia at a particular time. That is what it touched on.

In relation to Turkey, I may say that we are well aware of Turkey's problems. Vice-President Haferkamp and I were in Turkey very recently before the recent elections. On behalf of the Community and on behalf of the Nine, we held very detailed, lengthy and somewhat difficult discussions and negotiations. I want to say to those who wonder what we are doing for this very important part of Europe that 75% of all Western aid to Turkey comes from the nine Member States. That is something that should be borne in mind when considering what our attitude to Turkey is. The Community competence, in addition, of course, will increase that, but I want to say that we are very conscious of the need to increase our cooperation, and we are doing so, both as a Community and as nine Member States.

ASEAN was also touched on: are there difficulties in signature? My hope would be that this agreement, which we have under consideration at the moment at Council level, and which will come before the Council next Tuesday, can be signed before the end of this year. I have a particular interest in it, because it seems to have almost coincided with my own presidency. I have had very clear indications from the ASEAN side of their interest too. There are some problems to be resolved within the Community on this issue. I believe that when we resolve the problems within the Community, we will have no problems to resolve with ASEAN, and I hope we will see signature before the end of this year.

Latin America is an area that we have not touched on in great detail, but we now recognize that we should and must. For that reason, during our presidency, I have instructed our political directors to give very considerable attention to this, in view especially of the impending enlargement to include Spain and Portugal, which have very special and historical associations with the area. I hope that in further debates here, a succeeding President-in-Office will be able to go into much greater detail about our relations with Latin America as a consequence of the initiatives taken by this presidency.

The European judicial area comes up regularly for discussion in the framework of European political

cooperation. Perhaps it is a significant exception in that in every other area we deal with external positions, but here we deal with an internal one because of the importance of it to the life, limb and security of all our people.

Naturally the Parliament will be — and is entitled to be — kept informed of the progress of the work. Some members referred in particular to the various steps which were envisaged in the course of the creation of the judicial area. Could I just say the obvious: we are dealing with nine Member States, that have very different legal procedures and codes of law, for very obvious reasons. We are trying here to coordinate all of these varying items to create a new and unprecedented concept of a judicial area, governed by common procedures and regulations and, even if I may say, common law — a major step forward. It is therefore not something that can be done overnight. The ministers of Justice are dealing with this, I can assure this Parliament, with great expedition this very week in Dublin.

The first step is the work in relation to the general question of extradition in criminal cases. The second step envisaged is measures aimed at simplifying procedures for mutual assistance in criminal matters or transfers of prisoners. I would like to assure the House that there will be no delay on the part of this presidency in dealing with this matter.

I turn now to the related matter — it is not the same thing — of agreement among the Nine on the Convention on Terrorism. Here I would refer, in reply to the query addressed to me as Irish Foreign Minister, to the constitutional reservation, which I in fact said was not there, in relation to signing that Convention. I repeat that position here now. The Irish Government could then have signed that Convention with the same reservations as many Member States represented here. You should be aware of the fact that many Member States of the Community signed that Convention with reservations, such as that they would not extradite their own citizens. The Irish Government could have done that; the Constitution would not have posed a problem if there were reservations that they would not extradite for political offences. The Constitution would not have prevented us from signing that Convention in the same way as many of our colleague Member States did. But we recognized that to do that would not go far enough, and for that reason we have taken an active position in promoting the application amongst the Nine of an Agreement on Terrorism which we will all be able to sign without reservation. My Government, which has a special responsibility now to have this done, is ready and very anxious to have this agreement signed. We shall certainly be amongst the first — if not the very first

O'Kennedy

— to sign, when we can get all our partners to recognize that some of the procedures I have touched upon — harmonization from different codes and backgrounds — are not such as would pose a problem in the application or implementation of this agreement.

In relation to the Middle East: when I spoke at the United Nations on Palestinian rights, it was made plain that the Palestinian people are entitled — and I quote — 'to exercise their right to determine their own future as a people'. That seems to me as adequate a definition of what is meant by self-determination as one could expect. Somebody said I did not use the phrase 'self-determination'. To determine your own future as a people seems to me to be self-determination; that is the phrase I used. I have no reservations about using the phrase 'self-determination'.

Moreover, it is plain that it is for the Palestinians themselves legitimately to choose the political structures under which they wish to live. I will not go back over the speech I made at the UN or the references to it, beyond saying that we signposted to the Palestinian Liberation Organization and other parties certain principles which would in fact protect the life and security of, in the one instance, Israel — security of boundaries — and in the other, of the Palestinian people. I cannot go into it in detail now, but I want to make one point, and it is important: It is not terrorist activities, such as those of the PLO, that make the Nine take this position. If terrorism were to be the basis of the right to be heard and recognized by the Nine, I could think of a number who would be very well qualified, from Baader Meinhof, to the Red Brigades, to the IRA, to the UVF, or any other terrorist organization. It is not on that basis that the Nine have referred to the Palestinian Liberation Organization. It is the fact that the Palestinian people themselves say that this is the organization they want to represent them, and that there are elements within that organization now who are moving towards the political process. It is for that reason that we signposted to that organization, which hopefully will become involved in the political process — not because of terrorist activities. I hope I have made that clear enough now.

I have already considered the points made in the course of the discussion on CSCE as to the implications of developments like the Prague trials and the credibility of the *détente* process in public opinion. The Nine did make strong representations to Czechoslovakia, and had I the time and opportunity now, I would go into further detail. An effort is being made to improve people's condition. If, however, as in Czechoslovakia, people are seen to have invoked their rights, and these rights are then actually abrogated simply for having been invoked, then of course people will lose faith in the whole CSCE process. But in this

context, with regard to the CSCE, may I say that, while there is an element of security consultation here, there is no defence element in terms of Nine coordination. No defence dimension arises in relation to the Community, and it is therefore not appropriate for me in this context to comment on points made on such matters as the NATO response to Leonid Brezhnev's speech. The Nine coordinate within the CSCE, and that is the end of it.

I think, Mr President, I have already touched sufficiently on Cambodia and Vietnam. I have nothing further to add to what I said.

I want to say in conclusion that I shall be glad to work with the colloquy with the Political Affairs Committee of this Parliament. Performance will be the only test of my commitment there. I do recognize that the views that have been expressed here are of considerable significance, and they will help to condition my thinking as to what the further development of political cooperation will be.

There were, understandably, some tendencies this morning — perhaps because of historical associations between Council and Parliament — to assume that at all times we must be at odds with each other, that we, the Council are always taking the position that we will tell you as little as we can, and that you, the Parliament, must always take the position that you are going to force us to take positions that we do not want to take. I do not think that it is along the lines of that kind of confrontation that we can move together. There is an old game, and it is a game of politics as well; identify the opponent or the enemy, and from there on all can stand together. Whatever other cohesion this Parliament may find, whatever other unity it would have amongst itself, I would hope that it will never take that approach. But there were some tendencies that way this morning: one representative actually mentioned that he never felt he would be agreeing with a certain Member on the other side, but he found a basis of agreement in the fact that all were united against the President-in-Office of the Council. I would hope that henceforth the agreement that would emerge from this Parliament would not be on that rather thin basis, but would be on a much broader basis where, hopefully, we can all cooperate together.

Mr President, it is now my turn to thank the Members — I really sincerely mean this — for their patience in waiting. All the points I did not reply to have I can assure you, been taken note of.

(Applause)

President. — Mr President-in-Office, you know that the President of Parliament is not entitled to pass comment on the way a debate has gone. However, on behalf of those Members who are still here. I should

President

like to thank you for the earnestness with which you have sought a dialogue with Parliament today. I should like to add that it is not so much lack of interest as the problems caused by having several places of work which are responsible for there being fewer Members present than might have been the case if we had only one place of work. In view of way this debate has gone, I shall ask the Bureau to look into whether, since our most important dialogue is the one with the Council, the few debates in which the President of the Council participates ought not to be arranged so that the Council's reply can be delivered on the following morning, so that the European public can also follow this debate and your reply. This is a new Parliament, so please give us time to settle into this dialogue. Thank you very much for staying so long.

I call Mr Spicer on a point of order.

Mr Spicer. — Mr President, I rise very briefly to disagree, with the greatest respect, with what you have just said. There is no question of the lack of membership here tonight being due to our being in three places of work. The lack of Members here tonight is due to the fact that this debate was disrupted deliberately by one group in this Parliament. I shall raise this tomorrow as a point of order to the President at the earliest possible opportunity. In my view, to have no more than 25 Members present to listen to the President-in-Office is quite disgraceful. I shall raise it tomorrow morning when the President is in the Chair.

President. — The point you have just raised is not a point of order.

The debate is closed.

11. Agenda

President. — Given the situation in the House, we must assume that the debate on Cambodia can no longer take place this evening. I should like to make this clear to the Members who have remained in the Chamber for this item. The debate will be held tomorrow after the debate on world hunger. I note that Parliament agrees to this.

12. Urgent debate

President. — I have received from Mr Seal, Mr Lomas, Mr Caborn, Mr Balfe, Mr Adam, Mr Enright, Mr Megahy, Mr Griffiths, Mr Boyes, Mr Van Minnen, Miss Quin and Ms Clwyd a motion for a resolution, with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the cancellation of the election in Pakistan. The reasons supporting this request for urgent debate are contained in the document itself. I shall consult Parliament on the urgency of this motion at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

13. Membership of committees

President. — I have received from the political groups a request for the appointment of the following Members to the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the EEC-Turkey Association :

Mr Capanna, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Costanzo, Mr Fellermaier, Mrs Gredal, Mr Van der Gun, Mrs Hoffmann, Mr Johnson, Mr Langes, Mr Lemmer, Mr Pintat, Mr Remilly, Mr Rogers, Mr Sarre, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Spicer, Mr Taylor, Mr Verhaegen.

I have received from the Liberal and Democratic Group a request for the appointment of :

- Mr Irmer to the Committee on External Economic Relations to replace Mr Poniatowsky ;
- Mrs von Alemann to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport to replace Mr Irmer ;
- Miss Flesch to the Committee on Budgetary Control to replace Mr Bangemann.

Are there any objections ?

These appointments are ratified.

14. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 25 October 1979, with the following agenda :

10 a.m., 3 p.m. to 7.30 p.m. and 9 p.m. :

- Decision on the urgency of two motions for resolutions
- Vote on the request for an early vote on three motions for resolutions
- Oral question with debate on social legislation (continuation of the debate)
- Motion for a resolution on hunger in the world
- Oral question with debate on emergency aid for Vietnam and Cambodia
- Joint debate on the Battersby report on fisheries in the North-West Atlantic and on the Kirk report on the reproduction of salmon in the Baltic Sea
- Joint debate on the Dalsass report on seeds and the Colleselli report on rice
- Filippi report on certain wines originating in Tunisia
- Martinet report on certain Greek wines

— Plum report on the French Overseas Departments devastated by hurricanes, David and Frederick

— Motion for a resolution on fisheries policy

3 p.m.:

— Question Time (questions to the Commission)

3.45 p.m.:

— Voting time

I call Mr Denis.

Mr Denis. — (F) Mr President, I should just like to ask a question about tomorrow's agenda. Since the

debate on hunger might last eight hours, and since another hour is set aside for Question Time, how do you think we shall be able to get through such an agenda, even if we have a night sitting?

President. — That must be decided tomorrow by Parliament when it votes on the agenda. There is no other possibility.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 9.40 p.m.)

ANNEX

Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers

Question No 59, by Mrs Desmond (H-159/79)

Subject: Equal opportunities in education and training for girls

Will the Commission's document 'Equal Opportunities in Education and Training for Girls'¹ be examined at the forthcoming Council of Education Ministers meeting, and can the Council say what kind of legal instrument it intends to propose to ensure the implementation of the proposals contained in this document?

Answer

Since the Commission communication was submitted, the matter referred to by the honourable Member has been examined in detail by the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education meeting in May 1979 in The Hague under the aegis of the Council of Europe.

In the framework of the Communities, the Education Committee has made suggestions intended for a future meeting of the Council and of the Education Ministers meeting within the Council, based both on the abovementioned Commission communication and on the final declaration adopted in The Hague.

However, it would be premature at present to say in what form these measures could be adopted.

* * *

Question No 56, by Mr Davern (H-152/79)

Subject: Effect of European Court of Justice decision on Irish lamb exporters

In view of the decision of the European Court of Justice that France must end its policy of restricting lamb imports and mutton from Britain, what measures does the Council intend to take to help Irish lamb producers overcome the inevitable future loss of revenue?

Answer

The Court of Justice did in fact conclude, in its judgment in Case 232/78, that the national organization of the market as practised in France is at variance with the Treaty, but this does not prevent France from introducing aid measures of a kind which are consistent with the Treaty, pending the setting up of a common organization of the market.

At its meeting on 15 and 16 October 1979, the Council discussed a common organization of the market for this sector. It was careful to give due consideration to the position of the Parliament on the Commission proposal, together with its latest Resolution of 27 September. On this occasion it reaffirmed the need both to maintain the basic principles of the common agricultural policy, that is to say free movement, Community preference, and financial solidarity, and to ensure compliance with the aims of the Treaty as defined in Article 39 *et seq.* those concerning the situation of producers.

In view of the urgent need for a decision, the Council is to discuss this question again at a special meeting planned for 30 October 1979.

Owing to the negotiations in progress, it is difficult at this stage to give any further details on the particular issue of Irish producers raised by the honourable Member.

¹ COM 78 (44)

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 25 OCTOBER 1979

Contents

1. Approval of minutes	187	7. World hunger — Motion for a resolution by the Committee on Development and Cooperation (Doc. 1-393/79)	
2. Documents received	187	Miss Flesch	208
3. Agenda		Point of order: Mr Pannella	210
Mr Spicer; Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Miss Quin; Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mr Denis	187	8. Appointment of the Secretary-General of Parliament	211
4. Decision on early vote		9. Question Time (Doc. 1-405/79) (conclusion)	211
Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mr Bange- mann on behalf of the Liberal and Democ- ratic Group; Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Berkhouwer	188	Questions to the Commission	
Point of order: Mr Scott-Hopkins	189	Point of order: Mr Enright; Mr Hoff; Mr Seal; Mr Rogers; Mr Galland; Mr Lomas	211
Mr Müller-Hermann	189	Question No 6, by Lord O'Hagan: Cider tax	
5. Urgent procedure		Mr Burke, Member of the Commission; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Burke	212
Mr Pajetta; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Denis	189	Point of order: Mrs Baduel Glorioso . . .	212
Point of order; Mr Scott-Hopkins	190	Question No 10, by Mr Adam; Mr Brunner; Mr Fernandez; Mr Brunner . .	212
Mr Seal; Mr Marshall	191	Question No 11, by Mrs Lizin: Energy policy	
6. Harmonization of the Member States' poli- cies on social legislation — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-384/79) (continued)		Mr Brunner; Mrs Lizin; Mr Brunner . .	213
Mr Didò on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr van der Gun on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mr Turner on behalf of the European Democ- ratic Group; Mr Ceravolo on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Calvez on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mrs Chouraqui on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democ- rats; Mrs Hammerich; Mr De Goede; Mr Puletti; Mr Vernimmen; Mr Frischmann; Sir David Nicolson; Mr Caborn; Mr Vetter; Mr Petronio; Mrs Hoffmann; Mr Vergès; Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Pininfarina	191	Question No 12, by Mrs Roudy: Distribu- tion of the opinions of the Consumers' Advi- sory Committee	
Point of order: Mr Pannella	208	Mr Burke; Mrs Roudy; Mr Burke; Mrs Roudy; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Moreland	214
		Question No 14, by Mr Sarre: Rise in unemployment in the shipbuilding and man-made fibres sectors	
		Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Sarre; Mr Vredeling; Mrs Demarch; Mr Vredeling; Mr Enright; Mr Vredeling; Mr Boyes; Mr Vredeling; Mr Boyes; Mr Vredeling . . .	214
		Point of order: Mr Seal; Mrs Kellett- Bowman; Mr Boyes	215
		Question No 21, by Mrs Ewing: Closures of industrial plants by multinational companies	

- Mr Vredeling; Mrs Ewing; Mr Vredeling; Mr Marshall; Mr Vredeling; Mr Harris Personal statement; Mrs Ewing* . . . 216
Mr Vredeling 217
10. *Votes*
- Pininfarina and Bangemann motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-413/79/rev.): Harmonization of the Member States' policies on social legislation*
- Adoption of the resolution* 217
11. *World hunger — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-393/79) (resumption)*
- Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul, draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on External Economic Relations* 217
- Point of order: Mr Pannella* 219
- Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Tindemans on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD)* 219
- Point of order: Mr Pannella* 223
- Sir Fred Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Ferrero on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Poniatowski on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mrs Weiss on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mrs Bonino; Mrs Dekker* 223
12. *Welcome* 234
13. *World hunger (resumption):*
- Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission; Mrs Focke; Mr Pedini; Mr C. Jackson; Mrs Poirier* 234
- Point of order: Mr Penders* 247
14. *Membership of Committees* 247
15. *Urgent debate* 247
16. *Hunger in the world (resumption and conclusion):*
- Mrs Dienesch; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Almirante; Mr Lezzi; Mr Sälzer; Sir Henry Plumb; Mr Vergès; Mr Galland; Mr Poncelet; Mr Coppeters; Mr Romualdi; Mrs Agnelli; Mr Enright; Mr Bersani; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Capanna* 248
- Point of order: Mr Pannella* 267
- Mr Pannella; Mrs Cresson* 267
- Point of order: Mr Galland;* 269
- Mr Griffiths; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Sarre; Mr Habsburg; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Maher; Mr Capanna* 269
17. *Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-386/79)*
- Mr Denis; Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission; Mr Lomas, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Penders, on behalf of the group of the European People's party (C-D); Mr Prag, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mrs Baduel Glorioso, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mr Berkhouwer, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Groups; Mr Deleau, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mrs Agnelli; Mr Sarre; Mr Pannella; Mr Cheysson* . . . 274
18. *Fisheries policy — Report by Mr Battersby, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, (Doc. 1-402/79) — Report by Mr Kirk, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-403/79) — Motion for a resolution by Mr Kirk and others (Doc. 1-414/79):*
- Mr Battersby, rapporteur; Mr Kirk rapporteur; Mr Gundelach, vice-president of the Commission; Miss Quin, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Provan, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mrs Le Roux; Mr J. Nielsen, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Josselin; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Deleau; Mr Harris; Mr Turner; Mr Purvis; Mr Giummarra, on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples party (C-D); Mr Ripa di Meana* 286
19. *Regulation on the seed sector — Regulation on the common organization of the market in rice — Report by Mr Dalsass, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-396/79) — report by Mr Colleselli, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-397/79):*
- Mr Dalsass, rapporteur; Mr Colleselli, rapporteur; Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission* 301
20. *Regulation on wines originating in Tunisia*
- Report by Mr Filippi, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1-420/79):*
- Mr Giummarra, deputy rapporteur; Mr Almirante; Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission* 304

<p>21. <i>Regulation on certain wines originating entirely in Greece — Report by Mr Martinet, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1-399/79)</i> Mr Martinet, rapporteur; Mr Martin . . . 305</p> <p>22. <i>Regulation on emergency measures to repair the damage caused by hurricanes David and Frederick — Report by Sir Henry Plumb, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-430/79):</i></p>	<p>Sir Henry Plumb, rapporteur; Mr Vergès, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Sablé; Mr Deleau; Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission 307</p> <p>23. <i>Date and agenda of the next part-session</i> 309</p> <p>24. <i>Organization of the budget debate</i> 309</p> <p>25. <i>Agenda for the next sitting</i> 310</p> <p><i>Annex</i> 311</p>
---	--

IN THE CHAIR : MR MØLLER

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10.05 a. m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received the following documents :

- a) a report (Doc. 1-430/79) by Sir Henry Plumb, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-400/79) for a regulation concerning assistance from the Guidance Section of the EAGGF in respect of emergency measures to reconstitute the agricultural areas of the French Overseas Departments damaged by hurricanes David and Frederick ;
- b) a request (Doc. 1-429/79) from the Council for an opinion on the proposal for transfer of appropriations No 27/29 between chapters within Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the 1979 financial year.

These documents have been referred to the Committee on Budgets.

3. *Agenda*

President. — I call Mr Spicer on a point of order.

Mr Spicer. — Mr President, I rise to speak on a point of order which relates to the business of this House yesterday. You and the President will be aware that

yesterday we completely disrupted the day of the President-in-Office. He was due to speak to four committees in the afternoon but as a result of the change in the order of business and the postponement of the debate, he had to speak to them in the morning and very few could attend. Furthermore, instead of that debate being concluded, as it should have been, at 7.00 or 7.30 p.m. last night when a large number of people would have been present in the House, it actually finished at 9.40 and there were precisely 26 people in the Chamber. The point I wish to make is that, surely if group chairmen wish to change the order of business for the day, they should as a matter of courtesy give prior notification to the President so that the question can be dealt with at the beginning of the day's business. We certainly should avoid a repetition of yesterday's procedure, which I think brings us into disrepute both with the Council and the general public.

President. — Mr Spicer, your statement will be brought to the attention of the Bureau at the meeting this afternoon.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — I wish to add to the point of order made by my colleague. I do not think that it is sufficient to give notice of a change of business on the morning of the day it is going to take place. I believe that, in the absence of real urgency, the timetable laid down at the beginning of the week should be maintained. We have to make our arrangements on a weekly basis and not from hour to hour. I do not believe that it should be possible to make changes on a whim, as happened yesterday. It not only disrupts the Minister, it disrupts all our arrangements, and the people who asked for the postponement because they said they wanted to hear the statement did not even remain in the Chamber to listen to it, and so the whole exercise was futile.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — I call Miss Quin.

Miss Quin. — Notwithstanding what the previous speaker said, Mr President, I would like to propose what I think would be a sensible and logical change in today's agenda. Early this afternoon we have, on the question of fisheries, a report by Mr Battersby and a report by Mr Kirk and then much later on in the day we have a provision for a full-scale debate on fisheries. Would it not be much more sensible and logical to take these items together?

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* I should like to second the proposal by the previous speaker. I, too, fail to comprehend why we should consider separately the motion for a resolution on fisheries policy when we already have a joint debate scheduled on the reports by Mr Battersby and Mr Kirk. I should like to propose that we take the third item on fisheries together with other two.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Denis.

Mr Denis. — *(F)* Mr President, I was among the few Members who were here last night at the end of the sitting. The fact that only a handful of Members were present says a lot about the importance those who go on about Europe actually attach to the problems of political cooperation.

I put to the Chair yesterday a question which I was asked to repeat today. The question was about the practical manageability of today's sitting. The fact is, Mr President, that considering that we decided on Monday to devote eight hours to the debate on hunger, and allowing for Question Time before it, we shall not get the debate on hunger finished until something like eleven o'clock. As a result, topics like Vietnam and Cambodia — which are important because action is needed, as well as words — will come up at a late hour. What will happen with the other items — and there are a lot of them — which are also on the agenda?

Consequently, Mr President, I wonder if it is realistic to put forward an agenda like this, and whether it is consistent with the dignity of this House and with the capabilities of the staff, of whom we ask so much.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

President. — Mr Denis, I believe you when you say that many people do not take our work seriously, but the sooner we make a start on the agenda the greater the chance that we can get through it by this evening or this afternoon. I therefore suggest that we now turn to the items on the agenda.

Mr Klepsch has suggested that the two questions on fishing be taken together. If no one objects, I regard this as agreed.

That is agreed.

4. *Decision on early vote*

President. — The next item is the vote on the reference to committee of three motions for resolutions. Since the first two motions (Docs. 1-413/79/rev. and 1-423/79/rev.) both concern the harmonization of the policies of the Member States in the field of social legislation, I propose that they be put to the vote together.

Are there any objections?

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Mr President, we are dealing with two quite different things here, and my group's opinion can be expressed right away. In our view, this should be discussed by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and then put before the House. The Pininfarina motion represents nothing more than a request for the matter to be discussed by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. I am even inclined to think, Mr Bangemann, that there is no need to take a vote, because if we decide to refer the matter to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, the request formulated in the Pininfarina motion will be satisfied. The other motion presents in our view a detailed argument which needs to be debated. We ought therefore to have the opinion of the relevant committee beforehand. What we suggest is that the Pininfarina motion should perhaps be withdrawn, because in effect it is only asking for the matter to be referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, and that in the case of the other motion the author agree to its being referred to this committee. Neither is urgent in our opinion. The first is not urgent because it states the obvious, and the second because we should like the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment to discuss the matter.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Mr President, everything that Mr Klepsch said is right but the conclusion he draws is wrong. In the first place, this is not a motion on urgency but a motion to wind up the debate. You are perfectly right, Mr Klepsch, that this motion is only seeking reference to committee. It can thus be adopted without any difficulty. If things will be made easier because we are referring the matter to committee in any case and if the Socialist Group withdraws its motion, I do not think that Mr Pininfarina and I shall have any objection to withdrawing our motion, on the understanding that the whole matter is referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and

Bangemann

Employment. This means, however, that the Members of the Socialist Group will have to maintain their motion. If you do not withdraw your proposal, Mr Klepsch, it ought to follow from what you said that the motion by Mr Pininfarina and myself is adopted.

President. — Is there anyone who wishes to speak against referring the motion to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment?

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, I must say that our group is particularly anxious that we discuss the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Peters and his colleagues, in spite of the problems of lack of time and with the order of business. The Pininfarina motion cannot be taken with ours because the reasons behind the two are quite different. Whatever happens with the Pininfarina motion, Mr President, I really hope there will be time to consider the other motion by Mr Peters and his colleagues.

President. — I call Mr Berkhouwer.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) Mr President, I shall not go on about the Pininfarina motion, but I do go along with what one Member said about the importance of the general debate on world hunger and the highly topical debate — on which this Parliament has taken the initiative — on the situation in Vietnam and Cambodia.

Can the House not decide to debate the situation in Vietnam and Cambodia before we have the general debate on hunger, in other words to discuss the oral question by the Communist Group on emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia before we go on to the general problem of world hunger?

President. — I understood from Mr Glinne that there was no support for the withdrawal of the motion, so we can now proceed to the vote. Does any of the proposers wish to speak?

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, there seems to be some confusion. What you are putting to the House is the question on whether or not we should vote on the motions at 3.45 p.m. We are not going to vote on the substance of the motion now. The matter to be decided now is whether or not there should be a vote this afternoon on the motions. And so, presumably, when you call for one speaker for and one against the motion, you are referring to the question whether or not the motion should be voted on at 3.45 this afternoon. Let it be quite clear that we are not now considering the substance of any of these motions.

President. — Mr Scott-Hopkins, what we are discussing is whether or not to take the vote this afternoon.

I put to the vote the request for an early vote on the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1/413/79/rev.): Harmonization of the policies of the Member States in the field of social legislation.*

The request for an early vote is approved.

I now put to the vote the request for an early vote on the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1/423/79/rev.): Harmonization of the policies of the Member States in the field of social legislation.*

The request for an early vote is rejected. The motion is referred to the competent committee.

President. — We shall now consider the request for a vote without reference to committee on the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-418/79): Relationship between the European Monetary System and the international monetary system.*

I call Mr Müller-Hermann to speak against the vote without reference to committee.

Mr Müller-Hermann. — (D) Mr President, the motion for a resolution by Mr Ansquer deals with a very important and complex subject. In my opinion, however, the motion does not go into the subject deeply enough to allow us to take a decision today. For this reason, I propose that the motion be referred first of all to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs before it comes back to the House.

President. — I put to the vote the request for an early vote.

The request for an early vote is rejected. The motion for a resolution is referred to the competent committee.

5. Urgent procedure

President. — The next item is the vote on the request for urgent procedure in respect of two motions for resolutions.

We begin with the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-428/79): Arrest of six Czechoslovak citizens.*

I call Mr Pajetta to speak against the request for urgent procedure.

Mr Pajetta. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our views on the disturbing situation in Czechoslovakia, as well as on this trial, are well known. I am also in a position to tell the House that today in fact our party has put out an official document on this subject. But I do ask myself — and I put the same question to Mrs Cassanmagnago — whether by acting in this way we can give any sense, let alone a radical change of direction, to our work.

The motion is about the arrest of four priests, but it is unfortunately true to say that another four could be arrested next week. Are we going to bring this up in

Pajetta

Parliament every time? For my part, I have no idea why they have been arrested or what it all means. At any rate, I can say that I hope they have already been released. The point is: do you really think we can carry on like this? I say this because in my view the Members who have tabled this motion will be able to expand on it in committee and provide us with facts which we do not have at the moment.

The same goes for the motion on Pakistan, Mr President. This is a complex issue, which has taken a tragic turn over the last few years. Do we want to have a debate about Pakistan? Do we want the Political Affairs Committee to look into the matter? Fair enough. What we cannot do, if the proceedings in this House are to remain dignified and carry some weight...

(Interruptions and uproar on the right)

President. — The item on Pakistan will be discussed shortly. Your speaking time has run out.

Mr Pajetta. — *(I)* ... Mr President, let me finish. Questions can be dealt with swiftly, especially if the proceedings are managed differently.

I merely wanted to say that, if we are going to maintain the dignity and authority of this Parliament, there is no need to have an urgent debate every day but we have to show that the way to tackle problems...

President. — I call Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti.

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti. — *(I)* Mr President, although it is useful to hear the various points of view on this topic, we must insist that there be a vote on the urgency of this motion because we are worried about the violations of civil rights elsewhere — Madrid, for example — with trials and arrests. I am very well aware of where the Italian Communists stand on this issue; they have always voted with us in the Italian Parliament. Nevertheless, I feel it is important to stress again at this point the idea which was in fact brought up yesterday by a Socialist Member on the subject of Charter 77. What the Group of the European People's Party wanted was to look at the question according to the usual procedure, by letting the Political Affairs Committee consider it. We were motivated to ask for an urgent debate by virtue of the fact that others raised the issue. I ask that urgent procedure be adopted so that we can have a proper debate on the matter tomorrow.

President. — I call Mr Denis.

Mr Denis. — *(F)* Mr President, I noticed yesterday that one Member was allowed to speak on behalf of

the group and another for or against the motion. I want to speak against it.

If some Members are to be believed, Mr President, this Parliament has supposedly been elected to act as some kind of international tribunal and we are always having to cope — often in a somewhat random manner — with the world's problems. The result is that these questions take up far more of our time than the crisis in our own countries, starting with the unacceptable situation of seven million out of work.

As for Czechoslovakia and the iniquitous verdict which has been announced, the French Communist Party at the highest level has said what it had to say and done what it had to do. We are calling for the release of political prisoners but we are using the proper channels. Let us consider the beam in our own eyes! We gave an assurance to the voters that we would defend human rights within the European Community. And they certainly need to be defended!

I therefore suggest that this matter be referred to the competent committee, which can prepare a report that the House can use as a starting-point for a debate. In this way we can have a thorough discussion of human rights within the European Community.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, this is more a point of order than an explanation of what my feelings are. We really are in a ridiculous situation. We have an overcharged order paper for today. We have an impossible order paper for tomorrow and we are now about to vote on whether or not to have two more debates. I am not going to talk about the issues. They are of importance to various Members; I have no difficulty in accepting that. But when, Mr President, do you think you could possibly get them onto the agenda? There is no time today, there is not time tomorrow. So what do we think we are doing now, voting on urgency for these matters? There is no time in this part-session. Let this House be realistic! We are making fools of ourselves!

(Applause from the right)

President. — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure. The request for urgent procedure is approved. The motion for a resolution will be placed on the agenda for the morning of Friday, 26 October. Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

President. — We now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-425/79): Cancellation of elections in Pakistan.*

I call Mr Seal.

Mr Seal. — Unlike some of the other speakers, Mr President, I do not want to link this to any other item. I want to restrict it purely to the problems in Pakistan. While I can accept some of the arguments put forward by Mr Scott-Hopkins, I think your point, Mr President, is a very valid one. We are here in this Assembly to debate things which are urgent, and if that means cancelling aeroplanes or staying on longer, then we should do that and we should give an opinion. There is more to this particular item, Mr President, than appears from the outline given on the agenda. It concerns more than the mere cancellation of elections in Pakistan. It concerns the outlawing of opposition parties. It concerns the arrest of prominent members of opposition parties, and it concerns the attitude of the President of Pakistan towards women in Pakistan.

In fact, Mr President, it concerns a systematic removal of the people of Pakistan's rights. And we, in this Assembly, must show our deep concern at these particular actions. It must — and I repeat this — it must be an urgent debate, because the longer the debate is left, the less importance the President of Pakistan will attach to any decision that we come to in this Chamber. I am sure that the Assembly will agree that we must, as an Assembly, show not only Pakistan but any other country in the world that we are ready to spring to the defence of people's rights, wherever they may be. The working document, if I may say so, Mr President, is self-explanatory, and I am sure that once people have read it then they will support this motion for an urgent debate.

President. — I call Mr Marshall to speak against the motion.

Mr Marshall. — Mr President, everyone in this Chamber accepts that the attitude of the Government of Pakistan in not holding elections is quite reprehensible, but what we have to decide is whether it is practical to have a debate in this Chamber in this session. One might also ask why the Socialist Group put it on the agenda for urgent debate today. If they really wanted an urgent debate, they should have put it on the agenda at the beginning of the session, on Monday or Tuesday, instead of today. If it goes to the Political Affairs Committee, we will have a much more considered opinion on this very vital matter. If it comes in to be debated tomorrow morning or tomorrow afternoon, we all know what percentage of the House will be here and how loud our voice will

be. It is very much better that it goes to the Political Affairs Committee and then this House can debate the matter thoroughly at the next part-session. However, even while asking to have it deferred until then, I would like to make it quite clear that everyone in this group is wholeheartedly against the absurd anti-democratic policy of the Government of Pakistan which is abhorrent to us all.

President. — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

The request for urgent procedure is rejected. The motion for a resolution is referred to the competent committee.

6. Harmonization of the Member States' policies on social legislation (resumption)

President. — The next item is the resumption of the debate on the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-384/79) on the harmonization of the policies of the Member States in the field of social legislation.

I call Mr Didò.

Mr Didò. — *(I)* Mr President, Mr Pininfarina has raised a problem which certainly exists, but which we socialists see in a completely different way, I would even go so far as to say in the directly opposite way.

The truth is that our Liberal colleague, having emphasized the fact that differences exist in Member States' policies on social legislation, asks that these differences should be eliminated exclusively with the aim of restoring competitiveness to business enterprises; in other words, he is suggesting that the advantages which Italian workers enjoy, or are supposed to enjoy over their opposite numbers in other countries should be removed.

The examples quoted by Mr Pininfarina provide clear evidence of this. As an example of what he considers a distortion of free competition, he quoted first of all the mechanism of salary indexation, which is used in Italy as a means of protecting the purchasing power of wage and salary earners, but which is said not to exist in other countries. He also mentions the employment law, which makes hiring in numerical sequence rather than by name compulsory and which is alleged to be a source of serious discrimination in Italy, the fact that in Italy the pensionable age is 60 and, in some cases, 55 while in other countries the pensionable age is 67, the fact that industrial relations are abnormal because of the large number of disputes, which he claims makes legislative intervention necessary, whereas Mr Pininfarina knows very well that the Italian trade union movement is preparing the machinery to make strikes self-regulating — which in our opinion is the right solution.

Didò

This position taken by Mr Pininfarina corresponds very closely to the attitude adopted not only by the Italian Confederation of Industry, but also by UNICE, that is to say the European Confederation of Industry, an attitude which consists in dealing with the economic crisis by cutting back on the social advances won by the working class. Inflation is tackled by raising the level of unemployment and attempts are made to reduce the public sector deficit by cutting social spending and investment. This is true of Italy and of other countries. In the case of France social security spending is under attack; the same is happening in the United Kingdom where, in addition, an anti-strike law is under consideration. These are just further examples which confirm a very definite trend. In other words, industrialists and businessmen in each individual country believe that their own labour costs are higher than those of neighbouring countries and that competitiveness must be restored at the expense of the living and working conditions of the workers. This happens because the economic crisis and the inflationary process are only tackled by means of monetary and credit measures, which in any case have become less effective because nowadays inflation and recession coexist, as do inflation and mass unemployment. These are the policies adopted instead of tackling the real underlying causes, in other words the structural imbalances existing in the economic systems of our countries and in the Community as a whole.

The second unacceptable aspect of Mr Pininfarina's presentation of the problem is that it completely neglects the fact that the social imbalances existing in the Community are to a very significant extent the result of economic imbalances.

The truth is that in the Treaty of Rome itself social policy is subordinated to economic policy, an economic policy which is based on competition and on a free market which in practice no longer exists — or which at least no longer corresponds to the description given of it by the classical liberal theorists. This is precisely the reason why the results so far achieved in progressively harmonizing social progress — as the Treaty puts it — are extremely modest.

Yesterday we spoke of setting up, as an example, a committee with the task of checking to what extent the directive on equality of pay and treatment of men and women had been applied. Our argument is that harmonizing social conditions upwards is inseparable from an economic policy intended to overcome the existing imbalances at the sectoral and regional level within our countries and among the Member States. We must therefore turn the logic of the Liberal Group on its head and set very precise social objectives for our social policy, namely full employment and better living and working conditions. In this connection I

should also like to thank Mr Vredeling for having refuted Mr Pininfarina's thesis, which totally neglects the connection between social policy and economic policy. We shall discuss these problems in committee — both Mr Pininfarina's suggestion and the Socialists Group's proposal — because I believe that in the confusion of voting the request that this matter should be dealt with by urgent procedure was refused. This means that these problems must be dealt with in committee.

I also want to add that we have as of now several occasions in which to deal with these matters. First of all the budget for 1980, which we want to see extensively amended precisely because it is not designed to overcome structural imbalances ...

President. — You have five minutes time.

Mr Didò. — ... As I am speaking on behalf of my Group, I understood that, in accordance with Rules of Procedure, I had the right to speak for ten minutes.

Secondly, there is the discussion of the fifth directive, with its acknowledgement of the right of the workforce to take part in decision-making in the most appropriate way in each of the various Member States. Then there is also the question of the reduction of the working week, but on Tuesday morning we came up against a majority who went so far as to oppose the decision to oblige the Commission to submit for the meeting of the Council of Ministers on November 22, that is to say in a few weeks' time, a specific proposal on this, taking due account of the meetings which have already taken place between the two sides of industry and the wishes of the trade union movement.

We take a serious view of this vote because it puts off any statement of this Parliament's views, and not only weakens the proposal which, in any case, the Commission is bound to submit by 22 November, but could also be used as an alibi by those who are opposed to any solution to this vital question. We already saw the first consequence of this at the meeting of the Budget Committee last night, when the decision was taken to refuse the granting of 100 million units of account as aid to the steel-making sector, where — by a strange coincidence — a reduction in the working week was exactly what was planned ...

President. — I would draw your attention to the Rules of Procedure, under which it is only the questioner who has ten minutes' speaking time.

Mr Didò. — ... I am about to finish, Mr President. In any case I hope that at the committee meetings at which we shall discuss these problems at least those parties, including non-socialist ones, which have links with the trade union movement will be able to work together to find common solutions to these problems.

Didd

But in any case we shall give all our support to the week of trade union demonstrations, which the Confederation of European Trade Unions has declared for the end of November at the same time as the Dublin summit, for the very purpose of supporting these demands for full employment and a reduction in the working week.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

President. — I call Mr Van der Gun to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr Van der Gun. — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to begin with the no doubt reassuring news that I shall stay well within my allotted speaking time, largely in view of the fact that the vote will be taking place this afternoon. By referring this question to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, we shall have ample opportunity to deal in detail with the subject matter. Mr PiniFarina is quite right in saying that the harmonization of social legislation is one of the aims of the Treaty. He is also right in saying that it is an important precondition for European integration. That is something we would all go along with. Unfortunately, things look rather different in practice. It would have been better and easier if this process of social harmonization had taken place during a period of economic buoyancy rather than in one of recession such as we are going through at the moment.

I have been active for long enough in the trade union movement — at European level as well — to know the history of the difficulties in this field. On the one hand, the trade union movement argued that harmonization means harmonization at the highest level, and the result was a panic reaction from the employers who felt that that went much too far. This is why the cooperation of the two sides of industry in the process of integration has not produced the kind of practical results we were entitled to. We must realize, however, that the Commission cannot bring this project to a successful conclusion on its own. It is absolutely essential that as much cooperation as possible should be forthcoming from both sides of industry to enable us to attain the desired social harmonization over as broad a spectrum as possible. The situation at present is that the trade union movement in practically every Member State of the Community is having to fight for the maintenance of purchasing power — of both the working and the non-working population — and the maintenance of existing standards of social welfare and so on, and this clearly goes to show that the present climate is not exactly favourable to further integration.

The great merit of this oral question is that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment will

now have another chance to discuss this problem, and we shall try to come up with concrete proposals, although we realize only too well that this will be no easy matter. Although the Socialist Group's request this morning for an early vote on the motion for a resolution was rejected, the motion does undoubtedly include many elements which will be discussed once again by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. We shall all have to pull together to tackle this problem. We must also give the Commission as much encouragement as possible; after all, and despite the present economic climate, activities designed to further the harmonization of social legislation are highly desirable in themselves and here the Commission can count on our support and cooperation.

President. — I call Mr Turner to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Turner. — Mr President, our group welcomes the spirit of this question and the proposal that it should be referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

We feel that all inequalities in competition are bad, and of course they are particularly acute in this field. There are financial inequalities, for instance differences of taxation and social payments; there are legal inequalities, for instance differences regarding minimum working hours and work safety, standards of manning and so on; and there are factual inequalities which arise from the industrial relations climates in different countries. Productivity differs and cooperation and obstruction between workers and management also differs in different countries. We welcome any initiative which will help to remove friction from labour relations.

Of course, one cannot allow questions of trade union negotiations on wages to come in; that is an entirely separate matter. But where more sophisticated agreements between workers and management are concerned, covering such aspects of their work as fringe benefits and other matters appropriate to their particular workplace we very much favour any advance in that direction, and we feel that harmonization on a European scale can help in each country, particularly our own. I believe myself that works councils should be given far more basic representation throughout the whole of the EEC. I believe that works councils and the way they are run in every plant should be the subject of discussion in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, as should the form of representation on works councils, their effectiveness and their powers of consultation with management. The Legal Affairs Committee will be interested in seeing what that committee's conclusions are, and will want to discuss the subject as well.

Turner

But of course the disparities that exist in this field are very complex. Sir Brandon Rhys Williams, who unfortunately had to leave before he could speak, has made a considerable study of differences of taxation level and contributions to social services. I think that is the sort of thing which the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment should concern itself with. I believe that the factual inequalities which exist in this field can be lessened by work done on an EEC basis in the line of harmonization or initiatives which this committee might put forward.

I am sure there are areas where harmonization will be helpful to us all, but I must say that I think that the problem of identifying them and working out suitable solutions is going to be extremely complex, and I wish the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment well in its task. However, I think the Legal Affairs Committee should consider what they eventually come up with, because I think the topic concerns us too.

President. — I call Mr Ceravolo.

Mr Ceravolo. — (I) Mr President, we who are in favour of the maximum of Community harmonization of national laws could not but be interested by Mr Pininfarina's question, ready as we are to welcome any indications of shared attitudes, regardless of the questioner's party.

However, we must admit that the doubts we already felt with regard to the manner in which the question was framed increased once we heard Mr Pininfarina's explanatory speech.

In spite of the forcefulness of his presentation, we are obliged to say that Mr Pininfarina, the representative of the Italian employers, has almost completely got the better of Mr Pininfarina, Member of the European Parliament. How else can one explain such a restrictive and topsy-turvy manner of presentation? 'Restrictive' to the point of considering Community social policy almost exclusively from the point of view of the regulation of relationships between employers and employees; 'topsy-turvy' to the point of assessing social policy by the yardstick of competitiveness of individual companies and, in effect, subordinating social policy to that criterion.

Mr Pininfarina could only arrive at such a cynical conclusion by ignoring one or two fundamental points. In the first place, the main aims of Community social policy are not subordinate to economic policy, as the Commissioner himself rightly reminded us, and Mr Vredeling went on to say that the Treaties set as a fundamental aim the rapid raising of the standard of living of the working population by the promotion of greater equality in living and working conditions. In other words, the harmonization in question must be consonant with a policy of levelling-up

of the various national legislations. This is the exact opposite of harmonization as seen through the eyes of the questioner.

The second point he ignored is that the regulation of labour relations is, and must remain, the domain of collective bargaining in which the autonomy of the negotiating power of each interested party must be rigorously respected. If this is the case, as the Commissioner himself admitted, we do not believe that it is the function of the European Parliament to be used as a cat's paw by Italian capitalists.

This seemed to us to be the general trend of the concluding part of Mr Pininfarina's speech, particularly when he referred to individual factors that are typical of Italian social legislation, such as wage-indexing, method of recruitment, etc.

Here, *en passant*, I would remark that his suggestion that we should all study and get to know the facts is very apposite. Mr Pininfarina maintains that wage indexing as practised in Italy has no equivalent in other European countries, whereas it is well known that the principle of indexing is recognized in Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Finland and to some extent in France too, whilst it is also incorporated into the German pension system. This shows that the trend is towards indexing rather than away from it.

I shall now deal briefly with some other examples of his cheap polemics. A third point which he passed over is the connection between the present state of social legislation in the various countries and the tragic consequences that flow from the fundamental crisis affecting the Community economy, that is from recession and unemployment, which has reached very serious levels. Let us not beat about the bush. When the EEC Treaties were signed we cherished the illusion that a simple Community policy would be enough to set in motion the processes of economic and social integration of Europe. It is now increasingly common knowledge that what is required is a stimulus to set off the process of economic expansion on new bases.

And now, more than ever before, the problem of employment, from the point of view both of protecting the present level of employment for young people, women, and migrant workers, of increasing the supply of jobs, must remain the central problem of any Community social policy.

What is needed is something quite different from the subordination of social policy to economic requirements and to the requirements of competitiveness! On the contrary, a Community political and economic strategy is required which, with the aim of creating full employment, will coordinate technological progress, modernization of the productive apparatus, working hours, a better division of labour etc.

Ceravolo

While we are waiting for the solution to this problem are we supposed to be satisfied with the small amount of progress that has so far been achieved in the field of harmonization? Definitely not. There is a way in which, if Mr Pininfarina and his party are willing, we can together make a serious appeal to the entrepreneurs, who up until now have been opposed to such things, and ask them to take part in general discussions at a European level, both on sectoral policies and general problems such as that of reducing the working week.

We fully support his demand that the whole business of social legislation should be studied in greater depth, and we for our part shall not put any difficulties in the way of this process. But we are also determined to get the Social Affairs Committee to work on definite and urgent political options, above all that in favour of employment, which remains, as we said before, the central pillar of any Community social policy in the coming months and years.

President. — I call Mr Calvez to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Calvez. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are very happy with the initiative taken by our colleague, Mr Pininfarina, since it directly concerns key aspects of the process of constructing a united Europe and reflects a deeply felt expectation on the part of public opinion. The fact is that harmonization of social legislation is part of the social policy of the Community. Its rate of progress is dependent on the speed at which Community policies as a whole develop. And this was the major single topic of questions put to us during the course of our electoral campaign, because it is likely to have a direct influence on future trends in the employment market and to have repercussions on unemployment and the level of inflation, rates of which vary from one country to another largely because of the lack of harmonized social policies.

But the word harmonization does not mean, in the opinion of the Liberal and Democratic Group, that the policy which is recommended should be one of easy options, in which all the various social advantages are harmonized at the highest possible level, without taking any account of the competitive capacities of Community enterprises, which would see their competitiveness severely jeopardized as a consequence of the aggressive trade practices of third countries and the lower social expenditure in some of the states with which we compete. In order to avoid any misunderstanding we in the Liberal and Democratic Group think that it important to point out clearly that the aim should be to achieve a harmonization of legislation and not to make it uniform so that everything

concerned with social and labour policy would be identical in every Member State. If we wish to level upwards, we must also take care not to lose sight of the characteristics peculiar to certain sectors of industry as a result of their differing developments. If we were to try to extend indiscriminately throughout the industrial sector the advantages available in certain industries we should be putting an entire series of companies in jeopardy and we should, in the end, be guilty of a disservice to the very cause which we have so close to our hearts, that is, the fight against unemployment and the strengthening of European industry. I am also a trade unionist, whose international organization is at present being discriminated against, and I do not think that this Assembly, which defends the right to freedom of expression, should accept this. But we believe that, as economic and monetary union develops, the policy of Community social harmonization may acquire a new dimension, because the essential elements of social legislation have still to be tackled.

So we ask the Commission to supply Parliament with data concerning the differences that exist in the field of labour relations between the various Member States so that we can draw up some realistic proposals, proposals intended to create a more homogeneous framework for European social legislation, without neglecting the economic potential of each Member State. And we are also of the opinion that the experience of the Economic and Social Committee is worth drawing in, since this committee constitutes a particularly important meeting-place for the two sides of European industry.

We are waiting, therefore, for some concrete proposals from the Commission which could then be looked into by the Committee on Social Affairs, Employment and Education, and I should like to ask Mr Vredeling whether the Commission does not also believe that, as regards the harmonization of working hours, the different situations prevailing on the labour market in the different member countries and the different production capacities in the various member countries should not also be taken into consideration to a greater extent than has been the case hitherto. Does the Commission also share the view that the present economic situation in the Community and its likely trend in future makes the option of imposing greater burdens on the economy in general unacceptable? Is the Commission ready to take account, for example, in its future policy concerning harmonization of social security legislation, of the stabilization of general economic costs? As far as we are concerned, I shall conclude by pointing out that such a harmonization of existing legislation should begin with tests in specific sectors, e.g. the provision of better information relating to available employment on the Community labour market, the prevention of occupational

Calvez

illness, or night work. In this way the harmonization of labour relations would be made much easier, and would have a real effect on the competitiveness of Community industries. A phased plan for the coordination of social legislation, coupled with new economic initiatives and more decisive action by the Community bodies responsible for employment problems would, in our opinion, allow us to look forward to a brighter future for our economy and at the same time satisfy deeply felt requirements of our peoples.

President. — I call Mrs Chouraqui to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mrs Chouraqui. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Pininfarina's question raises a certain number of problems. What stage have we reached in the harmonization of social policies in the Member States? Is fair competition between Community enterprises possible? I am afraid that we must answer 'No' to both these questions. There is not yet any genuine harmonization and there are still very significant differences between production conditions and productivity of companies in the various Member States of the Community, in that there are still important disparities in the kind of social expenditure that exists in each country and the way it is financed. We know that the State's contribution is particularly high, for example, in the United Kingdom and in the Federal Republic of Germany, whereas in France and in Italy approximately three fifths of the total expenditure is attributable to the employers, the State only providing one fifth of the total finance. And we know that the proportion of social security income deriving from taxes is likely to increase in the United Kingdom and diminish in the other Member States. So one of the merits of Mr Pininfarina's question is that it reminds us of one of the fundamental weaknesses of the Treaty of Rome, namely that it was conceived and signed at a time when people expected that economic growth would bring with it social progress. From the time of the signature of the Treaty of Paris to the enlargement of the Community in 1973, the Common Market did benefit, it is true, from twenty years of continuous growth. During these twenty years Europe created the impression that it could successfully solve many problems. At that time it was not difficult to pursue a generous social policy. But, as we all know, a period of crisis followed and is still with us. If we do not want the disparities in our Community to get any worse but to diminish and finally disappear, we must continue to make an effort to see that the social policies of the Member States continue to converge. But the Commission expects a significant slowdown between now and 1980 in the growth of social expenditure in the

member countries of the European Community. And we know that significant differences are still to be found in the average level of social services and in the proportions of the economic resources of each country devoted in particular to health, old age pensions, family allowances and unemployment benefit. We therefore believe that collaboration and coordination are vital prerequisites for a harmonious development of European social policy, with regard to wage and salary earners.

But I should also like to make another point. It seems to us a matter of fundamental importance to us what we should succeed in establishing a regulation for the coordination of social security systems for those workers who are not wage or salary earners and their families. Since 1971 wage and salary earners in Europe have been able to move around within the Common Market without forfeiting the social benefits which they have obtained. The Community ought to make the same benefits available for those who are not salary or wage earners, without becoming bogged down in the technical difficulties involved in the drawing of such regulations. The fact that no such regulation has so far seen the light of day acts as a brake on the mobility of self-employed persons, who are often, as we know, creators of new jobs. And at a time of crisis such as the present it would be indefensible to deny to those who wish to do so the opportunity to create new jobs.

I should like to conclude by drawing attention to another point raised by Mr Pininfarina's question. The degree of interpenetration of the economies of Community Member States means that the workers are dealing with companies whose affairs are carried on in a Europe-wide framework. The disparities within the Community with regard to company law and labour law are a definite source of difficulties for any company which wishes to carry on its business in several countries of the Community because it is obliged to put up with the resulting costs and complexities of organization. But the other side of the coin is that these disparities also bring with them the risk for the workforce that the companies for which they work may adopt the organization in the location which offers the workers themselves the least protection. This is something we must look out for! This is one of the reasons why we think that action at Community level is required, action which we have been talking about for a long time in the Community institutions without however having arrived at any positive conclusion.

Let us therefore work together in this European Assembly to create a Europe with a system of security worthy of the name, that is to say a Europe dedicated to the service of the men and women who live in it.

Chouraqui

We are not just a Community brought together by common economic and commercial interests. Our aim is to encourage within our member countries efficient economic policies so that throughout Europe we can work and live more harmoniously together.

President. — I call Mrs Hammerich.

Mrs Hammerich. — (DK) Mr President, I am speaking on behalf of the Danish People's Movement against the EC since this debate is explicitly aimed at promoting harmonization and standardization of social legislation in the European Community with a view to achieving what is referred to as 'real European integration'. However, the majority of the people of Denmark are opposed to a common Community social policy for the following reasons.

Before the accession in 1973, many Danes were afraid that our social legislation would be weakened, or that social developments in the Community would stagnate as the result of harmonization. At that time, our leading politicians assured us that it would be the other Member States which would catch up with Denmark as regards the standard of social provisions, which was and indeed still is relatively high in our country. This has not happened. On the contrary, there has been a certain amount of stagnation in our own social development. No major direct harmonization has yet taken place and this debate reflects dissatisfaction that this is so. However, in our country a sort of passive integration has been taking place, certain things have rubbed off from the other Member States with result that the standard of social services in Denmark has deteriorated.

Some of you are probably thinking to yourselves, 'Why this opposition to social harmonization? Is this not mere chauvinism? Does it not reflect a lack of solidarity with people in other countries?' I should like to make a few basic points in this connection. Social welfare is not something which has been handed to the people of Denmark on a plate. It is a complex of rights which have been won by hard struggle over many years. This is true in all countries: social benefits are something which wage earners have had to fight for. It is to a great extent the strength of the democratic organization in a country which determines the extent of social development. Social legislation results from the demands of the people. No politician, therefore, has the right to give away these rights or to enter into agreements which, in the long term, will weaken the social struggle. We cannot trade the social welfare in our country for an abstract principle such as European unity.

Our country is not without its shortcomings in the social sector, and we know that the social conditions in some of the nine Member States are extremely unfortunate, indeed, in some places there is real need

and poverty, for example, in the South of Italy and, ironically enough, in the richest Member State of the Community, the Federal Republic, where more than six million people live in poverty and one million in accommodation for the homeless and where the unemployed have to do compulsory work for the equivalent of Dkrs 30 an hours. Do we in Denmark feel no solidarity with these people? Yes we do, even if we feel that the political leaders of the country should solve the most serious social injustices and glaring distribution problems before pressing on with a European solution.

We are completely in favour of solidarity, but we do not believe in the myth that there is one big pool of social advantages, and that the poor people, in for example, the South of Italy, will automatically receive what we give up. On the contrary, if we destroy ourselves as an example, a social example, we will at the same time be destroying a tool which other people could have used in their struggle for social justice. Social progress is won in the places where people live and work. International solidarity is a great help in this struggle and can take many forms, as the experience of the international trade union movement and the women's movement shows.

Contrary to what the Community maintains, real international cooperation does not presuppose the surrender of national independence and the trading-in of democratic control in one's own country. For this reason we must strongly oppose harmonization of social legislation. Progress in social matters results from the efforts of the people in the place where they live and work, not from harmonization and standardization.

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (N) Mr President, I am grateful to Mr Pininfarina for tabling this oral question. The number of speakers and the points they have made in the course of this debate clearly show how important this question is. I think we can say, that in the 25 years of the European Community a great deal has happened in the field of economic integration. Not for nothing was the Community originally known as the European Economic Community. One of the previous speakers rightly pointed out that it is time that we were making a bit more progress towards a European Social Community. I know that Mr Vredeling has done everything in his power in the past, and will continue for as long as he holds his present office to do everything he can to guide Europe towards a Social Community. As he himself has said, social policy ought to be a policy objective in its own right.

And yet I must admit to being a little disappointed with the report he gave here this week. He rightly gave us a very clear summary of what has happened recently in the field of social legislation in Europe

De Goede

mainly during his period of office. But I could not help feeling that he was also using this summary as a bit of a smokescreen to conceal the fact that far too little has been done in recent years to harmonize social legislation and wage structures.

Mr Van der Gun pointed out that the situation is now very difficult, and that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment will be examining it, but that the period of economic buoyancy has gone and is not likely to return in the foreseeable future. Every time, but even during the long economic boom period, we proved incapable of making greater progress, so that is really no excuse.

Mr Vredeling has told us that we must appreciate that the Treaty gives us only very little room for manoeuvre in terms of the further integration of social welfare systems, wage structures and so on. However, be that as it may, I think that we must realise that there are two distinct aspects to this problem — an economic aspect and a social aspect.

During the campaign preceding the direct elections to the European Parliament in June this year, I was confronted with problems in my own country, the Netherlands, for example with regard to the footwear industry. I was told that thousands of jobs had been lost, not as a result of competition from countries outside the Community with low labour costs, but because of competition from other Member States of the Community which have a completely different wage structure — in other words, lower labour costs — and much less expensive social welfare provisions, the result being that employees' contributions are that much lower, which in turn reduces the cost factor for the product concerned. Clearly then, it ought to be possible — indeed, I would say to Mr Vredeling that it would be justifiable — to use economic developments in Europe to bring about greater gradual harmonization in this area, in the interests of economic improvement, a more honest competition policy and fairer competitive conditions.

Fortunately, there is also a social side to this kind of thing, which must not be forgotten. It must be possible for us to improve the pay and social welfare conditions of people in countries like Italy and Spain. It is important that the situation in these countries be brought more or less into line with other more prosperous parts of the Community.

I should like to conclude by asking Mr Vredeling a few questions. Is it true that, in certain sectors, the differences have tended to increase rather than diminish during his period of office? Of course it is true that, in a number of countries — including the Netherlands — significant improvements have been made in the field of social welfare in recent times. That may be one reason for an increase in the differences. I believe, though, that we should tackle this

problem in a European context, and I should like to see Mr Vredeling use his remaining period in office to put forward proposals designed to bring about the further harmonization of wage structures and social insurance provisions. For instance, we could begin by harmonizing the maximum weekly working time and the age of retirement. Another possibility would be to gradually introduce a minimum wage, although it will probably take something in the region of 10 years before we get any legislation on a minimum wage at European level.

Nevertheless, these are a few points on which I should appreciate Mr Vredeling's comments. I am afraid, Mr President, that my speaking time on this subject is running out, but at least I am reassured after hearing Mr Van der Gun say that discussion will at long last be resumed in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on a broader basis. I shall use my membership of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to continue to press for a social, as well as an economic, Europe.

President. — I call Mr Puletti.

Mr Puletti. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the question submitted by Mr Pininfarina on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group on the harmonization of Member States' policies with regard to social legislation raises quite a few problems. I should like to add straight away that if we had not been obliged this morning to vote remarkably hurriedly on a request for urgent procedure we should have been able in good faith to find many points in common between what Mr Pininfarina had set out in his motion for a resolution, requesting that the document should be sent back to committee, and what the Socialist Group also wanted.

What I have to say follows on naturally from what Mr Didò said, but deals with another aspect of the problem. In fact if we were to stick to the literal meaning of the words, if we were to speak of the need for harmonization of social legislation. I think that all of us should be ready to give our assent, inasmuch as the need for harmonization is a step along the road to European integration on which I think we are all agreed and for which this Parliament must work.

But it is only too evident that Mr Pininfarina's question reflects the unmistakable logic of free enterprise, so much so that in illustrating some aspects of his question he spoke of the need to transfer what he considered the best model so far achieved in the production process in various European countries to the Italian situation. In other words, he thinks in a framework which is typical of economic liberalism and which, though it may have some positive features, is fundamentally different from the logic of our Group, which believes in democratic socialism.

Puletti

What is more, the fact that many Italian Members are speaking on this question shows clearly that it arises very much from an Italian background and particularly from the prevailing concern in Italian industry to bring trade union agitation down to a level lower than in other member countries of the Community. The problem is there and it is a waste of time to deny it. And it is all the more serious for us Italians, whose industry and economy are based upon the transformation of raw materials into finished products, and whose competitiveness depends on labour costs. But we must first decide on the approach with which we intend to solve it. It seems to me that we must clear the ground of two erroneous assessments.

Firstly, if Mr Pininfarina's question is intended to bring out the need to adapt — and correct — Italian trade union activity to the rules and traditions of other countries, in order to slow it down and limit its scope, then we must say that in this respect we are not in agreement. We have been critical — and continue to be so — with regard to those aspects of trade union activity inspired by the so-called 'autonomous movements', which are very often movements that advance demands and claims of a distinctly corporatist nature. Nevertheless, the trade union movement in our country has achieved a certain maturity which must be taken into account and of which we have had evidence in recent months.

We must remind Mr Pininfarina, who is certainly well aware of events and problems to do with Turin, of the position taken up by the Italian trade union Confederations with regard to the sixty-one dismissals at Fiat, which was certainly not one of flat rejection from the outset, given that from time to time the activities of irresponsible groups in the factories and acts of terrorism were a source of danger.

We should also like to remind him that, as regards the problem of self-regulation of strikes in the public sector, the trade union Confederations act in a manner which indicates that they are responsible political bodies.

When we speak of harmonizing social legislation we must not only take account of the context of the tradition of the trade union movement in the individual countries, but also of their living standards. In our country we have been able to achieve certain goals only after years of waiting, and the living conditions of the working class have been raised to the European level only after years of struggle, and moreover the structure of social legislation is still more firmly grounded in the past than in the future. This is why, though we admit that this problem exists, because industrialists and small and medium-sized companies cannot be put at a disadvantage, we must nonetheless take account of the demands of the trade union movement and of growth in the European Community as a whole.

I should like to conclude by saying that we are certainly not in favour of the corporatist trade unionism which has appeared from time to time in recent years, we have no nostalgia for any kind of Sorelism, but we are convinced that the governments in the individual Member States must take due account of the maturity of the trade union movement. To conceive of harmonization as a way of inhibiting the trade union movement's ability to fight is above all to ignore reality.

President. — I call Mr Vernimmen.

Mr Vernimmen. — (NL) Mr President, although I cannot go along with the subsidiary comments made by the authors of this oral question, Mr Pininfarina and his friends are right — objectively speaking — on one point at least. The various social security systems operating in the Member States of the European Community have become a competitive factor in our economic system. This situation has been exacerbated in recent years by a certain trend towards corporatism. I feel that the harmonization of social security should be studied first and foremost from the point of view of principle, in order to decide whether such harmonization is or is not desirable and feasible. The answer to this basic question will depend on the aims behind this operation, in other words, minimalist or maximalist? If it is decided to go for harmonization on acceptable conditions, we must first, I believe, agree on the structures rather than on a particular form of labour legislation. To this end, we shall probably need a wide-ranging dialogue with both sides of industry, particularly with the trade unions. There is frequently discussion in various Member States about deferring pay or redistributing incomes. Nor should we forget that, in some countries, the trade unions play a part in administering the social security system.

The way in which social security is financed is of enormous importance, and warrants urgent study. Financing is an aspect of the problem to which we sometimes do not pay enough attention. In fact, it should have a redistributive effect in favour of the working population. We should examine the question of whether social security financing should be more closely linked to taxation. We must get away from the automatic mechanisms which tend to lead to a certain type of corporatism and — and this is something I would stress — which are very prejudicial to industry — particularly labour-intensive undertakings, whose competitiveness is adversely affected, with the resultant threat of unemployment. So I would say that harmonization is a good thing, provided it is undertaken with due caution. Let us not forget that social security is a matter of enormous importance to millions of working people.

President. — I call Mr Frischmann.

Mr Frischmann. — (*F*) I should like to take advantage of this debate on the harmonization of social legislation to express briefly what the workers feel on this matter and what they will feel tomorrow, when they know what has been said here.

Everyone is aware that the Treaty establishing the European Community promised economic and social progress, a constant improvement in living and working conditions (this was in the Preamble, Article 2), a rapid rise in living standards (Article 117 expected an improvement in living and working conditions through their harmonization in line with progress); other Articles had laid down definite obligations with regard to equal pay for men and women and the equivalence of holiday schemes. Subsequently other measures were adopted concerning social security systems, working conditions, salaries and wages, health and safety, etc.

The workers in our respective countries are in a position today to see that after more than 20 years the European Community has not achieved any of these objectives, nor had it done so even before the present crisis. All along the line social matters have been sacrificed to other considerations or 'forgotten'.

Today the disparities remain and are even getting worse. A country like France beats all records as regards the length of its working week or its labour costs, which are amongst the lowest in Europe.

Those measures that have been discussed or adopted up to now at European level, such as early retirement, reductions in overtime working and a few appropriations distributed here and there to finance restructuring or redeployment of labour, are obviously not going to solve the problems that are really worrying the workers!

As regards harmonization and progress, the Commission itself expects to see an overall fall in social spending as a percentage of the 1980 gross domestic product throughout the Community. And if there *is* any harmonization, it is always harmonization to the lowest common denominator, never harmonization upwards to give everyone the benefit of the most favourable treatment, and this is a situation which Mr Pininfarina would like to make even worse.

Well, this situation is already intolerable, as regards both employment and living standards. It is high time to put an end to these grandiloquent declarations of intent, these fine promises and the sort of manoeuvres which are going on here, and instead replace words by deeds and set to work seriously to solve the problems which beset the working classes.

The first thing must be the improvement and upward harmonization of purchasing power, which is a prerequisite for giving production a fresh impetus and thus creating new jobs. Secondly, we must give practical and immediate attention to the problem of reducing the duration of the working week and harmonizing it throughout the Community — even if the vote we took on Tuesday morning rejected the urgency of the matter — and in particular we should aim for the 35-hour week, the fifth shift, extra holidays, a lower retirement age, a general improvement in working conditions, especially the reduction of the pace of work and of the arduousness of operations.

Only then shall we be able to speak of a grand social policy, of serious measures designed to solve the problems of unemployment, and only then shall we be able to give real meaning to the word 'harmonization' in line with progress. Only then will the workers no longer be frustrated, as they are at the moment, in order to increase profits, which subsequently swell the amounts of capital invested outside the Community!

I shall finish by pointing out that many resolutions of this sort have already been adopted but have never been followed up; or it has been voted, as on Tuesday morning or this morning, to refer these questions back to committee, that is to say putting the whole business off to the Greek kalends! But the workers — and they will have no choice inevitably — and their unions will see in this further reasons to unite and to take action in each country and throughout the Community to obtain new progress and a harmonization of social legislation to their advantage; as far as we are concerned, we are, and shall remain, by their sides.

President. — I call Sir David Nicolson.

Sir David Nicolson. — Mr President, let me start by saying that I am sure that this motion is not merely an employer's stratagem, as one earlier speaker suggested, but one which raises very broad issues that those of us who are concerned with management in industry understand fully. We accept that solutions are needed in our industrial relations policies in many areas. I should personally like to see an industrial charter for Europe, which I consider a desirable and urgent objective. If nothing else, I am sure it would contribute to well-being and to economic convergence, which is, after all, one of the objectives of the Treaty of Rome.

But I think we have to remember that social legislation includes not only fringe benefits, but also things like profit sharing, although I know that some among us perhaps do not believe in profits. However, I believe that this is an area for participation in the design and administration of systems within a harmonized framework, but that we have to consider the form

Nicolson

of participation. This leads us to the question of setting up proper works councils in industry and deciding what the membership of these councils should be, as well as the methods of election and the means of ensuring that ballots will be conducted in a democratic way. I think it also leads us into considering the methods of approaching proper labour contracts and also differentials policies.

Many of us really want a social market economy, the aims of which I interpret as being, firstly to create wealth, and then to use that wealth to benefit the creators in a broad sense. This is therefore a proper area for study on a Community basis, and I believe it is vital also to the creation of a true common market. It affects employment and prosperity, and we must try to concentrate on practical issues like this in this Parliament and show that we can make a contribution to progress. So, Mr President, I agree that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment should analyse this situation fully, provided that this is done on a broad basis and in conjunction with the Economic and Social Committee.

President. — I call Mr Caborn.

Mr Caborn. — The wording of the oral question, I believe, needs some clarification, particularly as far as the United Kingdom is concerned, because it refers to social legislation and industrial relations. This could be a difference of interpretation, but I do not think that is the case, as I have checked it against the French text. Industrial relations is singled out in paragraph 1 as a possible cause of unequal competition. The question then goes on to say:

One of the obvious obstacles to real European integration is the often considerable disparity in the legal provisions on labour relations between the various Member States.

I would submit to this Assembly that industrial relations in all of our countries are symptomatic of the state of any one country at any given time. The labour organizations, the trade unions, are a defensive mechanism. If the author of the question thinks he can deal with the trade unions through European harmonization of labour laws, then his understanding of labour is very naïve — at least as far as this question is concerned.

The Commissioner in his statement dealt in the main with the social legislation. On the area of industrial relations he gave a warning: equal competition should not be the criterion on which to base a discussion or investigation of industrial relations. Passing laws on industrial relations is not like passing laws on lawnmowers, where you finish up with one or two uniform products which perform according to the operator's wishes. Even though I believe there are Members in this Assembly who would like to have labour as uniform and disciplined as lawnmowers, this can never be the case. Lawnmowers are a product; in

labour relations, you are dealing with people. Labour has to be consulted, and through consultation cooperation is developed.

George Woodcock, a past General Secretary of the British Trades Union Congress, once said when asked a question on labour and industrial relations: 'Industrial relations are like a marriage between a man and a woman, a very finely balanced mechanism, and whilst they work within a broad legal framework, the main ingredients to a lasting relationship are based on cooperation, credibility and integrity'. And he went on to say that these relationships should not be taken to legal courts when difficulties arise, because the interpretation of laws by the judge cannot pass down like findings 'Thou shalt cooperate!'. 'Thou shalt have credibility!'. 'Thou shalt have integrity!' This might be hard for some people in this Assembly to understand, but having arrived in this European Parliament straight from the workshop floor, I can assure you that the words of George Woodcock are correct.

I think the attitude of some Members of this Assembly — in fact the majority — to my colleague, Mr Didò's motion for a resolution for an urgent debate on the 35-hour week, was nothing less than scandalous. Many workers have been taking action throughout Europe on the question of the 35-hour week. In my own country, the engineers have just been out for some nine weeks of industrial dispute in trying to achieve a 35-hour week. Not for themselves alone — we have six million people unemployed in this Community, and the trade unions believe it is their job, on the social front, to provide those people with work, so that they can bring their families up with integrity and dignity. That we believe, is a valid role of the trade union movement.

The resolution that Mr Didò proposed to the House called for objective guidelines to be set for the gradual introduction of suitable measures, taking the conditions in each sector and country into account. But the very people who voted that down now wish to appear as the champions of working people. I would warn this Assembly that the direction in which it is now pointing is one of considerable danger. The British Tories can bear witness to that if they reflect on the defeat of their last Tory government, when Mr Heath, their leader, stood on high and announced legislation on what was good for the trade unions. This ended up with the United Kingdom working a three-day week and the fall of that government.

No! Labour relations are not the cause of the problem. Whilst a lot can be achieved on the social side — on education, on communications, and, indeed, on new structures, as far as some of the country's trade unions are concerned — the cause, as I said earlier, lies with the economic situation in any country, with, for example, the power of the multina-

Caborn

tionals. With six million people unemployed, how do we deal with the new technology? The trade unions are basically a defensive mechanism, and they will therefore protect jobs unless the social programme is correct. Look at the investment policies which are throwing workers out of employment! Look at youth unemployment! These unemployed youngsters are the sons and daughters of trade unionists, and they want to see a job! I submit therefore that when the Economic and Social Committee is considering this question, it should not get involved in the inner workings of trade unions. That has brought disastrous results in the UK, and who knows but that in two years' time the Tory government that is again proposing restrictive legislation in the UK could well suffer the same fate as the Heath government did in 1974.

President. — I call Mr Vetter.

Mr Vetter. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have all had more or less direct experience of how little faith significant sections of the population and the workers of our countries have in the creation of a united Europe. One of the fundamental reasons for this situation, which we must overcome together, is the undeniable fact that the social and political instruments of this Community are quite significantly underdeveloped. The reduction of the deficit in the field of social policy is an indispensable precondition for making our Community an economic and social community. The trouble is that the policies of the Commission and the member governments have done nothing to bring us any closer to achieving this goal in recent years, in spite of the fact that heads of state and heads of government were very prompt in making declarations in support of a European social union and although the EEC Treaty provides a perfectly solid legal basis for such a union.

The practice of this Community is pre-eminently to pursue a common social policy only when it suits the needs of competition and commercial policy. And this point of view is also reflected in the motion for a resolution put forward by Mr Pininfarina. He takes economic problems in particular as a pretext to bring forward the question of harmonizing social legislation.

I am incapable of following this liberal logic. The starting point of European social policy is the living and working conditions of the people in our member countries and it is high time that economic and social policy were given equal status.

At the same time, I was very pleased to hear what Mr Vredeling had to say on this matter.

I should like to call upon the Commission and the Council to put before this House without any further delay the outlines of a European social policy which

would be in accordance with the treaties and which would pave the way to a just and progressive European social order, a policy which would answer the interests and needs of the people, that is to say the development of a Community policy in the field of employment, vocational training, improvement of living and working conditions and social security, with participation of the workers in company bodies.

Let me, in conclusion, add one more thing. I hope that in these fundamental questions of social policy this House will succeed, by overcoming group and party barriers, in promoting real social progress, without which it is impossible for the workers in the Community countries to show this Parliament the confidence we all need to build the Europe that is now taking shape.

President. — I call Mr Petronio.

Mr Petronio. — (*I*) Mr President, I listened to Mr Vredeling's answer to Mr Pininfarina's question, and noted that it pretty well separated the social aspect from the economic aspect which Mr Pininfarina was calling into question. Commissioner Vredeling said that the problems we are discussing here today were still in their initial stages, in their infancy, because although the Treaty of Rome contains many splendid words and fine affirmations on the subject, we know that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. Moreover, he said that the national governments were loath to say much on this topic. You will therefore appreciate that, if we wish to tackle this problem — at whatever institutional level — we shall be starting from next to nothing, and the problem, as a consequence, will not be easy to solve. Perhaps we shall not even be able to define it clearly. Some people say, in fact, that the problem is of a social nature and that it must be looked at from a point of view somewhere between the humanitarian and that of the welfare state; others maintain that the problem is peculiarly economic in nature. I fully agree with Mr de Goede, when he says that not only the Social Affairs Committee should look into this question, but also the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs — but not with the aim of having a dispute between trade unionists, economists and monetarists, otherwise we risk conjuring up the shades of Keynes or Milton Friedman, and we would spend months, or even years, discussing insoluble problems. It would seem that the destiny of man is to be continually posing himself problems, which in turn give rise to other problems, so that each time he tries to extricate himself he finds himself all the more bogged down in them, all the while ignorant of the fact that his destiny is to remain perpetually entangled in these problems.

Petronio

In our opinion the parliamentary committees — which will have to deal with this problem on the basis of facts and not hearsay — will need to have at their disposal comparable data and figures, since Europe does not at the moment have any such statistics. Archimedes said 'give me a lever and I shall move the world'. If we had precise data and figures relating to productivity, the cost of social charges in the individual countries, as a general average, both within the Community and as compared with other countries, such as the United States and Japan, we could begin to tackle the job. But, just as in historical research it is vital to quote one's sources and prove their authenticity, so in economic statistics, data and percentages must be verifiable, must be real and must be concrete. When we speak of increases in the cost of living, or of reductions or increases in productivity, we must be certain of what we are quoting, we must quote the source, and the source must be reliable and authoritative, otherwise we shall only be dabbling in economic philosophy, or in abstract economics, or in comparative European or international economic philosophy, but we shall not be getting to the root of the problem.

From one point of view Italy is undoubtedly socially very far advanced, but this does not mean that social legislation in Germany is backward. Germany, for example, manages to have an efficient public service, whilst in Italy, on the other hand, public administration is totally inefficient. A national economy is not just a question of factories and workers, it is also affected by the time that is wasted because the traffic does not work smoothly in the cities, in the streets, on the railways and in the air. A healthy economy depends on the efficiency of the postal and telegraphic services; a healthy economy depends on reliable information from the mass media. In the modern world an economy cannot function on the self-sufficient manorial system, as it did in the Middle Ages, but is bound up with a vast number of technological factors. It is therefore beyond doubt that these data, these facets of the huge social problem in Europe, must be debated in the appropriate fora. For our part, we hope that it may be possible to proceed, but in the meantime, speaking now in general terms, we do not agree with the notion that inflation must be fought at the cost of the workers, or that industrialists should be favoured at the cost of the workers, or that industrialists should be impoverished in favour of any other group whatsoever. We are broadly in favour of the idea of co-management, in contrast to the pernicious theory of class struggle and permanent conflict, which threatens to undermine relations within Europe and sap Europe's strength and defences *vis-à-vis* the United States and Japan.

President. — I call Mrs Hoffmann.

Mrs Hoffmann. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the question of harmonizing social legislation raises a fundamental problem.

In a Europe plagued by unemployment it is very evident to us French Communists and allies that what those political forces which would like to equalize competition between enterprises really want is a levelling down of social legislation. Moreover, it is evident that in the social policy section of the budget which has been put before us the whole business is doomed from the start, since the projections which have been made have been made on the basis of unchanged legislation.

We cannot accept such an approach and we said so from the beginning. I wish to say again without any equivocation that our group will not accept that our factories should be dismantled, our villages emptied, our schools closed, nature despoiled and our young people plunged into despair for the sake of serving the interests of the multinational corporations. We refuse this in the name of the millions of men and women deprived of employment, in the name of the homes where privation and poverty are permanent guests, in which life gets harder and harder because wages cannot keep up with prices.

We do not accept this policy because, so far from being a remedy, it helps to aggravate the economic and social situation. We are very much afraid that enlarging the Community to include Greece, Spain and Portugal, countries which have only just emerged from decades of fascism, will be a historical setback for the progress so far achieved through the struggles waged by the peoples of the other countries of Europe. The truth is that the European integration which you are seeking here is the harmonization and levelling down of our social legislation. Be sure that we shall oppose any Malthusian visions, along with all those who, throughout France, are caught up today in the struggle to survive, in the struggle against the policy of austerity and erosion of the quality of life which is practised by the government and the French bosses.

The truth is that you lack the political will necessary to see that the commitment undertaken by the Community to harmonize social legislation up to the most favourable level to be found in the different states is respected. If you did have this political will, you would despatch recommendations to the various national governments. We, for our part, are in favour of the immediate and effective implementation of these commitments, particularly with regard to employment, wages and salaries, equal pay for men and women, pension rights, social security benefits, working hours and conditions, the introduction of the 35-hour week, and trade union and political rights.

Hoffmann

We want to see an end put to all forms of discrimination based upon age and sex, we also want to see migrant workers and those from the French overseas departments and territories, guaranteed equal pay for equal work, as well as the full range of rights in the social field, for example the right to unemployment benefit. We must also see to it that frontier workers are ensured all the social rights obtaining in their home countries and that they are guaranteed an upward harmonization of social security benefits through a common system of European financing. We must also see that equal rights for men and women as regards work, training and promotion guaranteed and that the principle 'equal pay for equal work' is applied, as recognized by the Treaty of Rome. Finally, it is indispensable that everything that has been achieved in the field of social security benefits, maternity leave and general legislation to promote the emancipation of women should be harmonized upwards.

This will be the trend of our activities, which will be aimed at seeing that the Assembly commits itself to respecting those obligations concerning social legislation which were entered into when the Community was set up.

President. — I call Mr Vergès.

Mr Vergès. — (*F*) Mr President, my contribution to this debate on the harmonization of social legislation in the Member States of the Community will be short and simple.

The islands of Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion, as well as Guyana, have been French departments since 1946, that is to say for more than 33 years. Because of this these territories have been considered as belonging to the Community since the Treaty of Rome, that is to say for more than 20 years. Now it so happens that last week workers in agriculture, industry and commerce on the one hand, and public servants on the other, took part almost in their totality in strikes in the islands of Reunion and Martinique and organized in demonstrations in the capitals of these islands. The same thing happened the day before yesterday in the island of Guadeloupe. The trade union organization which represents all the trade unions in the island of Reunion has called another general strike for tomorrow, Friday, and this time the unions representing agricultural workers and other trades and professions have been asked to take part along with student and youth organizations, etc.

Tomorrow the island of Reunion will be in a very real sense a dead island.

What is the first demand motivating this unprecedented wave of strikes in this country? It is the extension to the overseas departments of the system of

unemployment benefit which exists in the other departments of France, because in these curious French overseas departments, where unemployment is endemic, there is no system of unemployment pay. Such an extension has always been promised, but this promise has never been kept. Now it happens that a French law, dated 16 January 1979, stipulates that these measures should be compulsorily extended to cover the overseas departments within 10 months of the promulgation of this said law, that is to say, before 16 November, in exactly three weeks. All the evidence suggests that once more this promise, though it is the direct result of a law, will not be kept. This goes a long way towards explaining the unprecedented movement in which almost all the workers are now joining in response to the appeal launched by all the trade unions, with the total support of the press, the political parties and even the employer organizations.

This being the case, the discussion which has taken place here with regard to harmonizing social legislation in the member countries of the Community cannot but appear derisory to the 100 000 unemployed, as also to all the workers in our countries which belong to the Community. They will be justified in feeling frustrated, bitter and angry after all the fine speeches which have been made to them about Europe. I thought it right and proper that this Assembly should be informed of this.

President. — I call Mr Vredeling.

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (*NL*) Mr President, I should like to take this opportunity to quote a few statistics in reply to the comments and questions from Mr Petronio, Mrs Chouraqui and Mr Vernimmen, who particularly requested certain figures on social security and the financing thereof. Here are my statistics, which I think you will agree are quite significant.

In the EEC, we spend 25 % of our gross national income on what is known as social security. That figure is fairly constant. Mr Frischmann claimed that social expenditure as a proportion of gross national income was in decline. That is to some extent true, inasmuch as the proportion of GNP devoted to social expenditure is expected to fall very slightly from 25.4 % in 1977 to 25 % in 1980. However, for France — where Mr Frischmann himself comes from — the proportion is expected to rise from 23.9 % in 1977 to an estimated 25.5 % in 1980. I am afraid that this increase in France does not quite fit in with Mr Frischmann's line of reasoning, but it is nevertheless a fact, and as such deserves to be stated.

As far as the other figures are concerned, I must say that social security expenditure as a proportion of gross national income varies enormously from country

Vredeling

to country. For instance, Ireland spends 18.2 % of its gross national income on social security, as compared with the Netherlands' 31 %. It is against this background that we must view the question of harmonization. Statistics can sometimes be quite interesting; here is another interesting one. Some 36.7 % of social security expenditure within the Community is financed by the various national governments, the remainder of the finance coming from employers, employees and miscellaneous sources. This average figure of 36.7 % is distilled from a range beginning at 26.7 % for Italy and rising to 87.1 % for Denmark. That is the historical background to today's debate. The problem in talking about harmonization and standardization is reflected in the differences in the proportion of gross national income on the one hand, and the widely varying levels of government intervention on the other. The importance I attached in my reply to Mr Pininfarina's central point that we need social harmonization to prevent distortion of competition has been echoed by a number of Members, and I think that the point is a valid one. I even heard the same view expressed by Sir David Nicolson, who said, in rather more measured terms, that we should not aim for social harmonization merely as a means of harmonizing competitive conditions.

Mr Calvez said that the Commission should give details of the differences between the situations and systems used in the various Member States. I should like to refer you here to a study we published and submitted to the European Parliament, and which bears the misleading title of Social Budget. The title is misleading because the document amounts not so much to a social budget as to multiannual estimates of social expenditure in the various Member States of the Community. These estimates can be used to deduce trends and make forecasts of developments, assuming no change in current policy. In other words, it is not a policy document as such, although the hard facts it contains may be used to draw certain policy conclusions.

I would commend the document to this House's attention. You have all received copies of it, and additional copies have been sent, as always to the Economic and Social Committee, which will be producing a report on it. That is something the old Parliament always used to do, and I think you would be well advised to use this study as a basis for our debates. Of course, the document could also be subjected to the scrutiny of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

We have heard a number of suggestions in the course of this debate, such as Mr Calvez's point about trials involving a shorter working week. At least, I think that is what he was getting at. Trials or experiments are currently in progress in a number of sectors in the Community to assess the possible consequences of a

shorter working week. Some of them might warrant financial assistance from the Community. Unfortunately, I understand that your Committee on Budgets has seen fit to relegate this item to only a token entry. May I take this opportunity to sneak in an appeal to the whole House to redress the Committee's mistake. This appeal comes to you on behalf of my colleague Mr Davignon, who has the unenviable task of pursuing a structural policy for the steel industry without the aid of any special social measures. The Commission has said that this is an impossible task. I realise that I am going beyond my terms of reference here that I am overstepping the mark somewhat, but I can assure this House of every assistance in putting right these apparent misunderstandings, and the only way we can do this is via the EEC Budget.

I beg your pardon for digressing to make what amounts to a political statement. Getting back to my original point, I would say to Mrs Chouraqui that I have really already answered her question by the figures I have just given you on the extent to which social security is government-financed. While I am on this point, I would draw your attention to an interesting development which is currently supported in the Federal Republic of Germany; at least that is what I gather particularly from public statements made here and there by the Federal German Minister of Social Affairs, Mr Eherenberg. He would seem to be in favour of financing social security to a greater extent on the basis of the added value of the goods produced by undertakings rather than of the number of people employed in the undertakings. That is an extremely interesting suggestion, and a similar suggestion has come from the French Commissioner for National Planning. The matter has also been occasionally discussed in the Netherlands. At any rate, a change in the system of financing social security is under discussion.

A number of Members have rightly pointed out that expenditure on social security and in particular on health — for instance, hospital costs — is in danger of going through the roof in certain countries, with **the result that financing is becoming an increasingly serious problem in its own right.** Social security costs differ markedly from one Member State to another, but in most of the Member States they are borne by the undertakings. If these costs are then linked to the number of people employed, they tend to weigh too heavily on those undertakings which would like to take on more workers or those which wish to use labour-intensive production methods. At any rate, they tend to act as an obstacle to the creation of new jobs or the retention of existing ones. This must also be viewed against the background of the forecast of poor economic growth and the problems anticipated in bringing about a return to full employment. In other words, it is a long-term problem which will still

Vredeling

confront us in the 1990s. That is why I was interested in the suggestion that the financing of social security in the Community should be harmonized. This would undoubtedly be a long-term project but, since the problem itself is of an enduring nature, the suggestion may well be a valid one.

Mrs Chouraqui made a number of other points as well. We are indeed currently engaged in drawing up a Community directive on worker participation — in other words, information and consultation — in the multinationals. That is included in this year's plan of work. It is a complex problem, and we may not quite manage to get everything done by December. We are incidentally, in close touch with my colleagues' departments on this question.

I must take issue with what Mrs Hammerich said, and you will hardly be surprised, given the name of the Danish political grouping she belongs to. Indeed, she describes herself as an anti-marketeer. A number of the things she said are simply not true. Of course it is impossible to pursue a social policy within the Community if the people directly affected are against it. For instance if the people in Southern Italy were to say that they wanted no help from the Community, it would be foolish indeed to try to force that help on them. The fact is, though, that the people of Southern Italy welcome Community help. I do not know if you have ever been in Sicily — I happen to have been there myself — but I am sure you would be surprised to see all the projects that are being financed from Community funds. You may then turn round and say that is something the Italian Government should have been doing. But that's not the point. At any rate, when one is there one can see for oneself the enormous amount of work that is being done with Community assistance and what the Community is doing for those very poor regions which, indeed, bear some of the hallmarks of developing countries. That is a great plus of our Community. Coming as you do from Denmark, Mrs Hammerich, you ought to appreciate that it is impossible to have all the benefits of the very significant exports of Danish dairy produce within the Community — some of which goes to Italy — while at the same time wanting to keep all your national achievements in the social field to yourself and not caring a fig about the social consequences in other countries. I realize I am doing you an injustice in putting it so starkly, but it is precisely because of my respect for you that I think it worth taking the trouble to challenge your assertions. Denmark leads the Community as far as its social security system is concerned — although I can say with some pride that it shares that position with my own country — but it is precisely for this reason that it should be the driving force behind attempts to extend that kind of system to cover the whole Community. Fortunately, a

number of Mrs Hammerich's compatriots are working with a will to this end, and I would include you particularly in this category, Mr President.

I must take issue with Mr De Goede's claim that what I said in my original statement was a smokescreen to conceal the fact that far too little had been done. Not at all, Mr De Goede: here you are well wide of the mark. In fact, I said quite explicitly that far too little had been done in the social field. He cited the example of the footwear industry. In answer to that I would say that while it is true that thousands of jobs in this industry have been lost in the Netherlands because of competition from Italy, in drawing your conclusions from these figures, Mr De Goede, you should not overlook the fact that there has been a commensurate increase in the number of jobs in Italy. I realize that you did not have time, in the five minutes allotted to you, to develop your argument fully. But if you want to harmonize working conditions and social security systems so as to prevent the movement of jobs from one country to another, you are barking up the wrong tree, because the aim of structural reorganization within the Community is precisely to shift jobs so as to get a more even spread. Redistribution of work is not something that concerns only one country; it is often a Community matter. Just take a look at the unemployment figures in a country like Ireland and compare them with those for the Federal Republic of Germany or the Netherlands.

Sir David Nicolson said that he saw social legislation as a contribution to progress. He rightly pointed to the economic constraints. The differences are indeed so great that we are limited by economic factors. But on the assumption that social harmonization will be a contribution to progress, and if we therefore conclude from this that there must be harmonization of social security, and that most progress has to be made in those countries where the figures are lowest, I can only go along with Sir David wholeheartedly.

There is one point I must put Mr Vetter right on. He said that the Treaty was an adequate basis for working towards a more fully developed social policy, whereas I said that the Treaty was only a fragile foundation. What I meant was that the wording of the relevant Treaty provisions is rather deficient. It says only that the Commission shall have the task of promoting close cooperation in a variety of fields, but it does not say that the Council must come to a decision on proposals emanating from the Commission, as is the case, for example, with the Common Agricultural Policy. There is no such reference in the EEC Treaty. This is an annoying fact, but it does not mean that our hands are completely tied. We have submitted a number of proposals for directives in the field of labour law, for instance.

Vredeling

Let me remind you of our draft directive on the extension of the social security system for migrant workers to cover the self-employed and those not gainfully employed. Work on this project is still in progress, but the current situation is rather tricky, as one country objects to Article 235 being applied to this matter. The country concerned is the same one I mentioned a little earlier as also being against the extension of social security as such. It has every right to take this standpoint just as I have every right to oppose it. But, because of the requirement that decisions should be unanimous, this country can effectively hold up progress, and that is the situation we are in at the moment. So it is just not true that all the Member States accept the principle that Article 235 gives us the opportunity, if the Treaty has not provided the necessary powers, to take the appropriate measures, including measures of a social nature. Mr Vetter was quite right in saying that the legal basis is adequate in itself, but progress is being blocked by one Member State. Let us hope that this will be no more than a temporary obstacle, after all, hope springs eternal.

Mr President, I think I have dealt adequately with the points brought up by the various Members, and I should like to conclude with a general observation. This debate has resulted from an oral question tabled by Mr Pininfarina. I am grateful to him for tabling the question, but it would seem that, owing to a total misunderstanding, the Socialist Group's motion or a resolution will not be voted on, but will instead be referred to the relevant committee. I must say that I believe this to be a blessing in disguise in that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment will now have the opportunity to prepare a rather better debate than today's incidental debate on the extremely important question of the social security of the people of the Community.

President. — I call Mr Pininfarina.

Mr Pininfarina. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like first of all to thank Mr Vredeling for his detailed exposition and for the sympathy which he showed on Tuesday evening, and which he repeated a short while ago, with regard to my question.

Over and above the information which I asked for and which has been given me, I am certain that the Commission appreciated the constructive spirit behind my question. The constructive aspect of this question was the desire to free the business of harmonizing social policies from the dead hand of the Council of Ministers — as the Commissioner could not forebear to point out — and also to free it from the rivalry of the two sides of industry and, ultimately, from the psychological, practical and political difficulties which from the moment the treaties were

drawn up, have prevented the Community institutions from getting properly to grips with this problem.

As a member of this directly elected Parliament, I am of the opinion that, quite apart from the attempts that have already been made, it is the job of this new Parliament to take up this matter beginning, if necessary, right at the beginning and, above all else, claiming a central role in the process. Of course, this power of initiative must be exercised in collaboration with the Commission and with the Economic and Social Committee. I can concur with the objection put forward by Commissioner Vredeling, to the effect that the complexity of the questions I have raised is not just a matter of competition between companies. Nevertheless I insist first and foremost on the attention we must give to creating equality of opportunity for all European citizens.

But this does not mean forgetting altogether the problems raised by the laws governing competition, which cannot be violated beyond a certain point, if we are to avoid threatening the very survival of the companies in question and, consequently, the livelihoods of millions of workers. This is why I emphasized the importance of the overall efficiency of the Community economic system, which every day has to face the challenge of the non-Community economies — and in particular the North American and Japanese economies — which, for their part, are not hampered by a lack of internal harmonization, as we are.

As my speaking time is very short, I shall try to conclude rapidly, in order to avoid disagreements with those Member who have spoken in this debate and to whom I offer my thanks for the important contribution they have made — both positively and negatively — to the analysis and consideration of this problem. In general, the reaction has been positive, because everyone has admitted that the problem is important, urgent and in need of being dealt with in this Parliament. One member did say the very opposite, but I think that she is simply anti-European.

I should just like to clarify something arising from what Mr Didò said in his speech and, to a lesser extent, from what Mr Puletti said in his. In particular, the fact that I quoted legislative measures in my speech which highlighted the disparities existing amongst the member countries, perhaps led people to assume that I wished to abolish these laws, whereas this was never my intention. A propos this, I should like to quote two sentences from the speech I made on Tuesday evening, particularly because I am convinced that, at that time, many people did not listen to me and only got up to speak because I am a liberal and an entrepreneur — in other words, mainly for ideological motives. I quote :

The objective should be to take the laws and regulations in the State where they have produced the best results at the least cost and apply them in all the States.

Pininfarina

And then, further on, at the end of my speech, I say :

But the House must first of all undertake a thorough and well-reasoned investigation into the subject with the help of the social partners. A contribution from them which relates to their respective spheres of authority is, in my view, essential, and the same applies to the Economic and Social Committee.

I am therefore sorry to have been somewhat misunderstood. On the other hand I should like to thank Mr Ceravolo, of the Italian Communist Party, who to some extent did show openness of mind and a modicum of understanding. Of course, he criticized me for tackling the problem the wrong way round. It is in the nature of things that a Communist should criticize a Liberal, but what I regretted was that he should have said that I had considered this matter from the point of view of an Italian and an entrepreneur in other words that the entrepreneur had got the better of the politician. The honest truth is that I was trying to do the opposite, that is to say, to speak as a Liberal and as a European, and not as an entrepreneur or as an Italian. I also wish to thank those Members who gave me their support and, amongst these, the Member who pointed out the need for a common industrial charter for Europe. In short, it seems to me that the problem — because of its nature and implications and because of its great importance in the lives of the people of Europe — is worthy of the attention and the work of our Parliament.

I deliberately avoided entering into a discussion on the merits of this or that particular measure, particularly as it would not have seemed right to me to claim both to get to the bottom of this huge problem in this brief debate and to indicate the solutions to it.

In conclusion, I believe that the Parliament — at the end of this debate — must take the view that it is not only important that this matter should be given detailed consideration, but that the need is also pressing and that the Committee for Social Affairs should be made responsible for the matter, so that, by obtaining information from all possible sources, it may finally report back to this Assembly for the purpose of those decisions which the Assembly considers appropriate to take.

I am glad that the Parliament considered it appropriate to emphasize by the vote it took a short while ago the urgency of getting down to a detailed study of this matter. As I recommended in the motion for a resolution which I submitted, and I hope that this afternoon's vote will confirm this attitude, because it is important that the matter should arrive in committee with the authoritative backing of a vote which emphasizes the present unsatisfactory state of harmonization of social policy.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote on the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-413/79 rev.) will be taken this afternoon during voting time.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, the meeting of the chairmen of the political groups and the agenda which we originally approved provided for a *great* debate, by the *great* European Parliament, motivated by *generous* sentiments with regard to world hunger and, as a concession to some of the sanctimonious elements amongst us, the majority parties agreed to devote seven hours to this debate. Subsequently, the use and the abuse of the principle of urgent debate has taken away with one hand what was given with the other. Such is the obstructionism of the majority in this Parliament with regard to the major European matters which we must deal with.

This is frankly disgusting, Mr President! We shall start to make use of the seven hours allocated to us at half past four in the afternoon and we shall only get round to the debate at ten o'clock this evening. I do not know whether this is a procedural motion, but I say that if this is the 'order' which you wish to give to this Parliament, it is a disorder for which we shall all pay and, Mr President, the insensitivity of the majority, which in this way suddenly manages to impose two or three hours of debate on us on the theme of the harmonization of social legislation in our countries and does not even get round to beginning in a worthy manner, Mr President, a discussion on the death of 60 million persons — 25 thousand of whom will have died this morning — and at the same time showed no wish to discuss this matter, is frankly nauseating. And now by all means go ahead and vote at 3-45, because you have not got a quorum!

Is this the way the Parliament defends itself against its non-aligned members? Is this the way the Parliament defends itself against one particular group? Carry on defending yourselves in this way and, if the people of Europe have a chance to speak their mind, either you will be swept away or your entire Parliament will be swept away!

President. — If you had not spoken, we should already have started the debate on world hunger.

7. World hunger

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-393/79) tabled by the Committee on Development and Cooperation on world hunger.

I call Miss Flesch.

Miss Flesch. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the problems of world hunger, which we are discussing today, is undoubtedly a most pressing and tragic one. However, Mr President, in my speech I wish to concentrate almost exclusively on questions of procedure, first of all because of the restrictions which the Committee on Development and Cooperation has

Flesch

voluntarily imposed upon itself at this stage in order to make today's debate possible and secondly because I feel this procedural information is necessary in view of certain misunderstandings there appear to have been, which have given rise to press releases or other declarations.

May I recall that at its September 1979 part-session, the European Parliament referred four motions for resolutions on the problem of world hunger to the Committee of which I have the honour of being chairman. These were :

- the motion for a resolution on world hunger submitted by Mrs Bonino and others with a request for urgent debate, pursuant to Article 14 of the Rules of Procedure ;
- the motion for a resolution on world hunger submitted by Mr Klepsch and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, pursuant to Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure ;
- the motion for a resolution on world hunger by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, pursuant to Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure ; and finally,
- a motion for a resolution on world hunger submitted by Mr Pajetta and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, pursuant to Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure.

I take it that, if certain other groups did not follow the welcome initiative of Mrs Bonino and Mr Pannella in submitting a draft motion for a resolution, this was not for want of interest in this problem but probably because they thought that was in the best interests of Parliamentary efficiency.

In any event, in view of the discussions which have taken place in Committee, I am convinced that this in no way reflects a lack of interest by these groups in the grave problem which concerns us today.

The Committee on Development discussed these motions at its meeting on 1 and 2 October 1979. After a long debate, it was decided that the representatives of the four groups which had submitted motions for a resolution should meet to try and draft a common text to be used as a basis for our discussions at the October part-session.

Mr President, I should like to digress here a little and point out that in the motion for a resolution put forward by Mr Klepsch and others on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples' Party we were asked, for example, to examine the problem of world hunger and to prepare specific proposals to tackle it so that Parliament could discuss these at its October part-session, that is within barely three weeks. You will not be surprised to hear that to its great regret the Committee on Development and Cooperation was

unable to comply with this request. Indeed, we have found that the task entrusted to us by the European Parliament is an extremely difficult and delicate one and that thorough preparation is needed before proposing measures with a chance of being concrete and making a real contribution to improving the situation.

The representatives of the political groups which tabled these four motions for resolutions, namely Mr Pannella on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and defence of Independent Groups and Members, Mr Wawrzik on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples' Party, Mrs Focke on behalf of the Socialist Group and Mr Bonaccini on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, met in Luxembourg on Tuesday 9 October, and I should like to take this opportunity of thanking them again for their efforts. Indeed, they succeeded in agreeing on a single text, intended rather as a provisional version, which had the great merit of being concise and to the point.

At its meeting in Luxembourg, on Wednesday 10 October the Committee on Development and Cooperation discussed this preliminary draft motion for a resolution and adopted it unanimously after incorporating three amendments put forward by our chairman Mr Bersani on behalf of the European Peoples Party. Since then, Mrs Poirier and Mr Pannella have made it known to the Secretariat that they did not vote in favour of the motion for a resolution but abstained. I have therefore asked the Secretariat to transcribe the tape of this meeting. It emerges from this transcript that the Committee reached a concensus at the end of its discussions, so that it was not necessary, as is often the case in our Parliamentary committees, to have a vote by show of hands. To avoid any misunderstanding, Mr President, allow me to read the transcript of what I said as chairman of the Committee :

Is the Committee willing to agree on the motion for a resolution together with the three amendments tabled by Mr Bersani, which will of course be subject to the appropriate linguistic and editorial changes? It is understood that further suggestions for changes, improvements and amendments may be made at the plenary session. Can we take this to be agreed? (*Silence*)

Thank you.

After the vote, on 10 October, Mr Pannella informed us that for technical reasons he would maintain his motion for a resolution on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, in particular because he considered it

intolerable and inadmissible that the President of the European Parliament already had announced that she would propose the Article 28 of the Rules of Procedure should apply for this debate.

Flesch

Consequently Mr Pannella announced that he would maintain his motion for a resolution so that he could speak at greater length in the debate. If Mr Pannella's motion is not before us today, this is perhaps because he did not think it necessary to submit it again. In any event, at the meeting of the Committee on Development and Cooperation held yesterday evening, on Wednesday 24 October, Mr Pannella raised this issue again. Unfortunately, he was unable to attend the debate on the issue which he himself had brought up. On this occasion I presented to the Committee the facts which I have just outlined to Parliament, and the members of the Committee who were present did not contradict these facts. Let me repeat, Mr President that the Committee on Development and Cooperation still has before it the four motions for resolutions which were referred to it, and that the motion for a resolution currently before Parliament in no way constitutes a report on this subject. This is also why the opinion of the Committee on External Economic Relations has not been attached to this motion. That was simply not possible from the point of view of procedure. If the Committee on External Economic Relations wish, this opinion is open to revision — there is still time to re-examine and revise it — and it will, of course, together with those of the other committees concerned, be attached to the report which the Committee on Development will eventually be submitting these four motions for resolutions.

As is clear from the motion for a resolution which I have the honour of presenting to the European Parliament today, the Committee on Development and Cooperation has confined itself to a few essential points: it plans, acting in concert with the other Parliamentary committees,

to take the initiative, as a matter of absolute priority, in proposing practical measures of food aid and financial and technical aid to agriculture and development and guaranteed food supplies not only for the developing countries but also for the world as a whole, and to submit a report to the European Parliament by February 1980 at the latest.

Parliament will then be able to express its views on specific measures, but I hope that the Commission, in particular Mr Cheysson, will be able, here and now, to indicate certain trends, certain lines of approach to this subject

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Development has submitted a motion for a resolution today in order to emphasize its concern with the grave problem of world hunger, realizing that we should use this opportunity of launching a broad public debate on this issue, to draw the attention of all those concerned — and this means all of us — to the fact that almost a quarter of the world's population is

suffering from starvation and that, in 1979 alone, 17 million children under the age of 5 in all 50 million people, are expected to starve to death. As chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation I have been asked to open this debate today. My task is obviously not at all the same as that of a rapporteur introducing a report to Parliament. This is why I have intentionally confined myself to these procedural points since I realize that the procedure adopted was somewhat unusual and may have confused and misled some Members. The Committee on Development and Cooperation has made an effort to limit itself to what it regards as the essentials. This of course in no way prevents any Member of the European Parliament or any Group, from proposing amendments to our motion for a resolution. This has always been the case, and in fact I see that this invitation has been taken up, since 25 amendments have already been tabled.

If the Committee on Development and Cooperation has not tabled any amendments itself, this is because it considered that, its text contained the essential points at this stage, and that sometimes one can err on the side of perfection.

President. — The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

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

*IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL***President**

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Madam President, you have already received from other Members one or more notes of complaint about the conduct of the proceedings this morning.

For my own part, at the end of this morning's sitting I was the witness and the victim of an incident which I definitely feel was a serious and distressing matter. The President pointedly refused to call a number of us, including Mr Schwartzberg and myself, although Miss Flesch had not yet finished her speech. Without further ado he suspended the sitting and said quite clearly for everyone to hear: 'If you want to talk, you can do so on your own'.

I have taken note of what happened, Madam President, and I hope that anyone who is too tired or who has no inclination to chair our sittings will refrain from doing so, for the sake of his own dignity and ours, and for that of Parliament.

President. — Mr Pannella, the President is entitled to suspend the sitting whenever he wants. If there was any specific incident, you may complain to the Bureau.

8. *Appointment of the Secretary-General of Parliament*

President. — I am pleased to announce that, pursuant to Rule 49 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau has appointed Mr Hans Joachim Opitz Secretary-General of the European Parliament. On behalf of everyone here, I offer him the most sincere congratulations and hope that he will be wholly successful in this important post.

(Applause)

I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Madam President, in view of the fact that there are not very many people back from lunch in the Parliament, may I take it upon myself to congratulate Mr Opitz, on behalf of my colleagues, on his appointment, and to assure him of our continued cooperation in the good work of this Parliament.

(Applause)

9. *Question Time*

President. — The next item is the third part of Question Time (Doc. 1-405/79). We continue with the questions addressed to the Commission.

At its author's request, Question No 4 is postponed until the next Question Time.

I call Mr Enright on a point of order.

Mr Enright. — Madam President, some of us have tried to ensure that the proceedings of this House go smoothly by not putting down questions when there is another question upon which we can put a supplementary. If questions are withdrawn unilaterally like that, it makes the work of this House quite impossible. I therefore protest most strongly. We have been trying to save time by doing this, and yet we find ourselves totally frustrated.

President. — I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — I merely wish, Madam President, to follow up the point of order from my colleague on my right, on which I believe other Members will also be speaking. Is there any way that you can allow this question to be answered by the Commission? It is very important to those of us with textile concerns in our constituencies, and we would like to hear what the Commissioner has to say about this particular question. I am just wondering if you would liberally interpret the rules to allow the Commission to comment on this.

President. — I call Mr Seal.

Mr Seal. — Madam President, I feel it is completely wrong for you to allow Mr Paisley to withdraw this question just because he has not got the time to attend this Assembly. Many of us have important textile interests, and this is a question that affects all of us. The Americans are subsidizing oil in their country and destroying part of our textile industry in the EEC. It is an important question, and as many of my colleagues have said, Madam President, we have refrained from putting down questions of our own because this one is already down. I feel that you should not allow this question to be deferred just because Mr Paisley cannot attend.

President. — I should like to remind you of paragraph 9 of the guidelines for the conduct of Question Time under Rule 47A of the Rules of Procedure which states that 'a question may be answered only if the questioner is present or has notified the President in writing, before Question Time begins, of the name of his substitute'.

I cannot therefore grant your request.

I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Roger. — Madam President, in the enlarged Bureau a request was made to Members and to chairmen of political groups, that Members should not waste the time of Parliament with unnecessary questions. I do feel that you, as President, ought to take this up as a matter of urgency, because when the enlarged Bureau considered the matter, this request was made and people like Mr Seal refrained from putting questions down specifically because there were equivalent matters down on the order-paper already: it is very unfair.

Mr Scott-Hopkins would, I am sure, concur with this, although we speak from opposite sides of the political spectrum. When Members see that a question is down and they come to hear the answer, this can be used as a device, Madam President, for preventing matters from being discussed. We could, of course, litter up the order paper, but as we are attempting to be orderly in conducting our business, I would crave your indulgence: there is one rule in the Rules of Procedure, Madam President, which gives you the authority to act in your capacity as President and allow the business. I think in this instance you should exercise your prerogative, and I appeal to you to do so because of our desisting from littering up the order-paper.

President. — Mr Rogers, I think we are wasting a lot of time. The Rules of Procedure are quite clear on this point: if the author is not present, the question is not called.

I call Mr Galland.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Madam President, I am in favour of following paragraph 9 of the guidelines for the conduct of Question Time of which you have reminded us. Yesterday, several related questions were taken together. The Members who have just spoken could have done the same today. Let us stick to our Rules of Procedure.

President. — I call Mr Lomas.

Mr Lomas. — Madam President, is it not the practice, when a Member is not able to be here to ask a question, that he gives you, as a courtesy, a reason for not being here? What is that reason in the case of Mr Paisley, and what is he doing if, as an elected Member of this Assembly who tabled a question, he has not even the courtesy to be here to ask it?

(*Applause*)

President. — We are not here to teach each other courtesy, but to apply the Rules.

At its author's request, Question No 5 is postponed to the next Question Time.

I call Question No 6 by Lord O'Hagan :

Will the Commission now withdraw its proposed tax on farmhouse cider?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The Commission communication of 26 June 1979 suggested compromise solutions to major problems relating to the proposed Council directives to harmonize the structures of consumer taxes other than that on beer, wine and alcohol. One result of these proposals, if adopted, is that fermented beverages of tariff heading 22.07, including cider, of an alcoholic strength greater than 6% would be subject to the table-wine rate. So far as the Commission is aware, this proposed lower limit gives rise to difficulties only in the United Kingdom and only in relation to a small proportion of the total cider production there. The problem is a limited one, particularly when compared with the very large issues that arise in relation to excise harmonization for all alcoholic drinks. However, the latest Commission proposals are by their nature pragmatic, and the Commission would certainly be prepared to consider alternative solutions which could lead to overall agreement.

Lord O'Hagan. — Is the Commissioner aware that while this may seem a limited problem to the Commission, if the Community introduces a discriminatory tax on farmhouse cider, it will lead to the biggest uprising in the West country since Monmouth's rebellion? Is the Commission aware that competition policy and attempts to harmonize taxation, when carried too far and brought to bear on local, regional beverages, which are not exported and are no threat of any sort whatsoever to the regularity

of the internal market, but have a very firm place in the affections of people of a particular region, will do nothing except damage the purposes for which the Commission exists? If the derogations specified within these proposals for France and Italy in respect of certain wines are allowed to continue, does not the Commission think it discriminatory that cider, and particularly farmhouse cider produced in one particular region of one particular country, should not also have a derogation for itself?

Mr Burke. — Since the Commission's proposals are a suggested compromise to a number of difficulties in a number of Member States, and given the fact that this particular matter was raised at a recent Council, I would indicate to the honourable Member that in the event of an overall solution it is likely that certain problems may be settled in relation to the issues he has raised. I would not necessarily hold out any hope in the situation. On the other hand it is not for me to make the decisions; it is for the Council of Ministers to do so.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 7 will receive a written reply.¹

Question No 8 will not be called as the subject concerned is already included on the agenda for the present part-session.

Since its author and his deputy, Mr Martinet, are absent, Question No 9 will receive a written reply.¹

I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso on a point of order.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (*F*) Madam President, may I act as deputy for this question?

President. — I am afraid that, as I pointed out a few moments ago, the President must be notified in writing of the deputy by the author of the question himself before the start of Question Time.

I call Question No 10 by Mr Adam :

Does the Commission consider that the supply of Community oil to South Africa, either directly or indirectly by means of exchange transactions, does nothing to relieve the Community dependence on oil imported from third countries?

I call Mr Brunner.

Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission. — (*D*) The amounts exported from the Community to South Africa are very small. No crude oil whatsoever is exported — only minuscule amounts, i.e. 77 000 tonnes per year of refined products. Furthermore, these figures have been dropping from year to year and reached their lowest level to date in 1979. These negligible amounts in no way affect relations between the European Community and the oil producing countries.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Adam. — I found the reply rather surprising. I would not have thought that the issue of the supply of oil to South Africa was a minor matter, however small the amount involved.

The fact is that we have a strategy within the Community of trying to reduce our dependence on imported oil from other sources. If any oil produced in the Community is going outside the Community, that is a matter of considerable importance in relation to that energy strategy. Could I ask the Commission if it would not agree that as far as possible all the oil produced within the Community should be used or sold within the Community, or at least within our partners in the International Energy Agency, and that the recent decision of the British Government to allow the sale of North Sea oil by BP to Conoco to enable that company to pass on oil to South Africa can only be condemned?

Mr Brunner. — (D) I repeat that there are no exports of crude oil to South Africa at all — only very small, and since 1979 steadily decreasing, amounts of refined products. These quantities are completely negligible. Moreover, these products do not come under the trade embargo, although the case of Rhodesia is different from South Africa. This is thus all above board, and there is no reason to make a political issue out of these negligible quantities — at least this is how the oil producing countries view the matter.

Mr Fernandez. — (F) Does the Commission intend to take action against BP, acting through CFP Total, for their infringements of the embargo on exports to Rhodesia-Zimbabwe, and the other multinational companies who give economic support to the racist regimes of Rhodesia and South Africa?

Mr Brunner. — (D) This is a matter for the governments and the countries in which these companies are based. As far as the Commission is aware, steps have already been taken.

President. — I call Question No 11 by Mrs Lizin:

Could the Commission indicate whether it is considering, in accordance with its powers and its rights of initiative, submitting an early proposal to the Council in the appropriate legal form, for a directive allocating targets for crude oil imports and consumption among the Member States within the framework of the global targets adopted both at Community level by the Strasbourg European Council and at international level through the commitments entered into by certain member countries of the Community at the Tokyo economic summit?

I call Mr Brunner.

Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission. — (D) The important thing in fixing energy-saving targets is the political determination to achieve them. On 26 September in Paris, we decided to lay down fixed

amounts for imports and were able to share these amounts out among the individual Member States. The Commission does not feel that the introduction of legislation on this matter would serve any useful purpose. Legislation could not have the necessary flexibility, as these energy-saving targets are all subject to short-term economic developments, nor would legislation achieve more than the determination of the governments.

Mr Lizin. — (F) I am not disputing the fact that we must rely on the determination of the Member States. What we are talking about today is the determination of the Commission to ensure that the targets fixed by common accord are respected. I should therefore like to ask the Commission what steps it intends to take if one of the Member States fails to respect the restrictions.

Mr Brunner. — (D) The Commission is constantly monitoring the situation in the Member States with regard to these targets and draws attention in good time to any unusual movements which could jeopardize the achievement of these targets. So far, we have found this close cooperation between the Commission and the Member States adequate to ensure that the targets fixed are achieved within the margins provided for.

President. — I call Question No 12 by Mrs Roudy:

Can the Commission say whether it is prepared to authorize distribution of the opinions of the Consumers' Consultative Committee as requested by that committee?

I call Mr Burke.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The Consumers' Consultative Committee is composed of twenty-five members appointed by the Commission on the basis of nominations made by four European organizations: the European Bureau of Consumers' Unions, the Committee of Family Organizations in the EC Euro coop and the European Trade Union Confederation.

Its statute is that of an advisory body to the Commission. Its role is to give the Commission an informed consumer view on policy issues, in respect of which the Commission asks its opinion, and to give the Commission reports on its own initiative on matters which it believes merit attention. The Commission provides the CCC's secretariat with meeting rooms and facilities for translation and interpretation. If the Commission were to publicise the CCC's opinions, the result would be tantamount to establishing a new representative organization, partly in competition with the Economic and Social Committee, which is established by the Treaty, and also partly in competition with the four organizations from whose nominees its members are chosen. For these reasons I do not

Burke

consider that it would be proper to publish the CCC's opinion.

Mrs Roudy.— (F) If I have understood the Commissioner correctly, he said that it would not be useful to publish the documents of the CCC. My second question is as follows: is this Consumers' Consultative Committee representative of the consumers? If it is representative of the consumers, there should be a means of communicating with the consumers, i.e. it should be able to publish its opinions. If it is not representative of the consumers, it clearly does not need to communicate with the consumers.

Mr Burke.— The first part of the supplementary, in which it is alleged that I said that the opinions were not useful, attributes to me something which I did not say. Therefore, the second part does not arise. Of course, in general, I regard the information given to the Commission as being useful, as indeed I regard the consultants' opinions in various aspects of Commission work as important and useful.

President.— Mrs Roudy, are you not satisfied with this answer?

Mrs Roudy.— (F) The answer was that this Committee was useful, whereas what I had asked was whether it was representative of the consumers.

President.— The Commission feels it has answered your question.

Mr Scott-Hopkins.— In the light of the reply we have just received and the work of the Economic and Social Committee, what is the value of the CCC, and why does he not abolish it?

Mr Burke.— I cannot agree with the honourable Member's opinion that this body, which has proved itself useful in consultation with the Commission, should be abolished. In fact, it follows on from the previous useful contacts we have had with the Contact Committee for Consumers in the 1960s. It has its own statute as an advisory body.

I think I have replied to the questions put by the honourable Member, Mrs Roudy, fully.

The Committee is, of course, representative of the four organizations, and if any one of those four organizations feels that its opinion is not being properly represented, it, as a separate organization is fully free to voice that opinion in public.

Mr Moreland.— Could it be that one of the reasons why the Commissioner does not wish to publish the reports is that this organization might be critical of some of the things his office does, and might say that

a number of the regulations and directives relating to consumer affairs are bureaucratic and unnecessary, as was, for example, put to him by my right honourable friend, the Minister for Consumer Affairs, from the United Kingdom?

Mr Burke.— The answer is in the negative, because normally the Consumers' Consultative Committee takes a view different from that expressed by the Minister in question, which I am glad to say was not representative of consumer opinion in the Community as a whole.

President.— Since its author is absent, Question No 13 will receive a written reply.¹

I call Question No 14 by Mr Sarre:

In view of the extremely serious deterioration in the situation in the shipbuilding and man-made fibres sectors, and given the rise in unemployment in both these industries, has the Commission no proposals to make other than the two proposals for decisions of 31 July 1979 concerning aid for restructuring, and does it not consider that any employment policy must entail a substantial reduction in weekly working hours, longer paid holidays, and the introduction of an extra team for shift work in these two sectors?

I call Mr Vredeling.

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission.— (NL) In May of this year, the Commission submitted a general communication on the redistribution of work to the Council, which held an initial discussion on it the same month. This discussion is to be continued on 22 November by the Council of Ministers of Employment and Social Affairs. This Communication dealt, *inter alia*, with the measures mentioned by the honourable Member and the possibility of implementing these measures on a sectoral basis. In the Commission's view, the sectors mentioned by the honourable Member, i.e. shipbuilding and man-made fibres, are among those in which measures of this kind could play a part in solving the employment problem, provided the two sides of industry and the governments see to it in their consultations that the competitive position of the sectors involved is not unnecessarily weakened as a result. The Commission intends in the near future to make proposals for certain supplementary social measures for the shipbuilding sector, including subsidies and financial aid for early retirement. In this connection, I should like to draw Parliament's attention to the discussion currently in progress in this Parliament itself on the 1980 budget, in which this is one of the issues.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Sarre. — (F) Could the Commissioner inform us at this stage of progress to date in the discussions between the various parties involved, as regards the shipbuilding or man-made fibres sectors?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) The precise state of affairs is that the Commission has submitted a proposal to the Council with a view to solving the difficulties in the shipbuilding sector. This proposal, of which I can only remember the English title, i.e. the scrap-and-build programme, draws attention to the need for accompanying social measures. This proposal is currently before the Council. The Commission is in contact with employers and employees. The Commission has received a request from the trade unions — I know this personally — not to delay in submitting the proposals for the social measures to the Council. We are continually in contact on this matter.

Mrs Demarch. — (F) What is the exact number of jobs which the Commission expects to be lost as a result of this new scrap-and-build programme?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I leave it to the honourable Member to decide for herself how she wishes to interpret what we have in mind, but I can inform her from memory that the aim of the scrap-and-build programme is to prevent the loss of 35 000 jobs.

Mr Enright. — It has been very interesting to hear the Commissioner upon man-made fibres, but is the Commission also aware of the fact that the natural wool-based textile industry in West Yorkshire is losing jobs at a considerable rate and that a large part of this is a result of United States penetration of this market and also of the fact that they are unfairly subsidized in energy terms, so that they benefit from unfair competition? Is he further aware that the loss of employment in textiles, whilst it may not be an enormous proportion of the total EEC job take-up, means for places like Batley and Leeds that there is up to 10% male unemployment and even higher female unemployment, and that much of that female unemployment is hidden? What steps does he therefore propose to take?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I can answer the honourable Member's question as follows: the problems of the textile sector as a whole, i.e. not only those of the man-made fibre industry, but also the wool-based textile industry mentioned by the honourable Member, are covered by the sectoral approach of the Commission. We, and Mr Davignon in particular, are working on these problems. As regards the accompanying social measures, a number of proposals have already been drawn up for the man-made fibres industry. The problems of the textiles sector as a whole are of such an order of magnitude that we will only be able to deal with them as part of general employment policy. As regards the honourable Member's specific question regarding certain parts of the United Kingdom, I might draw his attention to

the fact that the Social Fund devotes a great deal of attention and provides a considerable amount of aid to those very plans which relate to the United Kingdom, indeed to the very areas he mentioned, in the form of partial financing of retraining projects and financial aid, particularly to young persons in technical training. In addition, there are special projects for vocational training for women. I should like to draw the attention of the honourable Member to these possibilities since up now their existence has not been very widely known, and our budget in fact exceeds the applications we receive.

Mr Boyes. — In view of the fact that this question, No 14, deals with unemployment in the man-made fibres sector, and that in my constituency we have just lost a factory involving 2 000 jobs, which, as Mr Vredeling is probably aware, is not only a question of jobs but in my area means almost the death of a particular town, would the Commission be prepared to give us at this stage the answer it might have given to Mr Paisley on Question No 4, in view of the fact that that question is about protection for the textile industry in the UK?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) It is a little difficult for me to give an answer to the question by Mr Paisley which the President has just declared was out of order. This puts me in a rather awkward position and I am not quite sure what I should do.

Mr Boyes. — I'll put it specifically then. What steps has the Commission taken to safeguard the textile industry in the Community against polyester imports from the USA?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) Thank you for rephrasing your question and rescuing me from an embarrassing situation. The answer is to be found in our ongoing world-level talks on trade in this connection, particularly in the context of the multifibre arrangements. As you know, the difficulties in the textiles sector receive special attention under these arrangements. These talks are to be continued in the near future with a view to renewing this agreement.

President. — I call Mr Seal on a point of order.

(*Interruption by Mr Fernandez: 'Look to your left too!'*)

Mr Fernandez, I am not failing to look to my left. I have noted the requests to speak in the order in which they have been made, which is also the order in which speakers are called.

I noted that Mr Seal put his hand up well after the others to speak on a point of order — as, incidentally, he always does during Question Time.

Mr Seal. — Madam President, I accept that I always raise points of order during Question Time but that is because of the way you conduct Question Time. Now, may I ask, Madam President, what systematic procedure you use for selecting people to ask questions?

Seal

Because I have been advised by your staff that we must not put our names in, we must put our hands up; yet, Madam President, you seem to have some predetermined method of selecting questioners. Now I am sure, Madam President, that I am incorrect, but I should like you to reassure me that you do not do this, and that you pick out people at random.

President. — I never pick out people at random. The requests to speak are listed in the order in which they are made.

Mr Seal put his question after Mr Boyes. I called Mr Sarre, Mrs Demarch, Mr Enright and Mr Boyes who had raised their hands in that order before him. Mr Seal put his question afterwards, as has, I repeat, already happened on repeated occasions.

At its author's request, Question No 15 is postponed to the next Question Time.

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Madam President, you very properly made the point that you were taking people in the order in which they raise their hands to ask questions on Question 14. Now I was in my place to ask a supplementary to Question No 4. That was ruled out of order because Mr Paisley was not here in order to ask his question, as he should have been, if he had not arranged for a substitute. Another honourable Member has now been allowed to ask that precise question as a supplementary to Question 14. I would therefore respectfully submit that, although I have not asked for a supplementary question on No 14, I should be allowed to ask a question on the answer the Commissioner gave on Question 4.

President. — You should have put your question earlier. I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — Has the President got the right to ignore people who are raising points of order? (*Interjection by Mr Scott-Hopkins*)

Mr Scott-Hopkins, I don't know... Well, I shall deal with you in a moment.

(*Laughter*)

We are not worried about you lot over there: I mean, we know exactly what you represent and what you stand for. I am addressing my question to the President, not to Jim Scott-Hopkins.

Madam President, one of our friends from the left said you ignored people from that area, and you said that you never ignore people from the area. I stood up, shouted three times 'Point of order!' You ignored it completely and allowed Mrs Kellett-Bowman to stand up and make what was not a point of order but a speech and a contribution. I want to know whether these meetings are going to be conducted fairly or not?

President. — Mr Boyes, I should like to point out that I do not ignore the Members on that side of the Chamber.

I repeat, I called Mr Sarre, Mrs Demarch, Mr Enright and Mr Boyes. I think that reply is sufficient.

Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 16 and 17 will receive written replies.¹

Question No 18 will not be called as the subject concerned is already included on the agenda for the present part-session.

At its author's request, Question No 19 will be postponed until the next Question Time.

Since its author is absent, Question No 20 will receive a written reply.

I call Question No 21 by Mrs Ewing:

Is the Commission aware that a number of industrial plants in the Community are being closed by multinational corporations which have other plants in other countries where fiscal, environmental or other legislation may be more favourable to them, and that these closures cause unemployment and considerable hardship to those dismissed, and that one such closure, that of Corpach Mill in West Inverness-shire by Wiggins Teape may be imminent, and if so, what effective action is the Commission proposing to take in the immediate future on this matter, bearing in mind that the OECD has already a code of conduct for multinational corporations covering these matters agreed by its members, and that so far the European Communities' record in this field has been far from impressive?

Mr Vredeling, Vice President of the Commission. — (*NL*) The Commission is aware of the difficult situation in the Wiggins Teape paper factory in West Inverness-shire in Scotland. As far as the Commission is aware, Wiggins Teape does not intend to continue the same activities in a different country as implied by the question. As far as we know, the factory does not appear to be profitable and has no reasonable prospects. The talks between Wiggins Teape and other companies in the same sector are continuing with a view to finding a solution which is acceptable on economic and other grounds. There are no grounds for assuming that Wiggins Teape has infringed OECD or Community regulations as regards closure of this factory. The Community regulations regarding closure of factories are laid down in the EEC directive on mass dismissals. In view of these facts, and since this is a matter for the British Government, which is aware of the situation, the Commission does not feel that it is necessary to take steps. Naturally, the Commission will see to it that the relevant Community legislation is respected. As regards multinationals, I might add that the Commission, as announced earlier, intends to make a proposal to the Council as soon as possible for a directive on information and consultation of employees of these multinational companies.

¹ See Annex.

Mrs Ewing. — In my four years and more as a Member of this House, I have never been so disappointed or saddened by an answer: obviously, the Commissioner has believed information from one source without making adequate enquiries. Is he aware that this company has created a total social and economic dependency in the north-west Highlands in the haulage industry, the forestry industry, even the railway line, and that an entire dependent infrastructure has been created — schools, jobs, etc? Yet this company, a subsidiary of a very wealthy parent company, the British-American Tobacco Company, which is hardly short of a penny, although it is still making a very substantial overall profit on its paper and pulp, which until a very short time ago it regarded as a single entity, now proposes, because it is making a loss on the paper — which it always did and always accepted it would, having got favourable terms from the British Government to go there — to close this down, with social and economic ruin as a result? Am I to understand that the Commission draws no conclusions whatsoever from my question about the behaviour of multinationals, of which I have given a very factual account which I defy Wiggins Teape to quarrel with in any respect? And may I just reiterate that if that is the way that multinationals are going to be able to behave, it spells ill for the remote areas in this Community?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) In answer to this what I hesitate to call 'question' by the honourable Member — I had the impression that it was addressed more to the media than to me — I should like to point out that what the honourable Member said about the Commission's answer and the Commission being misinformed on this matter does not correspond with the facts in my possession. I am dependant on the information I obtain from the Commission departments, and if the honourable Member is trying to imply in her 'question' that the Commission regards this as a shining example of good behaviour on the part of a multinational, she has got completely the wrong end of the stick. I do not intend to pass any judgement on this matter, since I am not completely familiar with the facts, I should like to add that if a tenth of what the honourable Member has said is true, you can easily guess what view I take of the behaviour of a multinational of this kind.

Mr Marshall. — Would the Commissioner not agree that British-American Tobacco has acted with great responsibility and patience in seeking to have this particular plant put to other use, thereby protecting jobs as far as possible, and that it regarded closure as a last resort rather than the first alternative? They sought to provide additional employment rather than to create immediate unemployment.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) The responsibility in this matter lies firstly with the government of the country in question, i.e. the British Government and the British Parliament, and secondly with us.

Mr Harris. — As I was brought up in a small village in Devonshire which entirely depends, and has depended for many years, on a Wiggins Teape mill, would the Commissioner accept from me that, despite the remarks made by Mrs Ewing, the company in question, Wiggins Teape is a highly responsible company which puts employees' interests very high on its priorities? I would urge him not to accept everything that Mrs Ewing says in relation to this company.

Mrs Ewing. — Madam President, a Member of this House has suggested that my information is inaccurate. I think that is a serious abuse of parliamentary privilege. However, can I just assure this House that the accuracy of my information can be checked by anyone who would care to approach me.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) The Commission always bases its views on the most reliable possible information, including that received from Parliament. I have just received two conflicting reports, and who am I to say without looking into the matter further who is right?

President. — Question Time is closed.¹

10. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on the motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed.

I put to the vote the Pininfarina and Bangemann motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-413/79/rev.): *Harmonization of the Member States' policies on social legislation.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

11. World hunger (resumption)

President. — The next item is the resumption of the debate on the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-393/79) on world hunger.

I call Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul to present the opinion of the Committee on External Economic Relations.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, deputy draftsman of an opinion. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on External Economic Relations devoted its meeting on 5 October to the problem of hunger in the world and asked the President for permission to draft an opinion on the report

¹ See Annex.

² OJ C 289/79 of 19. 11. 1979.

Wieczorek-Zeul

and the motion for a resolution drawn up by the Committee on Development and Cooperation. The President gave her assent, and I was nominated by the Committee on External Economic Relations to draft this opinion, which was accepted by the committee at its meeting on 11 and 12 October, together with an amendment which will also be voted on here today. Because of the working methods adopted by the Committee on Development and Cooperation, it is impossible for our opinion to be presented here, although I have been asked by the chairman of the Committee to set out the opinion of the Committee on External Economic Relations and to request your support for my committee's amendments.

Why has the Committee on External Economic Relations taken up this problem, and why have we drafted an opinion and tabled amendments? Quite simply, ladies and gentlemen, because the problem of hunger in the world and the number of those dying of starvation are so appalling that we felt that we who are responsible for matters relating to the European Community's external trade and external economic relations had a moral and political duty to state our opinion and bring this vital question before the whole House.

The documents you have before you and the opinion of the Committee on External Economic Relations repeat the dreadful figures. In 1979, the year the United Nations has declared the Year of the Child, 17 million children in the countries of the Third World will die before our eyes. How can we bear to sit here doing nothing? Why is it that the press and the peoples of the European Community do not cry out in abhorrence at the terrible fate of these 17 million children? How can we call Europe civilized when we simply ignore the death and suffering of millions outside our own continent and simply move on to the next inconsequential item on our introverted political agenda? This is an intolerable situation, and — and this is my own personal opinion — many young people find it incomprehensible that we should be spending 2 000 million DM on armaments while at the same time tolerating all this suffering in the countries of the Third World.

(Applause)

The Committee on External Economic Relations therefore feels that it is up to the European Parliament to appeal to the consciences of people throughout the world so that we get some action, rather than just more resolutions. If we fail to take action in time, over 700 million people — and perhaps more than a thousand million — will be living in absolute poverty and misery by the end of this century.

Our opinion stresses, though, that hunger in the world is not an inescapable fate, but is in fact to a great

extent the result of an unequal and inequitable division of wealth and development opportunities between North and South. The last few years have seen an increase rather than a decrease in the gap between the poor and rich countries, between North and South. This, as we say in our opinion, is a development which is fraught with the utmost danger for peace in the world. The European Community, which has already displayed practical solidarity in its policy *vis-à-vis* the countries of the Third World, is in a better position than any other political grouping to help to bridge this gap between North and South and to work towards a new, equitable world economic order.

The Committee on External Economic Relations in its opinion therefore supports the Committee on Development and Cooperation's call for immediate steps to help those people threatened with starvation. We also support the committee's appeal to the Commission and the Council to work out and implement an effective agricultural and food policy that takes account of the conclusions reached by the FAO Conference. Finally, we also give our wholehearted support to the Committee on Development and Cooperation's call for the industrialized countries to set aside 0.7 % of their gross national product for development aid purposes. That is something that deserves to be reiterated here in this House ...

(Applause)

... We also support the idea that the Committee on Development and Cooperation should submit a report to the European Parliament by 1980, proposing practical measures for a comprehensive policy on these matters. For this reason, the Committee on External Economic Relations has not formulated any detailed proposals, but has simply pointed, in its amendment, to the need for the European Community's external economic and trade relations to form part and parcel of the fight against hunger and underdevelopment throughout the world. Our trade relations with the countries of the Third World can help them to generate the finance necessary to develop agriculture, transport and irrigation in those countries. That is why we want to see the motion for a resolution include a call for the elimination of custom duties and other obstacles to trade to enable the countries of the Third World — and particularly the most underdeveloped among them — to build up trade relations.

Finally — and this again comes within the compass of trade and external economic relations — the nature of a developing country's trade relations dictates what kind of development model that country will adopt in the long run. It is no secret that a bias towards industrial development often results in agricultural development being neglected.

Wieczorek-Zeul

Finally, the amendment tabled by the Committee on External Economic Relations calls for the report which is due to be submitted to the European Parliament by February 1980 to include a detailed appraisal of the root causes of hunger in the world. We also call for the conclusions reached by the FAO in particular to be included in this report, and we want to see concrete steps taken by the European Community at all levels, either by way of FAO investigations or by visits to the FAO or to the UN or in the affected countries themselves.

Some of the members of the committee even felt very strongly that the European Parliament would be well advised to send delegations to the countries worst affected by the threat of hunger. However, this was not the view taken by the committee as a whole.

I should like to conclude by making two personal remarks, which I hope will tie up with these concrete proposals. I believe that there should be separate negotiations on the International Cereals Agreement and the International Food Aid Agreement, as the delay encountered on the former is apparently holding up a decision on the latter.

It is in our utmost interest to bring the International Food Aid Agreement to a successful conclusion. Secondly, our proposals should include a demand for a modified International Food Market Organization. Ladies and gentlemen, I apologize for perhaps having let comments of a personal nature slip in here and there, but I am sure you will appreciate that one's emotions and sense of commitment are aroused by a subject like this. At any rate, I would ask you most sincerely to vote for our amendments and thus to help make the European Parliament a moral and political platform from which we can appeal to the world's conscience and ensure that words are matched by deeds.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Panella. — *(F)* Madam President, I wonder if it would be possible to ask Miss Flesch one or two specific questions which would help clarify the discussion. I believe this has been done on several occasions in the past.

President. — I think it would be better, Mr Pannella, if we heard all the speakers first. You will then have the opportunity of asking two or three questions if you wish.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* It is not for my benefit that I am making this request, Madam President, but to help the discussion. If you ask me, there are important points to be clarified.

President. — Questions can be put after the speeches.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* It will be too late then.

President. — I fail to see why. On the contrary, it will supplement the report when the speakers have finished.

I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, unless immediate measures are taken, twelve million children will die of hunger in 1979, the year proclaimed as the 'International Year of the Child' by the UN.

A million people throughout the world suffer from serious malnutrition and millions of others survive on rations far below the minimum subsistence level. The physical and mental development of large numbers of young children in the developing countries is arrested by food deficiency, with severe consequences not only for themselves, but also for the next generation. In recent years, famine has struck entire regions of the world and food production per inhabitant in the developing countries as a whole has dropped. To supplement national programmes, international assistance is needed to finance increased food production and to set up emergency reserves. At the World Food Conference held in 1974, it was estimated that agricultural development aid would have to be increased to 5 000 or 6 000 million dollars per year for the remainder of this decade. Although commitments of funds for this purpose have increased sharply since that time, they still fall short of the stated objective by 2 000 to 3 000 million dollars. To make up this shortfall it would only be necessary to commit the equivalent of 1 % of the military budgets of the industrialized countries. This is, in any event, the conclusion of the United Nations report drawn up in New York in 1978 on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditure. It is a fact that military expenditure is a substantial factor in the budgets of industrialized countries, as well as in those of developing countries, with which trade in arms is constantly increasing. According to the estimates of the SIPRI, that is the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the value of the large-scale arms exports to developing countries increased from 3 000 million dollars in 1970 to 6 300 million dollars in 1975 and 7 300 million in 1976. Before 1976 world military expenditure was estimated at about 350 000 million dollars, as against approximately 3 000 million dollars in food aid. State aid to developing countries by industrialized nations with a market economy has amounted to only 0.32 % of their combined GNP. Thus we have not reached even half of the objective of 0.7 % fixed at international level. To attain this objective, it would be sufficient to devote equivalent of only 5 % of the military expenditure of industrialized countries to development aid.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the problem of hunger, which is closely linked to that of underdevelopment could thus be solved by reducing mili-

Glinne

tary expenditure, which amounted to 400 000 million dollars in 1978; it is estimated that it will amount to 470 000 million dollars in 1979, of which the Third World countries themselves will account for 14%. And these 400 000 million dollars for 1978 represent an increase of 50% over the last twenty years at constant prices....

Madam President, we must also review our economic and trade relations with the Third World. Although food aid and the supply of food to poor countries undoubtedly represent a short-term solution, the fact is that, as the opinion drawn up by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations underlines very opportunely, in the long term the real solution to the problem is in the setting up at last of an equitable world economic system. World hunger is not an inevitable and irreversible phenomenon: it is the consequence of an inequitable distribution of wealth and development. What is needed therefore is an economic and trade system enabling the developing countries to achieve their full potential and bridging the gap between rich and poor countries. The Community's trade and economic relations with the developing countries must help to set up this new economic order based on fairness and solidarity between the industrialized countries and the developing countries, which supply raw materials. In our opinion the Community has an important role to play in this sphere. It must also ensure that its policy of cooperation with the developing countries promotes local production of agricultural and other products such as food crops and livestock, for which the local population is crying out. This calls for a voluntarist policy on our part to encourage the development of small and medium-sized farms in these countries. Then, and only then, will the Community have made a real contribution to getting rid of the causes and not just the effects of this heart-rending problem of world hunger.

Madam President, other spokesmen for the Socialist Group will try to show the need to tackle the causes of hunger and to apportion the blame which attaches to us as industrialized countries, because in our opinion, this debate would be a failure of it were to limit itself to purely caritative considerations. The caritative approach is an honourable one, indeed it is extremely honourable when there is a genuine desire to provide immediate aid to one's neighbour who may, nowadays, be in the plains of Indo-China or the deserts of the Sahel.

However, the caritative approach is not sufficient unless it also substitutes lasting justice for the disorder which has been, and still is, at the root of the very injustice we are seeking to eliminate.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Tindemans to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democratic Group).

Mr Tindemans. — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by expressing my regret at the fact that we are still having to discuss the problem of world hunger here in the European Parliament when the United Nations and the FAO have already covered the same ground so often, and are also in a much better position, technically speaking, to deal with the problem. One of my own failings — if I may be allowed to strike a personal note for a moment — is to assume that, whenever a particular problem — like that of world hunger — is entrusted to serious-minded people or organizations, we can rest assured that the matter will be given all due attention. I appear to have made the same mistake yet again. Despite all the conferences, meetings and discussions that have been devoted to this awful problem, the situation has not improved. On the contrary, it seems if anything to have got worse.

In 1960, the number of undernourished people in the world was put at 200 million, and that figure has now grown to an estimated 800 million in 1979. I should like to give you a few figures to illustrate my point. Despite the record harvests in recent years, even in a number of developing countries, the *per capita* food production in most of the developing countries has been in decline. In 1979, production of cereals will be 15 million tonnes down on the 1978 figure. Food production, which was increasing at the rate of 2½% during the 1960s, is now growing at a rate of only 2%, which is less than the rate of population growth.

In 1950, the developing countries were still net exporters of cereals, whereas nowadays they are importing 80 million tonnes of cereals per year, and this figure is expected to double by 1985. Nor should we forget that, by the year 2 000, there will be something like six thousand million people to be fed throughout the world. So, taking into account the socialist countries' imports, we are threatened with a serious shortfall, which can only be alleviated by drastically increasing food production by a rate of at least 4% per annum over the medium-to-long term in the developing countries. The current situation is particularly critical for the 40 poorest countries which, for a variety of reasons, are only developing with great difficulty. They are in a position neither to increase their income nor to boost their food production. The result is an inevitable growth in their balance of payments problems and ever-increasing difficulties in importing food.

The food crisis which has developed since 1973 has served to highlight the immediate importance of food reserves, and this for a variety of reasons. As far as food stocks are concerned, we are faced with an entirely new situation. For the first time in five years, we are now having to draw on these reserves to meet current demand. It therefore follows that we have to

Tindemans

find some means of replenishing the stocks. Geographically, they are situated mainly in North America, which means that there is a very real danger that it may prove impossible in an emergency to mount a rescue operation quickly enough to help the worst affected countries. Current and planned investment in food production and distribution are quite inadequate to meet future needs. And yet, the most reputable experts say that there are indeed solutions to this appalling problem. We must make every effort to find these solutions and put them into practice, we must denounce all those who stand in our way, we must persevere with might and main to rid those millions of people of the spectre of starvation. We have the necessary means at our disposal. Scientific expertise, efficient organization, increased knowledge, respect for our fellow human beings and a higher sense of moral duty should together enable us to eradicate this scourge of mankind. We must only have the courage to face the truth. There are one thousand million people in the Third World who are unaffected by hunger; indeed, some of them are very comfortably off. However, another two thousand million live away from the cities, and something like half of them simply do not get enough to eat. The last 50 years have seen the destruction of a stupendous number of natural food sources, in other words, the destruction of nature. Unless something very drastic is done at world level, even more destruction will take place over the years to come, and the problem of hunger will become well nigh insoluble.

Let me repeat that this is a job for the international organizations, because local politicians all too often prevent the use of scientific aids, either out of ignorance or because of short-sighted self-interest. If we really want to prepare the ground for a better future, we must get the international organizations involved in the developing countries. Nothing can be solved by national or bilateral measures.

Despite all the meetings which have been held under the auspices of the UN or the FAO on the problem of hunger, one gets the impression — and I am weighing my words carefully here — that no one except for the starving people themselves is really concerned about this problem, either among the leaders in the developing countries themselves nor in the international institutions.

The greatest efforts in the field of development aid are undoubtedly benefiting the one thousand million people I referred to earlier who are already relatively well provided for. It is perfectly obvious that only a small proportion of the starving millions can be saved by direct food aid from abroad, whereas relief can only be offered to the majority in the form of agricultural reorganization and rural development, on condition that the people are given the chance to work the land

or to learn to work the land and are suitably helped and encouraged to do so. I make this point because obstacles are often set up in the people's own countries, and because the development aid from the industrialized countries is often along the wrong lines and sometimes reflects the failure of the developed world to understand the true needs of starving people, not to mention contempt for their social and cultural situation. Development aid should be directed far more than hitherto to the development of agriculture, food production, better training facilities, the necessary advice and guidance, rural development and better transport facilities. We should also do everything in our power to improve the quality of agriculture and stockbreeding, so that the flight from the land can be stemmed by an entirely new psychological approach, and so that food supplies can be assured. In this way, it should be possible to check or prevent the concentration of a wretched proletarian fringe around the urban centres in the developing countries.

It is in the rural areas of the poorest countries that hunger is most widespread. The urban proletariat can, of course, also be short of food, but, to prevent unrest in the cities, the authorities — bearing in mind no doubt the French proverb 'an empty belly has no ears' — usually make greater efforts to alleviate poverty than out in the hinterland, where no trouble is anticipated.

Many of us still seem to be under the misapprehension that the land in the tropical and equatorial regions is highly fertile. In fact, this is rarely the case, and where it is true, it is usually thanks to special factors like silting from rivers or the vicinity of volcanoes. In the tropics, the land becomes exhausted at a much faster rate and therefore has to lie fallow for that much longer. Erosion, overcropping and deforestation can easily have a catastrophic effect on the land and destroy any hopes for the future. This is too easily forgotten and one even comes across mistakes of this kind in UN texts. The limitations of nature itself and socio-political obstacles — often of a local nature — all too often prevent the kind of regeneration which stay-at-home academics take for granted.

Four ways of tackling the problem of hunger have been proposed. The World Food Conference which was organized by the FAO in Rome in November 1974, dealt mainly with the classic foodstuffs which could be sold or given away by the industrialized countries. The recommendations passed by this Conference referred particularly to the maintenance of stocks of readily mobilizable reserves of food, the supervision of vulnerable areas, improvements to warning systems, transport and distribution networks and problems of finance. Although direct food aid is often the only means of tackling the immediate problem, it cannot offer a lasting solution.

Tindemans

There are three questions we should be asking ourselves here. Firstly, who should pay for this direct food aid? Secondly, will the aid go directly and exclusively to the starving people? After all, every expert in the field in the developing countries has a bitter tale to tell of corruption and the misappropriation of food aid. Thirdly, will the wealthy countries always be able to produce surpluses of food to send to the starving millions in the world? As far as this last question is concerned, I wonder whether we ourselves know what kind of an agricultural policy we want. The continuing debate in this House seems, at any rate, to come up with no clear solution.

A second remedy would be to produce new types of food. A whole range of factors are needed to keep millions of people adequately fed, for instance, scientific knowledge, technical equipment, financing, organization, transport and distribution. There must also be some assurance that this kind of food will actually be acceptable to the people who need the help. So far, though, no international conference has even waxed enthusiastic about the search for new foodstuffs. The job has been left to experts and research laboratories.

A third remedy would be to clear new land for arable farming and stock-breeding. This, however, is not an easy matter given the very real danger of erosion and overcropping of the land.

Finally, the fourth remedy is the best: making agriculture more intensive and increasing the yield from both arable and pastoral land. Our agricultural institutes could perform a highly useful function here by creating new departments for tropical or sub-tropical agriculture or stockbreeding.

I shall refrain from going into any more technical details about agricultural policy. I should just like to make the point that the women's organizations could do an important job here, inasmuch as in a large number of developing countries, the work on the land is done by women, many of whom are illiterate. It would be a great step forward if they be given some idea of the technical aspects of land improvement. In other words, guidance and instruction are vitally important. In the interests of this kind of policy, however, we must proceed with the necessary psychological subtlety, which is all too often missing from international aid. As many of you will no doubt realize, the rural dweller, the man who lives and works on the land, tends to be highly suspicious of anything he is told by an outsider. As I mentioned earlier, political, social and economic circumstances are often a major — not to say insuperable — obstacle to agricultural improvement and hence to any improvement in the food situation. This explains why international conferences tend to generate nothing more than resolutions, because the delegates from the developing countries come mainly from that section of the popu-

lation which is opposed to any change in the *status quo* in their own country.

Obstacles may also exist in the social and cultural sphere. I would be the last person to advocate uprooting any human being, but sensible tuition and good training given in an atmosphere of respect should achieve a power of good. Unfortunately, this requires a humane treatment, and that is what is all too often missing from the international organizations. International institutions, should, however, be able to keep a close eye on the implementation of funds for rural or agricultural development. All aid could be made dependent on its correct utilization. This would mean that all aid and all special projects would be suspended if they did not actually benefit the people for whom they were intended and if local obstacles were not eliminated.

Only international organizations can do this kind of work. The Member States acting in isolation cannot interfere in the internal politics of developing countries, whereas this should be possible in an international framework. This being so, I can see increasing scope in this field for the European Community and the European Parliament.

We here should be deeply concerned by the problem of starvation and malnutrition. We should take every opportunity to encourage the UN, the FAO and World Bank to pursue the right policy on a large scale. We, for our part, must not make the old mistake of delivering impressive speeches, adopting resolutions blaming anyone and everyone, using fine words and holding press conferences and think we can then go home satisfied with what we have done.

This debate should provide a lasting stimulus, not only to the Commission and the Council, but also to the world's collective conscience and all those who are in a position to help in the fight against hunger. I believe this House has a duty to take a calm look at the ways in which the European Community can and should make its contribution. It is not up to us to act as a kind of tribunal or to blame each other for the present situation. This would only drive a wedge between us when we need to find a consensus to enable us to construct an effective new policy. We need a lot more genuine cooperation between the developing countries and the industrialized countries and also among the industrialized countries themselves. That is a *sine qua non* for the creation of an international economic order and an economy based on international solidarity. We must work together to formulate and implement the necessary short and long-term measures. Let us, however, not forget that — as the British economist Keynes said — 'In the long term we are all dead'. We must do all that is necessary in the minimum possible time to save our fellow human beings — at world level, European level and within the developing countries themselves.

Tindemans

I had originally intended to set out a number of measures at world, European and local level, but I shall refrain from doing so in view of the fact that we shall all be voting for a motion for a resolution in which these very measures are proposed. Please accept my apologies for having spoken at some length, but I thought it necessary here in our first debate in this House on hunger in the world to reiterate that no statement of principle will ever save people from death from starvation. We must tackle this problem together in a spirit of humanity, making use of all the technical facilities available, and we must take whatever measures look most likely to lead to a successful conclusion. Our specific task here is to ensure that our European development policy is in line with the aims I have tried to sketch out: food aid over the short and very short term in an attempt to save lives, and much more attention to rural development and agricultural policy in the developing countries in the longer term. However, we must at the same time take the necessary steps to prevent our policy from failing to achieve tangible results and benefiting only those who no longer need our help. We must set out to offer genuine help to the poorest and the hardest-hit. At the same time, we must make sure that the international agencies are kept fully aware of the problem of hunger, and we must persevere in our attempt to carry the fight to the enemy by means of well thought-out measures to tackle the problem of hunger. By so doing, the European Community will be able to show that it is striving for a better kind of society and that it does have a genuine Community foreign policy, which includes a determination to fight hunger and help create a better world.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Madam President, I should like Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure to be rigorously applied, so that we can get on with our work properly and without constant interruption — which does not happen in any of our national parliaments, as far as I know — by these television crews from the so-called 'state' companies which are so often fawning and deceitful. I am expressing a wish here, but it is based on the Rules of Procedure.

President. — Your words surprise me, Mr Pannella, since for this important debate there are far fewer television crews than during earlier part-sessions.

(Applause)

The question of permitting photographers and television crews to enter the Chamber has been referred to the Quaestors. In the meantime, we shall apply a general ruling of procedure, since Rule 11 is not specific on this point, Mr Pannella.

I call Sir Fred Warner to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Sir Fred Warner. — Madam President, I am grateful for your answer to the point of order but I am also grateful to see that the photographers have disappeared.

Madam President, the motion which we are discussing today stands in the name of all the groups in this Parliament represented in the Committee on Development and Cooperation. It seemed that in a matter of such absolutely overwhelming importance as the right of human beings to find enough food for survival and for good health, your committee must be seen to be speaking with one voice. I hope that this Parliament as a whole will also be seen to be speaking with one voice at the end of this debate.

There are two things one can do about starvation, about malnutrition, about food production and food distribution: you can talk about them, or you can take practical action to remedy them. Today, we are only going to talk about them, but we all know very well that this is not going to save a single life: talk is not going to add a single European Unit of Account to the food budget. So what is the point of our six hours' debate today? I suggest it can have two purposes. The first is to draw the attention of public opinion throughout Europe to the importance of this matter and to earn their full support and approval for measures which the Community institutions will have to take. In this view I follow what was said by the spokesman for the Committee on External Relations.

This matter of public opinion is constantly overlooked. The views of the public are almost wholly taken for granted. We speak of the British Government pledging so many millions of pounds to assist India, or the President of France giving so many billion francs on a visit to West Africa, but this completely hides the reality: it is the British or the French population, the taxpayers who are providing all this money, and they are often suspicious of the way in which it is being used. They want to know why it is needed, whether it is being properly used, whether it is reaching the people for whom it is intended. I fear that governments will never feel able to set aside the 0.7 % of GNP which they have promised unless their people agree that this is fully justified.

It is necessary to be absolutely honest and straightforward with the public. I therefore think it unwise that the preamble to this motion contains several unsubstantiated figures. I am not quibbling here about meaningless statistics. It is terrible and disgraceful that 450 million people suffer from chronic malnutrition. It would be terrible if there were only 450 thousand or 450, but I do think it wrong that this Parliament

Warner

should use figures which, in spite of what is said in the text, do not accord with those of FAO or those of the World Food Council, or those of the Population Reference Bureau or those of any other authority I have been able to consult.

Now the second justification for this debate is to give your Committee on Development and Cooperation firm guidelines on what you want it to do. I suggest that in general terms those guidelines should be for the committee to get down to severely practical work. to define their relations with the Commission and ensure by careful monitoring that the Commission is making the most effective possible use of the funds entrusted to it and taking every new initiative which can be fruitful. To be fair, since this Parliament was elected, this is precisely what the committee has been trying to do, but again and again it has been frustrated in this task, or forced to postpone discussion because of interruptions and the introduction of general ideas. We have been subjected to what I can only describe as political hijacking and flown miles off our intended course. Here we are today again on our desert airstrip, faced with 25 amendments. We shall not mind any of that if the result of this debate is really to move forward to dealing with the problem, but I do suggest that we shall move forward faster if these amendments can be referred to the committee so that they can be dealt with properly and carefully.

The problem of food aid today, with great respect to the previous speaker, Mr Tindemans, is not necessarily entirely one of production. I am going to leave it to other speakers to discuss the balance between what food is available in the world and what is needed: it is an exceedingly difficult question; but as Mr Tindemans said, our really immediate problem is one of distribution. In this we have many difficulties.

To deal quickly with the most terrible point of all: what are we to say of those countries, fortunately still very few, where the so-called governments deliberately obstruct the distribution of food? We are against political discrimination. We do not believe that we should deprive populations of food aid simply because they are in the grip of bad régimes. But we shall hear in the coming discussion on Cambodia and Vietnam how food is deliberately kept from populations in order to destroy their will to resist. In those cases, what are we to do? We can but do our best, but absolute priority must be given to ensuring that all those who escape over the frontiers are immediately fed and cared for. Not one soul who can be saved must be allowed to die in a refugee camp.

Even in those countries where food aid is welcomed, and that is most of the world of course, distribution is often extremely difficult because of the weaknesses of local administration. The Commission cannot distri-

bute the food itself. In such cases, we must make every use of the voluntary organizations: the Red Cross, Oxfam, the various religious bodies. Given the means and the encouragement, these people never fail to respond. I know that the Commission is well aware of this and has made much use of voluntary services, but I suggest that your Committee on Development and Cooperation would do well to invite the principal organizations of this kind to come and give us their views on food supply and distribution. We have still got a lot to learn.

The Commission itself now has great experience of administering food aid. They have achieved many successes, but there are still things which we might be bold enough to say to them. For instance, are they deploying in the most efficient way the staff available to them? Commissioner Cheysson says that they are and that their manning levels compare very favourably with those in national aid and development ministries. Confirmation of this by a full study of establishments might provide the basis for yet better deployment and increases in staff where they are needed. At the same time, there really must be an early review of all procedures, about which many of the recipient governments complain. I suggest the Court of Auditors could be asked to undertake this review on our behalf. Is the Commission pursuing proper buying policies where they are obliged to purchase on the open market? Are they, by their activities, unwittingly increasing the cost, and thereby diminishing the amount available of essential foodstuffs? This should be examined. One way of ensuring supplies at fair prices, as two previous speakers have pointed out, and particularly in respect to cereals, would be the early conclusion of the new Food Aid Convention and a successful resumption of negotiations on the International Grains Agreement. I suggest that your committee should invite the Council of Ministers to comment on this and say how they think quick progress could be made. I note the point made by the spokesman for the Committee on External Economic Relations that separation of the two agreements might be helpful.

Next, I suggest the Commission should devote more of its time to the elimination of waste. I wonder if this Parliament is aware of how much of the world's total food is lost *after* harvesting. Take rice, the absolute staple food of Asia. Today, new strains of rice ripen before the end of the monsoon, and part of the crop rots before the sun can dry it. No one can afford oil for drying it, but these crops could be dried by burning rice bran. More grain is lost by primitive threshing and winnowing. When rice is hulled and polished in the village, up to 30% can be lost as cracked or powdered in this one operation alone. Even in modern commercial mills in urban centres, more than 5% is invariably lost, and sometimes 10%. It is lost in transport, lost to insects and rodents

Warner

in storage. The result is that in some areas up to 40 %, in others 10 % is wasted after the rice has been grown and gathered in. But if it were saved, there would be no rice deficit in Asia for some years to come, even if not one dollar was spent on new irrigation projects. I have drawn this to the attention of the Commission, and their reply is that it would require a social revolution, or at least complete social re-education, let us say, to deal with the problem. I do not believe that is so; simple solutions can be developed to deal with the matter at the level of existing village organization.

Now a more contentious point. We do nothing as Europeans to help with family planning and population problems. Opinions, I know differ very sharply on this. Some years ago, I asked a Laotian friend of mine how many brothers he had: his house seemed to be full of brothers. He said, 'Oh, I was born one of 24 brothers'. I said, 'Congratulations, and how many sisters do you have?' 'Oh, I do not know', he said, 'I do not think we ever counted them'. Now that was 15 years ago: 50 children playing happily in a wooden compound in Laos. Today, half those children will have been killed, they will be dead by now. The other half will be in a camp, languishing undernourished on the other side of the Mekong. Times have moved on, and not in the right direction. We must face up to the fact that some of our ideas are out of date. Twenty years ago, developing countries resented all suggestions in this field; that is not any longer the case. In August, a remarkable conference was held in Colombo on population and development. Fifty-eight countries, over half of them developing countries and some from Eastern Europe, fully accepted the conclusion that there is an inevitable link between population planning, health and development. The United Nations is far ahead of us in this field, and gives superb services. The Commission says that the ACP countries are underpopulated and are not clients for such assistance. In some cases this is obviously true, but as a general reply I find it most unconvincing. Your committee and the Commission should, in my opinion, re-examine the matter together.

As Mr Tindemans said, food aid is only a palliative, a short-term solution — and a rather wasteful one at that. People should be enabled to grow their own food, but this is a highly complex matter requiring great expertise, thought and planning. May I say that local practice and knowledge should not always be disregarded; it is not true that local practices invariably stand in the way of progress. We should not be too proud about this. But whatever is done must be done in the general context of the environment so that we are not destroying people's means of living in a short-term attempt to get more food out of the ground, but are creating a more fertile environment for them.

I make one more point on this question of agriculture. The best solutions need not always lie in vast infrastructural schemes costing billions of dollars and requiring years of planning and study before realization. Sometimes these ponderous dinosaurs of mid-twentieth century vision saddle the recipient with unnatural technical problems and high production costs. Simpler solutions abound, and let us not have the arrogance of those government planners who imagine that only they can give worthwhile aid. Private joint ventures between European and local partners, so long as they reflect the wishes of the local populations, will develop resources faster, more efficiently and more naturally than the public sector. Joint ventures do not create useless new bureaucracies of technological officials; they provide natural local cadres of management and technical skills, growing up in the project itself and in the surrounding districts. This is often the shortest way to the creation of wealth.

Finally, I would just say a word or two about the amendments. We have 25 before us. I have already suggested that the best way to deal with these would be to send them back to the committee, where they can be carefully and properly studied, instead of attempting through the long hours of the coming night to get some sense out of them here, particularly those which entirely re-write the proposal in front of us. That is my proposal.

I do hope, however, that on Amendment No 20 we may be given a little more information in the course of the afternoon. Has this gone to the Committee on Budgets? It is an overwhelmingly important matter to cut 0.5 % from the budget. Has the Committee on Budgets pronounced on it? Secondly, it can only come, as far as I can see, from non-compulsory expenditure. Do we want to cut the Regional Fund, etc. by a high figure in order to produce an overall figure of 0.5 %? Thirdly, how is it proposed that the money be spent? Do we believe that the Commission could handle this? Perhaps the Commission could comment on that.

Finally, I just wish to make a renewed appeal to this Parliament to allow your Committee on Development and Cooperation to get on with its job in partnership with the Commission. Let us come down from generalities to everyday ordinary actions; let us review all the good work done in the past by the Commission and see what can be improved; let us see what has been overlooked; let us listen to other organizations which might be able to give us new or better ideas. Then we shall be able to make a really valuable report to you next year, though I think it is going to be difficult for us to be ready by February, and it may be that your rapporteur will be asking indulgence for an even longer extension.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Ferrero to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Ferrero. — *(I)* Madam President, we Communists are convinced that we are debating here today a fundamental and urgent question. It is fundamental and urgent, firstly because the lives of millions of men, women and children are at stake, and secondly because, in our view, famine is a symptom — certainly the most tragic one — of a type of relationship between the industrialized world and the world of poverty and underdevelopment — a type of relationship that certainly cannot be allowed to continue.

For precisely this reason, as Mr Glinne rightly pointed out, humanitarian statements serve no purpose (or perhaps are not enough). There is a need — and we all agree on this — for practical measures, adequate responses and initiatives, consistent and effective policies. To achieve this, to be effective, it is necessary to tackle the problem at its roots, to tackle the basic causes of hunger. That is why we say that it is useful, and indeed necessary, that the problem of hunger in the world should give rise to a great and responsible political debate, avoiding demagogy and rhetorical flourishes, and also avoiding purely, and often spuriously, specialized exercises — a debate in which the vital forces, the public, the popular masses in each country would participate, finally leading to action appropriate to the problems, tensions, and dangerous contradictions which characterize our age.

To this end, then, it is in our view significant — and we disagree with Mr Tindemans on this — that the European Parliament, a few months after direct elections, should decide to tackle the problem of hunger, and indeed to commit itself, as stated in the motion for a resolution presented by Miss Flesch, to examining a series of coherent and practical measures by the end of February.

We Italian Communists agree with all the proposals contained in the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Development and Cooperation, and we shall therefore vote in favour of this motion. although we regard it only as a starting point for a discussion and a dialogue which must continue and which must also draw on the numerous amendments which have been tabled. Like Sir Fred Warner, I too think that it would be erroneous, unwise and irresponsible to examine these amendments hastily tomorrow morning. I think they must be used as a basis for the work of the committees with a view to the February debate. I wish to stress this, precisely because some of the amendments tabled are in our view particularly interesting, especially those which take up the proposals put forward by the so-called Brandt Commission.

The motion for a resolution which we are debating is in our view a good one. However, we say that it is not

enough. It is necessary for the European Community and the European Parliament to do more in this field of hunger, and in the more general one of relations with the so-called Third World. The Community, first with the Yaoundé Agreement, and now, above all, with the Lomé II Agreement, has amassed a political heritage the novelty and value of which we Italian Communists acknowledge, although we shall not tire of stressing its inadequacies, sometimes rather critically; we acknowledge its novelty and value also in relation to the historical responsibilities of Western Europe, and — Sir Fred Warner and Louise Weiss — in relation to the guilty colonialist past of many countries of Western Europe.

Thus it is on the basis of this heritage that the European Community must play an autonomous, specific and original role, not only with regard to the problem of hunger and nutrition, but — I repeat — in the general field of relations among the different parts of the world. This is required by the seriousness of the problems, and of the threats hanging over us; it is required by the imminence of great international events, starting with the resumption of the North-South dialogue. This Parliament, also, must have a part to play, which, allow me to say it here also, cannot be the part to which it was relegated, for example, in the recent Luxembourg meeting with the ACP countries. I wish to make my meaning clear: it is right that here today we should debate, compare positions, find points of agreement if possible, and vote on documents on world hunger. Excellent! This is important. But then — as I think we all agree — action is required. Consistency and continuity over a period of time are required.

In a few days the Community budget will be debated and voted on. It will be interesting then, I think, to see the attitude which Parliament adopts on questions of aid and development cooperation. Take, for example, the important problem of financial and technical cooperation with the non-associated developing countries. The Council, in the draft budget for 1980, once more cut back the funds — already small — allocated by the Commission. So, for the second time, our Group, in an amendment of which Mr Spinelli is the main signatory, has proposed a substantial increase in the appropriations: 1 000 000 000 units of account over the next three years. Last year our proposal was supported only by the Socialists and was therefore rejected, with the rest of Parliament voting against. What will Parliament do this year? This, in my view, is a practical and early opportunity to test the sense of responsibility and real political will which every political force represented here brings to the struggle against hunger, poverty and underdevelopment.

Ferrero

I have said that, on a subject such as the one we are debating, an exceptional commitment is in some sense required on the part of this Parliament. We therefore want to put forward here a practical proposal which, let us say, to some extent goes beyond the normal functioning of our Parliament. The European Parliament should set itself the aim over the next few months of bringing together part of the work of its committees on the various aspects of hunger in the world, but going beyond this to cover the whole question of underdevelopment. It should hold public hearings, should listen to and consult in the most suitable way the representatives of the main countries concerned, of the non-aligned countries, of the international organizations, and should thus arrive as soon as possible at an extraordinary sitting — a debate in Parliament which would tackle these questions as a whole, with the vitality and commitment which the Third World and the developing countries have the right to expect from the representatives elected by the peoples of this part of the old continent.

The significance of a proposal of this kind seems clear to me: we are on the eve of the resumption of the North-South dialogue, and of a United Nations Assembly on these problems, and we have behind us a long series of formal and significant meetings, from the UNCTAD Conference in Manila to the Ottawa meeting of the World Food Council and the recent Assembly in Havana of the non-aligned countries.

What is the net result of all this work? We are now approaching the end of the Second Development Decade, following that launched by the United Nations in 1960. Of course, many things have changed, the developing countries are no longer docile and resigned as in the past, but meanwhile the gap between development and underdevelopment has widened, and investments and the much-vaunted aids have dropped, as regards the public share, to a derisory 0.3% of the gross national product. Moreover, this percentage is cancelled out by inflation and interest paid. Trade has contracted, and the 'green revolutions' have failed.

What are the causes of this undeniable disaster? There are — as is well known and has already been mentioned here too by Mr Tindemans — specific causes, precise economic, social and political reasons for the persistence and worsening of the problem of hunger and in general for the underdevelopment of a large part of the Third World. But if, beyond these causes — which nevertheless, I wish to stress again, must be examined and tackled in all their complex reality — we go to the heart of the matter, it will be found that the cause of underdevelopment and hunger, Sir Fred Warner, is certainly not the insects and rodents infesting the mills in South East Asia. The first and decisive cause of underdevelopment and hunger — as I do not think anyone can deny — is

the attempt to defend and strengthen the real privileges of material interests, the attempt to perpetuate an outdated, unjust international economic order.

This is what has hitherto caused all development strategies based directly or indirectly on aid to fail. Let this be clear: aid is necessary, both emergency aid and cooperation aid; indeed it should be increased and above all reallocated to measures of a structural nature, especially with regard to agriculture and rural development. Nevertheless, aid policies have had, still have and will continue to have an intrinsic limitation, which is that they leave untouched the mechanisms of the world market, do not break the circuits of dependence on exploitation, and impose a particular model of consumption and production.

It is clear, then, that things cannot go on as they are. The problem of hunger certainly calls for immediate emergency measures, and above all there is a need for specific structural measures related to production, distribution and consumption of food products. But it is only by tackling the problem at its roots that we will find a solution, and there is no doubt that this lies in a new international economic commercial and monetary order, and mainly in the development of the process of detente. In this connection it would be truly hypocritical, I think, to discuss hunger without mentioning the problems created by the arms race, which continues and is indeed being dangerously intensified in the present international situation.

We are all, I hope, aware of the close and now increasingly obvious link between peace, emancipation from underdevelopment and transfer of resources from the arms race to the developing countries. This, in our view, is an aim which must be pursued today as a first priority. I agree with what Mr Glinne said on the subject. And yet, we must be aware that even if we succeeded in bringing about a reallocation of the millions of millions at present wasted to prepare for or wage war, even if this great and vital aim were achieved, there would still be the problem of the great economic dispute between North and South in the world — in short, the problem of achieving a structural change in the present terms of trade.

Certainly this involves, on the one hand, an internal transformation of the economy and society of the developing countries, but also, on the other hand, profound processes of reconversion of production, agriculture and industry within the capitalist area itself; these processes are, moreover, essential for economic recovery of our countries. We must bear in mind that we are faced with a crisis of the capitalist world, which can only be overcome through profound changes in the social and economic structure and through a revival and development which is no longer based on the exploitation and underdevelopment of the Third World.

Ferrero

This, then, is the central point: the solution to the problem of hunger and underdevelopment involves criticism of the present consumption and waste of world resources by a minority of the human race. The explosive nature of this contradiction is already clear, as well as its disruptive effect on the whole international situation, and it is not hard to foresee an even more tragic and uncontrollable escalation in the next few years, if the hitherto dominant tendencies are not reversed. If we wish to avoid a catastrophe of unimaginable proportions, we must not ignore the many signs which there already are of the stage which matters have reached. Woe betide us if we ignore the appeal made, or attribute merely to rhetorical emphasis the words used a few days ago at the United Nations by Fidel Castro speaking on behalf of the non-aligned countries. If we do not find peaceful and wise solutions to the present problems of injustice and inequality — said Castro — the future will be apocalyptic. Please note, ladies and gentlemen, that is not a threat. It is a diagnosis of the situation, and it is also an alarm which is being sounded in too many different quarters now for it not to provoke thought and action.

Of course it is true, Mr Tindemans, that we can and must act at once. We are convinced of this, since we are also aware that every real step, however small, in the struggle against hunger and underdevelopment and to achieve a new system of international economic relations — on account of the equilibria which it changes and the interests which it threatens — involves a struggle, a movement going beyond national frontiers and the Community, a truly worldwide struggle and movement. For this very reason it calls for a sustained commitment of vast internationalist scope on the part of all the forces which really wish to tackle the problem of hunger.

In this battle, the workers' movement in this part of Europe has an essential part to play. We Italian Communists are profoundly convinced of this, and our strategy in Italy and in Europe has been and is still inspired by this conviction, because the search for a new road to the democratic and socialist transformation of the societies of Western Europe in which we live, in this period of history, inevitably depends, in our view, in the first place precisely on a new relationship between the old continent and the countries and peoples which are now emerging on the world scene.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

President. I call Mr Poniatowski on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Poniatowski. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we all know the Chinese proverb: 'Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day, teach him to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.' We probably need to do both things today. The decision is a difficult one, because the solution will vary from country

to country and from region to region, and must also take account of various civilizations and religions.

If we consider the practical possibilities open to us, there are three kinds of solution: operations to be undertaken by the advanced, rich countries, operations to be undertaken jointly and, finally, measures which depend on free and independent decisions by the developing countries facing the threat of famine.

Our task is first to provide aid commensurate with the problems. We all know that a few years ago the OECD fixed the amount which the industrialized countries ought to contribute to the developing countries at 0.7% of their gross national product. However, no country has ever attained this figure. The European countries have been among those giving most, but unfortunately the richest countries have been among those giving least. In recent years, the United States has given an average of 0.22% and Japan 0.21%. These figures represent an average contribution of 15 000 million dollars each year compared with debts amounting to more than 250 000 million — these are the 1977 figures — which many developing countries are incapable of repaying.

The most appalling aspect of all this, and here I concur with certain previous speakers, is the enormity of military expenditure in relation to the OECD effort, and I say this not just to suit the occasion, but because I have written and said it many times in the past 25 years. Let me just quote three figures given by the FAO: bringing 1.5 million km² under cultivation would cost 30 000 million dollars, or 7.5% of total military expenditure in 1976. The cost of bringing the Ganges basin, an immense area of 800 000 km², under cultivation would be 4% of 1976 military expenditure, and the production potential would be 150 million tonnes, in other words this alone would provide food for the 1 000 million inhabitants which we will have at the end of this century.

Another useful contribution which we could make would be to stabilize raw material prices, and indeed this is essential for the less favoured regions in countries which in some cases have raw materials but have no energy, as yet no industry and only elementary agriculture. These countries account for 63% of world population, 17% of international trade, 7% of world industry. This is where there is famine. The little wealth which these countries possess can vary greatly. Prices may double, triple or fall, and as a result it is difficult to draw up budgets or economic programmes. This is why the successive studies carried out in turn by UNCTAD, at Yaoundé, and in the North-South Conference have concentrated on setting-up pricing systems and storage schemes.

Schemes exist on paper, what is lacking is the political will. For this and other reasons it is also necessary to stabilize an international means of payment whose

Poniatowski

fluctuations and variations further aggravate the price fluctuations. The currency which is used as a means of payment throughout the world is a national currency and cannot be expected to act as a vehicle for the entire world's financial and commercial transactions. This is a recipe for an international monetary crisis which will disrupt the international economy. Something else we can do is to support current research into fertilizers and industrial and agricultural genetics. Extremely important discoveries are under way which could lead to substantially increased production in stockbreeding and agriculture.

The fact is that, in the final analysis, the problem of the food deficit is a finite one, which involves tragedy for millions, it is true, but which can be mastered. In 1978, a year without famine, production of wheat, maize, barley and rye amounted to 900 million tonnes. The food deficit was 36 million tonnes, that is 4 % of production, and at present this deficit can be made up by better organization of the production and storage of produce and by stable prices. However, if nothing is done — and the World Food Council warns us about this — in 10 years the deficit will be between 120 and 145 million tonnes. There is no excuse for the present situation.

There are also the measures we can take in conjunction with the developing countries, above all in developing cooperation on social, medical and educational matters. I will leave it to Mrs Agnelli to go into this aspect of the problem. In addition there is the development of economic and financial cooperation, on which Mr Galland is going to speak.

Finally, there are areas over which we have no control, firstly of course population policy which is the sole responsibility of the countries in question, although it is clear that increases in population can wipe out any progress in increasing resources and any other efforts which might be made in this sphere. Mrs Prouvot will deal with this issue on behalf of our Group. Then there is the matter of the choice of economic policy. There is no escaping the need for balanced economic development: the need not to smother developing economies by the over-rapid expansion of heavy industry and above all the need to give priority to agriculture in those countries where there is a food shortage! Certain countries are suffering from hunger because of their failure to pay attention to this.

But my main concern is that the disparity in riches and opportunities between countries is increasing. Harmonious development of the world economy, with its implications for political harmony, can only be achieved by steadily reducing the gap between the haves and the have-nots. Today the opposite is happening. The gap is increasing. The rich countries are adopting more and more sophisticated systems. They are introducing costly and complex scientific and technological equipment which is alien to those

who can scarcely feed themselves, or who are suffering from hunger. The two worlds are drawing further and further apart in terms of wealth, knowledge, and skill. There is not much time to lose. The gaps are widening fast, and cybernetics, automation, telematic systems and the realities of economic productivity only accelerate the process. Will we be able to aid and share intelligently and wisely.

This is the big question and it is not an easy one. Who is to benefit from the natural resources of the globe — the sea, raw materials, energy? Who is to profit from new discoveries? The strong, the clever, the most knowledgeable? Will we fight for them? The answer is yes, if the concept of empire triumphs over that of humanity. Empire-building involves the political and economic destruction of the weak. Humanity, in the world of today, means a long-term commitment to open up the future and redistribute knowledge and wealth, a sort of Marshal plan for the Third World.

Hunger, poverty, disease and underdevelopment are above all human tragedies and will always be with us as long as we see the human race as divided by a host of conflicts, rivalries and hatreds and not as a single being born of the same prehistory and the same history, engaged in the same extraordinary adventure. That is the way to peace. That is the way to lasting progress for all, justice and solidarity worthy of the whole human race.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Weiss, speaking for the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mrs Weiss. — *(F)* Like all of us in this House, I am deeply disturbed at the hunger afflicting the world, and I thank you, Madam President, for calling me, as I thank my colleagues for entrusting to me the task of speaking on their behalf on this fundamental problem. It is a problem which, as has already been said, leaves millions of people suffering while in the eyes of countries who are poorer than even, countries that are not developing but, also, becoming more and more underdeveloped, it is Europe, rich as it is, that bears the blame.

Let us be frank. Perhaps, my Group has put its trust in me because of the various famines I have experienced side by side with their victims, anxious as I was to help them and to have first-hand knowledge of their plight. As long ago as 1921 I was in the midst of the horrific famine raging in the new Russia of the Soviets. Then I saw the work of the French in overcoming famine in the Sahel, only to see the problem return today, and in quietly alleviating malnutrition in Tonkin with rice from Cochinchina and Cambodia — Cambodia, the land of the ineffable smile with the apparent blessing of the gods. In the course of a long

Weiss

and unrestricted journey through China, at the time of the Great Leap Forward, I discussed with Chairman Mao's experts ways of relieving the peasants' afflictions. I am well acquainted with the disasters in the Indies, from which I escaped following a hazardous journey, and I also fully understand Japan's population policy, dictated by the scarcity of arable land.

As we have already heard, solutions to these problems are very hard to find, and determining Europe's responsibilities is a highly delicate matter. Somewhere between the given statistics from the technocrats at the FAO and the exemplary compassion of Sister Theresa, giving refuge to dying wretches for whom it would have been better if they had never been born, we must — as the previous speakers have all emphasized — find some workable plans, while never forgetting the humble words of the Lord's prayer: give us this day our daily bread. Let all men, whoever they may be, have their daily bread.

A fundamental mathematical law applies here. Regardless of geographical circumstances, social structures and ideologies, famine can be defined in terms of a single figure, which is impossible to ignore: the relation between mouths to feed and resources available. It is also the reality behind the following story, about a small boy I met in the deserts of Somalia. This boy suddenly emerged from behind some rocks. The officer who was with me took half his packet of cigarettes and a fifty franc note and offered them to the boy, who stretched out his little hand from inside his tattered jellaba, took the money, threw the cigarettes in the officer's face and, using some French he had probably learnt from the teacher who travelled with his caravan, said: 'You should give me a hundred francs and all the cigarettes, because you are rich.'

He was burning with the same envy which consumes the whole Third World, unaware of course that we have problems of our own.

It is this envy cunningly exploited by others in the privileged part of the world, that I think we, as Members of the European Parliament, must get to grips with. It is useless — immoral even — to approve vague resolutions which are nothing more than pious hopes. My experience tells me that the different types of famine and malnutrition which the Nine, with a welter of good intentions but limited means, wish to confront can be divided on the whole into three categories. First of all, natural disasters: earthquakes, cyclones, droughts, epidemics. In many cases, the Community has already sent aid to victims of such disasters; and it is to be regretted that the long and impressive list of relief operations has not received a great deal of publicity. Let us support this policy of ad hoc aid, adding the wish that in future this work will be more widely known and recognized as a European undertaking. Not only is this something to be proud of — this is no time for false modesty — but it is a way of combating the danger of the world about us.

Secondly, there is the endemic scourge of outdated methods of agriculture, which is made all the worse by people's sexual ignorance. A massive education campaign is required on two fronts. This has already begun in various places — we should be aware of this, and not be like single-minded understudies. Let us not forget either that the experts take little account of the failures which the victims bring upon themselves: wells and irrigation channels abandoned, free seed either left to the weevils or sold, fortunes made by moneylenders, vaccinations refused in the name of anti-colonial freedom, and so on. Even worse, local experts we have trained pack their bags and come to work in the West. You may think this smacks of sick humour, but after I had been talking with the Lamas in Tibet it suddenly occurred to me that amongst the underdeveloped peoples, the inhabitants of the 'Roof of the World' were the only ones to have instinctively overcome the problem of numbers, thereby ensuring the survival of their civilization for centuries. But how is this possible, on such poor soil and in such dreadful climatic conditions, with agriculture in such a backward state and industry so primitive that it defies the imagination? In fact, to keep the population stable — and to do otherwise would have been suicidal — the Tibetans kept the birth rate down by means of lamaism and polyandry. All the same, I cannot commend lamaism to the House as a remedy... and in spite of my feelings regarding women's liberation, I can recommend polyandry even less. I therefore return to proposals which we could adopt to combat malnutrition and famine — which, above all thanks to the mass media, cause so much hatred and which are both the result of crass ignorance in matters of agriculture and sex, as I said just now.

I think it will be difficult for my Group to support general recommendations which cover too wide an area and are therefore ineffective and self-defeating. Our first objective should be to satisfy, basic needs, and to ensure that this operation, which must be carefully planned, can also be supervised right through to the end.

There is hardly a mention of this idea of supervision in all the proposals brought before Parliament. Why are people so frightened by it? Are you so faint-hearted? European aid to the Third World must cease to be what it only too often turns out to be, that is — and let's be honest about this — aid from poor people in rich countries, the taxpayers, to rich people in poor countries, the dictators and the dictators' mistresses. Europe must make sure that this aid in its entirety reaches the bulging little stomachs, the exhausted mothers and the suffering men without delay. We can thus reject the accusations of so many outright or subtly disguised tyrants who use Europe as a scapegoat to cover up their own greed and contempt for their social obligations.

Weiss

Thirdly, we come to famines brought about by ideological systems that go against human nature. Without any axe to grind I return to the famine in Russia I mentioned at the beginning, a famine that resulted from drought and the confusion that follows a military defeat. Another reason was a new agricultural system the deficiencies of which are all too obvious today after sixty years in operation. Russia had some of the richest wheat-growing land in the world. Lenin and his comrades returned to Russia imbued with the ideas of the French Revolution. Their first move was to give the land to the muzhiks. They realized immediately, however, that property was turning these peasants into members of the lower middle class, in other words sworn opponents of the revolution. The solution was the kolkhozes, which produce little or nothing, which explains the major part played by small private gardens, the sometimes excessive imports from Poland and Romania and, similarly, the enormous sales of surplus American wheat to the Kremlin. So that we now have a situation whereby one of the two military superpowers supplies the other with the food it needs to pursue an unprecedented arms build-up, aimed precisely at the hand that feeds it. No comment, except to note in passing, in Marxist jargon, an 'internal contradiction on a world scale'.

Certainly, the Nine must not hesitate to help the Vietnamese boat people. In July, Parliament sent a million units of account to the High Commissioner for Refugees in New York. In August we received a letter of thanks, with an undertaking to provide a report on how the money was to be used. It seems, however, that it will be some weeks yet before Parliament receives this report. Meanwhile, the unfortunate people for whom these funds were meant to provide urgent relief will continue to starve. Furthermore, the recent Geneva Conference on the refugees has given us the impression that the international relief may help the villains almost as much as their victims. As for the Cambodians, the peasants, the craftsmen, the country's elite and its moments which were once saved from destruction by the French colonial rulers, they have just suffered two campaigns of genocide where ideology has acted as a cloak for greed aimed at their rice and fisheries. Europe bears neither blame nor responsibility for these disasters. The first act of genocide, by the Khmers Rouges, stunned the Free World, which did nothing to stop them. Still, under cover of their dubious status as the legal government, these criminals are even listened to with a certain indulgence. The second act of genocide by the Vietnamese usurpers left us horrified. Without admitting that the third Indo-China war had begun, the Nine, in a spirit of completely unselfish solidarity, took it upon themselves to come to the aid, by the only means they could see, of the remnants of this decimated people. The Commission is to be congratulated for contributing to a joint effort to send a boat with tonnes of

basic necessities which will be distributed in November by non-governmental organizations working on the spot. The Council of Foreign Ministers should also be complimented for their response a few days ago to the massive appeal by Mr Waldheim, who proposed, — in the light of an emergency which is only too obvious — that the United Nations should quickly send even greater quantities of supplies to the survivors. We can also be proud of the little *Ile-de-Lumière*, a private boat which left Bangkok for the disaster area on Tuesday of this week. Under protest, the six doctors on board had to sign an undertaking not to provide people with treatment. They hope this ban will be lifted when they arrive, and this is why they set out all the same. Europe is being reduced to the absurd role of a beggar, going on her hands and knees before the criminals begging permission to save the innocent.

Therefore, my colleagues wish to make the following proposal: that the chairmen of all the Groups and committees, fully informed of the efforts being made, should get together and work out a recommendation for a single aid programme. Some plans have already been made, but there is still much to be done. Complete unanimity among the forces of democracy is absolutely imperative when people's right to live is at stake. This programme must firstly deal with famine caused by natural disasters, providing immediate effective aid under supervision; it must also tackle endemic famine, with basic education in farming and family planning; finally it must combat famines resulting from so-called ideological wars, via national or international non-governmental organizations working in the field and accountable to their sponsors for the money they spend.

But I don't want to finish these few distressing remarks and wishes — you may find my remarks a little indelicate, but I have seen too much at first hand not to be excused some indelicacy — without saying something about the situation in Europe. Government aid to combat under-employment and unemployment constitutes a struggle against virtual famine. Just look at the figures, ladies and gentlemen. Our problems would become insoluble if, because of an opposite trend to that of overpopulation, namely a fall in the birth rate, the inactive sector of the population ever became as large as the active. With the necessary change in the moral climate, our peoples will, guided by their innate spirit, turn away from the abyss. We must never lose confidence, we must forge ahead and carve out new paths, and no matter what the difficulty, the works of the Lord's prayer always come back to me: give us this day our daily bread for us and for all mankind.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (I) Madam President, it is with an extreme sense of unease that I begin my speech, for a number of reasons — first and foremost because, after hearing all the speakers state that the problem of hunger and of extermination by hunger is not in fact a problem of natural disasters or adverse fate, but a problem with deep political causes, I ask myself in what sort of institution we are working. Indeed, if Members older than I and with greater political experience — some even with government responsibilities have stated publicly that the reasons for current extermination, for underdevelopment and malnutrition are political — and therefore due to a policy or to a lack of political will in the true sense of the term — I wonder how today and can speak today and even ask — as some have in fact done — for more time to think, to study the problem, and to analyse the documents.

In my view, in recent years there has been a 'policy of starvation' which has been consistently pursued. Apart from the reasons which I heard in the previous speech, to which I do not think it is worth devoting a single word, because they are in my view the expression of an extremely racist cultural attitude in that, if I understood correctly the countries of the Third World were accused of agricultural archaism and sexual ignorance, I think that perhaps we should examine our own consciences rather more closely and listen with less presumption and more humility to what the countries of the Third World have been asking of us for years and we have failed to give them.

But just think, in our countries, the civilized countries of the West, there is no population policy! Why then should we wish to impose one on the countries of the Third World? Perhaps because in that way they would give us less trouble? Let us think for a moment before transferring all our cultural models.

There is, moreover, a second reason for unease on my part. As we have said, it is important that the public should become aware of the gravity of the problem, because, as Sir Fred Warner stated, if the public is not aware, we shall never succeed in persuading the governments to give 0.7% of the gross national product, the amount which they were already committed to giving in 1970. Well, given the way in which this debate, is developing and the likelihood that we shall finish it at a very late hour, the journalists will not even be able to inform the public of the gravity of the situation. Let us think twice, then before saying that people are unaware. I frequently hear natural disasters mentioned. It is true that natural disasters occur, but when I read in the budget of our Parliament that, for the heading natural or man-made disasters — the man-made ones being worse than the natural ones — an appropriation of 3 million units of account is allocated, I wonder whether it is not ridiculous that our Parliament should grant an appropriation of only 3 million units of account for emergency aid, when so much has been said about the problem

of natural disasters and of those which are sometimes brought about by human agency (and man is very frequently worse than nature in his violence and aggression towards other human beings). At this point I wonder whether we would be acting responsibly in voting on 5 November in favour of this minuscule appropriation, or whether we would be mocking ourselves, others and, above all, precisely those countries in which people are dying.

In his speech, Mr Tindemans said that, in his view, the international organizations dealing with this problem do not seem to have lost any sleep over the tragedy which is going on. I think that is not so much a question of losing sleep as, above all, of not forgetting all the political responsibility which we have carried for years, and of deciding to allocate money. Unfortunately this political will is entirely lacking. Sir Fred Warner suggested that the amendments be referred to committee so that they could be carefully and properly studied. Well, I am no expert on this problem of underdevelopment, but I have been studying it for about 10 months, and I have learnt of the existence of roomfuls of studies, documents, proposals, projects and strategies for the food sector, but there is one small point — there is no finance for them because no one wants to put them into practice. And today I think I have identified another type of pretext which has emerged from the speeches, namely that the problem is so complex that it must be studied in depth. On the contrary, ladies and gentlemen, in my view the time has come to act at once.

Some Members with government responsibilities have stated that the arms race and the increase in arms expenditure are intolerable when there are people dying of hunger. The increase in arms expenditure can certainly not be blamed on a malevolent fate, but there will still be someone who will approve this increase and refuse to allocate this money for the development of the countries of the Third World. There are some measures which can be taken at once. For example, the Community can and must renegotiate as soon as possible the food aid convention, increasing its contribution from 1 287 000 tonnes — if I am not mistaken — to two and a half million tonnes. The Community must speak up in favour of the new cereals agreement. All this has been repeated for years and examined in all its details. You are all well aware of the problem of the international food fund and the suggestion that it be increased from 500 000 tonnes to 650 000 tonnes. Why is it said today that further study is needed and that the problem is not properly understood? We understand the problem perfectly, so much so that whenever the countries of the Third World propose a solution to us, we choose the diametrically opposed solution. We are therefore perfectly well aware of the problem before us. In my view this pretext is no longer tolerable, otherwise the political responsibility falls to all of us, day by day. Now, for example, there is the problem of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand, and the Commission has only 3 million

Bonino

units of account at its disposal, I think, for 1980. If I understood correctly, Mr Cheysson has ten officials, so I propose the creation of a European food task force, with an adequate budget and independence of action, so that, whenever something occurs, we are not forced to hold a great debate in Parliament in order to obtain the necessary funds, but will be able to act at once and not with a delay of two or three months while the Parliament debate is awaited.

Of course, ladies and gentlemen, the problem cannot be solved overnight, but, if we do not begin, it will never be solved, and it is too convenient, too irresponsible and perhaps also too cynical to say to ourselves 'the problem is immense and must be studied afresh'. Mr Glinne said that we must not confine ourselves to charitable action, that we must look not only at the effects but also at the causes. Well, in my view, charity also has a dignity of its own, and differs in this respect from giving alms. But what we are doing is not even giving alms. And yet we have the barefaced effrontery to write '1 000 Indo-Chinese accepted, 5 000 Indo-Chinese accepted' and so on, when we know very well that 20 000 people cross the Thai frontier every day. Well, we are no longer even giving charity, and still less are we discovering the causes.

When we vote on the budget next week, political will will undoubtedly be expressed, and thus we shall be able to see how much political will is shown by those Members who have spoken today of political causes and responsibilities, on which I fully agree. Someone also said that the tropical regions are not as fertile as ours, that they produce less and have suffered soil erosion, etc. However, it did not occur to anyone to discuss the problem of exploitation of the tropical regions for the benefit of the food industry. Moreover, what quantity of cereals which could reduce the hunger of human beings is instead devoted to feeding our domestic animals? I think that any animal, any dog or cat in the United States receives more proteins and more cereals than people in the countries of the Third World.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, for this reason I think it is important to take a decision at once. It is no longer possible, after years of hiding behind the pretext of natural disasters, for us to shift now to the pretext of the complexity of the problem and the studies which must be made. We can and must act at once; there are books already existing on the subject. The problem is whether the political will to act exists. I think that one of the first things which the Community definitely must do is to renegotiate the food aid convention. At all events, I think that the extent of our political will will be shown in practice when we debate the budget.

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by saying that I can

very largely go along with what Mrs Bonino has just said. I should also like to thank her for being one of the authors of our first and, in our opinion, very comprehensive motion for a resolution on hunger in the world. This motion has come into being thanks to her endeavours, and has engendered this extensive debate on the problem of hunger. Mrs Bonino discussed in detail the question of food aid and catastrophes, so I shall restrict my remarks mainly to ways of adopting a structural approach to this problem.

I shall therefore refrain from examining the extent of hunger in the world and the sheer misery it entails. Suffice it to say that there can be no more terrible demonstration of the shocking inequalities in the world we live in. Nor shall I try to ascertain which countries have tried to do something about the problem and to what extent they have failed in their endeavours, or which countries have met their obligations. I shall use the time available to me to concentrate on the specific measures the Community can and — in my opinion — must take, not only to alleviate the current acute suffering, but also — and primarily — to examine the root causes of this utterly unacceptable and nameless misery.

The most frightening feature is that, if there are no fundamental changes, hunger in the world will increase, no matter how much aid and support is forthcoming. Obviously, the European Community's material, financial and technical aid must be increased to a maximum. The very minimum response must be to release 0.7 % of our gross national income for development aid. This is something all the Member States have undertaken to do, but — with a couple of exceptions — these obligations are far from being met, despite the solemn declarations. They must be met in the very near future. The immediate and basic needs of the people of the developing countries in the Third World must be satisfied without delay. Let me clarify this point and avoid any misunderstanding by pointing out that I take basic needs to be the right to be adequately fed and the right to shelter, basic services and education, which means there must be a fundamental structural reorganization of the world economy and commercial policy, aimed at an equitable and rational distribution of work, production, raw materials and material aid.

In other words, our aim must be to construct a new, just international order, especially from the economic point of view. I made the same point in our debate on aid to the South-East Asian boat people during our first part-session in July. Share and share alike is not a principle which applies only to the Community. It is just as valid for the rest of the world. The EEC, one of the world's most powerful trading blocs, can and must play a positive and decisive role in this respect, if only because of the close economic and other links between the West European countries and the developing countries, which after all depend on each other for market outlets and supplies of raw materials.

Dekker

The EEC has a special role to play here, not only for the reason I just mentioned, but also because it is in an ideal position to influence the other industrialized countries and so ensure that the necessary action is finally forthcoming. For instance, the Community could start by tackling and eventually eliminating protectionist tendencies. The international markets for raw materials must be stabilized by international agreements such as the Common Fund for the stabilization of commodities. Other speakers have already made this point. Those developing countries which are important suppliers of raw materials must also process them in their own countries. The Community will have to find solutions for the problem of the developing countries' indebtedness. I am happy to say that a start has been made here, but we are still far from reaching our ultimate goal. The essential process of stimulating food production in the developing countries must go hand in hand with special measures on the world market, such as guaranteed stable prices.

One disappointing — not to say disgraceful — aspect is that those measures I have just referred to — and I could give you plenty more instances — are all well enough known, and have been frequently proposed, but by the developing countries themselves. This has happened in particular in the various international consultation bodies, first and foremost in the North-South Dialogue. I myself took part in the North-South Dialogue and it seems to me quite clear how we should set about the process of redistribution. I believe that those countries which must be expected to contribute most — in other words, the countries with the most resources — know perfectly well what is needed. So the fact that nothing has been done yet is not because of ignorance about what is needed.

Despite the appalling tragedy of the starving millions which now confronts us, we have heard practically nothing so far about the necessary changes. I am afraid that, if we fail to get moving on a fundamental international redistribution, we shall be having debates every year or even every month on the continuing problem of hunger. The number of victims will simply be increasing all the time. As to the proposals before us now, and beginning with the Committee on Development and Cooperation's motion for a resolution, I would remark that while it is true that the motion recognizes that the problem of hunger in the world can only be solved by more structural measures and additional financial and technical resources, there is no mention whatsoever of concrete measures designed to bring about this structural reorganization. All we have are rather vague proposals to increase appropriations earmarked for food aid and other proposals on agricultural and food policy. The motion for a resolution reminds us once again that we have undertaken to set aside 0.7 % of our gross national product for development aid, and there are a few other proposals concerning a more effective world food strategy. However, there is no detailed examination of a fundamental approach to the root causes of the misery in the world.

There are, however, a number of amendments setting out more detailed proposals. I hope we shall not need any more long debates, studies and mountains of paper before we can at last get down to developing a structural action programme, espousing an approach with which we can win over all those international organizations, in which the Community is represented and thus has certain obligations, for a fundamental world-wide change. I should like to call on the Committee on Development and Cooperation in particular to take this debate as a basis for finally taking a fundamental decision, the need for which the committee has itself endorsed in principle. I should like to propose that the Commission should encourage this structural approach by reporting every six months on any structural, financial and technical measures taken by the EEC, and that Parliament should also receive a six-monthly report from the Commission to enable us to carry out our watchdog duties. I believe that it is only by keeping our finger on the pulse and by mobilizing all the resources at our disposal that we can ensure that this debate, which has seen so much reference to solidarity and concern, will lead to appropriate action.

12. *Welcome*

President. — I have pleasure in welcoming to the official gallery Mr William, the Executive Director of the World Food Council.

Mr William was invited by the enlarged Bureau to attend our proceedings at the request of a number of Members. I am sure that I speak for all Members when I thank Mr William for the interest he has shown in our proceedings.

(Applause)

13. *World hunger (resumption)*

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson *Member of the Commission* — (F) This time, Madam President, nobody will be able to say he did not know. The pictures on the screens in our homes have impressed themselves unforgettably on our minds and those of our children: the pictures of the Sahel in 1974 with skeletons of animals and emaciated men and women scraping up dribbles of mud, the same thing later in Somalia, the milling throngs in Bangladesh, those children with distended abdomens and unseeing eyes, and the unseeing eyes, too, of that mother carrying the bundle of rags that was once her baby, or those of the shattered people coming off the boats from Vietnam having lost a mother or brother or sister, or again, only yesterday, the picture in the papers of that mis-shapen figure consisting of a few badly assembled and disjointed members that was once a child — a child like yours or mine, except that he came from Kampuchea.

Cheysson

Then there are the world's 200 million goitre-sufferers, all those blind children who will never be able to see because they have had no vitamin A, and infant mortality rates as high as 12 or even 15 %.

Other speakers have already recalled these facts — or will do so — in terms that make us wince. Let me take a more statistical tone. Between 700 and a thousand million people live in absolute poverty, 450 million are below the critical threshold and in thirteen of the world's countries the percentage of people not receiving the calorie intake necessary for survival has climbed from 8 to 12 % in eight years.

The malnutrition situation is no better. Just think of the protein aspect — the average person in the Third World consumes less than 20 % in terms of dairy products, of what the average person in the industrialized countries consumes, so two good harvest years — 1977 and 1978 — should not cause us to forget the facts that the World Food Conference, the FAO and the World Food Council, as Madam President pointed out a few moments ago, are continually reiterating.

The industrialized countries — 35 % of the world — produce two-thirds of the world's food. The developing countries' grain imports have doubled since 1970. They now amount to 80 million tonnes and are on their way to the 100 million mark. As has already been said, this makes \$15 thousand million at present prices, in other words 15 % of their total imports or, say, two-thirds of the official aid they receive from the whole world. And every time a blow falls on the Western world it hits the Third World harder. Every extra cent on oil means that much less grain.

In 1974, the World Food Conference established that food production in the Third World needed to increase by 4 % a year. As things are, the rate of increase is 3 % in good years, but it falls to 1 % in the least-favoured countries that, taking population growth into account, is a decrease in *per capita* terms. That is the situation, and that is why there is so much death. The facts of the case are that progress in medicine has not been accompanied by sufficient progress with regard to food.

So obviously the first thing to be done is to increase production in the Third World. The rural sector must have absolute priority not only because this is where the society and culture of all these countries have been fashioned, not only because this is where there is work, but also because their survival and development depend upon it.

After a few years, when they were dazzled by what the colonial powers had done before, the leaders of the Third World have now made food production their first priority, and in that connection we have remarkable evidence in our special relationship with the ACP countries because, as you know, each of those countries decides its own priorities without any possible

interference by our offices or our governments. Whereas they used to allocate about 25 % to the rural sector in the first agreements, the figure now is 40 % which, if you think about their infrastructure requirements, is a remarkably high proportion — and more remarkable still if we compare it with our bilateral aid. There you will find no more than 12-13 % in the rural sector. When theirs is the choice the figure is 40 %. They know what they are doing; there is no saying otherwise.

The Community — it is only natural — has begun to adopt the same approach. It has done so in the Lomé Convention, in the emergency operations in Africa, like the 1974 Sahel action, as well as outside the Association, with for example, the measures in favour of the countries worst hit by the petrol crisis in 1974/1975 (\$ 110 million) and the special action following the Avenue Kléber North-South dialogue (\$ 420 million). All this went to the rural sector, to the development of food production.

The same applies to our aid to the non-associated developing countries. 98 % goes to the rural sector. We are committed, totally committed.

Experience confirms what each of us already knows, and that is that it is extremely difficult to obtain rapid growth. Technically the solutions are all within reach. They have to be adapted, true enough, but the right technology can be found every time. Little fresh arable land is available, as Mr Tindemans has pointed out, but tripling productivity in the land that is already under cultivation — a recent evaluation made by Mr Leontiev at the request of the United Nations — is not inconceivable. So we are working at the technical level with the FAO and with other organizations on appropriate technologies, the production of improved strains, the supply of fertilizer and machinery, vaccination campaigns, and so on.

But in too many cases, this turns out to be quite inadequate or purely theoretical. We have to counsel and train, and the farming populations have to be motivated. And we know ourselves how difficult it is in our own countries to induce rural populations to change types of crop, types of structure, modes of transport and marketing methods. The difficulty is far greater in the Third World.

Some excellent things have been said on this subject today — by Sir Fred Warner for example — and we are very gratified to have been able slowly and pragmatically to develop methods such as increasing the number of very small projects and systematic assistance to the non-governmental organizations and voluntary agencies active at grass-roots level to which Sir Fred Warner referred a moment ago.

In this context, there are some examples — though there is not time enough to describe them in detail — which I find remarkable. There are the fishermen on

Cheysson

the Niger river in the Mopti region who continue to organize their fishing in the traditional way, but whom we have taught to use nets which do not rot and to improve the way they preserve their fish. We have also fitted outboard motors to their canoes — the same canoes as before. Another example is the introduction of draught animals to regions where animal husbandry and crop raising used to be mutually exclusive activities, with all that this means in terms of greater productivity and far-reaching sociological change.

I shall not waste your time by quoting other examples, but my point is that this kind of work demands a great deal of patience and tenacity. These are societies in the process of change. They are changing from within because no progress can be made unless it comes from within and it takes ten to fifteen years — half a generation.

Sometimes projects may be even more ambitious. One of which we in the Commission feel immensely proud was invented by the Indians. After a first experiment in four cities — Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi and Madras — the Indians decided to take on a giant project which would enable the people in 142 towns, a population of 150 million, to have certain milk products to improve their protein intake. Ultimately this will mean 10 million families contributing to dairy produce in India. This is a fine rural development and nutritional improvement project, but 8 years will be needed for this project to take shape, to find out how milk can be collected in different conditions from those applying in our countries, how to transport it and whether it will have to be converted on the way and reconstituted, as we believe, in special units.

During this time the Community will be supplying 186 000 tonnes of grain, 114 000 tonnes of milk powder and 19 000 tonnes of butter oil. The value of this, \$ 270 million, will account for 60 % of the cost of the project, the rest being covered by the World Bank and India itself.

These are some examples of the efforts being made to develop production and to integrate that production within the countries themselves.

Is it enough? Of course not. First of all, more needs to be done with more ample resources. Next here are certain difficulties that have to be tackled: sociological difficulties that are all the more serious in that we are dealing with a less developed and less structured environment. What can we do to motivate the rural population in regions like Central Sudan and the Dharfour which are so promising in their crop-growing potential but where there are no cooperatives and no village structures?

Very often, the problem is also bound up with difficulties not connected with production. In a given country, palm oil production, for example, may begin

to grow at a healthy rate — thus improving calorific and protein intake — but it may subsequently collapse because of an inadequate prices policy. Similarly, production may be about to take off, but the rural people will be forced to pull out by a cyclone or drought, which can reduce income to zero in any given year. The importance of Stabex as a guarantee to agricultural populations against the loss of export crops in bad years cannot be overestimated.

Then there are the problems that are physically downstream of production. Some have already been raised. In certain cases up to 40 % of a crop may be lost by bad storage, bad conservation methods or attack by external agents.

That calls for our systematic involvement in infrastructure projects — hydraulic schemes, silos, transport, storage and milk reconstitution units — do you know that there are only four of those at the present time in the biggest of the Third World countries? We have to be involved in these projects, and here again financial resources are required.

Certain financial resources could, of course, be better used and I am thinking in particular of the value of our food aid, the actions by the World Food Programme and the policies applied by courageous countries like Cape Verde.

For these projects, one possible idea would perhaps be to finance them jointly, not just with other big international organizations, but with countries whose responsibility for the worsening of development difficulties is unfortunately beyond question. I am thinking of the oil countries, which are already doing so much to support large-scale, spectacular projects in the likes of road infrastructure or dams, and which could be involved in more modest and more numerous projects in rural development infrastructure.

Results in improving production will be slow, make no mistake. Moreover, the developing countries will never produce all they need. It would be unreasonable for them to embark on types of production with a very low return and run the risk of channelling already inadequate human and financial resources in directions offering little promise. If, therefore, we wish to think responsibly about the food problems of the Third World, we must take a reasonable but purposeful look at the marketing networks that would give the Third World countries access to the food raw materials they need and want to import, but which they would like to import in secure and foreseeable conditions.

This raises the problem of their purchasing power, which I shall not go into now. It also raises the problem of the stability of that purchasing power, which I shall not go into either.

But with regard to these secure conditions, let us consider what we have done up to now. The World

Cheysson

Food Conference has — once again — recommended buffer stocks for the Third World, but the project has not yet been put into effect. Why not? Admittedly, the Americans are in a position to stockpile reserves of food grain, though for domestic rather than external purposes. And the Community in this area — to put it briefly — is nowhere. Is it admissible, Madam President, in a world where the economy is now globalized as we all know, that the price of essential commodities like wheat should increase by 50 % in three weeks, as happened in 1973, because a large contract was signed between the Soviet Union, which had had a bad harvest, and American suppliers, who were only too pleased to offload their stocks? Is it acceptable that the price of sugar should go up by a factor of 5 in one year, only to fall again to one-quarter of that figure? Is that acceptable to the producer, who needs a secure income? Is it acceptable to the suppliers? Is it acceptable for the world markets? For most food products, the world markets are so limited that prices on them have little value except as a guide, and every kind of speculation is possible. Is this not something for the Community — which has a certain weight and responsibility — to ponder on?

You may say that our responsibility for world food problems is negligible, compared with that of the Americans. True enough, the United States and Canada between them control two-thirds of grain exports, although it would, incidentally, be interesting to look at exactly what that means. But we ourselves have some control over dairy produce, because we account for 50 % of world trade. And then we have a place in the Third World, we have a certain responsibility there, and it is an unchanging fact that, for an absolutely indeterminable but certainly very long period of time, the temperate zones of the world — and Western Europe is one of these three zones — will bear a heavy responsibility for safeguarding food supplies and for feeding the world with certain products that the tropical areas are unable to produce for themselves. Now, are we sure that we have the capacity to bear that responsibility? What the Third World is asking us for is some predictability, some stability in market conditions.

Apprehensively, we did accept what is called the advance fixing of refunds with some of the Lomé countries. In plain language this means that we agreed to make it possible for our merchants to offer fixed prices for wheat deliveries over a whole season. This is fine, but, is restricted to one product and only a few countries. What possibility is there of long-term contracts? In 1975, when Egypt came and asked us for a firm, 5-year contract for 300 000 tonnes of grain, 30 000 tonnes of milk powder and 100 000 tonnes of sugar, we shrank away as though someone had made us an immoral proposition — immoral, that is, in market economy terms.

But, in that case, what about the long-term agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union? Between the United States and Japan? Between the United States and Poland? What about the long-term agreement between Canada and Algeria, between Canada and Brazil? What about the long-term agreements that Australia and New Zealand have signed, those that Sweden has with Algeria and that Argentina herself has with Algeria, Chile and Peru? Even Turkey has a long-term agreement for food supplies. How many has the Community. Was it stupidity on the Americans' part to have thought up a regulation known as PL 480 allowing medium-term credit for food supplies, possibly in the form of concessionary loans — a system which the Canadians and the Australians have also taken on board? Was it the height of intelligence on our part to have consistently refused to tackle these problems? The Community does not pull its weight in safeguarding food supplies via world trade channels. We are for the market economy, but we fail to take that attitude to its logical conclusion.

(Applause)

Now, what about food aid? I have left food aid till last, Madam President, because it should be no more than a palliative, a stand-by. Here there certainly is an effort on the part of the Community: 640 million EUA appeared on the 1979 budget. Added to what individual countries are themselves doing in the way of bilateral aid, we have a total of 750 million EUA for 1979. The corresponding American figure is 1 000 million. As for the products concerned, you already know what they are: 720 500 tonnes of grain, 150 000 tonnes of vitaminized milk powder 45 000 tonnes of butter oil and 6 100 tonnes of sugar.

The allocation criteria are objective. I would repeat once more in this House that there is nothing political in them at all. We take *per capita* GNP. The yardstick we use is that applied by the IDA, the Agency of the World Bank. We restrict our food aid to those countries that need to import food products regularly and whose balance of payment is in deficit. One-third goes via the international and non-governmental organizations and two-thirds direct.

Of course this is not enough. Every Member who has spoken has said so. Not enough for requirements and not enough for the applications received. In 1978 they totalled 3½ million tonnes of grain of which the Community was able to send 1 200 000, nearly 300 000 tonnes of milk powder of which we sent half and 137 000 tonnes of butter-oil of which we were able to supply one-third.

You know all about the Commission's proposals for the 1980 budget, and I take this opportunity to thank Parliament for having declared its intention — through the Committee on Development and Cooperation, and later its Committee on Budgets — to take

Cheysson

the fullest account of our proposals which, most strangely, the Council of Ministers had reduced to the minimum — as it has done every time, incidentally, in previous years.

On this score, Madam President, I have only one concern which, with your permission, I shall explain. As all the speakers so far have said, we have to be able to make our full contribution, already announced by our governments, under the food-aid agreement. It is 1 650 000 tonnes a year — our share of the 10 million tonne target set by the World Food Conference.

For the Community, and allowing for bilateral aid, this corresponds to a certain figure which we had written into the preliminary draft budget. If you improve on this we shall be very pleased, but I am very concerned to hear that the Committee on Budgets this morning adopted a figure that is 1 150 000 tonnes lower than the figure we proposed. This is serious, because it means that the Community would not, in that case, be able to fulfil the policy undertaking it has given and which has to be expressed in precise terms, as all speakers in this House have said. I appeal to the European Parliament.

The provisions for 1980 do not go far enough. In our 3-year forecasts, our proposals go much further: from an annual expenditure of 640 million EUA for 1977, rising to 810 million for 1980, we want to achieve 1 000 million by 1982. That would enable us to send a million and a half tonnes of grain, which would make a total of 2 million tonnes if we include that from the individual Member States, 185 000 tonnes of milk powder and 80 000 tonnes of butter-oil. Could even more be done? Possibly.

I would, however, put Parliament on its guard against the simple inference that increasing the appropriation necessarily means an increase in quantity and solves the problem. Things are not that simple. First of all, there are the nutritional constraints. There is no real point in shipping large quantities of milk powder if the necessary infrastructure is not there. Milk powder and butter-oil cannot be sent out if calorie intake requirements are not met first.

Then there are organizational problems. Milk distribution is not a simple matter, and I was very interested to hear Members asking that distribution conditions be checked with the greatest care. Again, and above all, Madam President, we must not forget our policy, which is that food aid is a relief and nothing more. In no event must we arrive at a situation in which food aid takes the place of local production on a lasting basis and becomes an incentive not to produce.

Does that mean we cannot do any better with this general food aid or no more than just increase its quantity? I do not think it does. For one thing I feel that certain more sophisticated products, better

matching nutritional needs, should be encouraged on top of what is done in the way of wheat and milk powder. The Commission has already proposed this on several occasions: a little more sugar and, in particular, a few manufactured products, children's foods and foods for particularly serious situations.

I also think that new methods could be encouraged and, in this connection, I urge the Community to agree to the requests put to us by the Third World countries to help them build up buffer stocks and develop storage infrastructures and offloading facilities in ports. This may sound banal, but it has its importance.

The last specific heading I want to raise is our emergency action in the event of a natural disaster or equivalent situation. Obviously these are the most glaring cases, and we have to be able to act very quickly with food aid, as well as financial assistance to cover the cost of transport, doctors, drugs, tenting, and so on. This has to be done in liaison with, and very often through, international organizations, especially those set up for that precise purpose. Here I would like to pay a special tribute to the Red Cross, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and UNDRO — the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Coordinator.

Lastly, in such cases, there is the need for coordination between Community and Member States — coordination in transport infrastructure facilities and in the action that is launched. After having sometimes criticized our structures, I am happy to say that the decision taken by our Member governments in March 1977 is now operating well. We now have a smooth-running joint disaster warning and action system. Centres have been formed in each of the nine countries, as well as at Community level, for immediate action, covering the very first hours of a disaster and the first stage in restoring the situation. Appropriations for this are already provided in the budget. In the Lomé formula (Chapter 59) they are large. Their scale is still modest, but I would assure Mrs Bonino that they can be supplemented, if need be, under Article 950.

This system, as Mrs Weiss has been good enough to recall, has made a number of emergency operations possible, remarkable for their promptness. Idi Amin was overthrown on 10 April. On 23 April an immediate decision was taken on aid for Uganda. The road linking Uganda to the sea was opened on 5 May. On 11 May the first Community convoy — 11 trucks — went through.

Macias, the tyrannical ruler of Equatorial Guinea, fell on 5 August. The first aircraft to land there — we had borrowed a Cameroonian plane and paid for the fuel because speed was of the essence — flew in with goods purchased in Cameroon ten days later.

Cheysson

Somosa — here I am leaving the ACP States — was overthrown on 17 July. No later than the 25th of that month, the first line of credit was opened for the Red Cross. A few days later seed was bought by the FAO using our credit. In September two months later, over 3 million EUA were put at Nicaragua's disposal.

I shall be talking about Cambodia this evening in another debate, and will give you the relevant facts then.

Can we therefore conclude that all this is satisfactory? No, we have to be able to do better by having buffer stocks in certain international or non-governmental organizations, doing more purchasing on the spot when we have to act very quickly and having appropriations better matching foreseeable needs. In the framework of the Lomé II Convention, we shall have 40m EUA a year for such action. Our 3m EUA non-association aid for 1979 and the 5m EUA for 1980 are — and Mrs Bonino is quite right — ridiculous. In fact, they are so ridiculous that in 1979 we have rounded them up to 22 m, soon to be 40 m. There is thus scope for considerable progress.

But to be credible, to be efficient, we must also, Madam President, have the necessary human resources. I hesitated a great deal before mentioning this this evening, because the current figures are so ridiculous they make me ashamed. These emergency operations I have been talking to you about are run with *two* — and I mean *two* — officials. It is fortunate that hurricane David did not strike in the same month as Somosa fell, because then we would have been completely unable to act. So please be reasonable. We are administering 650 m EUA of food aid with 7 A-grade officials and 2 borrowed, on a somewhat irregular basis by the way, from an auxiliary agency so as not to be completely understaffed.

Our credibility is at stake. On practical grounds, therefore, and with your permission I would ask Parliament, where the decision is in its hands, to help us to have reinforcements and to ensure — and several speakers rightly pointed out that these things would come up again at the budget debate — that the available staff is increased.

The problem is complicated, and its various facets need to be studied in coordinated fashion, seriously and soberly and not purely under the influence of emotion or from the sole standpoint of the Commission but by questioning others, the international organizations, brokers on the big markets, people familiar with agricultural policy and others who know the problems of rural development. This is why, with your permission, I would express, on behalf of the Commission, our very great satisfaction at reading, in the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Development and Cooperation, that you are likely to be having a debate in a few months with extensive

preparation by all the relevant committees and calling, publicly I hope, on those outside Parliament, who are familiar with these problems. This Parliament may be proud at dealing with the 'boat people' at its first part-session, raising the subject of refugees at its second, and now declaring its commitment to the war on world hunger, together with its resolve to act seriously and soberly on the basis of thorough study. I hope that the procedures inside this House and the apparent indifference outside will not be allowed to hide what, to me, is justification for great satisfaction in European development.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Focke.

Mrs Focke. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank Mr Cheysson for reporting to us unemotionally, in this debate, on the role of the European Community, on its responsibilities and capabilities, as well as on its failures to act. The fact is that the European Community is the biggest trading power in the world. Its surpluses are gradually eating away its budget, and its people are falling ill from overeating. This European Community claims it is for peace policy, human rights and more international social justice. It has powers, instruments, capabilities, resources and instruments like Lomé I, and soon Lomé II, or the common trade policy, and even, in the meantime, some signs of a worldwide development policy. At long last it now offers the prospect of development cooperation, their governments are jointly and severally responsible for the situation in this world. All nine States have committed themselves to the 0.7 % target for development aid, and the citizens in our countries, ladies and gentlemen, can be shaken into action and be very generous in some disaster situations. Even so, as Mr Cheysson has just said, 'the Community does not pull its weight' — is true. As ever, this is still the sad reality. Half a billion people are in permanent hunger, and this hunger is growing. In 1979/80, for example, we shall have 80 million tonnes less grain and 80 million more people on this earth. Starvation disasters are growing to the apocalyptic scale of Kampuchea.

We are holding today's debate in this contradictory situation of surplus and hunger — the ultimate violation of the most elemental of human rights.

But this discussion, ladies and gentlemen, will have failed in its object if it is not seen as the start of a coherent and continuous action by the European Community, if once again it merely ends with a fine-sounding resolution and if it does not help us to abandon the methods and structures of the past and the ways in which we have tried to identify and solve problems up to now.

(Applause)

Focke

It must call a halt; it must mean an end to the too slow, too late, too little, too cautious and too hesitant. It must be the starting signal for this action urged by this European Parliament and its committees and aimed at speedier and more practical measures and better results. For this we shall need angry impatience, some signs of which are apparent today; but we also need patience and a sense of proportion, however difficult this may be for us. We need imagination, but we also need better organization, and we certainly need more money.

In February, after some intensive effort, we shall come back to the Plenary Assembly with something that will have, by then, to be fully worked out. From today on — I would like to say this very clearly — we Members of Parliament will have to keep exerting pressure on the Commission, and even more so on the Council, and constantly check up on what they are doing.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Development and Cooperation has tried to deal immediately with what suggests itself at this moment, namely the attempt not just to reinstate the Commission's 1980 food aid proposal, slashed by the Council, but to go further than that with a hefty jump and to apply, for the first time, an amount representing the optimum that the Commission can, in its own words, handle or, to be more outspoken, distribute.

Unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Budgets did not go along with this proposed amendment. Now it really will be a matter of whether we are ready, at the budget debate in November, to put our preparedness to act to the test by tabling and adopting this amendment proposed by the Committee on Development and Cooperation. Otherwise it will be the same old story: we talk but when the first opportunity to act comes along, we let it go by.

(Applause)

Of course, we also know that food aid is not only a quantitative question, and that for many years there have been qualitative and structural shortcomings which will one day have to be corrected. For this reason, when we really begin the intensive work in committee after this debate, our first job will be to investigate this and, by February, point the finger more plainly at these deficiencies, but we must also table proposals for rectifying them.

In the same period we shall look closely into the way our Community food aid is throttled through being linked up with a new world cereals agreement that is not materializing. As the Committee on External Economic Relations requests, this link-up must definitely be broken.

We shall also be looking into the by and large — in spite of the few examples that we thank you, Mr Cheysson, for quoting with regard to disaster aid —

still defective coordination between the Community and individual Member States in food aid. We shall have to study the unwieldy decision-making machinery in Brussels. For about the last five years, the Council is supposed to have been deciding on a new regulation on the administration of food aid. Even if it did finally materialize, this would certainly be no patent cure, but it would at least be a step forward in that it would enable the Commission to act more freely and quickly, it would allow us to have pluri-annual food-aid agreements, and it would make it easier occasionally to purchase food in nearby areas instead of always on European Community markets and perhaps to do a little more in the way of decentralized stocks. It is a scandal that, after five years, nothing has happened, and that the day before yesterday in Luxembourg, the development aid Ministers again failed to make any progress on this matter. To me, this is one of the things on which we have to get the Council moving.

(Applause)

We shall also be looking at the excessive delays that continue to occur between requests for aid and delivery on the spot, as well as the shortcomings in transport, packing, storage — how much waste occurs in this alone? and distribution, so as to ensure that the food really reaches those it is intended for — the hungry.

We shall indeed — and you were right, Mr Cheysson, to dwell on this aspect — have to look into the Community's inability to do anything about supply and price fluctuations on the world markets or to show more foresight, make better provision and develop more emergency stocks. Where, in fact, is the Community's contribution to the 500 000 tonne emergency stock decided by the United Nations years ago?

Secondly, we must look at the relationship between effective food aid and the EEC agricultural policy. Nothing must be allowed to remain of the old approach to food aid as, so to speak, an offshoot of EEC agricultural surpluses. Food aid is a development policy instrument in its own right. It must obey its own particular criteria and not be tied to the Community agricultural policy. There is nothing against using certain surpluses in European agricultural policy if they correspond to specific needs in the recipient countries, but that is just where our problem lies, because they must, of course, also be surpluses that can be supplied at reasonable prices. So here is a second major task for the Committees in the next few weeks.

Thirdly, we know that real food aid becomes increasingly efficient the closer it is tied in with rural development and local production projects. There are opportunities for this kind of tie-up, Mr Cheysson, in the Lomé Convention and in the cooperation that is beginning with the countries outside that Convention, and I would very much like to know how much tying

Focke

up the Commission has in fact done. How many food shipments are connected up with such projects? In our committees we shall, I am sure, want to know very much more about this in the next few weeks, and I could well imagine that the inability of the Community hitherto to get more development cooperation projects going with other Third World countries outside the Lomé Convention in the kind of numbers that Parliament has long been outlining would be that much less if more concentration was focused than previously on projects tied in with the worldwide food-aid network.

Fourthly, it is — of course — a question of the whole problem of rural development and increasing agricultural production in the Third World and an even greater shift of emphasis in the instruments that we have for this purpose.

It must surely alarm us to know that in Africa for example, where we are now into the Fourth European Development Fund, there was more food per head of population in 1970 than there is today. I am glad to learn from a report on rural development and on Community projects under the Lomé Convention that we are today — you have just referred to this again — giving more for rural development projects than for export crop projects, for example, which for many years received the lion's share from this Development Fund. But I am not sure that this is sufficient, or that we have tried hard enough to shift the emphasis — always fully respecting the independence of our partners — and to provide sufficient resources to make it easier than previously to put this shift of emphasis into effect and also to serve other priorities of the developing countries. We, as Members of the European Parliament, shall have quite definitely to give our very close consideration to the new chapter of the Lomé II Convention on agricultural cooperation between the ACP countries and the EEC, and check to what extent and how rapidly it is put into effect.

More agricultural development and production naturally means more development in general, more growth, more employment, better incomes, and greater justice in the distribution of wealth in the Third World. Food aid can only be an aid, a transitional solution, as has rightly been stressed once again. The ultimate object is self-sufficiency, in other words the ability for all mankind on this earth to buy food with the income from their own labour. Industry and craft trades, therefore, energy and technology, training and education, all these are involved. I cannot deal with this in detail now, but one of our tasks in the coming weeks will naturally be once again to state the priorities in as practical terms as possible and at the same time remind our governments, or most of them — and here, unfortunately, I must include my own country among the offenders — that they are far from

reaching the 0.7 % target. To my mind, the growing hunger in the world is helping to build up a moral pressure, and at the same time it is something that makes the citizens in our countries — if there are still any for whom this is a major obstacle — readier to increase the share of tax revenue earmarked for this purpose.

Sixthly, another equally important point is the whole problem of trade liberalization and the opening of our markets — a new, forward looking structural and industrial policy in the European Community designed to advance the new international division of labour. This, ladies and gentlemen, naturally means more than just involving ourselves, however deeply, in a debate entitled 'World hunger'; it means that throughout all our committee work, in breadth and length, and in an infinite number of individual cases when there is conflict between our interests and the development of the Third World, between agricultural policy and development policy and between the problems of developing industries in the Third World and employment policy in the West, we must always have the courage to face up to this conflict of interests and look beyond the boundary of our own horizons.

This is basically the conclusion of this debate which I regard essentially as a pledge on our part to make a fresh start in the way we deal with our problems.

It also, of course, means more readiness to provide information. I agree with you, Mrs Bonino, in part — the readiness is there with the information we are already giving but we must be clear about this: we have to have more courage, in the present situation in the Community, to tell the taxpayers, workers and unemployed — the citizens who elected us — that all this has to come from somewhere, and that it means that in the future we have to give up part of the increase in our income. It is as concrete and precise as that, and we shall have to say this and have the political and civil courage to repeat it over and over again at every opportunity that offers.

Let me repeat: in this debate we are first and foremost pledging ourselves. It can be only a first step. The second debate — that is our proposal — must take place in February at the latest. At that time we have to produce a European Community food programme in the form of a concrete package. For this we shall need every kind of expertise. Thank you again for the suggestion, Mr Cheyssson. I could imagine, for example, that it would be useful to ask Willy Brandt, who is to contribute a chapter on the war against hunger in this world in his reporting of the North-South Commission in the next few weeks, to speak to the relevant committees. We shall need him and others — every expert we can find. But we must, above all, also urge the Commission to over-

Focke

come any form of compartmentalized thinking, to weld together more strongly than before its services and officials and the various Directorates and Directorates-General and form them into a combat unit, and to embark upon an out-of-the-ordinary effort, on top of what has already been done, in order to combine together our instruments, financing capabilities, possibilities of action and above all ideas. At the same time, from the Commission, but above all from the Council, we shall require concrete decisions. We have no right to back out from this world hunger problem. What is more, we are capable of conquering it, it is just a question of political will.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR : MR JACQUET

Vice-President

President. I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini. — *(I)* Mr President, I am happy to be following Mrs Focke because she has hit the nail on the head.

I am grateful to Mr Commissioner Cheysson who, with the help of his great experience in these matters, explained that there are two ways of approaching this question. Although I admired the spirit in which Mrs Bonino talked about an act of compassion, I hope she will not mind my saying that, in my view, we shall be powerless to do anything unless the economy of profit and imperialism is superseded by an economy based on brotherhood between the peoples and the nations of the world.

Commissioner Cheysson told us that, even if a policy of aid finds requisite expression in concerted action by the international agencies, it can only produce a policy which Tibor Mende, in one of his latest books, calls a policy of 're-colonization', one which reduces the number of those dying of hunger throughout the world, but leaves unsolved the real issue underlying this debate and the problem of hunger itself, which is the need, with Europe's help, to give the world a new economic order and a new international order.

I had hoped to see a large number of young people in the gallery today — they may well, in fact, have been there — because this is a historic moment in the life of the Community and in full accord with Article 3 of the Treaty of Rome, which envisages the Community not only as the basis on which our peoples can achieve a balanced development, but also as the medium through which Europeans can help the family of nations to grow strong.

So, today, we recognize that there can be no future unless we accept that the majority of our international partners are the developing countries, and that we can make a contribution to peace and international deve-

lopment only by trying to integrate our economies. But, as Mrs Focke has just said, this requires us to know exactly what sacrifices we shall be called upon to make.

There can, of course, be no doubt that, against the background of the tragedy of underdevelopment, which we rather simplistically call hunger, Europe has cleaner hands than any other large international community. I hope our colleagues from the Italian Communist party will not mind my saying that I and, I imagine, Mr Bersani and others, who long ago pinned our faith on the AASM/ACP association with the developing countries, warmly welcome the recognition of its value by the Communist spokesman.

I will not repeat what you Communists thought of Yaoundé a few years ago. I merely note that you now recognize the value of its achievements. On the basis of our special relationship as friends of the American people, we may have to convince them that the principles of free trade will not solve the problems of a developing world ; if, on the basis of your own special relationship with the Comecon countries, you ever have to do the same, I only hope that you will be able to convince them that the problem of the new order — and this could be the subject of argument if we get to grips with Comecon — cannot be tackled by insisting on the non-convertibility of currencies, by the use of loans with strings attached or the strong-arm salesmanship which, failing evidence to the contrary, is still the hallmark of the Soviet Union's trade policy.

I say this without wishing to score a point, but only to welcome the fact that attitudes are changing in this House. They are changing because we recognize that our real partner is the Third World. We also realize that even though, alas!, we are a long way from a system of world government which might permit the free world to obey its conscience and make expenditure on prestige and armaments take second place to expenditure on real human progress and the service of mankind, we can nevertheless work for a Community which, after twenty years' existence, at last appreciates, in a typically Western way, which is traditional for some and a novelty for others, that future progress depends on working in conjunction with the new nations. We in Europe have made our choice, and we shall follow this road to the end, leaving others to see to the balance of military power and the maintenance of social equilibrium within the human community. We may yet have to face the crisis of war involving our young people, or the prospect of a major conflict of interests or military confrontation.

I feel we must ask Mrs Bonino to try and understand the need for our committees to work patiently and conscientiously on the issues which have been brought out in this debate. If it were merely a question of raising the entries in our budget which, I agree with her, must be done, I should be the first to say :

Pedini

let us get on with it at once. If it were merely a question of providing food aid, I would agree with her that it should be done this evening.

However, what the situation requires is to give an impetus to a new type of economy and a recognition that when, as a European Community, we discuss our common agricultural policy, we must in future do so in a way that takes account of the situation which is dominating this debate, in other words the fact that the people we are dealing with are the poor of the world and that we must work out a different policy on over-production and storage than the one we have adopted hitherto.

In the same way, when working out our future trade policy, we must go for something more than the liberalization of trade between our well-established economies; as Commissioner Cheysson said, we must go for a liberalization of trade in conjunction with stable prices and guaranteed supplies of raw materials. It is for this reason, I imagine, that Mr Cheysson is, in all probability, contemplating the desirability of an association from which, after Lomé, the new institutions for industrial areas will come into being under Community law. The Lomé association could also perhaps be reinforced by joint development agencies to enable the associated peoples to share supplies of raw materials, manufactured goods and technology.

We shall, Mrs Bonino, be discussing questions and commitments relating to scientific research in the Community, which could hardly exist at all if it did not have a comprehensive policy on science and research. When we do so, we should perhaps bear in mind that our desire for scientific inquiry and the application of technology cannot be confined to questions affecting our own wellbeing and the superior living standards which we enjoy in comparatively sheltered circumstances. Even if we had no drought in some of our areas, it is our duty to study solar energy, encourage the application of nuclear isotopes, investigate soil erosion and accelerate research on the desalination of water. This is because the associated countries in the new, underdeveloped world are waiting for the initial burst of energy which sets a nation on the road to development and which we could guarantee to them if only we devoted a little of our research effort to the direct conversion of solar energy, a development that cannot be far away. Would that not be aiding people to combat hunger in the best sense of the term?

As Mrs Focke said, we must be consistent with regard to every aspect of industrial policy. We must recognize that the time is approaching when there must be a fresh division of labour among the nations of the world. Dealing with the problem of hunger means accepting from now on that the dignity and honour of a Parliament such as ours requires that the planning for a new Europe can no longer be selfishly and exclu-

sively conceived in terms of our own good. We have to convince the employers, the trade unions, the workers, the people and our society as a whole that a substantial number of the industrial and other privileges we enjoy today must be handed over to the other countries.

Are we adult enough to undergo such a change of heart? If we are, then the twenty years of Community history behind us have borne their fruit, because it means that a European Community designed for Europe is opening itself up to a new world and helping to create a new world order.

When we talk about education policy or cultural policy, we must accept, for ourselves as well as for others, the fundamental principle that development is not worthy of the name if it is conceived exclusively in economic terms and does not at the same time enrich the cultural and civic life of the community concerned. When people talk about population and over-population, they tend to forget that the population problem finds its proper level once a nation reaches a certain stage of cultural development as a result of the scientific and technical resources made available to it.

So, Mr President, we have to look at the Community and its affairs in a new light. We shall not be able to do this on the basis of a single debate such as this one, however charged with emotion; each of us must develop his own ideas further as a member of his committee.

As far as my own Committee is concerned, we have already considered the need for young people to take a greater interest in these problems because in the days to come this sphere of activity will be their spiritual home. We must launch more schemes like the young people's movement for voluntary service in underdeveloped countries, which has already shown that, among our youth, a new spirit is abroad. As soon as our children enter primary school, we must imbue them with a sense of brotherhood with the human race and enable them to rise above selfish concern with their own wellbeing. This is not just a question of educational technique; it involves a reorientation of our cultural responsibilities.

This has been a good debate. It has enabled the various political parties here to rise above the level we are accustomed to in the narrower confines of our own Parliaments. The debate gives one the feeling of being in a Parliament which has the stature to cope with the great issues of the present day. We must, however, be prepared, as my committee is prepared, to cope with the difficulties inherent in this new approach, which is to prepare public opinion for the sacrifices which are involved, but which are the only alternative to a desperate end of millenium when we shall have no idea what kind of future awaits our peoples.

Pedini

It is in this spirit that I shall vote for the resolution which has been proposed. The Committee on Development and Cooperation deserves our thanks for having seized the opportunity to stage a debate on this formidable subject and for reminding us of the last discussion we had with the associated countries. I shall vote not only for the benefits which will accrue as a result of what we have been saying, but also in fulfilment of the responsibility which we have towards our electors, to whom we shall have to account; and so I look forward to seeing Europe act as the guarantor of social advancement and of a new cultural status, which must constitute the end-of-century message to the world.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Christopher Jackson.

Mr C. Jackson. — Mr President, I would like to add my thanks to Commissioner Cheysson for his thought-provoking speech, and perhaps especially for his urging us to report in depth. If by some miracle a hundred or so out of the many millions of men, women and children now dying of starvation could appear here in this Chamber in front of us, we would all know what to do. Medical services, food, care, would all be mobilized, and the problem would be solved. Would that reality were so simple: for despite decades of work by the FAO, the World Bank, despite bilateral aid, Community aid, the work of voluntary agencies, despite convoys of food, despite millions of dollars, there are today, as Mr Tindemans said, probably many more people in desperate poverty in the world than ever before in its history. Those near starvation are equal to or greater in number than the population of Germany or France, or Italy or Britain.

The moral case is clear: surely not one of us can coolly confront the anguish of our fellow human beings without response. But for those who are hesitant, we may add to the obvious moral reasons for action, a political one also. It is well known that poverty frequently leads to political instability. By the year 2000 we face the prospect of perhaps 10 % of a larger world population being in utter poverty, and an even greater number of urban poor. The risk of aggression, of interference with world trade or with vital raw materials is clear.

But despite the moral and political reasons for action, despite enormous and dedicated action by agencies and countries, the world is failing to solve the hunger problem. That is why we have to be particularly clear-headed in our approach. And the first question we must ask is: Why, despite some splendid successes, is overall aid failing to achieve the results it should? Is it that our aid is too often wrongly applied, or even misconceived at the start? Is it that the governments and social structures of developing countries themselves too often hinder the effectiveness of aid in reaching those who most need it?

I was glad that Commissioner Cheysson reminded us that aid is not simple. I agree. Fifteen years ago I was campaigning for 1 % of GNP as an aid target. I fought those who said increased aid was wrong. But today there is an increasing groundswell of expert and informed opinion that says: 'Hold it; be careful, for our aid may go astray — and worse, it may even damage those we are seeking to help!' We cannot be satisfied with this.

Let me give a few examples. Take food aid to Guatemala after the earthquake in 1976: although only housing had been destroyed, thousands of tonnes of food aid arrived. First, the farmers could no longer get enough labour to gather the crops; it was easier for the labourers to stand in the handout queue. The government tried to exclude the aid; still it arrived. Then the domestic market for maize collapsed, with the result that the peasant farmers were poorer than they were before.

In Bangladesh, a loan-aided irrigation well in one village was supposed to be owned by a farmers' cooperative, but in reality it was owned by the biggest landlord; the local farmers were paying higher rents and found themselves worse off, and the rich landlord could better afford to buy others out when times were hard.

As recently as this June, a former head of the world food programme in 23 central and western African countries said that 90 % of his food aid programmes were unsatisfactory. Corruption and inefficiency were mentioned, and he also said that food aid might lead to starvation in his regions by undermining local food production.

In addition, noted economists such as Keith Griffin, believe many first-class infrastructure grant-aided projects would be done anyway, and that in practice they release developing countries' funds for something unrelated to development — even for armaments.

Mr President, in this context I beg to move Amendments No 21 and 22 standing in my name, that of Sir Fred Warner of the European Democratic Group, Mr Bangemann, Mr von Habsburg, Mr de la Malène and Mrs Weiss. The primary purpose of the first of the amendments is to ask the Commission to report urgently on the effectiveness of various forms of help to developing countries, and the second amendment, which is a corollary to this, adds the Commission to the list of those the Committee on Development and Cooperation should consult in preparing its report.

May I remind this house of the words of Martin Luther King, words often quoted by President Kennedy? We should, he said, be tough-minded and tender-hearted; and if ever there were a problem requiring this approach it is world hunger. We must resist the temptation, with all respect to Mrs Focke, to

C. Jackson

make a rush job of Parliament's report. This problem has baffled the world for years, and with all respect to our talents, I very much agree with Sir Fred Warner that we shall do better to show our concern for those in need by taking the time that wide consultation and open-minded research require.

May I finally suggest some questions to which our report should address itself. First, what forms of help have proved to be of greatest immediate benefit to the rural poor and starving? Second, what forms of help are most likely to prove of lasting benefit? Buffer stocks, perhaps, as suggested by Commissioner Cheysson. Third — a very difficult question — how should the Community take account of human rights and political systems in relation to aid? Fourth, how do we reconcile our reluctance to become involved in the internal affairs of developing countries when it is our duty to our taxpayers and to ourselves to be sure that the aid we provide is used effectively, and used for the benefit of those who need it? It is indefensible simply to urge that we throw more money at the problem without first making sure we are giving truly effective help. And we owe it to those we try to help to think before we act, lest we in error harm them. That is why the amendment standing in my name lays such emphasis on the effectiveness of aid.

There is so much to do, and we are rightly dissatisfied. The Community and its Member States together are already the world's largest aid supplier; larger than the United States, and standing in great contrast to the USSR, which provides less than one-tenth of the aid that we do both in absolute terms and in relation to GNP. It is only right that others should bear their share of the burden and increase their help too.

Mr President, we now look forward to our report and to action. I hope that by being tough-minded and tender-hearted this Parliament will indeed succeed in making a major contribution to helping those who are the neediest in the world.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Poirier.

Mme Poirier. — *(F)* Mr President, one of the most sickening things for the Communist woman that I am is the fact that hunger is affecting more and more human beings precisely at a time when immense riches can be obtained from the earth, thanks to the scientific and technological progress that mankind has made. How can we put up with the idea that one third of the children born in the underdeveloped countries will not live to be five years old? But whether it is a question of the lack of food or poverty, deep down the reasons stem quite simply from the economic and political relationships between men and between societies; they are not the work of fate or natural disaster. Notwithstanding all the fine speeches, to agree that the pursuit of capitalist profit should continue to be

the mainspring of these relations means accepting defeat in advance in the war on hunger and death. Whether you like it or not, the fact is that wherever the underdeveloped countries have remained under capitalist control, their food dependence has increased. Conversely, since 1950, 40 % of the population of the Third World have defeated the famine they had known for a thousand years. As if by chance, these are the socialist countries like China, in all its immensity, and Cuba. There is no inevitable shortage of food. If we first take our countries, for example, the statistics of the American Department of Agriculture tell us that the world grain and rice harvests in 1979 were among the biggest this century — enough to feed the whole of mankind and lay in big reserves as well. But at the same time, the United States are putting pressure on the EEC countries, in particular, to reduce their grain exports in order to maintain its monopoly position on the world markets. Then there is that extraordinary system that we see more particularly in France where, as a result of the EEC agricultural policy, animal farming sectors are being liquidated, traditional crops uprooted, tens of thousands of tonnes of fresh produce destroyed, and a whole range of agricultural research facilities, certainly valuable to our country but to the whole of mankind as well, disbanded. Now let us take the countries where famine reigns. Most of them are not poor countries, disowned by nature. Instead they represent an immense potential from the industrial and also agricultural standpoint. For us it is tedious repetition, though pregnant with misery and dreadful tragedy, to say that all the colonial or neo-colonial relations — in other words those that still exist in practice between the industrialized and developing countries, are based on the plundering of the latter's assets, on the supply of raw materials at the lowest possible price and on the shameless exploitation of human labour. Yes, wealth exists in these poor countries too. In 1971, the year of the terrible drought that affected the whole of mankind, the Sahel countries exported 15 000 tonnes of off-season French beans and vegetables to the greater profit of the colonial exporting companies. In 1971, too, Mali was exporting grain. Today, Mexico sends half of its vegetable production to the United States; three times a week, a DC10 loaded with tomatoes, French beans or melons takes off from Dakar bound for Paris, Amsterdam and Stockholm, and in this we can see the hand of the multinational companies about whom I have not heard much said today. For some years now, assisted by political and commercial structures which have even been furthered by the Lomé Convention, these companies have built up enormous agro-industry corporations based on export crops. The latter are being developed at the expense of the food crops essential for the survival of the local population. But what is more, because of the intensive mechanization necessary for this kind of farming, they are increasing the dependence of the countries concerned, without bringing the slightest benefit to the population. The more

Poirier

these industrial export crops are developed, the more the developing countries see their own specific resources shrink. As a result, they are now importing — as has already been said — over \$ 10 thousand million worth of food products, or 80 % of the aid they receive. But because they have earlier loans to pay back, they do not have enough resources to close their food gap, and are unable to raise the credit they need for industrialization. And of course someone profits from the situation, the proof being that, whereas Western and American consumers pay \$ 200 thousand million every year for these imports, not including oil, from the Third World countries, the Third World itself receives in return only \$ 30 thousand million, the difference being pocketed by the multinationals. In this scheme, the latter and the governments supporting them — our governments — have not the slightest interest in industrializing these countries and yet, if the developing countries could control the processing and distribution of the products they export, their income would be \$ 150 thousand million.

All this gives very concrete form to the problem of world hunger and the need for industrial development in these countries, because the lack of available food is not the only cause of hunger. The lack of purchasing power applies to both countries and individuals. According to the ILO, there are 300 million human beings in the world with no work and no resources. According to the UN, the annual income per human being in the poorest new countries, accounting for one third of the earth's population, is the equivalent of only \$ 120, and that at a time when we know how to tap the sun's energy, irrigate deserts and reclaim marshland; when we know that we have to safeguard the natural equilibria and know how to. But colonial conquest has accumulated capital in a few countries and in the hands of a few people — a few hundred thousand — who have organized the world at the expense of millions of others. These things have to be described as they really are. In the present state of economic relations, men women and children will continue to starve to death and the aid given with ulterior motives by the Western countries, although valuable nevertheless, is an inadequate palliative. As long as profit is the rule, hunger will persist.

As far as the EEC is concerned, we will not help to establish a new world equilibrium by pushing ahead with supranationality and demolishing national economies. On the contrary, we believe that the basis for this equilibrium must rest on the diversity and complementarity of our different countries and on the extent to which the assets and potential of each nation and each country are turned to account. I absolutely reject the idea of our own nations or countries being especially well-endowed. That notion can only make sense to those who, at bottom, want to keep the world as it is, with all its present distress and injustice and, above all, its system of exploitation. This notion is designed to fasten the blame on the 7 million work-

less in the Common Market countries, and the millions of French workers earning the bare minimum who have no responsibility for the cruel problems we are discussing today, whilst those who are really to blame are safe and sound with their billions, their power and their untroubled conscience. Like Georges Marchais speaking on our behalf to the Consultative Assembly of the Lomé Convention, we say that the real and mutual interest of nations does not consist in distributing scarcity and austerity more evenly among countries but, on the contrary, requires international relations based on the development and fulfilment of each country and each individual. It is rather by preserving the wealth of France that French people, for example, will be able to help solve the world hunger problem and arm themselves effectively to combat poverty and bring about, now, changes in the economic and political relations between our countries and those of the Third World. Of course, the countries of the Third World who produce wealth, must be fully involved in all the decisions. They must stop being simply suppliers and become partners. New relations have to be instituted based on mutual equality, respect for sovereignty, genuine aid not seen as charity but as a restitution for colonial plundering, with no interference and no spirit of domination on the part of the industrialized countries towards the developing countries. A moment ago I heard a reference to local overlords and other tyrannical leaders. They exist in the Third World — and in our countries — and there they are the most zealous servants of neo-colonialism. So let us look after our own overlords and prevent them from causing harm. Let the people solve their own problems. Historically, it is colonial intervention — in the interests of the people, of course, as everyone knows — that first and foremost has completely disorganized the economy and development of the underdeveloped countries. I see, in this Assembly, that contempt and the colonial spirit are still very much alive. The Third World countries' demand for sovereignty and independence made so often and so strongly may be in contradiction with the interests of the multinationals, but it is not in contradiction with the interests of other nations. The French Communists, in the case of oil prices, have refuted this divisive and spurious argument.

We repeat: everything possible has to be done to allow these countries to increase their production, by such means as investment in hydraulic projects, more agricultural research and major land improvement projects, so that they can achieve food self-sufficiency, the only definitive solution to the hunger problem. But for years to come, these countries will still have to depend on imports to meet their requirements. It is absolutely essential, therefore, to put an end to the Malthusian policies which, with EEC intervention, are holding back or reducing agricultural production in countries like France which could, instead, considerably increase their exports, and thus provide food for the hungry.

Poirier

It is therefore the general attitude of the EEC countries with regard to commodity agreements and integrated programmes that has to be changed in a spirit of justice and solidarity. Fighting against the shut-downs of all kinds in Europe is a way of meeting the requirements of our workers, which are far from being met, and also building up the necessary exports to the underdeveloped countries, just as improving the living conditions of our workers also opens big markets for products coming from the developing countries.

We add our voice to all those demanding that the Development Fund should effectively receive the 0.7 % of GNP from every country, but we insist that the capital should be invested for purposes ensuring, primarily, the subsistence, development and industrialization of the countries where this is needed. Establishing machinery to stop the monstrous profits of the multinationals and halt the armaments race in which the developing countries are also caught up — that too is an aspect of the solutions to be found at the human level.

But if capitalism is to be made to give way in these areas, we shall need a great deal of firmness, clear thinking and combat on the part of the people who, on their own account have the same common interest in living. We are fully convinced of all this, we are not just spreading illusions, and this explains the attitude of the French Communists and Allies Group when this debate comes to an end. We want our people to act and speak with political clarity, and that political clarity is not, in our view, reflected in a motion for a resolution intended, for many, to make believe that there is unanimity in an Assembly where, instead, the political divisions are so marked.

This is why we French Communists and Allies shall be abstaining in the vote on this motion. Before I close, I would like to point out to Mrs Flesch that I explained my position on this subject in the clearest fashion during the meeting of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, where I took the place of Comrade Denis; there could have been no possible doubt about our intention not to sign this text, although all those attending tried to change my mind, presumably to achieve in this assembly a unanimity which we refuse to agree to.

President. — Honourable Members, I think this is a suitable time at which to suspend our proceedings. I call Mr Penders on a point of order.

Mr Penders. — (NL) Mr President, I would just like to ask, firstly what exactly the intention is with regard to the order of business; in other words how long you plan to continue, and what other items on the agenda

you intend to dispose of; and secondly I would like to know if you are 100 % sure that what you now rule will in fact be kept to.

President. — Since our agenda has not been amended, it must be adhered to. With the night sitting, we should be able to get through all the items. We shall of course have to keep very strictly to the allocated speaking times.

We shall now suspend our proceedings and resume at 9.00 p.m.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 7.40 p.m., and resumed at 9.00 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

14. *Membership of committees*

President. — I have received a request from the political groups for the following Members to be appointed to the Delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the EEC-Greece Association:

Mr Adam, Lord Bethell, Mrs Boot, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Delorozoy, Mrs Demarch, Mr Druon, Mr Estgen, Mrs Groes, Mr Harris, Mrs Hoff, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mr Köhler, Mr Papapietro, Mr Pürsten, Mr Rey, Mrs Roudy and Mr Schinzel.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

15. *Urgent procedure*

President. — I have received a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1—435/79) by Mrs Macciocchi, Mrs Bonino, Mr Capanna, Mr Coppieters, Mr Pannella, Mrs Lizin, Mr Motchane, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Charzat, Mr Sarre and Mr Bonde, with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the extradition of Franco Piperno.

The justification of the request for urgent debate is contained in the document. I shall consult Parliament on the urgency of this motion tomorrow, at the opening of the sitting.

16. *World hunger (resumption and conclusion)*

President. — The next item is the resumption of the debate on world hunger.

I call Mrs Dienesch.

Mrs Dienesch. — (*F*) Mr President, the World Food Council has been saying that the 1980s should be the decade of food and development. A moment ago, Mr Cheysson recalled the picture we see every evening on our television screens, and I hope that the decade of development and food will not end — like the Year of the Child — with pictures showing the overwhelming impotence of the richest countries, in spite of their good intentions.

To deal with the problem we shall certainly have to fight. You have referred, Mr Commissioner, to infant mortality in these countries. The figure is 15 %. The figure for our countries, thanks to everything that has been done for children in the way of health conditions and nutrition, is 1.5 %. That to my mind, is something that should strike our imagination and indicate the size of the task facing us.

Take calories, for example, the press urges us to reduce our intake, not in order to benefit those who have none, but for the sake of our figure or our state of health. Here again, the daily average intake in the poorest countries is falling, being hardly 200. In the developed countries, however, growth has raised the figure now to nearly 4 000. That is a measure of what we have to do.

It is clear that the poorest countries we have just been talking about do not have the financial resources necessary to purchase their primary food needs. Per capita income has increased by \$ 2 in ten years. And we know that the grave shortages suffered by these developing countries heighten their food crisis to such a point — in certain cases — that it becomes a kind of famine.

Is it because the world does not produce enough? All the speakers have admitted that we produce sufficient. In terms of world harvests enough is available. World stocks, we are assured, would suffice. But the truth is that the growth rate for the world population, of which more than half are undernourished, is not now being currently balanced by the necessary increase in food production. Over a period of six years, world production has gone up by only 2 % a year, the figure being 3.5 % in the developed countries.

This has made some people think that efforts should be concentrated on population trends. I shall not go back over what many previous speakers have said — including many women, Mrs Veil in particular. There is obviously no question of anyone, even if we are getting a bit crowded, interfering with personal rights, and people's dignity and customs, even though we should increase our efforts to inform and educate, but this too should not show any disrespect for these nations' specific way of life.

You spoke, Mr Commissioner, about agricultural development. Clearly this is the key to the problem. One subject that strikes me, with regard to agricultural development in poor countries, is water — vitally necessary for such development. Water management and conservation technologies would enable arable land to be reclaimed in the different countries — 100 000 km² for example, in Africa. In Israel, for instance, rational irrigation systems have enabled agriculture to grow at a rate of 6-7 % per annum over the last 10-15 years, though water consumption has hardly changed.

In our travels, we have seen fields of wheat flourishing in the middle of the Sahara and we must surely ask ourselves, in view of the disturbing lack of water in certain areas of the world, whether this will not — if we do not take care — be a limiting factor for the future of agricultural production.

It is therefore important — I feel that this is a hint we should take — to make good use of what we have and above all avoid waste.

Agriculture and the agro-food industry are inseparable. In our countries, moreover, we are trying to locate them closer together. I was very struck, Mr Commissioner, when you said that there were only four milk reconstitution plants, and that this was one of the points where we could perhaps improve our aid for undernourished countries, particularly for the children.

In these industries, that we must certainly try to promote alongside agricultural development, we should not forget either — and I feel that here, perhaps, we have sometimes done more than is required — the extraordinary progress that industrial technology can bring to these countries. It could also help to establish a fair balance between agriculture and industry.

But we should remember that the pursuit of efficiency, though justified of course in this field, may sometimes lead to overmechanization, which creates its own difficulties and resurrects other obstacles to agricultural development. Development in the Third World cannot take place in a void. The machinery has to be adapted to climate, customs, attitudes and local land-use, and the people have to be appropriately trained. Here I feel we must make a considerable effort and not simply parachute in schemes and improvements geared to the technical, economic and ecological conditions prevailing in temperate environments that have often proved disastrous when transplanted to completely different settings like the tropical forest, oases and the edges of the desert. If precautions are not taken, the soil and the economies of the tropical system could be made barren for ever. An

Dienesch

example is the Aswan Dam in Egypt, a good illustration of a technological and agricultural development project whose effects on the natural and human environment had not been sufficiently studied in advance.

True enough, it successfully stores all the flood water of the Nile — 120 thousand million m³ — and this is no mean advantage, because it doubles the arable area. But there has been an enormous loss which has not yet been measured, namely all or most of the alluvium previously brought down by the flood water. This continuously watered valley is now permanently damp, and previously unknown parasites belonging to wet tropical environments are now multiplying, and will have to be controlled by using large quantities of pesticide and decontaminating the area.

I feel that we must take these things into account in our future efforts. Fortunately they are under consideration, but the consequences, in the example I have quoted, entailed an enormous expense in concrete and modern industrial plant, massive use of chemical fertilizers, and a great deal of energy, all of which will have to be paid back, possibly to the detriment of agriculture.

We should not forget that, beyond a certain threshold, the increase in yield is no longer worth the increase in production costs. It is not that having potent resources is in itself damaging or dangerous — of course not — but what is serious is failing to foresee its effects. In other words we have to act with prudence and foresight.

I suspect, Mr Commissioner, that the little experiments you quoted, which gave good results, were probably financed at a very much lower level, so that they generated fewer backfires so to speak.

Green revolutions have sometimes disappointed the hopes they raised in the countries where hunger reigned. Why should we not think about setting up a Community research centre on the model of the French Gerdat (Groupement d'études et de recherches pour le développement de l'agronomie tropicale)? in addition to its research role, this body could examine projects for developing countries and decisions on whether Community money should be spent would be based upon its opinion.

Moreover, since I am now referring to certain human aspects of the problem, it is also clear that farmers producing ordinary food crops in the Third World (grain and root crops) are unable to stand up to world competition and, what is more, their output is not enough to supply their own national markets.

For that reason, the farmers in these sub-tropical areas specialize in products like coffee, cocoa beans and pineapple, and have abandoned staple commodities for export crops. As a result, the period when they no longer have enough to eat — between one harvest and

the next — tends to lengthen. They have fewer and fewer stocks to carry them over, and they are developing the habit of buying the additional food they need on the general market with the money they earn from their export crops.

Only a policy of systematically developing and using their own resources and their own agro-food products will enable them to acquire some measure of independence and, let us say, reduce their food and economic risks in the future.

The creation of a Centre for agricultural development in the framework of the Lomé II Convention is a first step, and an example that should be followed more widely.

As for Europe — since it too is expected to provide aid — it also will have to increase its agricultural potential and play a leading part in the war on hunger. Not long ago, in a debate on our surpluses, I made the point that, regardless of the difficulties of the moment, we should not give up the objective of vigorous expansion in our agriculture. Perhaps this is the way that we will be able to help countries in the Third World.

The policy of aid for the Third World is the natural complement to the common agricultural policy. It should, of course, also be a stimulant by virtue of our national requirements. We should not forget that our stocks of milk powder have fallen, and when you were speaking, Mr Commissioner, about these reserves that we should build up, I feel that we should also apply this at the European level and find ways of laying in stocks to help these countries.

Our Community should therefore direct its general policy in such a way that we can not only maintain but further increase the present volume of food aid. I agree with you that we should argue for returning to the figures given by the Commission in its draft budget, because obviously at the very moment when we are campaigning against hunger, if an effort has to be made — and I do not underestimate it, we must not imagine that there is no limit to our budget — it is not these chapters of generosity, to put it simply, or mutual aid to those who are less fortunate that should necessarily be cut.

Next, we ought to supply secondary processed products with a high grain content. We should also develop triangular operations consisting in the EEC supplying the aided developing countries with products purchased in other developing countries, if possible in the same geographical area. This type of action cannot be too strongly recommended. It offers the twofold advantage of promoting the seller's local agriculture and ensuring that the aid given to the peoples concerned is more diversified and better suited to their food habits.

Dienesch

We must resist Malthusianism a self-evident proposition where the common agricultural policy is concerned, as I already said, and bring about a change in policy so as to be able to conclude long-term supply contracts. These measures have long been recommended by our Group — since 1979 — and the ACP States themselves agree. At the meeting of the Council of Ministers in the Fiji Islands, the ACP States pressed us to see whether an arrangement could not be found for Community surpluses of certain food products to be made available to the ACP States on favourable terms.

We should also strive for more stability in the world's agricultural markets, which implies market organization at the world level.

We should remember too that agriculture in the developing countries themselves needs to be developed in ways which have already been pointed out, but on which I think it is useful to insist. I am referring to the education, not only of farmers but also of consumers — and women in particular — in these countries. I think a previous speaker has already said this, and I agree fully with him: we have to improve technical cooperation — the sharing of know-how.

We also have to adapt these technologies to the geographical, climatic, ecological, ethnic and philosophical environment of the countries we are helping. Neither racism nor prejudice must be allowed to have the slightest influence. We have to understand other people, and help them in terms of what they are.

Lastly, we must develop this rural economy based on maximum diversification in food production — the keystone of the structure that has to be built.

A moment ago, referring to these problems, reference was made to political difficulties. Mrs Louise Weiss explained very clearly how in the case of Cambodia, for example, we were held back, caught in the cross-fire, so that the help we wished to bring took a long time to get through. There I feel that only an international force might perhaps be able to obtain what we — the Community or each of our countries — have been unable to achieve.

There are certainly political questions, but there are also questions of types of society, and in that connection I would say to Mrs Poirier, who made a long defence of the regime of the state-trading countries that, if I understand her rightly, it is quite untenable to argue that the countries who organize their agriculture on the Kolkhoz basis are able to supply help and mutual aid to other countries. Today, let it be said, America is having to send the USSR 25 million tonnes of wheat. So do not let us put capitalism in the dock. I am not defending it, but the arguments put forward in defence of certain regimes are so exagger-

ated, Madam, as to be absurd, and I just wanted to make that point.

Lastly, there are moral reasons. Our war on hunger must also be based on a certain hierarchy of values. Today — and we must not be afraid of saying so — we live in a consumer society which sometimes talks about human rights in high-flown words. The historians of the 21st Century must not come to regard ours as the century that was unable to feed mankind. We claim that the life, rights and dignity of the human being are pre-eminent, and yet are we not every day guilty of excesses and waste? Think of the wasteful use we make of products that could perhaps be useful elsewhere and which, in any case, would awaken a spirit of solidarity if we were able to do without them. We must ourselves find fault with our own attitudes when their effect is harmful to the action to which, with a good conscience, we pay lip service. We can go no further and still have that good conscience if we do not achieve effective results. We must not allow this century, this world of today, to be condemned out of hand for not respecting the right hierarchy of values, or to be accused of failing to help a world in danger of death.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — *(I)* Mr President, as this is the first time I have spoken in this Parliament, I should like, through you, to pay a tribute to the President, Mrs Veil, because, although we hold very different political views, she is a woman who has fought all her life against Fascist oppression and for recognition of women's basic human rights.

I am glad that my maiden speech is, in fact, concerned with the exercise of the most elementary human right, the right to live. I have been struck by the strange, very strange, indifference and feeling of resignation which prevails in the world and even here, in some speeches, and by the picture of living dead who have come into the world to present the absurd and atrocious spectacle of the senselessness of death and the senselessness of life: a hundred dying of hunger every minute while we Eurocentrics remain unmoved and arrogantly white. Yes, in terms of our philosophy and culture, these people are still people with yellow, black or brown skins. So I see little hope of changing the fact, which is a question of culture as well as of morality, that 46 000 babies die every day, ending up as part of a kind of human hash which, after all, represents quite three-quarters of the world, the Third World.

Thanks to huge calculating machines, the figures for the carnage are before us. We count the dead but they don't count. It is a sort of refusal to recognize them, as

Macciocchi

though they were a *déchet*, unavoidable rubbish, a kind of surface scum, and Mr Poniatowski did, in fact, refer to a fate which is irrevocable. Apart from horror and repugnance at this slaughter, the debate has produced the alternative views either that nothing can be done to change things or that we should act as charitable benefactors. There has been frequent use of the words 'aid', 'donors', and 'countries which will benefit' but I think they are all lies, in terms of culture, history and semantics, because the countries which are at the receiving end are the countries which have been pillaged and oppressed.

This international outrage does not seem to have had the slightest effect on the consciences of individuals, parties or organizations. I trust that the second debate we are due to have in February will be more down to earth and practical; even though we have had so many practical suggestions from speakers; and by more practical I mean doing things a little more modestly and with a little less oratory to provide for immediate and positive action here and now to end the slaughter, at least as far as lies within our power.

These 50 million dead have nothing abstract about them, nor are they a human dung-heap, though they make less impression on us than the oil slick in Brittany. With the facts we have been given, we could almost re-write the political history of the conflicts of the world in which we live and which have so often been marked by starvation, plunder and a struggle for supremacy by super-powers who have exploited peoples and their state of abject physical and moral despair. Many recent events have taken place under the banner of hunger; witness the Sino-Russian conflict in the 1960s. Mrs Poirier told us today that the Chinese are among those who have escaped from the diabolical clutch of death from starvation, but I should like to remind her that there was a time, during the Khrushchev era, when the withdrawal of tractors, seed-sowing machines and expert advisers from China cost thousands upon thousands of lives. I am glad that the French Communist spokesman revised the judgment which had been passed on China. At the time, only a small group spoke up in defence of the desperate efforts made during the cultural revolution which, in my view, was only a desperate attempt to find food for 800 million Chinese. I am glad that there has been some modification of the previous judgment, which was one of contempt, hatred and unremitting encirclement.

I think we should also bear in mind what happened when, not long ago, the Americans cut off food supplies to the Allende Government and placed that Government in a position of such difficulty that it eventually succumbed in circumstances of tragedy and bloodshed. When, with the knowledge we now have, we witness the events in Vietnam and Cambodia and see the widespread scarcity which the refugees leave behind when they reach Thailand, we can look at it

all not only as spectators of the current ideological struggle, with people on both sides holding the red flag but as observers who can, quite objectively, say that we are now seeing what is, perhaps, the first food war of the century.

I think we are in the presence of an infinitely more subtle and sophisticated form of neo-colonialism, one which bears traces of cannibalism. And when our Communist colleague Ferrero mentions Castro and his speech on behalf of the non-aligned nations — at the point where Castro rightly said that the future will be calamitous — we ought perhaps to bear in mind that neither Castro nor Cuba could withdraw from a power policy under which Cuba is sent food-ships in exchange for loyalty to a political line based on the Soviet bloc. What we are trying to achieve here in Europe, as dedicated Parliamentarians with a clear idea of the disposition of forces in the world, should impel us to be independent of the big power blocs and to ensure that Europe ceases to connive with them in any way — and not only with them, but with the multinational organizations which those blocs represent.

So it is not just a question of providing more money, though we want to do this and have said so. What we have to do is work out a solution to these new problems, however complicated they may be and even if money is not the answer. In any event, as politicians, we all know how easy it is to manoeuvre within a budget, whether in a State or a local community. We must not think only in terms of statistics or aids, but must try to increase our capacity to learn and to extend our political and cultural horizons without being hide-bound by dogmatism. We are facing a combination of circumstances in which, under a new division of labour in the world, development and under-development are actually inter-linked. I will go further: we are living at a time when development is impossible and inconceivable unless under-development is assured. On this I should like to quote a statement by one of the greatest economists of the Third World, Samir Amin. He says that there is one and only one capitalist system, and it embraces all the industrialized countries, including those of Eastern Europe, and all forms of industrialization, excluding China. The new factor in the situation is, therefore, that death through starvation is the greatest obstacle to international development, especially since it is the fault not only of the old and new colonialism, but of the entire industrialized world, including the Soviet socialist world, however different its form. The conflict of interest between North and South is the most dangerous of all existing conflicts, more dangerous than that between East and West because, in the case of the latter, the meetings between Heads of States and the Salt I and II agreements give grounds for hope that a balance may be found between these enormous forces, with their overwhelming destructive power.

Macciocchi

At the present time, we have a situation in which an astute and ruthless neo-colonialism is based on an expenditure of 400 000 million dollars a year on armaments, or more than 30 times the 0.7 % of gross national product, we are proposing to give in development aid. At times one gets the impression that we are being asked to empty the ocean with a spoon. But this is not the case, because, if one recalls everything that has been said, here and elsewhere about armaments, by Mr Poniatowski for example, and calls to mind the million dollars a minute, the 400 000 million dollars a year, one realizes that there is no great difference between the possession of nuclear weapons and the possession of grain, which is the new knock-out weapon. Food is the new instrument of political pressure. There is, of course, an oil cartel, but there is also a grain cartel, and this Parliament must make its voice heard on this too, since this new weapon is in the hands of four countries, among them the two great powers, the United States and Canada, mainly the United States. In this connection, I quote the words of Earl Butz, the U.S. Secretary of State for Agriculture, who told the recent World Food Conference: 'Food is a weapon. It is now one of the principle tools in our negotiating kit'. A CIA report states: 'Washington would acquire virtual life and death power over the fate of the multitudes of the needy'. Even without indulging in that kind of blackmail, the United States is acquiring enormous political and economic influence because: Not only the poor, less-developed countries, but also the major powers would be at least partially dependent on food imports from the United States'.

As an example of food as a weapon, perhaps we should recall the latest agreement mentioned by the lady who spoke before me between the United States and the Soviet Union, in which 25 million tonnes of grain were involved. This has gone from 18 million last year to 25 million, a colossal drain on the grain resources available on the world market. Apparently, this super-sale was negotiated on the basis of military considerations, such as the Russian brigades in Cuba, and that, for making good some of the Soviet shortage of cereals, Washington obtained an undertaking that the Soviet Union would not export its troops from Cuba to any other country in the Western hemisphere.

Such is the range of questions which demand attention from everyone in this House, including the groups on the Left. As someone has already said, we have to explain the need for speed and to arouse public interest with new arguments, new ideas, a new conception of the world, a new philosophy and, may I add, a new ethos. I thought Mr Tindemans was wrong in his speech a few hours ago when he referred to 'ivory tower intellectuals'. He was wrong, because some of those intellectuals have now come down from

their ivory towers to study the problem of hunger and death from starvation. I should like to mention one of them, Susan George, the author of *How the Other Half Dies: The Real Reasons for World Hunger*,¹ and to thank her for coming to listen to the debate. Other intellectuals were here with us yesterday evening, representing different shades of political opinion and different countries, and they came to ask us, as Members of this Parliament, to ensure that concrete proposals emerged from this debate. Those who took part in our press conference yesterday tried to make concrete proposals, and we took some of them up; I am delighted to see that, when Edith Cresson speaks for the Socialist Group on the Charter of Economic Rights, she will refer to some of the proposals. We ourselves will be submitting some 19 amendments embodying some of them. We are proposing a Charter of man's economic rights, publication of a White Paper, the inclusion of an item on the agenda on the subject of making it an offence punishable under criminal law to speculate in essential foods, whether in the EEC, the USA or the Soviet Union, and finally the introduction of a levy — not just a request to contribute 0.7 % of GNP — both on the income of the wealthy countries and on the profits from the manufacture and sale of armaments — a proposal which will include the Soviet Union although it has so far refused to become involved. I should like to remind Mrs Poirier that the sale of arms is a tragic and disquieting example of the silence of the Left on this subject.

France is third on the list of arms salesmen; does she not realize that capitalist money creates tyrants as well as murderers? That money buys arms and, unfortunately, these arms are produced by Europe's working class. This comment is not addressed to people who have no interest in the subject, but to the parties of the Left. Who can ignore the fact that this makes the working class an accomplice in the slaughter which goes on to keep the factories in production and the workers in work? It is not true that our prosperity gives the countries of the Third World a better chance of making a living. The truth is the exact opposite: the situation calls for a re-distribution of wealth.

We have also raised the subject of the right of individuals to decide for themselves what they want to do, and the duty of the State to allow them to do so. Finally, we have proposed the formation in Europe of international hunger brigades. In the speech by Mrs Louise Weiss, which contained nothing with which I could agree and much that was beautiful but inaccurate, she referred to the ship, the *Ile de Lumière* which, with financial help from private individuals, went to the rescue of the Vietnamese refugees. I should like to see this ship becoming the ship of Europe, as a sort of symbol of what can be achieved by people with a conscience and a feeling for those who suffer.

¹ Penguin Books, Ltd, 1976.

Macciocchi

Early in November we shall, as Emma Bonino and others have reminded us, be showing our determination to take action on the budget. At that part-session and the one in February, we intend to come prepared with more specific and well-thought out ideas for a proper long-term plan for an immediate attack on starvation. Strasbourg is, today, in international and European terms, a point of close contact with the Third World. If, when we come to vote on the motion, our decisions are not paternalistic or dilatory, if we are not content with generalizations and if the substantive resolution includes some of our amendments, I am sure we shall vote for it. As far as I myself am concerned, if the motion remains as it is, we shall have thrown away any remnant of credibility as participants in the dialogue with the Third World.

(Applause)

Mr Almirante. — (I) Mr President, I was elected as a Member of this Parliament in the constituency of Southern Italy, which is typical of the under-developed areas which, unfortunately, still exist in Europe and if, because of this, I were to feel lukewarm — I am not saying hostile, but lukewarm — towards this resolution, you would have to understand and, perhaps, forgive me.

As I listened to those who have spoken, I thought of my distant homeland. When I heard them talking about babies dying in the under-developed countries, I recalled that the highest infantile mortality rate in the whole of Europe is recorded in Secondigliano, a part of the city of Naples which is very dear to me, and when I heard that as is only too true, there are no sanitary installations in the underdeveloped countries, I remembered the cholera in Naples five or six years ago when people died in its slums. I do not recollect any show of European solidarity for Naples or for Italy at that time, apart from the usual telegrams of sympathy and formal messages of encouragement. When I heard, again what is unfortunately only too true, that people in the underdeveloped countries have no houses, and live in shanties and hovels, I remembered that there are villages near Messina which were built in 1908 after the terrible earthquake and are still inhabited by many poor people and, again, that 11 years ago another earthquake devastated an area of Sicily, *il Belice*, not far from Palermo where people still live in squalid wooden shanties without sanitary facilities of any kind. But I must resist the temptation to think only of my own country, since the Italians of the *Mezzogiorno* know they are the advance guard of a much deeper South. Poor as they are, those good people would criticize and condemn me if I did not, on their behalf, express solid support in this House for any action which Europe was, to its credit, undertaking to meet the tragic needs of the underdeveloped nations. Do not, however, expect me or us to give unqualified support because, without wishing to offend, I distrust the unanimous decisions and rhetor-

ical outbursts of solidarity which we have heard in this debate. More than anything, I am afraid that the developed world may believe that it can satisfy its own needs and economic and political appetites at the expense of the underdeveloped nations, using their hunger as an excuse. I hope you will not mind my being out of step with you and speaking frankly, but I feel someone should do so. I say this because I am afraid — perhaps in your heart of hearts you too are afraid — that we are witnessing the beginning of a gigantic speculative operation based on the hunger and the lives of the underdeveloped peoples, speculation that is both political and economic.

Obviously the closed ranks of the Left — I do not blame them but I certainly do blame the inertia, the mental laziness, the poverty of ideas and the lack of imagination and initiative shown by the West and its liberal movements — obviously the Left have, from their viewpoint, done well to try and use this gross political gamble to win back the credibility which they have largely lost in recent months, especially as a result of the revealing events, some of them still taking place, in the Far East; they were mentioned by Mrs Weiss who, whether you like it or not, still gives moral leadership to this Parliament. I repeat, I do not blame the Left for jumping on this vast and speculative bandwagon. I am even more apprehensive about other possibilities. For example, I suspect that these enormous sums of money — at least, one trusts that they will be enormous because they should be — will be used — I won't repeat the routine gibe and say, by the multinationals — by the financiers who exist in every developed country, in every country in the free world, and even in Russia and the countries behind the iron curtain, to excuse their crimes against the underdeveloped nations. I believe there will be a huge rush to corner foodstuffs with the help of financiers, whether they are companies, public corporations or the State, and that the problem of hunger in the underdeveloped countries will become very big business. I also suspect that the rich countries will take advantage of the situation to accumulate even more surpluses and pile up further surplus stocks of cereals and other foods. I have noticed so much enthusiasm in quarters where there was hitherto marked reluctance to take any interest in this problem, that their intentions cannot be above suspicion or free from self-interest.

I have heard it suggested that one way, perhaps the best, of helping the developing or underdeveloped countries is to industrialize them, so we will probably see the highly industrialized countries speculating in that, too. There is also the danger that this flood of money to help people who are starving to death and dying like dogs will fill the coffers of governments which are anything but democratic and whose jurisdiction extends over much of the area involved. At a meeting of the Committee on External Economic Relations, I heard a representative of the Council of

Almirante

Ministers say that there was no need to consider human rights questions in connection with aid to these countries ; this is another reason why I am afraid of speculation and further enrichment of *régimes* which rule, govern and enslave the underdeveloped nations.

We nevertheless fully support the motion, but we do so in the belief that it will be for Parliament to see to the financial arrangements. When we debate the budget, we shall know the real intentions of all the X groups, and I feel sure that the House will find a way of ensuring that the funds allocated are put to the best use. However, the management of the funds and of this whole undertaking can obviously not be the responsibility of Parliament or of the Council of Ministers, who do not appear to be very interested anyway. It should be the responsibility of an international body with legal personality which should, as far as possible, have no connection with politics. Is this possible? We ought to discuss the possibility, otherwise we may be building on sand or, worse still — and we should all be to blame if we did not foresee it in time — we might aggravate the situation which has been so movingly described.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Lezzi.

Mr Lezzi. — (I) I was very impressed, Mr Commissioner, by the fact that you began your speech by giving us the terrible figures about humanity's sufferings. I assume that you began in this way because, despite the positive results achieved by what you did under the aegis of the development policy, you believe that very much more should be done, and better done. That is undoubtedly your intention and that of your collaborators, and it is also the intention of Parliament.

We all have these figures before us. The grave warning they give about starvation in the world is fully warranted, and I readily acknowledge that Mr Pannella and his colleagues in the Radical Party have scored a triumph. This is only the first stage but all the political groups will surely continue the fight on the lines described by Mrs Focke, and we shall advance shoulder to shoulder with the Commission. The reports of this Parliament should somewhere contain a reference I once made to Marco Pannella when, in Easter 1978, he began his campaign in Italy for this important cause. Starvation and malnutrition are not the result of some Biblical curse, but of an unequal distribution of wealth and resources, a position we can take action on and radically change. In 1978, the developing countries had a deficit of no less than 35 000 million dollars, the global deficit being 250 000 million dollars.

This called for a policy designed to lower the barriers against the export from developing countries of raw materials, agricultural goods and, in some cases, industrial products. The fact that, as far as this Community is concerned, this has been broadly achieved, is due to the efforts of this Parliament and of Commissioner Cheysson, but the terms of trade between North and South still leave the industrialized countries at a considerable advantage.

The oil crisis dealt a heavy blow to backward countries who have no oilfields of their own, so much so that, if the terms of trade between North and South are not changed, any real development in those countries may prove impossible.

Willy Brandt has been and undoubtedly still is in the thick of the battle for a constructive renewal of the North-South dialogue. He has emphasized the need for a radical change in the relationship with developing countries through the replacement of the old principles of dependence on a neo-colonial basis by a system of mutual cooperation between North and South. 'We have ten years', he said, 'in which to prevent a catastrophe.' He went on: 'We must abandon the old idea that the transfer of resources from the industrialized world to the countries of the Third World is a matter for the West alone to decide... Cooperation must start and continue on a basis of equality.'

The need for a different relationship is now generally understood. It certainly is in this House, which has heard people from all the political parties arguing passionately for the policy of development, and in the Commission, which knows that world hunger will not be defeated by the policy of 'aid'.

Aid, a good stop-gap in emergencies, means massive imports of foodstuffs, produced and packaged in the industrialized countries, bringing in huge profits for the multinationals, fresh markets for the products of the Western food industries and a consequent drop in the value of local products and thus of local agricultural output.

So we must breathe fresh life into the policy of cooperation. In official statements the OECD has maintained that this type of cooperation is the basic condition for the survival of both economies, that of the industrialized countries and that of the developing countries.

This in turn means that the European economy must be reorganized. Europe's industrial crisis cannot be resolved simply by obstructing the industrial development of the backward nations. The economy must be reorganized and productivity increased.

During the remainder of this century and for years to come, we face two great challenges in the economic and social fields. The first is the task of re-designing the economic structure of Western industry ; without

Lezzi

this, talk of opening up trade is self deception if not hypocrisy. The second is to make radical changes in the Third World pattern of development by substantially extending its internal market; this will enable it to tackle its problems within the framework of international cooperation without losing its independence.

In the Third World we have hitherto witnessed the abandonment of agriculture and a fall in production for the home market. Hence its continued economic and political dependence on others.

The growth of industrial activity has not, under present conditions, corrected the imbalance which prevails in so large a proportion of countries in this area; nor will it do so. This means that agriculture must form the basis of the prosperity and independence of the Third World. In this connection, I cannot forget the strength of Mr Bersani's determination, in the Committee on Development and Cooperation to ensure that between Lomé I and Lomé II more strenuous and effective efforts are made to develop agriculture in the Third World.

Agriculture must, accordingly, form the basis of industrialization, not along the lines planned by city capitalism, which Mrs Poirier condemned but on the basis of its own independent development.

We have reached a moment in history when the old economic system, which some people would like merely to bring up to date by de-centralizing some parts of the industrial structure, and the subordinate status of food production, come into conflict with the new economic system based on mutual interest and a genuinely equal distribution of labour throughout the world.

It is, of course, difficult for the capitalist countries and the West to change a system which, in the past, has enabled them to off-load their differences on to the developing countries and settle their own domestic problems in that way. That course is no longer open; we cannot abolish hunger in the world so long as the industrialized nations continue the indiscriminate plunder of natural resources, the exploitation, the waste and the over indulgence which Mrs Focke condemned in her speech.

As a rule the attitude so far adopted by the industrialized countries has been one of non-cooperation. In the Third World countries, this has created a widespread impression that dialogue is useless and that the only way out is to fight. This tragic assumption will result in the world being split up into poor and rich, into town and country, a possibility which is already being viewed with apprehension at international gatherings, for example, the Conference of Non-aligned Nations.

All this is likely to endanger peace and the removal of international tension, one of whose main champions in the West was Willy Brandt and his Government.

We must make certain that this assumption is not made; we must do our utmost to build up the feeling of trust which is vital if the North-South dialogue is to be re-opened with the proper agenda and freedom of action. Willy Brandt has urged us to ensure that the foundations of *détente* are built to last a long time. We must, accordingly, remove the obstacles which stand in the way of *détente* and have a bad effect on policy in and towards the Third World. We must not treat proposals for the economic, social and cultural advancement of Third World countries as a threat to what is assumed to be the stability of the industrialized nations.

The crucial issue is this: we have to build *détente* on foundations which are solid and lasting, not like that which, in recent years, has given peace and quiet to the whites in the industrialized countries, while simultaneously causing hunger, misery and fifty million deaths a year in the Third World; nor one based, as hitherto, on the twin principles that the *status quo* must be maintained and that the parties retain their hegemony in their respective spheres of influence; nor again a relation of tension based on the balance of terror, but one based on agreement, the reduction and control of armaments, and on its capacity to remove forthwith the deep-rooted injustices on which the *status quo* rests.

A sound multi-polar *détente* becomes all the more urgent and necessary in the light of disturbing signs of a deterioration in the other *détente* based on a bi-polar axis. All this calls for firm determination to revive the East-West dialogue, a responsible attitude to the disarmament talks, and a fresh start in the North-South dialogue, which is the key to the present international situation and the great challenge which Europe must take up. Speaking for the Socialist Group, Mrs Focke urged the House to initiate appropriate long-term action by the Community, to be pursued with dogged determination. I do the same, in the knowledge that these considerations and convictions have already inspired the activities of the various political forces which are determined to keep up the pressure in Europe for a true development policy for the Third World.

(*applause*)

President. — I call Mr Sälzer.

Mr Sälzer. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in all the basic significance and gravity of this debate two things stand out: first that there are totally differing positions in matters of basic importance but secondly that on one very important question there is broad agreement: namely that if political conditions were right then there would not have to be any hunger in this world, although the question of how they could be right is the subject of controversy.

Sälzer

From many responsible studies, we know that if the available arable areas of this world were farmed according to the organizational principles of our Community, then the nutritional needs of the present population of the world could be satisfied many times over.

(Applause)

The common agricultural policy often comes in for some ill-considered abuse, but it has one considerable achievement to its credit, and that is that we, the old-established industrial nations, are in a position to produce more food than the people in our countries can consume, and to make a positive contribution, with our surpluses, to ridding the world of hunger.

In my view, ladies and gentlemen, it must make us think to know that it is precisely the granaries of Europe — which are largely under Communist rule — that are unable to meet the needs of the people that live there.

(Applause)

Maybe you know that the following story is now going around in the Soviet Union. Leonid Breszhnev wakes up one morning and tells his wife he dreamt that the whole world had gone socialist. Whereupon his wife asks him in dismay: and who is going to supply our wheat, then?

(Interruptions)

Ladies and gentlemen, if the Communists and Socialists here demand a new world economic order, I agree. But it must certainly be a different order from the one the Communists and Socialists want, because it must be the order that has demonstrably brought the greater benefits and that is a social, market economy order.

Now we all know that talking about hungry people does nothing to feed them. We have to give concrete help, and that costs money. To my mind, this outlay that we have to make — and we ought to be concerned about this — should be tied to three conditions. Firstly it must directly benefit the people concerned, secondly the governments that receive it must understand that it is a contribution towards active self-help in the solving of their problems and thirdly we have to spend this money — and the amount will, in my view, and as this debate has shown, have to be considerable — in such a way that we can justify it to the taxpayers in our countries.

(Applause)

President. — I call Sir Henry Plumb.

Sir Henry Plumb. — Mr President, colleagues, many words have been uttered during the debate on world hunger this afternoon and this evening, and it is encouraging to think that from the majority there is a unity of approach. Irrespective of our party-political interests, we are concerning ourselves with the major problem in the world — hunger. It is ironical that, whereas we spend about half our time in this Chamber and in our committees dealing with surplus foodstocks, here we are now spending the five hours which have been set aside for this debate on the problems of the world's hungry.

Looking at the world scene as the 1979/1980 grain-marketing season gets under way, the parallel with 1972 and 1973 is already being drawn. And if no one remembers that particular time, I will remind you that it was a time when world prices were higher than the prices in the EEC; it was a time when the grain stocks that had accumulated over five years in the United States of America were suddenly raided from Russia, with something like 30 million tonnes of grain moving from the West to the East; a time when there was a shortage of soya; a time when the Peruvian fish harvest failed; a time, therefore when the price of protein suddenly went through the roof and there was an embargo on many of the products that were traditionally supplied from markets we had been using over a period of years.

As we look at the future, the expected 24 % fall in the grain stocks of Russia, together with a fall in production in other areas including parts of Asia and parts of Africa, will place considerable strain on world supplies and on the logistics of grain handling. As wheat and coarse grain demand jumps from 157 million tonnes last season to a forecast 169 million tonnes this season, the prices have already risen by one-third compared to a year ago.

From a commercial point of view, of course, all countries, with the experience they had in 1972/73 particularly, are more prepared for this situation than they were seven years ago. But the food aspect of this new shortage indicates a wealth of planning, but a shortage of action.

Mr President, this Parliament cannot sit idly by as we enter the next decade without voicing its concern about world food security and proposing an action programme. World hunger is not necessarily due to inadequate food production. Inadequate distribution of available food and insufficient purchasing power in many countries are main contributory causes. That is a point that has been made time and time again during this debate so far. Of course, inadequate distribution can result from high food production in industrialized countries, where the use of inputs such as fuel and fertilizers has reached a level where extra returns on additional inputs are relatively low, where developing countries are hard put either to compete for the purchase of those inputs, which could show a

Plumb

high rate of return on the land they farm, and also pay for their imports of food — food that is needed so much in the countries and among the people we are talking about.

So many developing countries suffer from hunger because their governments have tended to give top priority in their investment policies to industrialization and urban development, which use up scarce resources.

This of course needs foreign exchange, which has to be earned essentially through commodity exports. There are examples that I have seen myself on a number of occasions, where incentives have been given for cash crops such as cocoa, coffee, fibres, or rubber, often at the expense of an increase in food for local consumption. This often goes too far; governments have pursued cheap food policies with disastrous disincentive effects on their own farmers. It is usually the rural population which suffers most from hunger and malnutrition. They have no resources when drought or disease decimate their crops. Internal transport and storage are inadequate, and internal markets are poorly organized.

As we debate this today, we all recognize the responsibility of society at large to feed a hungry world. Farmers cannot be expected to give their produce away just because it is they who produce it. There has to be a fair balance and a fair distribution within the societies in which we live. It is largely a question of purchasing power. Higher personal incomes in the developing countries would increase markets for the farmers of those countries, as well as providing export opportunities for the West's food resources. It is, however, essential that any benefits from export returns reach back to the rural population. The benefits must go all the way back to the rural population, rather than the treasuries of those countries being the main beneficiaries, with little or no effect at farm level. In broader terms I believe that we should encourage the negotiation of international commodity arrangements as part of our own development assistance policy. Among other things I believe — and have believed for some time — that we should act quickly to join the International Sugar Agreement.

The EEC can of course be proud of its action in the Convention of Lomé, and I congratulate the Commissioner on all that he has been trying to do as far as this is concerned in recent times. But action is still necessary to ensure the Lomé arrangements benefit farmers directly, and on a broader scale.

Perhaps a related way of helping rural people who produce the food and yet suffer from hunger is to promote rural people's organizations. Governments have frequently affirmed their willingness to do so, but so far there has been little action. For instance, I attended the conference in Rome some time ago on

agrarian reform; just 3 % of the participants at that Rome conference were farmers from the developing countries. From my experience, it is noticeable that the majority of representatives who attend an international conference are often people who are compulsive conference-goers, and who are the rich in their own society.

(Applause)

Farm organizations and cooperatives will promote self-help, and they have a capacity to complement, and even substitute for certain government services, in fields such as extension, marketing, credit, or training, as well as to constitute a voice for the rural society and its people. The European Development Fund should give much greater attention to assisting developing country farmers to organize themselves. Research should be aimed at the problems of drought, of disease-resistant crops, of low technology, and of minimizing the use of expensive fertilizers and insecticides, and greater photo-synthetic efficiency.

Perhaps another area for investments directly related to the food problem — a point that was raised earlier today — is infrastructures. More especially, this could involve inexpensive and effective storage systems for food at village level and internal transport systems within the developing countries. Although food aid makes a major contribution in combating world hunger, food technology — for example, encouraging products of high protein value — should receive priority.

It is possible to believe — hard-headedly — that more should be done for the world's poor, simply because they might one day, before the end of the century, provide a potentially valuable market. I prefer to act for reasons of conscience. People have to have something to live off before they can have something to live for, and it would be unforgivable for the world to indulge itself in windy rhetoric about a new international economic order, without dealing with the practical problems on the ground.

There is an urgent need to review the intergovernmental bodies dealing with one or other aspect of the world food problem. We have many: currently, in one way or another, FAO, UNCTAD, the United Nations General Assembly, the World Food Programmes Governing Body, the World Food Council, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Bank, and GATT — and there are many others — are all concerned. I believe, Mr President, and colleagues, that we could do the world's hungry a great service if we succeeded in bringing about a World Hunger High Command, to ensure that effective action is taken on food, which obviously is the world's most pressing problem.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Vergès.

Mr Vergès. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this debate on world hunger is a sign of the gravity of the problem and ought to trigger off the general debate that could well dominate the work of this Assembly in the immediate future as it will, in any case, dominate historical development during the next few years. Compared with the scale, gravity and complexity of the problem the few minutes of a speech, like the few hours of this discussion, seem derisory. We shall not repeat the horrifying figures quoted in the reports and set out in the studies made by the specialized agencies and international conferences. Suffice it to say that between the beginning and end of this debate over 10 000 children will have died and that in one year, a population equal to that of one of the big Common Market countries will have died of hunger. It is also clear that there can be no question, in a few minutes, of indicating even roughly any immediate solutions to cope with the problem, but even in this limited framework we feel that the first thing is to ask ourselves why we are in this situation.

Our belief is that we are at the end of a centuries-long process, triggered off by European trade in the 15th and 16th centuries, and amplified, particularly during the 18th and 19th centuries, by the expansion of Europe's industrial power and financial strength. This dividing up of the world among a few powers led to the rise of what we call the West. The over-exploitation of workers in Europe in the 19th century and of the populations and wealth of the colonies were the foundations of this tremendous accumulation of material power and wealth in the West; and that material power ensured the development of the sciences, arts and ideas. Everything has been modelled in relation to the material and intellectual values created in this way, and this largely explains the universal character that these values have acquired this Euro-centrism that is so often mentioned and of which we see examples at every moment in so many areas.

But today the billions in the colonial and dependent countries are coming into political independence. They are already the vast majority of mankind and that majority will go on increasing. These people are faced with the same economic task that confronted the European countries two centuries ago. How are they to achieve the rapid accumulation they need to develop a country's productive forces and, first and foremost, to provide for their populations' sustenance and progress at all levels when there is no question of asking greater sacrifices from these nations than those they are making at present, and even less question of colonizing the West to take back the wealth and profit that went in the other direction in the 18th and 19th centuries? if we added to that an annual growth rate of 2.5 – 3 % which doubles populations in 25 to 30 years, how can the problem — or rather all the problems — be solved? One has only to think of the

fact that, in 30 years, the population of China went up from 650 to 969 million, that of Mexico is now 14 million, that of Bogota has risen from 70 000 to 5 million and that of La Réunion, which is where I come from, doubled in about 35 years. Add to this the fact that the economy in these countries — to serve the development and expansion it needs of the colonizing countries — has been completely outwards-oriented, concentrating on export farming at the expense of staple food crops and causing a massive rural exodus and just as massive urbanization, and one can see the frightful legacy inherited by the colonized peoples. For the population to produce, by its own efforts, the bowl of rice that will enable it to survive is an historic hope that has materialized in very few countries. Even today, those countries that try to survive by increasing their exports of agricultural or mineral raw materials see their imbalances growing worse and worse. Their economies are becoming increasingly dependent on the companies dominating the world markets.

The worsening inequality in the terms of trade, the increasing indebtedness and the food gap that widens every year are all part of the spiral of contradiction with which the Third World is struggling whilst inside each country economic imbalances and social inequalities become steadily more acute. That is the basis of today's crisis of neocolonialism and dependence which is causing major political changes in many of the Third World countries.

Thus the vast majority of the world's population — thousands of millions of people — now has to undergo in a few generations and in conditions that are a hundred times more difficult, a process that extended over several centuries and innumerable crises in Europe. That is the historical legacy which explains the present situation.

The causes of today's situation were already beginning to develop in the 50s, and some people were already forecasting the great famines that were to come. They were not heeded as they ought to have been. Today the tragedy is upon us, and when certain people are moved with pity there is first of all an historical truth that has to be recognized: there is no such thing as innocent colonialism.

It is on this basis that we have to try to scan the future, however dark it promises to be, and trace the paths to be explored. Although so many children, and grown men and women are dying today in the world, the likelihood is — for the reasons we have outlined — that even more will die each year in the coming decades. Food aid has been mentioned but, though it is necessary, it will always be insufficient, because it will never solve the basic problems. We should never forget that, in the world as it is, only a few countries are net grain exporters and that this grain market is dominated by six or seven multinationals. On top of

Vergès

which, food aid is often — and increasingly — used as a weapon. The need has also been mentioned to increase the 0.7 % of GNP allocated by the developed countries to aid for the Third World, and to set up bodies to give technical assistance and for technological transfers, etc. All these points have been raised and should be part of a general solution.

Above all, there is increasing talk of a new world economic order, but we feel that we must ponder the scale and effects of such a solution. This new world economic order implies radical changes in the international division of labour, the world market networks, and the power of the companies dominating those markets. It must be a break with present structures, not just a reorganization. That means that there will be no new world economic order without a new social order in every country, a new world cultural order of — so to speak — a new world mental order. In a word, we believe that we are on the threshold of a tremendous change in the whole history of mankind. The next 20 years will see how this challenge of history is met. Two centuries ago a French revolutionary was able to say that happiness was a new idea in Europe; today it may be said that claiming the right to live is a new idea for the majority of the world's population, and that this claiming of the right to live and the right to equality will bring with it an historical upheaval for the whole world.

The spread of malnutrition and famine in the world is the logical — but not inevitable — effect of an economic process. It reflects these contradictions that dominate the history of the world of today: the terrible waste of material and intellectual assets, the build-up of armaments and the wastage of production to meet every whim of the privileged minorities, while other people are deprived of their essential requirements in the developed countries and of the minimum necessary to survival in the underdeveloped countries. It reflects the contrast between the potential of modern technology, the discoveries of the human intellect, the acceleration in the scientific and technical revolution and the widening gap between the developed and the underdeveloped countries. The forces of progress in the world have to meet these tremendous challenges. For our part, we believe that they can and should meet this challenge by a close alliance between developed and underdeveloped countries.

Everything depends on the next twenty years. The fact that this Assembly is debating the issue shows that it is aware of this tragedy being played out on the world stage. Regular discussion in this House is necessary if we are to grasp the scale of the problem and explore our future approach. It is in these terms that we regard this debate as a positive contribution.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Galland.

Mr Galland. — (F) If we really want to meet this challenge of world hunger, if we want to ward off the threat to the 700 million people who will be absolutely destitute — at the limit of survival — by the year 2 000, we have to be on our guard, in this debate, against grandiloquent declarations of generosity. In that light, this debate — which could have given rise to some warranted misgivings — is of very high quality.

We must keep our thinking clear and restrict our search to realistic solutions — those with the maximum chance of being effective.

First of all — and this is obvious — the effort must come from *all* the developed countries in the world — only solidarity at the world level is capable of coping with this tragic problem.

It is sad therefore to have to note the differences in this respect even among the nine countries of the Community where, indirectly and through the agency of the members elected to this Parliament, we can try to do something in each of our countries. Paragraph 4 in the Committee on Development and Cooperation's motion for a resolution draws our attention to this point.

But the differences are considerable. In 1977, net public aid expressed as a proportion of gross national product ranged from 0.09 % for Italy to 0.85 % — nine times more — for the Netherlands.

Equality of effort among the Nine must be striven for at all costs. We have to admit that it is not the richest countries that are the most generous if their public aid is compared with their gross national product, the figure for the Federal Republic of Germany, for example, being only 0.27 % in 1977. We must obviously try, therefore, to increase the financial aid given by each of our countries, on the model of the Netherlands, to give more help to this Fourth World of destitute people.

We approve the Commission's file on Europe, the Third World and rural development, which states on page 4 that the Commission is endeavouring to induce Member States to coordinate, if not harmonize, their development policies and objectives.

But the most important thing, without question, is to ensure that the money provided is put to optimum use in relation to concrete problems.

Here I would like to draw a distinction between two situations.

Galland

First of all there is the type of famine that is the result of a bad or even disastrous economic situation, and this applies to practically all the underdeveloped countries, whatever the past causes.

In this case what is necessary is long-term planning because, unfortunately, only long-term action is realistic and can be effective if we know how to go about it.

The supplying of foodstuffs to these countries is, of course, necessary, but this is only the visible part of the iceberg.

The very first thing is to ensure that, to meet these immediate needs, the food sent is compatible with the lifestyle, traditions and climate of the populations concerned.

This seems obvious, and yet it is not so long ago that we were sending the Sahel milk powder which, in the local environment, rapidly proved to be a germ carrier and therefore dangerous, whereas the fact was that babies could perfectly well be fed with their mothers' milk, and the real food needs of those unfortunate peoples were of a very different nature.

Another fact is that it may be almost pointless to send food if nothing has been done beforehand to provide the storage infrastructures that are essential for grain imports, for example.

But our real responsibility is also — and perhaps above all — to enable these countries to organize and equip themselves step by step so that one they can meet their own food requirements.

Here again, we have to be realistic. The technology we provide has to be usable both in terms of human resources and machinery.

The first need in many countries is to train, not high-level engineers, but specialized technicians who will know, in countries like Niger for example, how to develop the multi-cropping system in which wheat and groundnuts dominate and can be broadly developed with simple training.

As regards the senior categories that are necessary, these need to be trained in the knowledge that developing really professional agricultural producers takes almost a generation.

As regards plant and machinery, this has to be designed to suit the continent and the training of the people for whom it is intended. In most cases it has to be specially made, because it needs to have characteristics for which we now have little use. In most cases it will correspond to the definition: simple, sturdy and small.

This compatibility between equipment and a country's prospective agricultural development is a key factor to success.

Here again, this seems obvious, and yet a few years ago, the Poles were sending tractor-operated snow-ploughs to Nigeria. Though not reaching this level of exaggeration, we must admit that the agricultural machinery we offer is too often ill-suited to the local needs.

Secondly, there is the famine resulting from a political situation that may well prove disastrous. Although, in this political field, and in a debate that should have been a perfect model, I should have preferred to avoid polemics, I cannot allow the — to my mind — staggering statements by Mrs Poirier, the French Communist, to go unanswered.

Because, in truth, who is making the most effort to help the countries of the Fourth World to cope with famine? The Socialist countries or the Liberal countries? And if we have a 5% deficit in world grain production, where does the reason lie? What is the source of the biggest setback in agrarian reform, if it is not the USSR, whose agricultural production targets are never reached and which, in spite of a tremendous potential, is forced to import massive grain tonnages from the United States? Is it any wonder, when one has seen, as I have, the pervading presence of doryphora in Polish potato fields, a pest long since unknown in our countries? The truth of the *kolkhoz* ought to teach you caution.

Lastly, now that I am about to discuss the type of famine that arises from a political situation of which Cambodia is the current frightful illustration and with regard to which Georges Marchais, to whom Mrs Poirier referred, stated a few weeks ago on Europe No 1 that he had supported the Pol Pot régime and defended the Vietnam invasion, with whose dreadful consequences we are familiar. I feel all the more strongly that Mrs Poirier's astounding grossness in her economic and political arguments should not be allowed to pass.

In the field of solidarity and aid to the Third World there is definitely nothing that the French Communists can teach us.

As I was saying, the most unhappy example of famine as the result of a political situation today is Cambodia, where we are at the point of wondering about the chances of survival of a whole nation. And when we are struck, as Commissioner Cheysson said, by that dreadful photograph of a child in yesterday's *Figaro*, which reminds us of other occasions, there are two points we have to make.

The first is that, regardless of what political régime — and however hateful we find it is, the cause of the famine, international solidarity must come into play, and help must be given.

The second is that, this being a situation of survival, where the future is unforeseeable unlike famine caused by economic factors, only the short-term

Galland

counts, particularly in a country like Cambodia where only a few years ago agricultural production was still enough to meet the needs of the people.

In this case the essential problem, is that of transport and conveying the food to the starving population. What do we have to do to get acceptance for this aid and provide transport and supervise distribution when the régime in force refuses? To open the doors of survival, perhaps it will be necessary to lose no time in awakening the collective conscience so that European pressure is no longer just that of our individual governments or the Community but also of all our peoples demonstrating *en masse* and with dignity in all our towns on the same day, so that this unprecedented international pressure will allow us to save those that still can be saved, and to help a nation of two and a half million people, threatened, quite simply, with annihilation to survive.

For world hunger, an unflinching resolve coupled with a realistic approach to the various situations, effective remedies and long-term hope will be the characteristics of the Liberal Group.

Faced with the present tragic world situation, the first concrete measure that I shall propose to the Liberal Group will be to reinstate, in the European Communities' 1980 budget, the 1 135 000 tonnes of grain requested by the Commission and reduced by 37 % to 720 000 tonnes by the Council.

This must be without prejudice to further budgetary initiatives aimed in the direction of what we would like to do, not only to assist but also to help organize the Fourth World of tomorrow, proposals for which we intend to put forward at the debate planned for February on the same subject which must result in concrete measures after thorough and concerted work by several of our committees and primarily, of course, those on Development and Agriculture and the Political Affairs Committee.

In this spirit, Mr Cheysson, and determined that our work shall be a model of its kind, we shall be at your side.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Poncelet.

Mr Poncelet. — (F) Mr President, the arrangements for the debate are such that, from what I have been told, I shall have only one minute to speak on a subject as important as that of hunger. You will agree that it is too short and, not wishing things to become even more absurd, I give up my speaking time.

President. — The arrangements must be made within your group, and the time is allocated on that basis.

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, in this debate, which we chiefly owe to the Italian Radicals, I would

like to speak very briefly about the connection between the various problems and priorities, and also about the struggle against certain systems which once again is connected with them. As regards the reciprocal connection, it is clear that the problem on the agenda today has, among other things, something to do with woman's position in the world and with education and training. The point is that the new facts we are continually hearing with regard to the millions of cases of child starvation and so on all stem from the same source, as we ourselves can all deduce from the United Nations documents. But I would like to remind you of what Rabelais wrote, namely *science sans conscience n'est que ruine de l'âme*, and that link is issuing from many of these hunger lists.

We have to decide on priorities and, on closer investigation, it is clear that priority must be given to children and women because of the particularly close connection between the undernourishment of mothers and infant mortality. I would also like to point out that we cannot evade the question of how it happens that in so many developing countries, land reforms do not materialize and that, on the contrary, there are still a number of political régimes that resist land reforms and even use barbaric methods against farmers who want land reforms. This too needs to be clearly stated today.

We know that child mortality in the poorest areas can sometimes be avoided, at least to some extent, by very simple measures. One of these would be to institute a direct link between primary education and the local production of nutritious food. And here I would refer to the experiments — or are they more than experiments? — on the practical mixing together in education of theory and practice, as applied in the Chinese People's Republic since the cultural revolution. May I also point out that whenever undernourishment is referred to as the main cause of infant mortality, then indirectly one must also think of the malnutrition of the mother and the lack of knowledge among the older people.

With that I shall close: this lack of knowledge among the older people stems from illiteracy, and is the result of the lack of education. This makes women's position in the world the crux of the matter. I would just like to quote one more figure: about 55 million girls in the developing countries do not go to primary school. This is important because the problem of female illiterates casts its shadow on the question we are discussing today.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi — (I) Mr President, the position of our political group on this important subject was explained in the Italian Parliament when it debated a document tabled for urgent debate by the Radicals. We were against treating it as urgent at that time because, unfortunately, hunger is an old problem and there is no greater urgency about it than its own intrinsic urgency, what is now the traditional view of our party.

This tragic and grave problem cannot fail to engage the conscience and, therefore, the cooperation of every one of us and of the international agencies which, like our own, are responsible for handling problems of such vast and dramatic dimensions.

I should like to explain how the Liberals came to start this battle some time ago ; I refer to the battle against hunger which, as I said, is as old as the world. Liberals and Radicals stand somewhere between Utopia and reality and believe they can solve problems of this nature by action which can sometimes be considered magnanimous, sometimes ingenuous or, from a certain viewpoint, disingenuous. What, on the other hand, are the Communists who, in Parliament also tagged on to the request for urgent debate, trying to achieve ? After spreading terror, revolution and hunger for so many years, they have now decided that hunger can become a useful tool in a political battle the great political battle to change the state of affairs in the world.

This problem can be dealt with only on the basis of a deliberate and responsible commitment, undertaken with a will and after consideration of all the technical difficulties involved. The problem did not, as some have hypocritically argued, arise from colonialism or imperialism. While it is true that colonialism has much to answer for, it is not to blame for this ; on the contrary, colonialism can claim to have awakened among certain peoples of the world what we would now call the urge for freedom and independence.

I should like to emphasize this because I have once again heard from several parts of the House this evening that, although the world produces enough food to feed the whole of the human race, the fact is that, despite this, most of them live in poverty and need, and children and babies die by the hundred thousand and by the million.

Why is this ? If the world is so badly organized, it is perhaps because capitalism is in crisis, Socialism is bankrupt or Communism is bankrupt. We must put our heads together and find something else, because it is absolutely terrible to think that we are potentially in a position to feed the whole world while the number dying from starvation is going up, not down. They have all said : 30 or 40 years ago, the number of deaths from starvation was a minute percentage of the

colossal figure today. In all conscience, therefore, we should work together and, without hypocrisy, without an eye to propaganda or other ulterior motives, try to pin down and get at the reasons for this tragic situation and make a joint effort to find something which will ensure that, in a new order of things, there is a place for genuine democracy, real freedom, consideration for others and compassion. Compassion means awareness that one is really building a world for man where he no longer starves and where he is free, and I should like to remind my friend, Mr Pannella, that people do not die of starvation alone. Society and the world are so disorganized that other values are missing, too ; the spirit is also starved, and people are dying because of that too.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR : MRS DEMARCH

Vice-President

President. — I call Mrs Agnelli.

Mrs Agnelli — (I) Mr President, I will practise the self restraint enjoined by your predecessor, I should merely like Mrs Poirier to listen to what I shall have to say in the coming debate on Cambodia. Mrs Poirier seems never to have heard of the place or to read newspapers or magazines, watch television or listen to the radio. I suppose this is because they all belong to the multinationals.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — Madam President, I too will attempt to be as brief as I possibly can and not cover matters which have already been covered.

I have been reminded very much in this debate of a phrase of Tacitus, '*Ubi solitudinem faciunt pacem appellant*' — where they create a desert they call it peace. I very often feel somewhat the same about some of the phrases that have been thrown around this afternoon. We somehow think that these are going to be solutions to the problems of hunger. They are not. As Mrs Focke said, we have to get down to some very hard work indeed. Those of us who are on the Committee on Development and Cooperation are going to have to take perhaps only Christmas Day itself off, if we are to get through the work needed in order to do something worth-while. There are two aspects which have not been touched upon yet but which I would like to look at very briefly now.

Enright

The first thing that is vital for us to look at is energy — the whole question of cooperation with the Third World in terms of energy. It really will not do at all for us to continue to act the rich person using up all the sources of energy and just conducting experiments in energy in our own country. We have to ensure that alternative supplies of energy in the Third World are assisted.

I look at what is happening at the moment between the United Kingdom and Sri Lanka where a dam and a power station are being built at Victoria. This is good for Sri Lanka, not only in terms of power, but also in terms of irrigation, and is helping to produce conditions in which food can be grown. I should also add that it is very good indeed for British labour being used upon it which would otherwise be totally unemployed, so there is a tremendous interdependence. I would point too to concern being shown by the Crown agents in the United Kingdom for this whole problem of energy in the Third World, and I would recommend to this House that they look at the booklet that has been produced: *Must the world run out of energy* from which I will not quote now, but which certainly does repay serious reading.

The Colombo plan is also something that we must re-examine, because that is one area where we have begun to see that there is a very thin line indeed now running between donors and recipients in one area are donors in another. Here too they are very concerned with this whole question of energy, so I do beseech the committee to take a careful look at it. I thought the original amount of money proposed by the Commission was a disgrace if there was to be a meaningful cooperation programme on energy. I think it even more disgraceful that the Council of Ministers has rejected even this meagre amount. If we are going to cooperate in energy then it is the business of the committee to see to it once again that we do not have just a vague commitment but that we have a programme and will be able to spend the money.

The second area that I would like to look at is the area of fisheries, which has scarcely been mentioned in this debate. I think we should point out that perhaps the greatest under-production that exists in this globe is in fishing. Now that many African and other countries have a 200-mile fishing limit, they are grossly underfished. Here is a tremendous source of protein which should be used. We in this wealthier world have fishermen who are unemployed. Those fishermen can be used in this area; they can buy concessions, so that you would not have a very high technology of fishing suddenly shoved onto countries which cannot sustain it. We have already seen one very unfortunate example of that, where a great deal of money was lost simply because there was not the expertise. But if we are paying, as in the agreement

with Senegal, for concessions for Italian or French or United Kingdom fishermen, we have to ensure absolutely that they are training the country concerned to take over the operation at a later stage.

We have also to make sure that it is not just a rip-off on one side, and a rip-off can be disguised in a number of ways. In particular, there are all the difficulties of infrastructure, storage of fish, refrigeration and so on. A tremendous amount of money can be made by a middleman deliberately and coolly in things like ice. This is one of the minor but very important details that must concern us. If we get all this fish out of the sea, it could be of great value in terms of protein to the landlocked countries and should be used in that way.

Another matter we need to look to is something that was of great concern to my predecessor in this House, John Prescott, and I would like here to pay a particular tribute to the work that he did in fisheries, and also in fisheries in terms of the Third World, in the previous Parliament. I refer to a Community training centre, which is not just geared to inward needs but is also geared to the needs of those countries that can make their living through fishing if they have the resources to exploit their full potential. We also have to look at the apparently minor but very important matter of what happens during periods of time when they are unable to fish.

Finally, Madam President, I would like to underline one point that has been made a couple of times and is brought out most forcibly in the world development report for 1979. That is the actual percentage of its gross national product that each of the Nine is contributing. It is quite appalling. I am ashamed, as a Member from the United Kingdom, that we are putting in such a small percentage, coming nowhere near 0.7% at the moment. I think it crucial, and I am not saying this to make a party-political point, because under the last government, which was of my political complexion, there was an equally disgraceful situation. I think it is up to me and my colleagues to go back to our own country and tell our constituents exactly what it means if we do not reach the figure we should reach, and also to tell them what it means in terms of sacrifice. I think my Conservative colleagues have got to put pressure upon what is now their government, while I have to ensure that it takes a very high priority indeed in the political manifesto of my own party. It is appalling to think of the amount of money spent in all of the nine countries on drinking, gambling and smoking, and not used as a tax source to help the Third World, which is a possibility.

We have, as has been said before, enough energy for man's need but not for every man's greed, and we will only ensure that there is enough for every man's need by attending to the details and not making grand statements all the time.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Bersani.

Mr Bersani. — (I) Madam President, in the five minutes at my disposal I shall try to give you a statement of fact rather than my views. It has been rightly said that there has never been a period in the history of the world when so many people are liable to die of starvation. Just now some journalists told me that they were alarmed at the way the debate was going, and felt that it had little practical value, but I believe — and sincerely hope — that this debate will have a considerable impact on what we do to deal with the greatest problem in the world today.

In her excellent speech, Mrs Focke said that we must adopt a different approach to it. I think that, if we look at the gist of what has been said today, we can claim to have prepared the way for a new approach which looks more closely, more imaginatively and more compassionately at all the problems involved. It is ideas that change the world, and it was essential for them to be brought into better focus and coordination in today's debate. Faced with such an overwhelming tragedy, involving tens of millions of children, women and men, it is hard to know where to begin. However, conscious as we are of the fantastic gap between the facts of the situation and our own moral and political responsibility, we cannot say that we have nothing to go on. The efforts made in recent years and prompted by persistent pleas from this Parliament and the Parliaments of the ACP countries linked with us in the ACP-EEC joint Parliamentary Committee have, by encouragement, pressure and sustained determination, played a major role in keepings things moving in the right direction. The impassioned plea made by Commissioner Cheysson gave us an indication of the dedication which, as I have seen at first hand, he and his staff bring to their task. But we, too, have pursued the other institutions with the same constant and unremitting zeal. In this connection I should like to say to Mr Lezzi how much we value the report he made a little while ago on this very subject, hunger, and in which he reviewed all the difficulties in a critical but constructive spirit based on a correct appreciation of ends and means. Lomé is more than an example of aid, because the Convention involves a sophisticated type of cooperation and it is beginning to bite into the structures of a world which, as we have all said here, must be radically reorganized before the spirit of brotherhood between men can flourish and spread. Lomé, Stabex and all the other institutions are milestones along the road to the future.

Here, agriculture will gain new freedom as a result of the cooperation which the Community is promoting, but there can be no doubt that it carries a heavy burden of responsibility. We must look at the common agricultural policy in a new light as it acquires fresh impetus from the prospect of new horizons, such as those involved in the reference today to

a *décalage* of 70 million tonnes of cereals and one between 130 and 140 million tonnes between now and 1985. We need to have far greater resources and a change of quality as well, and we must achieve this while attempting to solve the political problems of disarmament, disequilibrium and a different world view.

I sincerely trust that the discussion which has been going on and has been given fresh impetus by our colleagues today will help us to get to the heart of the problem with energy and determination.

(Applause)

President. — I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — Madam President, in summing up for the European Democratic Group I should like to concentrate briefly on the real practical problems and the kind of action that might be taken to help.

Last Sunday, I asked the pastor of a small village church in a poor tropical country what he would say to this Parliament on world hunger. He said, first of all you must give us your help in the way that we can use it. He said, a European country sent 50 cows to our village. We had never seen a cow before, and we did not know what to do with one cow, and then we suddenly had fifty. And when we found out what to do with one cow, we did it to all fifty at the same time, with the result that first we had a milk surplus, and then we had no milk!

Secondly, he said that villagers are too terrified of government officials to listen to anything they say, so there is no point in sending government officials to villagers to tell them how to improve their agricultural output. You have to send your help, he said, through those who are clearly there to help and not to rule and threaten.

Thirdly, he said villagers should be shown how to grow cash crops for the local markets. He said they had done this in their village, and the realization that they could actually earn money in that village from the ground around them with their own skills had enormously increased the output not only of the cash crops, but also of the food that they grew for themselves.

His fourth point was that corrupt monopolies prevented the expansion of the trade that grew up in this village beyond the local markets, and since government appeared to have a stake in these corrupt monopolies, the further expansion of their food output beyond their immediate neighbourhood was impossible. They could grow more, but they couldn't distribute it because of the corrupt monopolies.

Fifth, he said, the corruption in the universities in his country, where you had to give a large present to the professor before you enrolled in the course, prevented

Catherwood

villagers from going to university, so that the people who came to try to teach them how to grow were people from the towns whom they did not trust, and never their own people whom they did trust and who would have broken through the prejudice there.

I think it is enormously important that we listen not just to our own general conclusions in this centre of Europe, but that we listen to the people in the village who are trying to improve the food output of a tropical village miles from anywhere, because that is where the reality is. Here we have theory, but in this pastor in a small tropical village you have the reality.

I think that this practical advice from a village level tells us that, although of course we need to be generous in Europe — and Commissioner Cheysson showed us how ungenerous we are being — the problem of world hunger cannot be solved simply by throwing money at it, but only by a most careful cooperation with the people we are trying to help, the people in the villages of the Third World. There are many institutions in Europe with this experience, and I think we need to use the authority and the publicity of this Parliament to make sure that we can collect this great fund of European knowledge and expertise in a systematic way and then make proposals which will use and apply that knowledge. If we do that we shall then find that the money we put in and we should put more money in — will go a hundred times further.

We do have a very real problem which I do not think has been touched on, namely 'you can take a horse to water but you can't make it drink'. We can put all our technical skills and our money in a form which even the hungry will not accept from us because of ignorance, because of pride, because of long tradition, because of deep suspicion of our motives and because greedy and corrupt people stand between our help and those who need it. So I think it is especially important that we should listen to those institutions and individuals in Europe who have found their way round this problem. I have been in the business of promoting overseas trade for my own country, and I have found that there is a fund of experience in particular institutions and particular individuals that is quite exceptional. This includes obviously our own Commission, and particularly Commissioner Cheysson.

We have authority to ask all of these people for their help and advice, and we have the influence with our national governments to see that that advice is taken. Because only if that advice is taken are we going to break through and actually solve the problem on the ground where the problem is.

Of course there is a very delicate problem, namely the problem that has been described by various cliché words like 'imperialism' and 'multinationalism'. What

these cliché words really mean is that in trying to make our help effective we must avoid interference with the internal affairs of sovereign States, especially if they are new and very self-conscious sovereign States. We can see the problem, and it was because European nations could see problems in Africa and Asia that we got into imperialism and started running them ourselves. We must lean over backwards to avoid that problem as countries, or indeed as companies.

One of the best ways round that problem is to concentrate on improving the Third World's external trade. In this way we would not be interfering in the internal affairs of a country, we would simply be giving advice as between customer and supplier, thereby respecting the dignity of the Third World. If this advice is phrased in terms of external relations, which we all have to deal with, we shall avoid all the delicate problems of internal sovereignty. If this advice is taken trade will continue to grow. By improving its ability to meet the needs of external markets, a developing country can improve its ability to meet the needs of its own people, as the village I give as an example improved simultaneously its cash crop for other people and its own supply.

So, to end I would say the greatest contribution we can make to feeding the hungry is through the trade relations of this greatest and richest trading bloc in the world which we here represent and through the relations between us and the countries which contain the world's 1 000 million hungry mouths and 400 million starving mouths.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

Vice-President

President. — I call Mrs Pruvot.

Mrs Pruvot. — *(F)* Mr President, there is no more basic right than the right to eat, and there is no more pressing aim than to conquer the hunger of a thousand million human beings. On this note ended the 5th meeting of the World Food Council of the United Nations held in Ottawa last September.

Of all the problems we have to resolve, that of world hunger is the least controversial. Between now and the year 2000 we shall have two thousand million more mouths to feed. Two thousand million was the world population fifty years ago. Mr President, we have thirty years in which to ensure the survival of the human race. It goes without saying that a problem of this dimension can be solved only by world-wide action. The solution exists and we all know what it is: it is called international solidarity. If only mistrust could at a stroke be replaced by a universal concern for the

Pruvot

survival of the human race, then the insane expenditure on armaments (more than a thousand million dollars a day world-wide) could immediately be devoted to development aid in all its forms. That in fact should be our starting point, because the staggering population explosion among the underprivileged is itself tied to their condition of poverty and destitution.

In the industrialized countries the rising standard of living is coincidental with a general fall in the birth rate.

In the developing countries the opposite is true; in other words, there the birth rate is so high that any benefits of even a substantial improvement in agricultural production and in the development of school education are often wiped out by the still higher increase in the population. Besides, contraception, so familiar to us in the privileged countries, only has any meaning or application above a certain living standard, that is, in countries where infant mortality has dropped owing to better nutritional standards, to the availability of drinking water and to the improvement in health conditions. There are many countries where there is now an awareness of this situation and where efforts are being made to limit the population explosion. Since 1960, the birth rate in some forty countries, representing about one half of the population of the developing countries, has fallen by 15%. In China, for example, it has fallen by 20%. This is why we are seeing a continual drop in the projected population figures for the year 2000 prepared by the UN. While in 1968 the figure stood at 6 500 million inhabitants, now the figure is around 5 800 million. Of course, 5 800 million inhabitants by the year 2000 would still represent a considerable increase, but it would be nothing like as catastrophic as the forecasts which not so long ago predicted figures of 7 000 to 8 000 million inhabitants by the year 2000 and 40 000 millions by the year 2100.

To provide this population with the daily minimum requirement of 2 200 calories would need a production of 4 800 million tonnes of cereals, or three and a half times the present output. Given the foreseeable technological advances, a production capacity of this order should certainly be within our reach.

What this means is that the slowing down of population growth, coupled with the pursuit of economic growth, offers us some real hope for the future. In the short term, however, the prospects are less encouraging.

Countries in which famine is rife are in effect caught in a vicious circle: hunger and disease destroy the capacity for work and the possibility of receiving an education. Without work there is no income. Without income there is no effective demand and no agricultural development.

To get out of this vicious circle the battle has to be fought on all fronts. The countries that need it must be given food aid to improve their immediate living conditions, while taking care not to discourage local production. They must be helped to develop their agriculture, given suitable technical assistance and provided with the necessary funds to create productive employment. At the present time, many of the developing countries spend over 20% of their foreign currency reserves on the purchase of foodstuffs, even though the bulk of their population lives off farming.

In its motion for a resolution the Committee on Development and Cooperation quite rightly insists that the governments should undertake to abide by the rate of public development aid set by UN Resolution 2626 at 0.7% of the gross national product.

The arms race and economic competition, which do nothing but accentuate the disparities between an ever more numerous but ever poorer majority and an ever richer minority, are clearly suicidal. How can we expect the starving masses to continue to accept suffering and defeat when faced with the indifference of the well off?

It is true that the faint voice of these unfortunate people sometimes has difficulty in being heard, and when it is heard, even the most generous are almost powerless to respond to their stifled appeals for help. Such is the distressing case with Kampuchea.

One cannot help feeling that a solution to this human drama would be found more easily if only politics did not complicate matters so much. Mr President, the situation is alarming. In saying this I do not believe that I am indulging in gloomy speculation or pessimistic fantasy, nor am I behaving as an amateur of catastrophe, but simply as a responsible politician.

From time to time this House loses itself in debates on butter mountains, or on lobster catching or on sheepmeat. Although such debates quite properly reflect our preoccupations, they are nevertheless topics for rich countries. We talk of reforming our common agricultural policy, of freezing our output, of letting land lie fallow when all the while the world food deficit is growing year by year.

Every year we are dumping thousands of tons of fruit and vegetables. Can we accept this situation and say nothing? How many UN General Assembly resolutions on the problem of hunger remain a dead letter?

Let us hope that the European Parliament's resolution may be adopted unanimously and that it may provide the stimulus necessary for it to have the maximum effect.

(Applause)

President. — The next speaker on the list is Mr Capanna. Unfortunately, as his group has used up all its time, Mr Capanna will not be able to speak.

Mr Capanna. — (I) Just let me have thirty seconds.

President. — I am sorry, you must sort out the allocation of speaking time within your group. It is going to be a very long sitting and we have wasted that 30 seconds. One definition of democracy is we sit down and listen to other people talking. Your group's time for talking is finished. I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (I) I understand that the sessional staff are counting our speaking time in minutes, not in seconds. So can we be quite sure, Mr President, that Mr Capanna should not be allowed to speak for thirty seconds?

President. — Thank you, Mr Pannella. We shall check the time.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, I have been most impressed by something in this debate and it is this: no one who has spoken so far, I repeat, no one, has struck a note of self-criticism. Until this moment, no one has admitted he was wrong, even in the slightest. Yet what we are discussing is extermination; Commissioner Cheysson called it that, and so do we. This extermination covers our generation with as much shame as you people pile on Hitler and Stalin put together, and I mean you, because I don't blame those two any more.

Does that mean that no one is to blame, then? But, Mr President, where there are crimes and wrong doing, surely someone must be to blame! This Parliament is full of easy consciences. You men of power, the parties of power in Europe, whether in the East or in the West, you are so calm about what you have been responsible for in the past, although you condemn others. When it comes to yourselves, you say: we must keep going and carry on. Oh well, you are probably right and I am wrong.

The way we are conducting this debate, we are as thick as thieves. And, of course, we have Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure — on which I should like you, Mr President to congratulate the President of Parliament, the group chairmen — none of them present — and the majority who voted for this Rule. For I have discovered something: it is that I am to blame for this slaughter, I and my fellow Radicals, we antimilitarists, we pacifists whose national secretary is at this moment in jail in Paris, in a military prison because, seven years ago, as a young and popular electrical engineer, he resigned on account of a military order and became a conscientious objector. Now he is in prison and, Tindemans — or Tindareus — is here! And what is Tindemans, Mr President, but the representative of the Europe that used to be and of its poli-

cies? Mr Tindemans, you have guessed right: it is we who have exterminated and murdered. You people were right to gag us with Rule 28, since our words won't make up for yours or save any lives; do you think that your words as recorded by the cameras, these distortions of the truth, might perhaps save those who are dying?

I think we must recognize Mr Commissioner Cheysson as possessing a determination and candour which Parliament and the political parties have no right to claim for themselves. But, Mr Cheysson, you were entitled to say more to us this evening than merely: I want something more to work with. If you had asked us for fifty instead of ten, you might have got sixty. These people would have understood. However, if you ask for thirteen instead of ten, they will give you nine, because the men and women of good will who are here at this hour, Mr Bersani and the others, and the lady who has just spoken — not the leaders, because they are elsewhere — those whose only weapon is good will, bordering perhaps on naivety, will have the right and the duty to ask, sooner or later: what will happen in the Committee on Budgets, what will they do with the budget, how much will they allocate for fifty million dead? Well, Mr Commissioner, with the greatest respect, and Mr Bersani, with the greatest friendliness and esteem, I must tell you this: we must change horses and say we made a mistake, and this includes me because, as a follower of Gandhi's non-violence, I had to go on hunger-strike ten years ago, when I was already roaming the streets of Europe with conscientious objectors, saying: For every penny you give the Army, ten people die! So I am as guilty as you are, because I am against violence and ought to have risked my life. You are not anti-violence, you are something else.

I should like to conclude by thanking you for your forbearance, Mr President. All I wanted to say was that, as no one made any mistakes, the people who are to blame are the tens of millions of women and men who did not revolt against the murderer, Europe, and who thought she would give them life, whereas we gave them extermination and death!

President. — I call Mrs Cresson.

Mrs Cresson. — (F) Mr President, it is not the duty of Parliament to cover ground that has been covered many times before, but to highlight the factors that have led to the present situation, the mistakes that have been made and from which some people have reaped huge rewards.

We must ask ourselves two questions. Firstly: why this constant deterioration? and, secondly: what can we do to stop it and bring about a change for the better?

Cresson

First we have to find out what is causing the situation. Is it the climate, drought, hurricanes? Is it population growth, population density per hectare under cultivation? Is it the state of technological advancement, the use of fertilizers or pesticides?

Mr President, let me say that it is none of these. Given the means, we can overcome the ravages of the climate. There are countries with a high population density per hectare under cultivation that are well able to meet their food requirements. China, for example, has 0.13 hectare per head of population and India has 0.3 hectare. So the determining factor is not so much the population distribution, as we are asked to believe, but the system of land tenure and, by extension, the political and social system. According to the FAO, 2.5% of landowners possessing more than 100 hectares control three quarters of all the world's arable land and 0.23% of them control one half of it. In Latin America, one third of the rural population controls less than 1% of all agricultural land.

Second point: in most cases intervention by rich countries has exacerbated the situation. Take the Green Revolution, based on the use of western products and techniques. The developed countries, particularly the United States, come along and accelerate the concentration of land. Then the big agricultural and food multinationals step in and intensify output of export crops to the detriment of crops intended for local consumption. They throw into unemployment a large part of the workforce engaged in traditional agriculture. And all this with the connivance of local élites set up on the model of the so-called 'liberal' school of economic thought, the principal criteria of which are efficiency and profitability.

This system is manipulated by a handful of businessmen at the Chicago Stock Exchange or in the plush offices of big grain combines who keep a stranglehold on the market price. This price is largely the result of speculation, hoarding and negotiated agreements. And those who juggle the price for their own gain are playing with the lives — and deaths — of millions of people. This system is not just a means of making money, it is also a political weapon as deadly as any military weapon. We Europeans would do well to think about this before we decide that the common agricultural policy is costing us too dear.

Nearly all of us here come from nations that have committed criminal acts. And it would be futile to indulge in recrimination. The fact is that the strong are sometimes guilty of oppressing the weak if there are no laws to stop them.

The European Parliament must therefore invest itself with the means not of joining in the lamentations of which public opinion would soon tire but with the means whereby a useful contribution may be made. Through its ACP agreements, for example, Europe has so far done the most. What we need to do is to help

the poor nations to help themselves, so that they need not be for ever dependent on aid.

We realize, of course, that the present level of aid is just not adequate. Aid from the Comecon countries, incidentally, represents only 6 to 8% of aid from the West. The level of aid must therefore be increased very quickly, and in this connection the idea put forward by the Brandt Committee of an 'international tax' raised in the industrialized countries on the basis of their potential seems to me to be worth closer examination.

But, as I have said, aid is not enough. Not only is it frequently diverted but also it can have a perverse effect, particularly on agrarian structures and agricultural production. Parliament has on a number of occasions spoken out in favour of aid being granted so as to preserve certain minimum standards, such as those adopted by the ILO. Well, I am sure you will agree that the right of poor people not to die of starvation does constitute a minimum standard. That is why we are asking the European Parliament to pass a Charter of Human Economic Rights, the wording of which might run as follows: 'Any multinational corporation operating in Third World countries that fails to observe certain conditions will be banned by Europe from importing into Europe any of its products.' My speaking time being limited, I cannot list the conditions now, but I will submit them in writing.

We have come to the conclusion that the pressures exerted on governments to persuade them to observe human rights — necessary as these pressures are, they rarely have any effect — are inadequate when trying to contend with the pernicious activities of the multinational corporations justified on the grounds of economic expediency. The standing arrangement between local élites and the multinationals, sheltering behind the argument of non-interference, means that money and arms deals can be concluded with complete impunity. The European Parliament should compile a White Paper on the implications of these activities of the multinationals. There are already numerous documents in existence, as Mrs Bonino mentioned a short while ago. All that is needed is for them to be gathered together and for us to draw our lesson from them.

Finally, the Commission should take into account such information when negotiating new trade agreements like the one presently being negotiated with Brazil. I believe now that it would be unthinkable to renew agreements like the one on generalized preferences, which comes up for renewal in 1980, without first evaluating the results of the previous agreement. And I mean both the direct and indirect results I spoke of a moment ago.

It would be equally unthinkable for agreements to be negotiated without Parliament having first discussed the specific criteria that need to be applied to take

Cresson

into account the real food requirements of the poorest nations.

But there are times when prompt action is needed. This is the case now. For this reason the European Parliament should encourage the immediate setting up of a 'save the people' taskforce to look after those who find themselves in a desperate situation. It is simply not enough for us to salve our consciences by sending food and medical supplies.

The problem of hunger must be tackled by us Europeans. No one else will do it.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Galland on a point of order.

Mr Galland. — *(F)* Mr President, as we have said on numerous occasions, we of the Liberal and Democratic Group have always sought as far as possible to protect and defend the minorities in this Parliament. We still have eight minutes of speaking time left to us in this debate. Our last speaker, Mr Maher, will use up only three of them and so we should be happy, with your permission, to give the remaining five minutes or so to Mr Capanna so that he may have his say.

President. — We will see how the time goes, and I promise not to take the time you have just taken from your own speaking time!

I call Mr Griffiths.

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, friends, I wish Mr Pannella were here now to continue to take part in this debate by just listening to us, because the first words which I wrote when considering remarks for this debate, were that no one has clean hands, and speaking at this very late stage, I would like to take up a few points made by other speakers. In a sense this is negative and critical, but we need to consider these points so that we do not delude ourselves about the problem we have before us.

The social market economy was referred to as being the way in which we were going to solve the problems of world hunger. Now let us remind ourselves that although the social market economy — or the capitalist system, as we might perhaps better understand it — did rely a great deal on the inventive genius of men from all over the world, it has really owed its success to the oppression of the working class in countries all over the world before the trade-union movement was properly organized; and it owes its success to the exploitation of the Third World, migrant workers and all sorts of other groups which are not organized to defend themselves. The idea that British imperialism has got anything to do with the desire of the British to help other nations govern themselves better is just a total misinterpretation of history.

A word, too, for my Communist colleagues because from the way they spoke, anybody would think that we did not have Ten Days that Shook the World some sixty-odd years ago. Probably half the land surface of the world today is under the control of Communist States and their record is no better — and in fact is probably worse — than anything in the Western World. I do not exclude socialism from criticism in this respect, because we are just not beginning even to tackle the problems of world hunger.

Someone asked the question: Why is overall aid failing? I will just ask them to read a book written more than 10 years ago by a French economist, René Dumont, called *False Start in Africa*. The answer is there, but that is not the real question which we should be asking ourselves. The real question is: Why does the present imbalance of wealth between the North and South still continue? And the answer is also a short one: It is because of the terms of trade. And what we have to face up to is that we in the West, in the rich, developed world, have to make sacrifices so that the terms of trade can be improved. As one who has worked — more than a decade ago now, I agree, but I did work for several years — in an East African country, this is the vital question, and we, our national parties, our national governments, have to convince our people that we have got to make sacrifices if this problem is to be overcome. Do not let us delude ourselves: the whole of the Western World has to make sacrifices.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — *(NL)* Mr President, it is a good thing that this Parliament should be tabling motions at such an early stage in its existence to help solve the enormous problem of world hunger. The countries in the Community are among the richest in the world, and it is no more than our duty to look after countries that are not only poor but even lack the basic resources necessary to feed the men, women and children in their populations adequately. I shall confine myself to a number of comments in support of the motion for a resolution and some of the amendments that have been tabled. It is a good thing that this resolution should set our feet in two paths, that of the acute need for aid to save the lives of people who, without our help, will inevitably die, and that of structural aid to improve the chances of survival of millions of people in the future. But we must realise that if we decide to put this international solidarity into effect and we Christian Democrats are all for such a decision it will inevitably mean that we have to give up some part of our prosperity. In this connection I would draw your attention to paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution wherein the Member States are urged to earmark 0.7% of their gross national

Maij-Weggen

product for aid to the developing countries with all speed. For years the UN has been pressing for this 0.7 %, and we should be ashamed that not one of us — all nine countries — has apparently been in a position to meet this target.

In this connection, I would like to make an ad hoc proposal and it is that we, as Parliament, should send an express letter to all the nine national parliaments. I am afraid that if we go through all the formal channels, we shall still not have reached the 0.7 % by 1985. But if we make a direct appeal to all the national parliaments then this petition will already be on their order of business this November and perhaps, in that case, they will manage to have a serious debate on the question in the near future. I ask you to note this proposal and to include it in the votes that we shall be having on the amendments.

But it is not just a question of reminding others of their duty. We must ourselves set a good example and therefore I strongly support Amendment No 20 tabled by Mr Wawrzik on behalf of the Christian Democrat Group. This amendment asks for one half per cent to be deducted from all items in the budget and set aside for urgent food aid. This, as we must clearly realise ladies and gentlemen, means that one half per cent would come off all our salaries and all our expenses, and I expect that all of us know best how to cope with that.

Nor will simply stretching out a helping hand be enough. We have to help the people in the Third World to help themselves, and that implies understanding their situation and their culture. Appropriate and small-scale aid is often far more effective than grand projects which serve purposes of prestige rather than relieving hunger. Ten small agricultural schools are often of more help than an expensive laboratory, and a hundred spades are often of more assistance than an expensive motorized plough that noone can repair if it breaks down. People need to be helped to produce their own food, the food they and their families need. We have to prevent them flocking to the towns, where they often find themselves in a far worse situation, because problems in the country become too much for them.

We must all take to heart the shaming picture of women and children looking for food on the rubbish conveyors and dying in the gutters, and we must not overlook these women in our search for new strategies for development and food aid. In many developing countries they play a central part in food production and food distribution. Their involvement is of the utmost importance in the solutions to world hunger problems. Mr Tindemans made the point this morning. Two amendments have been tabled on this point, one by Mrs Squarcialupi and one by us, and we strongly support both. Mr Tindemans has explained

how important the role of women is. Let me give you a small example to illustrate the point. In India many children are suffering from blindness as the result of undernourishment or malnutrition and particularly because for a long time they lacked certain vitamins.

The poor physical condition of these children worsens this disease. The cause is known, but expensive laboratories, free hospitals and clever scientists have not been able to change the situation. Currently, women's organizations are being brought into the circuit in certain areas. They give advice about changes and improvements to food habits, and that has helped. In those areas where women's organizations have been active, the situation of the children has substantially improved. We often think that action has to be on the grand scale but these small measures are often particularly effective.

Mr President, I shall end as I began by saying that it is a good thing that this Parliament should be making proposals to solve the hunger problem at so early a stage in its existence. But let us not leave it at fine words: let us ensure that the decisions we take are put into effect as well and that the money and aid we make available get to the right address. A lot has been said about the indifference of mankind and it is true, people are indifferent, but this is because they are powerless and that they see that their political leaders are apparently powerless too. I think that if our European citizens were made to realize that aid does help, then they would also be ready in the future to put their hand in their pockets and develop the badly needed international solidarity that would lead to a new economic order in which everyone would have work and clothing, a roof over his head, and above all, food to eat.

(Applause)

President. — Before we continue with our proceedings, I should like to take this opportunity of welcoming to the rostrum Mr von Padberg, whom I congratulate on being awarded the Gold Medal of the European Parliament on completion of twenty-one years' service.

(Applause)

I extend to him my personal best wishes, and also I am quite sure, the best wishes of all Members of the House.

(Applause)

I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — *(F)* Mr President, the problem of world hunger has its origins in the way in which production and world trade are organized. As a Socialist I utterly reject the wording of the title of the debate, which would imply that we are dealing here with a natural scourge and that to overcome it, therefore, all that we need do is summon up a collective iron resolve.

Sarre

Who does not deplore the fact that there is hunger in the world? The truth of the matter is that the scourge of world hunger has its roots not in nature but in human greed. I am speaking here of the profits made by the big multinational corporations which control the market in foodstuffs. The old colonial powers, like Great Britain and France, after stripping the traditional rural economies, for their own benefit alone, replaced them with a single profitable cash crop such as sugar, coffee, palm oil or the like. The classic example is India at the end of the nineteenth century, where basic food crops were replaced by cotton. The Indian subcontinent had never before known as devastating a famine as in the first half of the twentieth century. And, today, the old colonial powers, instead of helping the often tottering economies, continue to undermine them. Through an ostensibly disinterested policy of cooperation, these economies are placed by their very precariousness at the mercy of powerful multinational corporations. In the sheep's clothing of cooperation there frequently lurks the wolf of neo-colonialism. Behind the moral, humanitarian and right-thinking discourses of the rich nations lie the much harder realities. It is the plundering of the Third World's natural wealth and the exploitation of a cheap labour force that attracts these firms. Let us not forget that, even today, 52 million children throughout the world are being made to work. It would therefore be absurd and hypocritical to treat the whole of the Third World uniformly without making a clear distinction between, on the one hand, those nations and peoples that are struggling for development and for dignity and those, on the other hand, that are being shamelessly exploited for their resources by the multinational corporations. This stranglehold of the multinationals is all the more powerful because they both import and export. What an absurdity that they should be allowed to benefit from preferential systems! Imagine choosing the multinational in preference to the loosely linked bloc of underdeveloped countries!

Yes, there you have the reason for the hunger of hundreds of thousands of people whose only blame is to live under the oppression of a system founded on profit and untrammelled competition, whose only blame is 'to have been born in an area that has fallen victim to imperialism'.

Having denounced it, it behoves us now finally to turn our back on any policy that is tainted with neo-colonialism and to give full meaning to the expression, currently so fashionable: mutual respect for independence. We can do this, firstly by stepping up our food aid; secondly, by ensuring that our aid meets the standards and the requirements of their economy and, thirdly, by our respect for their cultural identity and for the democratic political choice of their people.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Habsburg.

Mr Habsburg. — (D) Mr President, the problems of international solidarity are on two levels. On the one hand we have disaster aid, in other words the support given in exceptional cases such as the tragedies in Cambodia and Vietnam or the bloody effects of the Soviet policy of hegemony in Afghanistan. Here the international community must take immediate action to save masses of people from death. But these are exceptional cases. Far more important is the question of how to come to grips with the poverty in the world. Here a realistic policy has to be followed, and empty phrases at last replaced by a practical plan of action.

Only a short time ago, in historical terms, there were famines in Europe. Only when coercive policies came to an end with the transition to market economy principles was it possible to drive out this scourge. Seen in this light, hunger is not least a political problem. This is illustrated, nowadays, by the Soviet Union which used to be the earth's leading agricultural country but is now forced, after sixty years of Marxist mismanagement, to import food from the market economy countries. It is therefore perfectly understandable that one of the most important reasons for world hunger, diagnosed by one of India's leading national economists, is the fact that, whereas only 6% of the world's population was living under communist rule prior to the Second World War, the new totalitarianism has now spread to 36% of mankind. It is significant that, since the new policy line leaving farmers free use of 7% of their land began to take effect in the People's Republic of China, food supplies to the towns have improved considerably.

(Applause)

Conversely, Angola, which used to be a thriving country, has become so impoverished since the Marxist MPLA came to power that it has to import food and was even forced last year to import coffee from Switzerland for its hospitals. And yet Angola was one of the most important coffee producers in the world at the beginning of this century. Further evidence of this organic connection between Marxism and hunger is the fact that the burden of development aid lies on only a few shoulders. At the moment, for example, the socialist countries are setting aside only 0.03% of their gross national product for development aid. If the money going largely in the form of military support to the Comecon countries and Vietnam and Cuba is deducted from this sum, then the share of the gross national product spent by the communist countries on development aid falls to 0.01%.

Habsburg

What is more, 80 % of this aid benefits 12 countries important to the Soviet Union on grounds of military strategy or as suppliers of raw materials. On top of this is the fact that the Soviet Union does its best to pay less than the world market prices for raw materials, but at the same time charges high prices for its exports. A significant example is the bauxite trade in Guinea. Again, it is precisely the Soviet Union and its friends, including their cronies in the West that are always accusing Europe of not doing enough to fight world hunger.

Today it is completely possible to provide adequate food for many times the present world population. Hunger is not the work of fate. On the other hand it has to be recognized that mechanically increasing the amounts of money granted to the developing countries does not dispose of it. A cheque has never solved a problem unless there was a clear concept of how the money should be used, nor will seed grow on ground that has not been prepared.

An increase in the production of food can be stimulated only if some general and politically thorny socio-economic problems are first overcome. There are many overdue measures that do not — or only partly — depend on external help. The decisive factors are adequate incentives for farmers, prices that cover costs, land reform measures and the provision of the necessary infrastructure. In the absence of these measures, the developing countries themselves are unable to absorb increased outside aid for the lack of the right initial steps.

So the first need, to drive hunger from the world, is some rethinking in the developing countries and the readiness to give free rein to the productive forces of the nation, in other words to operate on market economy principles. On our side, again, the right priorities have been indicated: agriculture, schools and education, and transport. It must also be recognized that it is beyond our power to help everyone at the same time. We must therefore have the courage to steer our long term aid in those directions where conditions are most propitious.

Only if these basic truths are recognized will it be possible to create a healthy world economic order. As Europeans, we should not be ashamed of our Europe because, through our diligence and intelligence, we have brought about economic progress in the world. And here I would like to say to Mr Pannella that Europe is not guilty of too little but of too much self-criticism, and has often fouled its own nest.

(Applause)

On that note I would like to close. In our development aid we must remember that the real friend is not the one who gives his neighbour an apple but the one who helps him to plant an apple tree.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi — *(I)* Mr President, after hearing some of the speeches, I realize, with dismay, that those who are hungry will go on being hungry; I should like to make a practical suggestion, as briefly as possible.

In the preamble to the resolution of the Committee on Development, there is a reference to 17 million infants starving to death every year. They die of hunger, malnutrition and disease and because their mothers are hungry, they are hungry from the day they were born. This suggests that one thing we can do is to work for human rights and for the improvement of women's status in the world and in society.

In our countries, children die because their mothers have received no education. Where women have received no education, infant mortality is high, and it goes down as the level of education goes up. You can imagine, therefore, what happens in the countries of the Third World, in the underdeveloped countries, where out of the 800 million illiterates, 500 million are women who do not know and have no means of knowing, because no one has taught them, the most elementary principles of healthy living and healthy eating, and who are incapable of coping with the little food which is available to them. Do you know why these 17 million babies die? They die to make money for the world's financial capitals. I have a booklet about bottle-feeding which says that the cost of bottle-feeding a three-month-old child in Europe amounts to about 2 % of a worker's pay but bottle-feeding an infant in Indonesia amounts to 19 %, in India 23 %, in Nigeria 30 % and in Egypt, 40 %. Despite its exorbitant cost, many mothers in the poorer classes in the Third World believe that bottle-feeding is essential, and they solve the problem of cost by diluting the artificial milk so that a carton lasts ten or fifteen days, instead of eight. What is more, they dilute the milk with unsterilized water, with the result that the main cause of infant mortality in all the underdeveloped areas is bottle-feeding with milk supplied by multinational companies, despite the fact that they have incurred penalties on its account in Europe. Only a week ago, the World Health Organization condemned all forms of advertising and distribution of artificial milk.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize once more the importance of education and of an improvement of women's general position in the community in countries of the Third World. As Mrs Maij-Weggen said just now, in those countries women run the family farms and businesses, and it would obviously help if they could be taught how to get the best out of

Squarcialupi

their land or cattle. Paradoxically, it is in the rural areas that 50 % of the children die of malnutrition and the remainder through lack of proper sanitation and medicine.

Finally, I should add that the multinationals are not interested in medical preparations for the Third World, because the return would be too small. In any case, the medicines which do reach the Third World are for use against our kinds of ailments, and not against diseases which kill millions of people every year.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Maher.

Mr Maher. — Mr President, the situation relating to world hunger is devastating and horrifying, but for God's sake let us not become too despondent; because if we do, we shall become paralysed, and will not be able to take the action which we ought to take.

Let us remind ourselves — and thanks be to the good Lord for it — that food is not a deposit like oil. If it were, the human race would now be contemplating the last decades of its existence on earth. But it is not. Food is a renewable resource, and we can produce more of it. We in the European Community have proved that as farmers — and I am one of them. I would say further, Mr President, that if the need were there, we could double production in the European Community compared to what we are doing today.

We are fortunate of course in that we live in a temperate zone of the world where we do not have to cope with the extreme natural disadvantages or climatic phenomena that confront people living in the Third World. In that context, let me say that we should not be deluded into thinking that we are going to solve the problems of the hungry people in the Third World quickly by education or by a transfer of technical knowhow. That will be a long, slow process. I agree with it, but it will be a long, slow process.

It is going to be essential for us to transfer food tomorrow, and next week, and next year from the European Community to the Third World if we are to save the millions that are otherwise going to die in the next week, in the next month, and in the years immediately ahead. And could I, Mr President, ask: What is going to be the attitude of this Parliament two weeks from now when it discusses the budget, with its heavy implications for the future of agriculture in the European Community? Are the Members of this Parliament, who tonight talk about the need to feed the world's hungry, going to say: Let us reduce production in the European Community? Let us reduce the income of the farmer, and so cut down

production? Is that the way to meet the needs of the hungry in the world? I would say, for God's sake let us be more positive. Let us increase production, let us make provision to supply more food to that part of the world where people cannot supply themselves. Let us not be negative. Let us be positive. Let us increase production.

Mr President, the farmers of the European Community have good reason to believe today, if they read the newspapers of the United Kingdom or listen to the media in other countries, that they are in fact the enemies of society, that they are the cause of all the problems of the European Community, instead of being recognized for what they are — the front line of the battle against world hunger. Let us use them, let us be positive, and let the farmers — and I am one of them — make a contribution towards supplying this food to the people who need it so badly in the world today.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna — *(I)* Mr President, will you please tell me how much time I have because I heard Mr Galland's offer.

President. — You have up to four minutes, Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna — *(I)* Thank you. I am very grateful to Mr Galland for being good enough to let me have some of his time, which makes my thirty seconds into four minutes. I don't want to say anything unfair, but I have a vague suspicion that, in doing this, Mr Galland is trying to avoid any appearance of being one of the 'heavy guns' who are attempting to shoot down our political group.

Now for the main topic, hunger, which, together with armaments, is one of the gravest issues facing us now and in the immediate future.

From the beginning of this debate I have been convinced that there are really only two ways of dealing with the subject. The first is that of a marauder who steals with one hand and gives his victim crumbs with the other: the classic tactic of perpetrating an attack while protecting one's flanks from criticism and pretending not to be involved. The other way is to take, or try to take, the right decisions after establishing the root causes of the trouble and make proposals designed to remove them. I must say — and Mr Galland may now regret having been so generous with his time — that the majority of those who have spoken and, therefore, the majority of the groups in this House have undoubtedly opted for the first alternative.

Capanna

We cannot gloss over the causes of this situation. Some speakers, including a very recent one, said they were fed up with the clichés about the multinationals. Is there no one here who refuses to be made a fool of, and will stand up and acknowledge the havoc wrought over many decades by Western capitalism and Eastern imperialism? The revolution of 1917 came after decades, not to say centuries, of pillage and devastation. This does not mean that I exonerate Comecon; I have two eyes, not one, and I see both sides of any question, I assure you. However, no one can deny that the root cause of our problem is the ruthless process of pillage, destruction and colonialism in which, with varying degrees of intensity and for varying lengths of time, all nine Member States have without exception been involved. No one can deny it, and this explains why neo-colonialism persists in various forms.

But the main thing I want to talk about, very quickly, concerns a subject which, with all due modesty, I am the first to raise. As we all know, the present situation has arisen because half the financial aid which, for various purposes, different international agencies and governments allocate to Third World countries, is used by the governments of those countries to pay off the interest or other obligations relating to loans or so-called financial aid. One does not have to be an economist to appreciate that, as far as those governments are concerned, this is a powerful and deadly source of chronic inflation, with resultant lowering, in relative and absolute terms, of the standards of living of those in work and out of work in those countries. It is, in consequence, one of the main causes of hunger.

A proposal, then. And it is at this juncture, if I can be frank, that we shall find out whether or not the majority in this Parliament is a committee, for capitalist affairs — and, to be frank, I think the predators are fairly well represented here, some in person. If this is not the case, the House will have no difficulty in coming to a decision of great significance and courage by adopting a resolution which cancels the debts of the third World countries and relieves them of the obligation to return the monies received. This proposal was not made by Fidel Castro; it was made long ago by the liberation movements of the Third World and by famous economists such as Samir Amin. I think it would be a qualified decision but, as the majority here represent the predators, I doubt whether it will be taken at all.

(Applause)

President. — I have no more speakers listed.

The vote will be taken at the beginning of the next sitting, incorporating the amendments which have been moved.

The debate is closed.

17. *Emergency aid for Vietnam and Cambodia*

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-386/79), by Mr Gremetz, Mr Pajetta, Mr Vergès, Mrs Baduel-Glorioso, Mr Denis and Mr Ferrero, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, to the Commission:

Subject: Emergency aid to Vietnam and Kampuchea

Vietnam is suffering today from the effects of large-scale destruction and a situation of dire economic and human need resulting from thirty years of war, compounded by the natural disasters of recent years.

Kampuchea is in a tragic situation following the genocide of several millions of victims, men, women and children.

These countries and these people need aid given unconditionally and commensurate with enormous requirements.

Does the Commission not consider it a matter of urgent necessity to propose to the Council:

- that food aid to Vietnam be immediately resumed and substantially augmented;
- that aid of a nature appropriate to the extreme urgency of the situation and going far beyond the decisions taken on 3 October 1979 be made available immediately to Kampuchea and its population?

I call Mr Denis.

Mr Denis. — *(F)* Mr President, as was feared and as I predicted this morning, this important debate comes at a very late hour. However, this in no way detracts from the seriousness of the problems raised by the question I am presenting and of which Mr Gremetz and Mr Pajetta were the first signatories.

Millions of men, women and children in South-East Asia are at present experiencing appalling or extremely difficult living conditions.

As far as Vietnam is concerned, that country is suffering the effects of large-scale destruction resulting from thirty years of brutal wars — first with the French, then with the Americans — which have left eight million dead and wounded. Do we think that without these three decades of constant colonial and imperialist aggression Vietnam would still be counted among the twenty poorest countries in the world? Most certainly not.

Its inhabitants may not be starving, but they are living in a state of extreme poverty and in a devastated country, while the Americans are refusing to honour their obligation under the Paris Agreement to pay war damages. In addition, the country has suffered further destruction caused by the recent floods and by Chinese aggression last February.

It is in this context that the Commission of the European Communities, followed by the Council, decided

Denis

in July to suspend all food aid to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: 70 million dollars of aid allocated for 1979 was suddenly withdrawn. In all, this represented 86 000 tonnes of cereals, 15 000 tonnes of milk and 4 000 tonnes of butteroil that the Commission decided not to send to the Vietnamese.

This decision coincided with the launching of a bitter campaign, in the capitals of Europe and in the United States as well, over the Vietnamese refugees. Leaning on this widespread anti-Vietnamese propaganda campaign, the Commission immediately found a pretext for its reprehensible decision: the 54 million EUA that should have gone to Vietnam would instead, said the Commission, be progressively transferred to the refugees.

Today, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, I am asking the Commission without further delay to resume food aid to Vietnam and substantially to increase it and, moreover, to consider a genuine cooperative plan to help in the reconstruction and development of Vietnam.

Surely no one could deny that this country needs not only to dress its wounds but also to come out of its state of economic and social underdevelopment. It needs factories, all kinds of infrastructures, hospitals and medical equipment, schools, machinery and so on.

Europe must play its part in this development and reconstruction. It has the industrial, financial, scientific, technological and manpower resources to do it. But if our aid is to be used to good effect we must first draw up a comprehensive and responsible plan that takes into consideration Vietnam's needs and what is required to satisfy those needs. A decision to proceed along these lines, accompanied of course by a resumption of food aid, would help to satisfy this demand for a new international order to which millions of people aspire throughout the world, even in Europe itself, and would be a mark of true European cooperation.

It is out of the same feeling of concern that I ask you to propose to the Council that aid of a nature appropriate to the extreme urgency of the situation and going far beyond the decisions taken on 3 October be made available immediately to Kampuchea and its population.

Events in this country over the last four years defy all description. The Khmer people have lived through a holocaust. Incidentally, I must say that it is nothing short of scandalous for Commissioner Cheysson to be repeatedly making statements, for example on French radio, to the effect that he considers it is the Vietnamese who are chiefly responsible for the tragedy in Kampuchea. It is unworthy of a European Commissioner to suggest that there was a deliberate intention

on the part of Vietnam to exterminate the Kampuchean population. To say this is to absolve the real assassins of the Khmer people. After the American defeat, for four years it was the Pol Pot regime and its supporters. I believe that this attitude is symptomatic of that same spirit of revenge that I referred to back in July, and it goes hand in hand with an attempt to divide the peoples of what was formerly Indochina among themselves, with the underlying intention to interfere in the internal politics of Kampuchea.

As with Vietnam, let me say again that it is not just food aid that the Kampuchean people need. Vital as it is, we believe Europe can and must do more than that. With our cooperation, the people of Kampuchea can be helped to return to a normal life and to provide themselves with the means to take care of their own destiny. By sending food aid and also doctors, engineers and scientists, the Community has already decided to grant 5.6 million dollars of aid to Kampuchea, on humanitarian grounds, through non-governmental international agencies. 680 000 dollars still remains to be given out.

It seems that the Foreign Ministers of the Nine have finally decided to cooperate with the legal authorities in Phnom Penh. This shows a degree of progress, and the action of Communist parties like our own could undoubtedly have had something to do with it.

However, what we need to see now is action — and prompt action at that. We intend to see that it happens. According to international relief organizations, in the coming nine months at least 105 million dollars will need to be spent in aid to Kampuchea. Some countries are setting us an example. According to *The Economist*, India, which has enormous problems of its own, has just decided to send 100 000 tonnes of rice to Kampuchea.

The situation demands that more be done than is now being done and that promises be fulfilled. The very future of the Khmer nation is at stake. It is in the light of all these factors and in a constructive spirit that we table this motion for a resolution with request for an early vote, so that this very necessary aid can be made available.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, despite the lateness of the hour I am pleased to have this opportunity to set the record straight on a number of points which in the Commission's view have been totally misrepresented.

Mr President, the oral question put down by the Communist and Allies Group highlights the terrible plight of Vietnam and Kampuchea.

Cheyssson

Their plight is the consequence of a number of historical events and the thirty years of horrendous war is certainly one of them. But it also has its roots in other chapters of history, in revolutionary fervour, in the period of colonization and in the highly unstable state of coexistence, dating back to ancient times, between several different cultures in this region. The result has been a stream of refugees, some fleeing from the war and from destitution, escaping temporarily and hoping — as indeed we do — that some day it will be possible for them to return, others leaving perhaps for good, having decided that there was no longer a place for them in the country of their birth, in the land of their ancestors.

On the other hand, for many of those that remained behind there was only misery, hunger and death. We are being asked what we are doing and what we hope to do in this situation. Let me first go over the refugee problem, but only very briefly since the question does not strictly relate to it.

Under its normal terms of reference and faced with over a million refugees scattered all over the world, the Community set aside in its 1979 programme the sum of 30 million EUA for the refugees of South-East Asia to be distributed through various governmental and non-governmental organizations. With the worsening of the situation due to refugees fleeing from Vietnam — and remember that at one stage, just before and just after the Geneva Conference, the numbers reached 50 000 a month — additional aid of 28 000 tonnes of rice and 3 000 tonnes of milk powder was granted by the Community. This represented 50 % of the requirements of these 'boat people' up to next February, perhaps more. A further 15 million EUA was deposited in cash with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. I will come to the Kampuchean refugees in Thailand in a moment.

But let us get back to the main point of the question : what have we done for those on the spot who are suffering misery and — let us face it — in certain cases famine ?

Needing to rebuild itself after that abominable war and after being hit by floods, Vietnam went through two terrible years, and the Community authorized an aid programme which, between 1975 and 1978 proceeded normally at the rate of first 20 000 then 100 000 tonnes of cereals a year, 1 000 then 10 000 then 20 000 tonnes of milk powder and 1 000 then 5 000 tonnes of butteroil.

In view of the exceptional circumstances the Community made additional aid available through non-governmental organizations and the Red Cross as, for example, after the Chinese attack when additional aid of 2 million EUA was granted. In just the same way, the 1979 food aid programme covered the items of

supply that Mr Denis mentioned and which were budgeted at 54 million EUA.

During the first months of 1979 we were still operating on the 1978 budget, the last boat to arrive at Haiphong being unloaded in September, that is about one month ago. Since then we have had to find a new line of credit. This took a little time, but it was an administrative necessity. On the other hand, we did give some thought to the way in which the 1979 food aid programme for Vietnam was being implemented. The aid programme was not cut off — it is still in being — but in fact it was suspended until we could be certain that it would be used under the best conditions in Vietnam and for the benefit of the Vietnamese people.

Naturally enough — even the Vietnamese delegation in Geneva were not surprised by it — resumption of aid was made conditional on the orderly departure of Vietnamese to their final places of refuge being arranged. In fact, the Vietnamese delegation in Geneva formally accepted that this matter should be the subject of an agreement, that there should be on-the-spot organization, that transit camps should be set up and that these transit camps, as part of our effort on behalf of the Vietnamese in Vietnam, should receive a share of the food supplies. I repeat now what I have told this House on two previous occasions : that our aid to Vietnam has not been cut off — in fact we have even announced that if necessary we would be prepared to increase it — and that we would consider immediate restoration of aid as soon as we receive assurances from the Vietnamese authorities and the High Commissioner for Refugees in respect of the organization of these departures and in respect of the treatment of Vietnamese who decide to leave their homeland.

The Council of the High Commissioner for Refugees, which met in Geneva last week, has given us some encouraging news. It has succeeded in opening an office in Ho Chi Minh City, formerly Saigon. The beginnings of this orderly organization are slow, even too slow, but given the conditions, this is a remarkable step forward. Moreover, the stream of refugees has dwindled considerably compared to what it was some months ago. We are beginning to see a humanitarian approach to a formidable problem. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr Waldheim, is to report to the General Assembly in New York on 15 November. And I repeat that immediately after his report the Commission will examine the implementation of an overall programme for Vietnam, and I think its decision will prevail. The likelihood of its prevailing is strengthened by the removal of some of the grave concern that had arisen — and to which one Member referred, although in terms which do not accord with the facts — over the apparent desire on the part of the Vietnamese authorities to prevent any

Cheysson

kind of contact with the Kampuchean population by anyone whatsoever.

I should like to talk to you now about Kampuchea, about the accumulation of evils it has suffered this century, about the incredible, bloodthirsty and diabolical Pol Pot regime and about the miseries of this people. When we saw the Pol Pot regime and its followers driven back into the jungle we thought that at last we could go to the aid of these people, not under our own flag, but through some governmental or non-governmental organization — it did not matter which — but the most neutral, the most impartial, one whose impartiality in fact would be beyond question. At Geneva — and the Community was the first to suggest it — we asked everyone to set aside funds so that a start might at least be made. Of course we are quite aware that we cannot solve the problems of the 2 1/2 million surviving Kampuchees with just 4 million EUA, but we had to try to reach these people quickly.

For weeks on end we looked at every avenue. Any organization whatever that could somehow gain access to the Kampuchean population in whatever part of the country had our assurance that they would have their expenses reimbursed immediately, and that food aid would be put at their disposal. For weeks on end the authorities that really control Phnom Penh stood in our way. That is a fact, and no one here can dispute it.

(Applause)

That is why in a television interview I said that I did not understand. I said that as one who had admired Vietnam's struggle for independence, as one who had been very close to Vietnam during that period, I was bewildered to see that it was those same people who were preventing others from going to the suffering and the dying and giving them food and medicines. Fortunately there have been some developments. On 24 September the Red Cross and UNICEF obtained authorization to put a few of their people into Phnom Penh to supervise the distribution of food supplies. Certain statements made afterwards caused us some anxiety, but let us forget about those. The fact remains that there are now some people over there who can check what goes on. Three days later the Community called a meeting in Brussels of every conceivable organization to draw up an immediate emergency programme. I reported on it to this House on Friday, 28 September. An initial programme of some twenty million dollars had been decided the day before, on 27 September. It is being directed by UNICEF and the Red Cross, and those involved include OXFAM, the *Médecins sans Frontières*, the *Secours Populaire Français*, the *Secours Catholique Français*, the World Council of Churches and other agencies, some twenty in all. The first plane took off as soon as a definite decision had been taken on 4 October. There seems to be every prospect of the food and medical supplies and doctors reaching the most needy.

A few days later, the Red Cross and UNICEF held a meeting in New York at which a programme was put together costing 111 million dollars over six months. At the same time, the High Commissioner for Refugees drew up a programme to cover the Kampuchean refugees in Thailand, presently numbering some 200 000 but expected to rise to 300 000 who have arrived there over the last few weeks following the military operations in Kampuchea. Besides these 18 million dollars we have to find a further 130 million. The Community has already put in 7 million dollars, four of the Member States have pledged 6 million and the Americans have just announced that they are contributing 30 million dollars. Tomorrow the Commission will lay a formal proposal before the Council. This proposal will be adopted by the Council on Tuesday, and we hope that this will enable the Community to play a prominent part in this 130 million dollar programme, as it did in the initial relief programmes.

As I have said before, our immediate actions cover needs up to the end of November. So you can see, therefore, that in the matter of aid to the refugees from Kampuchea, the Community has been involved at every stage and in every way and has been most assiduous in looking for avenues of penetration. Last Saturday at Ashford Castle the nine Member governments signified their willingness to intervene on behalf of Kampuchean refugees in whatever zone, by whatever means and through any intermediary whatsoever. We are convinced that to be effective we shall have to go through a number of non-governmental agencies with no obvious axe to grind, so that there can be no risk of any political interpretation being put on our actions, because all we want is to get to these unfortunate people before they are all dead. The project covers 2.2 million Kampuchees in Kampuchea itself and 300 000 in Thailand.

That, Mr President, is what I have to report. The Community has done everything in its power in the matter of Kampuchea. Many people have feared, as I said earlier, that the authorities would prevent all access to these stricken people. Mr Denis called for a more comprehensive, more responsible and a more systematic programme of cooperation. I could not agree with him more. It is precisely our aim, as it is in every case, to allow people to develop themselves and to go beyond just food aid. We have already seen some achievements in this area, for example in Laos where we have contributed 2 million EUA for irrigation. As for Vietnam, we delivered agricultural machinery to the value of 2.5 million EUA in 1977, and were to have done more in 1978. But again Vietnam defied accepted international rules by occupying her neighbour. The nine Foreign Ministers, who reflect Community opinion, said quite clearly on 11 September 1979 that they could see no solution other than in an independent Kampuchea ruled by a truly

Cheysson

representative government, free of any foreign presence, enjoying friendly relations with all the countries in the area and receiving international assistance to help in rebuilding the country. We all hope that day will come soon, so that we can cooperate with all the countries in South-East Asia. We are already cooperating with the ASEAN members. We made a start with Vietnam and hope to be able to resume cooperation. As soon as Kampuchea has gained that freedom, that independence and that representative government, we shall then be able to enter into systematic and comprehensive programmes for cooperation that will go far beyond food aid alone. This is not possible at the present time because normal international rules are being flouted in some parts. For the time being, therefore, we shall have to confine ourselves to food aid. I have told you what we are doing in Kampuchea and I have told you our hopes for the future, that is, to be able to resume in Vietnam the operations we were engaged in over the two preceding years.

(Applause)

President.— I call Mr Lomas to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Lomas.— Mr President, I am very pleased that Mr Cheysson gave such a detailed reply to the question. Some of it was encouraging, although I am bound to say that one or two of the remarks about Vietnam may have shown just a slight tinge of prejudice.

I think it is very significant, Mr President, that this debate is following immediately after the one we have just had on world hunger, because the issue we are now discussing is whether we really mean what we say about helping hungry people. The Socialist Group believes that we can at least contribute in some small way to this by increasing the food aid to Kampuchea and by renewing aid and increasing it from what it was previously to Vietnam. I think it is undeniable that there is a desperately urgent need for both: surely any one who has an ounce of humanity will agree to that. We had a debate in July, when a motion from the Socialist Group, calling for aid for Vietnam and for Vietnamese refugees was defeated by the combined votes of Members on the benches opposite. But I hope they will agree now that there have been considerable changes there. Mr Cheysson referred to some of them. They include the increase in cooperation between the Vietnamese Government at the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR). I will turn to that in a moment, but first of all I want to refer to the situation in Kampuchea, because that is perhaps a slightly less controversial area.

I think we all agree that the problem is enormous and that aid is needed in much larger quantities than have

so far been sent from the EEC and the Member States. One of the earlier problems has already been referred to: the doubt about the distribution of food. Where would it go? Who would administer it? Would the Phnom Penh Government allow it to go to areas still controlled by the Pol Pot régime, areas which happily are very small now and are getting smaller? There was a natural reluctance by the authorities to allow it to go to these areas, where it could be used to sustain the remnants of the Pol Pot army, but I think these problems are now largely being overcome and aid is now going to Kampuchea in increasing amounts. According to the reports, certainly in the media in my own country and from the Red Cross, the aid is still mainly coming from the Soviet Union and other East European countries and, of course, from Vietnam itself, which has halved its own rice ration in order to send supplies to Kampuchea. But aid is going also from the EEC, as has been stated, and from Member States, and I think there is a welcome change of attitude now towards the government in Phnom Penh. This was reflected at the meeting of Foreign Ministers held last week, when it was agreed to step up food aid, and it does appear there was a more conciliatory attitude to the Phnom Penh Government. This was probably influenced by the report of the General Secretary of the UN, Mr Kurt Waldheim, who said that the government of Kampuchea in Phnom Penh was now cooperating well with UNICEF and with other food-aid organizations like the Red Cross and a number of Catholic relief organizations.

This is progress, however small, and we can now hope that aid will be considerably increased and that we can help to save thousands of lives.

The question we are debating, however, refers to the decision of 3 October, which was endorsed by the Council about a week later, to send food aid, and asks whether this should be increased. Well of course, the answer to that is: Yes, it should, and must, be increased. Any amount of aid is a step in the right direction, but we are sending nothing like enough. Mr Cheysson, during our debate on world hunger, spoke in very moving terms of the crying need to assist people in all parts of the world. Well, the rich nations of this world, particularly the European Community with its scandalous food surpluses, really must do more than they have done so far, and I hope that the Council will seek ways of increasing its food-aid programme. I imagine that there will be a good deal of agreement on this need for increased aid to Kampuchea.

The question also, however, refers to Vietnam and asks that aid be immediately resumed and increased. I hope that very serious consideration will be given to this, particularly in view of the increasing cooperation from the Vietnamese Government regarding the refugee problem, the quite dramatic reduction now in

Lomas

the number of refugees leaving Vietnam and the cooperation with the UNHCR and its staff based in Ho Chi Minh City and Hanoi. I am encouraged by the reply I received from Mr Cheysson to a letter which I wrote to him when he said — and he has endorsed this tonight — that shipments of food as late as September were landed in Vietnam at the port of Haiphong, despite the agreement to suspend this in July. Perhaps the most significant part of his letter, however, was contained in a paragraph which said — and again this has been endorsed in his statement tonight — that the suspension of aid would be reviewed in the near future in the light of progress made on the agreement between the UNHCR and the Vietnamese Government concerning the orderly departure of refugees, and that at this time there may well be a need for increased aid.

The sooner that happens the better, but first we have to overcome the undoubted hostility shown to Vietnam, and I am bound to say that there is a very strong element of revenge in the policies of some of the Western governments, who have never really forgiven the Vietnamese people for inflicting defeat on the United States and their supporters. There is a saying that the first casualty in war is truth, and there is no doubt that facts have been stood on their head so far as many of the statements about Vietnam are concerned. They are blamed for the appalling conditions in Kampuchea, but it was the Vietnamese who went to the assistance of the Kampuchean people and helped to overthrow one of the cruellest and most bloody régimes in world history.

(Interruptions)

It was the Vietnamese who helped to stop the genocide that was taking place in Kampuchea. Does anyone doubt for a moment that this was not welcomed by the overwhelming majority of the Kampuchean people?

(Continued interruptions)

Are you defending the Pol Pot régime? Is anyone defending that régime there? Is anyone denying that it was a step forward when that régime was overthrown? Let us get some sense and some truth into this argument: it was as welcome as the intervention by Tanzania in Uganda, when they overthrew a despotic régime there and went to the assistance of the people in that country.

Mr President, I end by saying this: I believe that the time is long overdue that the European Community and the Western governments gave much more aid both to Kampuchea and to Vietnam, and I say to Members in this Chamber: they should try and forget their political prejudices and think of the humanitarian aid that is absolutely vital and necessary for the long-suffering people in both those countries.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Penders to speak on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples' Party (CD Group).

Mr Penders. — *(NL)* Mr President, following on the words of the previous speaker, my first question is whether he spoke on behalf of his group or for himself. Perhaps he can reconsider this later. We are certainly composing a sad trilogy in these debates on South-East Asia. We discussed it in July and September and are now discussing it again. In the meantime the situation in those countries, and in Kampuchea in particular is becoming steadily worse. The evidence is extensive and overwhelming. I feel that it is necessary to keep Vietnam and Kampuchea separate.

As regards resuming food aid to Vietnam we have to wait for the report that Mr Waldheim, the UN Secretary-General, is to make on 15 November this year on the refugee situation. I was gratified to hear from Commissioner Cheysson that, in the meantime, it has been possible to establish an office in Saigon for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. After this report it may perhaps be possible to resume food aid provided, of course, that it becomes possible to check whether the aid effectively reaches the people in need. But that is the only condition. We have no need whatsoever to employ food aid as a political weapon. I would also comment — and it may perhaps be a somewhat cynical comment — that the resumption of food aid to Vietnam may yield fruit as regards providing aid to Cambodia. It is a depressing connection, but we have to recognize it.

As regards Cambodia, the Community on its own and also on the international front should exercise maximum pressure on the Vietnamese authorities and I say the Vietnamese authorities deliberately. Here I am quoting Mr Cheysson. It is in itself a sad thing that, when discussing a country like Kampuchea, we have to speak about the Vietnamese authorities. But pressure must indeed be brought to bear on them so that the Heng Samrin administration calls off its truly scandalous interference with the provision of aid. In that connection, I must say that the words of Mr Lomas, the previous speaker, whether spoken for himself or on behalf of the Socialist Group, seemed to me pretty optimistic. The Group of the European People's Party does not want to play politics on this point. What counts is to provide massive humanitarian aid to all Kampuchean. In September I said that the European Community had not helped the cause of aid to Kampuchea when six — no less — of its Member States approved the credentials of the Pol Pot regime in the United States. That must of course have been a slap in the face for the Vietnamese regime. It would have been much better, in my view, to follow the line of the Conference of the non-aligned countries in Havana which deliberately left the seat of Kampuchea vacant.

Penders

In September Mr Cheysson already said that there was really no shortage of means. It is more a question of how they can be distributed. Our group however wants to forestall the possibility that resources may be exhausted if aid is resumed. For this reason we have also tabled a motion for a resolution instructing the Commission to make available to the Red Cross an extra 1 m EUA for the refugees from Kampuchea. In this way direct aid can perhaps be provided in the most effective way via Thailand. This 1 million EUA would have to be transferred from Article 590 to Article 950 in the 1979 budget.

But I would also draw your attention to the possibility of involving private, non-commercial organizations in furnishing aid, and in that connection I would mention, in particular, the Netherlands Cebemo and Ico organizations. In September, Mr Cheysson spoke very highly of these two organizations. He read out a communiqué from one meeting of these organizations and now he has done that again. Often they have contacts and possibilities in matters where governments are up against a brick wall.

In conclusion, Mr President, I have no doubt about the good intentions of the Members tabling the Socialist motion for a resolution but I must say, in all sincerity, that I find the idea of sending out a parliamentary delegation at this time really difficult to stomach. I would therefore ask those tabling the motion for a resolution to withdraw this paragraph. I myself, Mr President, cannot be blamed for the fact that if you do this then little is left of their motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Prag to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Prag. — Mr President, we are indeed dealing in this debate with two of the greatest human tragedies since the war. There is nobody, in spite of what Mr Lomas said, there is nobody, certainly in the European Democratic Group, who believes the Pol Pot régime to be anything but barbarous, brutal and half-crazed. Nobody could believe anything different of a régime which resulted in the death of 3 million out of the 6 million people of Kampuchea. After four years of unparalleled horror and devastation, hospitals and schools are empty, whole towns are empty, the transport system of the country is destroyed and the crops are unsown.

But let us look now at the other part of this question by the Communist Group — Vietnam. In Vietnam, we still see a policy of destroying ethnic and political minorities. So far, 1 million people have left; and that is a euphemism, because they have been pushed out — blackmailed out — of Vietnam. Of these 1 million, between 400 000 and 450 000 have died. They have drowned or they have died of disease, the victims of

persecution and oppression and of the total contempt of totalitarian systems of government for human rights, for the right of the individual to life and to dignity. Human beings are still being cynically exploited in order for the régime to earn gold or foreign exchange: £2 000 per family, Mr President, for an exit visa! Two months ago, Vietnam's Minister of Foreign Affairs thought that the total leaving the country might reach 3 million people: 1 1/2 million of them Chinese and the other 1 1/2 million people who 'had worked for the Americans or the old régime'.

We all know that action is needed in both Kampuchea and in Vietnam, but there is a very big difference between the two. In Kampuchea, the people are being crushed between two brutal, competing, Communist régimes. I wonder, Mr President, at the nerve of the Communist Group in bringing forward an oral question for debate in which they dare to mention Vietnam at all. Of course, the Pol Pot régime is the more vicious and barbarous and brutal, but the present régime in Phnom Penh is alien and detested. Vietnam has been the aggressor and conqueror in Kampuchea, has been the aggressor and conqueror in Laos and is the oppressor at home in Vietnam. A massive army of over 200 000 troops is holding down Kampuchea.

In the first two days of this week, we were privileged to have here a delegation from the ASEAN nations, representing about 250 million people. And there was no doubt about their grave concern about the intentions of the Vietnamese. How far will they go, and when will they stop? The military forces of Vietnam exceed those of all the five ASEAN States together. Yet this proposal from the Communist Group gives pride of place to food aid for Vietnam. I am not against food aid to anyone who needs it, and neither is anybody in the European Democratic Group, but the first responsibility for feeding the people of Vietnam must be that of the Vietnamese Government, which is spending countless millions on arms, aggression and conquest. The Vietnamese Government should turn its attention from conquest to feeding its own people. Our aid should be concentrated on Kampuchea and channelled, as it is at present, through the United Nations Agencies and through the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Before we think of food aid for Vietnam, we should think of pressure on the Vietnamese Government to stop the brutal and inhumane repression which deliberately creates refugees, of whom nearly a half die. We must stop Vietnam from forcing on other countries a population which it decides it does not want because it decides that they are bad, and how it decides between bad and good is its own nefarious business.

The second priority must be for the settlement of the refugees in Thailand. We heard the Thai representatives speak of the fears they have that the numbers of refugees will rise to 400 000 when the rainy season

Prag

ends. So I hope, Mr President, that we will not vote for the Communist resolution. I hope we shall give priority number one to Kampuchea, more now and certainly after the end of November, and second priority to the resettlement of the one million refugees in the five ASEAN States who must be permanently resettled.

President. — I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (*F*) Mr President, when I came to this Parliament I thought of it as a place where they played, so to speak, the gentler games like tennis or ping-pong. Instead I find them playing rugby. I'm sorry, but I am a peaceable person and I would not like to play rugby because it is a kind of sport that I am not used to playing and do not care for at all.

We put forward a resolution in the proper way, in a civil and democratic manner, as comrade Denis has done. He was interrupted. I found this regrettable and wanted to raise a point of order. Personally, I never interrupt speakers of other groups because I think it is stupid and simply wastes time. It is now 1.15 in the morning.

I have only five small points that I want to make. I am putting aside all my carefully prepared notes.

My first point is the following: in 1967, the American magazine *Life* published an article by the well-known British historian, Professor Toynbee. In his view, the Americans had made a big mistake intervening in Vietnam because Ho Chi Minh would have turned Indochina into the Yugoslavia of Asia. He would have been a new Tito. This analysis was made in 1967 by a world-renowned historian, in this case British. And the disruption of the whole area — Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand and Laos — proves his point. Personally I believed him in 1967, I knew that this historian was right. Unfortunately, politics has other motives, the realities are different.

Second point: I was absolutely astonished, Mr Cheysson, that you as a Frenchman and a European should wonder that the Vietnamese are a warlike people. Since the Second World War I cannot think of any nation that has been more warlike than the French. The British, the Belgians, the Dutch — we never had any — let their colonies go much more readily than you. You fought stubbornly at Dien Bien Phu, and it needed a war and other complications to make you leave Algeria. So I think we Europeans should be a little more careful in judging the actions of others. After all, we are all equally responsible, and we were all the losers at the end of the Second World War. Having said that, may I remind you that the Italian Communist Party did not approve of the invasion of Cambodia — now Kampuchea — by the Viet-

namese forces, and I believe that that will only serve to complicate the Community's decision to give aid, even though we urgently and earnestly call for it in our resolution. We hope that this aid will reach the people of Kampuchea, who are really at the end of their tether after the ravages caused by the Pol Pot regime. I believe that Havana and the non-aligned countries have given Europe a fine example of how to act when one is not sure what to do.

I come now to my third point: the restoration of aid to Vietnam. You said, Mr Cheysson, that you are presently considering the matter. As Europeans we feel — as I am sure you do too — a measure of guilt towards Vietnam. It is not a starving country, but it is a poor country and its poverty is our fault, not directly but indirectly. We should therefore restore aid to this country to enable it to rebuild.

Mr President, I believe Europe has a role to play in the world. It is a role of peace, a role of justice, a role of eradicating violence. Let us not talk only about terrorism, let us remember that hunger, too, is a very serious form of violence.

President. — I call Mr Berkhouwer to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (*NL*) Mr President, I am astonished at the way a woman claiming to be as progressive as Mrs Glorioso can distort history and Toynbee in the way she has done. We have to distinguish between Vietnam and Kampuchea. The sad fact is that Vietnam is driving its own people to the sea and conducting an aggressive war in Kampuchea for which it receives \$ 4 million a day in support from the Soviet Union. Half of the Kampuchean have been put to death by the Khmer Rouge, and the other half are now on the point of dying of want, hunger and disease. Tens of thousands are fleeing into Thailand where they live in pitiful conditions in refugee camps.

Since the resumption of our activities in September last, my political friends and I have been in consultation with the other Community institutions and in particular with the President of the Council when it met in Dublin. We found, to our great satisfaction, that action was taken on a motion for a resolution tabled by us the previous time and adopted, in which we called on the Council to provide massive humanitarian aid. I believe that Mr Cheysson will have heard with as much satisfaction as I of the fact that, last weekend, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting in Galway in Ireland again passed a decision to make the scale of aid as large as possible. We are gratified at this. I feel it is proof of good communication between this Parliament and the other Community institutions.

Sadly, of course, the situation in the meantime is worsening. I am surprised that it is not realised that

Berkhouwer

there are now about 200 000 Vietnamese soldiers in Kampuchea. Mrs Baduel Glorioso probably does not even know that the rest of Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge troops in some cases have joined up with the troops of the puppets in Pnom Penh and in others are struggling against the Vietnamese forces. Toynbee could tell you that, but I am doing so. I find this appalling, Mr President.

I would also like to ask Mrs Glorioso what the Western world is doing, politically, to prevent the powers that want to liquidate Cambodia as an independent country from doing so. For let there be no doubt about this: we must indeed help the victims and refugees, but must not an end be put to the expulsion, this driving of people into the sea and the chasing of Kampuchians into Thailand? Can we let this go on? And if it does go on, have we the necessary capacity, however much we would like to do it, to take in all the refugees, all the people who are driven out?

These people are being robbed of their elementary right to their own hearth and home in their own country.

We have been talking about world hunger for seven hours. It is now our human duty to stop talking about human rights and do something about them, to offer effective aid on the greatest possible scale: food and drugs to the thousands that are at this very moment on the point of dying but also — and here I go along with Mr Cheysson — aid to Thailand where the refugees are now arriving in masses. The Thais cannot cope with this on their own, and that is the drift of our motion for a resolution. I understand that our Socialist friends have also tabled a motion for a resolution. We have put forward a motion that is not contrary to theirs with the object of rushing aid to Thailand as well in the present situation.

One last comment. Visits by parliamentary missions have no relevance here. The dying people in South-East Asia have nothing to gain from being inspected by parliamentarians from West Europe. Only one thing is important to them and that is to stay alive.

President. — I call Mr Deleau to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Deleau. — (*F*) Mr President, although I have listened with interest to Commissioner Cheysson's statement, there is no escaping the fact that while the decisions taken in Geneva were unquestionably generous and held much promise, the situation has not in fact improved a great deal. The new exodus of refugees from Kampuchea is the best proof of this, and what we are witnessing now is the lingering death of a people. We must therefore not only act, but act quickly. How far has the Community programme adopted in July been implemented?

The first instalment of the Community emergency programme of 4 million EUA for the people of Kampuchea has only just been released. Since the Commission now seems satisfied that its aid will in fact reach the suffering population and will not be misappropriated by the warring parties, what measures does it intend taking to step up its aid programme? The decisions of the Geneva committee called for an increase in refugee intake quotas by the eventual host countries from about 10 000 per month to 30 000. They also urged Vietnam to agree that the departure of refugees would be organized in an orderly manner and that the 'transit' countries would accept these refugees.

Can the Commission tell us what have been the practical results of these decisions? We know that Thailand has given a commitment not to turn back refugees, but are these 'transit' countries not likely, sooner or later, to be faced with the dilemma that Malaysia faced of having to balance humanitarian considerations against possible risks to national security? Of course the international agencies are at present providing financial aid to help them set up reception centres for the refugees. For their part, the Member States are making every effort to take in greater numbers of them themselves. But more needs to be done. The Group of European Progressive Democrats therefore urges the Member States to increase substantially their refugee intake quota and to speed up their administrative formalities. As for the Commission, could it propose the creation of a special fund for the resettlement of refugees in the countries of the Third World? Such a step would encourage the transit countries to be patient and persuade others to join in this salvage operation.

Finally, the Commission said in a statement after Geneva, and I quote: 'The suspension of aid to Vietnam, in order to help the refugees, does not mean that this aid will not be implemented, on the contrary, it will be increased.' During the plenary sitting of 19 July, Commissioner Cheysson explained to us that 'it was just the 1979 programme that was suspended, and that the previous programmes had in fact been implemented. It is the 1979 programme that we shall have to review at a later date in the light of what happens in Geneva.'

In view of the results of Geneva, does the Commission expect to resume this 1979 programme and is it certain that the aid will in fact find its way to those for whom it is intended?

As for the problem of Kampuchea, are we to stand helplessly by while the Khmer people are being exterminated? This people has been literally decimated, and nearly all the children who still survive face inevitable disease and even death. Is it not time that we had an international force that can separate the warring parties and, above all, police special security

Deleau

zones? Our group believes that the Member States should bring the matter before the United Nations Security Council. The life of a people and perhaps even the fragile peace of the world are hanging in the balance.

President. — I call Mrs Agnelli.

Mrs Agnelli — (*I*) Mr President, I am very conscious that I shall not do justice to my subject. I rise to speak because I have just been in Thailand and on the borders of Laos and Kampuchea.

We are discussing aid to Kampuchea and Vietnam, but I think we ought to talk about aid to Thailand as well. There, where the rainy season has just ended and the Pol Pot army is being pushed towards the frontier, tens of thousands of refugees enter the country each day. Some of them, civilians, who had already been starved by the troops of Pol Pot, can hardly stand up, are shivering from malaria and lie half-naked waiting for death in the boiling sun. The others are the retreating army of Pol Pot, who are in much better physical condition. Many of them have a bagful of rice slung over their shoulders, with sometimes an ox or a piece of furniture with them; they still have their clothes but they, too, are fleeing to avoid being killed.

Now and then the Vietnamese fire a mortar at one or other of these groups or attack them with tanks. To transfer these people to greater safety would be very difficult: the roads are impassable except by jeep and further on, a few kilometres from the frontier, there are no proper reception centres. How could there be? When, last May, the Thai Government ordered the forced repatriation of forty thousand Kampuchians, who were sent to a terrible death — it has only to be described by the survivors to make your hair stand on end — it filled the world with anger. The world was angry, but then it did little or nothing to ensure that those refugees survived in future, and their number is increasing all the time.

Just to give these people enough food to stay alive requires enormous expenditure and organization; with sufficient money, everything can be bought on the spot: rice, lorries and medicine. What they need are field hospitals, medical teams and experienced relief workers. The Thais are rather suspicious of the foreigners pouring in. Fear of invasion by the Vietnamese is widespread, and almost anything could be used as an excuse.

Nevertheless, I believe it would be helpful if the Community obtained permission from the Thai Government to send in properly equipped field hospitals and doctors. This could be done by providing the International Red Cross or *Médecins sans frontière* with ample funds, and sending funds for the purchase of food on the spot. The only food that can be sent out is milk, of which the Community has plenty, and baby food would also be very welcome. As for the refu-

gees from Laos, I should just like to say that, in the last few years, they have been greater in number than all those from Kampuchea and Vietnam together. A whole race is about to be wiped from the face of the earth. Out of the 500 000 who originally lived in the uplands of Laos, only half remain; the rest were systematically exterminated. Those who managed to get away went to Thailand. A few thousand took refuge in the United States and Canada; the others have been in camps for four or five years.

It is strange that a world which is rightly concerned about the possible extinction of the monk seal or the peregrine falcon experiences no overwhelming need to save a section of the human race. A place must be found for these people where they can come together again and begin a fresh life. This we must do. At the same time — and this is my plea to the Council, the Commission and this Parliament — we must help those who will otherwise die; we must help the Kampuchians, whom the Pol Pot have reduced to want and misery; we must help the Pol Pot troops who are fleeing from certain death at the hands of the Vietnamese. We must also help the Vietnamese, since the Americans destroyed their country. But should it not also be our duty to find some way of preventing a nation from reducing another to starvation flight and exile, and to put an end, once and for all, to this vicious circle of events?

President. — I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (*F*) Mr President, the enormity of the present situation imposes a duty on us to seek out its causes so that we may have a clearer idea of how to cope with this tragedy. Let us go back to March 1970, that is nearly ten years ago. Not content with their savage intervention in Vietnam, the United States went on to provoke a military coup d'état — as they had been known to do before, and as they were to get into the habit of doing in other parts of the world — overthrowing the non-aligned Prince Sihanouk and replacing him by an obscure paid puppet of theirs, General Lon Nol. Some columns of North Vietnamese happened to be passing through the North-East of Cambodia. And that is when the atrocities began. But there was scarcely any reaction from governments and world public opinion. The Vietnam war was no longer a talking point.

After the Pol Pot regime came to power in 1973, the world watched with growing dismay the unbelievable barbarism of a regime that was to last three years. Is there any need to go into detail? A people condemned to forced labour, concentration camps and a communal burial pit in a Cambodia that had cut itself off from the outside world and by some irony of fate — or of the Pol Pot — began calling itself 'Democratic Kampuchea'. It was the result of a frenzied reaction to the Lon Nol regime.

Sarre

And so we can say that the principal oppressors of the Khmer people, in chronological order if not in order of savagery, have been the Lon Nol government backed by the United States, followed by the leaders of the Khmer Rouge backed by China.

The third act in this tragedy was the Vietnamese invasion in September 1978 — and with all due respect to some people, it was nothing less than an invasion — which merely served to exacerbate the situation. But now, faced with this latest cataclysm to engulf Kampuchea, the Pol Pot forces, what little there is left of them, continue to force tens of thousands of hostage families to slave for them in their strongholds, as they had previously done on a much wider scale throughout the whole territory of 'Democratic Kampuchea'. On the other hand, those who entered the country simply blockaded the Khmer Rouge strongholds without getting involved in close-fought action. It is nauseating to have to say and to recall that for a time it was impossible for food supplies from outside to reach those for whom they were intended.

In view of this situation, it would be inconceivable that we should think only in terms of sending in aid and emergency relief, vital as they are. Our Parliament can and must take the initiative on humanitarian grounds, as I have already explained during the debate on the emergency resolution tabled by the Socialist Group, on whose behalf I speak. There is a more important reason why we should do it: an initiative coming from this European Assembly will be seen by the governments concerned as having been taken independently of, and without any subornation by, the superpowers of the United States, the Soviet Union and China. Here is an opportunity that we can grasp. Therefore we in the Socialist Group propose that a special mission be entrusted to a small parliamentary delegation which should without delay visit Phnom Penh, Hanoi, Bangkok and Vientiane to discuss with the authorities concerned what emergency relief is needed for the Khmer people and for the refugees. The members of the delegation, in cooperation with the Commission and Mr Cheysson, would then take whatever measures are appropriate, including organizing an air-lift. Enough of talk. Now is the time for action. And we can act without seeming to interfere. The special position enjoyed by Parliament allows it to play a real and instrumental role in bringing an end to the tragedy in South-East Asia. If our approach is to be given every chance of success, it would be significantly enhanced if it were preceded by a token of goodwill in the shape of the restoration of food aid to all the peoples concerned and in particular to the Vietnamese. I believe that such an initiative should receive the unanimous support of the House. Unlike in other periods of violence in the history of the human race, we know the full extent of the tragedy here. Let us now get down to action. Fine sentiments,

discussions of principle and units of account will not solve the problems. Let us appoint a small group of parliamentarians to go out there, to decide on what needs to be done and to act on their decisions.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella — (*F*) Mr President, allow me to try out a rather wild assumption. Supposing that tomorrow the Vietnamese Government and the Government of Kampuchea accepted all the conditions which, rightly or wrongly, are laid down for them to receive aid. How much money would Europe allocate immediately as aid? I remember the figures which Commissioner Cheysson supplied, but I also heard Mrs Agnelli's speech a moment ago. In the circumstances, I do not think anyone here has anything against the Thai Government. Apparently, everyone is anxious to help but, if I understood Mrs Agnelli correctly, these terrible events, these people who are dying and will go on dying are all in Thailand. The money which the free world, our Western world, wants to send to help the Kampuchians and the Vietnamese cannot reach them because the wicked Vietnamese and the wicked Kampuchians won't allow it. In that case, why not try to save those who are in Thailand and save Thailand, which is itself in a terrible situation? There seem to be some people who, thanks to the mistakes of our Communist friends, have acquired easy consciences very cheaply. That is the truth.

The attitude and the mistakes of our Communist friends are a great help to their critics. What effect has their question had? It seems to me that they have enabled the Commission's attitude to be understood and some of your criticisms to shown up as arbitrary and one-sided. In this way, you have made it possible for some people to pose without much difficulty as the champions of humanitarian action if only the wicked Vietnamese or the wicked Kampuchians would allow them to be. This is not the real position because they would leave most of them to starve to death if that suited their political book.

I agree with you: food aid to Vietnam must be started again at once and it must be substantially increased for Kampuchea. But, please, only for the Vietnamese and the Kampuchians. That is the assurance we want, without any conditions laid down by the liberators or by those who believe that 200 000 people should get out of there and that 200 000 others should go to Kampuchea. Don't you want aid for the Communists, the peasants and the Vietnamese and Kampuchian Socialists to be sent at once? Are you sure it will get to those who are dying in Kampuchea and to all the Vietnamese who need it? I don't think so. To conclude, I consider the Commission's conclusions to be sound. I think the figures given to us err on the side of optimism.

Pannella

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to express my thanks to the Welshman who took the Chair tonight.

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, permit me to clarify a number of points.

One of the speakers asked me about the progress so far in implementing the programme drawn up in Geneva and, specifically, about the Community's participation in this programme. I must remind you that the discussions in Geneva were not concerned with either the Cambodians, or the Cambodians in Kampuchea, or with the refugees from Cambodia but exclusively with the 'boat people', in other words, with the refugees leaving Vietnam. The problems are quite different, the status of the refugees is not the same. The majority of refugees from Vietnam are unlikely ever to be able to go back, and so we are faced with the crucial problem of finding a home for them either near their homeland or further away. On the other hand, everyone hopes that the Kampuchean refugees, those in Thailand and especially those who are still in Kampuchea and suffering appalling deprivation, will be able to remain in, or return to, their homeland. These are two quite distinct problems.

Secondly, in the matter of aid to Vietnam, I would like to return to what I said in my statement on behalf of the Commission in July and reiterated at the September part-session. Mr Lomas mentioned that I had written to him on the subject. As soon as we receive the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the implementation of the agreement of principle reached in Geneva for the orderly departure of refugees from Vietnam — once that happens — the Commission will review the whole of the food aid programme for Vietnam, perhaps even an increased programme, with a view to its implementation.

Thirdly, the problem of Kampuchea itself is quite different from the problem of the refugees from Vietnam or the problem of aid to Vietnam itself. To prevent any misunderstanding, particularly with Mr Lomas, let me first say that what UNICEF and the Red Cross were asking of the authorities in Phnom Penh — that is to say, of course, the Vietnamese authorities — was obviously not that they should organize distribution in the zones controlled by the Pol Pot, but purely and simply that they should authorize the distribution of aid and medical supplies and allow doctors to have access to the Kampuchean population in zones controlled by the authorities in Phnom Penh, that is, the Vietnamese government. That is what we were asking for, and that is what we were being denied for weeks on end. From 24 September — remember the date — the government in Phnom

Penh authorized UNICEF and the Red Cross and also other non-governmental organizations to take over the distribution of food supplies or to supervise their distribution, to send in doctors and so forth. As I say, this happened on 24 September, which is why the meeting to draw up the initial programme could not take place until 27 September. You can see that we did not let many days pass between the 24th and the 27th. The first plane took off on 4 October, and eight planes have taken off since. At the same time a comprehensive programme was worked out which will continue to be implemented by UNICEF and the Red Cross. Incidentally, I am sorry that Mr Pannella was not here to hear this since he questioned me on the subject in terms that I must say I found particularly distasteful at times. The programme I just referred to covers 111 million dollars over six months and affects 2 200 000 Cambodians in Kampuchea and 300 000 Cambodians in Thailand. As for the physical arrangements in Thailand, these include the building of camps and the purchase of equipment by the High Commissioner for Refugees to the value of 18 million dollars. That is a total of 129 million dollars, Mr Pannella. That is what we have set in motion. The Community must make its own contribution as indeed it has done in the first instalment which is right now being implemented and as it will do in the future. I have said this before and I say it again. The Council of Ministers will be taking a decision on Tuesday on sums considerably larger than those already involved, so that the Community may have a share in this 130 million dollar programme which will have been drawn up and launched around us.

Your question about Thailand, Mr Pannella, is very relevant. But we cannot very well help Cambodian refugees in Thailand before they actually arrive there! Now, the fact is that they left for Thailand in vast numbers as soon as the dry season's military offensives started in the last week of September. Immediately, trucks were bought — I can give you a list of their makes and sizes — money was spent and now one convoy carrying food supplies leaves every day from Bangkok for the Thai frontier. I am not saying it is enough, but at least we have been able to act quickly because we do not have the formidable problem in Thailand which we encountered in Kampuchea and which I believe has now been ironed out. All this should give us the freedom of action I spoke of and enable us to go ahead with what I have already outlined under the conditions I have described.

(Applause)

President. — I have received the following motions for resolutions, with requests for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 47 (5) of the Rules of Procedure, to wind up this debate:

President

- by Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Pintat and Mrs Agnelli, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-411/79/rev.);
- by Mr Langes, Mr Klepsch, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Bersani, Mr Diligent, Mr Vergeer, Mr Michel, Mr Ryan and Mr Spautz, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) Group (Doc. 1-416/79);
- by Mrs Dienesch and Mrs Chouraqui, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-426/79);
- by Mr Sarre, Mr Zagari, Mr Glinne, Mrs Castle, Mr Estier, Mr Arndt, Mr Motchane, Mrs Cresson, Mrs Fuillet and Mrs Roudy, on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-427/79);
- by Mr Denis and Mr Ferrero, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group (Doc. 1-432/79);
- by Mr Prag, Lord Bethell, Mr Howell, Mr Spicer, Mr Normanton and Mr Tyrrell (Doc. 1-433/79).

The vote on these requests for early votes will be taken tomorrow at the opening of the sitting.

The debate is closed.

We shall now suspend our proceedings for ten minutes.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.55 a.m. and resumed at 2.10 a.m.)

18. Fisheries policy

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

- Report (Doc. 1-402/79) by Mr Battersby, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposals from the Commission to the Council for
 - I. a Regulation allocating among Member States certain catch quotas for vessels fishing in the regulatory area defined in the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the North-West Atlantic fisheries
 - II. a regulation laying down certain measures for the conservation of fishery resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of a Member State and fishing in international waters in the North-West Atlantic
- Report (Doc. 1-403/79) by Mr Kirk, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation on the conclusion of an agreement between the European Economic Community and the Swedish Government relating to certain measures intending to promote the reproduction of salmon in the Baltic Sea ;

— Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-414/79/rev.) tabled by :

Mr Kirk, Mr Caillavet, Mr Nyborg, Miss Brookes, Lord Douro, Mr Olesen, Mr Hutton, Mr Dalziel, Mrs Martin, Mr Haagerup, Lord Harmar-Nicholls, Mr Harris, Mr Hord, Mr Buchou, Mr C. Jackson, Mr Forth, Mr Deleau, Mr Patterson, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Miss Roberts, Sir Brandon Rhys Williams, Mr Sherlock, Sir Fred Warner, Mr Howell, Mr Simpson, Mrs Bañuel Glorioso, Mr Hopper, Sir David Nicolson, Mr Moreland, Miss Hooper, Sir Henry Plumb, Mr Price, Mr Purvis, Mr de Pasquale, Mr Johnson, Mr Seligman, Mr John M. Taylor, Sir Peter Vanneck, Mr Tuckman, Mr John D. Taylor, Mr Vandewiele, Mr Pearce, Mr Prag, Mr Moorhouse, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mr Simmonds, Mr Lima, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Beazley, Mr Provan, Mr Newton Dunn, Lady Elles, Mr Møller, Mr Curry, Mr de Courcy, Mr Ling, Mr Battersby, Mrs Cresson, Mr Adonnino, Mr Damseaux, Mr Geurtsen and Mr Gatto on fisheries policy.

I call Mr Battersby.

Mr Battersby, rapporteur. — Mr President, colleagues, I wish to report to you on two measures to implement the provisions of the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the North-West Atlantic fisheries. This Convention has replaced ICNAF, the International Convention for the North-West Atlantic Fisheries, to which many Community Member States formerly belonged. This previous agreement was not designed for the present situation ; the coastal states in the North-West Atlantic have since extended their exclusive zones to 200 miles ; consequently, part of the old ICNAF area has come within national 200-mile zones, in part encompassing good fishing grounds that used to be in international waters.

This situation required many changes in the previous convention, and a new agreement became essential, Negotiations took place at a number of diplomatic conferences in 1977 and 1978, at which the Community was present in its own right. The Convention was signed by the Community in accordance with its powers under the present fisheries policy. The fact that we were co-signatories with the Soviet Union is of great political significance. This is the first time that the Soviet Union has recognized the competence of the Community to negotiate in international fisheries agreements outside the 200-mile fishing limits — a precedent of great importance for the future, and not only in fisheries. In future the Community will be taking part in its own right in international fishing negotiations wherever our Community fishing interests are involved.

The second point of importance in this new agreement is the stress placed on scientific research and

Battersby

information where we can benefit considerably from the practical experience gained. In the Committee on Agriculture, this proposed Convention was approved by 30 votes with 2 abstentions and no votes against. It is considered by us to be an important step forward by the Community towards multinational cooperation in the world fisheries sector.

Three points, however, must be emphasized: this Convention is binding on the Community; it came into effect on 1 January of this year; and, in this agreement, there was the possibility of raising objections. But the Commission only advised the Council of the Convention on 24 July — 24 days after the closing date for objections. Parliament was advised on 6 August — long after the final date for objections. In future, it is essential that this Parliament be advised of international agreements within the period allowed for raising objections, in order to allow Parliament to register its opinion. I urge that this procedure be formalized as quickly as possible, because we are a freely elected parliament; we are not assigned representatives of national governments; nor are we a *post facto* rubber stamp. The method of quota calculation must also be disclosed to Parliament in this type of agreement before signature to allow for Parliament's opinion to be heard.

This Convention, as I said before, will be most useful to us from the point of view of experience. We shall learn a great deal from it on quota system management, on licensing, on statistical reporting, and so forth. However, the reporting system incorporated in the Convention is highly sophisticated and extensive. It calls for a skilled radio operator and a powerful transmitter. Only large vessels have this facility. Another point is that the transmitting vessel has to pay for the messages transmitted. We must be sure, when designing our common fisheries policy reporting system, that the information requested is kept to a practical minimum. Fishermen go to sea to fish — not to become bureaucrats. The Community must have the willing and enthusiastic cooperation of our fishermen in operating the future internal policy. Requests for information must be reasonable and logical, and reporting must not interfere with fishing activities.

I should like now to turn to the common fisheries policy. It is now three years since the 200-mile zone was created. For three years the Community has been endeavouring to formulate an internal common fisheries policy in its western and northern waters. These waters cover approximately 1.2 million square kilometres. The problem is complex. Six Member States have sovereign rights in these waters. Different Member States have historical rights in the waters of other Member States. But the problem is not insoluble. The Fishing Councils have been close to agreement on

many occasions. Often, a majority has reached a consensus. On the external front we have been successful in eliminating direct Soviet, East German and Polish fishing in our waters. These nations were taking over 1 million tons of fish every year from us. Norwegian, Swedish and Spanish fishing activities are now controlled. In fact, agreement has been reached almost everywhere — except amongst ourselves. A great deal of useful preparatory work has been done by the Commission, but internally we are still in a chaotic situation.

The uncertainty created by the lack of agreement between the Member States is unsettling for our fishermen, for the processing industry, for communities whose livelihood — and even existence — depends on fishing, for shipyards, and many other sectors of the economy. Future investment decisions have to be postponed, overall policy decisions become impossible, and running costs of old existing vessels increase. We must have a global, comprehensive, internal policy now. Piecemeal settlement of the issues is a timid, palliative approach which could result easily in the final policy being unsatisfactory to all parties. The Council must reach agreement now on a fair and lasting fisheries policy based on practical, scientific foundations, a policy which takes into account the fishermen — who have got one of the toughest and most dangerous jobs in the world; a policy which considers the fishing communities, and which guarantees both the future of the catching and processing industries, and supplies of prime quality fish caught by our own vessels at reasonable prices to the housewife.

For this common fisheries policy to be acceptable and successful, it must incorporate a comprehensive, resource-conservation policy. Fishing effort must be controlled. A licensing system, possibly backed by fishing plans, must be introduced. The destruction of stocks by over-fishing must be halted; otherwise the breathing-space gained by excluding East bloc fleets and controlling other third nation activities will be lost. The rights of individual Member States must be respected by a system of exclusive access and preferential zones, and by a fair and scientifically justified quota system. Historical rights, which have been enjoyed and utilized over long periods, must be taken into consideration.

The Community fishing industry has waited long enough for common policy. It cannot plan, it cannot invest: over-fishing cannot be controlled. Whole communities, including several in the United Kingdom, and including Hull in my own constituency, have suffered grave financial and social loss, and the lack of a fair common fisheries policy, based on practical scientific foundations and legal grounds, is a constant source of friction between Member States and individual fishermen.

Battersby

I submit Sir, that time is not on our side. Our resources are being depleted, and the future of the industry is being endangered by delay after delay in the Council. I urge therefore that in the forthcoming Fisheries Council, the Ministers agree in principle on a comprehensive policy, and that the Commission will then work out with due urgency the legislation required to implement that policy.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — *(DK)* Mr President, I drew up a report on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture which was adopted unanimously at the committee meeting of 11 October. It concerns the entry into force of an agreement between the European Economic Community and the Swedish Government concerning certain measures to increase salmon stocks in the Baltic Sea.

In February 1979 the Community concluded an agreement with Sweden providing for a 325 tonne catch quota for salmon in Swedish waters in the Baltic Sea. This quota was established on the understanding that the Community would enter into an agreement with Sweden with a view to contributing towards the stocking of the Baltic Sea with salmon fry. I drew the conclusion, and the Committee on Agriculture agreed with me on this, that the proposal submitted by the Commission should be adopted, and that the Community should contribute approximately 0.36 million EUA to the financial costs involved.

I should now like to turn to the general debate on fisheries policy. Like Mr Battersby, I must note that three years have now elapsed since the Council of Foreign Ministers decided to extend the Member States' fishing zones to 200 nautical miles. At the same time, the Council, on a proposal from the Commission, decided to formulate a common fisheries policy for the utilization of common resources in the Member States' waters from 1 January 1977.

I must now be evident to the European Parliament that neither the Council nor the Commission has been able to perform this task. The Council has failed to adopt the proposals which have been repeatedly submitted to it by the Commission. As Mr Battersby mentioned, an overwhelming majority of the Member States is in favour of the Commission's proposal. However, Parliament must today recognize the fact that a single Member State has imposed a veto time and again, thereby preventing the Community from reaching a solution on fishing. Unfortunately, Parliament must also recognize the fact that the same Member State has introduced national measures which, in my view conflict with the Treaties and exploit the lengthy procedures of the Court of Justice, thereby causing inestimable economic damage to the fishermen of many other Member States.

For my country Denmark, and for other Member States, this development has brought about a serious economic crisis for the entire fisheries sector, and at

the same time has caused serious unemployment in many towns dependent upon fishing. This critical situation, which has arisen for reasons I have mentioned in Community waters, is currently turning into something akin to a state of war, with Community fishermen being pursued by naval vessels as if they were pirates on the high seas. It must be quite obvious to this Parliament that this situation of legal uncertainty which has arisen with regard to fishing must be brought to an end. The Council must now fulfil the obligations laid down in Article 102 of the Treaty, pursuant to which it is clearly up to the Council to determine conditions for fishing no later than six years after the accession of the United Kingdom, Ireland and Denmark. Those six years expired on 1 January 1979.

I would add that if there may have been some doubt at one stage concerning the right to introduce national measures in common waters, those doubts have subsequently been removed one by one. The rulings of the Court of Justice over the last few months leave no room for doubt, not even for the Council. I would refer the House to the Court's ruling of 25 September concerning trade in sheepmeat. I know that my British friends in this Parliament have been exasperated by the position adopted by France, among others, regarding trade in sheepmeat, and I understand that exasperation. However, I also think that there is a clear parallel between the Court's judgment last September and the present situation in the fisheries sector. It is stated in point 7 of the preamble to the judgment that the expiry of the deadline for transitional arrangements signifies that subjects and fields explicitly included in the Community's sphere of action come under the Community's jurisdiction; consequently, in the event of it still being necessary to maintain special measures, this can no longer be decided unilaterally by the Member States concerned, but must be decided within the framework of the Community to ensure the protection of common interests. I believe that this ruling contains an exact parallel with the current situation in the field of fisheries policy, and I would ask Parliament and the Council to draw the consequences of that judgment. All the Member States represented in the Council must now be able to see that it is the right and duty of the Community to determine the conditions for fishing in common waters, and at the same time it must be made clear that the Member States may not enforce national arrangements.

I am afraid that, in my opinion, if we look back over the last six years, the Commission has not played a very impressive part in formulating the common fisheries policy. Unfortunately, the Commission has not been particularly energetic in trying to end the deadlock currently facing that policy. I would also point out that, although we are moving towards the end of 1979, the Commission has not yet submitted a proposal on the allocation of fishing and quotas for the coming year. I do not think it is reasonable that a

Kirk

whole industry is denied any inkling of what awaits them in the immediate future.

The time has now come to take decisions, so that those who work in fishing and hitherto related industries in all the Member States are able to see on what basis they are to work. The Commission must now put forward proposals which should centre on the maintenance of the fishing industry and move away from the approach favoured by the Commission in its recent proposals.

With regard to the balance between the fishing industry and the biologically necessary protection measures, in my view the Commission has committed an error in allowing the biologists' proposals concerning total quotas for most of the fish stocks concerned to be automatically incorporated into its own proposal. I am quite sure that the Commission had its reasons for doing this. Perhaps it was due to the workload imposed upon the Commission. However, it is not fair that an entire industry should be reduced to a situation in which it is threatened by wide-scale bankruptcy. In my opinion, and in that of many biologists, fish stocks would survive if they were held at a level lower than that of optimum utilization, without endangering the future existence of these stocks. On the other hand, many types of fishing would not survive if they were limited to an unviable catch level, and many undertakings which process fish could not survive if their supplies of raw materials were inordinately limited. It is therefore not satisfactory that, in creating a common fisheries policy fishing should be regulated while the objective of building up large fish stocks is excluded. The Commission should supplement the biological analyses of the consequences of fishing for fish stocks by economic analyses of effects of the regulations on fishing. Such studies would inform us of the effects on both fish stocks and the fishing industry, industry, and that is what we need to know. Finally, the Commission should make sure that its biological advisers take account of the effects of fish species on one another, so that the common fisheries policy may be suitably adapted to the real situation. It must be the Commission's task to prevent any limitation of fishing which is not sufficiently justified in terms of conservation.

I should like to end by saying that it is extremely important that the Council and the Commission should now face up to their responsibilities and bring to an end the serious legal and economic situation which has gradually arisen in the fisheries sector. Similarly, the directly elected Parliament should use all its influence in helping to find solutions which will ensure that the Treaties are upheld, and that the fishermen of the Member States enjoy proper working conditions, so that the many thousands of people employed in the fishery industries of the Member States can again feel that they have a *raison d'être* and have confidence in the Community organs.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice President of the Commission — (DK) Mr President, I wish to thank the two rapporteurs for their reports on two specific areas of fishing. However, I should like to start with a few remarks on the common fisheries policy as a whole, in other words, as part of the debate on the motion for a resolution on the common fisheries policy.

In 1976, when it became known that the Community, following the extension of fishing zones by other countries, particularly in the North Sea and the North Atlantic, had to extend its own fishing zones, a serious problem arose — namely, how to bring about a common fisheries policy both internally and externally. These difficulties were increased by the fact that, whatever biological arguments were used, and even if catch volumes were the sole criterion employed, considerable over-fishing had incontestably taken place, thereby seriously reducing fish stocks in the North Sea. Those responsible included certain third countries, but also fishermen from the Community's own fleets. The problem facing us, therefore, was that fishing zones had to be increased to 200 nautical miles in the most important waters, which meant that our access to fishing, in, for example, Icelandic waters, would disappear.

This resulted in serious losses for British fishing and, to some extent, for French and German fishing, and the withdrawal of British fleets to waters closer to the British coast.

We must build up once again those fish stocks which were severely reduced in past years. In order to secure a basis for a common fisheries policy, which was at first largely designed to protect our position *vis-à-vis* third countries, the so-called Hague resolution was successfully adopted in the autumn of 1976 on a proposal from the Commission. This resolution gave the Commission a mandate to conduct external negotiations on behalf of the Community, and in this way — as was mentioned by Mr Battersby — we succeeded in stopping fishing by third countries in whose waters we could not fish and which could not offer us any reciprocity. The problems of all European fishermen were diminished by the disappearance from our waters of fleets from the Soviet Union, East Germany, Poland and Japan. It remained possible for us to maintain the Community, and if we had not acted as a Community, it would have been impossible to conclude, year after year, important reciprocal fishing agreements with countries such as Norway, the Faroe Isles, Sweden and Canada, create new opportunities for fishing in West African waters, or to ensure continued fishing in the Mediterranean.

In any discussion on the common fisheries policy, it must not be forgotten that these measures helped to facilitate the situation of European fishermen, as they would otherwise have suffered considerable damage from being excluded from certain waters which had been of great importance to them in preceding years.

Gundelach

One of the conditions for the launching of this process was the acceptance in the Hague resolution — in any case for a period of no more than six years, as mentioned by Mr Kirk — that, until a common fisheries policy was established, national conservation measures could be taken, but under certain conditions and subject to the prior approval of the Commission. This provision regarding national measures was the price which had to be paid if we were to start working seriously for a common fisheries policy and protect our position with regard to third countries. That should not be forgotten in today's debate. However, it must naturally not be forgotten either that this opportunity to adopt national measures has hampered relations between the Community Member States and made the creation of a common fisheries policy more difficult.

The Commission shares fully the view expressed by the two previous speakers that there is a need for a comprehensive and definitive fisheries policy covering not only external relations, but also all the necessary internal provisions on fishing, such as those governing conservation, quotas and catch programmes. The lack of such a policy to provide security against the prevailing conditions over the coming decades makes it impossible for an industry which is already in difficulty, for the reasons mentioned earlier, to adapt to the new situation and to replace ships by new vessels better equipped for modern conditions, and for other industries to process the types of fish which are now largely replacing those for which catches have in the meantime had to be banned.

Neither that part of the fishing industry which operates on the water nor that part which operates on land can make the necessary investments or the necessary adjustments until the common fisheries policy is adopted. The longer it takes, the greater the difficulties will become, and it is clear that, now that three years have elapsed, we cannot expect or ask the fishing industry as a whole to wait any longer.

This view has been forcefully and repeatedly expressed by both the Commission and the Council in this House and in public. We endorse it today even more strongly than in the past, because, with the passage of time the problems are piling up, the climate is deteriorating, the scope for conflict between the Member States is growing and disagreeable and dangerous situations are emerging. However, I also wish to say that I cannot accept that the Commission should be criticized for making insufficient effort to bring this policy about, even where this last year is concerned. The Commission has submitted to the Council a comprehensive package of proposals for a fisheries policy of this nature and has adopted them to the new circumstances. The Commission has received the European Parliament's full support for this policy, which has been debated in Parliament on various occasions in practical and fully sympathetic terms.

The Commission's proposal was comprehensive. Naturally, it could be improved in various ways — as

could any proposal — but it did represent a sufficiently firm and comprehensive basis upon which the Council could take a political decision on the introduction of a fisheries policy. As Mr Battersby said, we have frequently been quite close to reaching agreement in the Council, and a large measure of agreement still exists today. The points on which there is not agreement, whether they concern conservation or the allocation of quotas, are much fewer in number than the public realizes. Fisheries policy has been an emotionally-charged issue, for reasons which I understand, but that often means that the difficulties are presented as being greater than they really are, and the negotiations in the Council of Ministers thus become more difficult than perhaps they might have been. The last stretch of the journey is not so terribly long. Parliament should support the Commission and the Council in their efforts to get down to sensible negotiations which can produce a result within a relatively short period. This can be achieved only by giving due consideration to other parties' interests, but we must also consider these problems with a certain *sang-froid*. Otherwise, the discussions will continue to consist of a series of repeated accusations creating an emotional atmosphere which precludes the reaching of an agreement.

As I said a moment ago, the price we had to pay in order to get going with the common fisheries policy, and the measures which were necessary month after month to ensure our vital fishing interests in the waters of third countries, was the authorization of national measures under certain conditions and subject to the approval of the Commission.

Many Member States, not just one, have adopted such national measures. The Commission has been able to approve the great majority, but it must be recognized that there were some which the Commission could not approve which raised serious problems of substance and, not least, of principle. Over the last year, Mr Kirk, the Commission has brought to the Court of Justice actions of a kind which it had never brought before, thereby demonstrating its will and its determination to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Treaty. The Court of Justice has its established place in the Community, founded upon a principle of law which must be respected. But people should not go to the other extreme by claiming that the political responsibility for bringing about a common fisheries policy has been transferred to the Court of Justice from Parliament, the Council and the Commission. The Court of Justice must decide on matters of principle pursuant to the Treaties, and wherever these questions of principle have arisen, we have not hesitated to refer them to the Court. In cases where we have perhaps hesitated — as Mr Kirk believes — it has been because there was the chance of a compromise. That was the case last autumn, when the European Council attempted to make a break-

Gundelach

through and to secure a decision. Under such circumstances, the Commission naturally does not wish to take measures which might destroy the existing possibility of a settlement. However, that being said, it must be emphasized that the Commission, in the coming months, as last year, will make use of its powers and competence as custodian of the Treaties to bring such actions before the Court of Justice whenever it proves necessary. Let me repeat, however, that the Court is not a substitute for the political organs. The political organs must assume their responsibilities and seek the implementation of a common fisheries policy over the next few months. The tools for the job are already available.

Mr Kirk said that we have given excessive weight to the advice of biologists. We have not only followed the advice of biologists employed in international organizations or those who, at various stages, have been employed by the Commission; each time we have submitted a proposal on the total volume of quotas, we have based our position on the unanimous view of biologists placed at our disposal by every single Member State. I would admit to Mr Kirk that fishing biology is not an exact science, and I am inclined to agree that the aim of looking after and maintaining fish stocks is not to create a fishing museum — the operation involved is an economic one. We must decide how to protect the future economic resources of the fishing industry. Fish are conserved on economic grounds, not for any other reason. I would agree with those views in principle, but it must be made clear that if a series of measures to protect existing fish stocks had not been taken, future generations of fishermen would have been faced with a North Sea fishing industry which has lost the greater part of its significance. But we cannot dispense with the biological advice; we must accept it as it is and hope that it will be improved with time, and do our best to ensure that this happens. However, the evidence which is now available, and which will be forwarded to Parliament as soon as possible, indicates that in certain areas our conservation measures have helped to improve fish stocks in the North Sea. It also shows that if we had not intervened three years ago, we would today be facing a much more dangerous situation than that described at the beginning of this debate. I want this to be absolutely clear. Our intervention saved European fishing. If we have gone a little bit too far in one direction or another, that is justified if we take an overall perspective. In particular, the report shows that even if there have been improvements, the situation in respect of a number of important fish species is still extremely delicate, and we must thus continue to act with great caution, not for conservation reasons, but on economic grounds.

The Commission will do everything in its power to secure the implementation of a common fisheries policy as soon as possible, for that is what the fisheries sector needs.

Mr President, I am very grateful to have the two specific reports presented by Mr Battersby and Mr Kirk. Mr Battersby made a number of comments which I shall now deal with very briefly. I have noticed that the report emphasizes that Parliament ought to be consulted on the Convention on North-West Atlantic fisheries before the expiry of the 60-day deadline for raising objections. I agree with Mr Battersby on the importance of that Convention, and will not take up Parliament's time by repeating his words, which were very fair. The narrow deadline may give rise to certain practical difficulties, but they should hardly be insurmountable. The Commission will endeavour to speed up the submission of proposals of this nature to Parliament, and will also seek to provide Parliament with better information on the criteria employed in allocating quotas among the Member States.

Finally, Mr Battersby's report raised the question of the coordination of trade policy with resources policy. I can assure Parliament that, in negotiations on access to resources outside the Community's fishing zones, the Commission takes all aspects of fishery policy into account. At the same time, the Commission takes the view that access to fishing should not, as a general rule, be obtained by facilitating access to the Community market. This point, moreover, prompts me to say that, in the proposals on prices which the Commission has to submit, we have found it necessary in the present circumstances to raise prices somewhat. We have also found it necessary to raise the so-called reference prices somewhat, as the situation whereby third countries have been granted increased opportunities for fishing means that they can no longer consume the fish which they catch themselves but sell them on our market. A sector which is already beset by difficulties such as those mentioned by myself and other speakers is also suffering from an increase in imports due to the fact that our boats have had to abandon a number of other fishing zones. We therefore consider — not on protectionist grounds, but in order to strike a balance — that reference prices must be increased.

I have no comment to make on Mr Kirk's report concerning salmon in the Baltic Sea. I am grateful for his report, and believe that it contains the right solution to what is an extremely important problem for certain Member States.

President. — I call Miss Quin to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Miss Quin. — Mr President, I should like to support both of the reports in front of us tonight. Mr Battersby's concerns a necessary aspect of implementation of the multinational agreement referred to, and Mr Kirk's report shows an example of a sensible arrangement between the EEC and a third country. Indeed, it seems to me one of the ironies of the present situation that we are able to conclude agreements with third countries but are unable to come to an agreement amongst ourselves.

Quin

Mr President, I shall be brief on this question, since the hour is so late. I welcome the opportunity for a debate on fisheries, since it is vitally important to many, if not all, our countries and our debate is timely, since the Council of Ministers is going to be discussing this issue on Monday. In fact, given this timing, it might have seemed more sensible if the motion for urgent debate had actually been addressed to the Council rather than to the Commission.

It would be easy for me, as a British Labour representative here, to get bogged down in the various disputes which exist between my country and other countries within the Community on fisheries, and particularly as I have my opinion on these. Mr Kirk has already mentioned them. However, I would prefer to stress the importance of getting an overall and satisfactory solution to all aspects of fishery policy within a single package. I do not feel, and I was glad to hear Mr Battersby say this, that it is sensible to negotiate on a piecemeal basis. I was pleased that Mr Battersby said this, I was also rather surprised, because I had been reading articles in the press over the last week which had suggested that the present British Government is seeking to replace the overall strategy of the previous government and to this very thing — negotiate on a piecemeal basis. I hope that this view is the one that is going to prevail. Certainly a solution is needed to resolve the present totally unsatisfactory situation and to replace what I feel was the disastrous policy negotiated at the time of the Treaty of Accession, when Britain, Ireland and Denmark joined the Community.

The previous Socialist Group in this Parliament produced many useful documents on the question of fisheries and stressed certain basic principles which I feel ought to be adhered to. Firstly, there is the primary importance of ensuring and improving the social economic well-being of communities and regions heavily dependent on fishing. The needs of these areas are vital, and many of them are amongst the poorest and most outlying areas in the EEC. These areas have been severely affected both by the exclusion from traditional fishing-grounds when limits were increased to 200 miles and also because of the uncertainty created by the lack of a Community policy. In my own constituency, I know that the development of the Port of North Shields has been hampered by the absence of any common and firm guidelines which would enable fishermen and those in jobs related to fishing to plan for the future in an area where male unemployment is twice the Common Market average. This uncertainty makes fishermen throughout the EEC, in all our countries, very suspicious of Community intentions and very hostile to some of the things that have happened so far.

Other aspects on which there needs to be firm agreement include the question of access, which obviously is a difficult one but needs to be resolved, and the

question of fishing quotas. Both these things need to take into account traditional fishing-rights, historic rights to fish in those areas. We also need an agreement to limit fishing effort by licensing, and I hope this is something that the Parliament will consider in the next few weeks. We also need conservation measures which are properly enforceable and which will therefore be respected. Here I feel that the coastal State has to have a very important role: it must have the right to take measures which are speedily needed. I feel that entrusting these decisions to some kind of international body or organization representing various countries may mean that decisions are often taken too late when conservation is vitally necessary.

I was interested in what Mr Kirk had to say in his remarks on conservation, but I was not convinced. I feel that there is a large body of scientific opinion which would not agree with the kind of level of stocks which he is envisaging.

Finally, Mr President, may I say that I do not want to see a fisheries policy becoming a pawn in negotiations over Community policies in other areas. The issue ought to be decided on its own merits, and concessions by any country on fish must not be exacted in order to make progress elsewhere. We need to take measures which will be acceptable to fishermen throughout the Community, measures which will be acceptable to consumers, and above all measures which will safeguard the future of this vital industry, on which our countries and regions within our countries heavily depend.

(Applause)

President. — In relation to the reports we have had, Mr Gundelach's statement and what you have said, Miss Quin, may I say that it is a pleasure to chair such a good debate. I think the standard is very high.

I call Mr Provan to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Provan. — Mr President, you have in fact given me the pleasant task of thanking you also for the way you have conducted proceedings this evening, tonight and this morning so far. You have given us a certain amount of humour and a certain amount of lightness, and I think you ought to be congratulated in the way you have conducted the Chair.

I would like to thank the rapporteurs for what they have said this evening: we, as a group totally agree with their reports.

I was interested to hear what Mr Gundelach said in reply, and also to hear what he said to the motion that is before us in Mr Kirk's and various other people's names. Mr Gundelach said in his remarks that we do not have very far to go. What he meant by that — whether he meant that we did not have very far to go to reach agreement or we did not have very far to go before we lost all our fish — I am not very sure; but

Provan

let me assure him that we are quite ready to sit down and have constructive talks on a future common fisheries policy; let there be no doubt about it, because we consider it to be urgent just as much as everybody else does. I believe that we have a large measure of agreement already. I think most parties are convinced that conservation is vitally necessary.

Mr Gundelach has reminded us of the overfishing in the North Sea. Mr Kirk has said that he believes that some nations are not, in fact, playing the game; but I would point out to him that we have practically already lost the herring fishery in the North Sea. What measures have been taken by my country have been scientifically based: let there be no doubt in anybody's mind that they have not been taken for national interests, that they have been taken on scientific evidence. History shows that when certain nations have been fishing, by-catches have been excessive. Now, by-catches, ladies and gentlemen, can amount to 5% or 10%. When they reach 300% I say we are going far too far, and that has been the case on certain occasions. That is not good enough, and that is why certain measures have had to be taken.

But let us agree that conservation measures can be agreed amongst nations. Let us accept that inspection and policing can be agreed amongst nations. Let us accept that structural measures to improve the fishing fleet can be agreed amongst nations. What we need to negotiate is zones for exclusive access, zones for preferential access too. It is on those measures that we have got to sit down and negotiate. We must also negotiate on total allowable catches, and on this I think there can be a large measure of agreement between nations, because I believe that nations that have traditionally pursued industrial fishing to produce fishmeal have a different problem from that in the United Kingdom, where we require fish for human consumption. I honestly believe that if we sit down and talk about it rationally, we shall reach agreement.

What worries me about the fishing situation at the moment is the part that Iceland is playing in marketing of fish. They are ruining our market. Fish is coming into the British fishmarkets at prices that are totally unacceptable, that are having to pay a levy of a meagre 3%. They have already ruined the fishing in the north-west waters, because they have put pressure on our North Sea; now they are coming into our markets and ruining them for our own fishermen. I say that this is unacceptable and something must be done about the levy of 3%. Canada sends fish into our country: they pay a levy of 16%, and I would put it to this Parliament that something must be done about this too at this level. They are causing tremendous problems for our fishermen.

The other aspect that I think needs to be looked at concerns the producer's organizations. They have been set up by the Commission in the Community,

and I am glad to say that they are developing nicely, but they have not got a role to play. There are many producers' organizations who have staff, who have secretaries sitting in offices, and yet they have no power to do anything. This must be changed. They must be given the right to look after their own economic areas, and I hope the Commission will come forward with a vital role for these to play in the future, because we believe that it is at that level that the policing should take place, that the fishermen should be allowed to look after their own economic areas. They will do the job properly, because it is in their own interest to do so.

I am glad to see that the producer organizations have developed to such an extent that I believe we are getting a European federation of producer's organizations. This, I think, will prove to people that they are developing on a line that they want to take responsibility, that they want to take the powers that it is necessary they should have.

To sum up, Mr President: we must have a proper floor-price for fish; the withdrawal-price level must be raised, and this must be done by taking account of the Icelandic dumping of fish in our market in the United Kingdom.

President. — I call Mrs Le Roux to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Le Roux — (F) This debate on European fisheries touches on a matter of particular importance in our eyes.

In fact, the crisis in our country's fishing industry and in related industries has reached a point where now it is their very existence that hangs in the balance.

Year by year, ships are laid up, shipyards close and canneries cease trading. In our country alone, 900 000 workers earn their livelihood in these industries.

Year by year, decisions about fishing, quotas, prices, markets, zones — in fact all decisions — are taken in Brussels on the basis of agreements and temporary regulations extended on who knows what grounds, taken without considering the claims of the workers or of the fishermen concerned.

The GATT agreements, by lowering the customs barriers, have opened the floodgates to massive imports into the Common Market. Even inside the Common Market, our country is being invaded by imports from Germany and Britain to the tune of 60% of the value of our national output in recent years, when the national consumption has risen by only 2 to 3%.

All this leads to incredible waste, in fact a waste on two counts.

On the one hand, stocks are being exhausted through indiscriminate looting of our underwater resources (to give just one example: the catching of immature fish

Le Roux

to produce fishmeat by Danish or Dutch industrial fleets for the greater benefit of Nestlé Unilever). On the other hand, tonnes of unsold fish are thrown back into the sea. Is this the harmonious development they have been promising us for years?

After the heart-rending images evoked by the debate we have just had on world hunger, we realize all the more clearly just how fundamentally immoral this waste is.

The decisions taken in Brussels with the agreement of the French Government are largely responsible for the continually falling output over the last ten years and the consequent reduction in the spending power of our fishermen and worsening of their working conditions. While others are talking of a 35-hour week and while the extraordinary scientific and technological advances should be making their work easier, fishermen today are having to work harder and for longer hours and on ageing boats.

Spain's entry into the Common Market, on the admission of the Community institutions themselves, can only make matters worse.

This structural crisis cannot be allowed to continue. Fishermen, canning-factory workers and shipyard workers are fed up with footing the bill for a policy that gives priority aid to industry. This is a policy of anarchy and waste.

We, elected Communists, support them in insisting that our resources must be conserved through rational measures that take into consideration the recommendations of scientists and the experience of the fishermen, and not through authoritarian retaliatory measures founded on suspicion.

Zones and quotas must be introduced in the mutual interest of nations, not for the benefit of the few.

We wish to draw Parliament's attention to the unfairness of the quota allocations which injure France, a traditionally sea-faring nation. Mesh sizes, too, should be subject to regulations based on the recommendations of scientific and economic experts, recently approved by the International Council for the Exploitation of the Seas.

In this area the British Government cannot continue unilaterally to impose its will on fisheries policy.

The French Government, for its part, must make sure that the historical rights of our country's fishermen are respected.

Finally, Community aid must go first and foremost to giving the smaller fishermen a guaranteed standard of living, to enabling them to develop their trade and renew their gear. Fishing — and especially high-sea fishing, on which thousands of fishermen depend for their livelihood and which, as the FAO put it, 'is an activity of prime importance as a source of foodstuffs' — must be recognized as an economic activity essential to our nations and be sustained accordingly.

President. — I call Mr B. Nielsen to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Brøndlund Nielsen. — (DK) Mr President, our Group lent its support to the two reports by Mr Battersby and Mr Kirk, and I shall not comment on them now. However, I would like to say a few words about general fisheries policy in connection with the motion for a resolution tabled by a number of Members on whose behalf Mr Kirk spoke earlier. This initiative has been seized very quickly and, given the seriousness of the subject, that can only give us cause for satisfaction. There are also several members of the Liberal Group among the authors of this motion for a resolution. However, some people may have the feeling that, if there had been a little more time to prepare this motion for a resolution and if a little more thought had gone into it, it probably would have been worded in less general terms. It is my view that the time has come to speak more specifically about fisheries policy. We are all aware of the particular question which has for some time given rise to complications. We also heard the rapporteur refer in the third person to a single Member State which had created difficulties in the Council.

We realize that this was not only a clear reference to one particular Member State and that several practical issues are involved here. I could list questions previously debated here concerning the fishing of Norway lobsters, the problems of the so-called Sperling Fund — these are specific questions which are urgent and create extremely serious problems in some Member States. The fact that so many members of the Government party in the United Kingdom have put their names to this motion for a resolution prompts various reactions. We might welcome this situation, in the belief that it provides evidence that the new British Government genuinely intends to pursue a different policy from that previously spoken of, and that the blockade in the Council on a common fisheries policy will be lifted. However, one might also feel that, as I mentioned just now, the matter has been expressed in such general terms that even members of the British Conservative Party who have hitherto opposed a common fisheries policy can subscribe to the motion now under consideration.

Mr President, I have spoken very specifically because I believe that the time has come to express ourselves clearly about these matters. We have been missing opportunities for too long, and the speeches by Mr Kirk and Mr Gundelach are clear confirmation of this fact.

In my view, fisheries policy is an eminently suitable subject to be dealt with by the Communities. By this I mean that the real, objective reason for EEC cooperation is that, in a number of fields, problems have deve-

B. Nielsen

loped in such a way that they can no longer be solved by individual countries. This is due to developments concerning technology and production, and such is the case in the fisheries sector. We have acquired technological assistance and equipment which are so effective that we could even destroy our natural resources. It is therefore necessary that we in the Communities should attempt to solve these problems. This cannot be done by an individual country, as countries' waters flow into each other. I believe that, particularly in a field such as this, it is essential to secure proof that the Community can work. In certain areas, we have already seen how disastrous overfishing has taken place — I would refer particularly to Icelandic herring, a special type of herring; there have also been problems with other types of fish. It is therefore necessary to intervene, and this Parliament has on various occasions over many years worked for a common fisheries policy. But the fact is, and this too has been said many times, that the Council — or one particular country in the Council has not wanted to listen.

I also felt that the Commission could have pursued the matter more than it has done recently. I feel that there must be an overall approach based on biological data. We must support such an approach and, in my view, recognize that fishing in certain Member States, and in certain places, should not be maintained at the same level as in the past. I am not saying that research will not succeed in establishing that a balance can be struck between types of fish, as a basis for the fishing industry. However, I believe that we must particularly concentrate on consumer fishing. We must call for special efforts in this area, as fish is an excellent type of food, and it is not particularly easy to buy fish in all the various regions of the Community. We must grant aid for consumer fishing, sorting and marketing, and the other requirements which have already been mentioned, including the establishment of organizations. We must go further in this direction.

Another point be raised in connection with fisheries policy: aid should be granted to the many traditional inshore fishermen throughout the Community. It is quite unfair that these people should be placed in difficulties owing to heavy industrialization. They have been put in a difficult situation, through no fault of their own, and the sea's resources are running low. We should therefore pay greater attention to the needs of these inshore fishermen.

I have given the House a fairly clear expression of my views, and I call on the Commission to work effectively to push things through and to use the means available to it. I would also ask the many authors of the motion from the British Government party to have a hard think about what is proposed here and

what will undoubtedly be voted by Parliament tomorrow. I appeal to their Government to endorse and implement a positive policy such as that indicated in the speeches by Mr Battersby and Mr Provan. I know full well that serious problems exist. Last spring, the former Parliament's Fisheries Committee visited various British fishing ports and gained a clear impression of the difficulties facing them, but it is pointless merely to take up a negative position which, in practice, will lead to the extension of those difficulties to an even wider area of the Community. We have discussed fisheries policy many times, and Parliament has often formulated what I consider to be sensible views. I hope that this policy will now, at long last, be given due consideration by the competent authorities.

President. — I call Mr Josselin.

Mr Josselin. — (*F*) Mr President, given the present situation it is scarcely surprising that certain decisions should have aroused the feelings they did in recent weeks. The urgent need for a debate such as this has been brought on by events and the reactions and strikes that you are all familiar with and also by the fact that the Council, too, will be discussing this question next Monday. Nobody could pretend however to be able tonight, in the space of a few minutes, to dispose of a subject so wide-ranging and in which the interest and the technical problems are so complex. But perhaps I may be allowed, as elected representative for Brittany, which accounts for almost half the total French catch, to express the hope that this debate, which comes at the very beginning of our term, may be the start of a more thorough consideration of the subject, in keeping with its importance.

There are at least four reasons why the House must give special priority to this subject.

In the first place, fishing is one of the ways of fighting world hunger — and I need not elaborate on that. A great many speakers dealt with the subject this afternoon. But perhaps I may be allowed to remind you that the oceans are mortal, or at any rate certain species in them are — overfished species that is — and it would undoubtedly be interesting to discover where the responsibility for this overfishing lies. It would certainly not do, as too often happens in agriculture, where the blame is laid on dairy surpluses, to blame overfishing on the fishermen who are often driven to fish further and deeper simply to keep their families alive. We know, too, that the oceans are under the constant threat of pollution. As Member for the region that suffered the Amoco Cadiz disaster I claim the right to speak on a subject I know well. If the disaster did anything, it showed the absolute necessity of coordinating our actions and our coastal protection and surveillance measures.

Josselin

The second reason, which to me is of at least equal importance, as others before me have emphasized, is that the less-favoured areas are frequently coastal areas, because they are outlying. Now Europe professes to be the battleground for the fight against regional inequalities, in which case we should give even greater consideration to the problem of life and survival in coastal areas.

The third reason is that, of all workers, it is surely the fishermen who have the toughest living conditions, the most hazardous working conditions and a particularly low level of job and social security.

Finally, waves, like fish, are no respecters of national frontiers; they mean nothing to them. For this very good reason fisheries should be a preferential area of cooperation at international level, certainly, but above all at Community level. But what do we find? Faced with a fisheries crisis, we see not so much a spirit of cooperation, but an upsurge of national self-interest. And I believe we are now faced with a paradox, an extraordinary inconsistency between the professed universality of the oceans and the arrest of fishing-boats, which makes one think that one is going back in time a century or more.

How are we to explain the European ideal to a fisherman who sees his fishing gear confiscated when he has neither broken nor infringed any European law? You have to admit it is difficult. Well, I believe — without again going over the ins and outs of the crawfish problem, which, as you know, created quite a stir in Brittany and which will in any case be discussed in greater detail when the House considers a report by the Committee on Agriculture — I simply wish to impress upon you the urgent need for some clarification, I was going to say pacification, in this sector. I can quite understand the difficulties that, for example, our British colleagues will be faced with when they are forced to abandon their traditional fishing grounds. I would also say to them that I quite understand this desire of a State or a region to have greater control over its coastline. The people of Brittany know something of this since the Amoco Cadiz disaster. It is certainly a great problem. However, it is worth my while reminding you, as others have done before me, of a few principles. The first is the principle of equal access to all common fish stocks. The fact that the biological cycle of a particular species results in that species being concentrated at a given time along a given coastline should not automatically confer a kind of absolute proprietary right to that species. After all, the fish of that species might have hatched elsewhere. I think it is important to remember that. I must say that I wholeheartedly endorse the call for the introduction of a common resources-conservation policy. Let me say also that if we can accept that preferential zones may be neces-

sary for the protection of certain coastal areas, we should not forget either the historical rights that some fishermen have acquired — those from my region, for instance — in waters that were once international.

Finally, I come to quotas. While fully accepting that a quota system is essential, I hope that quotas will not be used as an excuse to exclude specific fishing boats or specific nationalities, and that serious consideration will be given to scientific data on fish stocks. The same goes for controls on fishing gear, where again I hope that selection will be on a scientific basis.

And, in conclusion, let us not forget the fishermen and the problems of harmonizing wages upwards, of social welfare and of training. As for prices, let me say to Mr Provan that the same goes for fisheries as for anything else; that very often the responsibility lies with the multinationals who indulge in the unfair competition that you spoke out against a moment ago.

Ladies and gentlemen, the text of the resolution does not seem entirely to square with reality. It seems to be appealing to the Commission when in fact it is the Council and indeed ourselves it should be addressing. We have to fulfil our responsibilities towards our electorate. I am ready to fulfil mine, and I hope the same goes for everyone else.

President. — I call Mr Newton Dunn.

Mr Newton Dunn. — Mr President, I think this debate is of such high quality and of such immediate importance that it is a great shame that it is taking place at 3.30 in the morning.

Commissioner Gundelach has spoken about the worsening atmosphere and the increasing difficulty of getting a common fisheries policy. Monsieur Josselin just now spoke about the urgency of getting such a policy. I would like to turn the searchlight for the moment onto another aspect — the uncertainty and waste which arise from the absence of a common fisheries policy. I represent, in the United Kingdom, the constituency of Lincolnshire, which contains one of the major fishing ports in the United Kingdom, Grimsby. I would like to give two short examples of the decay and of the shortfalls that have arisen in the last few years due to the difficulties that we are discussing. First of all, the landings of fish at Grimsby by vessels of all flags: in 1974, 2.04 million kits were landed — and for anybody who does not know, a kit is 6½ kilograms of fish. In 1978 it was 1.13 million. In other words, landings of fish are down by nearly one-half in 4 years. There is a similar pattern if you look at jobs on ships based at Grimsby. In January 1974 there were 106 trawlers with 1 800 berths. In July 1979 there are now 33 trawlers operating, with only 501 berths. The position on smaller inshore vessels is a little better; the number of inshore vessels has risen from 592 to 798, but the overall picture is

Dunn

still of a nearly 50 % drop in jobs on ships based at Grimsby. You only have to visit the port — and I hope you will, Sir — to see the extra unemployment that exists there, and the rows of rusting trawlers that lie along the north wall of the port. It is a terrible waste of men and of finance to see that happening; and this is caused by uncertainty and the lack of a common fisheries policy.

I should like to correct Miss Quin, who spoke a little earlier, on two points. First of all, she said that the thought the 1973 Accession Agreement was — and I quote — ‘disastrous’. But could I remind her that conditions then were exceedingly different. The most obvious example is that there was no 200-mile limit, and Iceland had not ousted British trawlers from her waters. The situation is entirely different now.

The second point that she needs correction on is this — and Mr Nielsen of the Liberals, spoke about it already: Miss Quin was worried that the present Conservative British Government would overturn the previous Government’s policy. But the enormous difference is that this Government in Britain is determined to make a settlement, whereas the last Labour Government had no intention of so doing. The Minister in charge of negotiations at that time was Mr Silkin, who is a self-confessed anti-Marketeer. It was not in his own interest to make a settlement. But the British Government’s policy now is very different.

I have said there is a great waste of men and of finance at Grimsby. But Grimsby is ready to accept change. I know that — they are my constituents. But what they will not accept any longer is uncertainty and waste. That is why I am supporting this resolution, and I urge the nine Fisheries Ministers to reach an agreement when they meet next week.

President. — Before we continue, I should like at this stage to thank, on behalf of the Assembly, the interpreters and other staff who have kept our proceedings going.

(Applause)

The staff have had a very hard and demanding day, and I would ask those Members who are present now to remind those who have gone of the pressure of work the staff have been under, and to bear this in mind in connection with the debate on the staff of the institutions that may well be coming up in the near future.

I call Mr Deleau.

Mr Deleau. — *(F)* Mr President, I have the impression that Parliament has realized the magnitude of the fisheries problem and the dangers of leaving Europe in this kind of maritime limbo for some time.

We therefore welcomed the decision by the Member States of the European Community to act in concert in extending the economic zone to 200 miles.

But we should at the same time have defined the rules for the exploitation of resources within this zone.

Unfortunately — to put it mildly — the Council was unable to come to a decision on this.

It now transpires that agreement could have been reached on a form of compromise to which the Commission would have lent its support.

But — and I regret to have to say this — the United Kingdom delegation, instead of helping to work out this compromise, chose to stick to positions of principle and constantly asked for negotiations to be adjourned.

Such a setback is obviously serious because it seems to us that the national protective measures were completely unjustifiable. They were liable to give rise — in fact have given rise — to incidents between British coastguard vessels and fishermen from the eight other countries of the Common Market, not least the 30 000 French fishermen who take 60 % of their catch in British coastal waters.

Let me say quite openly and quite clearly that we never again want to see the British authorities arrest a French boat in these circumstances. We demand that the United Kingdom immediately put an end to the unilateral measures she has adopted and which were condemned in a judgment by the Court of Justice at the beginning of the month. Her actions show a clear absence of Community spirit. We can no longer tolerate this situation, which is not only inconsistent with Britain’s international commitments, but stands in the way of the Community’s management of fish stocks and seriously damages Community interests in its relations with third countries by reducing its credibility.

We are therefore asking the Community to take the necessary steps as quickly as possible to lay down a European fisheries policy and to ensure observance of Community regulations.

We believe that a system of quotas must be introduced that takes into account the state of fish stocks and that allows all fishermen to play an equal part in building them up again.

And, of course, fishing plans must be worked out that are not in fact a way of placing geographical restrictions on access to certain Community waters, which would be contrary to the principles underlying the common fisheries policy.

Mr President, there very briefly you have the proposals that we are formulating and that we hope will help to resolve the serious problems that result from the lack of a common European fisheries policy.

President. — I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, first of all I would like to endorse most warmly the spirit and the words used by Commissioner Gundelach in his speech at the beginning of this debate. I should also like to congratulate my colleague, Mr Kirk, for initiating this debate on such an important subject.

Harris

Could I also offer, in a spirit of great friendship, a small correction to Miss Quin also. She did use the phrase, 'disastrous arrangements' negotiated by the previous Conservative Government on Britain's accession to the Community. She knows, I am sure, that Geoffrey Rippon specifically reserved our position on fishing and the whole issue was put on one side. In fact, we have not had a common fisheries policy since we have been in the Community. I hope she will accept that correction in the spirit in which it is given.

Could I also say to Mr Nielsen and to others that I hope they recognize — and I believe they do — that Britain does provide 50 to 60 % of the Community pond in fishing in the North and the West.

But the reason I want to speak tonight Mr President is because I too believe in the urgent need for a sensible and fair common fisheries policy. The need for that is underlined, in my particular case, by events that are about to happen off the coast of the West Country. Even now the factory ships from the Eastern bloc countries are beginning to gather off the coast of Devon and Cornwall in preparation to make a commercial killing out of the mackerel fishing, when restrictions are lifted next week, on 4 November. To show that I am not speaking in this debate in a nationalist spirit, could I say that the danger of over fishing, as far as the mackerel is concerned in the south-west, indeed comes from Scotland and from the East Coast of England.

I appreciate very much the difficulties which my colleague Mr Newton Dunn has spoken about as far as Grimsby and other ports are concerned. No doubt Mr Provan would say exactly the same about the difficulties which the Scottish fleets find themselves in. But this does underline the basic need for a policy — and a policy which is based primarily on conservation.

Of course the fishing boats from Scotland and the east coast, which supply the factory ships, are turning up; because the herring has disappeared in commercial quantities in the North Sea, and has been reduced almost to commercial extinction. That is why these very large purse seiners are now turning their attention to the mackerel in the Western Approaches; that is why we have the Eastern bloc factory ships now coming to the West Country. I wonder why we cannot have some trade-off with the Communist countries on the access given to the factory ships; why can't we have increased fishing in Communist bloc countries?

Over-fishing, Mr President, is wrong whoever does it. That should be the starting-point for a new determination on all our parts to get the agreement which we all want in this House.

I would ask Members from Brittany in particular to remember that we we all have a common interest in

this. I appreciate the spirit in which speeches have been made here tonight, and I realize that they appreciate we do have a common interest. Feelings are running high, as has already been said by Mr Josselin and others, on both sides of the Channel among our fishermen. I want to see a much better spirit — a return to the traditional spirit of friendship between our fishermen.

The French, I know, are angry over the arrest of the two trawlers. I have spoken up in this House on the use of under-sized mesh nets, and we will not go into that subject tonight. But relations, I must say, are not helped by acts of lawlessness, as happened just a few hours after this issue was raised in the plenary session in this Chamber last month — an act of lawlessness when fishermen boarded the Roscoff to Plymouth ferry' prevented it from sailing and tipped British fish into the harbour. That does not help the situation.

But never mind! Let us put these unfortunate incidents behind us. I am glad that the French Government is now willing to have bilateral talks on Monday morning first thing with Peter Walker, our Minister, as a prelude to the meeting later in the day. Let us hope that we do get somewhere now on this subject.

No one, Mr President, underestimates the difficulty of getting a common fisheries policy. A crucial element in such a policy must be proper safeguards for the traditional inshore and middlewater fisherman; and tribute has been paid to them here tonight. These fishermen are the very essence of our heritage. I hope we can get a policy, but I must say that, if we can't, I am afraid we, for our part, will have to stick to unilateral action. Otherwise we shall be arguing over stocks which have completely disappeared.

President. — I call Mr Turner.

Mr Turner. — Mr President, I am glad everybody agrees that something must at last be done, and, as Miss Quin says, it must not be piecemeal, but must be an overall agreement. I am glad that the Commissioner said the same. We cannot botch up this fishing problem by trying to solve it bit by bit, there must be a complete solution. I think we must be very clear in our minds that we are not going to allow it to be the unsolved problem of the common market, sacrificed to farming interest, or budgets, or other political matters.

I would like to mention for a moment the question of conservation, and simply ask this: Is 70 mm the right size for minimum net, or is it not? Mr Kirk referred to the recent judgment in the European Court. That judgment had nothing to do with the practicalities of fish conservation at all. It was a procedural judgment, and I think it is quite wrong for fishermen to talk about legal procedure: they should talk about reality, and the vital, need for conservation. You cannot

Tuner

reduce this case to one of procedural points. And so, I simply say this: is the British minimum size for nets the right minimum size for conservation? We should not get lost in the intricacies of the procedural matters that have been raised in the Court.

I would also like to say that I think it is quite ridiculous even to suggest throwing over reasonable conservation. But that is not in the motion before us. There was no suggestion of that. I am reminded of King Canute, who, of course, was a very old Danish export to Great Britain who tried to ignore the forces of nature: the North Sea taught him a lesson. I think we must remember that we are dealing here with a very serious question of natural forces which we have got to come to terms with.

The ridiculous confusion which exists at the moment in fishing in the North Sea is very well exemplified in Lowestoft in Suffolk, which I represent. There they catch plaice more than anything else; the British like plaice; the continental eaters of fish do not like plaice: we go on long voyages to Norway to get the plaice, we use powerful ships which pull trawls which require very high power; the fuel costs are therefore very high, and the minimum price at the moment of £ 30 is just about on the extreme margin of operability. You must compare that with certain continental beam trawls who disturb the bottom of the sea in a way that we do not think is a very good thing, who go primarily for sole and turbot, but who catch a lot of plaice and can offload it at a very low price in Lowestoft, because on the Continent the withdrawal price is £ 16. That sort of disorder in the market for fish is of course, caused solely by the fact that there is no régime for fish in the North Sea — and there should be one.

Mr President, may I end by saying that we must bring order to the North Sea — and quickly. We must bring order and conservation. They must both be done together: you cannot trade off conservation in order to get quota advantages of one sort or another. Both matters must be dealt with at once, and I say it is time to knock the heads of the Councils of Ministers together to make sure that they get an agreement, and that they consider both aspects — conservation and order in the market — at the same time.

President. — I call Mr Purvis.

Mr Purvis. — Mr President, Mr Nielsen earlier on seemed surprised to find the names of several of Mr Kirk's British colleagues on his motion for a resolution. I find myself well able to put my name to that motion because of its conciliatory and positive tone. I think the tone of this whole debate has been in that direction, and I for one am very encouraged by it. I hope it will spill over into next week at the Council meeting as well. For anarchy and uncertainty at sea are friends only to the pirate; armed confrontations cannot provide any long-term solution.

In my constituency of Mid-Scotland and Fife, a number of hard-working and highly productive families — for it is a family business — invest their resources and risk their lives to provide us with prime sea foods. Many small communities depend on earnings from fishing for their livelihood, and if the European Community is to mean anything but oaths to these people and if the European Community is to assure our tables of fresh fish supplies at reasonable prices in the future, then some rationality must be brought into Community fishing.

First and foremost must come conservation, for without controls on the levels of exploitation and on the means of fishing, and without protection of the spawning ground, there will soon be no fish worth discussing. Many communities along the coasts of Europe — not only in Britain — will die in a socio-economic disaster.

Second, there must be a fair and reasonable share-out of the available resources; this must in particular take account of the special needs and rights of coastal communities which are dependent on the marine resources in their immediately contiguous offshore areas.

Third must come effective and even-handed policing of conservation measures and of this share-out of the resources.

Fourthly — and this has been alluded to as perhaps a new element that the common fisheries policy will perhaps help — there will inevitably follow from a Community fisheries policy the need for some form of marketing apparatus. I hope this can be kept to a minimum, but volatile price movements in imports must be monitored and counteracted where necessary in order to maintain an orderly market. Even now the Scottish crab industry, for example, is severely threatened by unrestricted imports of crabmeat from Norway and Alaska. Boxes of crab bodies are being thrown into the sea off eastern Scotland because the market has collapsed, and will only accept the claws.

I can assure the Commission and Council that the fishermen of Fife want an end to anarchy at sea. They want an assured future; they want to know where they stand; they want to get on with their job; and they are prepared to be reasonable if they can look forward to fair and reasonable treatment from the Community.

Can I ask that all organs of the Community and the Member States concerned will now confront this problem tenaciously, and come up quickly with an acceptable solution which will do more than anything the Regional Fund or the Social Fund can do to ensure a secure livelihood for a proud, independent, productive and valuable section of our population — a solution which will remove one more cause of friction between the people of Europe.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Giummarra.

Mr Giummarra. — (1) Mr President, the motion for a resolution on fisheries policy, down as item No 74 in the agenda, arises from the realization that fishing and its ancillary industries are in serious trouble and that there is state of tension between countries which gives rise to confusion, disorder and general chaos and results in the imposition of heavy penalties on fishermen, who are the victims of the insecurity, discomfort and hazards of their life and work in treacherous and unpredictable seas.

The motion covers the whole spectrum of fisheries policy, which affects the future and prosperity of not a few countries of the Community, especially as regards the livelihood of their fishermen and also, of course, of those engaged in preparing, marketing, processing and retail sale. It also deals with the development of harmonious relations with countries outside the Community. We must hammer out a fisheries policy with them as part of a much wider relationship of collaboration, cooperation and friendship between the nations.

There has recently been an increase of tension and the dispute has affected not only restricted zones, such as the Mediterranean, but also the high seas. It has involved the subject of traditional fishing rights, conservation of fishery resources, pollution and, at the same time, the assertion of national sovereignty in the territorial waters of individual countries. It has also involved the relations between the Community and non-member States and, an even more serious matter the relations between the Community States themselves.

The problem is no longer confined to one or two countries or the relations between the Member States of the Community and States who are outside it, or between Tunisia and the European Economic Community, but it concerns the Community collectively, the Community as a single unit in its relationship with non-member States.

When this Parliament discussed the bilateral fishing agreement between Italy and Tunisia, some political groups were critical of the fact that the state of tension between the Mediterranean countries with fishery interests had been allowed to go on for so long and also of the fact that nothing had been done to prevent the rise in tension created by alleged violation of territorial waters by certain countries, very much at the expense of the fishermen concerned.

Against this general background of conflict in the various zones of the northern hemisphere, the Commission has, in my view, so far failed to use the right methods or to make a genuine attempt to alleviate the discomfort, danger and insecurity which is the lot, not only of fishermen working at sea, but also of those who work in conjunction with them in the ancil-

lary industries, and are a source of great wealth, profit and prosperity. The sacrifices and suffering of these workers argue powerfully for immediate action by the Community to secure a return to normal conditions in an industry which plays an important part in the establishment and maintenance of a sound and balanced economy in the various countries of the Community.

The common fisheries policy is a source of strength to the Community. For us in this House it is a source of obligations, decisions, commitment, solidarity and a positive response to the hope and confidence of the peoples who have entrusted the protection of their interests and of their jobs to a sympathetic and well-organized Community.

The prestige which the Community enjoys, the powers it uses and the political and economic influence which it can bring to bear enable it to carry out the pledge given to individual States to foster friendly relations between nations on the basis of a more appropriate working relationship.

The time has come for the Community to take energetic action to clarify relationships within the Community and to remove any possibility of a conflict which would be contrary to the spirit of cooperation which animates it and could not be tolerated for a moment. Because of this, we cannot defer action any longer. We must work out the basis of a general fisheries policy in the short term...

President. — I agree Mr Giummarra. Will you also please act in the short term...!

Mr Giummarra. — Mr President, I am speaking for a political group. I have spoken for precisely three minutes and I am about to sit down.

As I was saying, we cannot any longer defer the task of outlining a general fisheries policy which settles the disputes between the Member States, which safeguards the fishermen's future employment and the security of the ancillary and specialized industries, which coordinates their activities and, on the basis of proper marine research, guarantees the protection and development of fishery resources, which play an essential part in the supply of food to many countries. But this must be treated as an emergency and corresponding action taken to reconcile the claims of the countries concerned, to ensure their cooperation in using fishery resources sensibly and to safeguard the standard of living and status of fishermen and of those who work in the industries dependent on them.

President. — I call Mr Ripa di Meana.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (1) Mr President, Mr Giummarra has managed to bring the Mediterranean issue into a debate which has been largely concerned with the difficulties in northern waters. Together with the few Italian Members who are still in the House, I

Ripa di Meana

must say I am glad that reference has been made to a situation which is as tense and disquieting as that in northern waters, perhaps even more so.

The House has already dealt with the question which worries us most. I refer to fishing in the Sicilian Channel and in zones which Tunisia considers to be territorial waters. Our relations with Yugoslavia are also rather strained from time to time, though at the moment negotiations have succeeded in effecting some improvement. There is also a dispute with the Greek fishing fleets in the Straits of Otranto, that is to say, with a country which is about to join the Community family. So I am very glad that, along with many others, Mr Kirk has tabled the motion for a resolution. In addition to the points covered by implication in the motion, I should like to draw the Commission's attention to the questions of fishery resources, conservation and negotiations with non-member States.

Among the latter, Japan causes Italy much concern. Its ocean-going fishing fleets have seriously affected our traditional tunny-fishing which, thanks to net-fishing in Sicily, Sardinia and Tuscany, has always played an important role in the economy of those regions and of Italy as a whole. Its future has now been gravely jeopardized by the brutal onslaught and new techniques employed by the Japanese fleets in conditions which place the Italians at a complete disadvantage.

I conclude by saying, without any nationalistic bias, that the Tunisian question is far from closed. We realize that we must avoid confusing the issue by bringing in other matters, such as the wine-growing situation or the dispute between Tunisia and Libya, over oil-rigs. In the case of Yugoslavia and Greece, we must initiate talks without delay; as far as Japan is concerned, it is for the Commission to make itself responsible for getting a reasonable and satisfactory settlement for the Italian fishing industry.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken tomorrow morning.

19. Regulations on the seed sector — Regulation on the common organization of the market in rice

President. — The next item is the joint debate on two reports on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture:

— Report (Doc. 1-396/79) by Mr Dalsass on the proposal from the Commission to the Council for

- I. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2358/71, on the common organization of the market in seeds, and Regulation (EEC) No 950/68, on the Common Customs Tariff, and
- II. a regulation (EEC) supplementing Regulations (EEC) Nos 1347/78 and 79 fixing, for the marketing years

1978/79, 1979/80, 1980/81 and 1981/82 respectively, the amounts of aid granted for seeds

(Doc. 1-396/79);

— Report by Mr Colleselli on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation No 1418/76, on the common organization of the market in rice (Doc. 1-397/79).

I call Mr Dalsass.

Mr Dalsass, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, at so late an hour I shall try to be a little more brief than I had intended.

The object of the two proposals of the Commission that we are now considering is to extend the production aids granted under the Regulation on the common organization of the market in seeds to rice seeds (previously excluded), to fix the amount of aid for rice seeds for marketing years 1979/80, 1980/81 and 1981/82, to make some minor amendments to the common organization of the market for seeds and rice and in particular to replace the import levy on rice seeds by an import duty of 12 %, to delete the date of August specified in the basic regulation for any adjustments to aids decided in the previous year for the production of seed — the ruling should require that this adjustment be made before the beginning of the marketing year, without any specific date being given — and to express in ECU the amounts of aid for seeds previously given in u. a.

This aid relates to a quantity of some 17 000 tonnes and totals an annual expenditure of 2.06 m ECU (1.9 m EUA) at a rate of 12.1 ECU per quintal.

Rice production in the Community totalled 880 000 tonnes in 1978, France accounting for only 40 000 tonnes grown on an area of 12 000 ha. All the rest was produced in Italy on an area of about 190 000 ha, most of this being grown in the traditional rice farming provinces of Vercelli, Pavia, Novara and Milan, recently joined by Ferrara.

Total imports into the Community from third countries are running at about 600 000 tonnes, whilst the Community exports totalled 300 000 tonnes in marketing year 1975/76 and 242 000 tonnes in marketing year 1976/77. Community expenditure on rice from the EAGGF is estimated at 41.4 m EUA for 1979. Most of this will be to cover export refunds.

It is obviously an advantage for rice producers in the Community to have high quality certified seed giving higher yields and a better quality product. The Commission's proposal to grant aid of 10 u. a. (12.1 ECU) per quintal was therefore approved by the Committee on Agriculture particularly since there was already a similar form of aid for other types of seed, in particular oilseed plants, forage crops and pulses. Since the aid will be granted only to those rice

Dalsass

growers that have their seed certified by the responsible authorities, substantial efforts will no doubt be made to improve its quality if the production aid for seed is sufficient to cover all the additional expenditure for the improvements in growing methods and selection and processing that are necessary for certification by the responsible authorities. In this connection, you are referred to the list attached to this text which shows the individual components of the selling price of certified rice based on seed producers' costings.

In this light, the EEC Decision to grant aid, which will reduce the price of certified seed, would appear to be a good solution that could bring about a substantial qualitative improvement in Community rice production.

An essential condition for this, however, is that this regulation should lead to a reduction in the price paid by the grower for certified seed fully equivalent to the aid granted by the Community aid was paid direct to the growers using the certified seed.

In the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture, however, there are appreciable doubts about the effectiveness of the measures if — as in the EEC Regulation applying to other crops — the Community aid for rice seed goes to the producers and not to the users of the seed.

Our reasons for these doubts about the full effectiveness of the measures, should the aid be granted to the production firms, include the following.

In the aid is granted to the producer for the whole quantity of officially certified seed then there is no way of telling in advance what quantity of total production qualifies for aid and therefore what the cost will be to the EEC. This proportion could also, very easily, exceed the quantity actually used for seed, with the grave consequence that unjustified costs would have to be met by the Community.

Should it be possible — this obviously could only apply to the future — to have a special Regulation for rice, under the common organization of the market in seeds, laying down that the aid should be granted to the user enterprise, there could be no further doubt about the greater effectiveness of the measure and its straightforward operation. Again, the argument that the number of user enterprises is very high by comparison with the number of producers, and the associated concern that, if the aid were paid to the former, there would be substantial bureaucratic expense, would have no foundation in view of the fact that there already exists in Italy the Ente Nazionale Risi set up specifically for this sector which could be called in to coordinate and implement the necessary procedures.

The Commission should therefore check whether it would not be possible — in the future, as I have said — to grant the aid directly to enterprises using the certificated seed.

Next, if the granting of aid for rice seed is technically justifiable, it is also necessary briefly to review the broader context in which this proposal has been put forward, an important factor being the considerable trade policy effects on long-grain rice exports to the Community.

Briefly, the situation is as follows.

The Community has always followed the policy of keeping the Community price for long-grain rice high, and has set the price differential between the two types at 20 u.a./t, with the threefold purpose of increasing the use of round-grain rice, promote Community production of long-grain rice and at the same time protect Community rice production through the threshold price/levy mechanism.

The US were against this. In their view this was excessive protection for the Community and they protested against it. Finally, in the latest GATT negotiations last April, they succeeded in breaking it down and in having the Community undertake to phase out the 20 u. a. price differential between round-grain and long-grain rice in two stages.

Because this decision put Community production at a disadvantage in relation to production in the United States, the Council of Ministers of the Community decided on 2 and 3 April to increase the intervention and reference price for rice, and the present measure is proposed on that basis.

Two conclusions have to be drawn from this. Firstly it has to be stressed that the European Parliament is once again required to take a stance on a proposal that to some extent formulates a decision already taken by the Council. The vote in this Parliament, therefore, merely serves to dress a decision that has already been taken in legally proper and formally irreproachable clothes. The Committee on Agriculture and the European Parliament in general wish to voice their keen regret at such a procedure and enter a protest on this score with the Council.

That briefly is all I wanted to say. I shall omit further details and can only tell you that the Committee on Agriculture decided unanimously to approve this measure, and we hope that Parliament will also vote in favour of it.

President. — I call Mr Colleselli.

Mr Colleselli, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, I can be very brief because of the time and because the motion for a resolution was unanimously approved by the Committee on Agriculture. A quick summary of its contents is technically necessary because of what was said by Mr Dalsass.

This motion for a resolution provides for the granting of Community aid for sowing. It is, in consequence, necessary to take this product out of Regulation No

Colleselli

1418/76 on the common organization of the market in rice and write it into the regulation on the seed sector promulgated in 1971. The motion is a technical one, for the purpose I have indicated. The amendments to be made to the main regulation do not affect its substance and are also purely technical. They cover three things: the intervention centres for rice, the inward processing system and an adjustment of the Common Customs Tariff.

Under the proposed amendment, the intervention centres for rice would no longer be fixed annually. Experience has shown that the annual review of these centres did not often take place but, if changes become necessary at any time, these can be decided of its own motion by the Management Committee for Cereals. Another amendment gives power to the Council to exclude from the inward processing system some of the products listed in Article 1 (1) (c) of the 1976 regulation, viz. the following rice-derived products: flour, groats and meal, flaked rice, rice pellets and starch. The power will now be extended to cover all the products listed in Article 1, viz. paddy rice, rice and husked rice. This is to prevent disturbances in the market in rice.

The final amendment relates to the Common Customs Tariff for rice. Following the amendment of the Tariff, it is proposed to adjust Article IIa of the main regulation of 1976. Those are the main amendments which would follow the adaption of the motion for a resolution.

In giving these explanations, I was privileged to be speaking at the same time for the Committee on Agriculture, which unanimously approved the motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — I shall be very brief, Mr President. I thank the two rapporteurs for their reports and for the fundamental agreement which they have expressed in regard to these inter-related proposals. On Mr Dalsass's report, since it also affects the other report, there are a few questions. There is doubt as to whether it is best to give support to the producers and not to the consumers. The basic recommendation makes it necessary to give it to the producers. That is what we have done for other seeds since 1972, and it has worked very well. If we were to give it to the consumers, we would have enormous difficulties of an administrative nature which we actually would not be able to control.

There has been question of the introduction of an import levy for rice for seeding purposes over and above the existing tariff of 12 %. There again, in the basic regulation this is not provided for. Furthermore, it is not really necessary, because in order to import paddy rice for seed purposes you need a certificate,

and you then have to have the variety concerned either in the national list or in a catalogue at Community level. At the present time there are no third-country paddy rice varieties on these lists, and they therefore actually cannot be imported for that purpose.

Then there is the question of controls on support payments to producers. Here we do believe that there are no problems, because controls in the seed sector are among the best and most efficient for all agricultural products.

I really do not think there can be any difficulties here at all.

Finally, a question was raised in regard to the agreement in the Council on certain concessions in the context of the multilateral trade negotiations on rice. Here I must first make it clear that what is involved is not a change in fundamental Community policy concerning the relationship between long and short-grained rice; on the contrary it is a matter of concession in the multilateral trade negotiations, for which of course we have got counter concessions. This goes back to the relationship between the two sorts of rice which we used to have until a few years ago. We did introduce special treatment for long-grained rice in order to try and develop its production in Europe. It failed: it has cost an awful lot of money, and therefore this concession was actually in our own interest; for basic economic reasons we should go back to having the previous relationship between the two rices.

The necessary changes were actually introduced in the price-fixing exercise in the spring. Parliament was informed about this exercise in some detail, and a discussion did take place. There may be problems to settle in regard to how one deals in Parliament with GATT agreements in the future — I am certainly not denying that — but this particular matter has been discussed in Parliament previously.

President. — The vote will be taken at tomorrow's sitting.

The debate is closed.

20. *Regulation on certain wines originating in Tunisia*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-420/79) by Mr Filippi, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for certain wines having a registered designation of origin, falling within subheading ex 22.05 C of the Common Customs Tariffs, originating in Tunisia (1979-1980).

I call Mr Giummarra.

Mr Giummarra, deputy rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, I shall be as brief as possible in introducing Mr Filippi's report on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for certain wines having a registered designation of origin, falling within subheading ex 22.05 of the Common Customs Tariff, originating in Tunisia.

Favourable opinions on the proposal have been given by the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Development and Cooperation. This refers to the cooperation agreement between the European Community and Tunisia which was signed on 25 April 1976 and came into force on 1 December 1978. Article 20 (2) of the agreement provides for the opening of a Community tariff quota of 50 000 hectolitres per year in respect of the importation, duty free, into the Community of certain wines having a registered designation of origin under Tunisian law and falling within subheading ex 22.05 of the Common Customs Tariff, originating in Tunisia.

The agreement further provides that, to qualify for exemption from duty, the wine must be presented for clearance in receptacles with a capacity not in excess of two litres. The Community declared its willingness to grant the same exemption to wines presented in bulk, provided that it did not exceed 10 000 hectolitres in volume. The detailed rules applicable to the entry into Community territory of this product accordingly provide that the receptacles in which the wine is carried shall have a maximum capacity of 24 hectolitres. However, because of present transport conditions, Tunisia has been unable to take advantage of the tariff quota granted to it in respect of wine in bulk. Nevertheless, the period the Commission proposes to raise the maximum capacity to 200 hectolitres, the quota continuing to be restricted to the period 1 November 1979 to 31 October 1980 inclusive.

Under the provisions, the volumes prescribed for imported products are divided into two parts: the first, in quotas based on statistical data for the last three years; the second will form a reserve.

The Committee on External Economic Relations took account of the opinions of the other committees relating to the insignificant amount, when even assuming the quota was fully taken up, of the imports when compared with Community output which, of course, has averaged 144 million hectolitres during the past few years, and with the volume of imports from non-member States, which averages a little over 5 million hectolitres per year.

The Committee also noted the Commission's proposal reduces the quota from 20 000 hectolitres last year to 10 000 hectolitres for wine in bulk because of the

marked tendency of Tunisia and of the Community to encourage the process of bottling wine in order to raise its classification and added-value. Finally, the Committee bore in mind that the opening of the quota arises from an agreement which has already been signed and cannot be re-considered since Parliament has approved of it.

For all these reasons and especially because the opening of the quota has been provided for within the framework of the cooperation agreement with Tunisia, which is now in force, I invite the House, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, to approve the Commission's proposal. Furthermore, I hope that the Committee on External Economic Relations will try to ensure that, when the Treaty of Cooperation between the European Economic Community and Tunisia is revised, the regulations governing fishing rights in Tunisian waters will be written in and thus help to reduce the tension between the countries engaged in fishing and its ancillary industries, and to promote cooperation between the countries on the Mediterranean seaboard.

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — (I) Mr President, I am not going to speak about Mr Giummarra's references to the desirability of agreeing to Tunisia's request for tariff exemption, but about the last part of his remarks when he expressed the hope that the Committee on External Economic Relations would try to find a way of resolving the differences which have arisen between Italy and Tunisia over fishing rights in the Sicilian Channel.

I hope Mr Giummarra will not mind my saying so, but I thought he spoke in rather general terms and with less concern about this serious problem than the other committees involved have shown. The Committee on Agriculture, for example, which was asked to deliver an opinion before the Committee on External Economic Relations had reached a decision, stated that the Commission should consider the matter of fishing rights in Tunisian waters in the context of the revision of the Treaty of Cooperation between the EEC and Tunisia, and should regard this matter as essential condition of development and cooperation in the Mediterranean area.

It is important that reference should be made to essential conditions. I say this because we discussed this important matter during the sitting of 27 September — I think Mr Buttafuoco was our spokesman — and every Italian who spoke emphasized the extremely serious state of affairs in the Sicilian Channel. The situation has deteriorated since 27 September; some Italian fishermen have died; some have been imprisoned; and there have been serious disturbances as a consequence at certain points on the Sicilian coast, notably Mazara del Vallo, and these disturbances may lead to even

Almirante

more serious incidents, though God forbid that this should happen.

I am convinced that, on account of all this, a favourable opinion on the tariff exemptions for Tunisia must, as the Committee on Agriculture has officially requested, include a binding requirement that there should be an irrevocable agreement to settle the dispute between Italy and Tunisia as soon as possible. As was said during the sitting on 27 September, Tunisia has rejected previous approaches by the Commission with a view to the successful conclusion of the fishery negotiations with Italy.

I think this calls for the expression of something more than a vague hope. I therefore earnestly beg the Committee to make the Tunisian Government realize that this concession and any other is dependent on the need to regularize the position with Italy on the fisheries question.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, I would only like to repeat what I stated previously on behalf of the Commission, where I have taken personal responsibility in this matter. We are negotiating actively with Tunisia in order to solve this intricate and very important fishing problem. I am sure that we are going about it the right way, and will achieve a result. But I can't accept that we should make the execution of an existing agreement dependent upon obtaining something else. Naturally, a fisheries cooperation agreement is foreseen in the general cooperation agreement with Tunisia. In that context we shall try to resolve matters in a mutually acceptable fashion.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken tomorrow.

21. *Regulation on certain wines originating entirely in Greece*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-399/79) drawn up by Mr Martinet, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposal from the Commission

regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of a Community tariff quota for wines from fresh grapes and grape must with fermentation arrested by the addition of alcohol falling within heading 22.05 of the Common Customs Tariff, originating entirely in Greece (1980)

I call Mr Martinet.

Mr Martinet, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, the Committee on External Economic Relations has been consulted on a proposal concerning imports of Greek wines into the Community. The explanatory statement and the text of the motion for a resolution had already

been drafted when the committee came to appoint a rapporteur. The document now in your possession contains that same explanatory statement. However, the text of the resolution has been amended slightly and, as rapporteur for the Committee on External Economic Relations, I accept responsibility for it.

Now, the aim of this proposal is to allow imports of 430 000 hl of wines into the Community at rates of duty corresponding to 15 % of those specified in the Common Customs Tariff, pursuant to Articles 35 and 36 (1) of the Association Agreement between the Community and Greece. The quota of 430 000 hl allocated for 1980 is exactly the same as for 1978 and 1979. In other words, we are talking of importing 430 000 hl of Greek wine out of Greece's total output of close on 5 million hectolitres. The bulk of these imports is to go to the Benelux (about 63 %) and Germany (about 30 %). The Community's two main wine producers, France and Italy, will therefore import very little Greek wine.

Seen in terms of the Association Agreement and the fact that the volume is the same as in previous years, and in the light of Greece's imminent entry into the Common Market, there is no reason why the motion for a resolution submitted to us should not be adopted, particularly as it would endorse the Commission's favourable attitude to these wine imports.

We felt, however, that this problem could not be looked at purely from a technical or legal angle. As a matter of fact, these imports come in a year when a particularly good harvest is expected. In France, for example, it will probably be in excess of 8 to 10 million hectolitres. So there is a danger, if we import 430 000 hectolitres of Greek wines, that we shall have to distil an equivalent quantity of Community wines. This highlights a problem that is bound to come up in the negotiations to enlarge the Community to include not only Greece but Spain and Portugal as well, which are also wine-producing countries.

In view of this situation we felt that Community arrangements with respect to the organization of the market and control of production, particularly those introduced since 1970, were inadequate. In our view what the industry needs is not merely a system of price guarantees for producers, but also a tighter control of the entire wine market, an improvement in the quality of the product and a drive to encourage sales in countries that consume little wine and where there is a heavy duty on wines. All this requires a policy, and an agency to carry it out. I am not saying that nothing has been done, for that would not be true, but that not enough has been done. We have therefore added a rider to the Commission's text. While approving imports of 430 000 hectolitres of wine, we draw the Commission's attention to the inadequacy of the present arrangements in the wine sector, and request it to consult the relevant trade organizations and to draw

Martinet

up and put forward, as soon as possible, measures to improve the organization of wine production and of the Community wine market, in particular by setting up a specialized European agency.

I realize, of course, that this idea of setting up a European wine agency presents some extremely complex problems, which obviously we could not touch on in the resolution. And I also realize that the main problem lies not in setting up an agency but in laying down a more clearly defined and rigidly enforced policy. Our committee was equally at pains to stress the urgency of working out a resolution to these problems.

That is why we have put forward a resolution in two parts, the first approving imports of 430 000 hectolitres of Greek wines in accordance with existing agreements, and the second drawing the Commission's attention to the inadequacy of the present arrangements in the wine sector and requesting them to submit certain proposals.

President. — I call Mr Martin to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Martin. — (*F*) Mr President, four years ago the French agriculture minister of the time, speaking about the wine-growers in the south of France, said with that fine turn of phrase that was so much a part of his charm: 'If they have to die, let them die!' It did not take long for his wish to be granted. In March 1976, at Montredon-Corbières, some violent incidents took place which left two dead and a hundred or so injured, some of them seriously.

Years of Community wine policy, accepted and implemented by successive French Governments, finally led to this tragedy.

Well, let me tell you quite bluntly: unless we want to see a repeat of these tragic incidents, we must eliminate the causes that could spark them off. Foremost of these are massive and unjustifiable imports. The wine harvest is now completed or drawing to a close. The growers should have every reason to be happy with this year's excellent harvest, which in France should come to about 75 million hectolitres. But they are far from happy. Why? Because of the chaotic state of the wine market, and because of the huge stocks created by unjustifiable imports. As a result, the total available supplies for the 1979-1980 marketing year will come to about 96 million hectolitres.

Under these conditions the French wine-growers could not possibly tolerate the pursuit in their country of this policy of massive imports, which has already ruined thousands of their number and is seriously disturbing the wine market.

With the level of imports suggested by some people, the total available supplies in France are expected to be of the order of 103 million hectolitres for 1979 —

1980, while the total consumption is not likely to exceed 68.5 million. Such a situation would present insurmountable problems for the majority of French wine-growers, especially in the South. This is quite unacceptable; all the more so as an examination of national and Community balance-sheets shows that France is not an overproducer of wine, on the basis of the 1979 harvest, whatever some may say. In point of fact, taken over eight years, France has shown a shortfall of 21 million hectolitres on consumption.

Those who speak of over-production are therefore looking for an excuse to justify plans by the Community and the French Government to dismantle a large part of France's wine-growing capacity, particularly in the South, in order to pave the way for the enlargement of the European Economic Community and to leave the coast clear for the wines from Spain, Portugal and Greece.

Let me repeat once more, before I leave the subject, that the French Communists and their friends will never allow the interests of our country's wine-growers to be sacrificed in this way.

Mr Martinet, rapporteur for the Committee on External Economic Relations, is asking us to approve a proposal from the Commission of the European Communities relating to imports of Greek wines into the EEC.

In other words, what we are actually being asked to do — we, the representatives of a country and of a region that is already suffering serious effects from this disastrous policy — is to pull the noose tighter around the necks of our wine-growers.

Don't count on our support! Even if the French share of the imports of Greek wine, amounting to 23 000 hectolitres, may seem insignificant in relation to the millions of hectolitres imported by our country, in the present situation we cannot possibly give our approval to the proposed decision.

What of the immediate future. In view of the serious difficulties that tens of thousands of our wine-growers are experiencing, all imports of wine, from no matter where, should be suspended forthwith in order to reduce this intolerable pressure on prices and to stabilize the market. This is what the Communist Deputies to the French National Assembly are pressing for once again, at the same time calling for a minimum return to be fixed that is linked to production costs. I would also add that it is high time that we saw an end to this intolerable policy which forces France each year to import considerable quantities of wine that it does not know what to do with, while some countries of the Community, notably the United Kingdom with its excise duties, are forever putting new obstacles in the way of our sales to them.

In conclusion, I will tell you that the pious wish expressed in paragraph 2 of the resolution presented by Mr Martinet, seeking to improve the organization of wine production and of the Community wine market

Martin

will, without the slightest doubt, join all the other hopes of a similar nature expressed since wine-growing entered the Common Market, and be consigned to oblivion.

This may of course be just a devious way of inviting the Commission and the Council, with the blessing of the French Government, to step up their policy of grubbing up and clearing the vineyards in southern France and other regions in preparation for enlargement. For these reasons, among others, we Frenchmen of the Communist and Allies Group, in solidarity with the action undertaken by the French wine-growers, in particular those of Languedoc-Roussillon, will be voting against the resolution submitted by Mr Martinet.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken tomorrow.

22. Regulation on emergency measures to repair the damage caused by hurricanes David and Frederick

President. — The next item is the report by Sir Henry Plumb on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation concerning assistance from the Guidance Section of the EAGGF in respect of emergency measures to reconstitute the agricultural areas of the French overseas departments damaged by hurricanes David and Frederick.

I call Sir Henry Plumb.

Sir Henry Plumb rapporteur — Mr President, I am sure we are all grateful to the Commissioner for his endurance in staying with us for all these reports.

He is aware, of course, that the islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe have suffered considerably as a result of Hurricanes David and Frederick, as have many other neighbouring islands during the period, particularly from 30 August to 3 September. The Committee on Agriculture has given consideration to this particular problem. The agricultural infrastructure has been destroyed throughout these islands, and in particular the banana plantations and the production of fruit and vegetables, sectors which are of great importance to the economy of the islands as a whole. The French Government has requested aid from the Community to repair the damage caused to the agricultural infrastructure. The amount involved is 12 million units of account, based on an estimate by the French Government of the amount of devastation in the agricultural sector.

As both the French Government and the local authorities have already begun work to repair the damage, it seems reasonable to request the Community to provide funds to assist the French Government in its efforts to repair the devastation as quickly as possible. The amount which has been asked for by the French Government represents the equivalent of the amount committed by the French Government itself. It should be noted that the Community will grant a financial contribution only after the French Government has

actually provided funds, so that the real contribution of the Community will depend on the decision of the French Government to make available its own resources for this purpose.

In order to have the funds available, Mr President, it will be necessary to introduce a new budget line in the Guidance Section of the EAGGF. The Committee on Agriculture, stressed that it is very important that the way in which the Community's financial contribution is spent should be controlled and supervised to ensure that the funds actually serve the purpose for which they are intended. The Committee on Agriculture also underlines that the funds should be used as soon as possible and used directly on speeding up the restoration of the damaged agricultural infrastructure.

The Committee on Agriculture unanimously supports the proposal to spend that money on these islands.

President. — I call Mr Vergès to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Vergès. — (*F*) Mr President, it is now 5 o'clock in the morning, and bearing in mind that you have your plane to catch at 6.30 and that the interpreters are tired I shall be as brief as possible. We simply wish to say that all this is the logical result of our unanimous vote of 28 September in favour of emergency aid. At the same time, however, we should like to draw attention to a number of problems.

The first problem is this: The French Government has agreed to contribute 40 % and is asking the Community, through the EAGGF, to contribute another 40 %, making 80 % in all. The French Government remains silent about the missing 20 %, and it appears that this is to be borne either by the local communities or by the stricken planters, about whom we are told that they suffered total destruction. This is something that needs to be cleared up, because in all likelihood the burden would be too great for them to bear.

Second point: It has been stressed that the French Government is only appealing for Community aid to restore the centres of agricultural production; and has not so far sought any contribution from the Regional Fund or the Social Fund. Now, we have been given to understand that thousands of producers have been hit by the disaster and are in urgent need of social aid, so it would perhaps have seemed logical to request a contribution from the European Social Fund as well.

Last, but not least, given the extent of the damage and the size of the funds now available and drawing on the experience gained at the time of the Soufrière eruption, it would seem right — in fact the report of the Committee on Development and Cooperation requested it, reflecting the views of a number of committee members and also of the Committee on Agriculture — that the local communities and professional bodies should be involved from start to finish in the allocation of and control over the use of the funds to prevent any malpractice or mistakes.

President. — I call Mr Sablé.

Mr Sablé. — (*F*) On 28 September Parliament adopted three resolutions relating to emergency aid to the Caribbean islands devastated by hurricanes David and Frederick. Today, the Council is asking Parliament to approve a proposal from the Commission of the European Communities for a regulation concerning assistance from the Guidance Section of the EAGGF to restore the agricultural potential of the outlying and less-favoured areas that are the departments of Martinique and Guadeloupe. The French Government has made known that it is prepared to finance 50 % of the measures needed for this purpose, and the Commission is asking the Community to make a financial contribution of 12 million EUA for the devastated areas.

Following on the emergency aid to alleviate the most acute hardships, granted on the day after the disaster struck, we have now to finance a part of the necessary measures to rebuild the economy of these islands and, more importantly, to ensure the survival of their economy. The amounts involved are 10.5 million EUA to restore the banana plantations, 1.65 million for the restoration of secondary crops (market gardens, orchards, flower gardens) and 600 000 EUA for repairs to waterworks and irrigation systems. For their part, the French Government will undertake repairs to the electricity supply network, public buildings, schools, sports facilities and also to housing.

Tonight's debate is concerned only with the measures to restore centres of agricultural production that were destroyed by the hurricanes in order to minimize the social consequences of the loss of income from exports and prevent any dramatic rise in unemployment. It is proposed, through an amending budget, to use certain appropriations not used in the current financial year and to create a new budget line under Title 8, EAGGF, Guidance Section. It will then be possible to make these 12 million EUA available to the islands, 9.6 million of which are payable before 31 December and 2.4 million in 1980. In this way 40 % of the finance needed to restore our tropical agriculture will be provided through the adoption of the proposed regulation. But I believe that when Sir Henry Plumb and Mr Vergès expressed their disappointment at the fact that this debate is confined to the agricultural problem alone they did so with good reason. The text before us in fact ignores a number of considerations that we put forward in September. We said then that, besides obtaining aid for agriculture through the EAGGF, we should also seek additional finance from the Regional Development Fund and the European Social Fund. And so I regard the text as somewhat incomplete, and think that all the European Funds should have been called upon to contribute to a massive programme designed to renew the entire economy of these two overseas departments.

Finally, and here I go along with what others have said before me, several committee members have asked that the text be amended to involve the professional groups and local communities more directly in the allocation of and control over the use of this aid. I think we should also include the research institutes, which perform such an invaluable service in these far-off countries. That at least is what comes out of the reports by Sir Henry Plumb and Miss Flesch.

Before I finish, let me just say that our committee voted unanimously in favour of this motion. Above all, we have tried to show the importance of trade organizations to the economics of banana plantations, because it is in part they who will be responsible for securing the future of this product on the national market.

With an eye on the clock let me say, finally, that by its assistance to the agriculture of our departments in the Caribbean, which though geographically remote are nevertheless constitutionally covered by the Treaty of Rome, our Parliament will be demonstrating its support for populations hit by misfortune and will be making a great contribution to the spread of Europe's influence in this part of the Third World.

President. — I call Mr Deleau.

Mr Deleau. — (*F*) Mr President, I shall be very brief. The Group of European Progressive Democrats fully supports the Commission's proposal for a regulation to grant a total of 12 million EUA in aid for the reconstitution of the agricultural potential of Martinique and Guadeloupe, which was virtually wiped out by hurricanes. We are delighted with the speed with which the Commission implemented the resolutions of the European Parliament of 28 September. For this we congratulate the Commission.

However, we do not think that these measures are enough, and we are pressing the Commission to see to it that both the Regional Fund and the Social Fund are brought in. We trust that the Commission's decision concerning the EAGGF was not dictated by circumstances, that is to say by the fact that certain appropriations entered in Title 8, Guidance Section, had not been used. Every available Community resource must be put to use to bring relief to these severely damaged regions if we want them to be competitive, or at least self-sufficient, within the next two years.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, *Vice-President of the Commission.* — Mr President, I thank the speakers for the support they have given the Commission proposals to deal with what is obviously an urgent matter of giving assis-

Gundelach

tance to the reconstruction of agriculture in Martinique and Guadeloupe. These proposals have naturally been made without any prejudice to other action to be taken on the Regional Fund and the Social Fund. But, gentlemen, because we were in a hurry, we had to concentrate on what was most important, to get the banana production on its feet again. If we had to wait until we were ready to act in other areas we would have had to wait too long. Speed was of the essence and I am grateful that that has been understood by the House. Naturally it does not prejudice other measures which may have to be taken in the future.

I agree with Sir Henry Plumb that these measures will have to be subjected to proper control, that the money is used as intended and used effectively. We have to collaborate with the various local authorities and associations. In this respect I should like to stress that this is the procedure followed from the beginning. The Commission sent its own experts to Martinique and Guadeloupe to prepare a report before we made these proposals to the Parliament following your debate on 28 September, and we shall continue to proceed in this manner in the future.

President. — I note that no one else wishes to speak. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote as it stands, at the end of tomorrow's sitting.

The debate is closed.

23. Dates and agenda of the next part-session

President. — The enlarged Bureau proposes the following agenda for the sittings from 5 to 7 November 1979:

Monday, 5 November 1979

5 p.m. to 8 p.m. and 9 p.m. to 12 p.m.:

- presentation of the report by Mr Dankert, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the draft general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1980 (Doc. 1-378/79) — Section III
- presentation of the report by Mr R. Jackson, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on Sections I, II, Annex I to Section II, Sections IV and V of the draft general budget for 1980,
- debate on the draft general budget for 1980.

Tuesday, 6 November 1979

9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 2.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m.:

- continuation and conclusion of budget debate.

Wednesday, 7 November 1979

10 a.m.:

- presentation and discussion of supplementary reports by the Committee on Budgets,

11 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 2.30 p.m. onwards:

- *vote on:*
 - draft amendments to Sections I, II, Annex I to Section II, Sections IV and V of the draft general budget for 1980,

- draft amendments to Section III of the draft general budget for 1980,
- proposed modifications to Section III of the draft general budget for 1980,
- the motions for resolutions contained in the Jackson and Dankert reports.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

24. Organization of budget debate

President. — In accordance with Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure speaking time for the budget debate will be allocated as follows:

Council and Commission	80 minutes
General rapporteur	90 minutes
Rapporteur on the sections Parliament, Council, Court of Justice, Court of Auditors	30 minutes
Draftsmen of opinions (10 at 10 minutes each)	100 minutes
Socialist Group	122 minutes
Group of the European People's Party	118 minutes
European Democratic Group	74 minutes
Communist and Allies Group	54 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group	50 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats	32 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members	20 minutes
Non-attached Members	10 minutes

This speaking time will have to be used for the presentation of reports and supplementary reports and for moving draft amendments and proposed modifications. During the vote only the rapporteur will be allowed to speak to explain briefly the position of the Committee on Budgets.

I would remind Members that the deadline for tabling draft amendments and proposed modifications is 8 p.m. on Monday, 5 November 1979.

I would further remind the House that proposed modifications which affect compulsory expenditure require, for adoption, a majority of the votes cast. Draft amendments which affect non-compulsory expenditure require for adoption the votes of the majority of the current. Members of Parliament, i.e. at least 206 votes in favour. I therefore call on all Members to be present during the vote on 7 November.

25. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will be held on Friday, 26 October 1979, at 9.00 a.m. with the following agenda :

- procedure without report
- decision on urgency of a motion for a resolution
- decision on the request for an early vote on six motions for resolutions
- voting time
- motion for a resolution on compensation for the Orkney and Shetland Islands
- motion for a resolution on the torture of children
- motion for a resolution on an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights
- motion for a resolution on violation of freedom of the press in Malta
- motion for a resolution on the arrest of six Czechoslovakian citizens
- oral question without debate to the Commission on control of agricultural expenditure
- oral question without debate to the Commission on Community funds and sale of sugar surpluses
- oral question without debate to the Commission on national contributions to Community budgetary expenditure.

End of sitting :

- voting time.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 5.15 a.m.)

ANNEX

Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers

Question No 7, by Mr O'Connell (H-98-79)

Subject: Social Services in Member States

What studies has the Commission undertaken into the social services of the Member States and is it the intention of the Commission to harmonize social services in Member States to the extent that this is practically feasible?

What pressure can the Commission bring to bear on Member States whose social services fall below basic levels in certain areas, and what Community support can be given with specific application to these services?

Answer

Studies concerning social services have been carried out within the framework of the European programme of pilot projects and research aimed at combating poverty. Furthermore, the principal changes in this area are described by the Commission in the chapter on Social welfare services in the annual report on the development of the social situation in the European Community.

The Commission has no plans to harmonize the social services of the Member States and, in its view, each Member State should answer individually the question as to what proportion of social prosperity should be devoted to raising the level of social services.

The Commission appreciates the honourable Member's concern at the fact that the standard of social services is inadequate in certain regions of the Community. The Commission can provide an incentive in this field by publishing comparative studies and carrying out the abovementioned pilot projects aimed at combating poverty; it hopes that it will be possible to secure the continuation of the latter projects after 31 December within the framework of the budgetary procedure.

* * *

Question No 9, by Mr Radoux (H-116a/79)

Subject: Creation of a European Export Bank

Can the Commission indicate whether the plan to create a European Export Bank is to be considered as having been abandoned? If so, for what reasons?

If not, what is the present state of affairs and what developments are likely in the short term?

Answer

1. In February 1976 the Commission submitted proposals to the Council for setting up a European Export Bank. This bank was originally conceived as an institution under public law, the activities of which would have been directed towards providing export credit insurance. It was to assist European undertakings to submit joint tenders for major projects. Despite having been thoroughly examined by the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the relevant professional organizations, this Commission proposal has never been fully discussed by the Council.

2. Nevertheless, the Commission has not been idle in the meantime. While adhering to its original proposal, it has explored other avenues. For example, the Commission and the European Investment Bank have had talks over the last few months to establish whether the EIB could not incorporate a division for export financing. There are, however, legal, financial and organizational problems involved in the EIB taking over activities of this kind, which may well prove intractable.

There are other possible solutions. There is indeed the problem as to whether an institution under public law alone would be capable of solving the difficulties involved in financing multinational export activities. Perhaps the relevant financial institutions could create a joint institution in which the Community could participate and which could make use of the services of the various national export credit insurance institutions to provide administrative cover of the risk.

3. As the honourable Member can see, the Commission is fully aware of both the complexity and the importance of this matter, which it hopes will be included in an agenda for the very near future.

* * *

Question No 13, Mr Davern (H-137/79)

Subject: Aid for mountain and hill farmers

Is the Commission satisfied that the FEOGA aid provided for mountain and hill farming in the Member States has enabled farming to be continued and a minimum population to be maintained?

Answer

The Commission can confirm that EAGGF aid to farmers in mountainous and other less-favoured areas has encouraged several hundred thousand farmers to continue agricultural activity. The figures show that although, for example, there are less than half as many projects in the United Kingdom as in France and the Federal Republic of Germany, the amount of aid allocated to each project is three times as great, which accords with the nature of agricultural activity in the various countries. The Commission is now proposing that this aid be increased.

* * *

Question No 16, by Mr Cronin (H-141/79)

Subject: UK aid for offshore equipment

Will the Commission explain its protracted delay in opening infringement proceedings against the British Government for its persistent operation of an aid scheme for offshore equipment which is clearly in breach of the European Community's rules of competition?

Answer

The Commission decided on 2 May 1979 that the aid measures in favour of off-shore installations in the United Kingdom should be terminated within a period of two months, i.e. as from 2 July 1979.

The Commission can inform the honourable Member that the British Government has conformed to this decision by the Commission, and that there is therefore no reason to take any further action in the matter.

* * *

Question No 17, by Mr Flanagan (H-142/79)

Subject: Reducing fuel consumption of automobiles

Does the Commission intend to introduce proposals which would oblige European automobile manufacturers to reduce fuel consumption of new cars by a specified amount within a number of years?

Answer

1. As indicated in the programme on energy savings, the Commission is discussing with the industry voluntary performance targets for the fuel consumption of new vehicles.
2. It is drawing up a draft directive on the harmonization of the methods of measuring fuel consumption, which will be forwarded to the Council in the coming months.
3. Concurrently with the discussions with the automobile industry, but on a more general level, the Commission plans to set up an information system which will enable it to follow the progress made towards attainment of the objectives set for 1985 (see COM (79) 312 final).

* * *

Question No 20, by Mr Ansquer (H-145/79)

Subject: Factors of inflation

Since the Commission has had occasion to reassess the effects of increased oil prices on economic prospects, can it indicate the effects of these increases on inflation in each of the Community Member States?

Answer

According to the most recent estimates by the Commission, based on intersectoral statistics (input-output tables), the rise of almost 60 % in the price of crude oil which has already taken place could automatically lead to a further rise in consumer prices of between 1.5 % and 2.7 % taking the Community as a whole for the period July 1979 to July 1980¹. The 1.5 % figure is based on the hypothesis that the rise in crude oil prices only leads to an equivalent rise in the price of petroleum products.

The 2.7 % figure is based on the hypothesis that an increase in the price of crude oil leads to an equivalent rise in the price of all energy-related products.

The Commission therefore considers an effect on Community inflation in the order of 2 % as the most likely outcome.

This average figure for the Community as a whole is derived from individual figures for member countries which vary considerably, mainly as a function of the different extent to which the countries depend on oil and the energy content of the various forms of manufacturing.

Effect on prices for private consumer spending of a price increase of 60 % :

	Oil and petroleum products	All energy products
DK	1.8	2.2
D	1.3	2.5
F	1.6	2.5
IRL	1.7	2.6
I	2.1	3.1
B	1.3	2.5
L	—	—
UK	1.4	3.3
EEC	1.5	2.7

These estimates do not include secondary effects on consumer prices which could result from the link between prices and earnings, particularly the indexing of salaries, and which could have a more or less pronounced effect for each country according to their systems for the formation and redistribution of primary earnings. Particular attention should be paid to the guidelines issued by the Council in Strasbourg on combating inflation. In particular these state care should be taken to ensure that the toll taken of real resources by the increase in oil prices is not offset by nominal increases in earnings.

* * *

¹ These estimates are higher than earlier estimates because of the period covered (see note 3 of the supplementary information). This further rise in consumer prices assumes that no additional rise in oil prices will intervene in the period under review.

Question No 22, by Mr Schwartzberg (H-150/79)

Subject : Import tax on civil aircraft in the United States

Has the Commission succeeded in getting the United States to implement the agreement negotiated within GATT between the US and the Community and designed to remove the 5 % import tax on European civil aircraft ordered by American airlines ?

Answer

The Trade Agreement on Civil Aircraft has been approved by Congress. It forms part of the Trade Agreement Act which was signed by the President of the United States on 26 July 1979.

When the Treaty enters into force, which should be 1 January 1980, the US customs duty on civil aircraft will be reduced to zero.

* * *

Question No 23, by Mr Poncelet (H-153/79)

Subject : EEC-China Textile Agreement

The EEC-China Agreement allows China to increase its textile exports to the Community, which, in certain cases, means exceeding the overall internal ceilings.

In which cases does this apply ? Does this mean that the Community will have to reduce the third country quotas negotiated in the Multifibre Agreement ?

Answer

The conclusion of the EEC-China Textile Agreement is in accordance with the foreign policy interests of the Community. At the same time the Agreement does not neglect the interests of the European textile industry on that account. While the additional imports of textiles made possible by the Agreement could theoretically lead to the overall internal ceilings being slightly exceeded, it became clear in practice in 1978 that the overall internal ceilings as a whole were only exploited to a level of approximately 80 %. In all probability, therefore, the theoretical exceeding of the quota will have no effect in practice.

* * *

Question No 24, by Mr Berkhouver (H-156/79)

Subject : Import duties outstanding on the import of fighter planes and tanks from the United States

According to an article in the *Express* of 22 September 1979. Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark owe the Community customs duties amounting to more than \$ 1 500 million on the import of fighter planes and tanks from the United States.

Are these duties to be recovered by the Commission ?

Answer

As the Commission has already said in reply to a written question by Mr Waltmans (No 646/77), it considers that no provision of the Treaty authorizes a Member State to exempt unilaterally from common customs tariff duties material imported from non-member countries for national defence purposes.

In particular, it considers that Article 223 (1) (b) of the Treaty, which is invoked by the countries cited by the honourable Member in order to exempt fighter planes and tanks from the United States from customs duties, is not applicable in this case.

This Article states that : Any Member State may take such measures as it considers *necessary* for the protection of the *essential* interests of its security which are connected with the production of or trade in arms, munitions or war material. By measures necessary for the protection of the essential interests of the security of a State must be understood, literally, *the measures without which the security of that State would not only be seriously compromised but would be threatened with total eclipse*. This cannot result from the implementation of a customs duty.

If it is certainly *advantageous* from the financial point of view for a Member State to reduce the budgetary burden resulting from the purchase of war material from third countries by exempting them from customs duties, it is not reasonable to maintain that lifting these duties is *necessary* for the protection of the *essential* interests of the security of the importing State.

Consequently it is only by a unanimous decision of the Member States, based on Article 28 of the Treaty, that the application of duties in the Common Customs Tariff can be waived.

A decision of this kind has not so far been taken, so it must be recognized that the customs duties in respect of war material imported from third countries by the Member States must be levied by them and transferred, as own resources, to the Budget of Communities.

Since the contracts signed between the Member States concerned and the United States are very complex, and allow for the manufacture of a relatively large part of the war material in question in those particular Member States, the Commission, which has no knowledge of the terms of the contracts, is unable to determine the amount of customs duties for the importing of this material from the United States which should be transferred to the budget of the Communities. The weekly magazine cited by the honourable Member, therefore, has sole responsibility for the figure it mentions.

* * *

Question No 28, by Mr Christopher Jackson (O-64/79)

Subject: Common market for apples

Has the Commission any evidence of certain Member States giving national subsidies to their apple growers or marketers, and does it believe that these aids cause distortion of the common market in contravention of the Treaties?

Answer

The Commission has not been notified of any national subsidies according to the normal procedure outlined under Article 93 (1) and (3). Such aids that we do know to exist are not in contravention with rules of the Treaty, such as aids to research, aids to combat parasites, and aids for investments and insurance. Investment aids can assist marketing of apples, including aids to establish conditioning stations and stocking installations. The Commission has incidentally given clear guidelines as to which aids are permissible in Article 93 (1) of the Treaty.

It is part of Commission policy whenever possible to pursue actively non-authorized aids in this and other fields in order to avoid distortion.

* * *

Question No 31, by Mr Provan (H-164/79)

Subject: Sheepmeat

Will the Commission state what progress has been made in removing barriers to intra-Community trade in sheepmeat which were declared illegal by the European Court on 25 September 1979, and give its views on France's compliance with this ruling?

Answer

The Commission has sent a letter to the French Government to emphasize the fact that there is no link between the Court Judgement of 25 September 1979 on Case No 232/78, and the new sheepmeat régime. A special meeting of the Council has been called, however, to establish this régime.

* * *

Question No 32, by Mr P. Møller (H-165/79)

Subject: Workers' co-ownership rights and 'economic democracy'

Does the Commission agree, especially in view of Article 222 of the EEC Treaty, that the questions of workers' rights to co-ownership of undertakings and 'economic democracy' lie outside the scope of the EEC Treaty?

Answer

No. The scope of the EEC Treaty is sufficiently wide to deal with questions relating to economic democracy. Article 222 of the EEC Treaty only applies to property as such and not to rights which could be associated with property and employee participation.

Moreover, the Commission would remind the honourable Member that in its resolution of 24 April 1979, Parliament expressed the hope 'that conditions will be created for a policy of individual asset formation for workers, including a share in production capital — not necessarily in the same undertaking'.

On 14 September the Commission submitted a memorandum to the European Parliament on employee participation in asset formation. It hopes that the Parliament will give its opinion on this in the near future.

* * *

Question No 34, by Miss Brookes (H-167/79)

Subject: Financial grants aid for tourism

Could the Commission give any information regarding the availability of financial aid for the tourist industry?

Answer

1. Regulation (EEC) No 724/75 of 18 March 1975 establishing a European Regional Development Fund provides that the Commission may contribute to the financing of investments in the tourist industry provided that they individually exceed 50 000 EUA and that at least ten jobs are created or maintained.
2. A series of investments that are geographically or financially linked or meet the above criteria may be considered as a single investment.
3. The amount of the Fund's contribution may not exceed 10 000 EUA for each job created or maintained, nor 50 % of the aid accorded to the investment by the national public authorities under a system of regional aids.
4. Regions and areas that may benefit from the Fund are limited to those aided areas established by the Member States in applying their systems of regional aids.
5. The Commission recently submitted to the Council proposals for a first series of specific projects to be financed from the 'non-quota' section of the Regional Fund. These proposals include special measures for the development of rural tourism in certain regions of the Community.

* * *

Question No 35, by Miss Quin (H-168/79)

Subject: Proposals to standardize bottles containing poisonous substances

Will the Commission please confirm if it intends to make proposals to standardize bottles containing poisonous substances and, if this is the case, what provisions does it intend to make to ensure that such bottles are recognizable by blind or partially sighted persons?

Answer

On 18 September 1979, the Council adopted the Directive amending for the sixth time Council Directive 67/548/EEC concerning the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances. On this occasion, the Council called on the Commission to draw up at the earliest opportunity proposals for harmonization, pursuant to Article 15 (3) concerning child-proof safety closures and warnings for the visually handicapped.

The Commission intends to implement these harmonization measures with all speed.

Consequently the Commission has started the work necessary for the preparation of proposals on the subject; the Commission cannot provide any information on the measures it will propose before making a thorough study of the subject and having the appropriate consultations.

* * *

Question No 36, by Mr Hutton (H-169/79)

Subject: Energy saving

Bearing in mind the Commission's desire to save energy and bearing in mind that the winter is approaching would the Commission tell the Parliament what steps it has taken to encourage the use of thermal insulation, in industrial and commercial buildings in the Community?

Answer

The Council has adopted a recommendation to Member States in February 1979, that they should adopt by the end of 1979, where they are not already adopted, programmes for reducing energy requirements in existing buildings, including commercial and industrial buildings.¹

The Commission has further proposed to the Council a resolution which, amongst other points calls upon Member States to adopt, by 1980, energy saving programmes with comparable effects, based on guidelines attached to the resolution.² The guidelines consist of a basic programme for saving energy covering all sectors of energy use.

In Annex I of the Third Report on the Community's Programme for Energy Saving,³ which the Commission has sent to the European Parliament, is to be found a review of basic energy saving measures adopted by each Member States as of January 1979. It can be seen that most Member States now have legislation proposed or in force to ensure adequate insulation in new industrial and commercial buildings, and financial aids to support the renovation of existing buildings, including industrial buildings. In addition, most Member States now have exemplary programmes for public buildings.

It is hoped that the discussion of the resolution calling upon Member States to establish comparable programmes will help ensure that all Member States give full attention to the scope for a strengthening of their existing programmes.

* * *

¹ Official Journal L 37 'Recommendation concerning the reduction of energy consumption in buildings'. 79/167/EEC.

² COM (79) 312 'New Lines of Action by the European Community in the Field of Energy Saving'.

³ COM (79) 313 'Third Report on the Community's Programme of Energy Saving'.

Question No 37, by Mr Curry (H-172/79)

Subject : Agricultural budget

On what criteria does the Commission base its distinction between EAGGF Guarantee and Guidance Section expenditure, especially in the case of ambiguous items such as the premiums for the non-marketing of milk ?

Answer

1. The expenditure which is to be financed by the Guarantee and the Guidance Sections of the EAGGF is defined in Regulation (EEC) No 729/70 as being :

- in the case of the Guarantee Section, refunds on exports to third countries and intervention intended to stabilize the agricultural markets ;
- in the case of the Guidance Section, common measures relating to structures, including structural adaptation necessary for the proper working of the common market.

2. Bearing this definition in mind, the Commission had proposed in 1976 that 50 % of the non-marketing subsidy should be financed by the Guidance Section of the EAGGF. The Council felt that there were both market and structural aspects to the measure and finally provided, exceptionally, for fixed financing in Council Regulation No 1078/77, with 60 % coming from the Guarantee Section and 40 % from the Guidance Section. The division adopted was of necessity intrinsically subjective rather than objective.

* * *

Question No 38, by Mr Patterson (H-176/79)

Subject : Draft Directive on control of illegal immigration and employment

Since October last year, when the European Parliament last debated the Commission's draft directive on the control of illegal immigration and illegal employment, it has been reported that further changes in the draft directive are being considered as a result of discussion in the Council. Could the Commission therefore say whether it intends to bring the matter before Parliament again, and which voluntary organizations representing immigrant communities, especially in the United Kingdom, it has consulted and is consulting ?

Answer

The Commission has modified its original proposal on the basis of the opinions of and discussions in, the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee. These institutions have in large measure voiced the views of the organizations that represent the interests of foreign workers. Furthermore, the Commission has, as is customary, consulted the employers' and employees' representatives of all Member States on the Advisory Committee on Free Movement of Workers and the Permanent Committee on Employment. The Commission believes that it has been fully informed of the views of foreign workers.

Should the Commission modify its proposal, which it has no intention of doing at present, it will not fail to notify Parliament accordingly.

* * *

Question No 39 by Mrs Baduel Glorioso (H-177/79)

Subject: Protectionist measures in the knitted goods sector

Following the decision taken by the French Government on 13 August 1979 to demand a technical certificate for imports of knitted goods, will not the Commission approach the French Government with a view to ensuring that Community regulations are re-established, thus preventing obvious infringement of the rules on competition which are the basis of Community life, and guaranteeing not only respect for the rules on free movement but maintenance of employment levels in handicraft undertakings and small industries which are hardest hit in Italy, particularly in Emilia Romagna?

Answer

The Commission commenced infringement proceedings under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty against the French Government for the decision to which the honourable Parliamentarian refers — the requirement of a preliminary technical stamp for imports of twinsets and pullovers.

In addition, negotiations took place at the highest level between the Commission and the French authorities to achieve the removal of this requirement.

The requirement has now been removed. As from 15 October 1979 pursuant to an 'Information to Importers' of the French Ministry of External Trade published in the Official Journal of 14 October 1979 the provisions of the 'Information to Importers' of 9 August 1979, which were the subject of infringement proceedings under Article 169, have been repealed.

* * *

Question No 43 by Mr Blaney (H-188/79)

Subject: Agricultural policy — milk producers

Would the Commission not agree that having regard to the Community surplus of milk products and the cost of stockpiling and disposing of same, and having regard to the fact that one-third of the milk producers in the Community are responsible for less than 12 % of total milk production, there is an urgent need to introduce a system of weighted price differentials in favour of small and medium farm size producers in relation to milk output; and that such encouragement of these producers to remain in milk as a labour-intensive enterprise will slow down in the numbers leaving agriculture and help to alleviate the unemployment problem in the Community; and further that as an alternative to milk production the Community should adopt a positive policy of incentives for beef production?

Answer

I agree with Mr Blaney that the unemployment problem is serious in the Community. However, other factors have to be taken into account in the running of our common dairy policy such as its budgetary cost, the need to improve productivity and farm incomes, etc. A differentiated pricing arrangement would be too broad in its effect and would have many unintended consequences. The Commission already provides an incentive to dairy farmers to switch to beef production in the form of a conversion premium although in mountainous regions there are still premia for milk producers. The Commission's proposed co-responsibility levy did in fact make exceptions which would have benefited lower-income farmers.

* * *

Question No 46, by Mr Ceravolo (H-192/79)

Subject : Outcome of the Berlin Conference announced by the Club of Rome

In the light of the Commission's assessment of the alarming outcome of the Berlin Conference as regards the gradual deterioration of the environment, the dramatic consequences of the world population explosion and the prospect of future exhaustion of traditional energy sources, what adjustments does it intend to make to the various action programmes and Community policies concerning this problem ?

Answer

The Commission did not take part in the Berlin Conference held by the Club of Rome, and therefore has no knowledge of the alarming outcome of that Conference.

Nevertheless, the Commission draws the honourable Members' attention to the Community's aims in the sphere of environmental policy established by the Council in 1973 and forcefully re-stated in May 1977.

This policy is not just concerned with preventing pollution, and with the good management of resources and the natural environment, but also wishes to direct development in such a way as to maintain the quality of life.

The aims of the Community's environmental policy therefore concur with the preoccupations of the Club of Rome.

The problem of the exhaustion of fossile energy sources was on the agenda of the Club of Rome's first report. All the work of experts has subsequently confirmed that, although the earth's resources are not finite, at the present rate of production they will not be exhausted in the near future. The first question we should ask is rather whether economic and political conditions, as well as the effects of the exploitation of these resources on the environment, will allow sufficient resources to be made available at an acceptable price.

With this in mind the Community and the Member States have been pursuing programmes for energy saving since 1974. A group of independent experts has recently drawn up a report on behalf of the Commission (the Saint-Geours report) on an energy-efficient society. Consideration of this report will allow the search for the best use of resources to go ahead.

* * *

Question No 47, by Mrs Castle (H-194/79)

Subject : Common organization of markets in dairy products

What is the Commission's estimate of the cost of disposing of surplus skimmed-milk powder over the coming year, and what proposals has it for eliminating those surpluses ?

Answer

The Commission's estimate of the cost of disposing of surplus skimmed-milk powder for 1980 is 1 274 million EUA which covers traditional measures of export restitutions, food aid and aid for its use in calf feed. It also includes a sum of 150 million EUA which may or may not be necessary to dispose of powder at higher rates of subsidy for pig and poultry feed, depending on the state of the market. To stop surpluses we need a milk policy which discourages overproduction, and we must have a ceiling on the present system of open-ended intervention stocking.

* * *

Question No 49, by Mr Irmer (H-197/79)

Subject : Child massacres in Ethiopia

According to a document published by Amnesty International, more than 5 000 Ethiopian children have been tortured, treated as political prisoners or massacred because of the beliefs of their parents ; in the light of its attitude in similar circumstances to the former Central African Empire, does the Commission intend, in this the International Year of the Child, to take appropriate action towards Ethiopia, especially as regards the implementation of cooperation schemes under the Convention of Lomé and its successor ?

Answer

1. The Amnesty International document to which the Honourable Member refers is already a year old, and the sad events described there happened two years ago. A number of reports since then indicate that the situation has quietened down, and this has moreover been acknowledged in a recent report by the Political Affairs Committee (Document 132/79). The Committee therefore hopes that this disturbances of the early part of the revolutionary period which marked the collapse of the feudal and imperial régime are now disappearing.
2. The Community is linked to Ethiopia, as to 57 other ACP countries, through an act of international law, the Lomé Convention, which imposes obligations on it. As the Convention has not been terminated under the conditions laid down, the Community will obviously meet these obligations.
3. Nevertheless the Commission takes the opportunity provided by the honourable Member's question to reaffirm its profound belief in human rights, that is in the respect for human dignity and for the individual. It is guided by this concern when implementing the contract constituted by the Lomé Convention, in accordance with the directives of the Council of Ministers and the resolutions which the European Parliament has adopted many times on this subject.

* * *

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 26 OCTOBER 1979

Contents

<i>Point of order: Mr de Goede</i>	324	<i>Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia:</i>	
1. <i>Approval of the minutes</i>	324	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	328
2. <i>Documents received</i>	324	<i>Motion for a resolution by Mr Sarre and others (Doc. 1-427/79) — Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia</i>	
3. <i>Petitions</i>	325	<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Pannella</i>	328
4. <i>Procedure without report</i>	325	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	328
5. <i>Decision on urgency:</i>	325	<i>Motion for a resolution by Mr Denis and Mr Ferrero (Doc. 1-432/79) — Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia:</i>	
<i>Mr Klepsch; Mr Capanna; Mr Pannella; Mr Galland, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Ferri, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mrs Macciocchi, on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members; Lady Elles, on behalf of the European Democratic Group</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	328
6. <i>Decision on early votes:</i>		<i>Motion for a resolution by Mr Prag and others (Doc. 1-433/79) — Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia:</i>	
<i>Mr Berkhouwer</i>	327	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	328
<i>Point of order: Mr Patterson</i>	327	<i>Motion for a resolution by the Committee on development and cooperation (Doc. 1-393/79) World hunger:</i>	
7. <i>Votes:</i>		<i>Point of order Mr Glinne</i>	328
<i>Motion for a resolution by Mr Berkhouwer and others (Doc. 1-411/79) — Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia:</i>		<i>Mr Pannella; Miss Flesch, chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation; Mr Ferrero, on behalf of the Communist and Allies group; Mr Simpson, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Glinne; Mr Pannella; Mr Klepsch; Mr Galland; Mr Ferrero; Mr Pannella; Miss Flesch; Mr Pannella; Mrs Poirier; Mrs Bonino; Miss Flesch; Mr Glinne; Miss Flesch; Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples Party, (C-D); Mr Pannella</i>	328
<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Berkhouwer</i>	327	<i>Battersby report (Doc. 1-402/79) — Conservation of fishery resources</i>	
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	327	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	333
<i>Motion for a resolution by Mr Langes and others (Doc. 1-416/79) — Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia:</i>			
<i>Explanation of vote: Mrs Dekker; Mr Penders, on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples Party (C-D)</i>	327		
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	328		
<i>Motion for a resolution by Mrs Dienesch and Mrs Chouraqui (Doc. 1-426/79) —</i>			

- Kirk report (Doc. 1-403/79) — Reproduction of salmon in the Baltic:*
Adoption of the resolution 333
- Motion for a resolution by Mr Kirk and others (Doc. 1-414/79) — Fisheries policy:*
Adoption of the resolution 333
- Dalsass report (Doc. 1-396/79) — Seeds sector:*
Adoption of the resolution 333
- Colleselli report (Doc. 1-397/79) — Market in rice:*
Adoption of the resolution 333
- Martinet report (Doc. 1-399/79) — Regulation on certain wines originating entirely in Greece:*
Adoption of the resolution 333
- Filippi report (Doc. 1-420/79) — Wines originating in Tunisia*
Adoption of the resolution 333
- Plumb report (Doc. 1-430/79) — Damage caused by hurricanes David and Frederick:*
Adoption of the resolution 333
8. *Compensation for the disaster in Orkney and Shetland agriculture — Motion for a resolution by Mrs Ewing, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-408/79):*
Mrs Ewing, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Hutton, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Maher, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Provan; Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission 333
9. *Torture of children — Motion for a resolution by Mr Sarre and others (Doc. 1-409/79)*
Mr Sarre; Lord O'Hagan, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Irmer, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Boyes; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Pannella 335
10. *Ad hoc committee on women's rights — Motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others (Doc. 1-415/79):*
Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mrs Maij-Weggen on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D); Lady Elles, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mrs Demarch, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr von Aleman, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Dekker; Mr Johnson 338
11. *Violation of freedom of the press in Malta — Motion for a resolution by Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Democratic Group (Doc. 1-419/79):*
Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Habsburg, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D); Mr Irmer, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Bersani 343
12. *Arrest of six Czechoslovakian citizens — Motion for a resolution by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and others (Doc. 1-428/79):*
Mr Klepsch; Mr Battersby, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Damette; Mr Balfe; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Balfe 346
13. *Control of agriculture expenditure — Oral question without debate (Doc. 1-301/79):*
Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Castle; Mr Gundelach 348
14. *Agenda —*
Point of order: Mr Balfe 350
15. *Votes*
Motion for a resolution by Mrs Ewing (Doc. 1-408/79) — Compensation for the disaster in Orkney and Shetland agriculture:
Adoption of the resolution 350
Motion for a resolution by Mr Sarre and others (Doc. 1-409/79) — Torture of children:
Adoption of the resolution 350
Motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others (Doc. 1-415/79) — Ad hoc committee on women's rights:
Amendments to paragraph 1:
Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Scott-Hopkins 351
Adoption of the resolution 351
Motion for a resolution by Mr Scott-Hopkins (Doc. 1-419/79) — Violation of the freedom of the press in Malta:
Point of order: Mr Balfe 351
Mr Klepsch 351

<i>Motion for a resolution by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and others (Doc. 1-428/79) — Arrest of six Czechoslovakian citizens:</i>	
<i>Mr Arndt</i>	352
<i>Point of order: Mr Irmer; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Glinne</i>	352
16. <i>Community funds and sale of sugar surpluses for 1979 — Oral question without debate (Doc. 1-305/79):</i>	
<i>Mrs Castle, author of the question; Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Castle; Mr Gundelach</i>	352
17. <i>National contributions to Community budgetary expenditure — Oral question without debate (Doc. 1-302/79):</i>	
<i>Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Castle; Mr Natali</i>	354
18. <i>Tribute</i>	354
19. <i>Personal statement:</i>	
<i>Miss Flesch; Mrs Macciocchi</i>	355
20. <i>Membership of committees</i>	355
21. <i>Dates of the next part-session</i>	355
22. <i>Approval of the minutes</i>	355
23. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	355

IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9.05 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

I call Mr de Goede on a point of order.

Mr de Goede. — *(NL)* Mr President, a list for speakers in the budget debate in the week starting 5 November is now being circulated. There are some figures at the top. If these are meant to represent minutes then I would like to register a protest here and now at the way speaking time has been apportioned. I wish to make an urgent request that Members of Parliament should be told well in advance how much speaking time they are going to have in the budget debate in the week starting 5 November. May I say now that there must be some mistake here. Non-attached Members have in fact a total of 10 minutes for the most important debate of the year, whilst the Socialists have more than two hours. This cannot be right, as the ratio was quite different this week for both the debate on hunger and the debate on political cooperation: — the non-attached Members had 30 minutes and the Socialists one hour. I hope the Bureau will shortly be able to give the correct speaking times so that we do not come to Strasbourg for nothing for the week of 5 November.

President. — I note your statement, Mr de Goede, and can assure you that your point will be raised with the Bureau before the next agenda is drawn up in its final form.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received:

(a) the following motions for resolutions:

— by Mrs Dekker, Mr de Goede, Mrs Van den Heuvel, Mrs Bonino, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Lord Bethel, Mr Linkohr, Mr Van Minnen and Mr Coppieters, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on human rights in the Soviet Union and the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow (Doc. 1-431/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee;

— by Mr Hoffmann, Mr Vergeer, Mr Van Aerssen, Mr Klepsch, Mr Helms, Mr Pursten, Mr Giavazzi and Mr Jonker, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group), pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on a common position for the European Community at the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 1-434/79)

which has been referred to the Legal Affairs Committee as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Transport, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture for their opinions;

President

- by Mr Hume, Mr Josselin, Mr Ruffolo, Mrs Vondeling, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Linde, Mrs Clwyd, Mrs Gredal, Mr Collins and Mr Colla, pursuant to Rules 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on a Community charter of regional languages and cultures (Doc. 1-436/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning for its opinion;

- by Mr Ghergo, Mr Barbi, Mr Barbagli, Mr Costanzo, Mr Dalsass, Mr Klepsch, Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti, Mr Vergeer, Mr Seitlinger, Mr Fischbach, Mr Ryan, Mr Herman and Mr Janssen van Raay, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group), pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the fate of the Kurdish people (Doc. 1-437/79/rev.)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee;

- by Mr Patterson and Mr C. Jackson, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the sale of French apples in the United Kingdom (Doc. 1-442/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture;

- by Mrs Lenz, Mrs Schleicher, Mrs Rabbethge, Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti, Mrs Boot, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Purtsen, Mr Pottering, Mr Nordlohne, Mr Mertens, Mr Hoffmann, Mr Alber, Mr Runtsche, Mr von Bismarck and Mr Notenboom, on behalf of the Group of European People's Party (C-D Group), pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on family policy in the European Economic Community (Doc. 1-443/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment;

- by Mr Bocklet, Mr Salzer, Mr Purtsen, Mr Schall, Mr Mertens, Mr I. Friedrich, Mr Aigner, Mr Konrad Schon and Mr Pottering, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the behaviour of members of the Commission (Doc. 1-444/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee;

(b) from the Council

- the letter of amendment to the draft general budget of the European Communities for the 1980 Financial year, adopted by the Council on 16 October 1979 (Doc. 1-438/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets;

(c) from the Commission

on 26 October 1979

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No. 29/79 between chapters within Section III — *Commission* — of the general budget (Doc. 1/439/79)
- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No. 30/79 between chapters within Section III — *Commission* — of the general budget of the European Communities for the 1979 financial year (Doc. 1-440/79)

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 28/79 between chapters within Section IV — Court of Justice — of the general budget of the European Communities for the 1979 financial year (Doc. 1-441/79)

which have been referred to the Committee on Budgets;

Since the proposed transfer concerns expenditure not necessarily resulting from the Treaties, I have consulted the Council on behalf of Parliament, in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Regulation.

3. Petitions

President. — I have received from Mr L. Constantinesco a petition on the political and moral duty of the European Parliament.

This petition has been entered under No 15/79 in the register provided for in Rule 48 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, and, pursuant to paragraph 3 of that Rule, referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

4. Procedure without report

President. — On Monday, the Chair announced the titles of the Commission proposals submitted for approval under the procedure without report provided for in Rule 27 A of the Rules of Procedure.

Since no Member has asked leave to speak and no amendments to them have been tabled, I declare these items approved by the European Parliament.

5. Decision on urgency

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgency for the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-435/79): Extradition of Franco Piperno.*

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Mr President, I want to speak against holding an urgent debate on this matter because I feel that the motion is an insult to the House. Having witnessed the solemn way in which we reacted to the murder of Aldo Moro, I take the view that the motion is not fit to be received by this House. *(Applause from the right)*

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (I) Mr President, if we were convinced that Franco Piperno was the murderer, or one of the murderers, of Aldo Moro, we would certainly not have tabled this motion for a resolution. In fact we are convinced of the contrary — that Piperno has been made the victim of a serious political frame-up to which no citizen of any democratic

Capanna

State should ever be exposed. It is for this reason, and for no other, that we have tabled this motion for a resolution asking the European Parliament to discuss the extradition ordered by the French legislature — which, of course, means the French Government — of this Italian citizen. This is beyond the shadow of a doubt a matter which falls within the terms of reference of the European Parliament, and that is why I insist that we treat it as a matter of urgency.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

(Protests from certain quarters)

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, I would point out that many of these hotheads who are doing their best to prevent me from speaking for three minutes were not even here earlier this morning.

As for the matter in hand, the essence of the problem is not Piperno himself, but the right to political asylum.

In the 1930s the Italian Government sent to Paris a set of files which were much more solidly backed than those which Rome has sent to Paris this time, asking for Italian anti-fascists accused in a far more specific fashion of crimes far more serious than that attributed to Mr Piperno to be returned to Mussolini. That is the real nature of the problem.

Mr President, of 46 accusations levelled by the Italian judiciary, the French judiciary rejected 44 on the grounds that they were unfounded.

It is therefore a problem of law that confronts us here.

President. — I call Mr Galland to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Galland. — *(F)* I ask honourable Members to reject urgency for two reasons.

Firstly, the assertion which Mr Capanna has just made is quite unfounded. In our country, Mr Capanna, justice is impartial. It does not depend on those in power: we had a demonstration of that very fact only yesterday in this forum.

Secondly, we are not a court of law, Mr President.

I therefore urge the entire House to vote against an urgent debate.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — I call Mr Ferri to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Ferri. — *(D)* Mr President, I have asked to speak because as an Italian Member of the European Parliament I simply cannot let pass my compatriot Mr Pannella's comparison of the Government and Institutions of the Italian Republic to the Fascist régime of Mussolini. This comparison concerns both the Government and the legislature and is intolerable. In this House we are not in a position to give an opinion on the existence or not of sufficient evidence; the

request for extradition was granted by the French legislature, not with regard to political crimes or offences, but with regard to ordinary criminal acts aiding and abetting kidnapping and being an accessory to murder. It is not for us, it is not within our rights to give our opinions at this time; we deeply respect the provisions of the Italian Democratic Constitution, according to which, until there has been a definitive judgement passed, every accused person has a right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty: this should hold for Piperno also. In Italy we have independent judges, and they make their judgements according to the law and in observance of human rights; we cannot therefore accept this move, and we oppose the proposal for urgent procedure.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mrs Macciocchi. — *(I)* Mr President, I would like to say — addressing myself above all to Mr Klepsch, Chairman of the Christian-Democratic Group — that the request for urgent procedure which has been made does not mean that we are supporting in any way the perpetrators of the horrible crime committed by the Red Brigades. We are against terrorism; I myself fought bitterly to condemn the hideous crime which was committed against Aldo Moro.

Therefore, let there be no doubt in our minds. The request we are making is altogether different; what we want to discuss is a European Judicial Area where orders can supersede the existing national laws. We are afraid that there is nothing left of the French law of 1927 which provided for the defence of the right to asylum, and that, therefore, the existing legislation — which represents in itself rights and guarantees for citizens, even when the citizens are regarded as guilty by a State is falling into disuse, and that extradition is being granted on the basis of political pressures and not as a function of legislation by a democratic State to protect the rights of those judged guilty by other states than their own.

The question, therefore, is that of the automatic character of extradition within the Nine. We would like an examination of what exactly this European Judicial Area, if anything, really is. In building Europe we have striven towards greater freedom, and we have been deeply concerned at the prospect that our freedom may well be circumscribed and that a situation could arise where there were two parallel legal codes, one written and the other not yet written, but being applied parallel to the written law.

This is what we are worried about, and it is with this in mind that I assure my colleagues that even if they decide not to adopt urgent procedure, I shall carry on trying to get this subject discussed in the Political Affairs Committee and elsewhere.

President. — I call Lady Elles to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lady Elles. — I would like to support Mr Klepsch and reject this motion for urgent debate. We had a major debate in this House at the last part-session on extradition. We have a promise from the President-in-Office that an agreement is being drawn up and will be signed and ratified by all Member States of the Community. We have also had several great and distinguished men, including His Holiness the Pope, saying that murder under any other name is still murder. If there is evidence that somebody has committed such a crime, it is not for us to judge if the crime has been committed by that particular individual, but it must be treated as murder and not as a political offence. Therefore, Mr President, I would suggest that it is not a matter to be discussed by this House today, but if it is the wish of this House it should go the appropriate committee under Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure.

President. — I put the request for urgency to the vote. Urgency is rejected.

The motion for a resolution will be referred to the appropriate committee.

6. Decision on requests for early votes

President. — We shall now vote on the requests for early votes on six motions for resolutions (Docs. 1-411/79/rev., 1-416/79, 1-426/79, 1-427/79, 1-432/79 and 1-433/79) on emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia.

I propose that since all six motions relate to the same object, these requests should be put to a single vote.

I call Mr Berkhouwer.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) Mr President, I think that will be rather difficult, as some groups are for one and against another I think we will have to vote on them separately.

President. — Mr Berkhouwer, as author of one of the motions, can you state what procedure you propose the House should adopt?

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) Mr President, we must vote separately on each motion for a resolution without delay. We cannot do anything else, as some people wish to vote for one motion for a resolution and against another.

My group is going to vote for the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Berkhouwer and Mr Pintat; for the motion tabled by Mr Langes, Mr Klepsch and others, and for the motion by Mrs Dienesch and Mrs Chou-raqui. We very much regret that we cannot vote in favour of the motion tabled by Mr Zagari and others, since we see no point in West European Members of Parliament making a trip to South-East Asia. We must

get aid to the area; our presence is not required. Assistance is what is needed. We are against the motion by Mr Denis and Mr Ferrero, because they make no distinction between Cambodia and Vietnam. We have no objection to the motion by Mr Prag, Lord Bethell and others. That, briefly, is my explanation.

President. — I call Mr Patterson on a point of order.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, are we voting on whether we are later going to vote on these motions, or are we voting on the motions themselves? Listening to Mr Berkhouwer it seemed as if we were voting on the substance of the motions. I understood from the agenda that we are merely voting now on whether we are going to vote later on.

(Laughter)

President. — You are quite right.

I put the request for early votes to the vote.

Early votes are agreed.

7. Votes

President. — The next item is votes on motions for resolutions.

We shall begin with the six motions for resolutions for which an early vote has been agreed.

We shall first consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-411/79/rev.) by Mr Berkhouwer and others: Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia.*

I call Mr Berkhouwer to give an explanation of vote.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) I have nothing to add to what I already said. We are in favour of Nos 1, 2 and 3, and against Nos 4 and 5, and in favour of No 6.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-416/79) by Mr Langers, and others: Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia.*

I call Mrs Dekker to give an explanation of vote.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, I wish to explain why we should not support this motion for a resolution. Firstly, it is the only resolution in this whole group in which actual amounts are given. I really think that the one million units of account proposed here for immediate aid is pitiful. In September we voted on aid for the populations of a couple of islands in the Caribbean which had suffered in the hurricanes. Several million units of account were set aside for that, and now we think we can get away with only one million for this tragedy in Cambodia. Mr President, this had to be said in relation to our explanation.

President. — I call Mr Penders.

Mr Penders. — (NL) Mr President, I am astonished at Mrs Dekker's explanation. No one is mad enough to think that one million units of account would be sufficient for Cambodia and Vietnam, and our group has certainly never claimed that it would be sufficient. Of course, a far larger amount is required. What is at stake here, and Commissioner Cheysson will confirm this, is immediate aid. The one million units of account are earmarked for this. We can transfer this sum at a moment's notice from one item to another, and we can allocate it for this purpose. Moreover, if there is an opportunity to do more in the next few weeks then we should do it. I am astounded by this explanation, which I really find rather silly.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-426/79) by Mrs Dienesch and Mrs Chouraqui: Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia.*

The resolution is adopted.

We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-427/79: by Mr Sarre and others: Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia.*

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, I should like to point out very briefly that the originality of our motion for a resolution lies in the proposal that the parliamentary delegations should make an on-the-spot assessment of the circumstances in which aid is being organized. Everyone knows that the conditions prevailing in those countries which would be visited are such that this proposal could in no way be termed a pleasure trip.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) There is now a further reason for voting in favour of this resolution, for which I would in any case have voted, which is that since Parliament approved the previous proposals, it is in my view clear that to send a delegation to the area as suggested by the Socialists is a necessary step. Once Parliament has decided to act in the way it has decided, I feel that it is not only necessary and appropriate but really judicious to accept this suggestion.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

Since the result of the vote by a show of hands is inconclusive, the vote will be taken by standing and sitting.

The resolution is adopted.

I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-432/79) by Mr Denis and Mr Ferrero: Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia.*

The motion for a resolution is rejected.

I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-433/79) by Mr Prag and others: Emergency aid to Vietnam and Cambodia.*

The resolution is adopted.

* * *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1—393/79) tabled by the Committee on Development and Cooperation: World hunger.*

I call Mr Glinne on a point of order.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, if I am not mistaken, during yesterday's debate on this subject, several speakers suggested that the various amendments which exist at present should be assembled and sent to the parliamentary committee responsible. Do you not agree that this would be a very positive way of solving the problem?

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr Glinne and others seem to have suggested sending the amendments to committee. Does Mr Glinne therefore not want us to adopt a resolution? We cannot after all postpone the discussion of amendments to a resolution which has already been adopted.

Frankly, Mr President, there are times in this Parliament when I doubt my own sanity, especially when I hear suggestions like this one.

President. — Mr Pannella, the Rules of Procedure stipulate that both the motion for a resolution and the amendments would be referred to committee.

I call Miss Flesch.

Miss Flesch, Chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation. — (F) Mr President, I think that what you have just said is perfectly correct. However attractive a proposal to send the amendments to committee might be, it is clear that in that event we should refer the whole thing. Personally, Mr President, I wonder whether, after a debate which was very interesting and, in my view, very important; we can afford to conclude without a resolution.

President. — If I have understood rightly, Miss Flesch feels very strongly that we should put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

I call Mr Ferrero.

Mr Ferrero. — (I) Mr President, we stated yesterday that the debate had been a serious one. At the same time, since the House intends to hold a major debate on the same subject in February, after several months work in committee, it was felt advisable to discuss

Ferrero

these amendments in committee. We said that the Communist Group approved some of these very interesting amendments and wanted them to be looked at more closely.

Rule 29 of the Rules of Procedure provides that when amendments are referred back to committee, the vote on the motion for a resolution shall also be held over. Accordingly, I think that, since it is now 10 a.m. on Friday morning, the only serious and responsible way to end this debate with a resolution and to pave the way for the work to be done to prepare for the February sittings would be to ask the authors of the amendments to withdraw them. We ourselves are the authors of one of the amendments, and we are prepared to withdraw it and come back with similar proposals at a later stage for the debate concluding the work of the committee. I think it would be seen as a show of considerable goodwill, Mr Pannella, if you were prepared to follow suit.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Simpson.

Mr Simpson. — Mr President, on behalf of the European Democratic Group I support the last speaker. We wish all the amendments to go back to the committee, because we feel that any vote on those amendments will very much prejudice the issue and the debates we would wish to have, as well as the information we would wish to bring to a subsequent sitting of this Parliament. I do hope that agreement can be reached on this issue, and I am sure that if Mr Pannella really considers the matter, he will recognize that he has a greater chance of achieving his aim by debating these matters in committee than by taking a premature vote in this sitting this morning.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, it seems to me that there are only two possible solutions if we are to arrive at a fitting conclusion for a debate of this importance, whether it be today or in the near future. If the authors of the amendments were to withdraw them, we could vote on the resolution today. Otherwise, I would strongly suggest that the entire matter be sent to committee and that the problem be resumed at the ordinary November part-session once the consultations needed in order to reduce the number of amendments have been completed. I cannot see us debating this problem amendment by amendment for another two hours, however important it may be.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* I can only appeal for the understanding of all Members present. I must say that we are being blackmailed, and I shall explain how.

We asked for this debate to begin in July or August, or, failing that, in September. It is now already the

end of October. In the meantime, three or four million more people have died. We were told that we were not ready. Well, are you ready now?

I would like to know what has become of our order of business. Has anyone noticed that since July we have not once tabled a question with debate? We refrained from doing so because we were prepared to keep to the draft agendas proposed by you, the majority, and imposed on the enlarged Bureau.

But look at what has been happening! What are the group chairmen doing? No sooner do we adopt our agenda than the requests for urgent debate start flowing in totally disrupting our arrangements.

We should have begun the debate on world hunger — which you wanted to be unhurried, peaceful and dignified — at around 9 o'clock yesterday morning. We did not get started until 5 p.m. Now you tell us that it is too late to consider the motion for a resolution and the amendments in an appropriate manner. What is this if not a form of blackmail? You can hardly blame us for pressing for a vote!

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Honourable Members, this entire discussion amounts to shadow-boxing since there are only two possibilities. Either we vote on the draft amendments now and then take a final vote on the motion for a resolution or, in view of the large number of draft amendments, the rapporteur or committee chairman proposes that the entire matter be welded into a resolution by the Committee on Development and Cooperation. These are the two possibilities open to us under the Rules of Procedure, and we shall have to choose between the two. Under our Rules of Procedure, none of the helpful suggestions made here, such as the withdrawal of all the draft amendments and a vote taken solely on the text of the motion for a resolution, is acceptable. There are only the two possibilities I have mentioned. But perhaps the rapporteur for the Committee on Development and Cooperation can help us out, of this situation.

President. — I call Mr Galland.

Mr Galland. — *(F)* Mr President, I do not share the opinion of Mr Klepsch on one point. It is quite obvious that there is a simple way of closing this debate.

If Mr Pannella were prepared to accept — and he should be prepared to believe that some Members of this House mean what they say that we are not seeking to destroy systematically every debate of any quality, or trying to block all his initiatives, he should understand this: the debate on hunger has taken place. Even if it had taken place one or two months earlier, there is no magic wand which could have

Galland

prevented people from dying. Mr Pannella, what we are putting to you — and I beg you, please try to help us here — is the organization of a major debate next February for which we shall have a motion for a resolution drawn up in collaboration with various parliamentary committees and at which you will be able to put forward all your suggestions. The only technical solution available for closing yesterday's debate is to vote on the Committee's motion for a resolution. We all know that if we embark on the amendments, the debate, which was a debate of quality, will end without a vote, and that would be a pity.

However, I would repeat that this does not mean that we are avoiding all the proposals which you have made. On the contrary, we are proposing that you cooperate with us so that we can have a full set of proposals in February. Mr Pannella, let us close yesterday's debate with dignity by voting on the motion, however imperfect it may be, and resume the debate more fully in February. You have our commitment in this respect.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — I call Mr Ferrero.

Mr Ferrero. — *(I)* I am quite sure that Mr Pannella understands the situation perfectly well, and that his attitude is perfectly calculated. I should like to address myself to him once more, and this time I shall not mince words: Mr Pannella, you are not the Ayatollah of Hunger here in this House, and you are not going single-handedly to determine Parliament's position on these problems.

In view of the situation that has arisen, and of the attitude adopted by Mr Pannella, who, with his colleague Mrs Bonino and others is the author of most of the amendments, I ask for Rule 29 (5) of the Rules of Procedure to be applied. Since it appears impossible to hold the necessary serious discussion on the amendments tabled, and seeing that it will be impossible to close this debate — though it has been a very interesting one — with a resolution, may I ask for Rule 29 (5) to be applied, so that the amendments can be referred back to the committee, thus giving us a basis for more serious work, as well as allowing a time-limit to be fixed for the Committee on Development and Cooperation and the other committees to submit their conclusions. I quote:

Parliament may fix a time-limit within which the committee shall report its conclusions on the amendments referred to it.

This will allow us to fix a time-limit, the February part-session, for example, while in the meantime the Committee on Development and Cooperation and any other relevant committees could consider the Flesch motion for a resolution and the amendments already tabled, together with any other amendments

there may be. That would enable us to hold a full-scale debate on all measures to be taken in the struggle against world hunger.

President. — Pursuant to Rule 29 (5), reference of an amendment to committee may be requested at any time. Such a request shall always be granted if it is made in person by the chairman or rapporteur of the committee responsible. Parliament may fix a time-limit within which the committee shall report its conclusions to it.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, I had intended to oppose Mr Ferrero if he made a formal proposal. Indeed, I was expecting a proposal of this kind from the extreme right, if only for its sickening cynicism, the pressure of time notwithstanding.

Since Mr Ferrero has seen fit to appoint me an Ayatollah, I have no compunction about speaking as I do. So for the next minute or so I propose to hold forth like the Ayatollah Khomeini, since that is the kind of speaker he is looking for.

Mr President, Parliament has decided unanimously to put a motion for a resolution to the vote. The Office of the President and all the political groups have made it clear that they want a resolution adopted at this sitting.

Our Rules of Procedure provide for the right to table amendments to a motion for a resolution. Do you seriously mean to take that right away, Mr Ferrero?

Would somebody please tell me the reason for being in such a hurry? Why did we sit up all night, why did we spend the last few days discussing other amendments at considerable length? Perhaps the real problem is rather different, Mr Ferrero: on the one hand, another twenty or thirty thousand people will starve to death in the next hour or two and on the other, there is the matter of a hundred or so airline tickets. That is the only reason I can think of for all this hurry, and I fail to see why we cannot discuss these amendments for half an hour or so.

Mr Galland, I would put it to you that if we had not wasted our time arguing about all this, we could have quietly got on with putting the amendments to the vote; we would have withdrawn some, and stood by others, but we would have been able to get on with it.

We have every right to insist that you ensure that the Rules of Procedure are strictly applied. But if this is the position we are faced with, and if, moreover, the Communist Group says that we must either withdraw the amendments or the motion will not be put to the vote at this sitting, I would say to Mr Ferrero that we will have to give in to this dirty blackmail. If we have to choose between no resolution at all and the right to table and defend amendments, if we have no choice

Pannella

but to submit to this unworthy intimidation, then we shall do so; but I hope, Mr President, that we shall not have to make that choice.

President. — Mr Pannella must be aware that there can be no question here of blackmail; if there were, he would immediately have to bring the matter to the attention of the Chair. The Chair cannot accept that Mr Pannella is being blackmailed in any way, but I would point out, Mr Pannella, that a resolution was adopted unanimously in the committee of which Miss Flesch is chairman. If you wish to table a motion for a resolution of your own the procedure is very simple.

We were hoping to vote on the motion for a resolution without the amendments. If you continue to insist, I shall of course be required to put each of the amendments to the vote. You have the right to insist on that.

I call Miss Flesch.

Miss Flesch, Chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation. — (F) Mr President the position adopted by Mr Klepsch is perfectly correct: our Rules of Procedure do only provide for two possibilities: either we discuss the motion and the amendments and arrive at a result on the basis of a vote, or we decide that since time is pressing we are unable to accomplish such an exercise correctly, thoroughly and with dignity, in which case both the resolution and the amendments should be sent back to committee.

The proposal made by Mr Galland is only feasible if all the authors of the amendments are prepared to withdraw them, thus enabling a resolution to be adopted, however imperfect that resolution might be, and temporarily putting an end to our debate. They would of course be able to retable them afterwards in the interim period leading up to the major debate in February. If the authors of amendments regard this as intimidation or consider that they cannot withdraw their amendments, then the only two solutions available are those laid down in the Rules of Procedure.

For my part, I have pointed out as rapporteur, Mr President, that I would consider it highly regrettable if we were unable to close this debate by a vote on the motion for a resolution. However, if the amendments are maintained and their discussion insisted upon, I shall, in my capacity as rapporteur, in view of the late hour and the turn which the discussion has taken, much to my regret, have to invoke Rule 29 and have the entire item referred back to committee.

(Applause)

President. — Miss Flesch is proposing that all the amendments may have to be withdrawn. They would

then be discussed in committee. The only other possibility is for the motion for a resolution and the amendments to be referred automatically to the committee responsible.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, I must make a statement: Miss Flesch, it is just not true that there are only two possibilities. There is a third: under the Rules of Procedure we are entitled to proceed immediately to a vote on the amendments. We have withdrawn some, and we shall stand by others. We were particularly concerned that the amendment by the Committee on External Economic Relations should be put to the vote, but you were all in such a hurry to get away and close the sitting that you didn't even realize that.

The problem has nothing to do with politics. The only problem is that you are all in a hurry to get home. That is the only thing that is urgent. My congratulations to the House!

What I had particularly in mind Mr President, was this: If I am not mistaken — and I would like to have an assurance from the Chair on this point — the Rules stipulate that if we are not present to move our amendments, they are dropped. In that case, since the whole situation quite literally makes me sick, I am leaving. If the authors of other amendments leave too, their amendments will be dropped as well, and the rest of you can vote for whatever you like, if that's the kind of Parliament you want to be.

President. — I call Mrs Poirier.

Mrs Poirier. — (F) Since it seems to me that in this House one has to state one's positions several times for them to be heard, and there is a desire for the French Communists to contribute to the unanimity apparently desired on all sides, I feel obliged to restate our position. The position which I set out in committee and restated — I thought clearly — yesterday is the following: we shall abstain in the vote on the motion and we shall not take part in the vote on the amendments.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (I) I was under the impression that when a motion for a resolution is accompanied by amendments, the amendments have to be put to the vote before the motion. Since the Rules of Procedure have not, to my knowledge, been amended, any amendments there are must be put to the vote first, and you may not cause them to be dropped. The Rules of Procedure are quite clear on that point.

Bonino

Mr President, I would like to explain how the idea of walking out of the Chamber arose. I am one of the authors and signatories of the amendments and you can rest assured that I am no Ayatollah. It is simply that I have spent several nights working on these amendments, and I can assure you, Mr Ferrero, that I have no delusions of grandeur whatsoever; in preparing these amendments I simply thought that I was making a positive contribution to the adoption of more concrete measures, so that the effort put into this debate would not be wasted. Since we feel that it would be extremely disappointing for this debate to be closed without a resolution, we indicated that we would not be asking for a roll-call vote. All we want is to be allowed to make very brief statements on fifteen amendments, Mr Galland. If we take one minute for each, that will take fifteen minutes in all, according to my calculations. There is no parliamentary obstructionism in that. But what are we now being told? That there is an aeroplane leaving at one o'clock. Well, there was still time to take a vote, Mr Galland!

I realize that whatever work I do for this Assembly — and I work hard — is bound to be interpreted as an attempt to subvert your plans. However, since I want the resolution to be adopted, in spite of its limitations, I have decided to leave the Chamber. I would have Mr Galland know that to me it is a matter of principle and dignity not to withdraw these amendments, because I believe in them profoundly; and for that reason, I shall have to be content with their being dropped when I walk out. All the same, Mr President, when amendments to a motion for a resolution are tabled, the vote on the amendments is taken first. Is that clear?

President. — I call Miss Flesch.

Miss Flesch. — (*F*) Mr President, in view of the way the debate is progressing and with reference to the provisions of Rule 29 of the Rules of Procedure, I request that the motion for a resolution and the amendments be sent back to committee.

I would also request Mr President that you propose to the Assembly that it set itself a deadline and resume this matter during its ordinary November part-session.

President. — At the rapporteur's request, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) As a result of the request made by the committee chairman. Miss Flesch, under the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution and the amendments are being sent back to the committee responsible. However, it is up to the Assembly to

decide on the deadline by which the examination in committee must be completed. Miss Flesch proposed that the work be completed before the ordinary November part-session. I should like this to be the clearly expressed decision of Parliament.

President. — I call Miss Flesch, and I would ask her to propose a date.

Miss Flesch. — Mr President, I just proposed that the Assembly set a deadline, and as a deadline I suggested the ordinary November part-session, which means that the work should be completed before that part-session begins.

(*Uproar*)

President. — I put the rapporteur's proposal to the vote.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — Mr President, I should like to make a brief statement on behalf of my Group. We greatly deplore the fact that someone who only yesterday told this House that while we were talking, others were dying of starvation, should have prevented the vote on the resolution.

We merely want to underline the discrepancy between propaganda statements and reality. But I believe that the rapporteur has taken the only correct course of action.

(*Applause from certain quarter on the right*)

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Mr President, since the authors of the amendments had announced their intention to walk out of the Chamber — and I hope Mr Klepsch, in particular, is listening — the amendments could not have been called. All that remained, therefore, was to put the motion for a resolution to the vote, just as the group chairmen, wanted though they were elsewhere yesterday when we were discussing world hunger. If we are to protect ourselves against these contemptible tactics designed to present a distorted record of what actually happens, I think we need a silo, Mr President — a silo like the ones used to protect grain from rats; it might also help to prevent all the good intentions and elegant sentiments expressed in this Parliament from vanishing into thin air in the space of a few hours. The matter at issue is — and the report of proceedings will confirm this — that our amendments were dropped in our absence, and you still would not put the motion for a resolution to the vote!

President. — I must ask Members to refrain from any further personal exchanges.

* * *

President. — We shall now consider three motions for resolutions on fisheries policy.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Battersby report (Doc. 1-402/79): Conservation of fish stocks.*

The resolution is adopted.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Kirk report (Doc. 1-403/79): Reproduction of salmon in the Baltic.*

The resolution is adopted.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution (*Doc. 1-414/79*) by Mr Kirk and others: *Fisheries policy.*

The resolution is adopted.

* * *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Dalsass report (Doc. 1-396/79): Seeds sector.*

The resolution is adopted.

* * *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Colleselli report (Doc. 1-397/79): Organization of the market in rice.*

The resolution is adopted.

* * *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Martinet report (Doc. 1-399/79): Wines originating entirely in Greece.*

The resolution is adopted.

* * *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Filippi report (Doc. 1-420/79): Wines originating in Tunisia.*

The resolution is adopted.

* * *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Plumb report (Doc. 1-430/79): Damage caused by Hurricanes David and Frederick.*

The resolution is adopted.

8. *Compensation for the disaster affecting Orkney and Shetland agriculture*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-408/79/corr.) tabled by Mrs Ewing, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on compensation for the disaster affecting Orkney and Shetland agriculture.

I call Mrs Ewing.

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, could I first of all express my gratification and that of the farmers in the Orkney and Shetland Islands that this House by a very ample majority agreed to give time today to debate this subject.

I do not propose to keep the House very long, because I really have given in my motion for a resolution a fairly factual account of the reasons for tabling it. I would like however, to remind those of you who are not familiar with the terrain, that these are very remote archipelagoes. Shetland, for example, is 200 miles north of Aberdeen, the main port of supply. Jokes are made, of course, about how little sun they have there anyway, but they do have a harsh climate and harsh soil conditions even in average years. They have been the victims of two enormously difficult years with documented rainfall that has been extraordinarily excessive, so that the cattle, for instance, are in even by September. One fact might bring to your attention how serious the matter is. Because of their remoteness, it has been the practice for these islands to try to grow their own feed, but because of the weather this has proved impossible. Freight charges are really catastrophically heavy and many of the farmers are being put out of business.

I may say that although I have mentioned a figure, you must not think, as I said earlier, that this figure is being imagined by me or by the farmers. It is actually based on documentation which I can supply to the Commission, farm by farm, heading of damage by heading of damage, and I think the figure of 5 million therefore is very drastic indeed. Many of you will know that there is an oil-related industry in this area, but in case you think that this will solve the problems for these islands, perhaps I could just explain to you that it is known that within two to three years one thousand people in oil-related industry will be redundant. Only agriculture can give these persons employment.

I am sure you would wish to know that as a result, I am certain, of your deciding to have this debate, the Government of the United Kingdom has taken action. There was nothing to stop them doing it last week or the week before. The action taken by the Government of the United Kingdom, of which I gave notice to Commissioner Gundelach yesterday, is designed to give partial aid to these islands, but the amount of aid

Ewing

that they are going to give will, of course, cover only a tiny fraction of the damages suffered and will be spread not only over these remote islands but other islands as well. I am sure that the Parliament will wish to know that the simple fact of holding this debate has produced very drastic action already from the United Kingdom. However, I want to say to Commissioner Gundelach that my request still stands, because of course what is offered is just a fraction of what is needed.

There was a precedent last year in Scotland when snow fell heavily. It is a very dramatic thing when snow falls and causes blizzards and animals are lost. It is very tragic, very sudden, very clearcut. Amounts of money were paid by the Commission for that catastrophe. However, I would suggest that the failure of two harvests, the inability to work this difficult peaty soil, even with modern tractors, the failure of crop, the freight charges, the uncertainty caused, all add up to a far greater disaster than the one that set a precedent last year.

These islands have an economy that is based socially and economically on agriculture. I would therefore stress the points I have drawn to the attention of the Commission and hope that some help can be accorded.

President. — I call Mr Hutton to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Hutton. — Mr President, I want to support this request for special attention to be shown to the poor people of Orkney and Shetland. I think I am probably the only person in this House who has lived in Shetland which, as Mrs Ewing pointed out, after Greenland, is the most remote part of the European Community. I have lived there through the long bleak winter when the wind howls endlessly like a jet engine, and the sun only appears briefly every day. There are few natural advantages there, and in these last couple of years even those have disappeared.

In May of this year farmers in Shetland were trying to lamb in a blizzard. In June they were hand-feeding their lambs. The sheep have grazed out the grass, there has been no regrowth for autumn grazing, and the farmers will have to go through another winter knowing that there will be no grass in the spring and they will have to start the year by re-seeding. All the local feed had gone a year ago, extra feed had to be brought in to get through last winter, and that took all the farmers' spare cash. So now they have to go outside again to get through this coming winter. At least they are taking a European view, they are looking as far afield as Denmark and Germany to buy what hay they can find to survive, and the transport which brings that in will double the price.

The old folk of Shetland, the 80 and 90-year olds, can never remember a season so bad; it has been the wettest year since records began. This week, ladies and gentlemen, was the only dry week they have had in Shetland this year. Until September there had not been two dry days together. Water ran down the drills of the potato fields. Barley still lies uncut, and the cattle have been put on it because the machinery cannot get into the fields to cut it. Men have been cutting hay in Cunningsburgh under water, and carrying it uphill on their backs to dry it against their fences. In the main Shetland agricultural show this year, there was not one single entry of field crops. That has never happened before in the history of the show. People in the European Community in 1979 should not face a position as grim as that without our help. Half the normal acreage of hay has been cut, and that says nothing about its quality. A third of the islands dairy cattle looks like being sold, three quarters of the young stock is to go. The island of Unst, the most northerly island in this Community, has lost its dairy capacity altogether. The neighbouring island of Yell has had its dairy capacity cut by half, and because there are no other supplies in Shetland to make up the deficit, the milk has to be brought by boat from Aberdeen, two hundred miles away.

All this, as Mrs Ewing pointed out, has hit the Shetlanders at a particularly bad time. Building on the Sullon Voe oil terminal is now slowing down, and the Shetlanders had hoped to resettle the men who had been working on that project in agriculture. Now they have been hit by this. It is the young men who have not had time to build up cash reserves who are being hardest hit, and who are being forced to leave farming or cannot start at all. These are hardy people who are used to making the most of conditions which most of us would not tolerate. If we let these people go out of farming now, it will be to our shame. I beg the honourable Members of this House to give this resolution their wholehearted support.

President. — I call Mr Maher to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Maher. — Mr President, coming from Ireland I am very pleased to give generous support to Mrs Ewing's proposal. In Ireland we also have some offshore islands that have become depopulated because of their isolation and the difficulties of continuing farming there. I think perhaps in the medium and longer-term this is the real problem of these areas that Mrs Ewing is speaking about. The younger people are not prepared to continue living there; they will not accept the conditions of life. I think it is the responsibility of this Parliament to recognize this fact and to do anything that we can to alleviate the very great distress they are suffering at the moment. I think

Maher

it is important that we ensure that we at least make it a little more bearable for them to continue. They are a hardy race. I know some of them. I think we should recognize them as such; we should help them and support them. They do not want alms, but they are in a particularly difficult position and would appreciate some assistance. I think we have a responsibility to recognize that.

President. — I call Mr Provan.

Mr Provan. — Mr President, we have had three very good speeches, pleas or whatever you like to call them, from the Members who have already spoken in this debate. Mrs Ewing put the point extremely well when she said that there were very good, practical people who lived in that part of the world. I put it to you that they are independent people who would not normally ask for help, and it is significant that it is not they who are doing the pleading on this occasion, but three Members from the mainland of Scotland and one Member from Ireland are pleading on their behalf. The local government is helping the crofters with transport subsidies.

It was announced in the House of Commons yesterday, as Mrs Ewing so rightly said, that our Government is going to give national assistance. Far be it from me to contradict Mrs Ewing, but I totally reject her contention that this assistance was given because she had raised the matter in this House. Our Government has been looking at the situation in Orkney and Shetland for a period of weeks. We have had ministerial visits to sum up the situation for ourselves, and they have decided that the situation is so severe that it requires national assistance. What I ask of this House today is that we also go along with that, because it has been properly investigated, and ask for support from our Community funds for Orkney and Shetland. And I ask this House to call on the Commission to look at its disaster fund and to match, pound for pound, what our national Government is providing by way of assistance to these people.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) Mr President, the Orkney and Shetland Islands are perhaps not, as one of the previous speakers claimed, the most remote part or region of the European Community. There is also Greenland, for example, and as Members will remember from yesterday evening's debate, there will be a vote this morning on Martinique and Guadeloupe. However, that does not affect the case which has been put concerning living conditions on these islands and the handicaps under which their inhabitants suffer.

The Commission is aware of these difficulties, which are naturally due to the islands' remoteness and an

exceptionally severe climate. Whatever the circumstances, life is difficult there, as are economic activities. Owing to a number of climatic factors which have been described here this morning, the situation on the islands over the last few years and months has become dramatically worse. The Commission and myself have spoken with their representatives about the problems involved. These talks have given rise to an exchange of letters and the compiling of information, and the Commission is thus sufficiently prepared to meet the challenge — this point has indeed been made by other Members during the debate. It is the Commission's fundamental view that we cannot have a Community of any significance, worth and substance if we do not show solidarity with the remoter parts of the Community, where people live under extremely difficult conditions. We have adopted many measures to help regions situated closer to the centre of the Community. We should therefore be all the more willing to grant assistance in the short and longer term. It is in everybody's interests that remote places should remain inhabited. Depopulation, as mentioned by another earlier speaker, is in nobody's interests, as it would damage the Community as a whole.

The Commission therefore lends its full-hearted support to the motion for a resolution. I have been informed that the British and Scottish authorities are now taking certain measures but, as we also emphasized, this in no way precludes the need for additional assistance or cooperation among the Community institutions with regard to the necessary measures, which, as I understand the situation, should be partly designed to overcome certain existing and extremely serious difficulties, and also to ensure improved organization and stability in the future in both agriculture and fishing. It is not only a question of granting 'disaster aid', although that is the most urgent type of aid needed. It is also a question of solving certain problems of a more permanent nature to make life more attractive and ensure the maintenance of the population in these islands.

President.— The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

9. *Torture of children*

President.— The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-409/79) tabled by Mr Sarre, Mr Jaquet, Mr Didò, Mr Estier, Mrs Charzat, Mrs Cresson, Mrs Fuillet, Mrs Roudy, Mr Motchane, and Mr Loo, on the torture of children.

I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen the International Year of the Child will have been overshadowed by the publication of two reports.

Sarre

The first comes to us from the International Labour Office in Geneva. From this report we learn that in 1979, 52 million children are being put to work in the world. The report even states that there is every reason to believe that the number of children exercising an economic activity is infinitely higher than the statistics indicate. This figure alone demonstrates the scale of the problem, and should provide food for thought for the proponents of free trade. They should reflect on the conditions which allow the European markets to be flooded with low-price products and the way in which, through exploitation, the capitalist system succeeds in provoking the collapse of world prices. The second report, which concerns us more specifically today, was drawn up by the humanitarian organization, Amnesty International. It provides a frightening account of detentions, arrests and cases of torture. We know only too well, that Amnesty International has been far too vigilant and perspicacious in the past for us not to give full credence to its reports.

The enormity of these crimes is exemplified by the young Haitian who has been a political prisoner since childhood and was taken away from his family at the age of ten, by the repressive treatment of children in Argentina, by the massacres in Bangui where some 50 to 100 schoolchildren met their deaths in prison, by the events off Cape Town or the bodies of adolescents alongside the road to Addis Ababa.

And what can we say about the prisoners of Jakarta who, fourteen years of age when arrested in 1965, are still waiting in their cells?

Can we remain indifferent to such an indictment? Can such a denunciation fail to have an effect? Can we resign ourselves to the occurrence of such crimes?

I know that many of you are sceptical and doubt the effectiveness of interventions of this type. But just think about the consequences were we to remain silent!

If such deeds, which have been corroborated and established as true, were not immediately denounced, were banished from our conscience, it would mean that we no longer had anything to say or do. There would no longer be any obstacle to these bloody tyrannies. The silence would be tantamount to resignation. It is the duty of this Assembly to react vigorously against these crimes, and that is what I call on you to do by voting in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by the Socialist Group.

President. — I call Lord O'Hagan to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lord O'Hagan. — Mr President, we have heard a brief and useful introduction to this debate from Mr Sarre. He will, I hope, understand that different countries and different traditions of parliamentary and democratic assemblies lead different members and

groups in this Parliament to have different views about the way Parliament should work.

If we had a vote in this Assembly now or at any other time as to whether we were in favour or against the torture of children, not a single Member of this House would vote in favour of the torture of children. I don't know whether Mr Sarre would dispute that, but I trust the elected representatives of the people of this Community. I believe that we are all totally opposed to torture, particularly of children and, therefore, when one reads this detailed and moving report, one agrees with the sentiments of Mr Sarre, that this is something that must be opposed.

But coming from a country with a different parliamentary tradition to that of Mr Sarre, I do not think that every time there is an international, local, regional or world crime that we disapprove of, we must have a debate and a vote in this House. If we spend our whole time and all our efforts in plenary session denouncing crime after crime we shall never do our work as a representative assembly of the peoples of the Community, examining reports and looking at what can be done in practical terms from day to day to make the Community work.

So what I say to Mr Sarre is this: we must evolve a different procedure in this House. We have had a very good chairman today and I should like to congratulate the President for his conduct of today's business and his patience...

(Applause)

...but if we go on demanding this sort of patience then we shall soon exhaust this Parliament of candidates for the Vice-Presidency. We must evolve a new system so that those like Mr Sarre and his group, who have a right and a duty to express their feelings, can do so by circulating documents for signature, without having to deal with the matter on the floor of the House. We do not have to allow it to block the rest of the proceedings. When Parliament as a whole wishes to debate any subject of course we must do so. But urgent procedure is becoming not so much a farce, but a running sore on the body politic of the Community. What does the Council think of us? What does the Commission think of us? The way we conduct business in this House is disorderly and out of proportion. So, Mr President, I appeal to all those who have deep feelings to understand that by over-indulgence regarding requests for urgent debate we shall defeat the purpose of this Parliament. Unless we adopt a new procedure, we shall not be able to carry on with our job.

Mr Sarre, I agree with what you say. You are trying to do the right thing in the wrong way. Please understand if some of my group vote against you. I shall vote for you out of sympathy for your concern, but I disapprove, not of what you are doing, but of the way you are going about it.

President. — I call Mr Irmer to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Irmer. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, firstly I should like to refer to the statements made by the last speaker. In principle I agree with what he says. We must refrain from increasing our workload by requesting urgent debates on every single regrettable violation of human or civil rights, which occur every day. By that I mean that the honourable Member who has just spoken should discuss this matter within his own group, for the next item but one on the agenda concerns the situation in Malta. I also intend to speak on that matter later. Deplorable though the events in Malta may be, I fail to see why the basic procedural issue of whether or not we should paralyse ourselves with work should be decided in connection with what is for me the most dreadful topic in this whole context, that is the maltreatment, torture, and massacre of thousands or, better said, millions of children in the world. This subject cannot be a matter of indifference to this House, and if ever there were a motion protesting against it in favour of which every Member of this House should vote, then it is this motion tabled by Mr Sarre. My group will vote unreservedly and entirely in favour of this motion.

(Applause from the Left)

There is, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a second point of view regarding this matter. It is unfortunately true that many motions for a resolution obtain nothing more from this House than a moral appeal to the world not to accept these conditions, a moral appeal for a responsible return to reason and humanity. However, it is precisely here with respect to the maltreatment of children that we, as the European Community, have an opportunity of doing something tangible to counteract it at least in certain specific cases. I had submitted an oral question for Question Time which, unfortunately owing to the shortage of time, could not be dealt with. The oral question was also based on the Amnesty International report, and in fact concerned 5 000 Ethiopian children who had been tortured, treated as political prisoners or massacred. I asked the Commission whether, in this International Year of the Child, it was prepared to draw the consequences in relation to Ethiopia and, in particular, to re-consider the initiation of cooperation activities under the Lomé Agreement.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at the meeting of the Consultative Assembly of the Lomé Agreement in Luxembourg, two weeks ago, we failed to convince our partners in the Lomé Agreement of the very great importance we attach to the inclusion of a human rights clause in the new agreement. We were forced to note the rejection of this wish. However, when real cases of the violation of human rights in the partner

countries of the Lomé Agreement come to our knowledge, we should none the less also draw the economic consequences. Yesterday, we held a major debate on hunger on the world and agreed that the developed countries will have to make sacrifices because otherwise the major problems of the North/South conflict will not be solved. But how can we expect our nations and voters to make such sacrifices when day after day these same voters read of these violations of human rights in the newspapers? This is also a question on which our plans in the field of development policy stand or fall. For this reason, ladies and gentlemen, I take the view that this motion must be approved, and should at the same time take the form of an appeal to those responsible in the Council and the Commission expressing the desire of this Parliament to condemn and combat violations of human rights throughout the world and to condemn and take appropriate action against violations of human rights in those countries which are our partners in the Lomé I and Lomé II Agreements.

President. — I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, I shall honour what you say and speak for only a few seconds.

First of all may I address a remark to Lord O'Hagan. I think it is very unfortunate that he picked this particular resolution to make his point about urgent debate, because this group that we are discussing this morning is the only group that cannot speak in the major fora of the world and the only group that cannot choose who should speak on their behalf. I hope that he and his colleagues will, as they promised support unanimously the plea by Mr Sarre.

I am not going to speak for long, because Georges Sarre, my dear colleague, expressed what we all feel on this particular matter. My only hope is that we shall have a continuing debate throughout this Parliament on the rights of children. We all find the idea of physical torture abhorrent, but we must also consider the psychological effects on children, particularly by those living in advanced capitalist societies, of poverty, of being deprived of good educational standards, of going to school and then finding themselves without jobs. These are the kind of matters we have to speak about on behalf of children within these great fora of ours.

I think it is most unfortunate that after a seven-hour debate, I have to go home and say to people that this Parliament could not make a decision on a major area of concern, namely, world famine. I only hope that after this morning I do not have to go back to Britain and say also that the Members of this Parliament voted against a motion for a resolution about the torture and victimization of children. I support fully what my dear colleague, Georges Sarre said, and hope

Boyes

that everyone in this House will vote in favour of his motion.

President. — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (*I*) Mr President, I should like to say a few words about the torturing of children. This is an enormous problem, and while a resolution on it is welcome, it is certainly not enough. In yesterday's debate on world hunger, we were accused of never having pinpointed those really responsible for world hunger, but of confining ourselves to analysing the material causes. Well, it is easy enough to identify those responsible for all manner of violence against children — adults! Adults who have not been able to intervene in an effective way. There are also clashes of will here, clashes of interests which act against the easing of tensions, against disarmament, against freedom.

Today, twenty years after its publication, it is clear that all the rights set out in the UN Charter on the Rights of the Child continue to be violated. There is enormous neglect as regards the right to education, the right to a balanced upbringing, the right not to work. I need not go into the details of child labour dictated by the ruthless logic of maximizing profits.

Honourable Members, we must look at the underlying causes of all this, of the violence perpetrated on our children — and they are all our children, even if they also belong to others. They are the victims of a misguided development model. We can exert an influence on this misguided model and work for the creation of a new international order.

Our responsibility, then, is enormous. While we shall vote for the motion for a resolution, we would also urge that the debate should continue, quite independently of the International Year of the Child.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) I just want to say, Mr President, that the cynicism of those who claim urgent procedure for the incident in Malta, and vote for its adoption in the House, and then say that problems like the one we are now discussing, or the problem of world hunger, will have to wait, does not shock me. I will only say that in the end, the voters of Europe will find these fine people out and pay them back as they deserve.

Mr President, for my part I shall vote for Mr Sarre's motion, as I have voted for all the motions he has tabled, because I think they all deserve support. I would also like to add that if we were to put the truth about this Parliament on the record — I don't mean a vote by roll-call, don't worry — it would be seen that there are about a hundred of us left now. The ones who usually dominate the Assembly have gone off to

catch their planes, and the Left is temporarily in the majority. The cynicism of a certain type of Conservative — and I am not speaking of the British Conservatives — really knows no bounds.

Some of us could not be here for the debate on world hunger, Mr President. Now let's see how many stay on for the debate on Malta. The truth is that the irresponsible behaviour of those Members who have rushed away to catch their aeroplane, even although they have been paid to stay until this evening, just happens to suit the plans of the chairmen of the right-wing groups to sabotage the motion which was adopted in committee.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting. I propose that we now close the list of speakers for all the remaining items on the agenda.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

10. *Ad hoc* committee on women's rights

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-415/79) tabled by Mr Glinne and others, on the setting up of an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights.

I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (*NL*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, — those of you who are still here — the principle of equal rights for men and women is endorsed by every person in this Chamber. But the application of this principle in our countries leaves something to be desired. However united we may be about this principle, when it comes to considering how we can put an end to existing inequalities, opinions start to differ very quickly.

The Socialist Group has had detailed discussions on the setting up of an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights which is advocated in this motion for a resolution. In our discussion, it was emphasized that the ever-present danger of isolating 'women's affairs' from all other political questions must definitely be avoided. Furthermore, it was stated that Parliament must be on its guard against what has occurred so frequently in the past, namely that the existence of a body dealing specifically with subjects relating to women is used by others as an alibi, so that they themselves no longer have to consider these problems. As Socialists in this European Parliament we do not want this to happen.

What do we want then? We want a full plenary sitting of this Parliament to debate the unacceptable injustices to which women are still subjected. There

van den Heuvel

are still persistent injustices. One only has to remember how the directives laid down by the European Communities are in fact implemented in theory but not in practice.

Parliament must debate these questions thoroughly, and that debate must be well prepared. A plan must be drawn up so that, hopefully in the not too far distant future, this inequality can gradually be demolished and replaced by justice. The *ad hoc* committee must also make use of what has already been done by the European Communities in this field. The Socialist Group is pinning its hopes for the future on all existing parliamentary committees, and not least on the bureau for women's affairs of the European Commission. During the coming budget debate we shall be advocating that this should be strengthened. We consider that our intentions are clearly expressed in this motion for a resolution which has been tabled with the support of numerous Members. However, two amendments have been tabled to this resolution. We find the first amendment by Lady Elles and others absolutely unacceptable, as it rejects the *ad hoc* committee which we think desirable. The second amendment by Mrs Maij-Weggen and others has been studied carefully. We cannot agree with that one either in its present form. This is mainly because there is a risk that the work, which we think the *ad hoc* committee should be tackling as quickly as possible, would be seriously impeded by having to wait for a report on basic principles from the Commission. If — and we are prepared to accept this — the term of the *ad hoc* committee is to be limited beforehand to the beginning of this summer recess, then it must be able to begin its activities immediately. If the Christian-Democratic Group were prepared to alter their amendment such that there was no need to wait for the basic report and there was reference to collaboration with the European Commission our group would be able to agree to this amendment. There must be an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights, and there must be one as quickly as possible. I would make an urgent appeal to my colleagues to support the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne and others.

President. — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (NL) Mr President, I will be brief because of the time factor. We can support virtually everything Mrs Van den Heuvel has said. In principle, we support the concept of an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights. Our objection to the motion for a resolution was, however, that the task was not clearly defined and there was therefore a danger that all other committees would be exonerated from the task of considering discrimination against women in society. This seems particularly harmful, as we in this Parli-

ment would then be encouraging the very thing we are trying to change in society, i.e. the isolation of women.

Our amendment provides for a clear definition of the *ad hoc* committee's task of preparing a debate before the summer recess.

I have no objection to Mrs Van den Heuvel's request that the discussion should not be based exclusively on a report on basic principles from the Commission but that the *ad hoc* committee should develop its own activities right from the outset and thus work in collaboration with the Commission. After that discussion, which should take place before the meeting in Copenhagen, the existing parliamentary committees could start work on the basis of those results. In this way we will then provide for an integrated discussion in Parliament of the problems of equality of men and women, and as women we won't be getting in the way of our aims.

To sum up, we accept the requested correction to our amendment, and when our amendment is accepted we want to work constructively with the *ad hoc* committee and assist with the numerous tasks which will arise in the various committees. Women in Europe can rely on the support of our group.

President. — I would point out to the gentlemen present that the ladies have set an example of eloquence and brevity which we would all do well to follow.

(Applause)

I call Lady Elles to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lady Elles. — Mr President, it is significant that it is only women who are taking part in this debate, and this rather supports the view that I hold on this particular point. I absolutely accept with Mrs van den Heuvel that all of us in this Parliament want a fair and just society, and that there should be no discrimination against anybody on grounds of sex. The question is, how do we do it? As she rightly said, we have a division as to the best way of obtaining the results we all desire.

Mr President, why are we having an urgent debate on this particular matter? After all discrimination has existed since Eve, and I can't think that having an urgent debate at this particular juncture is going to solve all our problems.

Secondly, with regard to the *ad hoc* committee, who would chair it? Will any senior political man in this Parliament be willing to serve on that committee? I would challenge the Socialists, and I hope they will prove earnest of their intentions, if I may use such an awful pun, to see that at least one senior man politician from the Socialist Party is made to sit on it and attend it without a woman substitute.

Lady Elles

Thirdly, I would like to say that I very much doubt if any action will come out of it. What in fact will happen is that every time a matter involving women is discussed in any of the relevant committees of Parliament, that discussion will be closed and the matter will be passed to this *ad hoc* committee. All those of us who have fought against discrimination in our own countries — and I expect that probably most of the women in this Parliament have done so — will know that if you have a women's committee on women, all subjects to do with women will be shoved on to that *ad hoc* committee. There will never be an integrated debate in any of the other relevant committees, and this *ad hoc* committee will in fact become a burial ground for proposals of women's affairs. To me the idea of having a special committee on the integration of 50 % of the population is abhorrent, if not absurd.

Mr President, if we really want to see what Parliament can do in this field, I would suggest that the proposals that I have put forward are simple, quick and effective. Mine is the only amendment which does in fact request that at the end of our various discussions in the different relevant committees of the Parliament, the Commission and the Council will propose measures on which they will have to take action. That is, after all, what we want. To all those political parties represented here who are perhaps not so progressive as the Conservative Party, I would wish that, as a result, you too may have a woman leader of your party, and even perhaps eventually a woman prime minister of one of your countries. How proud we are in our country that we are the first in Europe to have that.

(Applause)

In conclusion, Mr President I will just take this opportunity to say a word to somebody who is a Member of this House, but who has not, by his vocabulary, shown himself to be worthy of it, or to be believed. I very much resent the attack by Mr Pannella on the attitudes and policies of my party. It is totally without foundation, and it is beyond the terminology of any parliament that I have seen operating that these kind of words should be used.

If he wishes to be treated as a credible person, he should behave in accordance with the rules of parliamentary procedure.

President. — I must ask all Members to make every effort to avoid personal references of any kind.

I call Mrs Demarch to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Demarch. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the French members of the Communist and Allies Group I should like to explain the thinking behind the motion for a resolution which we

have signed. I firmly believe that our Assembly would do itself credit by setting up as soon as possible an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights, which would not encroach on the responsibilities of other committees.

In a period which is marked by the progress of women in their struggle for greater justice, equality and freedom, the Treaty of Rome is still far from being respected some 22 years after it was signed. Given this situation, how can we in this forum oppose the setting up of a committee which would listen to the views of the women of the Community as presented to it by women, study and deal with the various aspects of the special position of women? How can anyone therefore take exception to urgency?

Is it so difficult to accept the fact that outdated ideas still impinge heavily on the lives of women today? Perhaps we want to avoid facing up to the issue. Is the truth about the Europe of uncertainty and anguish living in terms of viability and profits at the expense of its social investments so intolerable that we should want to hide the Europe of inequalities?

How can one speak of equality when unemployment makes a mockery of the rights of millions of women, when firms with a female labour force are closed down in the interests of profit and reorganization, when wage discrimination is still practised in industry today — these are hard facts — with the result that women earn 24 % less than men in France, 27 % less in the Federal Republic of Germany and 29 % less in the United Kingdom? Where is the equality provided for in the Treaty of Rome when austerity measures hit social, health and cultural facilities? How can one speak of equality when certain professions are closed to women in the countries of the Community and when it is planned in the enlarged Community to whittle down to the lowest common denominator the advantages which women in our own countries have struggled to obtain in the field of social legislation, working conditions, training facilities for women, and which affect women's freedom of choice in all aspects of their lives?

There is no doubt in our minds that the austerity measures advocated by European governments run counter to any genuine progress for women by aggravating, organizing and legalizing differences of class and sex. We have no illusions on this score. Further progress towards the liberation of women will be achieved at national level, in our individual countries and as a result of direct action by women. In the meantime, however as far as the powers of this Assembly and its Members are concerned, an *ad hoc* committee on rights and equality for women, as requested by the Bureau at its meeting of 9 October when it voted in favour of such a proposal, would really help women to

Demarch

improve their lot by highlighting instances of failure to apply the Treaty of Rome and the directives and by reporting to our Assembly at its part-sessions. While respecting the sovereignty and independence of the Member States of the Community, this *ad hoc* committee would enable us to put forward recommendations to the various governments.

I feel that all the reasons I have given justify the request for urgent procedure for the motion for a resolution which we the French members of the Communist and Allies Group, have signed and which I would ask this Assembly now to approve.

President. — I call Mrs von Alemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs von Alemann. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, during the campaign for the first direct European elections women were particularly keen to find out what this Parliament and the European Institutions could do to improve the situation of women in the Community. In all the German *Länder* in which I spoke during the campaign, it was clear that basically women were only too willing to actively support this Europe which we have been elected to represent, and that the doubts often expressed by men regarding the problems of national sovereignty were not shared by the women.

We must give these same women some indication that we in this House are prepared to do something to improve their situation. It is for this reason that the Liberals together with other groups have proposed this *ad hoc* committee and, Lady Elles, why urgent debate was appropriate. If, as you say, inequality between the sexes has existed since Adam and Eve, then it is perhaps time to make some changes. Like Mrs van den Heuvel, for the sake of effective cooperation in this House, I give my group's support for the proposal made by Mrs Maij-Weggen on behalf of the Christian Democrats.

I said for the sake of effective cooperation in the future, as I was ashamed the day before yesterday to find that in this House a question of priorities is regarded as more important than the substance of the matter under discussion. I would have liked it very much if our motion had been accepted as it stood, but I believe that this is at least a sign that we are prepared to work together as women in this Parliament.

I agree with the previous speaker that the committee should not be composed only of women. We do not wish to be relegated to a ghetto, Lay Elles; none of us would want that. We all know that this will not happen, for if we include some men in this committee, it will certainly do a good job although women alone could also do a lot of good work.

One more thing, Lady Elles. You say that the British Conservatives are so progressive because they have a woman prime minister. Two energetic women — one could perhaps think of a second — cannot achieve equal rights for women on their own. This is why I support this motion and reject yours, as I believe it does not go far enough.

I should like to ask all the Members of this House to make a real efforts in future to adhere not only to the time-limits for speeches but also to sensible rules of procedure, not least out of consideration for our women voters. They ask me why we have night meetings when a great many people, Mr Pannella, are sitting here this morning relaxed and bright who did not remain until the end of proceedings last night and why we deal with the agenda the way we do at present. Why can we not have a little more sense here gentlemen? I hope that we women can help to bring this about.

President. — Personally, I can only say that I agree totally with your complaints.

I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (*I*) Mr President, today marks a very important stage in the life of the European Parliament and of Europe and on the way towards finding a solution to the problem of the situation of women in general. I hope that at the end of this sitting, approval will be given for the setting up of this *ad hoc* committee for women's rights.

This is not the ultimate goal but only a step forward for the women of the nine Member States of the European Economic Community. The way ahead is very long and cannot be covered all at once in a single moment. No fewer than 18 years elapsed between the signing of the Rome Treaty and the adoption of the directive on equal pay. Lady Elles should remember this, as she was rapporteur for the first directive on equal pay. Many more years elapsed before the directive on equal treatment for men and women at work and in education was adopted. Progress is slow. Why then are we asking for urgent debate? We are doing so simply because we no longer intend to wait such a long time, to talk in terms of centuries, or millenia, or even decades.

What should this *ad hoc* committee do? It should be an instrument for improving the situation of women in Europe. But in improving the situation of women in Europe we should automatically extend our field of operation to women throughout the world.

Our situation should serve as an incentive, a stimulus and an example which will help to improve conditions for women in all countries of the world. Everyone can make their own improvements to this instrument, that is to the committee. I feel that of the propo-

Squarcialupi

sed amendments the one tabled by my colleague, Mrs Maij-Weggen, who is deeply committed to the emancipation of women, could be accepted, subject to some improvements.

This committee must find an even better way to resolve the contradictions between the real situation of women and the image which is projected. Some people, it is true, are mistrustful and sceptical. I have had few opportunities to get to know my present fellow Members, but I have faith in them from the short acquaintance I have made and because of the opportunity I have had during the election campaign to get to know more closely the other women who make up our electorate.

It does not matter who first thought of setting up this committee: we all wanted it, including those who perhaps do not want it at present or would like it to be different. The important thing will be to vie with each other in the committee in order to extract the best from it and to prevent the discussion from being confined to ourselves. It is also important to clarify our ideas, to establish a dialogue among ourselves as members of the European Parliament and as European women representing other European women. We should not be shocked to find ourselves only among women on many occasions. It is both useful and important that women should know each other. We should follow the example of the working classes. The workers did not begin by negotiating with the employers; they first discussed matters among themselves and clarified their ideas, then they were able to fight.

Mr President, you have known me for rather a long time. I am tempted to continue but I wish to be brief; brevity should be one of the characteristics of politics, feminine-style, in an institution in which women should play an increasing and more effective role.

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, when the Community was set up so many years ago the issue of equal pay for men and women almost brought it to a halt. How sad it is that the discussions which took place then have not produced many results in the shape of equal pay for men and women. There are still enormous discrepancies in the Community. There is therefore all the more reason for us to make great efforts to achieve equality for men and women in our society. I am therefore very pleased with the motion tabled by the Socialist Group and others which I also signed.

To a certain extent, I see this motion as the follow-up or at least the tangible result of a proposal that my col-

league, Mr De Goede and I put to the European Parliament in the form of a request to the President of the European Parliament. We referred to a statement from our party congress in the Netherlands which stated that it was high time for a specific European organization to deal seriously with the question of equal pay for men and women. Our letter to the President of the European Parliament was passed on to the Chairmen of the political groups, and has resulted in this specific proposal for an *ad hoc* committee on the position of women. There is another reason why I feel there is an urgent need to set up such a committee, and that is my own few experiences during the part-sessions of this Parliament which I have attended.

I have noticed that there is absolutely no forum where subjects relating to women can be discussed. I also noticed that during the part-sessions and in the intervening periods numerous questions were asked both by the electorate and the press on the efforts the European Parliament was going to make to get this thing started. These are all reasons for setting up a separate committee, though I myself am convinced that it should be an *ad hoc* committee. A permanent committee may not be necessary to discuss the question of inequality of women. I also rather deplore the fact that such a rigid term for the *ad hoc* committee's mandate is being fixed in advance.

When this *ad hoc* committee starts to deal with new subjects, discusses all sorts of problems and develops many new activities then it must be granted time to do this. I hope that this *ad hoc* committee will make as many contacts as possible with Member States and with women, and will study the position of women in the various Member States. If this is the case then this *ad hoc* committee has a lot of work waiting for it, and we cannot therefore determine in advance when it will have completed its task. There are also the problems which it will doubtless encounter if it is doing its job properly. I certainly agree that some dates must definitely be fixed now and that things must be tackled as quickly as possible. Nor am I opposed to the idea that a strict timetable should be arranged within which the committee must complete its work.

I also wondered whether we were not in fact turning the thing upside down as in the amendment by Mrs Maij-Weggen, on behalf of the Christian Democrats, we would have to wait for a report from the Commission which would then act as a basis for the *ad hoc* committee's activities. The European Parliament must do the thinking, particularly because of our links with the electorate and the suggestions which we receive from them. This is just by the way, and I certainly am not trying to suggest that the Commission could not

Johnson

do the necessary. The Commission has already shown what it is able to do, and has done what is required in the economic sector for equal pay for men and women.

Finally, I would like to address myself to the gentlemen, as I rather gather from previous speakers that they are inclined to think this is some kind of 'ladies only' club. I would like to warn them that when this club actually starts achieving things, as I hope it will, this will affect the position of men too as the position of women — who are half of the population — cannot be changed without men being aware of it. I would therefore also like to ask for the attention and collaboration of the gentlemen.

President. — I call Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, as a token male speaker, may I reply particularly to what the last speaker has just said. It is of course, absolutely right that we should all be involved, and I just want to say how much I welcome this debate, as a man.

(Laughter)

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

11. *Violation of the freedom of the press in Malta*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-419/79) tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on violations of the freedom of the press and private property in Malta.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, I beg to move the motion for a resolution standing in my name.

This debate concerns the events which took place in Malta on Monday 15 October, the 13th anniversary of the election of Mr Mintoff as leader of the Maltese Labour Party. I thought a very brief recital of what exactly happened might be appropriate at this moment. At about 1 pm on that day a shooting took place at the castle where the offices of the prime minister are situated. It may well be that an attempt was intended on the prime minister's life, but the purpose of the intruder, Grima, in his political orientation, is not known. He was wounded and arrested. But later in the day, demonstrators celebrating Mr Mintoff's leadership of the Maltese Labour Party gathered in Valletta, and judging by the reports in the socialist daily newspaper, *Daily News*, dated 16 October, this was a planned celebration rather than a popular reaction to what might be called an attempt on Mr Mintoff's life. As the crowd was breaking up that evening, some of

the prime minister's supporters broke through the police barricades in Queen's Square, and broke into and broke up the offices of the Maltese Nationalist Party club. The crowd then ran towards the premises of Allied Newspapers Ltd., where the *Times of Malta* newspaper is printed. The newspaper does not voice socialist opinion, obviously. The fire which resulted took more than three hours to extinguish, and later that evening clubs of the Maltese Nationalist Party in other parts of Malta were damaged by arsonists. Then, to complete their evening's work, the crowd attacked, looted and broke up the home of the leader of the parliamentary opposition in Malta, Dr Adami, whose wife was physically attacked in front of him and brought to the ground. Spokesmen for the Maltese government have condemned this violence, quite properly, and a member of the Maltese Labour Party, speaking in the Maltese parliament last Friday, said that the prime minister had ordered police reinforcements to the headquarters of the Maltese Nationalist Party. Clearly the protection proved inadequate, and the character of the targets for the mob violence strongly suggests that the supporters of the Maltese Labour Party were less interested in the ballot box and in true democracy, than the suppression of political opposition by violence or intimidation.

We have an awful lot of violence in Europe — we all know this — and this is no exception to what has been going on in many of our countries. But nevertheless this is a time when I think this House should condemn it. What one wants to know is: Was the attack on the *Times of Malta* an attempt to suppress the opinions of that newspaper? Was the forced entry to the premises of the *Times of Malta* organized by individuals holding office in the organization of the Maltese Labour Party? Is the Maltese Government guilty of violation of Article 42 of the Maltese Constitution? Article 39 (1) of the Constitution states:

Except with his own consent or by way of parental discipline, no person shall be subjected to the search of his person or property, or the entry by others to his premises.

One must ask: Is the attack on property by a mob an indication of the absence of respect for property enshrined in the Maltese Constitution? We all know what happened, Mr President. There were the attacks on people, there was a savage attack on the leader of the opposition's wife, Mrs Adami, damage was done to the property of the leader of the opposition, and indeed damage was done at an earlier stage to the *Times of Malta*. I do not believe that this House can let these matters go by without passing comment on them. They were an attack on human rights, they were an attack on the freedom of the Press to express opinions contrary to that of the government of the day. We all of us uphold the principle that there

Habsburg

should be freedom, we all uphold the principles that political violence is not the way to solve political differences. I ask this House to join with me in condemning these actions and supporting the proper constitution of Malta. And I hope that the Maltese Government of today will agree to do that, and will take steps to make certain that events such as this do not happen yet again. I think the resolution that I am moving is a modest one, underlining these facts. They are indisputable; no one would deny that they actually happened. I think it is up to this House to condemn them and ask the government of Malta to see that their own Constitution is upheld in the future. I beg to move.

President. — I call Mr Habsburg to speak on behalf of the Group of European People's Party (C-D-Group).

Mr Habsburg. — (D) Mr President, the European People's Party (Christian-Democrat Group) supports Mr Scott-Hopkins's motion. We do so not only because we have a special responsibility towards Malta, which is, after all, a part of Europe which we can only hope will one day join our Community, but also because on hearing of the incidents of 15 October the European People's Party sent a fact-finding delegation to Malta. The delegation was led by Mrs Cassanmagnano-Cerretti, who is unfortunately no longer able to be with us. I was a member of this delegation, and can therefore speak from my own experience.

First, I should like to stress that the man who opened fire in the prime minister's ante-chamber was a member of the prime minister's own party and — as letters which he has since written show — is clearly mentally disturbed and was quite rightly therefore admitted to a psychiatric clinic. It was not therefore an attempt on anyone's life in the normal sense. What happened afterwards was, alas, well organized by a small close-knit group. It was not a mass demonstration; the attack on the *Times of Malta*, for example, was carried out by no more than 50 people. What was particularly outrageous was that the police stood idly by and were not allowed to interfere and that the *Times of Malta* building is right next to the prime minister's office from which the events could be closely observed.

I should also like to point out that everyone in Malta knows the names of those who took part in the attack on the *Times of Malta*. Most of them are employed by the public cleansing department of La Valetta and Floriana and were obviously secretly drafted in. Their leader is always present at meetings attended by the prime minister as he is more or less part of the latter's personal bodyguard.

The attack on the opposition leader's house was an extremely dangerous incident. I was able to talk to his

wife, who is still suffering from her injuries. She received fairly serious wounds as a result of blows to her face and other parts of the body. What was perhaps worse was the fact that the opposition leader's 79 year-old mother was threatened and his children beaten.

In other words, this was a deliberate attempt to terrorize Malta, Mr President. These incidents are part of efforts to radically change the government of Malta. It has already reached a point where half the population no longer trusts the police or the courts of Malta. It is also intolerable that nothing has been done so far, although the attackers are known and they were photographed at the scene. I believe therefore that it is incumbent on this Parliament to make it clear that such actions are intolerable. Over and above this, we must try to give firm support to the democratic forces in Malta which are still strong, and in this connection, Mr President, we must not overlook the fact that Europe enjoys enormous prestige in Malta. The vast majority of Maltese would like to join Europe. In addition, they live in the permanent shadow of a neighbouring power, namely Gaddafi's Libya. They do not want to join Libya, they want to join us. One more point. The population of Malta feels cut off from the rest of the world and isolated. We should therefore say quite clearly to the people of Malta that this Parliament supports democracy throughout the Mediterranean, particularly in those places where we have direct responsibility such as Malta. This motion for a resolution is a manifestation of that responsibility.

President. — I call Mr Irmer to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Irmer. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. My group has spoken against this motion being approved by urgent procedure. I must emphasize, however, that we endorse the content of the motion and will vote for it. The reasons for our opposition to urgent procedure have already been aired. We feel that too many requests for urgent procedure would pose a threat to Parliament's ability to carry out its work. I urge all our colleagues to exercise a bit more restraint from the next part-session onwards, otherwise we will make no progress with our work.

And now let us turn to Malta: the brutal attack on the family of a member of the opposition and the attempt to silence a critical newspaper are clear signs that Malta could be moving along a grim and dangerous path. These dangerous tendencies must be nipped in the bud: the time has come to give a clear indication that public opinion in Europe will not tolerate this. We must make our influence felt. There are undoub-

Irmer

tedly worse situations in the world, and we have had to deal with some of these cases in the course of this part-session. The events in Malta are insignificant compared to the situation in South-East Asia and the Horn of Africa and the violations of human rights in South Africa. But Malta is of special significance for us. It is represented in this building as a member of the Council of Europe. Malta has close ties with us from the economic, cultural and indeed every point of view, and it is situated on our doorstep. The nearer such violations of rights are the more sensitive we should be.

I also feel that an appeal by the European Parliament in the form of this resolution must succeed, as Malta will be more inclined to listen to European public opinion than many other countries which are further away from us.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let me now make a special plea to our colleagues from the Socialist Group. Malta's Labour Party, which is led by Mr Dom Mintoff, is not merely an associated but a full member of the Socialist International. Throughout their history the Social Democrats have always fought with honour and commitment to uphold justice and human rights.

In my opinion, it would be in the Socialists' own interests to protect their good name, particularly when such things happen in their own camp. Furthermore, they should also strive within their own party to ensure that such developments and events do not recur and that Malta returns to the path of democracy upon which it had made a promising start.

I see two ways in which this resolution may succeed if it is adopted. First, the fact that it has been passed by the European Parliament may stop Malta from following this disastrous course. Second, if the Socialist Group also approved the resolution this would be a clear sign that it was prepared to rectify mistakes within its own camp and was mindful of its great and honourable tradition.

President. — I call Mr Bersani.

Mr Bersani. — (1) Mr President, fellow Members it clear from the motion for a resolution which we are discussing that our interest in the problems of Malta is multi-faceted.

First, Malta has signed an association agreement with us which provides for full membership of the Community to be achieved in gradual stages. Second, there is a whole series of agreements which provide *inter alia* for a joint parliamentary committee of which I am a member. This has met many times in Malta, and has had occasion in the past to take note of repeated instances of violence resulting from particular political circumstances.

In addition, as many of my fellow Members have pointed out, there is our general interest in ensuring that the basic principles of freedom, co-existence, and political pluralism which have developed in the most orderly fashion, particularly in those countries nearest to us, may always continue to develop everywhere. As I have also had a few opportunities in the past to see for myself on the spot the grave concern aroused and the disruption caused to the normal democratic processes of the island of Malta by such violent interludes, I feel that we must underline the seriousness of the recent incidents and give our full backing to the organizations and individuals concerned. I know Fenech Adami very well. I talked to him and his family on the telephone a few hours after the incident, and can confirm what my colleague Mr Habsburg has said. The attempt to destroy the printing house and the attack on the most senior opposition leader — who quite apart from the office he holds is worthy of the greatest respect — are events which must be treated very seriously, particularly — I repeat — as they are not isolated incidents, but part of a whole series of acts of violence and strife which has been justly condemned here.

We must therefore show solidarity and support for the restoration of a situation free from the suspicion and fear which has once again spread over the island as on several past occasions.

Urgency is justified because the situation is still tense. A calm, firm and decisive message from us at this time will have the greatest impact. To those colleagues of the Maltese Labour Party who sit with some of us on the Joint Committee I would like to say that we look to them for a critical reassessment so that the basis of democratic conditions in Malta can be fully restored.

I would repeat that there are certainly some aspects of the democratic processes in Malta which in our opinion should follow different lines. It is inconceivable that attacks of this type should be used in an attempt to engender widespread fear among other sections of the population. Malta is very small with the result that party disputes and dialectics once they reach a certain point may have extremely far-reaching consequences. It is for this reason, Mr President, that I also wish — in my capacity as a former and present member of the Joint Parliamentary Committee — to add my voice to those of my fellow members, and I should like to conclude, Mr President, by saying that the committee, which undoubtedly has had a positive influence on democratic processes in Malta over a certain period of time, even in the face of the social problems predicted as a result of the complete dismantling of military bases, has unfortunately suspended its work for several months.

Bersani

This would be an opportunity for us to express here our wish that the committee should resume its work as soon as possible to study what specific steps could be taken to reactivate economic, financial and social cooperation. At the political level there is the moderating influence and support which we can give to the cause of freedom and democracy, which is certainly of fundamental importance to all of us.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

12. *Arrest of six Czechoslovakian citizens*

President. — the next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-428/79) tabled by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Langes, Mr Bersani, Mr Narducci, Mrs Majj-Weggen, Mr Michel, Mr Spautz and Mr Luster, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D) on the arrest of six Czechoslovakian citizens.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Mr President, I have two points to deal with: first I would like to ask the House to approve a verbal amendment to the text, which I feel should not be restricted to the cases of the four Catholic priests but should read as follows: 'having learned of the arrest and sentencing of Czechoslovakian dissidents in the various cities in Bohemia and Moravia'.

My group would not like to give the impression that only certain individuals are involved. We want to include all those concerned and would therefore like in paragraph 1 after the words: 'Expresses its deep regret at the new arrests' to add: 'and sentencing'. The rest of the text would remain unchanged. I have endeavoured to keep the other groups informed of this, so they already have an overall picture of the situation.

I should like to say a few words about the matter at hand. When the motion for a resolution was being prepared and presented it was said that we wished above all to safeguard human rights in the whole of Europe particularly in the light of the Helsinki Agreement, and therefore to condemn this blow against the civil rights movement. I would like to support what our colleague Mr Pelikan has said on behalf of the Socialist Group and I believe the House will have no difficulty in approving the motion.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Battersby to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Battersby. — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have visited Czechoslovakia on many occasions over many years. I was there during the

Novotny régime, before and after Dubcek, and in the early years of Mr Husak. I have travelled widely in that wonderful country. I have seen the intellectual force and quality of the Czech and Slovak peoples and have the greatest admiration and respect for these old, noble and highly cultured European nations. I also saw and felt the disillusion when in 1968, Czechoslovakia was invaded and occupied by its own Warsaw Pact allies. Their despair was exemplified by Jan Palach and the mass exodus of hundreds of thousands of its people to the West.

With the Helsinki Agreement there was again hope for the Czechoslovak people; hope that some light, some fresh air, some harmless freedom of expression would come into their intellectual and spiritual life. Where are these hopes now? The arrest of the six, whose only offence was to monitor the Helsinki Agreement which the Czechoslovak Government of Mr Husak entered into freely, and the savage sentences handed down are a matter of grave concern for us all, especially in view of the important meeting scheduled for next year. Are the six to be hostages for this meeting? Are there to be more? Therefore, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, I urge that all Members of this House, all who believe in the dignity of Man and in his fundamental freedoms, support this resolution and the amendment tabled a few moments ago by Mr Klepsch.

President. — I call Mr Damette to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Damette. — (*F*) Ladies and gentlemen, the French Communists did not wait until this Assembly met before vigorously condemning the injustices and the intolerable methods used in Czechoslovakia. However, our condemnation is not on the same lines as certain protests of a highly political nature. In our case it is basic and indignant condemnation of actions which are foreign to socialism and which distort it in an unacceptable manner. Our concern for human rights is neither selective nor determined by prevailing political considerations. The same cannot be said of those who tabled this motion for a resolution.

We will therefore vote against this resolution for two reasons. Firstly, because we refuse to regard this Assembly as the international court for human rights it claims to be. Secondly, because we refuse to subscribe to the view that human rights are a product reserved for export. We feel that in matters of such a serious nature we should attend first to our own affairs. All the discussions we have had are based on the assumption that Western Europe is a model for the rest of the world and has solved all its problems once and for all. We do not support this view in the least, as we feel that there are widespread violations of

Dannette

human rights every day in Western Europe. I would also like to take up my comrade Mr Denis's proposal that a debate on human rights in the European Community be organized in the near future in this Assembly. I can already suggest the first topic for the debate, namely the right to work and the rights of man at work in the European Community. We ourselves have a great deal to contribute on this subject.

President. — I call Mr Balfe.

Mr Balfe. — Mr President, someone once observed that there was nothing quite as nauseating as the British Conservative Party in one of their periodic fits of morality. I am really beginning to think that the test that we apply to various situations in the world gets stricter the further away we get from Britain. We have a group opposite, supported by people in this House, who express concern for virtually anything that anyone else does to violate human rights outside their own country and outside Europe, yet they seem to be peculiarly blind when it actually comes to looking inside their own country, or looking at any of the countries with which they consider they have friendly relations. I want to say one or two things about human rights — and they do have a bearing on Czechoslovakia, just in case you are worried, Mr President. There are some people in my constituency in England who are very concerned about human rights in Czechoslovakia, because they hope that what the British Conservatives are learning might lead to a few more human rights in places like Brixton and Peckham in England, where you can still be picked up on suspicion without having committed a crime at all. I notice that this resolution expresses extreme regret at the imprisonment of six Czechoslovakian citizens. Let me tell this House that every day of the week people are picked up in my constituency for an offence in English law known as 'suspicion', which basically means policemen do not like what you look like, and if you are poor, and if you are black that is it! So, let us have a bit of equality about that.

Let us also look at the question of human rights. I wonder how many Czech policemen at the moment are under investigation for murder. But that is what happened in the police force in Southall in London. The investigation — the cover-up — is still ~~still~~ ^{still} going on. We do not hear much about the human rights there. We do not hear much about human rights in Northern Ireland, where there is an abject and flagrant denial of human rights, which, were it repeated in Czechoslovakia would, I am sure, justify a resolution many pages long.

We do not hear much about human rights in the rest of Western Europe. I also think that we should be looking for a debate on human rights in Europe. Let me remind you, Czechoslovakia is in Europe — and so is France. They are both in the same Europe.

Many violations of human rights occur within these communities. I have yet to see them referred to with the same degree of concern as is regularly reserved for some countries in certain parts of the world. I say some parts of the world, because I look at the benches opposite and remember that at the last part-session we had the immortal words from there that human rights in Nicaragua was not an urgent issue. It was not an urgent issue, because if you are a fascist you are a friend. We have apologies for South Africa, coming regularly from certain benches within this House. The record of the other side on human rights is an extremely selective record. They choose to use a sort of emotional blackmail which consists in putting down resolutions such as this one, using their heavy majority in the House to get those resolutions debated and then using a moral blackmail which consists in saying: 'Well you have got to vote for this, otherwise you stand condemned as not being in favour of human rights.'

Let me make it clear that I am in favour of human rights, I am especially in favour of human rights for poor people, for working class people, for the minorities of Europe, and I am even more in favour of human rights for people who live in the British Isles, which is the country that I come from, the country that I represent and the country that has precious little to lecture others about on the subject of human rights.

I support human rights in Czechoslovakia, but I will not be voting for a resolution which has been put on the order paper because of bias and because of the particular feelings of one group for a very selective approach to human rights.

President. — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman on a point of order.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, I should like to correct a mis-statement by the honourable Member opposite who attacked the British police in a most scandalous way when they are not here to defend themselves. It has already been proved that the weapon used in Southall was not in fact, a police truncheon. These policemen uphold the safety of the British citizen, and it is scandalous that a British citizen should come over here and attack them in this cowardly way.

President. — I call Mr Balfe on a point of order.

Mr Balfe. — Mr President, there have been several instances of unexplained deaths in police stations in Britain. The police are not all white, so let us be clear about that.

(Laughter)

President. — We are not in the British Parliament here. This is the European Parliament, and this is not a point of order.

(Applause)

The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

13. *Control of agricultural expenditure*

President. — The next item is the oral question without debate (Doc. 1-301/79) by Mrs Castle, to the Commission :

Subject : Firm control of agricultural expenditure.

To ask the Commission what proposals it has to bring agricultural expenditure (EAGGF) Guarantee Section under firm control.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DK)* Mr President, first of all it must be demonstrated, so that we can have a common basis for our debate, that expenditure under the common agricultural policy has reached a peak which is unacceptable. Over the last six years — including 1980 — it has increased from approximately 5 000 million units of account to 16 or 17 000 million. However, it must be pointed out that the dairy sector accounts for almost 45 % of that increase in expenditure. In other sectors the increase is already down to only 10 % and these include cereals, meat and sugar, as vegetables are beginning to account for more thanks to the processing premiums granted under the so-called Mediterranean package.

I have given this outline to show where the main effort must be directed. The bulk of efforts to control the growth and extent of expenditure under the common agricultural policy must, given the existing circumstances, be concentrated on milk. Efforts must be pursued in such a way as to ensure that the volume of milk production is gradually reduced. Firstly, the increase must be halted, and we must hope that this may lead to a decrease in milk production. As I have often said in this House, there no longer exist commercial markets for milk products, save for cheese and new products such as yoghurt, and perhaps a proportion of the Community's milk. If we are to succeed in limiting expenditure, we must thus halt the increase in production and then preferably scale it down. Numerous proposals have been submitted to obtain that result, but we have unfortunately not got them through the Council, except for a freeze in milk prices in the current year, which I feel ought to be mentioned, and which will undoubtedly have some effect. I also say this to emphasize that pricing policies should not be forgotten, either now or in the future. This is indeed a decisive factor, with regard both to the level of production and consumer reac-

tion. However, neither a prudent nor a strict pricing policy is sufficient in the current budgetary situation, given the recent high rate of growth, even over the last three years when we pursued a moderate pricing policy. Mention was made earlier of the co-responsibility levy. A 1.5 % levy was introduced in 1977, which was unfortunately reduced to 0.5 % in 1978, at which rate it still remains, despite the Commission's proposals to the contrary. That is one of the reasons why the Commission must repudiate the Council's decisions on prices. Pursuant to the Council's decision, in the event of milk production increasing by more than 2 % a year — as it is doing — the co-responsibility levy will increase to 1.5 % from the beginning of the next production year. This is still not satisfactory. It is particularly unsatisfactory if it is accompanied by price increases which disturb the general picture. I would think that the right solution — I am expressing a personal opinion here, although it is similar to that which I explained to Parliament's Committee on Budgets earlier this week — would consist in imposing limits on the Community's financial responsibilities. At the moment, the Community has unlimited financial responsibility. Whatever is produced at a given price, and cannot be disposed of, is purchased by the Community intervention agencies and sold on either the world market or the internal market by means of steadily increasing subsidies or aid measures. That is why the budget has increased to such an extent.

We might envisage imposing a ceiling on the Community's responsibility for the disposal of these surplus products. Once this limit was reached — and this would involve no system of quotas, or allocation between countries, but a Community limitation of financial responsibility — those who increased production, as opposed to those who did not, would have to bear responsibility. Such a ceiling could either be based on prices or — and there is a large majority in favour of the alternative to which we must give political consideration — it could be in the form of an adjustment of the co-responsibility levy which would be applied to only a limited extent to smaller farms or farms which did not increase production, but would be mainly borne by more productive farms. This would not be a punitive measure, it is an economic reality. If farms are to produce more, the effect of this increased productivity ought to benefit the Community as a whole, and not be a burden on the budget. I believe that in this way it will be possible in a relatively short time, to achieve a reasonable balance in the budget and, in any case, to check the continued increases in milk production.

I shall not go into all the details of this type of proposal, but it is evident that other factors such as structural policy measures must be incorporated in it, to assist smaller dairy farms, which are often part-time

Gundelach

holdings with other sources of income, but which cannot support themselves on only 5 or 10 or 15 cows. In practice, a holding must have 40 cows to obtain a minimum income. Structural measures of a practical and specific nature must be introduced to help these farmers to switch over, wherever possible, to other production and, where it is not possible to do this for social reasons, to enable them to survive without creating further unemployment in the agricultural sector. This can be done without inordinate expenditure, but not through general income support, as such a policy would come up against the problem that an excessive number of these smaller dairy farms are part-time holdings which often receive substantial incomes from other activities. However, there is no doubt that allowances must be made for the smaller farms. We must also give consideration to the alternatives.

We must therefore seek, either through structures policy measures or by adapting the pricing policy, to promote other product lines which are not in surplus and in which there is a future market. This is the case, for example, for certain types of meat, including mutton, for which it is possible to maintain a viable alternative production, and which would not lead to structural surpluses. The most important thing is thus to halt expenditure in the dairy sector, but that does not rule out attempts to make savings in other sectors. I have mentioned sugar, which brings us back to the other question by Mrs Castle. Just as the Commission will be submitting a proposal on dairy policy within a few weeks, it will also be submitting a proposal on sugar policy over the next few weeks which will include a reduction of the combined A and B quotas. Account will be taken in the calculations involved of what is produced during a reference period to ensure fair treatment of the most efficient producers. However, we must reduce the overall volume, as we export and have exported up to 1.5 million tonnes as against re-exports of 1.3 million of imports from the ACP countries. This process frequently involves substantial refunds which can account for approximately 70 % of the product's value, and this also has a bearing on world market prices. These may often be artificial, but they frequently constitute a burden from a budgetary point of view. However, this leads us back to another question. The main point I wish to make is that we will be submitting a proposal providing for a downward adjustment of quotas to reflect the market situation — the situation both on our market and the world market — and we will extend the system of joint responsibility which already exists under the sugar arrangements so that, in the main, Community expenditure will involve about 1.3 million tonnes of sugar imported from the ACP countries.

The Commission also feels that the functioning of the intervention system for beef may lay itself open to crit-

icism. Over the last few months we have seen that, in a situation in which world market prices of beef increase and prices also increase in parts of the Community market, there are other sectors in which we face fairly substantial and costly intervention. This is unfortunate, as intervention frequently concerns the more expensive parts of the animal. There is a need for greater transparency and flexibility in our intervention system for beef, which might well lead to not insignificant savings.

I would add that, pending the implementation of a dairy policy, we will naturally attempt, and have been attempting for several weeks, to limit the Commission's expenditure within those fields covered by existing arrangements, by reducing export refunds and support for the disposal of dairy products such as skimmed-milk powder and others on the domestic market, and we are helped in this task by a generally upward trend in world market prices. The difference between world market prices and Community prices has, as during the last energy crisis, become substantially less, but we must take advantage of this by cutting down on aid and aid measures which are no longer quite so necessary, even under the present conditions of production. There are also other fields, which I shall not all name individually, in which certain savings can be made. I mentioned aid for tomato-processing, which recently attained an excessively high level. There is also the aid which has brought great benefit to the employment situation in certain Mediterranean regions, and which has almost been too successful, as the same employment objectives can be attained even following certain reductions. We shall also attempt, wherever the Commission is competent to do so, to make all possible savings in all fields under the management committees procedure. In cases where it is necessary to achieve savings through proposals to Parliament and the Council for amendments to the basic regulations, we will be submitting the necessary proposals in the main areas involved in the near future.

President. — I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Is the Commissioner aware that I warmly welcome his reply, and in particular welcome his determination to end the present open-ended financial commitment by the Community in the dairy sector which makes a nonsense of any budgetary control and has created the costly and wasteful surpluses which have shocked public opinion throughout Europe? Is he aware that I hope that all Members of the Council of Ministers, including my own Government, will support his proposals for limitation in this field when he produces them, and that I hope this Parliament will send that message to the Council of Ministers?

Castle

But would not the Commissioner agree that any proposals for limiting the financial commitment in the dairy sector must be accompanied by a minimum guaranteed price to producers themselves, so as to ensure a reasonable income for dairy farmers without creating an incentive to over-production?

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) Mr President, I noted with satisfaction Mrs Castle's opening remarks, and I hope that Parliament will respond in the same way, as there can be no doubt that we are facing a new series of extremely difficult talks concerning the dairy sector. Many people are employed in this sector, and there is no easy solution. Mrs Castle's final remark is therefore of vital importance in our attempt to achieve a satisfactory result. We must act in such a way that the justifiable interests of milk producers — not least those which I shall call family producers — with regard to income are given due consideration. However, I believe that it would be much simpler to pursue an incomes policy in agriculture, including the dairy sector, if we operated on the basis of a strict limitation of the quantity for which we can assume a financial risk. That makes it considerably easier for us to be more accommodating as regards justified income demands from the dairy sector within that quantity limitation. I therefore believe that what I have just tried to suggest answers Mrs Castle's last point, and I quite agree that this is of vital importance if the comprehensive review of this policy is to produce a satisfactory result. Without such measures, the resulting social difficulties would be so great that we would be doomed to failure.

President. — This item is concluded.

14. Agenda

President. — Honourable Members, in view of the time, I propose that we now move on to voting time. The outstanding questions by Mrs Castle can then be taken subsequently, since they do not require a vote.

Are there any objections?

I call Mr Balfé.

Mr Balfé. — You cannot just change the agenda which we adopted this morning when everybody was here. Whatever changes were made, we have had points of order on this before which were supported by the other side. Now, if we do not like what is going on in terms of the order of business, the time to sort out the order paper is at the beginning of the morning sitting. The two questions will not take very long. Let us have them answered, but let us not start setting precedents by changing the agenda in the

middle of the sitting. What I am asking the President to rule is that what he put to the House should not have been put, because I think we are setting a precedent which can easily be abused.

President. — I would refer you to Rule 12 (2) of the Rules of Procedure. This is not a matter of a debate. When the agenda has been adopted, it cannot be amended except in the cases provided for in Rules 14 and 32, or on a proposal from the President. I therefore propose that we now proceed immediately to the votes.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

15. Votes

President. — The next item is votes on motions for resolutions on which the debate has been closed.

I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-408/79) by Mrs Ewing: Compensation for the disaster affecting Orkney and Shetland agriculture.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

* * *

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-409/79) by Mr Sarre and others: Torture of children.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

* * *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-415/79) by Mr Glinne and others: Ad hoc committee on women's rights.*

I put the preamble to the vote.

The preamble is adopted.

On the single paragraph, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 1, by Lady Elles and Miss Brookes, on behalf of the European Democratic Group:

Replace the sole paragraph by the following paragraph:

'Decides to hold a debate in a plenary session of the European Parliament before April 1980 in order to identify the areas falling within the scope of the Treaties where action may be taken to eliminate discrimination against women and guarantee their full rights within the European Community; further decides, following that debate, to refer such matters to the relevant committees of the European Parliament for examination and report, and to appoint a rapporteur to coordinate the findings of the committees and report to Parliament on all the measures to be taken by the Commission and the Council;

¹ OJ C 289 of 19. 11. 1979.

President

— Amendment No 2, by Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mrs Lenz, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mrs Moreau, Mrs Rabbethge, Mrs Schleicher, Mrs Walz, Mrs Boot, Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti and Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD):

Replace the sole paragraph by the following two paragraphs:

1. Decides to set up an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights whose task it will be, on the basis of a report by the Commission setting out the basic principles, to prepare a parliamentary debate to be held before the 1980 summer recess in order to define the measures to be taken on the basis of the Treaties with regard to questions concerning women;
2. Instructs its relevant committees to draw up, on the basis of the results of that debate, proposals to achieve equality for women in all areas and to forward these proposals to the Council and Commission for their opinions.

These amendments are mutually exclusive.

I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (NL) Mr President, a proposal has been made so that we can reach agreement on our amendment. The text is now amended as follows:

Decides to set up an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights whose task it will be, *in cooperation with the Commission and drawing on a report by the Commission* setting out the basic principles, to prepare a parliamentary debate ...

President. — I propose that Parliament accept the oral amendment tabled by Mrs Maij-Weggen.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

Does anyone wish to speak on Amendment No 1, by Lady Elles?

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, I am answering on behalf of Lady Elles. As you have said, this amendment is different from the one which has been moved by the honourable lady who has just spoken. What we are asking for is that there should be a debate in the House on this matter before April 1980 and after that it should be sent to the appropriate committee so that the whole matter can be properly discussed. This of course would, as the House will realize, exclude the setting up of an *ad hoc* committee.

President. — I put amendment No 1 to the vote. Amendment No 1 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 2, as amended orally, to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is adopted.

(Applause)

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole, incorporating the amendment which has been adopted.

The resolution is adopted.¹

(Applause from the left)

I congratulate the ladies who spoke on this item. The way they debated in favour of their objective was extremely eloquent, and even the gentlemen have voted for it.

* * *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1—419/79) by Mr Scott-Hopkins: Violations of the freedom of the press in Malta.*

I call Mr Balfe on a point of order.

Mr Balfe. — I am sorry Mr President, I did not realize that we were still in the middle of that vote. I thought we had disposed of it. Before we move to the next vote, I am sure that we would wish any communication to the Maltese Labour Party to have the full authority of this House. I therefore ask you whether a quorum is present under Rule 33?

President. — Rule 33 (3) of the Rules of Procedure states:

All votes shall be valid, whatever the number of voters, unless the President, on a request made before voting has begun by at least ten Members, ascertains that a quorum is not present.

I note that Mr Balfe's request is supported by ten Members.

We shall now determine whether a quorum is present.

A quorum is not present.

The vote will therefore be placed on the agenda of the next part-session.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Mr President, I would like to make a statement on this vote. I do not understand this procedure as it simply means that we will have to vote on the matter again at the next part-session. My impression is that the members of the Socialist Group judge the protection of human rights differently in some countries than in others, and have therefore carried out this manoeuvre to hold over the matter for the next part-session.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — The fact that a quorum is not present requires me to rule that the vote will be placed on the agenda of the next sitting.

* * *

¹ OJ C 289 of 19. 11. 1979

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1—428/79) by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and others:*

Arrest of six Czechoslovakian citizens.

Mr Klepsch has tabled an oral amendment:

First indent of the preamble: '— having learned of the arrest and conviction of Czechoslovakian dissidents in various cities of Bohemia and Moravia,'

Paragraph 1: '1. Expresses its deep regret at the new arrests and convictions in Czechoslovakia ...'

The title of the motion should likewise be amended with the addition of the words '*and conviction*'.

I call Mr Arndt.

Mr Arndt. — (D) Mr President, we of the Socialist Group have already agreed this with Mr Klepsch. You are, of course, correct in saying that it is a minor amendment to the text, but it is an important amendment as the resolution will thus not be confined to a specific small group of people but will indeed cover the wide circle of those who are being persecuted. We therefore approve the motion for a resolution in this form.

President. — I consult Parliament on the proposal that the motion for a resolution should be put to the vote as amended orally.

That is agreed.

I call Mr Irmer on a point of order.

Mr Irmer. — (D) Mr President, would it not be possible to draw attention to the fact that voting is taking place by ringing a bell which can be heard throughout the House? I must confess that I was not in the Chamber when it was noted that there was no quorum. I had to make an urgent telephone call. This is often unavoidable. I did not know that voting was taking place otherwise I would naturally have come in. I am convinced that many colleagues out in the corridors or in the offices would have done the same.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution, as amended orally, to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, I think your procedure is a little strange. I have no quarrel at all with the method of using Rule 33 to find that a quorum is not present and therefore have the vote postponed. It is laid down in the Rules of Procedure and it is a perfectly legitimate way of trying to stop a vote you are going to lose from being taken, which is obviously why it was done.

My reason for rising to my feet, Sir, is that it is a little strange that having established that there was no quorum on that particular issue, we continued to vote.

I would suggest that you might have asked again whether there was a quorum. I am not criticizing the Chair, I am just pointing out the apparent inconsistencies.

The next point, Sir, is one of substance. You said that, as there was no quorum, the vote would be held over until the next part-session. Does that mean that it will be held at the beginning of the budget part-session on 5 November or at the ordinary part-session beginning on 12 November? That is a request for information.

I would imagine, as the House is sitting in full session on 5 November, that the vote will be taken on the Maltese motion at that time. It is for you to rule in this matter. I am simply asking what your intention is.

President. — My own preference would be for the vote to be taken during the ordinary part-session and not during the part-session devoted exclusively to the budget.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, I would be only too pleased if this could be done, but I do not wish a precedent to be created. Rule 33 (4) of the Rules of Procedure clearly states that 'the vote shall be placed on the agenda of the next sitting'. No distinction is made between budgetary and other part-sessions. As a result, the vote must be held on 5 November and not 12 November.

President. — It will be for the Bureau to reach a decision at its next meeting in two or three days time.

16. *Community funds and sale of sugar surpluses for 1979*

President. — The next item is the oral question without debate (Doc. 1—305/79) by Mrs Castle to the Commission:

Subject: Community funds and sale of sugar surpluses for the year 1979

To ask the Commission whether it will give its revised estimate, for the year 1979, of the cost to Community funds likely to be incurred during the year in selling its sugar surpluses on the world market.

I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, Commissioner Gundelach has already indicated in his earlier reply that we are producing an excess of beet sugar in Europe and that the resulting surpluses have to be dumped on the world markets with export subsidies. Can he please, therefore, give his revised estimate for the year 1979 of the cost to Community funds likely to be incurred during the year in selling these sugar surpluses on the world market?

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.

— Mr President, the latest forecast shows 750 million units of account for the expenditure referred to, which is 465 million pounds sterling. From this there should, in fairness, be deducted 210 million units of account which represents the contribution of the sugar producers in the form of co-responsibility. That brings the figure down to 540 million units of account, £ 335 million. I must also in fairness say that this figure does include expenditures relating to the import of 1.3 million tonnes of sugar under the protocol on ACP sugar, and the expenditure in that regard is actually 380 million units of account.

I said earlier on that same amendment of the total quotas and some co-responsibility adjustments would make it possible for us to move away from a situation in which sugar is a heavy burden on the Community. I would only add that, of course, it is not only a question of that. It is also a question of putting us in the position where we can, when the opportunity arises, be a party to the International Sugar Agreement. The Community has always been keen on multilateral commodity arrangements, and it would be a great shame if we could not join with the other sugar producers, Australia, Brazil, the United States and others in the proposed International Sugar Agreement. We can only do that if we have our sugar production under control.

President. — I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — I want to thank the Commissioner for that reply. Does not this very large sum of £460 million reflect the big margin between the cost of producing beet sugar in Europe and the world price? Is not the gap something like 70 %, showing that we are high-cost producers here who have to be sustained by steps of this kind? Would he not also agree that the commitment to import 1.3 million tonnes from the ACP countries, the cane sugar producers, is a minimum commitment that this Community ought to make to the developing countries whose economies, if they are sugar producers, are already being damaged by the Community's system of dumping its excess sugar on the world market with export subsidies? Will the Commissioner therefore pledge to defend the right of the cane sugar producers in the developing countries to survive in a world which is even more difficult for them than it is for our own agricultural communities?

Finally, could he give a few more details of how he would propose to reduce the excess beet sugar production in the Community?

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.

— Whether the Community fundamentally is a high-

cost producer of sugar is open to argument. What is not open to argument is that the difference between the support prices we have established and international prices has been so great that it has been necessary to pay export restitutions which amounted to around 70 % of the value of the sugar, which is a very big amount.

I would like to add that, over the last few months, in order to help the international sugar market to get into balance and avoid big sugar exports with high restitutions, we have reduced our restitutions or even not paid restitutions at all. World market prices have consequently rallied. I say this, firstly because it is important from the point of view of the budget; the heavy expenditure was, as I forecast, a problem in the earlier part of the year — more so than it is going to be in the latter part of the year, even if we have very big sugar harvests here too, as it seems we will.

But I am also saying this to underline that it is not just the Community producers who are price-oriented, it is also the producers in countries like Australia or Argentina or wherever it may be. They are naturally also seeking stable prices via an international sugar agreement at a somewhat higher level than the world markets have been giving over the last few years. In any event, in order to bring our sugar production more into balance with a stable internal consumption and a world market which, contrary to what may be believed, and contrary to fluctuations, is not showing any trend towards increases in consumption, we have, as I said in an earlier intervention, to adjust downwards the combined A and B sugar quotas, which are the ones that are subject to certain Community guarantees. This must, in my view, be in the order of one million tonnes. I would like to underline that in the context of overall sugar production, that is not a revolutionary figure. It is in the order of an adjustment, not a revolution, but necessary to bring us into line with the state of the markets internally and externally.

Finally, Mr President, in regard to the ACP sugar the Community has undertaken a commitment, and it must honour it, and it must go on honouring it, because these countries have unfortunately few if any other alternatives for earning money for their balance of payments.

I would like to add, because this is part of the picture of pricing internationally, that the ACP countries not only attach great importance to the guaranteed quota of 1.3 million tonnes of sugar, but also to the undertaking that in the yearly discussion of prices, they obtain the same price, fundamentally, as the European beet producers. When we have been holding back on price increases on our own sugar producers — though less this year, than I had wanted — the ACP countries are not all that happy. Because they can not sell the 1.3 million tonnes of sugar unless they are guaranteed round about our price level.

Gundelach

This is part of the analysis of the cost of production, part of the picture when we are discussing whether or not we are efficient producers. As a matter of fact our producers could probably better take some reduction in sugar prices than the ACP countries, could.

President. — This item is concluded.

17. *National contributions to Community budgetary expenditure*

President. — The next item is the oral question without debate (Doc. 1-302/79) by Mrs Castle to the Commission:

Subject: Net national contributions to Community budgetary expenditure

To ask the Commission when it proposes to bring forward proposals aimed at a more equitable system, as between Member States, of net national contributions to Community budgetary expenditure.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, as Mrs Castle will undoubtedly recall, we discussed this problem on Monday evening when I replied to an oral question with debate tabled by the Socialist Group and the Christian Democratic Group. Following requests from certain Member States and the directives of the European Council meeting at Strasbourg, the Commission has prepared a reference document on the financial consequences of applying the budgetary system for each Member State. This document was forwarded to the European Parliament on 17 September 1979, and has been the subject of a series of comments from the Member States. In the light of the opinions expressed and requests made, I can now confirm that the Commission is drawing up proposals on the impact of the budget system which will be forwarded to the Council of Finance Ministers and to the European Council and will also be sent to Parliament as soon as they are approved by the Commission.

President. — I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Of course I remember our debate on Monday evening, but my question was put down some time before that. Although our discussion on Monday evening advanced the position a little bit, it still leaves the fundamental challenge which this Parliament has got to face of the gross imbalance in the sharing of budgetary expenditure and budgetary receipts among the different members of the Community.

Would not the Commissioner agree that the present system of imbalance is totally contrary to the redistributive principles which are supposed to underlie

Community philosophy, which claims that it is out to distribute resources more fairly between the stronger nations and the weaker ones? Would he not agree that the present cost to the British people is over £1 000 million in net contribution for 1980, equivalent to an income tax rate of 3p in the pound — a massive contribution across the exchanges reducing Britain's chance of economic growth and adding to inflationary pressures? Will the Commission take on board, in preparing the proposals which it has undertaken to put before Parliament, that any proposals which merely sought to reduce this unjust share of the burden to some degree would be unacceptable to the British people as not rectifying the injustice, and that the purpose of the proposals must be to eliminate this imbalance of responsibilities in the Community as part of our battle to eliminate the causes of that imbalance, not least the present effects of the common agricultural policy?

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, I should like to point out to Mrs Castle that the figures which she has quoted on the financial impact of the Community budget are drawn from the document prepared by the Commission. I should also like to say that in the Commission's view we are not faced here with problems of a purely budgetary nature but with problems resulting from other differences existing within the Community. We are in the process of drawing up these proposals, which we intend to forward as soon as possible.

I would add that, while there are indeed problems of a financial nature concerning the budget, it should not be forgotten that the Community budget is not simply an instrument for effecting transfers of funds between Member States. Community revenue raised from own resources and Community expenditure are a reflection of common policies, the aim of which is to pursue jointly agreed objectives. The expected benefits amount to far more than mere transfers of resources. This must be borne in mind; but I believe that Parliament will have an opportunity to discuss these arguments in detail when the Commission presents its proposals.

President. — This item is concluded.

18. *Tribute*

President. — Honourable Members, it is with profound regret that I must inform you of the death last night of Mr Antonio Arnò, who devoted more than twenty years of highly conscientious service to this Parliament and was a close personal friend.

President

On your behalf I extend to his widow and children, and all members of his family, our very deepest sympathy and our grateful recognition of his services to our institution.

I now ask you to observe one minute's silence.

(The House stood for one minute's silence)

19. *Personal statement*

President. — I call Miss Flesch to make a personal statement.

Miss Flesch. — *(F)* Mr President I regret that this statement has to come after the announcement you have just made.

Yesterday, during the debate on world hunger, I did not protest when Mr Pannella accused me of lying, as I knew what had taken place in the Committee on Development and Cooperation and I did not want to hold up the discussion needlessly.

Although I am patient, Mr President, I nevertheless believe that one cannot let certain members of this Assembly say anything they like. Today Mr Pannella felt he had to accuse me, among other things which I will not mention here, of presenting a proposal to hold over the resolution on world hunger because, he said I wished to leave Strasbourg early.

Mr President I wish it to be noted that I am still present at the end of the debate at 1.20 p.m.

I put forward the proposal to hold over the resolution simply to enable Parliament to deal with its agenda under more or less reasonable conditions and to consider both the resolution and the amendments at its next meeting also under reasonable conditions.

Mr President, there cannot be two yardsticks in this House, one for those of us who wish to work and who respect our Rules of Procedure, parliamentary customs and our colleagues, even if they are political opponents, and another for Mr Pannella who could then be permitted to make any insinuations or gratuitous accusations he pleased.

(Applause from various benches)

Mrs Macciocchi. — *(F)* Although I did not hear the remarks to which Miss Flesch has just referred I very much regret what has happened.

Today, I listened very closely, but I feel that there has been a misunderstanding as we would all have wished to vote on the resolution. I am sad — and I believe the others are as disappointed as I am — that we will leave here having achieved nothing after a seven-hour long debate.

What was the misunderstanding? When Mrs Bonino stated this morning that she and Mr Pannella would withdraw the amendments as they could not be discussed by the Assembly, we understood that, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the amend-

ments would be dropped, as is usually the case if they are not commented on and discussed. We should then have voted on the resolution. This was where the misunderstanding arose!

I feel guilty that I did not rise at that point to say that we agreed to vote on the motion for a resolution.

It is regrettable in my view that such a misunderstanding, has arisen. Basically I agreed with you that a vote should be taken today on this motion and the amendments dealt with later.

President. — I would point out, Mrs Macciocchi, that Miss Flesch's statement was not in fact directed at you. I hope that the friendly gesture which Miss Flesch has made will be reciprocated by those who may have said unintentionally harsh things. Let us try, in this House, to develop a spirit of mutual understanding and of respect for each other's convictions. As a Vice-President, I shall do my best to help bring that about.

20. *Membership of committees*

President. — I have received from the Liberal and Democratic Group a request for Mr Poniowski to be appointed a member of the Committee on Development and Cooperation to replace Miss Flesch.

Are there any objections?

The appointment is ratified.

21. *Dates of the next part-session*

President. — There are no further items on the agenda. I thank the representatives of the Council and the Commission for their contributions to our proceedings.

The enlarged Bureau has proposed that Parliament should hold its next part-session from 5 to 7 November 1979 in Strasbourg.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

22. *Approval of the minutes*

President. Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to set before Parliament for its approval the minutes of proceedings of this sitting which were drawn up in the course of the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved?

23. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 1.30 p.m.)

