

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 244

July 1979

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1979-1980 Session
 Report of Proceedings
 from 17 to 20 July 1979
 Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Tuesday, 17 July 1979	1
First sitting of the Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage, p. 1 — Address by the oldest member, p. 1 — Verification of credentials, p. 7 — Composition of Parliament, p. 11 — Term of office of the President and Vice-Presidents, p. 11 — Election of President, p. 14 — Political groups, p. 18 — Agenda for the next sitting, p. 19.	
Wednesday, 18 July 1979	20
Formal opening sitting, p. 20 — Approval of the Minutes, p. 46 — Election of Vice-Presidents, p. 46 — Urgent procedure, p. 51 — Agenda for next sitting, p. 51.	
Thursday, 19 July 1979	52
Approval of the Minutes, p. 53 — Political groups, p. 53 — Verification of credentials, p. 53 — Composition of Parliament, p. 54 — Documents received, p. 54 — Texts of Treaties, p. 57 — Order of business, p. 57 — Limitation of speaking time, p. 71 — Decision on urgency, p. 73 — Composition of Parliament, p. 74 — Political groups, p. 74 — Council statement on the programme for the Irish presidency, p. 74 — Situation of South-East Asian refugees, p. 117 — Amendment of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament, p. 139 — Agenda for next sitting, p. 153.	
Friday, 20 July 1979	154
Approval of the Minutes, p. 155 — Petitions, p. 155 — Amendment of the Rules of Procedure, p. 155 — Number and membership of committees, p. 157 —	

(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)

Preliminary draft general budget of the Communities for 1980, p. 163 — Documents received, p. 178 — Preliminary draft general budget of the Communities for 1980, p. 163 — Documents received, p. 178 — Preliminary draft general budget of the Communities for 1980 (resumption), p. 179 — Arrests of dissidents in Czechoslovakia, p. 201 — Membership of committees, p. 204 — Verification of credentials, p. 204 — Dates of next part-session, p. 204 — Approval of the Minutes, p. 205 — Adjournment of session, p. 205.

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 17 to 20 July 1979 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 203 of 13. 8. 1979.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 17 JULY 1979

Contents

1. <i>First sitting of the Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage</i>	1	<i>Mr Klepsch; Mrs Bonino; Mr Glinne; Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Pannella; Mr Gendebien; Mr Lalor; Mr Pfennig; Mr de la Malène</i>	12
2. <i>Address by the oldest Member</i>	1		
3. <i>Verification of credentials:</i> <i>Mrs Bonino; Mr Pannella; Mr Capanna; Mrs Castellina; Mr Schwartzenberg; Mr Almirante</i>	8	6. <i>Election of President:</i> <i>Mr de la Malène; Mr De Goede; Mrs Bonino; Mr Arndt</i>	16
4. <i>Composition of Parliament</i>	11	7. <i>Political groups</i>	18
5. <i>Term of office of the President and Vice-Presidents:</i>		8. <i>Agenda for the next sitting</i>	19

IN THE CHAIR: MRS WEISS

Oldest Member

(The sitting opened at 10.10 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *First sitting of the Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage*

President. — Article 10 (3) of the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage provides that this Assembly shall meet today without requiring to be convened. This provision is, moreover, also to be found in Rule 1 (3) of the Rules of Procedure.

Rule 6 (1) of the Rules of Procedure lays down that at this sitting the oldest Member present shall take the chair until the President has been declared elected, and it is under this rule that it has fallen to me to exercise the functions of President.

(Applause)

Pursuant to Article 11 of the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct

universal suffrage and within the limits laid down in this article, we shall shortly proceed to the verification of credentials. I remind you that, pursuant to Rule 3 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, any Member whose credentials have not yet been verified may provisionally take his seat in Parliament.

2. *Address by the oldest Member*

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, elected representatives of Europe, the stars of destiny and the paths of the written word have led me to this rostrum, and given me, as President for a day, an honour of which I would never have dared to dream and the greatest joy a human being can experience in the evening of life: the joy of a youthful vocation miraculously come to fruition.

I spoke of the stars of destiny. Allow me to add my political friends who, familiar with my thinking, have enabled me to gain the confidence of the electors of my own country, France. I spoke too of the paths of the written word — the paths of the pen and of the Law, which in biblical times were one and the same.

President

As a journalist, writer, and film director, whose words and images have remained at all times faithful to her beliefs, I feel, at this moment, as though my experience throughout this century and my travels throughout the world were destined to culminate in my meeting with you today: I come to you as one who loves Europe and, with your forbearance, I shall try to give expression to the fears and hopes which torment and inspire our collective conscience.

Our peoples hear us today: the two Americas, Asia, Africa and Oceania hear our words. How proud I am to be a European! Let us together safeguard our most precious asset — our culture and the fraternity it brings us.

(Applause)

I ask for your agreement, votre accord, Ihre Zustimmung, il vostro consenso, Uw akkoord, Deres tilslutning, comhaontu, that this historic day should not end without kindling a new light in the firmament of our civilization as it embarks upon a new era. May that flame be kindled by you, here in Strasbourg, the symbolic metropolis of the reconciliation of our continent!

(Applause)

First, let us see ourselves in our true light in the world today as it makes the difficult transition from the age of steel to the age of the atom: on our little promontory of Asia we find ourselves caught up in an agonizing process of change from societies of conspicuous consumption into societies of a new kind, compelled to reckon with the contradictory demands of birth-rate and leisure, employment, security and threatened shortages of raw materials. Here in Europe switches and dials have replaced the strenuous labour of man. Elsewhere, man still ekes out his existence in economies of survival, or, worse still, of penury. Despite the manifold threats looming over it, Europe has a duty to continue to assist the disinherited of this world. Such is her burden still, but let us never lose the conviction of being both heirs and testators — heirs of a vital spirituality and testators of that spirituality to future generations.

Children, tomorrow! Whoever thinks of home, be it small or large — and the European home is immense — conjures up, if only through the shelves of a library, the memory of his ancestors. The more recent among them are familiar to us; those who are more distant tower majestically above the mists of history.

Honour to Charlemagne, Karl der Große! He brought the Iberian Peninsula into Europe, reconciling the Latin and the German genius. In 786, at Attigny, a small township of the French Ardennes where his palace stood, he had Wedukind, the King of the Saxons, baptized, while Irish monks were reclaiming the banks of the Marne. (By a happy chance, the

youngest Member of this Assembly is an Irish lady who bears the illustrious name of De Valera.)

(Applause)

Then came the Middle Ages. The historians of Europe are magnificent in their erudition and powers of synthesis, but the usage of this rostrum and the spirit of this Assembly clearly prevent me from naming them all. Honour to Pope Urban II, to whose impassioned appeal Europeans as dissimilar as the English Richard the Lionheart, the German Frederic Barbarossa and Saint Louis, King of France, inspired by the same faith, responded over many years!

And honour to Dante of Italy! His Divine Comedy represents the Summum of his age and is coloured by reminiscences of Islam.

Then came the Renaissance. It is impossible to mention all the humanists, by definition Europeans.

Honour to Shakespeare, of England, who, from the ramparts of Elsinore, washed by the tides of Denmark, left an eternal question which haunts us all: 'To be or not to be':

*O Constancy! be strong upon my side.
Set a huge mountain 'tween my heart and tongue.*

*I have a man's mind, but a woman's might.
How hard it is for a woman to keep counsel.*

(Applause)

Honour, all honour, to Grotius, citizen of Holland and internationally acclaimed progenitor of Human Rights! Then came the European age of the Enlightenment. Honour to Voltaire, the defender of Calas and the Chevalier de La Barre! Honour to Kant, the philosopher of Königsberg who brought method to metaphysics! And honour to Goethe, of Germany, whose name has become synonymous with the culture we must perpetuate to enable us to forget our mortality:

*Du mußt herrschen und gewinnen,
Oder dienen und verlieren ...
Die Tat ist alles.*

The great French Revolution, spiritual heir to Grotius, formulated the Rights of Man with even greater impact. The Rights of Man! How shameful, then, the concentration camps, psychiatric hospitals for the sane, and hooded judges sentencing blindfold prisoners! How shameful the genocides for which the whole earth mourns, but which still go unpunished!

(Applause)

Let us pick up again the thread of history with Karl Marx, the champion of the workers. Once again, a son of Israel left his fiery mark on Europe; but this second great Karl did not see his work fulfilled. He did not live to see the millions of homes, schools, hospitals, research and social insurance agencies, linked by busy motorways, which bear witness to the concern preoccupying the workers we all are — a

President

concern that every European may live better, with his every need catered for by the community. Had he been able to contemplate these achievements, would the author of *Das Kapital* have moderated his dialectic? Who knows? Angel or devil, a fanatic only remembers those facts which suit him. I am well placed to speak on this: I came from a protestant family of Alsace, and our pastors condemned the papists with such fury that I have been a liberal ever since.

Honour now to Ferdinand de Lesseps! Europe unani- mously applauded the inauguration of his canal on a great day for mankind in the desert between Asia and Africa.

But let us move on, and pay reverent homage to Victor Hugo. In 1849, presiding over a peace congress in Paris, he proclaimed his hopes for a European union, the idea of which had begun to take shape in French minds after the downfall of Napoleon:

You will have many more quarrels to settle, interests to discuss, arguments to resolve; but do you realize what you will substitute for men-at-arms, guns, lances, pikes and swords? A little wooden box which you will call a ballot box

Marguerite Hugo, the granddaughter of Victor, was a classmate of mine.

Now, among the more dazzling offspring of Zeus and the nymph Europa, I shall name my contemporaries, who, for many of you, already seem like forbears.

Enter our Pantheon, O patriarchs of the Court of Justice of The Hague, whom I knew in the prestigious aura of your old age! Enter, founders of the League of Nations, pioneers of a European Federation whose constituent text was hacked to pieces by innumerable commissions, sub-commissions, committees, and sub-committees, colloquies and seminars — those sacred bodies of international powerlessness! Enter Gustav Stresemann. I remember you, flushed with emotion, when you arrived at Cornavin Station to represent Germany at Geneva and speak for her at the rostrum of the Reformation Hall. With your bright eyes, your stiff collar and your determined energy, your will- power braved the insults hurled at you. This determi- nation stood by you, right up to the signature of the Kellogg Pact, when I saw you again, pale and wasted, warned by your heart not to over-exert yourself: but you did. Enter Aristide Briand. I can still hear your organ-like voice. I remember your feline gait, your silver locks, and the cigarette-end which smouldered endlessly between your lips, masking from your onlookers the majesty of State with which, suddenly, you were not averse to shine. In 1931, in Berlin, I translated the words that Chancellor Brüning spoke to you, after a disappointing meeting, in a lobby which the official interpreters had deserted: 'Tell Monsieur

Briand that, failing an immediate Franco-German understanding, events of which he can have no conception will be unleashed on the civilized world!' With his dreamy Celtic benevolence and the trust in human nature which stemmed from his Socialist back- ground, Aristide Briand failed to understand this warning.

A few years later, the Second World War broke out. It preserved our freedoms, but not beyond the Wall. And the tragedy endured of a Europe doubly under- mined by an economic war, with its complex strata- gems, and an ideological war, concealing a thirst for power. None of our European democracies was big enough to remain isolated. Enter Konrad Adenauer, of Cologne — lofty as the spires of its cathedral, teeming as the waters of the Rhine — under the outward appearance of a Christian *paterfamilias*. Enter also the unforgettable third Charles — enter Charles de Gaulle. To you both we owe our presence here. Konrad Adenauer, the General entertained you in his home, on that austere plateau near Alésia and Verdun, trampled by the invaders of France through the centuries. The name of our third Charles was never expressed in the Germanic I have used. His bearing seemed to be inspired by a famous device: 'King I cannot, Prince I will not, Gaulle I am'.

(Applause from the European Progressive Democrats)

The passer-by who contemplates the Cross of Lorraine at Colombey feels bidden by many calls. Memorable June 18th! The pink granite Cross of Lorraine stands foursquare weathering every storm. At times it is wreathed in clouds which fuse the leader with this monument. Their great arms stretch out in command, their heads merge in the spheres of action and the horizons of thought.

Enter now Paul Valéry. Each morning, in the small hours of dawn, the spirit suffused your lean body. Often your dark blue gaze fixed itself on Europe. Long before the second world conflagration, you explained to me one day, as you stirred the sugar in your coffee, that the fate of Western civilization would be decided on the Yalu river dividing China from Korea. I had never heard of that river. Two decades later, the Yalu was to be the Rubicon separating Presi- dent Truman from General MacArthur.

Enter Richard Koudenhove-Kalergi. The successor of your Pan-European Movement, in this Assembly, is a Prince of Habsburg. Do you remember, Richard, the lectures we delivered together in the Middle West? We were three Europeans, the famous English Labour Leader, Arthur Henderson, having joined us. From time to time, spurred by a touch of sombre humour, Arthur would exclaim: 'I say, can you tell me where to find a proletarian?' We had to explain our respec- tive national views on the quarrels which prevented

President

the battered Europe of the Treaty of Versailles from recovering. Our audience, cast in the role of a tribunal, was to hand down its verdict. Soon we found ourselves merging into a single culture, so compelling that, to the disappointment of the outside world, we stood together as companions striding towards a common goal despite incidental differences of opinion. We were unceasing in our expression of gratitude to the soldiers of the New World, enamoured of freedom, who had stood by us in our fight to preserve our own liberty. We were not to know then that they would do so a second time. Such was the price of our common survival. Today many other sacrifices are called for.

Enter Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet.

(Applause)

Robert Schuman, who with his laconic manner cleared up so many of the internal contradictions of our continent. William the Silent, of Holland, was a constant spur to Schuman, teaching him that one need not hope in order to venture, nor succeed in order to persevere. Jean Monnet! The Reaper who waits for us all has now carried you away. I met you in Bordeaux in 1914, unknown, but already a prophet in your youth. On the day of your funeral, all Europe crowded into the modest little church of Montfort-l'Amaury in the Yvelines. The little salamander, which you chose as your emblem, will yet emerge unscathed from many a conflagration!

Let me recall, too, Albert Einstein and so many other eminent refugees. And you, too, the victims I have known and loved, slaughtered in our fight for the recognition of each individual and for the rights of our liberal peoples: the German, Walther Rathenau, the Italian, Giovanni Amendola, the Romanian, Ion Duca, the Austrian, Engelbert Dollfuss, the Czech, Jan Masaryk.

Enter, all of you! Soon our Assembly will bid welcome to Greece, already associated in thought with our tribute. There is not, at this hour, one descendant of those blond and barbarous Cimmerians that once threatened Hellas who has not scaled, or sought to scale, the steps of the Acropolis, temple of Pallas-Athene, our Goddess of Wisdom, whom we have so often and so flagrantly disobeyed.

Such is Europe. Let those who come after us remain true to the cult we render to our forbears! Ladies and gentlemen, elected Representatives of Europe, let us rise to our feet and in solemn tribute to our heroes, observe a minute of silence.

(The House rises to its feet and observes a minute's silence)

But reverence for our ancestors must not paralyse our action nor turn our eyes from the future. Let us beware of becoming the classical image of our own selves. History moves on. Trends change. What was

impossible yesterday will be possible tomorrow. In any case, you will not be starting with nothing behind you. Over ruins on which the dust had hardly settled, Winston Churchill expressed the hope in 1946 that the European family would come together again. In the early fifties, after Robert Schuman's declaration of 9 May, it became clear to six of our most highly industrialized countries that a common market, based on a customs union and financial adjustments, would raise the standard of living of producers and consumers alike. It was a correct assessment, but experience showed that it stood in need of constant review. And so it was that the Six of the Common Market signed those extraordinary Treaties of Paris (1951) and Rome (1957).

Perhaps, thanks to his audacious plans for cooperation at a time when victors and vanquished were settling their accounts, the first begetter of the Coal and Steel Community is Émile Mayrisch, from Luxembourg, whose activities conferred on his country an international stature: Mayrisch, the man of empire and ruddy complexion who, as early as 1921, introduced me, with my European commitment, to his peers, the industrialists of the Ruhr.

The Six have become Nine. They will soon be Ten, all full participants in those organs of consultation, decision and execution now at work in this very city, in Brussels and in Luxembourg. Without those institutions, without the spirit of cooperation which they have shown, without the wealth of information brought together to balance the obligations and benefits of each, you would be hampered in your work. For the past twenty years, they have been building the infrastructures which will enable your Assembly to take over from the former Assembly of the Communities, whose eminent President, Emilio Colombo, is with us today, and to assume its distinctive image with the added distinction of universal direct suffrage. Emilio Colombo has guided this Assembly to its present prestige: he worked closely with Alcide de Gasperi, the third instigator of the Treaty of Paris.

(Applause)

I say universal suffrage, for women have had in it the full share which was theirs of right. They would not have had this share when, in France, I led the struggle for their equality in an atmosphere so redolent of a bygone age that our opponents could argue successfully that women's hands were made to be fondled and not to place ballot-papers in ballot-boxes. Without rejecting those fond attentions, European women have nonetheless made use of their ballot papers, and here they are now, in many a government building, firmly in the seat of power. I warmly welcome those of them who are here with us, for they are conscious, though not in a divisive spirit, of the task they face.

President

I would remind you, who seem to me so young, of the work of an Estonian aristocrat which appeared during the dark years of the armistice when our continent was recovering its breath before the Second World War. In his *Spektrum Europa*, Count Hermann Keyserling described himself as a Westerner by the colour of his skin, a European by education, a Balt by birth, Russian and German by blood, and a Frenchman by culture. I see him still, that true European, an immensely tall, ungainly figure with a mass of hair, an indefatigable talker commenting under the gaslights of Saint-Germain-des-Près until three in the morning, for the benefit of the young woman I then was, on what was a premonitory work. It opened with a broadside directed at each of our peoples: the Briton, half-lion, half-wolf, but an inoffensive gentleman once his aims were secured; the German, for whom things were more important than people, and who therefore could not resist a certain collective nostalgia; the Italian, who looked on the theatre and the stage as an end in itself; the Frenchman, incapable of understanding that others might wish to be different from himself, and wedded to his definitions like a savage to his fetishes. (*Laughter*) I will spare the others. But however loud his criticisms, he was lost in admiration for the wealth, variety, and strength of the contribution made by our nations to their common culture. Consequently, taking his analysis a stage further than the impulsive Hugo, he came to the view that to require of Europe that it should unite, like the United States or Russia, was to misjudge its essence and, in practice, condemn it to ruin. Away with the melting-pot! It must unite in a different way. Each of the nations of which it was composed would preserve its language, its style. A new, exemplary form of unity would develop, while the nations, complementing one another, would live on within it, their vigour intact. If, on the contrary, things went badly, all we could expect was what some would gladly have seen — a Europe in complete disintegration.

This gives you some idea of the concern with which Hermann Keyserling would have watched over the Treaty of Rome, identifying himself with the protests of its guardians against the distortions of the Common Market, which range from concealed tariffs to indiscriminate imports, manipulations of exchange rates, and many other odd stratagems, the reports on which I have carefully perused. Yes, there have been stratagems and pressures, even secret instructions designed to break up our Market, but it has survived, having been born not of chance but of necessity.

And you yourselves, my cherished Europeans, you must allow that your election campaigns have often appeared weighed down by underlying partisan thoughts rather than uplifted by European concerns. When you hazarded a reasoned argument, you almost invariably lost your way in the maze of European insti-

tutions. The faithful emerged from your meetings, their heads buzzing with such technical terms as compensatory amounts, green currencies, compulsory or non-compulsory payments and even GATT or SALT — a buzzing which might interfere with *your* sleep but not theirs. You translated those terms into trucks, poultry, jobs, allowances, internal security — of the other security, not a word! — and you knew that unfortunately you could not speak as masters, because of your dependence on creditors who would have the last word when it came to settling your debts — those poisoned flowers that spring from the ground of social change forced on us by our own progress.

That is why, whatever verbal shafts (including my own) are let fly against the present European structures, we must in all justice come back to expressions of praise and gratitude. They have done as best they could in a climate of abstraction and suspicion — abstraction that lies outside what is human, suspicion that lies below what is human. They have spared us the worst: unilateral subjection destructive of our national traits. The support of your Assembly will give them new life, provided that it does not itself succumb to sterile party strife. As the bearer of hopes it cannot disappoint, it will not succumb.

I now turn eagerly to the future. For what poor reasons should your Assembly look back fixedly on the Treaties of Rome and Paris? Without infringing them, it could, by virtue of its moral sovereignty over European public affairs, tackle those crucial problems which transcend them, which are of even greater importance than those of currency or energy. I see three such problems.

The first is a problem of *identity*, not of identity in the sense of similarity, but of identity as a deep perception of one's being. The low turnout in the elections which have brought us here proves how urgent a problem it is. A Europe without Europeans is inconceivable. I said so in this Chamber when I received Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, the recipient of the prize awarded by my modest foundation, presided over by Monsieur Pierre Pflimlin, the Mayor of Strasbourg, who is with us today, and Monsieur Braun, President of the Human Sciences University of this city. I repeated it in Paris, in the Senate, when, under the chairmanship of Mr Alain Poher, I received from the eminent Gaston Thorn, of Luxembourg, the Robert Schuman Gold Medal, awarded by the FVS-Stiftung in Hamburg. The Community institutions have produced European sugar-beet, butter, cheese, wines, calves and even pigs. They have not produced Europeans.

(*Applause*).

There were Europeans in the Middle Ages, during the Renaissance, in the Age of Enlightenment, and even in the 19th century. We must recreate them. Our young people have already set about the task, ruck-

President

sacks on their backs, oblivious to frontiers. Already twinned towns have produced a body of men and women to whom past conflicts are anathema and who know their fate is bound up with that of the continent. But on the whole, schools and universities do not follow suit, in spite of exceptional achievements such as we have seen from Monsieur Brugmans, at Bruges, in Belgium. Exchange professors distil their wisdom, thanklessly taking care not to pose as champions of a Europe without which they would have remained at home. A few dreamers have imagined textbooks for schools which would turn our common past into a game played by children. Lies do not bear fruit. On the contrary, what we must do, in all the schools of Europe, from the most modest to the most sophisticated, is to explain that after centuries of conflict and bloodshed a new era of understanding has dawned based on the highest common factor, that of our culture.

(Applause)

Once I have rejoined you on the floor of the House, I will put forward a draft proposal that seeks to define this common factor, and with it, our distinguishing national characteristics. All our professors and teachers, schoolchildren and students ought to be associated in this task. It would lead to the awakening of a European consciousness, to which your election campaigns were only a prelude. We shall have it then at last, our European University, not in one or several establishments for uprooted youngsters, but everywhere and manifold. The creation, already called for, of a European Academy, of a European Philharmonic Orchestra, is a further necessity. Add to this European sports teams, physical education being a part of general education. No, we must not be content to remain the classical image of ourselves. A ball sometimes travels further than a shell.

The second problem is the *birth rate*. The way things are going, there will soon be no more Europeans. So why this Assembly? The statistics on the subject seem to be doubly frightening, the way they are put and the reality they point to. When experts tell me that German women give birth to only 1.4, and French women to 1.8, of the 2.28 children required, I start at the thought of thousands of babies in pieces...

(Scattered applause)

... and then I experience the anguish of the long statistical agony of our civilization. How to revive it? How to rejuvenate it? We shall only succeed if we act together.

Like all of you, I have reflected on the age-pyramids. I have even been as far as Niigata, in Japan, opposite the Chinese coast, to talk to Professor Ogino about the results of his method. When I was young, social taboos condemned women attracted by the so-called masculine professions to heavy personal sacrifices. The others knew that they would have to cope unaided by their families with the burden of mater-

nity, at that time uncontrolled. Those taboos are dead, so dead that I perceive, in the assistance and respect which society, having changed its views, gives these women now, a kind of personal revenge. Assistance is essential, but believe me, the purchase of children, a course which our distraught governments are embarking upon by granting allowances and tax concessions beyond what their budgets can stand, will not change the pattern of the age-pyramids. Money is no substitute for either love or hope. If Western women no longer want children, it is because they consider them useless, and even a hindrance both to work and to leisure. For opposite reasons that produce the same results, Slav women in Russia also take care to avoid children. A collectivized child is no use to his family, and a great burden in a society where penury holds sway. It is not the assistance given to European women to encourage child-bearing which will change their minds. This attitude implies that the child is a burden, a risk, even a misfortune, but never an investment. Of love, needless to say, there is no question. What is more, schools encourage children to criticize, to abandon respect for their parents, and beyond the Iron Curtain, to inform against them.

I appeal to an instinct drawn from the depths of time. Why were fertile women blessed of old? Firstly, the child shared in the labour of the family; secondly, he took care of his elders; thirdly, he passed on his inheritance. Today a child is born: Firstly, his parents, impatient and worried, wonder what they will do with him; secondly, they do not depend on his assistance, their old age being taken care of by the State; thirdly, the family inheritance is no longer passed on; but is frittered away, as we all know. This is not to say that the desire for a society of leisure does not also come to us from the depths of time. With the exception of those with the privilege of power or knowledge — the conquerors and the creators — free men have never worked more except in order to work less. At all events, if our jeopardized Europe wishes to perpetuate itself, it must be prepared to face a profound moral transformation. It is surely reasonable to believe that, once they have acquired leisure, perceived the interdependence between the active phase of life and a contented old age, and satisfied their natural desire to hand down their possessions, married couples will be willing to enhance through children their zest for life. There is nothing to stop us from conceiving a different ideal, born of a faith in ourselves. The answer lies in our soul — the answer to the question of Europe!

Identity, birth rate. We now come to the third problem, which may, if you so will, prove a matter for your supreme authority — that of *legality*, of the Rights of Man. Those rights came to grief in Europe when the League of Nations broke down and our continent was overrun by the National Socialist dictatorship. They found refuge in the United States, first in San Francisco and later in Manhattan. There, they

President

sank into oblivion. Tyrants are welcomed with full honours in the Glass Palace and appointed to committees which supposedly concern themselves with improving the lot of the poor. International casuistry goes so far as to refuse to recognize as victims the boat people, adrift today on dangerous seas without provisions or destination, simply because they left their country 'voluntarily'.

(Applause)

Those responsible for the genocides with which we are familiar ought to have been expelled from the United Nations Organization. Who has demanded their expulsion? Nobody.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Is this surprising? If we term democracies those countries in which the opposition has neither fled underground nor been imprisoned, there are fewer than thirty at Manhattan, among the 150 or more frequenters of its palace, all of them signatories of the Charter. What an organization, as Charles de Gaulle exclaimed. To lay down the law is not an obligation: but to lay down the law and pretend to enforce it while in reality betraying it is a crime. It will be for you to condemn this crime. It is for you to set the example!

But this law will itself have to be thought over again in the light of the unforeseen privileges engendered by the tolerance of our liberal societies. In its own name, this tolerance has given way to fanaticism and abuse of power. The concentration of technical power leads to excesses which neither Grotius, nor the revolutionaries of 1789, nor Marx himself had anticipated. From the outside, a handful of sons of the desert can destroy a civilization to which they owe their wealth, while Europe, even impoverished, unceasingly proclaims her solidarity with the underprivileged of our common Vale of Tears. From inside, a few faceless men without clearly defined moral responsibilities can hold at their mercy until wind, cold, ignorance and paralysis ensue, masses of other anonymous men, their brothers. Europeans have a fear of privilege, even if it be the privilege of machines. In a spirit of respect for the philosophy underlying Human Rights, new conceptions of property, labour and the exigences of culture must be sought.

Identity, natality, legality: Europe will only recover her aura by rekindling their flames — the flames of conscience, of life, and of law. You, the elected representatives of Europe, have the tinder in your hands.

You may rest assured that I have made this speech, so little in tune with convention, in full awareness of the nuclear danger which hangs over us. Overburdened with weaponry, our planet turns on its axis, engaged in a third world war, now hidden, now brutally apparent — insidiously multiform. The documents I

have seen fail to convince me that disarmament has begun otherwise than on paper; nuclear science has, indeed, become widely accessible. The danger is now so great that it outstrips our anguish over it. If they were fully conscious of the risk, couples would have no children at all. Already, some peoples with more imagination than others have become like rats and built huge underground cities proof against blast and radiation. Already, shelter instructions are in circulation. But there is still a chance, which your moral authority as Europeans, united against a possible cataclysm, can strengthen. This chance resides in the fact that it is men, not weapons, that kill. Arms are not invented or brought out of hiding of their own accord. No, it is men who kill; and if we, the Ten, have not yet made plans to live beneath the earth, allow me to entertain the illusion that this is not through any lack of funds, but because our spiritual concepts forbid us to despair of human nature.

(Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, elected Representatives of Europe, acting as your hostess rather than as your President, I want, after the fashion of my pretty great-granddaughters who at this very moment are ranging the world by land, sea and air, to say thank you for your attention, *Merci pour votre attention! Danke! Grazie! Dank U! Tak! go ribh maith agaibh!* Thank you, and, in my incomparable native tongue, I would add: *du fond du cœur!*

(Standing ovation)

3. Verification of credentials

President. — The next item is the verification of credentials. Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure lays down that, at this sitting, credentials shall be verified by a temporary special committee composed of the oldest Member and eight Members appointed by lot.

The list of Members has been distributed. Since this list was printed, I have been informed by the competent authorities of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg that Mr Pierre Werner has been replaced by Mr Jean Wolter. I have also received written communications from Mr François Mitterand and Mr Gustavo Selva announcing their resignations. The second subparagraph of Article 12 (2) of the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage requires the Assembly to establish these vacancies and inform the Member States concerned thereof. This will be done immediately.

We shall now proceed to appoint by lot the members of the committee for the verification of credentials.

These are: Mr Fernandez, Mr Zecchino, Mr Tindemans, Mr de Ferranti, Mrs Gaspard, Mr Thorn, Mr John Mark Taylor, Mr Sutra.

President

The members of the special committee for the verifications of credentials are asked to go to Room No 3.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.20 a.m. and resumed at 1.05 p.m.)

The sitting is resumed.

The temporary committee for the verification of credentials, pursuant to Article 11 of the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, took note of the results declared officially by the Member States.

During the meeting, it received an official communication from the United Kingdom authorities to the effect that the election of Miss Roberts was invalid. Consequently, pursuant to the Act of 20 September 1976, the European Parliament takes note of this vacancy, which will be communicated immediately to the United Kingdom authorities.

The committee insists that the appropriate French authorities, who have been informed of the vacancy created by Mr Mitterand's resignation, announce the name of his successor without delay. As I promised during the committee meeting, I have myself telephoned to the Director of the French Foreign Minister's personal secretariat, who promised to use his best efforts and hopes to be able to give us the information necessary before the sitting is resumed at 3 p.m.

The committee took note of the complaints it had received concerning the counting of the votes cast during the ballot of 10 June 1979 in the French Republic. I remind the House that, pursuant to Article 11 of the Act of 20 September 1976, this Parliament

shall take note of the results declared officially by the Member States and shall rule on any disputes which may arise out of the provisions of this Act other than those arising out of the national provisions to which the Act refers.

We are therefore being entirely democratic in our application of the regulations applicable to this Assembly.

First of all, a letter from Mr Bernhard Oelerink attacking, in general terms, the financing of the parties and their electoral campaigns as infringing the Rights of Man and consequently demanding the invalidation of the elections to the European Parliament so far as the German Federal Republic is concerned. Since this protest is not directed to any infringement of the provisions of the Act of 20 September 1976, it has to be rejected.

A further objection comes from a lawyer, Mr Lau, who has sent us a telegram worded: 'Einspruch Europawahlen' (protest European elections). Since this objection is not directed to any infringement of the provisions of the Act of 20 September 1976, it, too, has to be rejected.

Finally, a contestation, dated 16 July 1979, has been presented by Mrs Solange Fernex on behalf of the

Europe-Écologie list. This is based on an appeal submitted by this list for the invalidation of the European elections on the ground that the French electoral law is not in conformity with the European Convention on Human Rights, with the spirit of the Treaty of Rome or with the French Constitution of 4 October 1958. Since none of the reasons indicated is based on an infringement of the provisions of the Act of 20 September 1976, this request must, like the others, be declared inadmissible.

The temporary committee for the verification of credentials was also obliged to note that, owing to delays in the submission of information, the files of many Members were still not complete with regard to the declaration of incompatibility. It therefore proposes to refer these cases to the enlarged Bureau and urges the Members concerned to complete their files as soon as possible by submitting the statement on the applicability of the provisions of Article 6 (1) of the Act of 20 September 1976 on the question of incompatibility.

Meanwhile, I remind the House that, pursuant to Rule 3 (3) of the Rules of Procedure :

any Member whose credentials have not yet been verified may provisionally take his seat in Parliament or on its committees, and shall have the same rights as other Members of Parliament.

Are there any comments ?

I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (I) Madam President, I have listened with attention to the report of the temporary committee for the verification of credentials, and it appears that among those elected, for example, from the Federal Republic of Germany, the representatives of the green list, Roland Vogt and Petra Kelly, do not figure.

The temporary committee for the verification of credentials has, we can be sure, respected national laws for the European elections, but there is no doubt that this is a political question, since the 900 000 German electors who voted for a particular list have not been allowed the right to even one representative. And yet a political movement was involved which, though certainly a minority one, was nevertheless of great political importance.

I know that this is not, perhaps, the most appropriate institutional forum, but I believe it is the duty of everyone, and especially of this new Parliament which has only just been elected, to give ever wider scope to minorities, including elected minorities, taking care not to undermine constituted groups by means of surreptitious, authoritarian and arbitrary changes to the Rules of Procedure. In particular, my object in asking for the floor is to emphasize that, in my view, this Parliament should issue as soon as possible directives which will guarantee the same rights to all the citizens of Europe, at least at the time of elections.

Bonino

You said in your speech, Madam President, that we must create a European identity, we must produce Europeans. Well, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, shutting out minorities, dissent and new movements is not the way to create anything positive. I would therefore stress the need to make it a political priority to see that elections are held in more democratic conditions and are made more accessible to all citizens by reducing the financial difficulties and those connected with the right to publicity. In particular, I reserve the right to be able to raise here the problem, which undoubtedly is a political one, of an ecology, anti-nuclear and feminist list in Germany which, although it got 900 000 votes — I repeat, 900 000 votes — has not received the right to have even one representative amongst us.

President. — Mrs Bonino, I shall reply when all the comments have been made.

I call Mrs Pannella — I beg your pardon, Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Madam President, that mistake is particularly appreciated by the Italian radical Members, who, speaking just a moment ago of a list excluded — in our opinion, arbitrarily — from this Parliament, were in fact talking about a feminist list. We, the radical party, are known for not believing in any privileged sexual status, which is why to have called me 'Mrs Pannella' is something which I feel able to welcome humorously as a Freudian slip, albeit an innocent one, on the part of our President.

Having said that, I would remark that the report by the temporary committee for the verification of credentials confirms the fact that very often in this Europe of ours we have a legal situation which does not correspond to any criterion of justice and which violates the rules of the democratic game. In particular, I note that this temporary committee for the verification of credentials will doubtless have confirmed that, under British laws, it is just that ten persons deputed by the British citizens to represent them in this Parliament should have been excluded on the basis of criteria of formal legality which do not correspond to justice or to the rules of the democratic game, and that others are therefore occupying their seats here.

So, if we want the life of this Parliament to be different from that of certain other, national parliaments in times, now past, which it is depressing to recall, if we do not want this Parliament to be solely the spokesman of the powerful and the bureaucrats who are dominating us, destroying our quality of life and once more threatening peace in our time — if we want this, I think we should all respond to your appeal, Madam President, when you recalled that the law should indeed be sovereign and not tolerate exceptions.

We thank you for this warning, Madam President. We here are aware of being, in a very small way, survivors

of a series of arbitrary, non-democratic acts which have prevented the citizens of Europe in many countries, such as France, Germany and Britain, from being able to exercise a choice, and from knowing before choosing. The new groups — not minority groups, but often majority ones, since the opponents of nuclear energy and the ecologists, the non-violent people, are often in a majority in the hopes of our people — have had their numbers drastically curtailed as a result of their arbitrary exclusion from the mass media. Irregularities have been committed: you have appropriated money which did not rightfully belong to you in the electoral campaigns, contrary to every *esprit de loi*; you have appropriated public money for your private party campaigns; you have suppressed in public-monopoly television and radio the right and the duty to inform citizens so that they could make their choice in full awareness; with barriers of 5 or 6 or 7 %, you have prevented people from taking their seats amongst us who had a legitimate mandate, in accordance with the principles of republican legitimacy, to take those seats, and now you are hoping, with the bureaucratic obtuseness which people are trying to impose on this Parliament, to violate the Rules of Procedure in the next few days, trying to dissolve groups which have already been set up, and in particular a group which comprises within it, beyond any doubt, the few representatives of determined federalist regionalism, of determined pacifist, non-violent action, of opposition to nuclear energy. We sit in this Chamber, Madam President, aware that isolated incidents of violence will have the power to defeat us for short periods, but you know, ladies and gentlemen, elected as you have been elected, that on the nuclear question we represent at least half of Europe, because if a referendum were to be held on this subject in our countries, either you would change your views or else you would be defeated.

Madam President, I thank you for the forbearance with which you have allowed me to speak with a somewhat greater latitude than would have been permitted under a strict interpretation of the Rules of Procedure — Rule 6 (2) — and I hope that your courtesy and tolerance are a herald of change in this Parliament as regards the methods which the somewhat irregular meetings of group chairmen seemed to portend.

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (I) Madam President, I associate myself with the statements made by both Mrs Bonino and Mr Pannella. I too must take note, and protest against the fact that the committee for the verification of credentials has not directed its attention to a problem which has manifested itself with regard to Italy: the impossibility — which must be attributed in the first place to the Italian Government but also to the governments of the other countries of the Community — for millions of Italian emigrants of voting in

Capanna

the other eight countries of the Community. All Members know, and certainly first and foremost the President, that they were only able to exercise their legitimate right to vote abroad in derisory numbers. That means in practice that if all of them had been able to vote, probably the 81 Italian Members who are sitting here today would have been different — that is, designated in accordance with different voting ratios and thus a different set of democratic relationships.

I shall conclude quickly by saying that if the European Parliament begins in this way it is very probable that it will try to continue along the same road: I therefore make just one observation. Today, I take it, the President and the Bureau will be elected, and following that there will be a meeting of the enlarged Bureau. Here a new group — of which I am part — has been constituted, which, on the basis of the Rules of Procedure, will be able to take part in that meeting and will thus see the legitimacy of its existence formally, legally and politically sanctioned.

Afterwards, however, there is a strong desire in this Parliament to vote in favour of the Luster resolution, which would mean a deliberate pruning of the liberties of one political group — an abuse of power which would be clearly and indisputably anti-democratic.

I have addressed this question, defying any accusation of having strayed from the subject, because it seems to me that the two questions are inextricably linked. It is not my habit, or, I think, of others, to make threats; I simply wish to express a political judgment. If it is intended to allow this *coup de main* on the part of the majority — because that is undoubtedly what it is — to go ahead with regard to adopting the Luster resolution, it is obvious that every kind of parliamentary tactic must be used to prevent this deliberate infringement of liberty being brought about.

President. — I call Mrs Castellina.

Mrs Castellina. — (*I*) Madam President, I should like to say a word about certain objections which have been raised to the telegrams and letters sent to the committee for the verification of credentials.

These objections may not have legal validity, but I think it necessary to emphasize — at the moment when this Parliament, elected for the first time by universal suffrage, is beginning its work and proceeding to verify the credentials of the new Members — how serious a matter it is, politically, that it should begin its work by taking note of objections which have been raised — objections which have a great political weight. We must all be aware that many other members would have been amongst us if the democratic principle of proportional representation had been adopted everywhere, and Solange Fernex is right when she recalls in her letter that this is the only principle which is in conformity with the

Convention on Human Rights. If this principle had been adopted, in France alone the votes cast by 886 819 people who voted for the Europe-Écologie list would have received concrete expression, while the list for the Socialist United States of Europe had almost the same number of votes and the fifth list, that of Mr Servan-Schreiber, received 372 682. And what is one to say of the rule — surely an incredible one — which obliges a political party, if it is to stand in the elections, to pay for the ballot-papers to be printed and distributed to the polling-stations? This rule prevented the PSU from presenting its own list, because it did not have the sum of 1 100 000 new francs, which was the heavy price for being able to stand in the elections.

I may well be true that we cannot decide in this forum on such questions, but as this Parliament will soon be called upon to decide on the uniform arrangements required for the election of the next Parliament, it would be a serious matter if we allowed this inaugural sitting to pass without insisting on the necessity for the new law, which will be valid in all the member countries of the Community, to respect democratic principles and be consistent with the principles laid down in the Convention on Human Rights.

President. — I call Mr Schwartzberg.

Mr Schwartzberg. — (*F*) Madam President, the group to which I belong, and particularly its French members, bring to the Assembly's attention an infringement of the most important article of the Act of 20 September 1976, which provides for the election of the representatives to the Assembly by direct universal suffrage. I regret to say that the announcement of the results by the French authorities infringes this principle.

The National Election Board in fact arrogated to itself the right to modify what was the clear and manifest result of a popular vote by depriving our list of one seat and giving it to the list of the party in power, which already had all the support it needed. The immediate result of this quite arbitrary decision was to deprive this Assembly of a powerful voice, that of François Mitterand, the principal candidate on our list, who resigned in protest against such cunning gerrymandering, which makes a mockery of universal suffrage and democracy.

As you said, Madam President, the common basis of our civilization is our uncompromising respect for democracy. Are we in this Assembly, finally elected by universal suffrage, then going to start renouncing democracy today? We represent nine peoples of Europe, and we have not been elected to hold our tongues and acquiesce. We therefore solemnly request this Assembly to restore to the list of French socialist and left-wing radicals that twenty-second seat which

Schwartzenberg

the popular vote gave it and which was taken from it by an arbitrary decision manifestly at variance with the law and with universal suffrage.

Honourable Members, the credibility of this Assembly is now in your hands; either you accept the unacceptable and the peoples of Europe lose confidence in this Assembly, or you reject it and give this Assembly the moral authority that the men and women who cherish liberty, that frail and vital ideal, deserve.

(Loud applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — *(I)* Madam President, after listening to your report on the work of the committee for the verification of credentials, I should like to make a few very brief remarks. I too am the representative of a minority, the Italian National Right, and I am absolutely convinced that the respect which minorities expect from this Parliament goes equally — I shall not say, above all — for the minorities of the right which I have the honour to represent.

I speak to fill a gap which, it seems to me, is now making itself felt, since the working document you have kindly distributed to us provides for a debate after your introductory report. Since none of the spokesmen of the majorities has taken the floor, I should like to do so to thank you, Madam President, for the very high cultural level and also the courage of your speech, which honours the whole Assembly. I refer in particular to the courage with which you spoke out on the subject of the genocide practised today.

Reference was made a few minutes ago to another kind of genocide which has arisen — certainly bloodless, but just as serious — against Italian workers in every part of the world. Of 5.5 million Italian workers in possession of an Italian passport, and thus possessing full rights as Italian citizens, only 100 000 were able to take part in the recent elections. This was the fault of the Italian Government and of the Italian parliamentary majority — a fault which goes back as much as thirty years, since only on the occasion of these recent elections was it possible, by means of proposals principally put forward by our minority, to obtain the right to vote for Italian workers, at least those living and working in the countries of the European Community. Allow me to thank them, and to thank them also in your name, for the work they are humbly carrying out, often suffering under injustices which will have to be removed.

I associate myself with what has been said about the treatment of minorities in various countries of Europe on the occasion of the recent elections. Certain cases have been mentioned. May I also be permitted to mention the case of the French *Eurodroite*, which, after achieving a proportion of about 2% and more

than half-a-million votes, was not able to reap any reward for its own hard work, as a result of the existence of an unquestionably unjust anti-proportional and anti-minority law.

I conclude, not with a protest, but with the hope that this Parliament will continue its labours in the same spirit in which you have sought, and successfully sought, to launch them, bearing in mind that this Parliament is the expression and the representative, not of power, but of our peoples, and is therefore the representative of our minorities, no less than of our majorities.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, while it is highly desirable that each of us should have an opportunity of giving expression to his concerns and conveying his views on the problems which await us, we are bound by our Rules of Procedure, which have been adopted democratically, and by the national rules by virtue of which you are here at this moment. The Bureau, which is shortly to be elected, will, I am sure, show the greatest possible equity and understanding when discussing the statements which have just been made.

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

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.40 p.m. and resumed at 3.15 p.m.)

The sitting is resumed.

4. Composition of Parliament

President. — I have just received from the competent French authority the official notification of the filling of the seat left vacant by the resignation of Mr François Mitterrand. Mrs Fuillet has been appointed a Member of the European Parliament. Her credentials will be examined by the Bureau. Meanwhile, pursuant to Rule 3 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, Mrs Fuillet will provisionally take her seat in Parliament and on its committees and have the same rights as other Members.

5. Term of office of the President and Vice-Presidents

President. — Before proceeding to the election of the President, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the term of office of the President and Vice-Presidents is not laid down in the Rules of Procedure, which, in Rule 6, merely provide that at the first sitting and at any other sitting held for the purpose of electing the President and the Bureau, the oldest Member present shall take the chair until the President has been declared elected.

I have received a proposal from the EPP Group (Christian-Democratic Group), the European Democratic

President

Group and the Liberal and Democratic Group that the term of office should be fixed at two-and-a-half years.

I shall first give the floor to one of the authors of this proposal.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Klepsch. — (*D*) I have the honour of speaking on this proposal on behalf of the three political groups in question: the Group of the European People's Party, the European Democratic Group and the Liberal and Democratic Group. As you said, the term of office is not laid down in the Rules of Procedure. Discussions were held between the previous political groups with a view to establishing common ground before the new Parliament assumed its functions, and indeed we reached agreement that the President should be elected, not for a term of five years, as would have been equally possible, but for two two and a half year periods in each Parliament. This was, of course, subject to confirmation by the newly-elected political groups. Unfortunately, the Socialist Group as now constituted is unable to continue with this arrangement, and we have therefore submitted this proposal so that the question should not remain unresolved.

Of course we were also prepared to postpone a decision on this matter until the Luster report, embodying the will of the previous political groups, was submitted to this House. However, as the chairman of the Socialist and Communist Groups and, I believe, also of the Group of European Progressive Democrats indicated this morning that they were in favour of a different term of office, we feel it is in everyone's interests to take a decision before we elect a President, in order to avoid innumerable subsequent disputes over interpretation. This House is a sovereign body and is entitled to take a decision. At all events we submit this proposal, which was the commonly agreed arrangement.

(Applause from the centre and right)

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (*I*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that any change to the Rules Procedure must be considered very carefully and not decided on all of a sudden just because certain majority groups have colluded to this end. First of all, any change to the Rules of Procedure must, under the Rules of Procedure themselves — Rule 54 (1) — be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure of this Parliament, and this committee has not yet been constituted nor has any decision on it been taken. I repeat that any change in the Rules of Procedure must be reflected upon with all possible calm, and, to me, an oral motion for a resolution without documentation, one which has been neither translated nor distributed beforehand to the 410 newly-elected Members, seems inadmissible: to proceed in this

manner would be underhand and unacceptable. I would point out that the Rules of Procedure list the only cases in which special procedures are provided for: first, Rule 54 (1), reference to committee; second, the vote is valid only if 206 Members have taken part. While it is true that any Assembly is sovereign, it is not right to go ahead with amendments to the Rules of Procedure using underhand means and before all the Members have been informed.

I would ask Members to give these points their consideration, but I think I can say on behalf of the group of independents, or at least of ten members of that group — and I hope that many genuinely democratic Members will wish to support our request — that on this resolution we propose, and call for, a roll-call vote pursuant to Rule 35 (4).

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in the spirit and letter of the Rules of Procedure as they relate to this matter — that is to say, Rule 6 (2) and Rule 54 — I should like to put very briefly the Socialist Group's views on the term of office of the President of the European Parliament. We feel that the role of the President should be based on that of the Speaker of the House of Commons (*laughter from certain quarters*) and should be laid down explicitly in Parliament's Rules of Procedure, rather than being decided by tacit agreement, by confused interpretations, by a more or less traditional consensus, or by a sudden show of force in the House. The Socialist Group also hopes to see a properly-organized rotation of the office of President — from year to year, for example — and, in conformity with democratic traditions very much alive in certain national parliaments, we feel that the honour of providing the first of this succession of Presidents should go to the numerically largest political group in the Assembly. These are our reasons for putting forward our candidate, Mr Mario Zagari.

On several occasions in the last few days, we have put these arguments to leaders of the other political groups, and we are confident that the sense of fair play the Assembly as a whole will ensure that a working-party composed of representatives from all the political groups and the Committee on the Rules of Procedure will be set up to deliberate, decide and clarify the situation without any show of force or improvisation.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

President. — I call Mr D'Angelosante.

Mr D'Angelosante. — (*I*) Madam President, in our view we cannot vote on the proposal which has just been moved by the chairman of the Christian-Democratic Group, Mr Klepsch, for the following reasons.

d'Angelosante

First of all, the Luster report, and the resolution it contains, cannot, once it comes up on the agenda, be adopted by a majority *coup* simply because it reflects an agreement which existed between the groups when it was drawn up. This agreement no longer exists, and therefore our Rules of Procedure cannot be amended in this irregular way.

Once this proposal has lost the support of half the groups which originally supported it, it is not right to push it through on a majority vote. It was, after all, a political agreement and cannot be replaced now by the will of only some of those who previously entered into it.

The main reason, however, is that what Mr Klepsch wants is not under discussion at the present moment. The question whether the President's term of office should be one year — as we, like the Socialist Group, believe — or two-and-a-half years — as the chairman of the Christian-Democratic Group is proposing — forms part of the package of proposals contained in the Luster report.

According to the agenda which we all have before us, consideration of these problems comes after the election of the President. The Christian-Democratic Group cannot therefore now, for its own convenience or of its own choosing, force us to hold up the election of the President in order to settle, as this group would wish, a question on which it would instead be wise and just to reflect at length before taking a decision.

It is our opinion that no decision concerning the Rules of Procedure of the elected Parliament can be taken in a *coup* staged by the majority or by accepting proposals handed down to us from the old Parliament. It is the right and privilege of every parliament not to consider itself bound by the one which preceded it, and we believe that this Parliament should avail itself of this right.

(Applause)

For this reason, we feel that all the questions — which indubitably exist — about adapting the Rules of Procedure to the new situation in this Parliament can only be solved by referring them to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions for detailed examination. It is only by referring them to this committee that these questions can be studied and settled — not by acts of force, a *coup* staged by the majority or a sudden acceleration of the timetable.

These are the reasons, Madam President, why we disagree with the Klepsch proposal and say there can be no vote on it. We would ask you to bear these things in mind when deciding.

(Applause from the extreme left)

President — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Panella. — *(F)* Madam President, I find Mr Klepsch's proposal quite simply inadmissible. According to Rule 6 (2), no business shall be transacted while the oldest Member is in the chair unless it is concerned with the election of the President or the verification of credentials. Mr Klepsch's proposal is therefore out of order, as we are not empowered to discuss it at this stage in our proceedings.

I am aware that certain right-wing parties, with traditional claims to Europeanism or federalism are backing a candidate who has campaigned against the powers of this Parliament and are now trying to sweeten the pill with parliamentary blandishments — in bad taste, I may add — in the hope of gaining a few extra votes, but we will not swallow it. The Rules are quite clear, and Mr Klepsch's proposal is out of order. I do not think we should be discussing it.

President. — I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien. — *(F)* Madam President, honourable Members, I rise to speak on behalf of certain democratic representatives, not in order to interfere with the conduct of this sitting or spoil an atmosphere which you probably hoped would be quiet, tactful, pleasant and problem-free, but to point out that apart from the procedural points we discussed this morning, are discussing now and shall be discussing later in connection with the Luster report, there is the fundamental question of the rights and liberties of this Parliament. Either we passively accept certain arrangements agreed on in secret by the leaders of the major traditional parties at a meeting in some restaurant or room, or else we take steps today, while there is still time, to ensure that no conspiracies are possible in this House.

Although the situation is not yet regularized and we have no Bureau or committees, we feel that nevertheless there is a move afoot to take decisions now that are not just decisions of procedure but result from the political balance of power and reflect certain intentions as regards the trend for the next five years. We therefore request, on behalf of various non-attached Members, that the existing Rules of Procedure be complied with and that the proposal before us be referred to the incoming Committee on the Rules of Procedure, since it is that committee that has to determine the rules of the game and not the existing Rules of Procedure; our new Parliament is quite different from the old one. Moreover no more than fifty Members of this Parliament were Members of the old one; that is another reason for taking the view that all the rights of our Assembly, particularly as regards the Rules of Procedure, ought to be safeguarded.

Gendebien

We call for a vote by roll-call on the proposal before us, for the democratic and parliamentary conscience of each Member is at stake. Even though some of you may not think this vote important, other votes will follow, that, will, perhaps, call into question the democratic functioning of this Assembly and our equal rights. We therefore request a vote by roll-call.

President. — I call Mr Lalor.

Mr Lalor. — Madam President speaking on behalf of the European Progressive Democrats, I wish to say that we are opposed to the motion which has been tabled.

(Applause)

I cannot understand why at this stage we should be debating this item. In fact you indicated to us before lunch that we would be recalled at 3 o'clock for the election of the President. I think that we should at this stage be proceeding with the election of the President, and I cannot understand why we should be talking about the length of his or her term of office.

As I see it, there is no legal vacuum between the former Assembly and the now directly-elected Assembly. We should not, at this stage, before the election of a President, endeavour to fix the length of time he or she will preside. I think that we should elect our President at this stage without determining what the term of office will be; let it be for the normal expected period, which might expire next March, or for the annual period. If any changes are to be made, these should be left to the incoming Committee on the Rules of Procedure, and I fully support all the speakers who have spoken along these lines.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — I call Mr Pfennig.

Mr Pfennig. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not understand this debate either. If my reading of the Rules of Procedure and the Luster report is correct, there is nothing in either of them concerning the term of office of the President. If we wish to lay down such a term — and the desire to do so has been clearly expressed here, whether for a year, two-and-a-half years or something similar — then it must be done before the President is elected and cannot be done retroactively. The question has nothing at all to do with the Rules of Procedure, but is a matter which this Parliament, without its Committee on the Rules of Procedure, can and must decide, here and now, before electing its President. As far as I can see, this discussion has added nothing new to what has already been proposed, and I therefore

call for the closure of this debate and a vote on the term of office of the President.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I have accordingly received a motion for the closure of this debate.

Pursuant to Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure, only the mover of the motion, one speaker for and one against the motion can be heard.

I call Mr de la Malène.

Mr de la Malène. — *(F)* Madam President, I very much regret the way this debate has been launched. I think the sitting should be suspended for a few minutes. It is up to the oldest Member and, in the circumstances, no one else, to interpret the Rules of Procedure to the best of her conscience and belief. You have only yourselves to blame, gentlemen, for organizing the debate in this way, without Bureau or Rules of Procedure. As you wanted to initiate this debate, the oldest Member must shoulder the burden of interpreting the Rules of Procedure. I therefore request that the sitting be suspended for a few minutes to allow her time for reflection.

(Applause from the benches of the Group of European Progressive Democrats)

President. — Mr de la Malène proposes that the sitting be suspended for a few moments.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 3.45 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m.)

The sitting is resumed.

Having reflected on the statements that have been made, I am of the personal opinion that a debate on the President's term of office should not take place while I am in the Chair. In these circumstances, we now have to proceed to the election of the President without prejudice to his term of office.

As it is in Parliament's interests that the question of the president's term of office should be settled as soon as possible, I recommend the future President to refer the matter immediately to the Bureau once it has been formed. It will then be for Parliament to decide.

I am making this statement in agreement with the authors of the proposal.

The debate on this item is therefore provisionally closed.

6. Election of the President

President. — The next item is the election of the President of the European Parliament.

President

I have received, in accordance with the conditions laid down by the Rules of Procedure, the following nominations :

Mr Amendola, Mr de la Malène, Mrs Veil and Mr Zagari,

Pursuant to Rule 7 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, we must therefore proceed to an election by secret ballot.

I remind the House of the relevant provisions of Rule 7 (2) of the Rules of Procedure :

If after three ballots no candidate has obtained an absolute majority of the votes cast, the fourth ballot shall be confined to the two Members who have obtained the highest number of votes in the third ballot. In the event of a tie, the elder candidate shall be declared elected.

Similarly, I remind the House that, pursuant to Rule 35 (7), only ballot-papers bearing the names of persons who have been nominated shall be taken into account in calculating the number of votes cast.

Ballot-papers and envelopes have been distributed. Members should mark the name of the candidate of their choice on the ballot-paper, place this in the envelope and deposit the envelope, when their names are called, in the ballot-box on the table in front of the President's rostrum.

Since the names of Members who have voted in a secret ballot have to be listed in the Minutes, Members are asked to sign the list placed near the rostrum before depositing their ballot-papers in the ballot-box.

Lots will now be drawn to appoint the four tellers.

The four tellers will be Mrs Clywd, Mr Baudis, Mr Beazley and Mr Coppieters.

I have just received, from ten Members, the nomination of Mrs Bonino.

Lots will now be drawn to determine the Member at whose name the roll-call will begin.

The roll-call will begin at Mr Berkhouwer.

The ballot is open.

I ask the Secretary-General to call the roll.

(The roll was called)

Does anyone else wish to vote ?

The ballot is closed.

I ask the tellers to go Room 1111 to count the votes.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 6 p.m. and resumed at 7 p.m.)

The sitting is resumed.

Here is the result of the ballot :

Number of Members voting : 404
Ballot-papers received : 401
Blank or spoiled ballot-papers : 21
Valid votes cast : 380
Absolute majority : 191.

Votes received are as follows :

Mr Amendola : 44
Mrs Bonino : 9
Mr de la Malène : 26
Mrs Veil : 183
Mr Zagari : 118.

The following Members voted :

Abens, Adam, Adonnino, van Aerssen Agnelli, Aigner, Alber, Albers von Alemann, Almirante, Amendola, Ansart, Ansquer, Antoniozzi, Arfè, Arndt, Baduel Glorioso, Baillot, Balfe, Balfour, Bangemann, Barbagli, Barbarella, Barbi, Battersby, Baudis, Beazley, Berkhouwer, Berlinguer, Bersani, Bethell, Bettiza, Beumer, von Bismarck, Blaney, Blumenfeld, Bocklet, Boden, Bøgh, Bonaccini, Bonde, Bonino, Boot, Boserup, Boyes, Brandt, Brookes, Buchan, Buchou, Buttafuoco, Caborn, Caillavet, Calvez, Capanna, Cardia, Caretoni, Romagnoli, Cariglia, Carossino, Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Castellina, Castle, Catherwood, Cecovni, Ceravolo, Chambeiron, Charzat, Chirac, Chouraqui, Cinciari Rodano, Clinton, Clwyd, Cohen, Colla, Colleselli, Collins, Collomb, Colombo, Combe, Coppieters, Costanzo, Cottrell, de Courcy Ling, Craxi, Cresson, Cronin, Croux, Curry, Dalsass, Dalziel, Damette, Damseaux, D'Angelosante, Dankert, Davern, Debatisse, Debré, De Clercq, De Keersmaecker, Dekker, Delatte, Deleau, Delmotte, Delorozoy, Delors, Demarch, Denis, De Pasquale, Desmond, de Valera, Diana, Didò, Dienesch, Diligent, Donnez, Douro, Elles, Enright, Eastier, Ewing, Fanti, Edgar Faure, Maurice Faure, Fellermaier, Fergusson, Fernandez, de Ferranti, Ferrero, Ferri, Filippi, Flanagan, Flesch, Focke, Forster, Forth, Bruno Friedrich, Ingo Friedrich, Frischmann, Früh, Fuchs, Fuillet, Gabert, Gaiotti de Biase, Gallagher, Galland, Galluzzi, Gaspard, Gatto, Gendebien, Geurtsen, Ghergo, Giavazzi, Gillot, Giummarra, Glinne, de Goede, Gonella, Goppel, Gouthier, Gredal, Gremetz, Griffiths, Groes, Van der Gun, Haagerup, Habsburg, Hänsch, Hahn, Hammerich, Harmar-Nicholls, Harris, von Hassel, Helms, Henckens, Herklotz, Herman, van den Heuvel-de Blank, Hoff, Jacqueline Hoffmann, Karl-Heinz Hoffmann, Hooper, Hord, Howell, Hume, Hutton, Iotti, Ippolito, Irmer, Christopher Jackson, Robert Jackson, Jakobsen, Janssen van Raay, Jaquet, Johnson, Jonker, Josselin, Jürgens, Katzer, Kavanagh, Edward Kellett-Bowman, Elaine Kellett-Bowman, Key, Kirk, Klepsch, Klinkenborg, Köhler, Krouwel-Vlam, Kühn, Labbé, Lalor, Lange Langes, Lecanuet, Lega, Lemmer, Lenz, Leonardi, Leroux, Lezzi, Ligios, Lima, Linde, Linkohr, Lizin, Loderer, Lomas, Loo, Louwes, Lücker, Luster, Macrio, McCartin, Maffre-Baugé, Maher, Maij-Weggen, Majonica, Malangré, de la Malène, Marshall, Maurice Martin, Simone Martin, Martinet, Mauroy, Megahy, Mertens, Messmer, Michel, van Minnen, Møller, Moorhouse, Jacques Moreau, Louise Moreau, Moreland, Mothcane, Müller-Hermann, Muntingh, Narducci, Newton Dunn, Nicolson, Brøndlund Nielsen, Tove Nielsen, Nord, Nordlohne, Normanton, Notenboom, Notbomb, Nyborg, O'Connell, O'Donnell, Oehler, O'Hagan, O'Leary, Olesen, Orlandi, d'Ormesson, Paisley, Pajetta, Pannella, Papapietro, Patterson, Pearce, Pedini, Pelikan, Penders, Percheron, Peters, Petronio, Pfennig, Pflimlin, Piccoli, Pininfarina, Pintat, Piquet, Plumb, Poirier, Poncelet, Poniatowski, Pöttering, Prag, Prachère, Price, Prout, Porvan, Pruvot, Puletti, Pürsten, Purvis, Quin, Rabbethge, Radoux,

President

Remilly, Rey, Rhys Williams, Rinsche, Ripa di Meana, Rogers, Romualdi, Rossi, Roudy, Ruffolo, Rumor, Ryan, Sablé, Salisch, Sälzer, Santer, Sarre, Sassano, Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg, Schall, Schieler, Schinzel, Schleicher, Schmid, Schmitt, Schnitker, Karl Schön, Konrad Schön, Schwarzenberg, Schwencke, Sciascia, Scott-Hopkins, Scrivener, Seal, Seefeld, Seeler, Segre, Seibel-Emmerling, Seitlinger, Seligman, Sherlock, Siegler-Schmidt, Simmonds, Simonnet, Simpson, Skovmand, Spaak, Spencer, Spicer, Spinelli, Squarcialupi, Stewart, Clark, Sutra, John David Taylor, John Mark Tylor, Thorn, Tindemans, Tolman, Travaglini, Tuckman, Turner, Tyrrell, Vanderpoorten, Vandewiele, Van Miert, Vanneck, Vayssade, Veil, Vergeer, Vergès, Verhaegen, Vernimmen, Verroken, Vetter, Visentini, Vondeling, von der Vring, Wagner, Walter, Walz, Warner, Wawrzik, Weber, Weiss, Welsh, Wettig, Wiczorek-Zeul, von Wogau, Wolter, Woltjer, Wurtz, Zaccagnini, Zagri, Zecchino.

Since no candidate has received an absolute majority of the votes cast, we shall proceed to a second ballot.

Normally, nominations for the second ballot should, before the ballot begins, be submitted in writing to the oldest Member at the office of the Secretary-General. Nevertheless, if it can be stated that the nominations for the first ballot are being maintained, we can proceed with the second ballot immediately.

Are there any changes to the list of candidates nominated?

I call Mr de la Malène.

Mr de la Malène. — (F) Madam President, I request that the sitting be suspended for a quarter of an hour.

(Protests)

Honourable Members, I do not see anything surprising about suspending the sitting for a quarter of an hour during an election such as this; your outbursts surprise me...

President. — When a suspension of the sitting is requested by a group, it is customary to grant it. I see no reason why we should depart from this usage.

The sitting is therefore suspended for a quarter of an hour.

(The sitting was suspended at 7.05 p.m. and resumed at 7.30 p.m.)

The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr de la Malène.

Mr de la Malène. — (F) Madam President, in reply to your recent question, I wish to state that I withdraw my candidature for the second round.

(Applause)

President. — I note that your nomination is withdrawn.

I call Mr de Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, although I have already indicated three times in the course of the afternoon that I should like

to speak, I appear to have been overlooked. I shall not take offence at this and appreciate still having an opportunity of making a few comments at this stage in the election procedure.

The outcome of the first ballot shows that one of the candidates came very close to obtaining the required majority, that the number of abstentions was very high — 21, in fact — and that 9 votes also went to Mrs Bonino. This suggests that a second ballot would not be required now if we had been provided with the necessary information before the first ballot. In any event, that is how I see it.

What I should like to ask you is the following. Of the remaining candidates — Mrs Veil, Mrs Bonino, Mr Zagari and Mr Amendola — some are well known to us. Through the Dutch press, I too have learnt of a number of Mrs Veil's praiseworthy achievements in French politics, and we have thus been able to acquire certain personal impressions of her. I am less acquainted with Mr Zagari. However, the question in this election is what the candidates who are still standing would do with their office if elected. Obviously, tomorrow the elected President will tell us what he or she intends to make of his or her period in office. After all, in the European election campaign, all 410 of us seated here had to inform the voters beforehand of what we intended to do if elected to this Parliament. What obstacle is there, therefore, Madam President, to your inviting Mrs Veil, Mr Zagari, Mrs Bonino and Amendola to make a three-minute statement in answer to two questions? The first question: what do you intend to do with your period in office? One thing in particular will be of great importance in the period ahead: do you want the European Parliament to acquire greater influence, to take a step backward or to mark time? In this connection, the question of powers cannot be ignored. The second question is also important: how do you visualize ensuring respect for the rights of minority groups in this Parliament? Where this question is concerned, the present Rules of Procedure fall short of the mark.

These two issues were not only of importance in the discussions which are known to have taken place in the *in camera* meetings of the political groups and committees, but are of great importance to public opinion throughout Europe, to the European electorate. Might the electorate and the press be permitted to know how Mrs Veil intends to conduct her office?

An answer to these questions would help us to complete the second ballot-paper. I trust you will give the candidates the opportunity to say something on the subject; they would also say a lot by remaining silent.

(Protests)

President. — I cannot force anyone to take the floor to explain his intentions.

I call Mrs Bonino.

(Protests from various benches)

Mrs Bonino. — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I find the intolerance of some Members of this House rather irritating, since I believe there should at least be the right to speak in this Parliament. We have been elected, certainly not to hold our tongues but to join in discussion, even though our positions may be different. I have asked to speak, Madam President, in order to withdraw my candidacy.

(Loud laughter and applause from certain quarters)

I would ask Members not to rejoice too soon, since further action will certainly follow. I thank the Members who nominated me as candidates for the Presidency, who wanted to manifest a right which belongs to all Members of Parliament and is not subject to a carve-up among the large political groups and their chairmen. I hope that those who have voted for me will now transfer their votes to a candidate of the European Left, but I hope above all that this Left — something which rarely happens — will start behaving as such and distinguish itself by its championship of independents, minorities and dissent. The withdrawal of my candidacy does not mean that our fight is over; it means that new battles are in sight, particularly regarding the Bureau, the presence of independents in the Bureau and the committees and respect for the Rules of Procedure. You have not learned much about us today. I assure you that we shall be able to show that we know how to fight without violence and in conformity with the Rules of Procedure, but most assuredly with determination.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — I note that your candidature has been withdrawn. I call Mr Arndt.

Mr Arndt. — (D) Madam President, I should like to make a point before we go into this second ballot. When you announced the result of the first ballot, you stated that 191 votes were necessary to achieve an absolute majority of the votes cast. I wish to object, on the grounds that the Rules of Procedure — at least in the German version I have before me — state that the candidate must obtain an absolute majority of the votes cast in the first three ballots. I am aware of the second sentence of Rule 35 (7), which states that only ballot-papers bearing the names of persons who have been nominated shall be taken into account when calculating the number of votes cast. But I do not feel that this rule can be applied in the case of votes cast as referred to in Rule 7 (2).

For example, if a candidate — for the sake of argument, let us say Mr Thorn — were to receive 206 votes but had not been nominated, then he would not be elected. But you would still have to work on the basis of the number of votes actually cast, and fix the absolute majority for the second and third round on that basis too. I feel it is important that this principle should be recognized. Any other interpretation would, in my view, be contrary to the Rules of Procedure.

President. — I think, if I may say so, that the votes have been correctly counted.

(Scattered applause)

We shall now proceed to the second ballot, for which the following nominations are being maintained: Mr Amendola, Mrs Veil and Mr Zagari.

The ballot is open.

I ask the Secretary-General to call the roll.

(The roll was called)

Does anyone else wish to vote?

The ballot is closed.

I ask the tellers to go to Room 1111 to count the votes.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 8.30 p.m. and resumed at 9.40 p.m.)

The sitting is resumed.

Here is the result of the ballot:

Number of Members voting: 404
Ballot-papers received: 400
Blank or spoiled ballot-papers: 23
Valid votes cast: 377
Absolute majority: 189

Votes received are as follows:

Mr Armendola: 47
Mrs Veil: 192

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Zagari: 138

(Applause from the left)

The following Members voted:

Abens, Adam, Adonnino, van Aerssen, Agnelli, Aigner, Alber, Albers, von Alemann, Almirante, Amendola, Ansart, Ansquer, Antoniozzi, Arfè, Arndt, Baduel, Glorioso, Baillot, Balfé, Balfour, Bangemann, Barbagli, Barbarella, Barbi, Battersby, Baudis, Beazley, Berkhouwer, Berlinger, Bersani, Bethell, Bettiza, Beumer, von Bismarck, Blaney, Blumenfeld, Bocklet, Boden, Bøgh, Bonaccini, Bonde, Bonino, Boot, Boserup, Boyes, Brandt, Brookes, Buchan, Buchou, Buttafuoco, Caborn, Caillavet, Calvez, Capanna, Cardia, Carettoni Romagnoli, Cariglia, Carossino, Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Castellina, Castle, Catherwood, Cecovini, Ceravolo, Chambeiron, Charzat, Chirac, Chouraqui, Cinciari Rodano, Clinton, Clwyd, Cohen, Colla, Colleselli, Collins, Collomb, Colombo, Combe, Coppierters, Costanzo, Cottrell, de Courcy Ling, Craxi, Cresson, Cronin, Croux, Curry, Dalsass, Dalziel, Damette, Damseaux, D'Angelosante, Dankert, Davern, Debatisse, Debré, De Clercq, De Keersmaecker, Dekker, Delatte, Deleau, Delmotte, Delorozoy, Delors, Demarch, Denis, De Pasquale, Desmond, de Valera, Diana, Didò, Dienesch, Diligent, Donnez, Douro, Druon, Elles, Enright, Estier, Ewing, Fanti, Edgar Faure, Maurice Faure, Fellermaier, Fergusson, Fernandez, de Ferranti, Ferrero, Ferri, Filippi, Flanagan, Fleisch, Focke, Forster, Forth, Bruno Friedrich, Ingo Friedrich, Frischmann, Früh, Fuchs, Fuillet, Gabert, Gaiutti de Biase, Gallagher,

President

Galland, Galluzzi, Gaspard, Gatto, Gendebien, Geurtsen, Ghergo, Giavazzi, Gillot, Giummarra, Glinne, de Goede, Gonella, Goppel, Gouthier, Gredal, Gremetz, Griffiths, Groes, Van der Gun, Haagerup, Habsburg, Hänsch, Hahn, Hammerich, Harmar-Nicholls, Harris, von Hassel, Helms, Henckens, Herklotz, Herman, van den Heuvel-de Blank, Hoff, Jacqueline Hoffmann, Karl-Heinz Hoffmann, Hooper, Hopper, Hord, Howell, Hume, Hutton, Iotti, Ippolito, Irmer, Christopher Jackson, Robert Jackson, Jakobsen, Janssen van Raay, Jaquet, Johnson, Jonker, Josselin, Jürgens, Katzer, Kavanagh, Edward Kellett-Bowman, Elaine Kellett-Bowman, Key, Kirk, Klepsch, Klinkenborg, Köhler, Krouwel-Vlam, Kühn, Labbé, Lalor, Lange, Langes, Lecanuet, Lega, Lemmer, Lenz, Leonardi, Leroux, Lezzi, Ligios, Lima, Linde, Linkohr, Lizin, Loderer, Lomas, Loo, Louwes, Lücker, Luster Lyngé, Macario, McCartin, Maffre-Baugé, Maher, Maij-Weggen, Majonica, Malangré, de la Malène, Marshall, Maurice Martin, Simone Martin, Martinet, Mauroy, Megahy, Mertens, Messmer, Michel, van Minnen, Møller, Moorhouse, Jacques Moreau, Louise Moreau, Moreland, Motchane, Müller-Hermann, Muntingh, Narducci, Newton Dunn, Nicolson, Brøndlund Nielsen, Tove Nielsen, Nord, Nordlohne, Normanton, Notenboom, Nothomb, Nyborg, O'Connell, O'Donnell, Oehler, O'Hagan, O'Leary, Olesen, Orlandi, d'Ormesson, Paisley, Pajetta, Pannella, Papapietro, Patterson, Pearce, Pedini, Pelikan, Penders, Percheron, Peters, Petronio, Pfennig, Pflimlin, Pininfarina, Pintat, Piquet, Plumb Poirier, Poncelet, Poniatowski, Pöttering, Prag, Pranchère, Price, Prout, Provan, Pruvot, Puletti, Pürsten, Purvis, Quin, Rabbethge, Radoux, Remilly, Rey, Rhys Williams Rinsche, Ripa di Meana, Rogers, Romualdi, Rossi, Roudy, Ruffolo, Rumor, Ryan Sablé, Salisch, Sälzer, Santer, Sarre, Sassano, Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berlegurg, Schall, Schieler, Schinzel, Schleicher, Schmid, Schmitt, Schnitker, Karl Schön, Konrad Schön, Schwartzberg, Schwencke, Sciasia, Scott-Hopkins, Scrivener, Seal, Seefeld, Seeler, Segre, Seibel-Emmerling, Seitlinger, Seligman, Sherlock, Sieglerschmidt, Simmonds, Simonnet, Simpson, Skovmand, Spaak, Spencer, Spicer, Spinelli, Squarcialupi, Stewart-Clark, Sutra, John David Taylor, John Mark Taylor, Thorn, Tindemans, Tolman, Travaglini, Tuckman, Turner, Tyrrell, Vanderpoorten, Vandewiele, Van Miert, Vanneck, Vayssade, Veil, Vergeer, Vergès, Verhaegen, Vernimmen, Verroken, Vetter, Visentini, Vondeling, von der Vring, Wagner, Walter, Walz, Warner, Wawrzik, Weber, Weiss, Welsh, Wettig, Wiczorek-Zeul, von Wogau, Wolter, Woltjer, Wurtz, Zagari, Zecchino.

As Mrs Veil has obtained an absolute majority of the votes cast, I declare her elected President of the European Parliament. I congratulate her on her election, offer her my best wishes for her period in office and invite her to take the Chair.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

President

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, although I shall not be giving my opening address until the formal sitting of Parliament tomorrow, I should like to thank you all now for the great confidence you have shown in me by appointing me to this eminent position.

7. Political groups

President. — The Christian-Democratic Group (EPP Group) and the European Conservative Group have informed me that their new names are respectively 'Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group)' and 'European Democratic Group'.

The political groups have informed me of the composition of their respective Bureaux :

Socialist Group :

Chairman : Mr Glinne ;

Vice-chairmen (in order of precedence) : Mr Fellermaier, Mr Estier, Mrs Castle, Mr Lezzi, Mrs van den Heuvel ;

Members (in order of precedence) : Mr Abens, Mr Ferri, Mr Loo, Mr Seefeld, Mr Olesen, Mr O'Leary, Mrs Clwyd, Mr Hume, Mr Colla ;

Treasurer : Mr Hume.

Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) :

Chairman : Mr Klepsch ;

Vice-chairmen (in order of precedence) : Mrs Cassanmagnago, Cerretti, Mr Vergeer ;

Other members of the Bureau : Mr Colombo, Mr Tindemans.

The other members of the Bureau will be appointed later.

European Democratic Group :

Chairman : Mr Scott-Hopkins ;

Vice-chairmen (in order of precedence) : Mr Møller, Mr de Ferranti, Lady Elles ;

Treasurer : Sir John Stewart-Clark.

Communist and Allies Group :

Chairman : Mr Amendola ;

Vice-chairman : Mr Ansart ;

Treasurer : Mrs Boserup.

Liberal and Democratic Group :

Chairman : Mr Bangemann ;

Vice-chairmen (in order of precedence) : Mr Pintat, Mr Bettiza, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Damseaux, Mrs Tove Nielsen, Miss Flesch ;

Treasurer : Mr Nord.

Group of European Progressive Democrats :

Chairman : Mr de la Malène ;

Vice-chairmen (in order of precedence) : Mr Lalor, Mr Nyborg, Mrs Ewing, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Flanagan ;

Treasurer : Mr Remilly

Mr Gendebien, Mrs Hammerich, Mr Bonde, Mr Skovmand, Mr Bøgh, Mrs Bonino, Mr Capanna, Mrs Castellina, Mr Pannella, Mr Sciascia, Mrs Spaak and Mr Coppieters have informed me that they have decided to form a new group, to be known as 'Group for The

President

Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members'. The Bureau of this group comprises Mr Pannella, Mr Gendebien and Mr Skovmand.

Before we proceed any further, I should like to thank Mrs Louise Weiss for the patience and efficiency with which she has conducted what has proved to be a long day's work and so brought us to the point of setting about the business of this Parliament.

(Loud applause)

I now consult the House on the course we should take at this juncture. Some Members have let it be known through the Secretariat that they would prefer to proceed this evening to the election of the Vice-Presidents. Since at the moment we have received nominations from only two groups, I must point out that, in view of the time required, first for inter-group consultations, then for printing the ballot-papers, the sitting will have to be suspended for more than an hour, after which the election itself, which will probably necessitate two ballots at least, will take several hours. I am, in fact, told by the general secretariat that, in view of the complex procedure involved, counting the votes in this particular case is a protracted business, much more than for the election of the President. In my

view, therefore, it would be desirable to suspend proceedings now and resume them tomorrow afternoon, since the morning will be taken up by the formal sitting, which we cannot postpone. In these circumstances, I propose, if you agree, that we now suspend the handling of our business and take it up again tomorrow at 3 p.m.

(Applause)

Does anyone wish to speak?

I declare our business closed for this evening, while thanking you for your active cooperation throughout the day's proceedings and for my election.

8. Agenda for the next sitting

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, 18 July 1979, with the following agenda:

10 a.m.:

— Formal sitting of Parliament;

3 p.m.:

— Election of Vice-Presidents;

— Possibly, order of business.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 9.50 p.m.)

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 18 JULY 1979

Contents

1. <i>Formal opening sitting of the European Parliament on the occasion of its first election by direct universal suffrage:</i> <i>Mrs Veil, President; Mr Lynch, President-in-Office of the Council; Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission; Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Tindemans, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Berlinguer, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Bangemann, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Debré, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Pannella and Mrs Hammerich on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and</i>	<i>Members</i>	20
	<i>Personal statement: Mr Almirante; Mr Pannella; Mr Almirante</i>	45
	<i>Point of order: Mr de Goede</i>	45
	2. <i>Approval of the minutes</i>	46
	<i>Point of order: Lord Harmar-Nicholls</i>	46
	3. <i>Election of Vice-Presidents:</i>	
	<i>Mr Pannella</i>	46
	<i>Point of order: Mr Scott-Hopkins</i>	46
	<i>Mr I. Friedrich</i>	47
	<i>Point of order: Lord Bethell</i>	47
	<i>Mrs Spaak</i>	48
	<i>Point of order: Mr Fellermaier</i>	48
	4. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	51
	5. <i>Agenda for the next sitting</i>	51

IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting was opened at 10.10 a.m.)

President. — I declare the formal sitting of the European Parliament open.

1. *Formal sitting of the European Parliament on the occasion of its first election by direct and universal suffrage*

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, you have done me a signal honour in electing me President of the European Parliament, and my emotions on taking the chair are deeper than I can put into words. First of all, I should like to thank all of those who voted for me. I shall endeavour to be the President they would wish me to be. True to the spirit of democracy, I shall also seek to be the President of the whole Assembly.

Today's sitting is being held in a setting with which many of you are familiar, but it is none the less an historic occasion. This doubtless explains the presence of the many distinguished guests who have accepted our invitations. I am sorry that I cannot mention them all by name, but on behalf of each and every Member of this House I bid them welcome.

We are highly honoured by the presence of many Presidents and Speakers of the Parliaments of associated and other countries, representing the nations of five continents. By coming here today, they have shown how much importance they attach to relations with our Parliament, thus lending invaluable support to our democratic enterprise. We greatly appreciate your acceptance of our invitations and your gesture of friendship and solidarity, and I should like to convey to you our special thanks.

Yesterday evening I expressed the gratitude we owe to Louise Weiss, who so ably guided our first steps. I

President

should like to add, with your indulgence, one further word and mention her outstanding contribution to the struggle waged in the cause of the emancipation of women.

It is my duty, but also an honour, to pay tribute to the previous Assembly, and more particularly to its presidents, who presided over it with such great authority. I should particularly like to stress the honour due to President Colombo who so ably filled this chair, and earned universal esteem for the manner in which he discharged this difficult task.

In its work ever since the first European Community, the Coal and Steel Community, was set up, and particularly since the establishment of the single Assembly of the Communities in 1958, the European Parliament has played a major and increasingly important part in the building of Europe. However new a departure its election by direct universal suffrage provides, our Assembly is first and foremost the heir to the parliamentary assemblies which have gone before it. It follows on in the path traced by those who have sat in this House from the time when, a generation ago, the European and the democratic ideal were brought together.

Its beginnings were modest and discreet, in keeping with the limited powers conferred on it by the Treaty of Rome, but through the growing political influence it has gradually acquired, the European Parliament has consolidated its role among the institutions and in the building of the Community. It was this growing influence which led to the signing of the Treaties of 21 April 1970 and 22 July 1975 which strengthened the Assembly's budgetary powers. Furthermore, through a number of practical arrangements, the part played by the Assembly in the exercise of the Community's responsibilities has been given sharper form and wider scope.

We in the new Parliament will not lose sight of these achievements of our predecessors. None of us will forget their contribution to the attainment of the hopes of the founding fathers of the Community for an ever-closer union between the peoples of Europe.

While we cannot forget the substantial achievements of the Assemblies which preceded us, I must now lay full emphasis on the fundamentally new departure that has been made by the European Communities in having their Parliament elected for the first time by direct universal suffrage.

For this is the first time in history, a history in which we have so frequently been divided, pitted one against the other, bent on mutual destruction, that the people of Europe have together elected their delegates to a common assembly representing, in this Chamber today, more than 260 million people. Let there be no doubt, these elections form a milestone on the path of Europe, the most important since the signing of the Treaties. It is true that the electoral systems still vary

from one Member State to the other — and this was laid down in the Act of 20 September 1976 on the election of representatives to the Assembly by direct universal suffrage — and it will be for us to draw up a uniform electoral system for future elections. This is a task to which, along with you, I shall devote my energies.

Whatever our political beliefs, we are all aware that this historic step, the election of the European Parliament by universal suffrage, has been taken at a crucial time for the people of the Community. All its Member States are faced with three great challenges: the challenge of peace, the challenge of freedom and the challenge of prosperity, and it seems clear that they can only be met through the European dimension.

(Applause)

Let us begin with the challenge of peace. In a world where the balance of power has enabled us so far to avoid the suicidal cataclysm of armed conflict between the superpowers, localized wars have, in contrast, proliferated. The period of peace we have enjoyed in Europe has been an exceptional piece of good fortune, but we should none of us underestimate its fragility. Is there any need to stress the novelty of this situation in Europe, whose history is a long chapter of fratricidal and bloody wars?

Like its forerunners, our Assembly has, whatever our differences, a fundamental responsibility for maintaining this peace, which is probably the most precious asset in all Europe.

The tension prevailing in the world today makes this responsibility an even heavier one, and the legitimacy bestowed on our Assembly by its election by universal suffrage will, let us hope, help us to bear it, and spread this peace of ours to the outside world.

The second basic challenge is that of freedom. The frontiers of totalitarianism have spread so far that the islands of freedom are surrounded by régimes in which force prevails. Our Europe is one such island; let us welcome the fact that Greece, Spain and Portugal, with traditions as old as our own, have joined the ranks of the free countries.

(Applause)

The Community will be happy to receive them. Here too, the European dimension should help to strengthen that freedom whose value is too often not realized until it has been lost.

Finally, Europe has to meet the great challenge of prosperity, by which I mean the threat to the living standards of our peoples posed by the basic upheaval which, over the past five years, the oil crisis has both sparked off and revealed in its full dimensions. After experiencing for a generation a rapid and steady rise in living standards without precedent in history, every country in Europe is now faced with a kind of

President

economic warfare which has brought the return of that forgotten plague, unemployment, and jeopardized the rise in living standards. This upheaval is leading to far-reaching change. In our different countries, everyone is fully aware that change is inevitable but at the same time fears it. Everyone expects guarantees, safeguards and reassuring action from the governments and elected representatives, at both national and European level.

We all know that these challenges, which are being felt throughout Europe with equal intensity, can only be effectively met through solidarity. Beside the super-powers, only Europe as a whole is capable of taking the necessary action which is beyond its individual members in isolation. However, in order to take effective action the European Communities must unite and gather strength. The European Parliament, now elected that it is by direct universal suffrage, will in future bear a special responsibility. If the challenges facing Europe are to be met, we need a Europe capable of solidarity, of independence and of cooperation.

By a Europe of solidarity I mean solidarity among peoples, regions and individuals. In the relations between our peoples there can be no question of overriding or neglecting the fundamental national interests of each of the Community Member States. However, it is undoubtedly true that, very often, the interests of all are better served by European solutions than by persistent opposition. While no country can consider itself exempt from the discipline and effort now demanded at national level by the new economic constraints, our Assembly must nevertheless continually press for a reduction of existing disparities since a deterioration of the situation would destroy the unity of the Common Market and, with it, the privileged position of some of its members.

Social solidarity, in other words the smoothing out of economic and sometimes financial inequalities, is also required if regional disparities are to be reduced. The Community has already taken practical and effective action in this field. It should continue to pursue this policy as long as the results are in proportion to the expenditure.

Policy must also be adapted in order to redress not only the situation in the traditionally depressed regions, but also that of regions considered up to quite recently as strong and prosperous but now stricken by economic disasters.

Finally, and most important of all, solidarity between men must be fostered. Despite the real, and indeed remarkable, progress achieved in this area over the past few decades, much remains to be done. However, at a time when all citizens will undoubtedly be required to accept the fact that the rise in the standard of living must come to a halt or progress more slowly,

and also to accept a brake on the growth of social expenditure, the necessary sacrifices will not be made unless there is a genuine reduction in social inequalities.

(Applause)

The principal objective of the measures to be taken in this field, both at Community and national level, is employment. Our Assembly must consider in depth the new situation where demand is increasing at a greater pace than supply. This is producing frustrations, and a combination of measures such as productive investments, the protection of the more vulnerable European activities and regulations on working conditions will be necessary in order to improve the situation.

Our Europe must also be a Europe of independence. This must not be an aggressive independence liable to end in conflicts, but Europe must determine the conditions of its development in its own way. This is particularly true in such matters as monetary and energy policy.

Of note in the monetary field is the major political significance for Europe of the recent setting up of the European Monetary System, designed to restore stable monetary relations within the Community, which has been affected over the past few years by the instability of the dollar, even when this was foreseeable.

In the field of energy, dependence on the oil producers is a major handicap for Europe. In order to restore the conditions which are essential for our independence, the Assembly might be well advised to call upon the European Governments to proclaim in this House their desire for cooperation and concertation — a desire which is belatedly beginning to become apparent. We must also further promote energy-saving measures and the search for new forms of energy.

Finally, the Europe which we advocate must be a Europe of cooperation. The Community has already established, in the field of relations with the developing countries, a form of cooperation which is in many respects exemplary. A new step in this cooperation has recently been taken through the latest negotiations with the associated countries. The Community now hopes that the new Convention of Lomé will be signed by all the countries which took part in those negotiations.

Although the new world economic situation necessitates a strengthening of this policy of cooperation, it also requires us to take account of the growing disparities evident among the developing countries themselves, depending on whether they are producers of raw materials. Within the framework of this selective cooperation, Europe must be able to obtain the raw materials necessary for its activities, to offer its partners equitable revenues and balance the necessary

President

transfers of technology with safeguards ensuring that its industries can compete under equitable conditions.

Because it has been elected by universal suffrage and will derive a new authority from that election, this Parliament will have a special role to play in enabling the European Community to attain these objectives and so prove equal to the challenges facing it. The historic election of June 1979 has raised hopes — tremendous hopes — in Europe. Our electors would not forgive us if we failed to take up this heavy but infinitely rewarding responsibility.

The European Parliament must exercise this responsibility in all its deliberations.

(Applause)

I should, however, like to stress the extent to which, in my view, this new authority will prompt Parliament to intensify its action on two fronts: firstly, by performing its function of control more democratically, and secondly, by acting as a more effective motive force in European integration.

(Applause)

The directly-elected European Parliament will be able fully to perform its function of democratic control, which is the prime function of any elected Assembly.

In particular, given the powers conferred upon it by the Treaties, the European Parliament has the task of authorizing the budget on behalf of the citizens of the Community. Henceforth in the Community, as in all the Member States, it is the Assembly elected by the people that adopts the budget. The budget is the most important act over which this Parliament has specific powers, being able to amend it or reject it in its entirety.

I want to stress the importance of the budgetary dialogue at its various stages, from the drawing up of the draft budget right through to its final adoption. This is a complex and lengthy procedure, involving deadlines and a 'shuttle' between the Council and the Assembly, but this complexity and two-way traffic are counterbalanced by the opportunity to make our voice heard.

However, this can only hold good if certain conditions are met: the first is our presence throughout this process, as our presence is essential. Secondly, our strength will clearly be all the greater if we are in agreement among ourselves and take care not to indulge in demagoguery but keep our feet firmly on the ground.

The first task on the programme of this Parliament will be to take the first reading of the preliminary draft budget for 1980, which we are to examine very shortly.

In a more general appraisal of the exercise of the budgetary powers of the directly-elected Parliament, it seems to me that one point deserves emphasis. A responsible Parliament should not confine itself, when

drawing up the budget, to the adoption of a given volume of expenditure, but must also examine the collection of revenue. This is perfectly consistent with the democratic calling of this Parliament. History teaches us that the world's first parliaments stemmed from the authorization to levy taxes.

The urgency of this consideration is heightened by the fact that, during the life of this Parliament, the European Community budget will reach the ceiling of 1 % of VAT revenue laid down in the Treaties, for the collection of own resources. In the years to come, the problem of revenue must thus remain in the forefront of our minds, and this Parliament, representing as it does all the citizens and thus all the taxpayers of the Community, will necessarily be called upon to make a leading contribution to the solution of this problem.

(Applause)

Parliament must also be an organ of control of general policy within the Community. Let us not be deluded into believing that the strictly institutional limitations on its powers can prevent a Parliament such as ours from speaking out at all times, and in every field of Community action, with the political authority conferred on it by its election.

(Applause)

Our Parliament must also be a motive force in European integration. This is particularly true at a time when, as I already have mentioned, Europe's prime need is a further measure of solidarity. This new Parliament will make it possible for the views of all Community citizens to be voiced at European level, and will at the same time more effectively impress upon every sector of society the need for a solidarity transcending immediate concerns, however legitimate, which must never be allowed to mask the fundamental interests of the Community.

We are, of course, aware of the existing allocation of powers in the Community, which confers autonomy on each institution. The Treaties attribute the right of initiative to the Commission and legislative power to the Council. The autonomy of each of the institutions, which is so necessary to the proper functioning of the Communities, does not prevent these institutions from essentially working together with one another and it is within the context of this cooperation that the fresh impetus provided by the newly acquired legitimacy of this Assembly must be turned into an effective driving force.

Our Parliament will therefore play its part in promoting European progress most effectively by strengthening cooperation with the other institutions. It should do so not only when its advice is sought — and here there are no limits that apply — but also under the new conciliation procedure, which should enable Parliament to participate effectively in the legislative decisions of the Communities.

(Applause)

President

The voice of our Assembly, confident in its newly acquired legitimacy, will be heard by all the Community authorities and, more especially, at the highest level of political decision-making. Here I am thinking in particular of the European Council.

(Applause)

As is only natural and normal in a democratic assembly such as ours, we differ on the programmes which we wish to implement, on the ideas which we wish to advocate and even on the very role we are to play.

Let us, however, avoid the error of turning our Assembly into a forum for rivalry and dissent. Too often in the past, public opinion in our countries has gained the impression that the European Communities are hamstrung institutions, incapable of reaching decisions within the necessary time-limits.

Our Parliament will entirely fulfil the hopes which it has raised if, far from being the sounding-board for the internal divisions of Europe, it succeeds in articulating and bringing home to the Community the spirit of solidarity that is so necessary today.

As far as I am concerned, I intend to devote my entire time and energies to the task before us. I am not unaware of the fact that, although we are the offspring of a common civilization and are fashioned by a culture that drew nourishment from the same sources, we do not necessarily have either the same idea of society or the same aspirations.

However, I am convinced that the pluralist nature of our Assembly can serve to enrich our work and not act as a brake on the continuing construction of Europe. Whatever our differences of temperament, I feel that we share the same desire to achieve a Community founded on a common heritage and the shared respect for fundamental human values. In this spirit I invite you to embark in fraternal fashion on the work that awaits us.

At the end of our term of office, I trust that we shall share the feeling that we have advanced the cause of Europe. I trust that, above all, we shall have fully responded to the hopes that this Assembly arouses, not only among the people of Europe but also among all those throughout the world who prize peace and liberty.

(Loud applause)

The next speaker will be Mr Lynch, Prime Minister of Ireland and President-in-Office of the Council. On behalf of the House I welcome him and the many many ministers occupying the Council bench at this sitting. He will be followed by the President of the Commission and the speakers on behalf of the political groups.

If we are to keep to the working arrangements proposed by the Bureau of the previous Parliament, we should close this sitting at about 1.00 p.m. I would therefore ask speakers to keep their speeches to about twenty minutes.

I call Mr Lynch.

Mr Lynch, President-in-Office of the Council. — A Uachtarain is a dhaoine vasile is mór an onóir domsa bheith in bhur bpáirt nuair atá tús á chur leis an mír nua ...

(Interruption by Mr Paisley. Prolonged and vigorous protests in the House)

President. — Mr Paisley, your name is not on the list of speakers for this formal sitting.

Please continue, Mr President.

Mr Lynch. — Madam President, I had hoped that the Member for Northern Ireland would not mar the historic opening of this newly-elected European Parliament by introducing a note of acrimony, particularly so early in the session.

(Applause)

Is mór an onóir domsa bheith in bhur bpáirt nuair atá tús á chur leis an mír nua seo de stair na hEorpa agus de stair an chine daonna. Is sibhse na céad comhaltáí a toghadh go díreach do Pharlaimint na hEorpa agus is sibhse, freisin, an chéad Pharlaimint idirnáisiúnta a toghadh le bheith in bhur n-ionadaithe de thoil dhá chéad seasca milliún saoránach i mBallstáit na gComhphobal Eorpach.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I will repeat in English what I have just said in the Irish language. May I first, Madam, thank you for the warm welcome that you have extended to me in my capacity as President of the European Council for the six months up to the end of this year.

I am honoured to share with you the opening of a new chapter in the history of Europe and mankind. You, the Members of this first directly-elected European Parliament, also constitute the first freely-elected international Parliament, representing some 260 million citizens of the member countries of the European Community.

I extend to you, Madam President, on behalf of the European Council and on my own behalf, heartiest congratulations on your election and I wish you every success in your task as President. The holder of this high office has a special role to play in the relationship between the Council and the Parliament. Your distinguished political career and the range of your achievements in your own country point to that relationship being fruitful and contributing to our common aims in the construction of Europe.

Lynch

To the Members present here today, I also extend my congratulations. You have participated in an historic election in which substantially more than 100 million electors voted, from the Atlantic to the central plain of Europe, from the Baltic to the shores of the Mediterranean. You have been chosen by these people to speak on the issues which will shape the Europe and indeed the world of the future.

I have much pleasure, Madam President, in conveying to you and to the Members of the European Assembly, on behalf of my colleagues in the European Council our joint conviction, expressed at our meeting, in Strasbourg on 21/22 June, that the newly-elected Assembly, taking its rightful place among the Community institutions, will serve the hopes and ambitions of Europe. The citizens of Europe have, through these elections, endorsed the furtherance of the basic ideals and principles of the Treaty of Rome. One of these basic ideals is European unity. I feel sure that one of the primary functions of this Parliament will be to carry forward the European ideal, to help cement and develop the economic and cultural progress of the Community and to chart the road to the ultimate political solidarity of Europe. In doing so, no nation need be called upon to abandon its own character, traditions and identity. On the contrary, a united Europe would not reach its full potential unless each of its member nations brought its own unique endowment to enrich the greater community that is Europe.

The Europeans today bear a heavy responsibility. It has always been the hope of man to master his own destiny. And that in essence is the task the Community is attempting. Our history, inspires us with its previous achievements and cautions us with its failures. We are part of a continent endowed with a cultural heritage of incomparable richness and variety, which has seen the birth of democracy in ancient Greece, the rise and fall of empires, the coming of Christendom, the glories of the Renaissance, the terror of inquisitions, and two wars which in this century almost destroyed mankind. Indeed many of us here will remember the time not so long ago when men lived in the memory of one war and in fear of the next. The fair land of Europe is marked still with the graves and crosses of the devastating wars which have marred our history.

For as long as conflict and confrontation remain in any part of the countries that comprise the European Community, so long will our hopes and ideals be overshadowed by the same symbols of mourning and destruction. Our task must be to end these dark shadows and the divisions which are their source. We must strive to end misunderstanding and intolerance of whatever brand — social, economic or religious — and to eliminate inequality and deprivation. I ask you, the Members of this most widely representative, freely

elected international assembly in the world, to use your great influence and powers to help root out these disruptive elements, which frustrate the ideal of European unity and cooperation. As long as there is unrest and mistrust in any part of the Community then the progress of Europe will be retarded. There is, therefore, a great onus on us, the Members of the European Community, represented by this newly and democratically-elected Parliament, to combine in a common effort to remove the causes of division and to support measures for the advancement of peace and harmony in places where these most essential qualities do not exist.

It is well to recall it was from the suffering of war that the European Community was born. We can argue about finances and policies, about regulations, procedures and structures but we must never forget that it was to avoid the recurrence of bloodshed and devastation that the Community itself and its institutions, with their careful system of checks and balances, were devised. The Community was created as an act of faith. It is a positive answer to the terrible imperative of Europe's uniting or being destroyed. Its aim was and is to sustain peace and advance the prosperity of the people of Europe.

The world is changing rapidly and fundamentally. Barely 100 years ago, relatively small countries were regarded as the great powers. Power today is exercised on a vaster scale. It involves forces, expenditures and technologies beyond the wildest dreams and fears of our forefathers. In this new world, Europe must speak within coherence and reason if it is to have an influence proportionate to its power. In this world the Community has a role greater than the sum of its parts. Indeed, this occasion should cause us to advert to how important the unique exercise in democracy represented here today could be an example for the nations and regions of the world.

The founder members were conscious of this global perspective when they wrote into the Treaty the objective of the progressive abolition of restrictions in international trade and the affirmation of the solidarity binding Europe to overseas countries. That global perspective is reflected in the summit of the world's leading industrialized countries, in which the Community participates. It is reflected in the Treaties which the Community has negotiated or is concluding with countries in Africa, the Caribbean, the Pacific and the Mediterranean. It is reflected, indeed, in the place of the Community as the world's greatest trading bloc whose external commerce has developed more than eight times over between 1958 and 1977, and now represents more than one-third of all world trade. As an indication of the importance of our external relations and equally of the goodwill which the Community enjoys in the world, I quote President Carter of the United States :

Lynch

The United States will give its unqualified support to what you in the Nine are doing to strengthen Europe in cooperation, for we see European strength and unity as a boon and not as a threat to us.

That is and must continue to be Europe's role. We must never become inward looking or self absorbed. It must be our aim in the ultimate interest of all peoples to advance world harmony, by example and precept, knowing that peace, like prosperity, is indivisible.

What has been the greatest influence in the Community's development? I believe that its strength has come from the balance and flexibility of the institutions created by the Rome Treaty, by the faith of the Member States in the European ideal which that Treaty was established to serve, and in the ability of the Community itself to grow and adapt with changing times. We have seen how the Coal and Steel Community grew into the Common Market, how that market developed through its policies for industry, for agriculture and for trade to the benefit of the people of Europe, how with that ultimate aim the Community has welcomed first Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom, and now Greece and the other countries seeking accession. More recently the European Monetary System was devised and set in motion as a further step towards integration. We have seen also how the institutions have responded to the need for change. Political cooperation has developed alongside the framework provided by the Treaties. The European Council has been established on a regular basis. Now the directly-elected Parliament takes its rightful place in this process of evolution. This ability to adapt and change is one of the most valuable characteristics of the Community and one which we must never lose.

That great European, Jean Monnet, whom we so recently lost, was indeed percipient when he said in an address to an earlier European Assembly that men come and go and others take over where they leave off. He continued:

What we can leave behind for them is not our personal experience, which will vanish with us, but institutions live longer than men and thus, if validly constructed, can accumulate and hand down wisdom to successive generations.

Jean Monnet saw the Community grow from six to nine member countries. Soon there will be another, and soon again two more, making the Community, in terms of the number of member countries, twice as big as it was at the beginning. But this larger Community will still be only part of Europe. I would wish to see the Community eventually encompassing more likeminded European countries and so adding to its strength. In expressing that aspiration, I do not ignore the many difficulties that lie before us.

Europe's explorers discovered America and Europe's emigrants played major roles in the building up of its United States. From their diverse backgrounds and

traditions they developed it into the most powerful democratic country in the world — *'e pluribus unum'*. Meanwhile of American independence, Europe has many times torn itself apart by bitter and prolonged wars. But Europe now has the capacity and the will to put that past behind it forever. The Community's membership now comprises countries large and small, some as industrially and economically advanced as any in the world and others whose proud and great traditions are not yet matched by their economic progress, but all, united in the common goal of eliminating inequality within the Communities as a whole. Madam President, this Assembly is both an end and a beginning.

It is an end in that it is the culmination of a process which dates back as far as 1957 when the principle of direct elections was enshrined in the Rome Treaty.

The previous Parliament, thanks both to its Presidents, from Robert Schuman to Emilio Colombo, and to its distinguished Members, has built an institution whose achievements command respect. I am glad to see many of the former Presidents and Members of that Parliament here with us today to honour this Assembly and confer on it the benefit of their wisdom and experience. I know that this newly-elected Parliament under your Presidency will continue and develop the work so well begun.

This Assembly is also a beginning in that for the first time the people have been given a direct voice in the building of Europe. This step marks the initiation of a new dimension in the process of European integration of which the long-term implications must be a matter for surmise. I think there is, however, general agreement that the involvement of the people more closely and more directly in the institutions of the Community is the beginning of a new and significant development.

The millions of European citizens who have so recently voted for your election here have expressed clearly their will. They will expect and insist that we advance the work of constructing Europe in an efficient and consistent manner. The information campaign conducted by the institutions, by the political parties and by the candidates has helped greatly in making clear the relevance of Europe to the people, and has added a necessary and welcome human dimension to a process which, because it is unique and without precedent and because it must take account of so many different interests, is necessarily complex.

The Community was born in response to challenge. It faces now a future that is a troubled and as unpredictable as when it began.

This Parliament will be faced — as are the other institutions of the Community — with highly intimidating tasks. You have mentioned some of them, Madam President. I have in mind: the rampant unem-

Lynch

ployment in all our countries; the energy crisis: the challenge of finding an adequate response to the needs of the Third World; the speed and impact of technological change; the instability created by growing stresses within society itself and the need once again to change and adapt, as the Community has done in the past, to cope with an enlargement to accommodate our friends in Greece, in Spain and in Portugal, without damaging the power, dynamism or integrity of the Community as we know it. It is, Madam President, an awesome list, and each problem is of vital concern. Of particular importance is the need to find work and with it a valued place for our young people. We cannot, through lack of political will or for any other reason, fail to find solutions to this problem for if we do we will fail the generation on which the future of our countries and of Europe must be built.

The Community has given proof earlier this decade that it can weather a crisis without upheaval and without resorting to protectionism. The experience, however, involved a measure of self-questioning bordering on self-doubt. It is a sign of maturity that the Community is engaged in some self-questioning. Thinking too precisely on the event can, however, be destructive of action and of the ability to form a common policy against crisis. The essential point is to maintain the dynamism of progress.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, one of the original features of the European enterprise at the time it was launched and since has been the continuous and fruitful dialogue between the institutions.

Each institution in accordance with the functions allocated to it by the Treaties, has an important contribution to make. Cooperation between the Parliament and the Council has developed to a remarkable extent over the years. Together the procedures have been determined, the machinery set up and above all the political will to work hand in hand has been demonstrated.

The relationship between Parliament and the Council is evolving and consequently it is inevitable that problems will be encountered. These need not be impossible of resolution, however, if we keep sight of the reasons why the Community came into existence and the purposes it has set out to achieve. I should like to say as Head of the Government of Ireland, the first Member State to hold the Presidency following the inauguration of the directly-elected Parliament, that we intend fully to respect that and to strive earnestly for the continuance of the fruitful cooperation which has existed between the Council and Parliament in the past.

(Applause)

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to conclude by expressing a wish which is easy to

state but difficult to realize: I hope that with effective cooperation between all the institutions and the political will of our Governments, backed by the faith of our peoples, the Community will continue along the path of peace, stability and progress. It is not possible for this generation to envisage what form European integration will ultimately take or in what way future generations will develop the European ideal. It is my sincere hope, however, that the motivation which encouraged the Founding Fathers to take the first cautious steps along this path will not be lost and that the momentum of this unifying process will be maintained.

Using the analogy of the growth of nation states from the provinces of yesteryear, they sought to escape from the constrictions of circumstances by building a new community with common rules and institutions freely agreed upon. Their clear aim was to advance the cause of Europe by common effort. In the rapidly changing world of today, we too continue to struggle to be masters of our destiny.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Jenkins.

Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission. — My opening remarks, Madam President are to you. It is my great pleasure on behalf of the Commission to welcome you to your high office, the highest office which it is within the powers of your fellow Members to bestow. I offer you my congratulations; I offer you the warm and full-hearted cooperation of the Commission in the pursuit of our common objectives; and, on a more personal level, I welcome you to one of the Community's smallest clubs, the union of Presidents, and look forward to working with you in the same spirit of close friendship as I have been able to achieve with your distinguished predecessor, Emilio Colombo.

Yours is a great and historic task, Madam President: to preside over, to guide, perhaps occasionally, even to chide a new Parliament, the product of the first international elections in history. This week the European Parliament, democratically elected by over 100 million citizens of Europe, comes of age. It comes of age, moreover, at a crucial time for the Community, for both its institutions and its citizens. While it is fitting that we should celebrate what we have achieved today, it is right too that we should recognize that to sustain the impetus of the European ideal, to withstand the deep-seated problems which now confront us, we—whether Parliament, Council or Commission—shall need all our combined strength and inherent unity.

Jenkins

The first task before this House, in my view collectively and individually, is to carry to the people of Europe those issues which are of concern and of importance to all within the Community. Your concern and your opportunity are to ensure that Community issues, not the narrow lines of national politics, dominate the discussion. It is an opportunity to demonstrate to millions of our citizens that their votes really mattered and to convince those who abstained — regrettably, my own country comfortably carried off the wooden spoon of discredit in this respect — that the Community and its Parliament are living organs of concern for the issues which touch closely on their daily lives. To achieve this, it will be necessary for this House to engage itself directly with the major problems which confront the Community and its Member States.

I will not hide from this House my view that we stand on the threshold of a sombre decade. Our difficulties were great enough a year ago. The prospects for sustained growth and employment were at best uncertain. Now the resurgence of the energy crisis, wholly predictable in substance if not in time, has made us painfully aware of the most important constraint on the future of our economy. We have sustained a major transfer of real resources, of real income, away from us as a result of recent oil price increases. That is something which we cannot just pretend has not happened. In these circumstances, on constant policies, predictions would necessarily show lower growth, higher inflation and more unemployment. That is a reason, not for supineness, but for the urgent evolution of new policies to mitigate, and then, over as short a period as possible, to overcome our present vicissitudes. I will return to these matters tomorrow, when I hope to report to you on the European Council at Strasbourg, the Tokyo Summit and the issues associated with them, which will be dominant throughout the span of this Parliament. But what is absolutely clear is that the ability of the Community to survive and to prosper depends on our joint determination to preserve what we have already achieved, to build on this, and, above all, to keep a vision and commitment to make progress towards a greater European unity. That vision — a constant reaffirmation of our will to move forward — matters, I think, far more than rather sterile blueprints about the exact form of political organization at which we shall ultimately arrive. That will not, in my belief, be something that can be found in the traditional text-books of political science. We cannot simply look it up under a model labelled 'federal' or 'confederal'. It will have an unique character of its own arising out of a balance between our need for unity on major issues and our strong and even disparate national traditions. But of one thing I am absolutely certain: there is a much greater danger of advancing too slowly rather than too fast.

(Applause)

This House, Madam President, has an essential role to play in this process. Of course, the relationships between the different institutions of the Community are complex and created in a spirit of balance. No one institution is dependent upon another: each has its prerogatives; each has its duties; each has its obligations. Within that balance, it is the concern and the duty of the Commission to act as the motor of the Community, to initiate policy and also to undertake the management and execution of existing policies. We should not only defend the frontiers of Community competence, but also, with a proper sense both of adventure and of realism, endeavour to push them forward where a practical and relevant case can be established.

Having said that, however, it is clear that this Parliament, resting as it does on a wide popular support and commanding a new democratic authority, represents a most important evolution for the Community. It is right that it should exercise to the fullest possible extent its powers to question and to subject to criticism the way in which the Commission exercises its powers and the way in which the Council of Ministers reaches or does not reach its decisions. We need the spur of constructive advice and imagination, and we will welcome all your efforts in that direction. It is right too that the Parliament, as a major partner with the Commission and the Council in the formulation of the Community's budget, should assert itself in the development of the financial muscle which underlies Community policies. This is an area of potentially great significance for the internal development of the Community where this House will have an essential influence. Equally, it is, I believe, right that the Parliament should aim to broaden the basis of popular support for Community institutions and create a greater sense of involvement in their policies.

Against this background, the Commission regards it as an obligation and priority to do all within its power to create and to sustain a positive relationship with this House. First, I and my colleagues will make ourselves available to the fullest possible extent to the Parliament and to its committees. We hope to have early discussions about ways and means of securing the Commission's maximum participation in and assistance at your various forms of deliberations. Second, we believe that it is important from the outset that there should be the opportunity for wider and earlier discussion of major proposals which we take to the Council. Here it seems to us essential that there should be a greater understanding of important issues at a Community level, and we would be willing to prepare, where appropriate, discussion documents as a basis for Parliamentary debate of broad policy issues in advance of formulating proposals for the Council. Third, the Commission will take the lead in seeking to improve the processes of consultation between the

Jenkins

three institutions. We are currently studying how to improve the conciliation procedure which resulted from an earlier Commission initiative.

It is through the development of procedures of this kind that the positive and creative relationship we want can grow and flourish. Our relationship must be based on the special character of our different institutions, each with its direct responsibilities towards the collective interest of the Community. You can count on us to do all in our power to deepen and intensify that relationship. On it will depend much of the future evolution not only of the Parliament and the Commission but of the the institutions of the Community as a whole.

Madam President, it is a platitude to say that we were all present yesterday at a historic occasion. Some may feel, and may perhaps hope, that it will appear more important in history than it was exciting or dramatic on the spot and at the time. That, I suspect, has been the case with many historic occasions in the past — they require a little ageing before they achieve their full quality. But what is not a platitude, and what is not without drama, is that this Parliament can assist in the making or breaking of Europe. We have had twenty years of substantial but intermittent progress — thirty years, if we go back to the beginning of the Coal and Steel Community. The question now is whether, with some of the original impulse exhausted and faced with new tensions and difficulties, and in a harsher economic climate than at any time since we picked ourselves up from the aftermath of the war, we will allow this past generation, these past thirty years of enlightenment to appear in the sweep of history as merely one of those brief, bright intervals which have occasionally illuminated our frequently dark and quarrelsome European climate. Or whether, by reasserting the momentum, by rekindling the idealism, we will make it the foundation of a more benevolent continuing future. It is upon the answer to that question — which we cannot as yet give, but in the determination of which we can all play our part — that the significance of this week of initiation will depend.

(Loud applause)

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

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, representatives of the Council and the Commission, as a result of our political confrontation yesterday you, Madam, have been appointed to the office of President. We give you our sincere good wishes for success in your task.

(Applause)

Your success will be conditioned by your impartiality and your ability to support, without any split between a majority and opposition, all the initiatives which

emanate from this Assembly in conformity with the duly accepted rules and procedures.

(Applause)

The President-in-Office of the Council has paid us the honour of attending and addressing this sitting of the recently elected Parliament. In thanking him, I wish to formulate the immediate and pressing wish that the Presidency of the Council will in future participate in all the major debates of our Assembly.

(Applause)

The latter, having recently acquired new legitimacy, must assert and extend its role, especially as the decision on direct elections was linked with the creation of the European Council, an institution for which there is no provision in the Treaty of Rome and whose action is admissible only if the elected Assembly constitutes a genuine counterbalance to it.

The Socialist Group is therefore looking forward to a far-reaching and constant improvement in the relations between Parliament and the Council of Ministers and, more particularly, its Presidency. Towards the Commission we shall maintain our attitude of expectant but vigilant trust.

Various speakers stressed just now the importance of the first European election held on 10 June, which has been described as a historic occasion. At the European Council of 21 and 22 June, the Heads of State or Government noted with satisfaction that the election had been held under satisfactory conditions. The Socialist Group as always attached great importance to the application of Article 138 of the Treaty which relates to the election of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, and it takes no little pride in the fact that twenty years ago, as well as recently, it has numbered among its members pioneers of the procedure which ultimately led to this consultation of the people. It would, however, be unjustified and irresponsible not to inquire into the real significance of the operation of 10 June which was so ardently awaited by most of the political parties, including our own. With the exception of Italy, the rate of absenteeism was enormous. Even in a country like Belgium where voting is compulsory there were up to 25 % of spoiled and blank votes and abstentions.

There is a lesson to be drawn from this. Europe has still not made a sufficient impression on its people; most of the citizens of Europe do not feel themselves really concerned by the Community which they accuse of bureaucracy, secrecy and a failure to influence the daily lives of the men and women at whom its action is directed. Europe is too intermittent, too obscure to be understood and accepted by each and everyone of its citizens. All the institutions of the Community, first and foremost the elected Assembly, must now more than ever before make a great effort to acquire more credibility. More information and a better quality of activity will be the order of the day if institutional Europe is to become a people's Europe

Glinne

and if, in particular, the Parliament is not to become dangerously denatured by 1984 into an incomprehensible talking-shop with Byzantine ways.

(Applause)

We must also avoid — indeed we should have avoided them in the past — manipulations and machination which are unworthy of us. How can Europe set an exemplary model when it is bogged down in sordid practices and the basest forms of parliamentarism, when irregularities are from the outset given official blessing? Last week in Luxembourg the Socialist Group particularly deplored and condemned — and we welcome the excellent statement made on this yesterday by Mr Schwarzenberg — the irregular procedure whereby the Socialists were deprived of one of their seats in France.

(Applause)

That arbitrary decision, contrary to the law and to basic justice, dealt a severe blow at direct universal suffrage. The result is that the European Assembly is now deprived of a great voice: that of François Mitterrand, who has resigned his mandate in solemn protest against this disturbing infringement of democracy.

Mr Edgar Faure. — *(F)* There has been no infringement of democracy in France. That is not true!

Mr Glinne. — ... Policies in Europe must also change. The Socialist Group, representing here 29.5 million European electors, or 27 % of the votes cast, is, as the largest force in this Assembly, well-qualified to point out the need for a change of direction in Europe. The frustrations engendered by past policies are too deep-seated and too numerous. A few months ago the European Confederation of Trade Unions, that great representative body in which tens of millions of workers are joined together and of which we see ourselves here as a natural political extension, became so disillusioned that it called into question its participation in the Tripartite Conferences.

The 6 million unemployed are the natural sceptics of Europe and so they will remain until transparent and effective solutions, involving a substantial contribution from the Community, have been found to their dramatic plight. The resolve to safeguard peace and freedom, the intention to organize economic and social progress and constantly improve the living and working conditions of our peoples, together with a determination to abolish all discrimination between the sexes, all these avowed intentions set down in the preamble to the Treaty of Rome and in other basic texts must not remain mere words on paper; on the contrary they must guide the action of the Community.

As a political group we are probably not yet strong enough to convince the Assembly easily of this, but,

in this Chamber and elsewhere, we shall be indefatigable in recalling the main themes of our election campaign whose relevance has just been stressed by the European Trade Union Confederation in a letter to the Presidency of this Assembly. We call for improved working conditions and programmes to achieve full employment, particularly through a fairer distribution of available jobs, and with the powerful support of a reduction in working hours and a systematic occupational training and education policy. We call for an effort to safeguard and improve living standards. There must be democratic control of economic and social development through structural reform, economic planning and the exercise of effective control over multinational companies and major industrial and financial groupings.

(Applause)

We want to see greater democracy in industry at every level in a manner adapted to the special circumstances of each country and in cooperation with the trade union organizations. We call for control of pollution and a comprehensive energy policy. An effective programme must be laid down by the European Community to save energy and develop alternative sources of energy. In this connection no new development or new utilization of nuclear energy can be accepted unless it is the subject of public control and management and unless effective safeguards are laid down against risks liable to damage public security and health and lead to environmental deterioration:

(Applause)

We must end discrimination, especially discrimination against women. We must develop more effective regional policies capable of contributing meaningfully to the removal of the broad disparities which still exist between the regions of Europe. We must protect consumers, in particular through objective information and the rights of defence against misleading publicity. We must promote peace, security and cooperation, and we must defend the rights of man and the civil liberties which reflect the most fundamental human needs.

To attain these objectives we shall seek as a Socialist Group, to promote, in each individual case within this Assembly, the formation of progressive, transnational and transpartisan majorities representing a coalition of our best endeavours.

Madam President, the Socialist Group also wishes to see created within the Community today and the enlarged Community tomorrow an effective transnational democracy at European level with the concomitant desire to break the bipolar system prevailing in the world and to escape from the constraints of dependence and authoritarianism. The motions which we shall already be tabling this week on a number of pressing international problems will reflect without

Glinne

delay our staunch attachment to the rights of man and the rights of our peoples.

(Applause)

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

Mr Tindemans. — *(NL)* Madam President, on behalf of the European People's Party — the party which gained the largest number of votes in the European elections — it is an honour for me to congratulate you on your election to the Presidency of this Parliament. On your shoulders rests a great burden of responsibility, because of what is done or left undone in this Chamber will be attributed to the President of this Parliament. Europe is listening to our every word and closely following all that we will be doing here. There exists a measure of scepticism which we shall only manage to overcome if Parliament discharges its full responsibility and fulfils the promises made by us during the election campaign.

We are the institution which is closest to the heart of the European Community if what we have learned is true, namely that all power emanates from the people, because we represent the peoples of Europe. The will of the people of Europe is expressed here in this European Parliament. I am well aware that this Parliament is not a Parliament like others, because we do not have to maintain a government in power. But we represent our people, and we must tell our peoples exactly what we are doing here. We must explain our proposals, our achievements and even our failures — and if we fail in any area we must explain why.

This implies that a new equilibrium must be sought through this Parliament, in cooperation with the Commission and Council, and that this Parliament must also formulate suggestions and initiatives which will then be discussed with other Community bodies and, we hope, implemented.

This Parliament results from a proposal made at the Paris Summit Conference in December 1974. On that occasion three proposals were adopted: the first was to transform the Summit Conference into a European Council; the second was to draft a report on European Union; and the third was to hold elections by direct universal suffrage to the European Parliament. It is my hope that the second proposal, involving progress towards a European Union, will not fall by the wayside and that suggestions for action in this area will be made in future.

(Applause)

We are meeting here for the first time at a moment when the world is being hard hit by a severe economic crisis, and both those members of our society who still have employment and the others who do not, are listening to our words and watching our actions.

In this connection I would point out to Mr Glinne that the European Confederation of Trade Unions is, this is our firm conviction, a neutral body and not an extension of the Socialist Party.

(Applause)

We are proud of the fact that thousands of working people voted for our party in the last European election.

(Applause)

The 1980s will be no less difficult than the 70s. This has already been stressed by the President of the Council and the President of the Commission. We must therefore together develop in Europe a policy to reduce unemployment and enable us to remain within the trade of the world's most prosperous countries without any of our Member States lagging seriously behind the others. As you yourself have said, Madam President, the basis of cooperation is mutual dependence, interdependence and human solidarity.

You have repeatedly used the word solidarity, solidarity in the world. But let us not forget solidarity in Europe, solidarity between our nations and our peoples. Let us have solidarity between the third and fourth worlds and ourselves, and, in Europe itself, let us have solidarity with the less-developed regions.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an historic moment. After decades of combat, hatred and war we have now, for the first time in history, together elected a European Parliament in which we can consult with one another to decide which policy is best for our countries and seek ways of finding a majority capable of pursuing a policy which will enable us to solve the great problems of Europe and help us to guide the future of our countries and peoples. In the context of history this is a great new departure.

In these early days, our Parliament must acquire prestige through the quality of its work and the quality of its debates. I hope, allow me to say this briefly, that we shall make active use of all the possibilities held out by the Treaties, including those provided for in Article 235 of the Treaty of Rome. We in the European People's Party give absolute priority to the fight against unemployment and in particular against unemployment among young people, as also to the energy problem which is extraordinarily complex and fraught with risks. Energy is after all the basis of our industrial development, and thus also of future levels of employment. It gave me great pleasure to hear the French Prime Minister making that point a fortnight ago. Let us begin by making concrete proposals. If his words were correctly reported in the press he said: "Why do we not immediately attack the problem of the common energy policy and the common transport policy?"

Tindemans

I personally would advocate a major debate on the state of the union — on the situation in the Community today. We must examine just how the Community is functioning and whether we really do have free movement of persons, goods, services and capital, or whether we are not already the victims of a hidden form of protectionism.

Let us see how we can make further progress towards economic and monetary union now that we have embarked upon a European Monetary System. We shall soon have an opportunity to deal here with the budgetary problem. Let us also make our attitude as a European Community perfectly clear towards the Third and Fourth Worlds.

I must naturally say something here about political cooperation. After all it is imperative for us to approach the great problems of the world in this dangerous age with a single voice, with a single European voice.

(Applause)

Let us also remember the danger which is looming in the Middle East, let us remember the importance of the North-South Dialogue and of our relations with the United States of America; I would go so far as to say; let us also have the courage to speak on the problem of European security.

(Applause)

Let us, as Europeans, not seek to shelve the problem of human rights ...

(Applause)

... and when disasters strike anywhere in the world, as is at present the case with the genocide in Vietnam, let us as Europeans have the courage to adopt a clear stance and take decisions on these frightening events.

(Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, we must build a citizen's Europe. In the past Europe was to far too great an extent a problem for a narrow élite only. We must make the issues clear to our citizens and electors and create a European spirit through gradual and perhaps small steps. Allow me to mention three such steps which are really no less important than the major problems of the day. Why are we in Europe unable to take common decisions on the likes of speed limits, passports, or summer time? ...

(Applause)

... so that each European knows that he is living in Europe. Yesterday we heard the oldest Member of our Assembly speak in unusually stirring terms about European culture, and today others speakers have followed her example. In 1975 the European Council decided that European Cultural Foundation should be set up as a testimony to mark the 25th anniversary of the launching of the Schuman plan in 1950. But, to my great regret, I find that the European Cultural

Foundation has still not been set up. Yesterday Mrs Weiss also spoke of the face of Europe in the future. She said, herself using these English words, that we must not become a melting pot. I concur wholeheartedly: the cultural wealth of Europe resides in the differences between our individual cultures and in our languages. We must therefore not create false problems for ourselves by pretending that a united Europe might be a melting pot in which national cultures and languages would fuse. Let us create no false problems: the real problems are difficult enough as it is. Walter Hallstein, who is an authority on this matter, said that those who have a European outlook, the activists of Europe, are not stateless citizens, but on the contrary remain true to their own culture and to their own country. They have recognized that a number of problems can only be solved by joint endeavour. We cannot go it alone. That is why we must unite Europe and work together!

(Applause)

We refuse to allow Europe to be treated as a decadent continent. We do not wish to open a discussion now about the ultimate objective and future of Europe, about the question whether there will be a federation or confederation in the future. I do not wish to touch on that point now. But there is one thing that I do wish to say: I venture to hope that our debates will be suffused by a federal spirit. This means that nobody, including the small countries, must ever be left with the impression of being dominated or disregarded by the big nations or by some form of *directoire*. It means too that we must all enjoy respect as fully-fledged Member States of the European Community.

(Applause)

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on our shoulders rests now the great responsibility to make something valid out of this Parliament, to make its activities fully known and to respond to the wishes of our electorate. It would be a most dangerous venture to mobilize 180 million electors only to find afterwards that Parliament is powerless or cannot use its power and do exactly what the electors are looking to us to do. Let us therefore not transplant our national conflicts to the European Parliament. Let us make it abundantly clear that we are representative of the will of the European people and that we seek effective, practical solutions through concrete proposals to those problems which our individual Member States can no longer solve at all or cannot solve adequately. Let us strive together in the true spirit of Europe to find solutions which have become imperative.

I have preferred not to make specific reference to our leading figures, but I should like to end with a quotation from Jean Monnet. At the most sombre moments in the process of European unification, he was prone to say in his quiet way: 'Whether you like it or not, whether you agree or disagree, there is no other future

Tindemans

for Europe, no solution other than cooperation and unification.' I have chosen to end with those words on the last chance to save our continent: there is no other solution — let us then bring that solution about!

(Loud applause)

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

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — My first duty on behalf of my group is to congratulate, you, Madam President, on your election. We are confident that the Parliament has chosen a most worthy representative whose voice will deserve to be heard by the Council and the Commission and the governments of Member States. I should add, of course, Madam President, that we in my party are used to electing ladies as our leaders, and we would wish you every success in the months ahead.

(Applause)

My second task is to ensure that this solemn occasion does not go by without some acknowledgement being made to the work of my predecessors of which these European elections and this directly-elected Parliament are in so many respects the fulfilment. I think we can claim that we worked as hard as anybody during the six and a half years that we have been in the European Community and this Parliament to make the Parliament an effective instrument on behalf of the citizens of the Community. This is especially true of my predecessors as chairman, the late Sir Peter Kirk, and more recently Geoffrey Rippon, who worked hard in this respect I should like also to place on record my group's appreciation of the work done by all our colleagues during the long years since 1 January 1973.

One may remember that when we joined in 1973, Sir Peter Kirk made one of the most remarkable speeches I have ever heard, concerning how this Parliament should develop. There is no need for me to emphasize how much I agree with what has just been said most eloquently by Mr Leo Tindemans. Nevertheless the theme of this European Parliament is one to which I should like to return for a moment. But may I begin with a warning, Madame President: let us not underestimate by any means the difficulties which lie ahead of us in establishing ourselves as a Parliament within the Community's institutional framework. True, we have a number of powers granted to us in the Treaty. We all know what they are, and they were referred to by previous speakers. It is true that these elections have now enabled us to exercise these powers with real authority, and real influence, but the proof of these matters consists in the practice, not in the theory.

Let me give two examples: the principal tasks for this Community over the next five years are to achieve a second enlargement to include Greece, and subsequently Portugal and Spain, and to maintain the Community's progress towards closer monetary integration, already mentioned by previous speakers, and the greater stability that will bring the EMS is perhaps but a first stage of that. Now who in this Chamber here really feels confident that this Parliament will have real influence unless we really fight hard for it on the big decisions to be taken in these areas? What consideration, for instance, has been given to the role that we in this Parliament should play, in the management of EMS, at any stage? And what influence has this Parliament so far had on the course of the enlargement negotiations? We were informed. We had an opportunity of listening, but after the events had taken place. Or indeed again, what influence has this Parliament had on the crucial question of the adjustment of the weighted majority voting system in the Council? The answer to all these questions is, I fear, 'very little, if any', and however eloquent and well-reasoned our speeches may be, our influence will continue to be negligible unless we exercise it with great skill and determination. Unless we can do this we will continue as we are and as we have been in the past.

The point of these elections was not primarily to give this institution more power, but to give the citizens of the Community a greater say in the decisions which affect them. From now on, when the views of the Parliament are set aside, it is the views of the people who elected us that are being ignored, not just us. I would emphasize this point both to the Council and to the Commission. The governments know, and the Commission will soon find out, that this is not the kind of democracy that we are all led to defend, or something which can or will continue indefinitely.

Our responsibility to our electors is to work efficiently, if we are to do so, we must not be hindered by precedent in deciding what procedures we should adopt to exercise a mandate that we have been given. I believe, for example, that we shall need to review before long the system of committees, with rapporteurs, reports and so on. Indeed one might even look closely at the system of confidentiality and secrecy which exists in these committees to the exclusion of the press and others.

I also believe that we should give a very high priority to working out satisfactory relations with our colleagues in national parliaments, both within the Community and elsewhere, especially those in the applicant States and in bodies such as the Council of Europe and others working in that field. I hope we can take up with the appropriate authorities all the

Scott-Hopkins

matters which have a direct bearing on the efficiency of Parliament and our work as individual Members, in particular the question of a permanent site for all our activities.

(Applause)

These problems and much else must be among the task we set ourselves for the first five years. The effectiveness of our solutions, and the skill with which we deploy our limited powers, will be the crucial test for the future.

These problems and much else must be among the tasks we set ourselves for the first five years. The effectiveness of our solutions, and the skill with which we deploy our limited powers, will be the crucial test for the future.

Although, as I have said, the period of establishing ourselves will not be an easy one and we would be foolish to think it will, we will not yield to the temptation of concerning ourselves solely with our internal problems and affairs. One effect of the European election campaign has been to present the European Parliament as an institution whose decisions have a direct relevance to the policies developed and applied by the Community to the ordinary citizen and thus have a great bearing on the lives of all our electors. As the 1984 elections approach, we shall find ourselves under great pressure to demonstrate that we have kept the promises that we all of us in our different ways have made this year, and that accordingly this institution, this Parliament, is something which is worth the electors voting for and continuing to support. This means that we must concern ourselves not only with the big institutional questions, but also with those relatively unglamorous issues of local, technical but nevertheless specific concern. Mr Tindemans has mentioned some of them, and they are of great importance, because they are the issues which affect people in their homes. We will find ourselves dealing with local and sectoral lobbies; we shall be worried about whether or not a particular region or a particular industry is getting a fair deal. This is right and proper, and in my view the proper responsibilities that we should be taking on. They are essential to Parliament's work if this institution and its Members are not to drift into remoteness and irrelevance. Our interest needs to be built up over the whole range of the Community's activities.

I should probably point out at this stage that I am not suggesting that we should take over in areas more properly the concern of national parliaments; that would not be the right approach. And it is wrong in any case to assume that any extension of our powers would automatically be at the expense of national parliaments. Let me give you two quick examples: in matters relating to the negotiation and the conclusion

of the Community's external agreements, which are becoming increasingly important given our position as the largest trading bloc in the world, there is inadequate provision for any form of democratic control either in the drawing up of the Commission's negotiating mandate or at the conclusion of these negotiations. National parliaments have little, if any, power in this particular area; it is one into which the European Parliament could move without presenting any formal challenge to the Council of Ministers or to any national parliament.

A different example arises in the case of the Council of Ministers; individually, of course, ministers are responsible to their national parliaments and they should remain so, of course. But the Council itself is responsible to no one. Its prime duty as a Community institution must be to the Community, and there is no one to whom it is accountable in the performance of this duty. In the past, my group and others have on several occasions criticized the way in which the Council sets about its work: its excessive secrecy, the inadequate answers to Members' questions, as well as the enormous length of time it takes to get those questions answered; the unassailable but none the less powerful influence of the officials of Coreper who work extremely hard — I sometimes wonder what they do. Although recent events in my country mean that there has been the most welcome change in the composition of the Council, we shall continue politely but firmly to seek to hold the Council to account for the decisions it reaches or more often — unfortunately — fails to reach. I wonder if the President-in-Office of the Council has any idea how many of Parliament's reports, flowing from Commission proposals, are still awaiting decision in the Council or have been shelved.

(Loud applause)

From what I have said, Madam President, I think it will be clear, that on some occasions Parliament will need to use its united strength and to exert pressure where pressure is needed. I think the evidence is that we really must move along these lines. Many texts have so often in the past been subjected in committee, and on the floor of this House, to the effort of trying to find compromise. I believe that, of course, it is right as a Parliament to try to find compromise where we can. But I believe we must honestly also face the fact that there is political division amongst us, and not always spend the time trying to find a compromise. Otherwise we become a little too remote and the actual text which emerges tends to become somewhat wishy-washy, to put it at its lowest. This serves to diminish our influence, and although I said I think consensus is admirable, we really must face up to the facts of political life as well.

Scott-Hopkins

But always attempting to find consensus also has the effect of making our workpace too leisurely. Let me give you one example, Madam President: Greece applied to join the Community in 1975. In March of 1979 Parliament debated a report on that application, not on the negotiations, which I have already talked about, but on the application. It is not surprising that the impact of our deliberations was really not very great. I hope that from now on we can abandon this and really move forward.

I talked of some of the tasks, Madam President, which lie ahead. But there is one which I have not mentioned and obviously one cannot sit down without talking about it. I refer, of course, to the drawing up of a uniform electoral system. You mentioned this in your speech. Honourable Members will be aware that, as in other groups, there are strongly held divergent views concerning this within my group. For myself, I suspect that in this Parliament we shall take many years to come to an agreement — although I hope not — on the nature of the proposal we shall forward to the Council. But we must get down to this task, as you yourself have said, Madame President, and we shall look forward to participating fully and with an open mind in these discussions which I hope we shall start in September of this year.

We have seen the fulfilment of the objective originally laid down in the Treaty of Paris in 1951 and confirmed by the Treaty of Rome. The case for the directly-elected Parliament has grown stronger over the years, not least because the world still looks to Europe as a source and model for parliamentary democracy. As every speaker this morning has said, this is a truly historic moment: the election over nine countries — by different means but nevertheless democratically — of deputies from different parties to come here as Members of Parliament and sit together in this one place. This is the first time, I believe, that this has ever happened anywhere in the world. Perhaps our example will one day be followed throughout the world. Indeed I hope so.

Let me conclude, Madam President, by saying that in my group we are conscious of the duty that we owe, not only to our electors, but also to our predecessors. This Parliament must and will work, this Parliament must and will be an example of what we Europeans can do when we set our minds to it. And this Parliament must be a glowing example to those who follow us that, however black the days may look at the time, the future does hold a promise which we ourselves are now helping to fulfil. We must pass it on to our

successors as a better institution than it was when we took it on. That, Madame President, I am sure you and all my colleagues will help us to do.

(Applause)

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

Mr Berlinguer. — *(I)* Madam President, honourable colleagues, I should like, first, to thank the comrades and the friends elected from the French Communist Party list, the representative of the Danish Socialist Peoples' Party, and the members elected from the Italian Communist Party's list, including the five members of the Independent Left, for entrusting to me the task of speaking now on behalf of the entire Communist and Allies Group which represents over 16 million electors in this House.

Some of the groups present in this Assembly have sought, and still seek, to hide the differences of opinion which exist within them on many questions concerning the Community's life and politics. We Communists have always had a different approach, which we think politically more honest and respectable. We do not try to hide those problems on which, within our group differences of attitudes exist. Thus, for example, on an important question such as that of this Parliament's powers, the Italian Communist Party is in favour of their strengthening, whereas the French Communist Party is against. The same is true of the accession of Greece, Spain and Portugal to the EEC.

At the same time we stress the important degree of agreement existing among all the sections of our group, particularly where the interests and aspirations of the workers of our countries and of all Western Europe are at stake: when we have to fight the domination of multinational corporations, when we have to strive for the democratization of the Community, to proclaim to the world the importance of peace, of cooperation and of progress in a new Europe in which socialism — socialism in freedom — must become the key to stopping the decline of this part of our continent — a decline which, whatever Mr Tindemans may say, is real — and to the thorough renewal of its structures, its habits, its ruling classes. This is, in fact, dear colleagues, what used to be called Eurocommunism: a great ideal which not only has attracted wide support so far and whose influence is bound to continue growing, but which seeks expression in specific initiatives and efforts in the social, political and cultural fields to face and resolve, through change, the burning problems of European society. It is in this spirit that in this Assembly, too, we shall resolutely strive to intensify our joint practical work, and at the same time to search out every area of agreement with the other forces of the Left and of democracy, because we are convinced that we need united effort if the problems are to be resolved.

Berlinguer

Madam President, honourable colleagues, it has already been remarked that the overall number of electors who actively participated in the emergence of this Parliament fell below expectations and that, in some countries, it has been particularly small.

We Italian Communists must above all condemn those authorities, both in Italy and in other countries, who bear a grave responsibility in having deliberately sought to restrict the right to vote of our compatriots working abroad and the freedom to campaign amongst them. Our protest against this conduct is accompanied by a firm commitment by the entire Communist and Allies Group to fight resolutely, not least through specific initiatives we shall be introducing in this Parliament — such as, for instance, the proposal for a statute for emigrants — for full equality of rights in every area for all foreign workers, both European and those from other continents, employed in the Community countries.

But over and above those specific problems, we interpret the low voting figures for this Assembly as an explicit criticism of the way the EEC has been run and has functioned so far. There is no denying that more than twenty years after the EEC came into being, regional imbalances still exist and are getting worse, unemployment is growing and the Community appears unable to deal appropriately with such pressing problems as those of energy or the deterioration of the environment.

There is thus much scope for renewal, both as to aims and to working methods, and there is much scope for this Parliament which at least is based on universal direct elections. Quite apart from the legal aspects, what will matter will be our ability to cope with problems and reject the temptations of empty rhetoric. What will matter is the links we can establish with workers' organizations, with peasants' associations and with the other mass organizations both at national and at European level. For in the final account, the important thing is that we should become the exponents of the interests and the aspirations of the workers of our countries and also of the most fundamental needs of the whole contemporary world. Our group will be guided by these aims in its work.

You have all read, I am sure, the dramatic speech which the President of the United States made two days ago. He spoke of a 'moral and spiritual crisis' that went far beyond the energy crisis, inflation or the recession, and of an 'erosion of confidence that threatened to destroy the social and political fabric of America'. We cannot predict today how the American nation and government will emerge from this situation.

But we can see very clearly that here, in Western Europe, the worsening of the economic situation, which has resulted in nearly 7 million unemployed in

the Nine, and in particular the rapidly developing energy crisis, are pushing a large part of the former capitalist dominating classes to look for authoritarian solutions directed against the workers and to stir up belligerent feelings against the socialist countries and against the developing nations.

Exponents of these attitudes are also present in substantial numbers in this House. Only yesterday we heard the Palestinian people, who for decades have been deprived of their homeland, described in this House as a 'handful of sons of the desert' who ought to bow obsequiously before 'Western civilization'. The question has even been posed whether 120 nations out of the 150 constituting the United Nations organizations should not be considered as outside its fold.

This is really not the spirit in which Western Europe should approach the difficulties and the problems — grave as they may be — which, one way or another all the countries of the world have to face; and when I say 'all' I am not excluding the socialist countries. Nor is this the spirit in which we should confront the dramas and the aspirations of the peoples inhabiting vast areas of the world who want to break free of the inhuman conditions of underdevelopment, hunger, thirst, poverty, to become free of savage tyrannies, such as that which is now collapsing in Nicaragua after benefiting for over forty years from American support and the silent collusion of a large part of Europe.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

Our peoples' mission and our peoples' interests lie elsewhere. Our interests are concerned with efforts to achieve new progress in détente, above all in the relaxation of tensions between the West and the East of our continent, to work resolutely for arms reductions and to ensure that Europe accepts the new realities of the Third World and, abandoning all colonialist or neo-colonialist pretensions, establishes with it a relationship based on peaceful cooperation, equality of status and equality of rights with the aim of setting up a new world economic order. This is the only way to preserve and develop what is best in the common heritage of our civilization, to encourage among our own countries and within them a spirit of solidarity and brotherhood and to relaunch, on new, more rational and more just foundations, the economic and social progress of each of our countries and of the Community as a whole; this is also the way to promote the full recognition of the rights and freedoms of every man and woman in our countries and in every part of the world.

Let me end with the hope that in pursuing these objectives now made urgently necessary by the profound changes occurring in the lives of our countries and of the whole European West — this Parliament will succeed in developing useful and meaningful relations with and among all the popular move-

Berlinguer

ments, and especially those which have their roots in the working classes.

This is what we shall aim for in our daily work in this Parliament, in the initiatives we shall introduce and in the links we intend to maintain with those forces on which our continent's very life and future progress depend.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

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

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Madame President, ladies and gentlemen. We are beginning our work in a world situation that does not give much ground for optimism. Material differences have always existed, but the stridency with which these differing material interests are being voiced today and the selfishness thereby being displayed are dividing the world into different interest groups, and that is a great danger to us all. Claims are even being made for special treatment in regard to the principles which we have followed in the past and the morality on which people throughout the world base their political action, and these claims are increasingly undermining, if not actually rendering impossible, any common basis for action. Moreover, we are no longer agreed on the rules which we should all observe — irrespective of the differing material interests and moral objectives being pursued by individuals.

This world situation is resulting in selfishness where material interests are concerned, in claims to special treatment in relation to basic moral precepts and in a state of fundamental intolerance, in which terror, violence and executions are considered valid expression of humanity.

In view of this situation it is not surprising that doubts should also be raised about Parliamentary democracy, which is after all intended precisely as a means of reconciling peacefully conflicting material interests, of bringing together different moral objectives within a pluralistic hierarchy of values and, finally, of settling differences in a spirit of toleration on the basis of recognized rules. And we are beginning our work at the very moment when this foundation has begun to crumble, when the very notion of parliamentary democracy is being called into doubt. However, I do not believe that there is any ground for pessimism.

When we look back at the formative years of this Community, which at the outset was not even conceived as a parliamentary democracy but where the basis of decision-making at European level was to be more or less institutionalized cooperation between the governments, then we are entitled to recall the past achievements of our parliament not only with pride but also with a degree of confidence.

My group would like most emphatically to extend its heartfelt thanks to all those who shared in this work. Not only to those who are always included in official expressions of gratitude — and here I would like to join in the comments you addressed to your predecessor, Mr Colombo — but above all, to the many whose names are not mentioned and who in the anonymity of committee meetings, conciliation meetings with the Council of Ministers and political group meetings have made a major contribution to ensuring that this Parliament can today begin work with means at its disposal that were created by the old Parliament but which did not exist when the old Parliament began its work.

Yet where do our tasks lie? What scope do we have and what duties will this Parliament be required to perform?

I believe that the most important task, one which must at all times be uppermost in our minds, will necessarily be to defend the social and political role of the individual. A society is based on its individual members and on the liberties that are accorded to them. A State or a community that shapes this society politically is therefore based, through this society, on these individuals that make up the State or community. In its future work, my group will therefore attach the greatest importance to the involvement of the individual Community citizen in political decision-making, to political and legal safeguards for the individual, and to the representation of his material needs.

Legal protection of the individual in the Community can be improved. In a joint declaration with the Commission and Council we have already undertaken to respect the basic precepts obtaining in our member countries in the political activity of the Community. Fundamental human rights and freedoms are enshrined in the constitutions of all the Community countries. The Community, too, will respect and uphold these rights. My group is, however, of the opinion that we should in addition work to give the individual citizen the feeling and assurance not only through this declaration but also through our practical political actions the feeling and assurance that he is living in a constitutional State, in a Community based on the underlying common notion that human and civil rights are to be defended at all times.

A related problem will be the preparation of a common electoral law. I believe that the protests we heard yesterday and the comments repeated today by the Socialist Group, regardless of how one judges the merits of the particular case, do nevertheless reflect the feeling that only when the citizens of this Community are able to elect a Parliament on the basis of a common electoral law, will all the citizens of this Community really have equal rights . . .

(Applause)

Bangemann

I believe, therefore, that this task facing Parliament, to which you, Madam President, have yourself referred, far transcends its immediate object. It is not only a question of our preparing for the next elections but of creating equal rights for the citizens of this Community in an important field of democratic participation. Furthermore, allow me as chairman of the Liberal and Democratic Group to make at this point a comment which I trust will not be misunderstood by the British Members. It is not a criticism of a member country. It is not a criticism, which I would not be entitled to make anyway, of the political decisions taken by that country. I would, however, ask these Members to consider whether, in view also of the voting systems in the eight other Member States, it should not be agreed in drawing up this electoral law that this law must place all citizens on an equal footing in terms of the effect of each vote cast. I would ask the Socialist Members to bear in mind that their colleague, Mr Mitterrand, at least had an opportunity to resign his seat. The ten British colleagues, who properly speaking should have the right to sit here with my group, have not even had this means of protest at their disposal. I would ask you to consider ...

(Loud applause)

... whether this does not also come within the scope of safeguards for minorities. A society — this European society of ours — will not be gauged by the position which it grants majorities, but by the way in which it makes allowance for minorities. That is real evidence of humanity and civic responsibility.

(Loud applause)

It is true that the traditional legal position is nowadays inadequate. The individual citizen rightly demands that the prevailing social and political structures, i.e. the State should give him the means of satisfying his material needs; he rightly turns to the State and also to the European Community when he is unemployed, when he has no opportunity for further training or when in the case of women, she is discriminated against in daily life. He rightly expects the Community to help him. Yet, ladies and gentlemen, are we really aware of the fact that the criticisms of unemployment in the Community, of regional imbalances and of the lack of social justice do not in fact apply to the Community but to the circumstance that we have so far failed to act jointly to remove these shortcomings and failings in our society. It was after all, the Community's disunity that led to regional imbalances. This was not the fault of the Community as such. However, the Community does have a responsibility to ensure that these past failings are made good, and we are ready to play an active part in seeing to it that the citizens of this Community are able to live in conditions of material equality and justice.

How can we achieve this? What means does Parliament have at its disposal? It is undoubtedly true that

we will be the forum for differing political views and, Madam President, I do not feel that the Socialist Group is wrong when it says that this House will also be the setting for political debates reflecting divergent party political standpoints. We are not worried at the prospect of such debates, but we would like to ask the Members of this House one thing. There is one issue on which we should all stand together and transcend our party divisions, and that is the defence of the rights of this Parliament; indeed, the extension of the rights of this Parliament.

(Loud applause)

If we are disunited on this important question for purely party reasons or because of ideological narrow-mindedness on the part of one or other of the political groups, this Parliament will be unable to win the day. If, however, we remain aware of the fact that our job is not only to represent Socialist, Christian-Democratic, Conservative, Communist or other views, but that it is for us to demonstrate here that parliamentary democracy is a living concept in Europe, then we will be able to perform the task entrusted to this Parliament and to realize its potential.

This is primarily a question of controlling the Commission and Council. Madam President, you have coined the phrase 'democratic control' and explained it here today. I am very grateful to you for having done so. Indeed, I feel that this perspective opens up for us a possible means of surmounting the futile controversy over ossified formulae. The basic issue in this Community is not about our being to a greater or lesser extent federalist or supranational or European, but about establishing democratic parliamentary control. This is our task and we should work at it without being blinkered by ready-made phrases.

We will make a start with our budgetary powers, which are considerable. It is possible that we will have to enter into controversy with the Council on this subject.

Yet we will do so with the intention of finding a solution with the Council. I should like here to address a few candid words to the Council. Complaints are made about bureaucracy in the Community, although bureaucracy is not confined to the Commission or to the legislative process, but is also a problem at the Council. I have participated in many conciliation meetings, and I would rather not know how many members of the Council are really so well-informed about the political significance of a particular issue that the political implications of the decisions they take or fail to take are fully known to the entire Council.

The Permanent Representatives' Committee was always fully aware of the situation.

(Cries of 'Hear! hear!' — Applause)

Bangemann

Are we living in a Community where officials and bureaucrats take the political decisions affecting that Community, or are we living in a Community where these decisions are taken by people who are politically accountable?

This is the broad approach of the contribution that we wish to make to the development of the Community. I do not believe that the autonomy either of the Commission, or of the Council or of Parliament is in danger. We will find a consensus, and I would like to make a special point of thanking the President and Members of the Commission for their contributions in the past and for their openness and their readiness to cooperate with us.

I should like to mention a third and final point which is not perhaps of any great topical significance for us today, but which will perhaps one day have a part to play when history judges this Parliament. This judgement will not depend solely on whether we have advanced the development of Europe or whether we have been able to save parliamentary democracy in Europe, but I believe that this judgement will be also formulated according to moral criteria. We ought not to confine ourselves to our own interests and our own needs. We ought not even to speak of Europe when we mean the European Community, because Europe is larger than the European Community. Many countries around us are counting on us, but they feel uneasy when we speak of Europe, thereby implying that they are excluded. The countries around us that do not belong to this Community, whether of their own free will or because they have no choice in the matter, also belong to Europe.

(Applause)

We must also take their needs seriously. This is one of the most important moral challenges facing us, and the *raison d'être* of this Parliament and its achievement will be gauged by whether we succeed in meeting these challenges.

I also believe, however, that we have a more far-reaching political responsibility to the world as a whole. The Community is economically strong. It is regarded in the world at large as a political factor of the first rank. Are we actually aware of this? Have we done enough to shoulder the political responsibility that this implies? Have we really considered the conflicts confronting the world as our own conflicts, or were we not sometimes glad that there were other major countries to solve these conflicts for us? In future this will not be possible. This Parliament — like the Community — will be gauged by the extent to which we face up to this task, and I feel that we should begin our work with this in mind. We will not be able to create any kind of model. Neither should we look with pride or condescension on countries that are required to act on moral principles of this nature

in much less favourable conditions. We are the lucky possessors. We can afford to be human and more just. However, ladies and gentleman, being able to afford these things also implies obligations. In a world of inhumanity and injustice we must dare to try and construct a humane order of things that is a little more just and a little more human than mankind has hitherto witnessed in the world.

(Applause)

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

Mr Debré. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies, gentleman, the Assembly of the Communities is meeting in its new shape at a time of terrible turmoil for the nations of Europe. The words that are used to describe it — whether 'monetary disarray', industrial crisis', or 'trade competition' — do not convey its substance. Nor does the formula 'readjusting to a new equilibrium' describe the situation any more accurately. What we are experiencing is a particular form of war called economic war. This verbal distinction is fundamental, because the words 'disarray', crisis', 'competition', 'readjustment' refer to phenomena thought to be extraneous to political power and likely to improve of their own accord.

'War', on the other hand, properly describes the present continuing and alarming state of the world, and it also signifies that it will not be appeased all by itself. Peace can only come through the action of men, of governments and systems that will want to bring it about, and who will also be determined to emerge, not on the side of the conquered, but on the side of the victors. I was happy to hear these words in our President's speech this morning.

The war that is going on is, first of all, a monetary war. The currency upheavals and the chaos of monetary policies must bear an important part of the blame for the fact that the world economy has become a jungle. How much do I regret that around the period 1965-72 the European governments did not adopt a tougher stand on America's financial policies and allowed themselves to be drawn instead into the mortally dangerous game of currency floating. Ever since then the powerful United States has been gambling with the dollar, and they are still doing so. Their leaders and their economists can give as many explanations as they like — they cannot stand up to the facts. By a political choice of its leading power, the entire world has been plunged into a monetary war which is affecting the economic and political life of nations. Let us be clear: for the peace of the world it is essential that the powers responsible for the world's economy stop playing with fire: there is no knowing what a currency conflagration could do to us.

(Applause)

Debré

The war is also an energy war. The fact has been shouted from the rooftops for the last few weeks, or, more especially, the last few days. Not before time. What is forgotten is that this energy war has been unleashed by the monetary war, and that it will last as long as the other does.

True enough, other causes have reinforced this primary cause. The alliance of oil-producing countries has become aware of its strength — a strength due as much to the new pattern of power as to our appetite for energy consumption. The oil producers' alliance means to use its strength ruthlessly. At the back of the contest lies the thought of territorial changes in the Middle East; so many passions attach to the question of territorial changes there that the oil problem will long remain outside the sphere of economic bargaining and be used as a weapon in the power struggle.

It is also a trade war. Easy transport has made our globe shrink. Reduced distances have made it possible to establish many industrial areas outside Europe, all of them only too ready to compete with Europe's industries and even her agriculture. The implications of the existence of these industrial areas, once so distant, today so close, should leave us in no doubt. There are governments, there are régimes, who are out to exploit the availability of labour here, the high labour productivity there, the lack of social provisions somewhere else, in order to conquer foreign markets, while taking every care that their own markets remain firmly closed.

Against this offensive, there is defensive action: protectionism is spreading throughout the world, and spreading all the more vigorously as everyone talks of free trade. So does a warrior, polishing his arms, talk of peace and nothing but peace, to lull his adversary.

There is yet another form of economic war, the investment war. It is closely linked to the other three. The abundance of the huge sums flowing to the oil-producing countries, the scramble for new markets, prompt investments superfluous to needs; the effects of this over-investment in many basic activities, both in industry and agriculture, combine with those of monetary inflation and of rising prices to result, especially in Europe, in excessive unemployment. Will the European nations be able to cope? Will they know how both to manage their domestic affairs and achieve that cooperation among themselves which will enable them to survive and progress together.

Certainly, this is not the only issue of our time, but it is the first and the most urgent, particularly for the European Economic Community whose responsibilities are fixed by a treaty. Those Community nations whose leaders were the first to understand that we were not passing through a transitory crisis but waging a long competitive war, and who have therefore managed to order their public finance, the evolution

of private incomes, their industrial investment and their trading capacity, are rewarded today by favourable economic and social conditions, whereas the others, whose leaders were less far-sighted, find themselves in varying states of preparedness to face some very serious difficulties as this war gains in intensity today. But these differences do not impair the solidarity of the European nations in the face of assaults — currency, energy, dumping, harmful investments — to which they must respond by concerted actions of their own; otherwise internal tensions will prevent further progress in the organization of Europe.

Given this fundamental fact of the economic war, how is Europe to progress? From over a quarter of a century's experience we can deduce four essential guidelines.

In the first place, inter-governmental cooperation must lie at the base of the European idea.

(Applause)

Secondly, the leaders of European States must pursue the goal of independence. Thirdly, mass support must demonstrate the value of collective solidarity side by side with the internal solidarity of nations. Fourthly, the European democracies must respect those fundamental values which constitute their distinctive mark and the source of their moral strength.

Let me elaborate on these four points. Europe is not a single nation; every attempt to organize Europe based on the denial of nationhood or on the domination of one nation over others, has failed in the past and will fail again. No one of course, can predict what future generations will do. But to act today as if the realities of our time were other than what they are is to court certain disaster. Let the dreamers remember that institutions cannot govern men unless they are built on a foundation of thorough, sincere and repeatedly affirmed consent. Unless it is based on legitimacy, which is a moral and psychological concept long before it finds expression in juridical terms, the law has either no force or it is the instrument of tyranny.

Our nations, which were to become the cradle of freedom and the bastion of democracy, have been created by the processes of European history through the assertion of their sovereignty, an assertion so firm that whenever the concept of nationhood is destroyed, territorial dismemberment is immediately followed by racist demagoguery of the most odious kind. I can think of nothing more inimical to the idea of Europe and of the freedom that Europe represents than a political organization based on ethnic regions. Today, as ever, the great name of 'nation' is bandied about and debased. Nevertheless, on our continent it represents the expression of a social will based in freedom which alone can guarantee the democratic exercise of power.

The role of an assembly such as ours is not primarily to support an administration — not even one as

Debré

august as the Commission itself — against the national governments. Nor is it to support the pretensions of the Court of Justice against the competence of the national judiciaries. Our role is, above all, to watch over the European dimension of inter-governmental activities and to ensure that these are constantly directed towards the interests of all: it is a most difficult task, but it is also our fundamental duty. This European dimension of intergovernmental activity should be marked by a special quality, the quality of independence. I am profoundly amazed to hear statements made in the name of Europe in which the hegemony of a great power is accepted without reservations as right and proper. Of course, we know that we are only one part of Europe: Western Europe. It is precisely this fact which in the present state of the world and in the present pattern of political forces, lays heavy responsibilities upon us.

But to go back to the economic war in which we are engaged, I must say that this Community has taken an astonishing line, as if its ruling spirits had failed to register the profound changes which have occurred in these last years. The American market is protected, very protected in many ways; so is the Japanese market, so are markets of the Communist countries of Europe and Asia, and so are the markets of Africa. Small European markets outside the Common Market are also protected. Is ours to remain virtually open to all-comers? What is the result? In the face of growing dangers of industrial failure and of unemployment, partitioning walls are beginning to rise up within Europe.

Let us be frank: harmonization of standards, practical provisions concerning public contracts are progressing and can only continue to do so. But what is forgotten is that the Community wasn't inspired by the idea of free trade with the world at large but, first of all, by the concept of Community preference which presupposes one approach to the outside world and another to internal exchanges.

Immediately, on the first day, I tabled a question on the Community's trade policy which, in my view, no longer conforms to the initial principles which persuaded some of us to accept the economic organization of Europe and which no longer meets the requirements of world competition either.

Our colleagues, Mr Messmer and Mr Poncelet, have tabled questions in the same spirit, one on the steel industry, the other on textiles, both of them highly topical. And talking of textiles, I must here state our attitude, our opposition, to the recent plans for agreements with China, imports from which, if we were to agree to them, would, as we have already warned, aggravate unemployment here.

(Applause)

It is all the more important to point out and correct these situations in that popular support is essential if, in years to come we are to see feelings of collective solidarity developing side by side with national loyalties. This collective solidarity will be generated by common policies and by the common desire to do better than the rest of the world.

Among the common policies, the most typical case is still that of agricultural policy. Regional aids also constitute a common policy. These policies, contrary to what some people say, are not merely the means of satisfying some sectional interests — farmers, or the inhabitants of the less-favoured regions; they are the practical expression of that very principle which would inform the Community's economic policies, by demonstrating to the farmers, for example, that they have priority over foreign farmers, to the men and women in the disadvantaged areas that the improvement of their working and living conditions is the common concern of the European nations. Many of us, I trust, would be quick to point to the dangers of any failure in this respect; in particular, we must never forget that the dismantling of internal customs barriers has been linked from the beginning to the common agricultural policy and still remains so. Not to proclaim these principles is to abandon the hope of bringing European solidarity into being, just as failure to enter the new paths opened before humanity by science and technology would mean the abandonment of efforts to make this solidarity felt.

How much do I regret that — nearly twenty years ago — I did not succeed in persuading the European governments of the time that we should embark together on the conquest of space. If today, in 1979, a European space crew manning a European-constructed spaceship launched by a rocket of European manufacture could be sent up to rival American and Soviet flights and precede those to be undertaken by the Chinese, what popular enthusiasm would be generated and what an immense progress in European solidarity would be achieved. Instead, the empty squabbles as to who should construct this or that bit of an American or Soviet craft, or the rivalry over which European country should have a token crew member on an American or Soviet flight fall to us as the crumbs of an aspiration we failed to achieve because we failed to understand either its political value or its psychological import.

It is never too late to mend. I hope that today's and tomorrow's governments will understand this and that they will also understand that other fields lie waiting for action on their part.

It is also in the common interest of the European nations to participate jointly in the exploitation of the oceans and in the exploration of the ocean bed. It is in their common interest to develop jointly certain lines of scientific research, particularly medical research. Here, as in the novel field of space exploration, the intellectual and physical exploits which,

Debré

beyond the necessary technical and scientific competence, are the essential elements of success, also create that confidence and enthusiasm whose significance for the future it is impossible to calculate. It is in this way and in this way alone, that Europe can enter men's minds and hearts.

The fourth point is no less important than the previous three. It is one which we must all keep in sight. The European democracies must respect those fundamental values which lie at their roots and which they would abandon at their peril. These values are many; some are simple and dictate constraints that are not confined to our present-day financial difficulties. Policymakers should give a good example and show that they are not prepared to gamble too lavishly with the taxpayers' money.

But other values are of higher rank and wider implications. We should reflect upon them with particular care. Thus, currents of thought claiming to rejuvenate our philosophy have gone so far as to subvert the very principles of our civilization by proposing to us models which embody pagan ideals, be they of Mediterranean or Continental origin. Tampering with philosophy is a dangerous game! To abandon the standards of what today is called 'Judaio-Christianism', that fundamental philosophy which liberal thought has developed and complemented, is to reject the supremacy of morality over power. It is to deny the central position of the human individual and his conscience as the origin and measure of all policy. We must eliminate from our minds, our laws and our conduct everything that threatens to deform a moral attitude which, despite national differences, informs the European spirit and legitimizes our cultures. This is a duty which we dare not neglect.

We recognize the same truth when we look to that other part of our continent whence a great voice, Roman and Polish at the same time, called out only recently to remind us that it, also, belongs to Europe; for despite the misfortunes that have overcome them and despite their own diversity, the nations of the other half of Europe share our spiritual origins and our present aspirations. The observance of the terms of détente, that is of security in Europe, necessary as they are, must go hand-in-hand with an increasing struggle for national freedom in conjunction with individual liberties. This struggle requires that we on our part should be able to set the right example.

The same is true if we cast our eyes to the farther shore of the Mediterranean where, unless we can provide the necessary example there as well, the forces of anti-Western religious fanaticism will stifle the voices of reason calling for understanding and peace.

And it is this same truth we acknowledge when we call upon the European nations to concern themselves with the tragedy of the Asian refugees. Our group, with its chairman, Christian de la Malène, has tabled a

motion about which we should like to make it perfectly clear that it is not a matter of parliamentary routine, but a political appeal of the greatest importance.

Principles go for nothing without the active ingredient of life. In order to be able to think and act, one must first of all exist. If we mean, through the solidarity of our effort in the economic and social fields, not only to prevent our involvement in, not to say our subjugation to, policies which are alien to us, but also, and above all, if we wish to strengthen that influence which the European nations deserve to exercise, we must have the courage — or, at any rate to begin, with, some of us must have the courage — to face the fundamental issue.

The governments must realize that if we continue along the road on which we find ourselves now, we are building, because we fail to procreate children, a Europe of coffins. How deeply right Madame Weiss was to place, in her beautiful speech, an improved birth rate among the top priorities for Europe! We must not listen to those oracles of absurdity who add up the men and women all over the globe and, on the pretext that India or China is overpopulated, would like to see our old Europe, deprived of new generations of youth, becoming ever more aged, that is to say ever less enterprising, ever more inward-looking and prone to abdicate its role in every field: of the economy and of the intellect, of power and of feeling. Let every European nation examine its conscience and ask itself whether, in the name of civilization, it is not being asked to renounce, by abandoning respect for the family and for motherhood, its own civilization, that is its freedom, that freedom which is the first of the fundamental values. If freedom is to become the strength of the world, there must be enough young people in that part of the world where freedom already rules. To my mind, there can be no meaningful social policy from now on unless priority is accorded to this question, which can be truly described as vital. If the generations now living are not replaced, only degradation and tragedy can result.

I spoke of the generations now living; that to which many of us belong has been ravaged and marked for the rest of its days by the era of absurd cruelty it fell to us to experience.

In addition to recognizing her outstanding qualities, the election of our President is a symbolic affirmation by all of us that we shall not even countenance the idea that that era might be forgotten, and that we expect that her first task will be, as it ought to be for all of us, to work for a final reconciliation of minds and hearts. In that era, men and women learned that the chances of victory in the struggle for freedom are conditioned by a triple resolve; in the absence of a determined realism, freedom falls victim to every kind of illusion; when there is no resolute striving for great-

Debré

ness, freedom is lost by default ; unless we are willing to be generous, we allow freedom to be confined to a selfish isolation. Surely if we occupy *different* benches in this House today it is because we once struggled for the right to debate our differences in the open. But if we are sitting, *together* in this House it is in order to help the legitimate leaders of Europe's nations, in full recognition of these nations' unity *and* their independence, to root out these three deadly flaws : illusions, acquiescence, isolation, and to motivate their actions with the three essential resolves : realism, greatness, and generosity. It is only when we have these, dear colleagues, that Europe will breathe, that Europe will live, that Europe will assert its rightful place in the world.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Pannella to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, I wonder if our group may be allowed to share its speaking time between two speakers — myself and Mrs Else Hammerich.

President. — Unless any Member present objects, I feel that in view of the special conditions attaching to this formal sitting, there is no reason not to agree to this request, provided, of course, that the total speaking time is kept to.

Are there any objections ?

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella — (*I*) Madam President, I should first of all like to make it clear that neither myself nor Mrs Hammerich will be speaking only on behalf of our group. We consider that, even though this celebration has been something of a parliamentary liturgy, real political debate has, in fact, got under way. We therefore regret that all Members have not had the right to reply, for example, to the statement by Mr Jenkins, which was not a formality but a political statement. This comment concerns not only the non-attached Members or the members of our group, but all parliamentarians of all the groups for I believe that, as Members of Parliament we have the duty and the right after a political speech, to express our opinions, in accordance with our Rules of Procedure.

However, we know that things can only change slowly, Madam President. We shall therefore bow, to some extent, to wills other than our own and make these two statements in a personal capacity within the time set aside for our group, in other words, ten minutes each.

Let me emphasize straightway that we naturally understand full well the criticisms which are made of the

world in which we live and the positive or negative contribution made by Europe, particularly as regards the current genocide, which has been referred to several times and which continues in Vietnam in different forms. In our own Parliament, we were the first to point out to the State its duty to intervene against genocide, and we point out that here too. We are particularly well placed to do so, as we did not support an earlier genocide against the same people. I believe that is an important point.

However, we must not seek cheap pretexts in order to ease our conscience. This genocide is undoubtedly happening, but how do you account for the fact that you, the majority groups — Social Democrats, Liberals, Christian Democrats, the men and the groups in power in the various regions of Europe — are responsible or jointly responsible for spending 400 000 million dollars per year on arms, while this year 17 million children aged under 5 have been victims of genocide and 50 million people have been because you use these 400 000 million dollars for arms instead of saving the lives of these 50 million people and 17 million children ?

It is all very well for Mr Debré and others, such as our Liberal colleagues, to speak of a humanist Europe or humanism. However, I believe that we should show a little modesty, that we should not salve our consciences and use the genocide of the Vietnamese as a screen for masking the fearful holocaust which your governments are perpetrating every day for our generation. If holocausts were nothing more than those which people might be reminded of, rightly or wrongly, by the presence of Mr Almirante, I believe that there would be no problem for our generation. However terrible it was, and provided we are aware of it, what is past is past and is not present. But what is tragic and dangerous is that, acting in the name of past holocausts, we are actively responsible for the holocausts of today, which are even more bloody and murderous than those of the past. The easy conscience of Socialists, Liberals, Democrats and Europeans who have spoken on this great occasion and who feel that the class problem is outdated and no longer a fashionable topic of conversation, and consider that it is possible for countries enjoying so-called real socialism, possessing unworthy alibis, to contribute to the holocaust of 50 million people who die, who are killed and assassinated, because the money by which they live and survive is used to build increasingly dangerous arms — all this, I believe, singles out a period of which Europe has no right to be proud. Those who are Christians, Liberals or Socialists might well find other things to do than simply indicating that they have a clear conscience and that they are good Christians, good Socialists or good Liberals.

Pannella

In conclusion, Madam President, I would cite one more example. We have heard protests and complaints from two majority groups: the Liberals, who emphasized that they were victims of an electoral law in the United Kingdom, and the French Socialists, who say that they were similarly victimized in France. How gullible can people be! When the French Liberals impose a package of electoral laws such as those introduced in this case, can they really be surprised when they suffer the same fate elsewhere? And do not the German Social Democrats, with their numerous references to humanism and human rights, perhaps bear some responsibility for this merciless arms race and this narrow view of energy, this classically capitalist development of our society? No doubt we shall have further opportunity to speak on these matters.

Finally, Madam President, I should like to say that I am personally proud, as an Italian Radical, to belong to such a varied group containing colleagues who will greatly enrich the life of this Assembly, perhaps more than you expect: I refer here to our colleagues from the Volksunie, our Wallon or French-speaking Belgian colleagues, and our Danish colleagues who, being opposed to this common market of the gullible which has been created, will make an enormous contribution. For a federalist such as myself, their presence here reflects the extent of the work to be carried out by our Parliament. It gives me great pleasure, therefore, to give way to Mrs Else Hammerich.

President. — I call Mrs Hammerich.

Mrs Hammerich. — *(DK)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to thank Mr Pannella for his kind words. The Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members has given me the opportunity of speaking today as the representative of the largest Danish group in this Chamber. What I have to say is on behalf of the Popular Movement against the EEC, and not on behalf of our newly formed group, which democratically decided to give us this speaking time, as we are in a rather special situation. Our views are unfamiliar to most people in this Assembly, our movement has not worked in a Parliament before, and we have very individual ideas on the Nine, the European Community.

I should like to take this opportunity of telling you frankly how we, who oppose Danish membership of the Community, approached the direct elections, and what we are going to do this Assembly.

First a few words on what we are not going to do, so that there will be no misunderstandings. We have not come here to sabotage the work of this Assembly. We shall not do so because we have a very specific aim. We hope to transform Denmark's full membership of the Community into a general trade agreement, and

our efforts to achieve this will be concentrated in Denmark rather than here. Ladies and gentlemen, we respect your views and expect you to respect ours.

We are not opposed to international cooperation — quite the reverse, it is very close to our hearts. We hope to see broadly-based international cooperation, and as much contact as possible between the politicians and peoples of our countries, but we seek free international cooperation, with each people retaining the right to be master in its own house, on the basis of national autonomy and the principle of sovereignty. We oppose the supranational character of the European Community and object to the supremacy of the Court of Justice in Luxembourg over our own highest court. We object to the fact that the Commission in Brussels may take major decisions not necessarily in accordance with the decisions of a free and independent Danish Parliament, the Danish Folketing. We oppose this Parliament's right to take decisions on, for example, the budget, without the endorsement of our people and the Danish Folketing. We support international cooperation where all countries and all electorates retain the right to say no. For only if this right is preserved will we avoid a situation where size and power will decide the relationships between our countries and our peoples.

As I said, we are the largest Danish group present here. We represent a large proportion of the Danish population. Common courtesy requires us to let you know what this large proportion of the Danish people actually has in mind. Our starting point was the Danish Popular Movement against the EEC, a vigorous and expanding movement. It originated in the years leading up to the 1972 referendum, and has grown in strength and resolution since then. We are working towards a very simple objective. Our aim is to further the cause of national autonomy and popular control in our country. It is our firm resolve that people shall be able to decide for themselves on major matters affecting their own society, wherever they may live.

We regard the European Community, in its structure and especially in its objectives, as being in fundamental conflict with these aims. The European Community, as a body, takes decisions out of the hands of the general population and turns them over to senior politicians, experts and bureaucrats. The EEC operates on the basis of the concentration of economic power and the domination of the large countries, in direct opposition to our concept of democratic control. We recognize the existence and work of this Assembly, but do not regard direct elections as the new democratic entitlement they are claimed to be. We disagree. These elections represent a step towards a takeover by the EEC of more of the powers of our own parliament, the Folketing. We are well aware, from what we have heard here, that strong

Hammerich

influences in this Parliament are working to obtain more power for the Communities, more supranational power. We shall do our utmost to thwart these influences; we are here to support all those willing to defend true popular control over the individual countries' destinies. Our aim is also to prepare the way for a fresh decision by the Danish people on the Community. If the people are to decide, they must be given wide information on all plans and projects under consideration. We shall provide the Danish people with comprehensive information on all the plans being laid here to enable the EEC to assume new powers, and new areas in which it intends to advance. We shall pass this information back to our country, to provide the most realistic and democratic basis for the debate on Danish membership of the EEC. I hope that you will now understand a little better the popular forces we represent here, and hence our actions in this Chamber. It is claimed that this Assembly will reflect all major popular opinion in the nine countries, and you have just heard a little about the feelings of a major part of the Danish population.

President. — I call Mr Almirante who wishes to make a personal statement.

Mr Almirante. — (*I*) Madam President, I hope you will forgive me for asking for the floor, but a few minutes ago Mr Pannella associated my name in what I considered to be an offensive manner with the holocausts of yesterday and today. I asked Mr Pannella for a personal explanation, and he told me that I had misunderstood him. I hope that this is the case, but I trust that Mr Pannella will have the courtesy to explain his reference.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) It was in no way my intention, Mr Almirante, to offend anyone. I consider that insults and offensive remarks are the negation of dialogue. As far as we are concerned, because we are fundamentally and unreservedly anti-Fascist, we respect all our adversaries, including those who are not anti-Fascist.

However, that being said, I would remind you that in my speech I said that certain people referred to the holocausts and that they feel, *rightly or wrongly*, that you may in some way remind them of these holocausts. My words were 'rightly or wrongly' and I hope that you will acknowledge that in Italy, precisely because we are unreservedly opposed to Fascism, we would never, particularly in view of the situation in which you find yourself, insult or offend you.

President. — I note your statement, Mr Pannella, and I trust that Mr Almirante will now be satisfied.

Mr Almirante. — (*I*) I am not wholly satisfied, but there will be opportunity in the future to resume this discussion concerning fascists of yesterday and today.

There exists a certain racism in this Assembly, given that, as the representative with my three colleagues of 2 million Italians who voted in the European elections, I am not able today to make a political statement as I had requested.

President. — I call Mr de Goede on a point of order.

Mr de Goede. — (*NL*) Madam President, I regret that I must raise a point of order here. I refrained from doing so this morning because I did not suppose that your announcement that the debate was to follow the lines set out in a document of 28 June would mean that the non-attached Members would not be allowed to speak.

I would therefore ask you even now to give them the opportunity of taking part in the debate, if only for a few minutes.

The reasons given to me by your messenger to the effect that this is a formal sitting at which non-attached Members may not speak are surely ones to which you would not personally subscribe publicly. We are no less formally Members of this House, and we wish to take part in this discussion no less democratically than those Members who belong to political groups. It can surely not be your intention to create two categories of Members, each with different rights, so that those who belong to a group may speak and those who do not belong to a group may not?

You yourself said at the beginning of your speech this morning that you are the President of the entire Assembly and that the Rules of Procedure would be applied correctly to everyone. In this connection, I would draw your attention to the fact that Rule 12 stipulates that a preliminary draft agenda must be presented to the Assembly. Normally, proposals for speaking time accompany the draft agenda. Whilst I realize that strict application of the Rules of Procedure in the exceptional circumstances of these first two days might give rise to difficulties, I would at the same time request your understanding for the situation confronting us. I would therefore ask you to allow those Members who do not belong to a group to speak for a few minutes.

President. — It is not possible to let you have these extra few minutes. The agenda is binding on us as it was drawn up, since it was essential for this formal sitting to be organized fairly tightly, otherwise it would have been quite impossible to conduct the proceedings in an orderly way. I would point out to you that in addition to Rule 12, the Rules of Procedure also contain provisions for organizing debates. That is what was done at the beginning of the sitting.

President

We shall now suspend our proceedings until 3.00 p.m.
The formal sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 1.30 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting was opened at 3.20 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

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

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — Madam President, could I suggest in the most courteous and friendly way that it would be in everyone's interest if we could start business at the hour that has been named.

(Applause)

If Members are not in their seats, that is their fault, but a good example from the President's chair would be very well accepted on all sides.

(Applause)

President. — I note your statement, and would hope that all the political groups will do the same. It was, in fact, at the request of one of the groups that the sitting was opened late. I agreed to this request, but since the applause which your statement has evoked would seem to indicate unanimous opposition to such exceptions being made, the sittings will in future begin at the times stated.

(Applause)

2. 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.

3. Election of Vice-Presidents

President. — The next item is the election of the Vice-Presidents of the European Parliament.

The following Members are candidates :

Mr Demarch, Mr de Ferranti, Mr Bruno Friedrich, Mr Gonella, Mr Jaquet, Mr Katzer, Mr Lalor, Mr Møller, Mr Pflimlin, Mr Rogers, Mrs Spaak, Mr Vandewiele, Mr Vondeling and Mr Zagari.

Since the number of candidates is greater than the number of seats to be filled, a secret ballot will be held pursuant to Rule 7 (1) of the Rules of Procedure.

I would remind the House that Rule 7 (4) of the Rules of Procedure states as follows :

The Vice-Presidents shall then be elected on a single ballot paper. Those who on the first ballot obtain an abso-

lute majority, of the votes cast shall be declared elected. Should the number of candidates elected be less than the number of seats to be filled, a second ballot shall be held under the same conditions among candidates not yet elected. Should a third ballot be necessary, a relative majority shall suffice for election to the remaining seats, and in the event of a tie the oldest candidates shall be declared elected.

I would also point out that under Rule 5 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the number of Vice-Presidents to be elected is twelve.

Ballot papers and envelopes have been distributed. I would ask Members to mark the names of the *twelve* candidates of their choice with a cross, to place the ballot paper in the envelope and deposit it in the ballot box when their name is called.

The names of representatives who have participated in a vote by secret ballot must be published in the minutes of proceedings. Members are therefore asked to sign the list which has been placed in front of the rostrum before depositing their envelopes in the ballot box.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Madam Chairman, I just wanted to say that we have nominated Mrs Spaak in order to offer the House as a whole an opportunity to behave differently than if there had been only twelve candidates. Leaving aside the rows and polemics, one has to recognize that the intention of the groups which have traditionally dominated this Parliament has in fact been to deprive any minority or non-attached Member of the chance to be represented in the Bureau.

I do not think this is very democratic. We therefore hope that all those who do not want, now or later on, to delegate their power and the power of this Parliament, for all time, to bureaucracies which have a propensity to stifle diversity and dissent, will vote for the candidate whom we have nominated for their approval. Our candidacy, quite apart from the well-known merits of Mrs Spaak, is also a candidacy of principle to prevent what we consider to be, I say with great frankness, an immoral act in Parliament, an act which is not very democratic.

President. — The name of the Member with whom the roll-call will commence will now be drawn by lot.

The roll-call will commence with Mr Fernandez.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, will the same Members act as tellers as in the election of the President?

President. — Yes. If the Members who acted as tellers yesterday are present, I propose that they do so again today.

President

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Ingo Friedrich.

Mr Ingo Friedrich. — (D) Madam President, would it be possible to ask the candidates to stand up so that we can all get a good look at them?

(Laughter)

President. — I hardly think that would serve any useful purpose. There are other ways of getting to know the candidates without having them stand up in the Chamber. To do so would create an undesirable precedent. I cannot agree to your request.

(Applause from certain benches)

Voting will now begin. I ask the Secretary-General to call the roll.

(The roll was called)

Does anyone else wish to vote?

The vote is closed.

I now ask the tellers to go to Room 1111 where the votes will be counted.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 4.20 p.m. and resumed at 6.15 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Lord Bethell on a point of order.

Lord Bethell. — Madam President, could I draw your attention to the fact that arc lamps have been burning in this Chamber and shining in our eyes throughout the entire day, whether the House has been in session or not. Not only is this wearing on our nerves and like to a police interrogation, it is also very bad for energy conservation. Could you give instructions to turn off the arc lamps when they are not required for television?

(Applause)

President. — Thank you for your comment. I shall make inquiries at once to see what can be done to rectify the situation about which you have complained.

The result of the vote is as follows:

Number of Members voting :	397
Ballot papers deposited :	393
Blank or spoiled ballot papers :	3
Votes cast :	390
Absolute majority :	196

The votes received were as follows:

Mrs Demarch :	148
Mr de Ferranti :	291
Mr Bruno Friedrich :	298
Mr Gonella :	307
Mr Jaquet :	293
Mr Katzer :	307
Mr Lalor :	161
Mr Møller :	284
Mr Pflimlin :	304
Mr Rogers :	270
Mrs Spaak :	60
Mr Vandewiele :	313
Mr Vondeling :	293
Mr Zagari :	288

The following Members took part in the vote:

Mr Abens, Mr Adam, Mr Adonnino, Mr van Aerssen, Mrs Agnelli, Mr Aigner, Mr Alber, Mr Albers, Mrs von Alemann, Mr Almirante, Mr Ansart, Mr Ansquer, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Arf, Mr Arndt, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Baillet, Mr Balfé, Mr Balfour, Mr Bangemann, Mr Barbagli, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Barbi, Mr Battersby, Mr Baudis, Mr Beazley, Mr Berlinguer, Mr Bersani, Lord Bethell, Mr Bettiza, Mr Beumer, Mr von Bismarck, Mr Blaney, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Bocklet, Mr Boden, Mr Bøgh, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Bonde, Mrs Bonino, Mrs Boot, Mrs Boserup, Mr Boyes, Mr Brandt, Miss Brookes, Mrs Buchan, Mr Buchou, Mr Buttafuoco, Mr Caborn, Mr Cailavet, Mr Calvez, Mr Capanna, Mr Cardia, Mrs Caretoni Romanoli, Mrs Cariglia, Mr Carossino, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Castle, Sir Fred Catherwood, Mr Cecovini, Mr Ceravolo, Mr Chambeiron, Mrs Charzat, Mr Chirac, Mrs Chouraqui, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mr Clinton, Mrs Clwyd, Mr Cohen, Mr Colla, Mr Colleselli, Mr Collins, Mr Collomb, Mr Colombo, Mr Combe, Mr Coppieters, Mr Costanzo, Mr Cottrell, Mr de Courcy Ling, Mrs Cresson, Mr Cronin, Mr Croux, Mr Curry, Mr Dalsass, Mr Dalziel, Mr Damette, Mr Damseaux, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr Dankert, Mr Davern, Mr Debatisse, Mr Debré, Mr De Clerq, Mr De Keersmaeker, Mrs Dekker, Mr Delatte, Mr Deleau, Mr Delmotte, Mr Delorozoy, Mr Delors, Mrs Demarch, Mr Denis, Mr De Pasquale, Mrs Desmond, Miss de Valera, Mr Diana, Mr Didò, Mrs Dienesch, Mr Diligent, Mr Donnez, Lord Douro, Mr Druon, Lady Elles, Mr Enright, Mr Estier, Mrs Ewing, Mr Fanti, Mr Edgar Faure, Mr Maurice Faure, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Fergusson, Mr Fernandez, Mr de Ferranti, Mr Ferrero, Mr Ferri, Mr Filippi, Mr Fianagan, Miss Flesch, Mrs Focke, Miss Forster, Mr Forth, Mr Bruno Friedrich, Mr Ingo Friedrich, Mr Frischmann, Mr Früh, Mr Fuchs, Mrs Fuillet, Mr Gabert, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mr Gallagher, Mr Galland, Mr Galluzzi, Mrs Gaspard, Mr Gatto, Mr Gendebien, Mr Geurtsen, Mr Ghergo, Mr Giavazzi, Mr Gillot, Mr Giummarra, Mr Glinne, Mr de Goede, Mr Gonella, Mr Goppel, Mr Gouthier, Mrs Gredal, Mr Gremetz, Mr Griffiths, Mrs Groes, Mr Van der Gun, Mr Haagerup, Mr Habsburg, Mr Hänsch, Mr Hahn, Mrs Hammerich, Lord Harmar-Nicholls, Mr Harris, Mr von Hassel, Mr Hauenschild, Mr Helms, Mr Henckens, Mrs Herklotz, Mr Hermann, Mrs van de Heuvel-de-Blank, Mrs Hoff, Mrs Hoffmann, Mr Hoffmann, Miss Hooper, Mr Hopper, Mr Hord, Mr Howell, Mr Hume, Mr Hutton, Mrs Iotti, Mr Ippolito, Mr Irmer, Mr Christopher Jackson, Mr Robert Jackson, Mr Jakobsen, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr Jaquet, Mr Johnson, Mr Jonker, Mr Josselin, Mr Jürgens, Mr Katzer, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr Key, Mr Kirk, Mr Klepsch, Mr Klinkenborg, Mr Kohler, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mr Kuhn,

President

Mr Labbé, Mr Lalor, Mr Lange, Mr Langes, Mr Lecanuet, Mr Lega, Mr Lemmer, Mrs Lenz, Mr Leonardi, Mrs Leroux, Mr Lezzi, Mr Ligios, Mr Lima, Mr Linde, Mr Linkohr, Mrs Lizin, Mr Loderer, Mr Lomas, Mr Loo, Mr Louwes, Mr Lücker, Mr Luster, Mr Lyngé, Mr McCartin, Mr Maffre-Baugé, Mrs Maij-Wegen, Mr Majonica, Mr Malangre, Mr de la Malène, Mr Marshall, Mr Martin, Mrs Martin, Mr Martinet, Mr Mauroy, Mr Megahy, Mr Mertens, Mr Messmer, Mr Michel, Mr van Minnen, Mr Møller, Mr Moorhouse, Mr Moreau, Mrs Moreau, Mr Moreland, Mr Motchane, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Muntingh, Mr Narducci, Mr Newton Dunn, Sir David Lancaster Nicolson, Mr Nielsen, Mrs Nielsen, Mr Nord, Mr Nordlohne, Mr Normanton, Mr Notenboom, Mr Nothomb, Mr Nyborg, Mr O'Connell, Mr O'Donnell, Mr Oehler, Lord O'Hagan, Mr O'Leary, Mr Olesen, Mr Orlandi, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Paisley, Mr Pajetta, Mr Pannella, Mr Pappapietro, Mr Patterson, Mr Pearce, Mr Pedini, Mr Pelikan, Mr Penders, Mr Percheron, Mr Peters, Mr Petronio, Mr Pennig, Mr Pflimlin, Mr Pininfarina, Mr Pintat, Mr Piquet, Sir Henry Plumb, Mr Pöttering, Mrs Poirier, Mr Poncelet, Mr Poniatowski, Mr Prag, Mr Pranchere, Mr Price, Mr Prout, Mr Provan, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Pürsten, Mr Puletti, Mr Purvis, Miss Quin, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Radoux, Mr Remilly, Mr Rey, Sir Brandon Rhys Williams, Mr Rinsche, Mr Ripa di Meana, Mr Rogers, Mr Romualdi, Mr Rossi, Mrs Roudy, Mr Ruffolo, Mr Rumor, Mr Ryan, Mr Sablé, Mrs Salisch Sälzer, Mr Santer, Mr Sarre, Mr Sassano, Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg, Mr Schall, Mr Schieler, Mr Schinzel, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Schmid, Mr Schmitt, Mr Schnitker, Mr Karl Schön, Mr Konrad Schön, Mr Schwartzberg, Mr Schwencke, Mr Sciascia, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mrs Scrivener, Mr Seal, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mr Segre, Mrs Seibel-Emmering, Mr Seitlinger, Mr Seligman, Mr Sherlock, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Simmonds, Mr Simonnt, Mr Simpson, Mr Skovmand, Mrs Spaak, Mr Spencer, Mr Spicer, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Squarcialupi, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Mr Sutra, Mr John David Taylor, Mr John Mark Taylor, Mr Tindemans, Mr Tolman, Mr Travaglini, Mr Tuckman, Mr Turner, Mr Turner, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Vanderpoorten, Mr Vandewiele, Mr van Miert, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Veil, Mr Vergeer, Mr Verges, Mr Verhagen, Mr Vernimmen, Mr Verroken, Mr Vetter, Mr Visentini, Mr Vondeling, Mr von der Vring, Mr Wagner, Mr Walter, Mrs Walz, Sir Fred Warner, Mr Wawrzik, Mrs Weber, Mrs Weiss, Mr Welsch, Mr Wettig, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr von Wogau, Mr Wolter, Mr Woltjer, Mr Wurtz, Mr Zagari, Mr Zecchino.

The following candidates have obtained an absolute majority of the votes cast and are elected in the following order of precedence, their age being taken into account where necessary :

Mr Vandewiele, Mr Gonella, Mr Katzer,
Mr Pflimlin, Mr Bruno Friedrich, Mr Jaquet,
Mr Vondeling, Mr De Ferranti, Mr Zagari,
Mr Møller and Mr Rogers.

Since one seat is still to be filled, a second ballot will be held.

Are there any changes in the candidacies ?

I call Mrs Spaak.

Mrs Spaak. — (F) Madam President, in view of the result I have obtained, I could in fact withdraw my

candidacy, but since to do so will not prevent the Assembly from having to hold a second ballot I shall maintain it, since it does get some representation for a minority.

President. — I note that you are maintaining your candidacy.

There are three remaining candidates : Mrs Demarch, Mr Lalor and Mrs Spaak.

The sitting will now be suspended to allow ballot papers to be distributed.

(The sitting was suspended at 6.20 p.m. and resumed at 6.40 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE*Vice-President*

President. — The sitting is resumed.

The ballot papers and envelopes have been distributed. I would point out that the same system of voting applies in the second ballot as in the first, except that, since only one candidate is to be elected, Members are asked to mark only one cross on the ballot paper beside the name of the candidate of their choice.

The voting is open. I now ask the Secretary-General to call the roll.

(The roll was called)

Does anyone else wish to vote ?

Voting is closed.

I now ask the tellers to go again to Room 1111 where the votes will be counted.

I call Mr Fellermaier on a point of order.

Mr Fellermaier. — (D) Mr President, I feel that at this point you should inform the House of further arrangements for this sitting. I think we should know this. All Members are wondering whether after the count — and a possible further ballot — the sitting will be resumed or whether after the ballot and announcement of the result it will be closed.

We should all be most grateful if you would consider this point and inform us of your views, Mr President.

President. — A meeting of the Bureau will be held immediately after the election, which we hope will be concluded shortly, to discuss the agenda. The President asked me to inform you of that.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 7.25 p.m. and resumed at 8.35 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

The result of the second ballot is as follows :

Number of Members voting : 379
 Ballot papers deposited : 374
 Blank or spoiled ballot papers : 18
 Votes cast : 356
 Absolute majority : 179

The votes received were as follows :

Mrs Demarch : 163
 Mr Lalor : 144
 Mrs Spaak : 49

The following Members took part in the vote :

Mr Adam, Mr Adonnino, Mr van Aerssen, Mr Aigner, Mr Alber, Mr Albers, Mrs van Alemann, Mr Almirante, Mr Amendola, Mr Ansart, Mr Ansquer, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Arfé, Mr Arndt, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Baillet, Mr Balfe, Mr Balfour, Mr Bangemann, Mr Barbagli, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Barbi, Mr Battersby, Mr Baudis, Mr Beazley, Mr Berlinguer, Mr Bersani, Lord Bethell, Mr Bettiza, Mr Beumer, Mr von Bismarck, Mr Blaney, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Bocklet, Mr Bøgh, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Bonde, Mrs Bonino, Mrs Boot, Mrs Boserup, Mr Boyes, Mr Brandt, Miss Brookes, Mrs Buchan, Mr Buchou, Mr Buttafuoco, Mr Caborn, Mr Caillavet, Mr Calvez, Mr Capanna, Mr Cardia, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Cariglia, Mr Carossino, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Castellina, Mrs Castle, Sir Fred Catherwood, Mr Ceravolo, Mr Chambeiron, Mrs Charzat, Mr Chirac, Mrs Chouraqui, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mr Clinton, Mrs Clwyd, Mr Cohen, Mr Colla, Mr Colleselli, Mr Collins, Mr Colombo, Mr Combe, Mr Coppieters, Mr Costanzo, Mrs Cresson, Mr Cronin, Mr Curry, Mr Dalsass, Mr Dalziel, Mr Damette, Mr Damseaux, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr Dankert, Mr Davern, Mr Debatisse, Mr Debré, Mr De Clercq, Mr De Keersmaecker, Mrs Dekker, Mr Delatte, Mr Deleau, Mr Delorozoy, Mr Delors, Mrs Demarch, Mr Denis, Mr De Pasquale, Mrs Desmond, Miss de Valera, Mr Diana, Mr Didò, Mrs Dienesch, Mr Diligent, Mr Donnez, Lord Douro, Mr Duron, Lady Elles, Mr Enright, Mr Estier, Mrs Ewing, Mr Fanti, Mr Maurice Faure, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Fergusson, Mr Fernandez, Mr de Ferranti, Mr Ferrero, Mr Ferri, Mr Fillipi, Mr Flanagan, Miss Flesch, Mrs Focke, Miss Forster, Mr Forth, Mr Bruno Friedrich, Mr Ingo Friedrich, Mr Frischmann, Mr Früh, Mr Fuchs, Mrs Fullet, Mr Gabert, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mr Gallacher, Mr Galland, Mr Galluzzi, Mrs Gaspard, Mr Gatto, Mr Gendebien, Mr Geurtsen, Mr Ghergo, Mr Giavazzi, Mr Gillot, Mr Giummarra, Mr Glinne, Mr de Goede, Mr Gonella, Mr Goppel, Mr Gouthier, Mrs Gredal, Mrs Gremetz, Mr Griffiths, Mrs Groes, Mr Haargerup, Mr Habsburg, Mr Hänsch, Mr Hahn, Mrs Hammerich, Mr Harris, Mr von Hassel, Mr Hauenschild, Mr Helms, Mr Henckens, Mrs Herklotz, Mr Hermann, Mrs Van den Heuvel-de Blank, Mrs Hoff, Mrs Hoffman, Mr Hoffmann, Miss Hooper, Mr Hopper, Mr Hord, Mr Hume, Mr Hutton, Mr Ippolito, Mr Irmer, Mr Christopher Jackson, Mr Robert Jackson, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr Jaquet, Mr Johnson, Mr Jonker, Mr Josselin, Mr Jurgens, Mr Katzer, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr Key, Mr Kirk,

Mr Klepsch, Mr Klinkenborg, Mr Kohler, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mr Kuhn, Mr Lalor, Mr Lange, Mr Langes, Mr Lega, Mr Lemmer, Mrs Lenz, Mr Leonardi, Mrs Leroux, Mr Lezzi, Mr Ligios, Mr Lima, Mr Linde, Mr Linkohr, Mrs Lizin, Mr Loderer, Mr Lomas, Mr Loo, Mr Louwes, Mr Lückner, Mr Luster, Mr Lyngge, Mr Macario, Mr McCartin, Mr Maffre-Baugé, Mr Maher, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Majonica, Mr Malangre, Mr de la Malène, Mr Marshall, Mr Martin, Mrs Martin, Mr Martinet, Mr Mauroy, Mr Megahy, Mr Mertens, Mr Michel, Mr van Minnen, Mr Møller, Mr Moorhouse, Mr Moreau, Mrs Moreau, Mr Moreland, Mr Motchane, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Muntingh, Mr Narducci, Mr Newton Dunn, Sir David Lancaster Nicolson, Mr Nielsen, Mr Nord, Mr Nordlohne, Mr Normanton, Mr Notenboom, Mr Nothom, Mr Nyborg, Mr O'Connell, Mr O'Donnell, Mr Cehler, Lord O'Hagen, Mr O'Leary, Mr Olesen, Mr Orlandi, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Paisley, Mr Pajetta, Mr Pannella, Mr Papapietro, Mr Patterson, Mr Pearce, Mr Pedini, Mr Pelikan, Mr Penders, Mr Percheron, Mr Peters, Mr Petronio, Mr Pfennig, Mr Pflimlin, Mr Pininfarina, Mr Pintat, Mr Piquet, Sir Henry Plumb, Mr Pottering, Mrs Poirier, Mr Poncelet, Mr Poniatowski, Mr Prag, Mr Pranchere, Mr Price, Mr Prout, Mr Provan, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Pürsten, Mr Pulletti, Mr Purvis, Miss Quin, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Radoux, Mr Remilly, Mr Rey, Sir Brandon Rhys Williams, Mr Rinsche, Mr Ripa di Meana, Mr Rogers, Mr Romualdi, Mrs Roudy, Mr Ruffolo, Mr Rumor, Mr Ryan, Mr Sablé, Mr Salzer, Mrs Salisch, Mr Sarre, Mr Sassano, Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg, Mr Schall, Mr Schieler, Mr Schinzel, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Schmid, Mr Schmitt, Mr Schnitker, Mr Karl Schon, Mr Konrad Schon, Mr Schwartzenberg, Mr Schwencke, Mr Sciascia, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mrs Scrivener, Mr Seal, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mr Segre, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Seitlinger, Mr Seligman, Mr Sherlock, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Simmonds, Mr Simonnet, Mr Simpson, Mr Skovmand, Mrs Spaak, Mr Spicer, Mr Spicer, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Squarcialupi, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Mr Sutra, Mr John David Taylor, Mr John Mark Taylor, Mr Tindemans, Mr Tolman, Mr Travaglini, Mr Tuckman, Mr Turner, Mr Tyrell, Mr Vanderpoorten, Mr Vandewiele, Mr Van Miert, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Veil, Mr Vergeer, Mr Verges, Mr Verhaegen, Mr Vernimmen, Mr Verroken, Mr Vetter, Mr Visentini, Mr Vondeling, Mr von der Vring, Mr Wagner, Mr Walter, Mrs Walz, Sir Fred Warner, Mr Wawrzick, Mrs Weber, Mrs Weiss, Mr Welsch, Mr Wettig, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr von Wogau, Mr Woltjer, Mr Wurtz, Mr Zagari, Mr Zecchino.

Since no candidate has obtained an absolute majority of the votes cast, a third ballot will be held.

I would point out that Rule 7 (4) of the Rules of Procedure stipulates that a relative majority shall suffice for election to the remaining seats, and that in the event of a tie, the oldest candidate shall be declared elected.

Are there any changes in the candidacies ?

There are none.

The remaining candidates are, therefore, Mrs Demarch, Mr Lalor and Mrs Spaak, as before.

The sitting will now be suspended to allow ballot papers to be distributed.

(The sitting was suspended at 8.35 p. m. and resumed at 8.40 p. m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

Ballot papers and envelopes have been distributed. Members are asked to mark only one cross on the ballot paper beside the name of the candidate of their choice.

The voting is open. I now ask the Secretary-General to call the roll.

(The roll was called)

Does anyone else wish to vote?

The vote is closed.

I now ask the tellers to go to the same room as before where the votes will be counted.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 9.20 p. m., and resumed at 10.10 p. m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

The result of the third ballot is as follows:

Number of Members voting : 268
Ballot papers deposited : 264
Blank or invalid ballot papers : 8
Votes cast : 256

Votes received were as follows:

Mrs Demarch : 130

(Applause from the extreme left)

Mr Lalor : 109

Mrs Spaak : 17

The following Members took part in the vote:

Mr Adonnino, Mr van Aerssen, Mr Almirante, Mr Amendola, Mr Ansart, Mr Ansquer, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Arfé, Mr Arndt, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Baillot, Mr Balfé, Mr Balfour, Mr Bangemann, Mr Barbagli, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Barbi, Mr Baudis, Mr Beazley, Mr Berlinguer, Mr Bersani, Mr Beumer, Mr von Bismarck, Mr Blaney, Mr Bocklet, Mr Bøgh, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Bonde, Mrs Bonino, Mr Boyes, Mr Brandt, Mrs Buchan, Mr Buchou, Mr Buttafuoco, Mr Calvez, Mr Capanna, Mr Cardia, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Cariglia, Mr Carossino, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Castellina, Mrs Castle, Sir Fred Catherwood, Mr Cecovini, Mr Ceravolo, Mr Chambeiron, Mrs Charzat, Mr Chirac, Mrs Chouraqui, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mr Clinton, Mrs Clwyd, Mr Cohen, Mr Colla, Mr Colleselli, Mr Collins, Mr Colombo, Mr Coppeters, Mr Costanzo, Mrs Cresson, Mr Cronin, Mr Curry, Mr Dalsass, Mr Damette, Mr Damseaux, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr Davern, Mr Debatisse, Mr Debré, Mr De Clercq, Mr Delatte, Mr Deleau, Mr Delorozoy, Mr Delors, Mrs Demarch, Mr Denis, Mr De Pasquale, Mrs Desmond, Miss de Valera, Mr Diana, Mr Didò, Mrs Dienesch, Mr Diligent, Mr Druon, Lady Elles, Mr Enright, Mrs Ewing, Mr Fanti, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Fernandez, Mr de Ferranti, Mr Ferrero, Mr Ferri, Mr Filippi, Mr Flanagan, Miss Flesch, Mrs Focke, Mr Bruno Friedrich, Mr Ingo Friedrich, Mr Frischmann, Mr Früh, Mr Fuchs, Mrs Fuillet, Mr Gabert, Mrs

Gaiotti de Biase, Mr Galland, Mr Galuzzi, Mrs Gaspard, Mr Gatto, Mr Gendebien, Mr Ghergo, Mr Giavazzi, Mr Gillot, Mr Giummarra, Mr Glinne, Mr Gonella, Mr Goppel, Mr Gouthier, Mrs Gredal, Mr Griffiths, Mrs Groes, Mr Hänsch, Mr Hahn, Mrs Hammerich, Mr Harris, Mr van Hassel, Mr Hauenschield, Mr Henckens, Mrs Herklotz, Mr Herman, Mrs van den Heuvel-de Blank, Mrs Hoff, Mrs Hoffman, Mr Hoffman, Mr Hume, Mr Robert Jackson, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr Jaquet, Mr Jonker, Mr Ketzer, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr Key, Mr Kirk, Mr Klepsch, Mr Klinkenborg, Mr Kohler, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mr Kuhn, Mr Lalor, Mr Lange, Mr Langes, Mr Lega, Mr Lemmer, Mr Leonardi, Mrs Leroux, Mr Lezzi, Mr Ligios, Mr Lima, Mr Linde, Mr Linkohr, Mrs Lizin, Mr Loderer, Mr Louwes, Mr Luster, Mr Macario, Mr McCartin, Mr Maffre-Bauge, Mr Mahler, Mr Majonica, Mr de la Malène, Mr Martin, Mrs Martin, Mr Martinet, Mr Megahy, Mr van Minnen, Mr Møller, Mr Moreau, Mrs Moreau, Mr Motchane, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Muntingh, Mr Nord, Mr Normanton, Mr Notenboom, Mr Nothomb, Mr O'Connell, Mr O'Donnel, Mr Oehler, Lord O'Hagan, Mr O'Leary, Mr Orlandi, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Pannella, Mr Papapietro, Mr Patterson, Mr Pedini, Mr Pelikan, Mr Peters, Mr Petronio, Mr Pfennig, Mr Pintat, Mrs Poirier, Mr Pranchere, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Pürsten, Mr Puletti, Miss Wuin, Mr Remilly, Mr Rey, Mr Ripa di Meana, Mr Rogers, Mr Romualdi, Mrs Roudy, Mr Ruffalo, Mr Ryan, Mr Sablé, Mr Salzer, Mrs Salisch, Mr Sarre, Mr Schieler, Mr Schinzel, Mr Schleicher, Mr Schmid, Mr Schmitt, Mr Schnitker, Mr Karl Schön, Mr Konrad Schön, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mrs Scrivener, Mr Seal, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mr Segre, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Seligman, Mr Sherlock, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Simonnet, Mr Skovmand, Mrs Spaak, Mr Spicer, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Squarcialupi, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Mr Sutra, Mr John Mark Taylor, Mr Tindemans, Mr Travagliini, Mr Tuckman, Mr Turner, MR Vandewiele, Mr Van Miert, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Veil, Mr Verges, Mr Verhaegen, Mr Verroken, Mr Vetter, Mr Vondeling, Mr von der Vring, Mr Wagner, Mr Walter, Sir Fred Warner, Mrs Weber, Mr Wettig, Mr Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr von Wogau, Mr Wurtz.

Mrs Demarch has obtained the highest number of votes.

(Applause)

On the basis of the three ballots which have been held, I declare the following Members elected Vice-Presidents of the European Parliament in the given order of precedence as determined by the order in which they were elected:

Mr Vandewiele, Mr Gonella, Mr Katzer, Mr Pflimlin, Mr Bruno Friedrich, Mr Jaquet, Mr Vondeling, Mr de Ferranti, Mr Zagari, Mr Møller, Mr Rogers and Mrs Demarch.

I warmly congratulate the Vice-Presidents on their election.

The Community institutions will be notified of the new composition of the Bureau.

4. Urgent procedure

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

- by Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Bangemann, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the tragedy of the Indochinese refugees (Doc. 1-223/79/Rev. II) ;
- by Mr Amendola and Mr Ansart, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the dramatic situation of the Vietnam refugees (Doc. 1-224/79) ;
- by Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), and Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament (Doc. 1-225/79/Rev.) ;
- by Mr Ansart and others, on the dramatic situation of the Nicaraguan refugees (Doc. 1-226/79) (*withdrawn*) ;
- by Mr de la Malène and Mr Lalor, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the plight of refugees in South-East Asia (Doc. 1-227/79) ;
- by Mr Glinne, and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the plight of the Indochinese refugees (Doc. 1-228/79) ;
- by Mr Bangemann, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the tragedy of the Indochinese refugees (Doc. 1-223/79) (*withdrawn*) ;
- by Lord Bethell, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the arrests of dissidents in Czechoslovakia (Doc. 1-234/79) ;

- by Mr Glinne, 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 Bangemann, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr Amendola, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, and Mr de la Malène, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the number and composition of parliamentary committees (Doc. 1-235/79) ;
- by Mr Ansart and others, on the political situation in Nicaragua (Doc. 1-236/79)
- by Mr Coppieters and others, on nuclear energy (Doc. 1-237/79).

The reasons supporting the request for urgent debate are given in each document.

Pursuant to Rule 14 (1), second paragraph, of the Rules of Procedure, I shall consult Parliament on these requests for urgent procedure tomorrow morning.

5. Agenda for the next sitting

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Thursday, 19 July 1979, at 10.00 a.m., and 3.00 p.m., with the following agenda :

- Order of business ;
- Decision on urgent procedure for nine motions for resolutions.

The sitting is closed.

(*The sitting was closed at 10.15 p. m.*)

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 19 JULY 1979

<i>Procedural motion : Mr Enright</i>	53	12. <i>Council statement on the programme for the Irish presidency — Council and Commission statements on the European Council meeting in Strasbourg :</i>	
1. <i>Approval of minutes</i>	53	<i>Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council; Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission; Mr Brandt, 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 Amendola, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Pintat, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Lalor, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Coppieters, on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members; Mr Romualdi; Mr Glinne; Mr Diligent; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Ansart; Miss Flesch; Mrs Ewing; Mr Blaney; Mr Seligman; Mr de Ferranti; Mr de Goede; Mr O'Kennedy . .</i>	74
2. <i>Political groups</i>	53	<i>Point of order: Mr Klepsch; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Lange; Mr Klepsch; Miss Brooks; Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission</i>	113
3. <i>Verification of credentials</i>	53	13. <i>Situation of South-East Asian refugees — Council and Commission statements — Motions for resolutions (Docs. 1-223/79/rev/II, 1-224/79, 1-227/79 and 1-228/79) — Joint debate :</i>	
4. <i>Composition of Parliament</i>	54	<i>Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council</i>	117
5. <i>Documents received</i>	54	<i>Point of order: Mr Klepsch; Mr Griffiths</i>	118
6. <i>Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council</i>	57	<i>Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission</i>	119
7. <i>Order of business :</i>		<i>Point of order: Mr Griffiths</i>	119
<i>Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Panella; Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Bonino; Mr Fellermaier; Mrs Spaak; Mr Panella; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Galland; Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and the Group of European Democrats; Mr Coppieters; Mr de Goede; Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Almirante; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Klepsch; Mr Bøgh; Mr Pfennig; Mr Ansart; Mr Leonardi; Mr Panella; Mr Bangemann; Mr Cecovini; Mr Panella; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Klepsch; Mr Ansart; Mr Gendebien</i>	57	<i>Mr Cohen, on behalf of the Socialist Group</i>	
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Van Minnen; Mrs Gaiotti De Biase; Sir John Stewart-Clark; Mr Radoux; Mr Glinne; Mr Ferri; Mr Capanna; Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Brønlund Nielsen; Mr Sutra</i>		<i>Point of order: Mr Poncelet; Lord Bethell; Mr Irmer; Mr Pannella; Mr Klepsch; Mr Balfe</i>	120
8. <i>Limitation of speaking time :</i>		<i>Personal statement: Mr Panella</i>	120
<i>Mr de Goede; Mr Almirante; Mr Fellermaier</i>	71	<i>Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission; Mrs Cassanmagnago Ceretti, on behalf of</i>	
<i>Personal statement: Mr Almirante</i>	72		
<i>Mr Pelikan</i>	72		
9. <i>Decision on urgency</i>	72		
<i>Mrs Bonino</i>	73		
<i>Explanations of vote; Mr Klepsch; Lord Bethell; Mr Griffiths; Mr Coppieters</i>	73		
10. <i>Composition of Parliament</i>	74		
11. <i>Political groups</i>	74		

<i>the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Lord Bethell, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Fanti, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Faure, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mrs Dienesch, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Pannella, on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members; Mr Petronio; Mr Lomas; Mr Battersby; Mr Denis; Mrs Lizin; Mr Ferguson; Mrs Boserup; Mr Motchane; Mrs Dekker; Mr Cheysson</i>	122		
<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-223/79/rev. II):</i>			
<i>Amendment to paragraph 9:</i>	137		
<i>Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Klepsch</i>	137		
<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Glinne</i>	137		
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	137		
<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-224/79):</i>			
<i>Explanation of vote: Mrs Baduel Glorioso</i>	138		
<i>Rejection of the motion</i>	138		
<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-227/79):</i>			
<i>Mr de la Malène</i>	138		
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Vergeer, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mrs Groes</i>	138		
<i>Rejection of the motion</i>	138		
<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-228/79):</i>			
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mrs Focke; Mr Segre, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group</i>	138		
<i>Rejection of the motion</i>	139		
		14. <i>Amendment of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament — Report (Doc. 193/79) by Mr Luster on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-225/79/rev.) by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and Mr Scott-Hopkins on behalf of the European Democratic Group — Joint debate: Mr Luster, rapporteur; Mrs Ewing; Mr Cecovini, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Coppieters; Mr Almirante; Mr de Goede; Mr Lynge; Mr Bettiza; Mr Fellermaier, on behalf of the Socialist Group, the Group of the European People's Party (CD), the European Democratic Group and the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Ferri; Mrs Bonino; Mr D'Angelosante, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Puletti; Mr Maher; Mr Almirante; Mr Bangemann, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Coppieters; Mr Bangemann; Mrs Castellina; Mr Pannella; Mr D'Angelosante</i>	139
		<i>Point of order: Mr de Goede</i>	149
		<i>Mr Glinne; Mrs Ewing; Mr Glinne; Mr Bangemann; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Gredal; Mr Fellermaier, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Luster; Mr Bangemann; Mr Vondeling; Mr Klepsch; Lady Elles; Mr Pannella; Mr Bangemann; Mrs Groes; Mr Combe; Mr Bangemann; Mr Luster</i>	150
		15. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i>	153

IN THE CHAIR : Mrs Veil

President

(The sitting was opened at 10.05 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

I call Mr Enright on a point of order.

Mr Enright. — Madam President, could we, as a matter of urgency, examine the way in which we vote, to avoid completely wasting, as we did yesterday, six hours? The whole business could have been completed in a much more expeditious and efficient fashion, and the time could have been devoted to political debate.

(Applause)

1. *Approval of the minutes*

President. — The minutes of yesterday's sitting have been distributed. Are there any comments?

The minutes are approved.

2. *Political groups*

President. — Mr Blaney has informed me that he has joined the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members. He has also requested that he be seated in the Chamber alongside his colleagues in the group. I regret that I cannot for the moment comply with this request. Parliament's services are now extremely busy

President

and it is not possible to change the seating plan of the Chamber. I can, however, assure him that the necessary steps will be taken in time for the next part-session.

3. Verification of credentials

President. — The report submitted by the special temporary committee for the verification of credentials points out that it has not yet received from some Members the statements regarding the incompatibilities referred to in the Act of 20 September 1976.

As the special committee has completed its work, the Bureau will continue the examination of the files. At its meeting yesterday evening the enlarged Bureau noted that it had received these statements from the Members whose names are listed in the minutes. It, therefore, proposes that the mandates of these Members should be ratified.

Are there any comments?

The mandates are ratified.

The Bureau is still receiving statements. It will examine them as they arrive and report to Parliament.

4. Composition of Parliament

President. — By letter of 19 July the President of the Chamber of Deputies of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg has informed me that as Mr Boden, Mr Santer, Mr Thorne and Mr Wolter have joined the new Luxembourg Government, they have resigned as Members of the European Parliament.

Mr Camille Ney who has been appointed to the new Luxembourg Government has also resigned from the European Parliament.

Having regard to the results of the 10 June election, the competent national authority has advised me that Mr Fischbach, Mr Hamilius and Mr Spautz had become Members of the European Parliament. Mr Estgen has not yet indicated whether he will accept his mandate.

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

5. Documents received

President. — Since the session was adjourned I have received the following documents :

(a) from the Council, requests for an opinion on :

- the recommendation concerning the discharge to be given to the Commission in respect of the implementation of the operations of the European Development Fund (1975) (4th EDF) for the financial year 1977 (Doc. 188/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets as the committee responsible and to the

Committee on Development and Cooperation for its opinion ;

- the following proposals and communications from the Commission to the Council :

- the directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to powered industrial trucks (Doc. 192/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs ;

- the decision concerning chlorofluorocarbons in the environment (Doc. 194/79)

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

- I. the directive on the limit values for discharges of aldrin, dieldrin and endrin into the aquatic environment
- II. the directive on the quality objectives required for the aquatic environment into which aldrin, dieldrin and endrin are discharged (Doc. 195/79)

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

- the 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 ;

- the directive amending for the first time Directive 76/768/EEC of 27 July 1976 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products (Doc. 199/79)

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

- the regulation amending the Staff Regulations of Officials and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Communities (Doc. 201/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

- the regulation amending the Staff Regulations of Officials and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Communities (Doc. 202/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

- the decision on the adoption of a programme of technological research in the field of clay minerals and technical ceramics (Doc. 203/79)

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

- the regulation on exceptional food aid to the Republic of Malta in the form of pigmeat (Doc. 204/79)

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

President

— the regulation approving the agreement between the Government of the Republic of Senegal and the European Economic Community concerning fishing off the coast of Senegal and two exchanges of letters referring thereto (Doc. 206/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation and to the Committee on Agriculture as the committees responsible, to examine development cooperation aspects and Community fisheries aspects respectively, and to the Committee on Budgets for its opinion on the whole of the proposal ;

— an amendment to the amended proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation on the common organization of the market in ethyl alcohol of agricultural origin and laying down additional provisions for certain products containing ethyl alcohol (Doc. 209/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on External Economic Relations, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Legal Affairs Committee for their opinions ;

I. the directive on the limit values applicable to discharges of mercury into the aquatic environment by the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry

II. the directive on the quality objectives for the aquatic environment into which mercury is discharged by the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry (Doc. 210/79)

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

— a communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on the energy objectives of the Community for 1990 and convergence of policies of the Member States (Doc. 211/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Energy and Research ;

— the regulation amending the Staff Regulations of Officials and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Communities (Doc. 212/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

— the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on new lines of action by the European Community in the field of energy saving (Doc. 217/79)

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

I. the regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1117/78 on the common organization of the market in dried fodder

II. the regulation fixing for the 1979/80 marketing year the flat-rate production aid for dehydrated potatoes (Doc. 218/79)

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

— the decision allocating to the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) a special financial contribution from the general budget of the European Communities (Doc. 219/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Social Affairs, Employment and Education for its opinion ;

— a communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council concerning an action programme of the European Communities with regard to consumers (Doc. 222/79)

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

— the directive amending Directive 71/118/EEC on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultrymeat (Doc. 1-231/79)

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

(b) from Mr Luster, on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, a report on the amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament (Doc. 193/79) ;

(c) from the Commission :

on 17 May 1979

— a proposal for the transfer of appropriations between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 189/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

on 22 May 1979

— a proposal for the transfer of appropriations between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 190/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

on 23 May 1979

— a proposal for the transfer of appropriations between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 191/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

on 20 June 1979

— a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 11/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 200/79)

President

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

on 6 July 1979

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 19/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 213/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 20/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 214/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 21/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 215/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 18/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 216/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

Since the proposed transfers concerned 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.

(d) from the Council, requests for an opinion on :

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 14/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 197/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 15/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 198/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 16/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 205/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

(e) opinions from the Council on :

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 12/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 187/79) — (Doc. 207/79) ;

- proposals for the transfer of appropriations Nos 3/79 and 9/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Docs. 189/79 and 191/79) — (Doc. 208/79) ;

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 6/79 between chapters within Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 134/79) — (Doc. 220/79).

These opinions have been referred to the Committee on Budgets.

- a proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 17/79 between chapters in Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 221/79)

(f) the following motions for resolutions :

- motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne, Mr Van Miert, Mr Van Minnen and Mr Sarre, on behalf of the Socialist Group, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the situation in Nicaragua (Doc. 1-229/79)

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

- motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne and Mr Pelikan, on behalf of the Socialist Group, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the political prisoners in Czechoslovakia (Doc. 1-230/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee ;

- motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Sarre and Mr Jaquet, on behalf of the Socialist Group, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the situation in the Central African State (Doc. 1-232/79)

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

President. — I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien. — (*F*) Madam President, you have kindly informed us that you have received a document drawn up by Mr Luster on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. To my knowledge, and to the knowledge, I think, of the 409 other members of this Assembly, we have not yet set up our committees and, *a fortiori*, have not yet set up a Committee on the Rules of Procedure.

Gendebien

Consequently, I am surprised to learn that a document emanating from the said committee has been received by you. I think this fact requires certain details and explanations on your part, and if necessary also on that of Mr Luster, whose duties we do not know; nor do we know indeed whether he still intends to sit on any new Committee on the Rules of Procedure.

President. — In the first place Mr Luster is currently a Member of Parliament. Secondly, I do not see Parliament could even sit without taking cognizance of certain decisions taken by the preceding Parliament.

(Applause)

Finally, I would point out that, at its meeting yesterday evening, the enlarged Bureau decided, on the basis of several provisions in the Act of 20 September 1976 on the election of Members of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, that since only the composition, and other details relating thereto, of the European Parliament had been changed, the directly-elected Parliament was not a new parliament and that legally it was the continuation of the outgoing Parliament. In any event this question will be examined in detail when the document is being considered.

6. *Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council*

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

- Agreement in the form of an exchange of letters on the provisional application of the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Senegal and the European Economic Community on fishing off the coast of Senegal and of the protocol and the exchanges of letters relating thereto;
- Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Government of the Republic of Senegal on fishing off the coast Senegal;
- Agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the Government of Canada concerning their Agreement on fisheries;
- Agreement on fisheries between the European Economic Community and the Government of Canada;
- Agreement in the form of an exchange of letters amending the Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Portuguese Republic.

These documents have been deposited in the archives of the European Parliament.

7. *Order of business*

President. — The next item is the order of business. At its meeting yesterday evening the enlarged Bureau drew up a draft agenda (Doc. PE 59.141) which has been distributed.

I would remind you that, pursuant to Rule 12 (2) of the Rules of Procedure Parliament is required at the beginning of each part-session, to vote on the draft agenda submitted by the enlarged Bureau and that amendments may only be made to the draft agenda if proposed by the President or submitted to him in writing by a political group or by at least ten Members.

Only the author of the amendment and one speaker for and one speaker against the motion may be heard.

I would also point out that Rule 12 (2) also stipulates that, once adopted, the agenda may not be amended except in application of Rule 14 on urgent procedure and Rule 32 on procedural motions, or on a proposal from the President.

Finally, if a procedural motion to amend the agenda is rejected, it may not be retabled during the same part-session.

Where appropriate additions must be made to the draft agenda on the basis of the decision which we will take in a moment on requests for urgent debate on various motions for resolutions.

I have received requests from several political groups that Mr Schmidt's report on behalf of the Legal Affairs committee, which appears as Item 8 on Friday's agenda, be referred back to committee. As a vote could not be taken during the debate on the report on Friday May 1979, since it was established, on request, that a quorum was not present, the enlarged Bureau was required under Rule 33 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, which stipulates that 'if a quorum is not present, the vote shall be placed on the agenda of the next sitting', to include it on the draft agenda, despite the fact that it was aware that the order of business was already overloaded.

Are there any comments on the proposal?

I call Mr Siegerschmidt.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — *(D)* Madam President, I am surprised that there are motions from groups to refer this matter back to the committee responsible, the Legal Affairs Committee, since according to the Rules of Procedure this measure must be voted on in the next sitting. We have continuity in the European Parliament. The work of this Parliament connects with that of the last sitting of the non-directly-elected Parliament. The Rules of Procedure are equally valid for the May part-session, which you, Madame President, have mentioned, and for this part-session. There must therefore be a vote during this part-session, unless there are other motions — but I would be inclined to

Sieglerschmidt

doubt whether such motions are compatible with the Rules of Procedure, because this document is ready to be voted on now.

President. — I call Mr Fellermaier.

Mr Fellermaier. — (*D*) Madam President, the Rules of Procedure are so clear on this point, that no referral back to committee can take place. Since, on the other hand, I am aware of the burden of business on this week, I move the withdrawal of the motion for a resolution on the Fifth Directive from the agenda and that it be placed instead on that for the September part-session. Please regard this as a motion by the Socialist Group.

President. — Mr Schmidt's report will be entered on the agenda for the next part-session.

You have just heard a request to postpone the Schmidt Report until next part-session.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

With regard to the order of business, I have received from the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members three requests for amendments: (a) to delete Item 4 (Luster Report); (b) or to enter Item 4 as the last item (after item 6); (c) to take item 5 — motion for a resolution on parliamentary committees — before Item 4.

Pursuant to Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure, I shall call one speaker for and one against the motion before putting it to the vote.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Excuse me, Madam President, but I thought that under Rule 12 the author had to be called first.

Is that right, Madam President?

President. — Who is in fact the author of this proposal?

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) If you will permit me, Madam President, I shall briefly explain the first part of this proposal, as author, and then you, as I take it, will call one person in favour and one person against.

(Protests from various quarters)

Madam President, before protesting, our colleagues should read the Rules of Procedure. It would be in their interest and ours!

President. — I remind you, Mr Pannella, that speaking-time is limited to three minutes.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) You are deciding that — you are not reminding me of it, Madam President. The three minutes start from now...

President. — I am reminding you of it simply because I think you are aware of the fact.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) No, Madam President, I do not think that Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure lays down a time of three minutes.

President. — Rule 31A, Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) In any event, I shall limit myself to three minutes, Madam President.

I think that the majority of our colleagues in Parliament now know the basics of the problem, which are not the content of the Luster Report, but the Rules of Procedure! We take the view that it is not admissible that, under cover of legal continuities — which exist but which certainly do not apply to all the acts of the preceding Assembly — and under cover of a strange bureaucratic, not parliamentary, continuity, we end up by not applying Rule 54. Madam President, our concern is to see that our Parliament works and can debate.

(Applause from various quarters)

You see, there is much more agreement among us than you thought, my dear colleagues!

But if, instead of talking about our programmes, if instead of talking about Vietnam, we are being asked, without our having realized this was going to happen, to spend hours debating your leaders' attempt to dissolve our group this very day, we must, under the eyes of a Europe which is still watching us today with curiosity and interest, show that we know how to respect the rules of the game. If you wish to do so in two months' time, you can dissolve our group then, but for the time being I request that this Parliament take up its right, its vocation, and discuss things which interest the citizens of Europe, rather than waste time in the attempt to assassinate a constituted political group. That is why, Madam President, I am proposing that this item be dropped. I ask all my colleagues to understand that dropping this item only means that the committee which we shall be able to set up thanks to our proposal, will be able, in September, if necessary — if dissent is an offence to democracy — to dissolve us. But why dissolve us in four or five hours, and not work on the things which are important for our Parliament and for our Europe?

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr D'Angelosante to speak in favour of the motion.

Mr D'Angelosante. — (*I*) I have already explained in another place, Madam President, the many seriously-argued reasons which ought to convince us of the undesirability, at least, of dealing with the content of the Luster Report and the resolution to which that report forms the background immediately, during this part-session.

d'Angelosante

I do not wish as I did not wish when speaking in another place to go into the question of Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure, because I think there is an almost superhuman difficulty in trying to elucidate political ideas by means of legal arguments. All I would like to say, Madam President, is that up to this moment, on this subject, which is the most sensitive of the present part-session, no one has given us an explanation worth listening to of the merits of the case. It may be that the Rules of Procedure are being observed, just as it may be that they are not being — as I believe — but what the fundamental, substantive, political reasons are, and why it is in the interests of this Parliament that it should immediately be confronted by this problem, are things which nobody has explained. Shortly another Member of this Parliament will speak against the motion put by Mr Pannella. I think in fact it will be Mr Klepsch, the Chairman of the Group of the European People's Party, which has been the resolute defender of this proposal in many forums. However, in none of these forums has Mr Klepsch had the goodness to explain why there is all this urgency and why it would not be preferable, as we propose, to re-examine a whole series of rules in the Rules of Procedure, including those relating to the formation of groups, which are inconsistent with the new reality of this Parliament. Without wishing to enter into the merits of the question at this point, I would only like to remark, Madam President, that Mr Pannella's amendment is worthy of a welcome because the urgency with which people are trying to force us to resolve a problem which, according to us, should, on the contrary, be discussed with the appropriate calmness and reflection, is marked by irrationality, a lack of explanation and is something which is incomprehensible. This is the reason why my group is supporting the amendment.

(Applause from various quarters)

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

Mr Klepsch.— *(D)* Thank you, Madam President. May I start by saying how glad I am to see you handling this case so generously. For although my colleague, Mr Pannella has invoked Rule 12 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, so that two Members may speak in favour of his amendment, you were quite right, it lay entirely within your discretion to decide on the matter for Rule 12 (2) only governs the question of speakers whom the President may call, and not those whom she *must* call; I am sure that in this debate you are aware that this is an awkward situation, which is why you have been so generous in your interpretation.

I wish to speak against the amendment by Mr Pannella, and to call for the agenda which was, drawn up almost unanimously by the Bureau to be adopted by this House, because it is essential that there should be clarity right from the start on the central items of business dealing with fundamental aspects of the Rules of Procedure. If we hold up the work of this House much longer by wrangling over points of this kind, it will be very difficult to make a start on the real work, which my colleague Mr Pannella has rightly demanded...

(Applause)

... I should like to make this clear: so far, Mr Pannella, you cannot complain about your right to speak in this Assembly, for you and your friends have had the lion's share of parliamentary speaking time.

Turning now to the motion for withdrawals from the agenda, I should just like to say this to my colleague Mr D'Angelosante. The report in question is based on a motion which includes the signature of his own group chairman as he is well aware, and I really cannot see that there has been any change in the situation since the motion was signed, since the decision was taken to resubmit the proposal. Mr D'Angelosante has not commented on this point. He has behaved as if he had nothing whatever to do with this motion, and that is not the case. He too was a Member of the Parliament and the political group which tabled this motion together with us.

Now with regard to the item under discussion. Madam President, if we do not take a decision today — and it must be considered in connection with the motion for a resolution which Mr Pannella has rejected, but which the tablers of the motion, which has been commented on, have requested should be debated jointly with this item — we shall be spreading all the problems which stem from it over the rest of the agenda, and I would regard this as a very unfortunate beginning for the new Parliament.

We need clarity, and that clarity can only be obtained by taking a decision today on both items: on the mandate contained in the motion for a resolution which has been signed by my colleagues, Mr Glinne and Mr Scott-Hopkins, and myself, and the Luster report. I therefore earnestly request the House to adopt the agenda submitted by the Bureau.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Madam President, in view of the importance of the issue, my ten colleagues and I — in other words the necessary number of Members under the terms of Rule 35 (4) of the Rules of Procedure — request a roll-call vote on this proposal.

President. — I note that twelve members of the group have requested a roll-call vote. Under Rule 35 of the Rules of Procedure, this request must be complied with.

I call Mr Fellermaier.

Mr Fellermaier. — *(D)* Madam President, the only help in a situation of this sort is to appeal for political fairness. If those who wish to achieve independence by recognition as a possible political group, or indeed by other solutions...

(interjection by Mr Pannella)

... I always listen very carefully to you and you have not yet been interrupted by anyone from my group. Perhaps you would have the patience to hear me out. You do not have to agree with what I am saying.

... If my honourable colleague believes that in a situation of this kind, in which proposed solutions are being worked out, she can outmanoeuvre the House by means of the roll-call vote, there are similar options available to other sections of the House, such as to leave the Chamber; then only one section will be left and the President will have to declare the absence of a quorum. But I put it to her that neither of these moves would be consonant with the dignity of this Parliament...

(Loud applause)

... and in the end, the political decision cannot be settled via questions of procedure. My group — and I speak now with full responsibility on its behalf — is very greatly concerned about a situation in which, as the President has stated, a seventh political group has been formed under the present Rules of Procedure, this fact has been printed in the minutes the following day and there is a basic willingness to reach a solution. But if you are now going to manoeuvre us into this situation of the roll call, by using the Rules of Procedure to force a roll-call vote with more than ten Members, I can see that in certain circumstances our sympathy might run out, if the first day of this Parliament is crammed so full of procedural matters, that we, Mr Pannella, cannot begin the political debate. After all, you too want the President of the Council to tell us what policy the Council intends to pursue over the next six months, you want the President of the Commission to give us his views on the outcome of Strasbourg and Tokyo, and the Political groups and all the Members to explain to their constituencies how they propose to shape and influence such policies in the future. I therefore appeal to Mr Pannella and his friends, in the name of political fairness to withdraw this demand for the roll-call vote and accept our assurance that we wish to reach a politically fair solution.

(Loud applause)

President. — I call Mrs Spaak.

Mrs Spaak. — *(F)* Madam President, I should like to stress the fact that we do not in any way wish to hold

up the business of this Assembly. I think it is good parliamentary practice to enable a new Assembly such as this, which has not had an opportunity to discuss so important a report in committee, to do so in a calm atmosphere. We are simply asking for this report to be referred to committee, and I repeat, we do not in any way wish to delay the business of this Assembly.

As Mr Pannella has just said, I am fully aware of the accusations of sabotage. That is not our intention. It seems to me that we would not be holding up our business in the least if we decided that the report should at once be considered in committee; we could obviously have the meeting today and reach an immediate decision, one way or the other. That is no more complicated than all the Rules of Procedure that we can use. I ask you, Madam President, to consider our intention, which is to ensure that business is conducted as correctly as possible.

President. — I do not see how a vote by roll-call instead of by show of hands makes any essential change in the decision. It can only be regarded as a delaying tactic. Parliamentary democracy means that the right of the majority to make its views carry should not be contested. I do not think that there can be any objection to the method of voting when, as in this Assembly, it is very easy to count votes expressed by a show of hands, which is a method which saves a vast amount of time.

I would remind you that there are very important items on our agenda. We should hear first the President of the Council and then the President of the Commission on highly important matters and have a political debate on these two hearings. We should also have — and I believe that this is almost the unanimous wish of the House — a debate on the Vietnam refugees. Although it is of course for Parliament to decide on referral to committee, we cannot waste time simply by having recourse to a particular method of voting.

(Applause)

I call Mr Panella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Madam President, I should like to express on my own behalf and on that of my group, the most pained surprise at the fact that the President of this Parliament, called upon to carry out a vote, should take it upon herself to explain the reasons for opposing a request which one part of the Parliament is putting to the other.

Madam President, I hope it may become possible for you to be the President of all of us and not of the majority which, from Mr Almirante to Mr Klepsch, elected you.

Pannella

May I also ask you, Madam President, by what right we have been having a discussion for 4 or 5 minutes when, I believe, we should have proceeded to a roll-call vote, and express to you how surprised I have been that there has been reference to an infringement of the Rules of Procedure, bearing in mind that a provision of the Rules of Procedure, such as the roll-call vote, has been dismissed by the Presidency itself as an anti-parliamentary and obstructionist tactic? I did not think a President could define a provision of the Rules of Procedure as a provision contrary to the Rules of Procedure, either in the spirit or the letter.

President. — Mr Pannella, I have not taken sides in the debate. I have simply appealed to your good sense by asking you if you would not be prepared to withdraw your proposal. However, we have Rules of Procedure: if you insist on your proposal, we shall proceed to vote in this way.

I simply draw your attention to the fact that the time available for the part-session is short and that it is desirable that we should take certain decisions before the end of the part-session.

I call Mr Fellermaier.

Mr Fellermaier. — (D) Madam President, on behalf of my group, I ask you to suspend the sitting for ten minutes.

President. — The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 10.40 a.m. and resumed at 11 a.m.)

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

Mr Galland. — (F) Madam President, some of the Members of the Liberal and Democratic Group held a meeting while the sitting was suspended.

First of all, they have to say that they are perturbed by the distressing spectacle of the debate which we have just experienced. They feel that it would be wise not to shy away from a debate on the issue, but that no criticism should be allowed of the way in which the Rules of Procedure are interpreted.

We therefore make the following proposal, that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure should meet today when the morning sitting rises at 2 p.m., that it should take a decision and that our Assembly should this evening make up its mind on the point at issue in the Luster Report.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, I naturally understand very well the concern expressed by my colleague. But bearing in mind those who have tabled the motion, and whose points we are now arguing about, I believe these cannot be so easily resolved under the present Rules of Procedure, since we have no committee on the Rules of Procedure. We cannot

form one until the items on the agenda with which we have to deal are adopted. That is our problem. But I fear — and I speak for many present in the House — that Mr Pannella, or one or other colleague from his group, will also be demanding that other items on the agenda should be voted by roll call. It is not our intention to spend the entire day adopting the agenda in this House.

(Applause)

For this reason, on behalf of my group and the Group of European Democrats, I should like to ask that we now decide on a roll-call vote on the entire agenda, in other words that we decide in a roll-call vote whether to adopt the agenda as submitted by the Bureau, and thus at the same time reject the motion deleting item 4 and any other motion for deleting other items on the agenda.

(Applause from the Group of the European People's Party)

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (N) Madam President, colleagues, apart from the proposed deletion, there was another proposal for amending the agenda, namely to place Item 5 before Item 4. We were very pleased to hear the statement by the Liberal Group, but the question on the composition of the committee still remains. If the main point of this proposal is to set up the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and have it begin work today, then the second proposal, to place Item 5 before Item 4 on the agenda, is very sensible and would surely be a very valuable solution. For I repeat, the point is not that we are trying to be obstructive, but that Parliament can only function properly when the committees are fully set up and able to begin work.

President. — I call Mr de Goede.

Mr de Goede. — (N) Madam President, I should just like to make one comment on the conduct of business so far. I fully understand — although I am not a member of Mr Pannella's Group — the frustration that has been voiced. It is surely highly relevant that a motion for a resolution that is to be considered in conjunction with the Luster Report contains the statement that, under the present Rules of Procedure, groups of non-attached members have to forgo a number of basic parliamentary rights. Since the majority of this Assembly has stated the fact in writing, there is obviously something in it. The motion does of course also state that this fault must be remedied. As Mr Fellermaier has appealed to the sense of fairness of the group of non-attached Members and has asked them not to delay the sitting, I would point out that 'fairness' starts with respect for minorities. The fact is that yesterday, in contravention of the Rules of Procedure, I was unable to take part in the debate following the address by Madam President.

De Goede

I was denied the floor on a point of order in a really discourteous way. The President should have called me to speak on a point of order earlier, but she did not do so. She invoked Rule 28 concerning speaking time, though she ought to have known that this Rule was being wrongly applied. So when someone of the stature of Mr Fellermaier calls for 'fairness' from minorities, he should start by calling for 'fairness' for the whole of Parliament.

I feel that the tactic being used by the Pannella group — the request for a roll-call vote on an amendment — is a desperate remedy; I think the Pannella group does not intend to limit this strategy to one roll-call vote, but intends to carry it through, at any rate I suspect as much. I feel this is a desperate remedy and not the right one, and I appeal to the Pannella group not to use it this time, provided that from now on all of Parliament respects the right of minorities, which has not been the case so far.

President. — I call Mr D'Angelosante.

Mr D'Angelosante. — (*I*) I should like to accept the proposal of the Liberal and Democratic Group referring at the same time to what was said by Mr Fellermaier, whose speech indicated the possibility of discussing this sort of 'tablet of the law' which the Luster Report has appeared to be, and which, according to us, is just as open to modification as anything else. This is also my response to the remarks which Mr Klepsch directed at me earlier. In my view nothing prohibits us from setting up the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions immediately and it is also my view that nothing prevents that committee from resolving the problem with the least possible delay.

Once that committee has resolved the prejudicial questions raised by Mr Pannella on the formal level of the Rules of Procedure, there will only remain the substantive merits of the problem. I think this will be the most rational way of getting on top of the procedural questions which are hindering our work. For these reasons we associate ourselves with the proposal by the Liberal and Democratic Group, and ask you, Madam President, to make your decision accordingly.

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — (*I*) Madam President, I speak on behalf of the members for the Italian National Right. We dissociate ourselves from the 'filibustering' methods adopted — in our view wrongly — by Mr Pannella and the group which he leads. We also dissociate ourselves from them, Madam President, because, having freely, and not as the result of any backstairs deal, voted for your Presidency, and having

been able to contribute directly and in a decisive manner, without reward, to your election, we are sure that you will be, from this very moment, as you were from the very start, the President of all the Parliament and in particular the President of the minorities, which it is our honour to represent. On the substance, we shall vote against the motion by Mr Pannella, because we want the Luster Report to be debated as soon as possible. We have in fact tabled amendments to Paragraph 36, sub-paragraph 5 of the report itself, since we wish to know, on the substance, what the rights of the minorities are: their rights as regards the Rules of Procedure and hence their political rights. I would say to Mr Pannella that to avoid the problem today and to refer it back would mean to try to create a majority within the minorities. Beneath these procedural manoeuvres there lies the attempt to establish some sort of surreptitious agreement with one or other majority group. We are not falling into the trap; we denounce this attempt and, as an authentic and autonomous minority, we ask at least to be able to know at the earliest moment this very day what our rights are in this hemicycle, and what the safeguards are which the Rules of Procedure are going to establish for us minorities within the ambit of this Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President. I am a little confused as to exactly what we are doing. We seem to be getting ourselves lost in the middle of a quasiprocedural debate which has no foundation whatever in the Rules of Procedure. A proposal by the leader of the European People's Party has been put formally to you. It has been seconded by myself on behalf of my group. As I understand the Rules of Procedure, one person can speak for and one can speak against, and then we take the roll-call vote. Can you please follow these rules of procedure now?

(Applause)

President. — Mr Scott-Hopkins, I am aware that a proposal has been put to me, but we were already dealing with another matter and I do not see how we can deal with the request to vote on the agenda as a whole before we have dealt with a particular item on that agenda. Mr Pannella has tabled a motion to amend the agenda and Parliament cannot vote on the agenda as a whole before voting on this motion.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, just before we started this interminable debate, which has no basis in the Rules of Procedure you were about to put that particular proposition to the vote. Let us get on with that now.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, I do not know whether the wording of my proposal is familiar to you and everyone here. I have proposed that we take a roll-call vote on the agenda — on the entire agenda — in other words, that the agenda be adopted in full in a single vote by roll call. This was a counter-proposal to the motion only to take a roll-call vote on Item 4. I am of the opinion that my motion departs further from the text and must therefore be put to the vote first. I would therefore respectfully invite you, Madam President, to act accordingly.

President. — I call Mr Bøgh.

Mr Bøgh. — *(DK)* Madam President, we have been accused of filibustering and I would just like, on behalf of the four delegates from the Popular Movement against the EEC in Denmark, to explain our position.

We come from a country where democracy is not gauged by whether the majority can obtain justice but by whether a minority can do so. We are here witnessing a manoeuvre aimed at crushing a political group by circumventing the Rules of Procedure. In calling for a roll-call vote our intention is not to delay the proceedings; the reason for it is that we are together here with compatriots who made fine promises about democracy during their election campaign. We wish to ascertain by roll-call vote, in the first place, whether our compatriots in other groups are prepared to be a party to stifling freedom of speech for the largest Danish delegation that represents probably half the population of Denmark and, secondly, whether our fellow Danes wish to be a party to this Assembly starting its work by violating, without any compelling reason, its own Rules of Procedure. The issue is one of democratic principles.

President. — I call Mr Pfennig.

Mr Pfennig. — *(D)* Madam President, will you please read out to the House the wording of the amendment tabled by Mr Pannella in writing one hour before the beginning of this sitting pursuant to Rule 12, paragraph 2 of the Rules of Procedure, which you consider must be put to the vote now?

If there is no such proposal tabled in writing by Mr Panella and ten other Members of this Parliament one hour before the beginning of the sitting, we can only vote now on the point raised by Mr Klepsch, that is on the agenda as a whole; I ask that it be put to the vote immediately.

President. — One hour before the sitting began I received from the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups Members three alternative proposals:

- (a) delete Item No 4 from the agenda or,
- (b) enter Item No 4, as the last item on the agenda or

- (c) consider Item No 5 before Item No 4. Pursuant to Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure I have called one speaker for and one speaker against the motion.

We shall now proceed to the roll-call vote on the amendment tabled, in keeping with the rules, by this group more than one hour before the beginning of the sitting. The only question is whether, in view of the wording we can vote on all three points simultaneously.

I call Mr Ansart.

Mr Ansart. — *(F)* Madam President, we are facing a very serious debate. Last week, before we met here in this Chamber, a meeting of the leaders of the political groups was held in Luxembourg. We have already been consulted about the problems, the serious problems, which have been put to us today. I believe that whatever the difficulties of our discussion, we ought to admit that we are in the process of interpreting the Rules of Procedure. The parliamentary rules are familiar to each of us and to all those who were going to debate the Luster Report. Of these rules, those governing discussion in committee are indispensable. One of the most important aspects of our work is the opportunity to discuss very serious problems in a calm atmosphere, to attend the meeting with a mandate from our political group and briefed on a number of the decisions needing to be taken, and when the discussion is complicated, to report to our groups.

Now in this case, we are going to discuss the composition of the new political groups in a new, directly-elected Assembly, on the basis of a report debated and discussed by the previous Assembly. When we are returned to our National Assembly, our business is governed by a Constitution, which is not the case here. So we and our new colleagues are going to discuss old reports, which would not have required the lengthy debate we are having now if they had been adopted unanimously. The wise course of action, we have been told by more than one speaker, is simply to return to an elected committee and discuss the report by Mr Luster. But this is putting the cart before the horse, and would in fact be very complicated; indeed it would involve re-interpreting the Rules of Procedure — which I would be the first to oppose — because we would run the risk of finding ourselves saddled with rules which might well deprive some political groups of the right to speak. I say this because last week I heard certain remarks, which I said at the time were dangerous, concerning the creation of the political groups and their political identity, and which I opposed. For this reason, Madam President, like Mr D'Angelosante, I wish to reiterate our support for preceding the debate on the Luster Report by the creation of the committee and discussion of the Luster Report by the said committee.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Leonardi.

Mr Leonardi. — (*I*) I asked for the floor as ex-chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, because I think that by briefly explaining the reasons for which we arrived at this situation, it may be possible to overcome the obstacles which are now arising to the prosecution of our work.

I have to tell you that when the problem of the revision of the Rules of Procedure was tackled, in collaboration with a group of senior officials, two solutions presented themselves: either to adapt the old Rules of Procedures so as to take into account the changes following from the 1976 Convention, or to revise the whole Rules of Procedure as such ...

President. — Mr Leonardi, I really think that you have wandered from the subject.

We must proceed to the vote.

Mr Leonardi. — (*I*) In this way finding a solution will become more difficult.

President. — We shall now proceed to the roll-call vote on the first part of the amendment tabled by Mr Pannella, namely the deletion of Item No 4 from the agenda. I shall draw by lot the name of the Member with whom the roll-call will begin.

The roll-call will begin with Mr Loo.

The ballot is open.

I call on the Secretary-General to proceed with the roll-call.

(The roll-call was taken)

Does anyone else wish to vote?

The ballot is closed.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.50 a.m. and resumed at 11.55 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

Number of Members voting: 363

Abstentions: 9

Votes in favour: 76

Votes against: 279

The following Members voted *for* the motion:

Mr Albers, Mr Amendola, Mr Ansart, Mr Arfè, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Baillot, Mrs Barbarella, Mrs Bøgh, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Bonde, Mrs Bonino, Mrs Boserup, Mrs Buchan, Mr Caborn, Mr Capanna, Mr Cardia, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Carossino, Mrs Castellina, Mr Ceravolo, Mr Chambeiron, Mrs Charzat, Miss Clwyd, Mr Colla, Mr Coppieters, Mrs Cresson, Mr Damette, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr Denis, Mr De Pasquale, Mr Didò, Mr Estier, Mr Fanti, Mr Edgar Faure, Mr Fernandez, Mr Ferrero, Mr Ferri, Mr Galluzzi, Mr Gatto, Mr Gendebien, Mr de Goede, Mr Gouthier, Mrs Hammerich, Mr Ippolito, Mr Irmer, Mr Leonardi, Mrs Leroux, Mr Lezzi, Mr Lyngge, Mr Maffre-Baugé, Mr Maurice Martin, Mr Motchane, Mr Oehler, Mr Orlandi, Mr Pajetta, Mr Pannella, Mr Papapietro, Mr

Pelikan, Mrs Poirier, Mr Ripa di Meana, Mrs Roudy, Mr Ruffolo, Mrs Salisch, Mr Sarre, Mr Schwartzberg, Mr Sciascia, Mr Segrè, Mr Skovmand, Mrs Spaak, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mr Sufta, Mr van Miert, Mr Verges, Mr Wurtz, Mr Zagari.

The following Members voted *against* the motion:

Mr Abens, Mr Adam, Mr Adonnino, Mr van Aerssen, Mr Aigner, Mr Alber, Mrs van Alemann, Mr Almirante, Mr Ansquer, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Arndt, Mr Balfe, Mr Balfour, Mr Bangemann, Mr Barbagli, Mr Barbi, Mr Battersby, Mr Baudis, Mr Beazley, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Bersani, Lord Bethell, Mr von Bismarck, Mr Blaney, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Bocklet, Mrs Boot, Miss Brooks, Mr Buchou, Mr Buttafuoco, Mr Caillavet, Mr Calvez, Mr Cariglia, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Castle, Sir Frederic Catherwood, Mr Chirac, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Clinton, Mr Cohen, Mr Colleselli, Mr Combe, Costanzo, Mr Cottrell, Mr de Courcy Ling, Mr Croux, Mr Curry, Mr Dalsass, Mr Dalziel, Mr Damseaux, Mr Dankert, Mr Debatisse, Mr Debré, Mr De Clercq, Mr De Keersmaecker, Mrs Dekker, Mr Delatte, Mr Deleau, Mr Delorozoy, Mr Delors, Mrs Desmond, Miss de Valera, Mr Diana, Mrs Dienesch, Mr Diligent, Mr Donnez, Lord Douro, Mr Druon, Lady Elles, Mr Enright, Mrs Ewing, Mr Faure Maurice, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Fergusson, Mr de Ferranti, Mr Filippi, Mr Fischbach, Mr Flanagan, Miss Flesch, Mrs Focke, Miss Forster, Mr Forth, Mr B. Friedrich, Mr I. Friedrich, Mr Früh, Mr Fuchs, Mrs Fuillet, Mr Gabert, Mrs Gaiotti De Biase, Mr Gallagher, Mrs Gaspard, Mr Ghergo, Mr Giavazzi, Mr Gillot, Mr Giummarra, Mr Glinne, Mr Gonella, Mr Goppel, Mrs Grendal, Mr Griffiths, Mrs Groes, Mr van der Gun, Mr Haagerup, Mr Habsburg, Mr Hänsch, Mr Hahn, Lord Harmar-Nicholls, Mr Harris, Mr van Hassel, Mr Hauenschild, Mr Helms, Mr Henckens, Mrs Herklotz, Mr Herman, Mrs Van de Heuvel, Mrs Hoff, Mr Hoffmann, Miss Hooper, Mr Hopper, Mr Hord, Mr Howell, Mr Hutton, Mr C. Jackson, Mr R. Jackson, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr Johnson, Mr Jonker, Mr Jürgens, Mr Katzer, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr Key, Mr Kirk, Mr Klepsch, Mr Köhler, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mr Kuhn, Mr Lalor, Mr Lange, Mr Langes, Mr Lecanuet, Mr Lega, Mrs Lenz, Mr Ligios, Mr Linde, Mr Linkohr, Mr Loderer, Mr Loo, Mr Louwes, Mr Lückner, Mr Luster, Mr Macario, Mr McCartin, Mrs Maj-Weggen, Mr Majonica, Mr Malangre, Mr Marshall, Mrs Martin, Mr Martinet, Mr Mauroy, Mr Megahy, Mr Mertens, Mr Messmer, Mr Michel, Mr van Minnen, Mr Møller, Mr Moorhouse, Mr Moreau, Mrs Moreau, Mr Moreland, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Muntingh, Mr Narducci, Mr Newton Dunn, Sir David Nicolson, Mr Nielsen, Mrs Nielsen, Mr Nordlohne, Mr Normanton, Mr Notenboom, Mr Nothomb, Mr Nyborg, Mr O'Connell, Mr O'Donnell, Lord O'Hagan, Mr O'Leary, Mr Olesen, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Paterson, Mr Pearce, Mr Pedini, Mr Penders, Mr Percheron, Mr Peters, Mr Petronio, Mr Pfennig, Mr Pflimlin, Mr Pintat, Sir Henry Plumb, Mr Pottering, Mr Poncelet, Mr Poniatowski, Mr Prag, Mr Price, Mr Prout, Mr Provan, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Puletti, Mr Pürsten, Mr Purvis, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Radoux, Mr Remilly, Mr Rey, Sir Brandon Rhys Williams, Mr Rinsche, Mr Rogers, Mr Romualdi, Mr Rossi, Mr Ryan, Mr Sablé, Mr Salzer, Mr Sassano, Mr Schall, Mr Schieler, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Schmid, Mr

President

Schmitt, Mr Schnitker, Mr Karl Schön, Mr Konrad Schön, Mr Schwencke, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mr Seal, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Seitlinger, Mr Seligman, Mr Sherlock, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Simmonds, Mr Simonnet, Mr Simpson, Mr Spautz, Mr Spencer, Mr Spicer, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Mr John D. Taylor, Mr John M. Taylor, Mr Tindemans, Mr Tolman, Mr Travaghini, Mr Turner, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Vanderpoorten, Mr Vandewiele, Mrs Vayssade, Mr Vergeer, Mr Verhægen, Mr Vernimmen, Mr Verroken, Mr Vetter, Mr Vondeling, Mr van de Vring, Mr Wagner, Mr Walter, Mrs Walz, Sir Frederick Warner, Mr Wawrzik, Mrs Weber, Mr Welsh, Mr Wettig, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr van Wogau, Mr Woltjer, Mr Zecchino.

The following Members *abstained* :

Mrs Agnelli, Mr Bettiza, Mr Brandt, Mr Cecovini, Mr Collins, Mr Galland, Mr Lomas, Mr Schinzel, Mrs Veil.

The proposal to amend the agenda has not been adopted.

We must now vote on the second proposed amendment.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, we had decided to request a roll-call vote on this second amendment as well. However, in the meantime we have heard what seems to us to be the very important proposal from the Liberal and Democratic Group that we should first constitute the committees, something that has also been proposed by other groups. In this case not only would we be inclined not to request a roll-call vote but also if the majority groups, anxious to press on and not lose any more time, were to make a gesture of goodwill we would very gladly open the way to honourable compromises and initiatives of this nature ; after all, we must be reasonable.

However, the suggestion that has been put to us should all the same be translated into a specific proposal. We could then, as is our wish, drop not only the roll-call vote but even the amendment now before us.

President. — Mr Pannella, it seems to me that your third proposed amendment :

consider Item No. 5 (resolutions on the committees) before the Luster Report.

is very similar to that put forward by the Liberal and Democratic Group, namely to set up the committees with a view to enabling them to deal with these questions.

I therefore think that if you withhold for the moment your second proposal, we could vote on this point.

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Madam, I must first of all just point out that the amendment in question was not tabled by my group but by some members of my group on their own behalf.

(*Applause from certain quarters*)

Next, as I have the floor, I should also like to make a comment on the Rules of Procedure. Mr Klepsch has tabled what seems to me to be the most far-reaching amendment, i.e. to leave the agenda as decided by the Bureau. I would venture to suggest that we should vote first on this amendment as it renders all the other superfluous.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Cecovini.

Mr Cecovini. — (*I*) We are considering an amendment to the agenda, and we have hardly begun to consider its first point. If there is no agreement on the proposals put forward by Mr Pannella, it seems to me that we can only proceed to a vote on the second and third points separately. What we would like is that Mr Pannella and his group should give up the roll-call vote, which wastes an hour for a minimal result. The second point asks for the fourth item on the agenda to be made the last item. The third amendment calls, in substance, for the order of the agenda to be reversed. It seems to me that that could be accepted by the Bureau if the latter was willing to deliberate at once, and was able to do so, and were to accept, at its discretion, this small change, namely this swap, by which the item about the committees would be taken first and afterwards Item 4. If this had already been done we should probably have settled the question an hour ago. In any event, I do not think we can interrupt the meeting since we are a good half way through the vote on the group of amendments proposed by Mr Pannella, and it seems to me that we should get through them one after the other. I would only ask Mr Pannella to withdraw his request for a roll-call vote.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Madam President, I want to stress that we are sensitive to any sign of goodwill on the part of the chairmen of the groups which will manifest itself concretely in a parliamentary fact and not just in a vote in the future — in a wish. I would nevertheless point out that hardly had a representative of the Liberal and Democratic Group put forward a proposal, but the chairman of that group immediately stated that this had not been done on behalf of the group.

We are not asking that the Socialist Group, for example, should accept what we are proposing, but we should like an effort to be made in that direction. Otherwise we can only confirm to the full the decisions taken already. It is therefore up to the chairmen of the groups to show that they themselves can adopt to some extent, the spirit of reasonableness demonstrated by the great majority of their members.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, I think the House is really getting rather bored with what we are doing and I think we want to get on. I don't understand what Mr Pannella is saying, because the gesture has already been made, in the name of Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group, in the name of Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the European People's Party, and in my name, on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Pannella, you can see this, you have it in front of you. We wish to see that the rights of minorities are taken into account and safeguarded in this House. That is the reason why the three group chairmen I mentioned have moved this motion and asked for urgent consideration. I don't know what else Mr Panella can want. What he is in point of fact doing — and I shall choose my words carefully — is that he is bringing this House into disrepute.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

It is not, Madam President, a question of the majority imposing on its will on the minority, it is rather a very small minority trying to impose their will on the majority of this House.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Frankly, Madam President, I think Europe and our electors will not understand what we have done. May I make one suggestion, in all friendliness, to Mr Pannella? He has had very good coverage and very good publicity up to now. Let us say: Basta, enough is enough. You have got what you want, and I am sure you have made headlines in your papers back at home. Let this House now vote on the suggestion that we have put before you, and then get on with our real substantive business with the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission. Madam President, I would have thought an adequate gesture had been made towards Mr Pannella and his colleagues. Could we now move on quickly to a vote — and not by roll-call?

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Fellermaier.

Mr Fellermaier. — *(D)* Madam President, an amendment has been tabled that the agenda should be approved in its original form. This is according to the Rules of Procedure of this House the most far-reaching amendment, because if it is adopted all individual amendments proposing individual changes in the order of individual items thereby automatically stand rejected ...

(Applause from the right)

And I would now urge you, Madam President, to let the House vote at long last on this amendment.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

President. — I am sorry, but motions to amend the agenda before the House have been made in a regular manner, and we are therefore required to vote on them.

Unless Mr Panella withdraws his motion we shall proceed with the roll-call vote on the second point.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, just one brief comment. The Member who has just made a request spoke for much longer. I would just like to ask you to construe my amendment as meaning that Parliament should move onto the agenda disregarding all the amendments to it, i.e. that all the amendments that have been should be rejected. That is the meaning of my amendment. I cannot interpret it in any other way. That is also why I have linked it with the roll-call vote and I do not see why we should vote on every individual amendment when an amendment has been tabled rejecting all these amendments.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

President. — We shall now proceed to vote ...

Mr Ansart. — *(F)* Madam President, the staff assisting you have seen me ask for the floor but you have not called me. This is unacceptable! I have not come here to twiddle my thumbs!

President. — I call Mr Ansart.

Mr Ansart. — *(F)* Madam President, I do not acknowledge Mr Scott-Hopkins' right to apportion blame and praise in this Assembly! We are here to defend our positions and we shall defend them!

I wish to put a question to those Members who have just been making a desperate effort to prolong the proceedings of this Assembly. I would ask them to explain clearly why one of the elementary rules of parliamentary business can be flouted in this way without their being proposed to admit the fact. Why do they refuse to refer the Luster Report for consideration in committee followed by a discussion here in public sitting? Normal practice would be for Item 4 to be taken after Item 5. Everyone recognizes this but discussion continues and Mr Pannella's interventions are being used as a pretext for postponing and changing the nature of our parliamentary business.

This Assembly is predominantly right-wing, Madam President, and we will not accept that, from the very outset of our work, the Right should be able to impose its will on this Assembly!

(Applause from certain quarters on the extreme left)

President. — I call Mr Gendebien for an explanation of vote.

Mr Gendebien. — *(F)* Madam President, I have a new suggestion. I would, however, beforehand also like to protest against the accusations made against our part of the House by Mr Scott-Hopkins. We are in no way seeking to bring this Assembly and its proceedings into disrepute!

I am afraid, however, that there are others who are quite simply trying by some shabby manoeuvre to undermine democratic rights. Our concern has been, is, and will remain to ensure that this Parliament functions properly and deals with the major social economic and international issues that affect us! However, we were not the ones who, at a time when we should have been considering these major issues, proposed the introduction as a matter of urgency and contrary to the spirit of the Rules of Procedure, of an amendment to these rules without the relevant committee having had the time to express its view.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, with a view to reaching a solution I would repeat the proposal made by a member of the Liberal and Democratic Group and request that the sitting be adjourned for 10 minutes so that the Bureau can meet and perhaps put a proposal to us that is sufficiently acceptable for us to withdraw all the amendments that we have tabled and for which we have also requested, in accordance with the rules and within the appropriate time-limit, a roll-call vote.

I believe that this proposal is a reasonable one and I would ask all the political groups in the interests of Parliament and of our public image to agree to this suggestion.

President. — I can no longer call Members except for an explanation of vote.

I call Mr van Minnen.

Mr van Minnen. — *(N)* — Madam President, I support the proposals by Mr Pannella in so far as they aim to protect the rights of the minorities, but I shall have to vote against them, because I refuse to have anything at all to do with a move that will also play into the hands of the neo-fascists.

President. — I call Mrs Gaiotti De Biase.

Mrs Gaiotti De Biase. — *(I)* The political problem which has been posed by the Group for Technical

Coordination is certainly serious, but it is perfectly possible to resolve it within the context of the motion tabled by Mr Glinne, Mr Klepsch and Mr Scott-Hopkins. As has already been said, a solution has been offered to the Group for Technical Coordination and to the other minorities present in this Assembly. I therefore declare that I am going to vote against the proposed amendments, because it is the duty of this Parliament to get down to work quickly and seriously.

President. — I call Sir John Stewart-Clarke.

Sir John Stewart-Clarke. — Madam President, may I humbly and simply suggest that we proceed, as you have suggested, with the roll-call vote on the remaining three amendments?

President. — I call Mr Radoux.

Mr Radoux. — *(F)* Madam President, I shall abstain because I feel that Mr Gendebien's proposal is a wise one and may help us out of our difficulties.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* We feel that the proposal to adjourn the sitting and convene the Bureau is a reasonable one.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Ferri.

Mr Ferri. — *(I)* Naturally I agree with the request for suspension of the vote made by the chairman of my group. However, I want to state that as I have already voted in favour of the first amendment put forward by Mr Pannella, I shall vote in favour of the second, if it is put to the vote. I believe that this amendment could be approved without compromising the substance of the question, because it only provides for the debate on the changes to the Rules of Procedure proposed by the Luster Report to be taken after the setting up of the committees, thus permitting the Luster Report to be considered by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure before it is presented to Parliament. It seems to me an extremely reasonable position. Therefore even those who defend the Luster Report in substance, should accept the voting of this subordinate amendment as proof of respect for minorities.

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — *(I)* Madam President, there is a widening of the consensus around the extremely serious proposal which we put forward as regards the

meeting of the Bureau. I think a clarification is necessary. The very fact that, on the basis of Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure, any proposal for a resolution tending to modify the Rules of Procedure themselves must be referred to committee, serves as a reply to the objection with we have just heard made. For this reason, the motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others cannot be decided today, because if this were done it would produce the absurd result of our group having to be dissolved now only perhaps to be reconstituted in a few months with the consent of the majorities. Our colleagues will remember that on Tuesday morning I spoke of 'infringements of liberty'. This is nothing less than what we are facing now.

I therefore associate myself with the proposal which — I repeat — is attracting a widening consensus, of suspending the sitting to permit the Bureau to meet so as to consider an honourable proposal for mediation on this question, which is not solely one of method, but also one of principle and substance.

President. — I call Mr D'Angelosante.

Mr D'Angelosante. — (I) The Communist Group supports the proposal for a brief suspension which would permit the Bureau to take a closer look at the proposals put forward and which, in my view, at least in part, deserve to be adopted. I do not think there is any point in persisting with the pretence that certain solutions should be adopted at once when a great part of the Parliament is not in agreement, and when other, wiser and more useful solutions are possible.

President. — I call Mr Brøndhund Nielsen.

Mr Brøndhund Nielsen. — (DK) Madam President, I am opposed to an adjournment of the sitting. I advocate that we continue the proceedings and also adopt the Luster Report. Any democratic system and any parliament that are to function properly must have definite rules and must proceed according to these rules. The arrangement should be such that reasonable account is taken of the majority that the voters have elected to this Parliament. We must have certain practical rules for our work. We must make allowance for minorities but there is no point in our making so many allowances as to impede the real work of this Parliament. I therefore support the line that we should continue our work in a normal manner without this endless discussion.

(Applause from various quarters)

We have already seen now that these minorities are attempting to abuse their position in order to sabotage the proceedings; I for one, will oppose this sort of thing. Mr Bøgh laid claim to various democratic senti-

ments and I would like to say in response that I totally fail to see what was democratic about the way in which, among others, Mr Bøgh voted yesterday. I wonder how it feels for a former author of a textbook in democracy for the Danish army to put in an appearance and yet not take part in a democratic vote by handing in his ballot paper. Madam President, we cannot let our serious work be delayed by that sort of thing, we must press on.

(Applause from some quarters)

President. — I call Mr Sutra.

Mr Sutra. — (F) Madam President, a debate on the Rules of Procedure is inevitable whether in committee or in this Assembly. I find it hard to imagine the Rules of Procedure being debated by 410 individuals: there would be a thousand speeches and the debate would last three days. For this reason — and this is my explanation of vote — I shall vote for the Rules of Procedure to be examined in committee before they are discussed by the Assembly.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Chirac.

Mr Chirac. — (F) I would simply like to point out, Madam President, that in all democratic assemblies when a political group requests an adjournment of the proceedings for 10 minutes the adjournment is automatically granted. I trust that the same will apply in our Assembly.

President. — As suspension was requested in order to allow the Bureau to meet. I am quite prepared to suspend the sitting, but I can give no assurances for the moment regarding a meeting of the Bureau.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.25 and resumed at 12.40)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I put to the vote by roll-call ballot point (b) of the proposal by the Group for Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members to enter Item 4 as the last item on the agenda.

The ballot is open.

I call the Secretary-General to proceed with the roll-call vote.

(The roll-call was taken)

Does anyone else wish to vote?

The ballot is closed.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.10 p.m. and resumed at 1.30 p.m.)

President

The following Members voted *for* the motion :

Mrs Agnelli, Mr Albers, Mr Amendola, Mr Ansart, Mr Arfé, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Baillot, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Bettiza, Mr Bøgh, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Bonde, Mrs Bonino, Mr Boot, Mrs Boserup, Mr Boyes, Mrs Buchan, Mr Caborn, Mr Caillavet, Mr Capanna, Mr Cardia, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Carossino, Mrs Castellina, Mrs Cecovini, Mr Ceravolo, Mr Chambeiron, Mrs Charzat, Miss Clwyd, Mr Coppieters, Mrs Cresson, Mr Croux, Mr Damette, Mr D'Angelosante, Mrs Dekker, Mr Denis, Mr De Pasquale, Mr Diddò, Mr Estier, Mr Fanti, Mr Fernandez, Mr Ferrero, Mr Ferri, Mr Galluzzi, Mr Gatto, Mr Geurtsen, Mr de Goede, Mr Gouthier, Mrs Hammerich, Mr Ipolito, Mr Irmer, Mr Leonardi, Mrs Leroux, Mr Lezzi, Mr Lynge, Mr Martin, Mr Motchane, Mr Pannella, Mr Papapietro, Mr Pelikan, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Ripa Di Meana, Mrs Roudy, Mr Ruffolo, Mr Sarre, Mr Schwartzenberg, Mr Segre, Mr Skovmand, Mrs Spaak, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mr Sutra, Mr Van Miert, Mr Vergeer, Mr Verges, Mr Wurtz, Mr Zagari.

The following Members voted *against* the motion :

Mr Abens, Mr Adam, Mr Adonnino, Mr van Aerssen, Mr Aigner, Mr Alber, Mr Almirante, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Arndt, Mr Balfour, Mr Bangemann, Mr Barbagli, Mr Barbi, Mr Battersby, Mr Baudis, Mr Beazley, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Bersani, Lord Bethell, Mr Beumer, Mr von Bismarck, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Bockley, Miss Brookes, Mr Buchou, Mr Buttafuoco, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Sir Fred Catherwood, Mr Chirac, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Clinton, Mr Cohen, Mr Colleselli, Mr Costanzo, Mr Cottrell, Mr de Courcy Ling, Mr Cronin, Mr Curry, Mr Dalsass, Mr Dalziel, Mr Damseaux, Mr Davern, Mr Debatisse, Mr Debré, Mr De Clercq, Mr De Keersmaecker, Mr Delatte, Mr Deleau, Mr Delorozoy, Miss de Valera, Mr Diana, Mrs Dienesch, Mr Diligent, Mr Donnez, Lord Douro, Mr Druon, Lady Elles, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Fergusson, Mr de Ferranti, Miss Flesch, Miss Forster, Mr Forth, Mr B. Friedrich, Mr I. Friedrich, Mr Früh, Mr Fuchs, Mr Gabert, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mr Ghergo, Mr Giavazzi, Mr Gillot, Mr Giummarra, Mr Gonella, Mr Goppel, Mrs Groes, Mr Van der Gun, Mr Haagerup, Mr Habsburg, Mr Hansch, Mr Han, Lord Harmar-Nicholls, Mr Harris, Mr von Hassel, Mr Hauenschild, Mr Helms, Mrs Herklotz, Mr Hermann, Mr Hoffmann, Miss Hooper, Mr Hopper, Mr Hord, Mr Howell, Mr Hutton, Mr C. Jackson, Mr R. Jackson, Mr Jakobsen, Mr Jansen von Raay, Mr Jonker, Mr Jürgens, Mr Katzer, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr Kirk, Mr Klepsch, Mr Köhler, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mr Lalor, Mr Lange, Mr Langes, Mr Lecanuët, Mr Lega, Mrs Lenz, Mr Ligios, Mr Linde, Mr Linkohr, Mr Louwes, Mr Lucker, Mr Luster, Mr Macario, Mr McCartin, Mr Maher, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Majonica, Mr Malangré, Mr de la Malène, Mr Marshall, Mrs Martin, Mr Mertens, Mr Messmer, Mr Michel, Mr van Minnen, Mr Møller, Mr Moorhouse, Mrs Moreau, Mr Moreland, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Muntingh, Mr Narducci, Mr Newton Dunn, Sir David Nicolson, Mr Nielsen, Mrs Nielsen, Mr Nord, Mr Nordlohne, Mr Normanton, Mr Notenboom, Mr Nothomb, Mr Oehler, Lord O'Hagan, Mr Olesen, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Patterson, Mr Pearce, Mr Pedini, Mr Penders, Mr Peters, Mr Petronio, Mr Pfennig, Sir Henry Plumb, Mr Pöttering, Mr Poniatowski, Mr Prag, Mr Price, Mr Prout, Mr Provan, Mr Pursten, Mr Purvis, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Remilly, Mr Rinsche, Mr Rogers, Mr Romualdi, Mr Ryan, Mr Sablé,

Mr Sälzter, Mr Sassano, Mr Schall, Mr Schieler, Mr Schinzel, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Schmid, Mr Schmitt, Mr Karl Schön, Mr Konrad Schön, Mr Schwencke, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mrs Scrivener, Mr Seal, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Seitlinger, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Simmonds, Mr Simmonet, Mr Simpson, Mr Spautz, Mr Spicer, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Mr John M. Taylor, Mr Tindemans, Mr Tolman, Mr Turner, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Vanderpoorten, Mr Vandewield, Mr Verhaegen, Mr Vernimmen, Mr Verroken, Mr Vondeling, Mr Wagner, Mrs Walz, Sir Fred Warner, Mr Wawrzik, Mrs Mr Wettig, Mr von Wogau, Mr Woltzjer, Mr Zecchino.

The following Members *abstained* :

Mrs van Alemann, Mr Brandt, Mr Calvez, Mr Cariglia, Mr Combe, Mr Dankert, Mr Delors, Mr Enright, Mrs Focke, Mrs Fuillet, Mr Gallagher, Mr Galland, Mr Glinne, Mr Griffiths, Mr Josselin, Mr Lomas, Mr Martinet, Mr Mauroy, Mr Megahy, Mr Orlandi, Mr Percheron, Mr Radoux, Mr Rossi, Mrs Salisch, Mrs Veil, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul.

I believe that certain group chairmen have proposals to make with a view to obviating the need to vote on the third proposal. I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Madam President, in view of the advanced hour and the work programme that we had actually planned and in view also of the fact that the time of the Council and Commission is limited to today on account of the conference beginning tomorrow, it would in my view, and also in that of other political groups, be very unfortunate if we were unable to hear and discuss today the statements of the President-in-Office of the Council and of the President of the Commission. I therefore appeal to Mr Pannella and propose firstly, that he now withdraw all his other amendments to the agenda, secondly, that we all agree here to begin at 3 o'clock this afternoon with the report of the President-in-Office of the Council and, thirdly, that we set up an *ad hoc* committee to arrange concurrently the discussion on the Luster Report, thus ensuring that, after we have completed the political debate this afternoon, a vote can be taken today on the Luster Report on the basis of sensible arrangements. I feel that this is a fair proposal that takes account of what Mr Pannella has said here. It is now up to him to demonstrate whether his concern is to have a fair discussion and reach a fair decision or whether it is to paralyse the political work of this Parliament; the ball is now in his court.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, even if we were not the very heterogeneous group that we are and even if we had been a radical libertarian group, I would still not have the right at this stage to give the Members of this House a response to such a new proposal, which merits consideration. With your permission I can state that our group is awaiting a gesture and, more particularly a gesture that opens the way to a dialogue.

Pannella

The setting up of an *ad hoc* committee would be an altogether exceptional step on which I cannot comment. My feeling is that we would thereby risk starting off down another dead end. In order to give the good news to the Assembly as soon as possible without, however, accepting the procedure under which the *ad hoc* committee would meet concurrently with this Assembly, i.e. the Assembly in which we have been elected to serve, I would request you, without adjourning the sitting to permit a very brief consultation of four or five minutes among the 13 members of our group. I wish to state here and now that I oppose the proposal to adopt the agenda and resume our work at 3 o'clock.

I would at all events like to thank those members of the various groups who have been active in initiating this dialogue and thereby given proof of their goodwill.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, I would like to thank Mr Pannella most warmly for having announced his intentions now so plainly. I withdraw my proposal.

(Scattered applause from the right)

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — May I ask you Madam President, to proceed to the third vote now?

(Applause from the right)

President. — We shall now proceed with the roll-call vote on the third proposal: consider Item 5 before Item 4.

(Request to speak by Mr Gendebien — protests from the centre and from the right)

Mr Gendebien. — (F) Madam President, following the proposal made by the Liberal and Democratic Group and as we represent several points of view, we wished, without adjourning the proceedings to consult among ourselves and we were prepared, given certain guarantees to accept the proposal.

(Uproar)

I regret this undue haste just when a solution was beginning to emerge.

President. — The ballot is open.

I call on the Secretary-General to proceed with the roll-call.

(The roll-call was taken)

President. — Does anyone else wish to vote?

The ballot is closed.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 2 p. m. and resumed at 2.15 p. m.)

The sitting is resumed.

The result of the ballot is as follows:

Number of Members voting: 251

Abstentions: 6

Votes in favour: 29

Votes against: 216

The following Members voted *for* the motion:

Mrs Angelli, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Bettiza, Mr Blaney, Mr Bøgh, Mr Bonde, Mrs Bonino, Mrs Boserup, Mr Capanna, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Cecovini, Mr Ceravolo, Mr Coppieters, Mr Croux, Mr Damette, Mr D'Angelosante, Mrs Dekker, Mr Ferrero, Mr Gendebien, Mr De Goede, Mrs Hammerich, Mr Lynge, Mr Martin, Mr Pannella, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Skovmand, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mr Verges and Mr Wurtz.

The following Members voted *against* the motion:

Mr Adonnino, Mr van Aerssen, Mr Aigner, Mr Alber, Mrs van Alemann, Mr Almirante, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Arndt, Mr Balfe, Mr Balfour, Mr Bangemann, Mr Barbagli, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Barbi, Mr Battersby, Mr Baudis, Mr Beazley, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Bersani, Lord Bethell, Mr Beumer, Mr von Bismarck, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Bocklet, Mrs Boot, Miss Brookes, Mr Buchou, Mr Buttafuoco, Mr Caborn, Mr Caillavet, Mr Calvez, Mr Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Sir Fred Catherwood, Mr Clinton, Mr Collins, Mr Combe, Mr Costanzo, Mr Cottrell, Mr de Courcy Ling, Mr Cronin, Mr Curry, Mr Dalsass, Mr Dalziel, Mr Damseaux, Mr Dankert, Mr Debatisse, Mr De Keersmaecker, Mr Delatte, Mr Delorozoy, Mr Denis, Mr Diana, Mr Diligent, Lord Douro, Mr Druon, Lady Elles, Mrs Ewing, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Fergusson, Mr de Ferranti, Mr Fischbach, Miss Forster, Mr Forth, Mr B. Friedrich, Mr I. Friedrich, Mr Früh, Mr Fuchs, Mrs Fuillet, Mr Gabert, Mr Galland, Mr Geurtsen, Mr Ghergo, Mr Giavazzi, Mr Gillot, Mr Giummarra, Mr Glinne, Mr Gonella, Mr Goppel, Mr Van der Gun, Mr Haagerup, Mr Habsburg, Mr Hahn, Lord Harmar-Nicholls, Mr Harris, Mr van Hassel, Mr Helms, Mr Henckes, Mrs Herklotz, Mr Herman, Mrs Van den Heuvel, Mrs Hoff, Mr Hoffmann, Miss Hooper, Mr Hopper, Mr Hord, Mr Howell, Mr Hutton, Mr Irmer, Mr C. Jackson, Mr R. Jackson, Mr Jakobsen, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr Jonker, Mr Jurgens, Mr Katzer, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr Key, Mr Klepsch, Mr Köhler, Mr Lange, Mr Langes, Mr Lecanuet, Mr Lega, Mrs Lenz, Mr Ligios, Mr Louwes, Mr Luster, Mr McCartin, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Majonica, Mr Malangré, Mr Marshall, Mrs Martin, Mr Mertens, Mr Michel, Mr van Minnen, Mr Moorhouse, Mrs Moreau, Mr Moreland, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Narducci, Mr Newton Dunn, Sir David Nicolson, Mr Nielsen, Mrs Nielsen, Mr Nord, Mr Nordlohne, Mr Normanton, Mr Noenboom, Mr Nothomb, Lord O'Hagen, Mr D'Ormesson, Mr Patterson, Mr Pearce, Mr Penders, Mr Peters, Mr Petronio, Mr Pfennig, Mr Pintat, Sir Henry Plumb, Mr Pöttering, Mr Prag, Mr Price, Mr Prout, Mr Provan, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Pürsten, Mrs Purvis, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Rey, Sir Brandon Rhys Williams, Mr Rinsche, Mr Rogers, Mr Rossi, Mr Ryan, Mr Sable, Mr Sälzer, Mr Sassano, Mr Schall, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Schmid, Mr Schmitt, Mr Karl Schön, Mr Konrad Schön, Mr Schwencke, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mrs Scrivener, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Seitlinger, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Simmonds, Mr Simpson, Mr

President

Spautz, Mr Spencer, Mr Spicer, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Mr J.D. Taylor, Mr J.M. Taylor, Mr Tindemans, Mr Tolman, Mr Travaglini, Mr Turner, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Vanderpoorten, Mr Vergeer, Mr Vernimmen, Mr Verroken, Mr Wagner, Mrs Walz, Sir Fred Warner, Mr Wawrzik, Mr Welsh, Mr von Wogau.

The following Members *abstained* :

Mr Boyes, Mr Griffiths, Mr Moreau, Miss Quin, Mr Radoux, Mrs Veil.

Proposal No 3 is rejected.

The order of business is therefore as follows :

Thursday, 19 July 1979

10.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m. and possibly evening :

- vote on requests for urgent debate
- Statement by the Council on the programme for the Irish Presidency — Statements by the Council and the Commission on the outcome of the European Council (followed by a joint debate)
- Statements by the Council and Commission on the situation of the Indochinese refugees
- Luster Report on the amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament (discussion and vote)
- Motion for a resolution on the number and composition of parliamentary committees (debate and vote)
- Suspension of the sitting
 - meeting of the enlarged Bureau
- Resumption of the sitting
 - appointment of committee members

Friday, 20 July 1979

10.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m.

- Presentation of the preliminary draft budget for 1980 (followed by a debate)

Are there any objections ?

The order of business is adopted.

(Applause)

8. Limitation of speaking time

President. — Pursuant to Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure I propose to allocate as follows speaking time for the debate on the statements of the President of the Council on the programme of the Irish Presidency and the statements of the President of the Council and the President of the Commission on the outcome of the European Council :

Council :	60 minutes
Commission :	30 minutes
Members :	180 minutes,
broken down as follows :	
Socialist Group :	38 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (CD) :	35 minutes
European Democratic Group :	27 minutes
Communist and Allies Group :	21 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group :	20 minutes

Group of European Progressive Democrats :	16 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defense of Independent Groups and Members :	13 minutes
Non-attached :	10 minutes

I call Mr de Goede.

Mr de Goede. — *(N)* — Madam President, colleagues, I am sorry that today's sitting has been held up so much, but I must again ask for your attention to a matter that cannot be allowed through as it stands.

You have announced that the non-attached Members will have ten minutes. I have just asked one of your senior officials how much time will therefore be available for me and Mrs Dekker. As non-attached Members we form a separate political group in this Parliament. The answer was that we should simply agree among ourselves how we divided our speaking-time. That I absolutely cannot accept; I have no desire to bargain with Mr Almirante over my speaking-time! I therefore ask you to tell me how much speaking-time I have available.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — *(I)* Madam President, I beg you to excuse me having to speak, but I have been referred to personally.

The group of 'non-attached' comprise at this moment — if my information is correct — nine Members of this Parliament: the four of us in the Italian National Right, plus another five whom I consider as friends and whom I have not hitherto had the pleasure of knowing personally. Therefore, contrary to what Mr de Goede has said, I am utterly ready to meet any colleague here to discuss the time available.

I should like the Chair to bear in mind that to negotiate over a total of ten minutes, among nine people, is a little difficult. I think that it would be fair on your part, therefore, while perhaps even undertaking not to make use of the time, to ask for it to be doubled. I think this request could satisfy the legitimate requests of Mr de Goede and his other colleague. In any event, Madam President, we rely on your courtesy and on the understanding of our colleagues.

President. — The Rules of Procedure provide that a total speaking time should be allocated to non-attached Members. Since you are nine in all and you have a total of ten minutes, I suggest that each one speaks for a little more than one minute.

I call Mr Fellermaier.

Mr Fellermaier. — *(D)* Madam President, with all due respect I sympathize deeply with the Member from D 66 who stated that he did not see himself in a position to negotiate an agreement on speaking time

Fellermaier

with an Italian neo-fascist. If the non-attached Members are currently allocated only ten minutes under the provisions of Rule 28, it is still at your personal discretion, Madam President, to ask the non-attached Members along and to determine on your authority how the non-attached members can be given an equal chance to speak on this first day of debate. I believe that the House would be in agreement if you then needed to increase the time allocated to, say, 15 minutes. Madam President, this matter must be settled on your authority; it cannot be a matter for negotiation between individuals.

(Scattered applause from the left)

President. — As these proposals were put to me by all the chairmen of the political groups, I do not see how I can fail to comply with them. On the other hand, in view of the different political tendencies represented in the group, should the non-inscribed Members be unwilling to negotiate among themselves — although I regret that, in a Parliament, negotiation should be impossible even among different tendencies — I am prepared to allocate speaking time, taking account of the different political views in the fairest way possible. In order to avoid further delays I shall do so if you fail to agree on this among yourselves.

For the debate on the statements by the Council and the Commission on the plight of the South-East Asian refugees I propose to allocate speaking time as follows :

Socialist Group :	19 minutes
European Peoples Party (CD) :	18 minutes
Group of European Democrats :	13 minutes
Communist and Allies Group :	11 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group :	10 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats :	8 minutes
Group for Technical Cooperation and Defence of Independent Groups and Members :	6 minutes
Non-inscribed Members :	5 minutes
Total :	90 minutes

For all other reports and motions for resolutions on the agenda, I propose, in keeping with our normal practice, to limit speaking time as follows :

- 15 minutes for the rapporteur and one speaker on behalf of each group
- 10 minutes for other speakers

Are there any objections ?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante, — *(I)* Madam President, I beg you once more to forgive me. Since a colleague, whose name I no longer recall, has called me a 'neo-Fascist', I should like to state that in the official transactions of this Parliament I am the honourable Member, Giorgio Almirante. My particulars are set out in the official documents. I cannot tolerate descriptions of myself

which can be considered politically offensive and prejudicial to my rights. Naturally, the stand I have taken implies equal respect, on my and our part, for the political honour of all the Members of this Parliament. I believe you, Madam President, will wish to understand and safeguard what is my right.

(Applause from some seats on the right)

President. Mr Almirante, your proposal has been noted. I call Mr Pelikan.

Mr Pelikan. — *(F)* Madam President, the first item on the agenda approved by the Assembly is the vote on the requests for urgent procedure.

When will this item be dealt with ?

President. — We are coming to it now.

9. Decision on urgency

President. — I consult Parliament on the urgency of four motions for resolutions on the plight of the Vietnamese refugees.

I first put to the vote the request for urgent debate on the motion for a resolution tabled by the European Peoples Party, the Liberal and Democratic Group and the Group of European Democrats (Doc. 1-223/79/rev. II).

The urgency is agreed.

I propose to the House that this motion for a resolution be entered on today's agenda for joint discussion with the statements by the Council and the Commission on the same topic.

Are there any objections ?

That is agreed.

I put to the vote the request for urgent debate on the motion for a resolution tabled by the Communist and Allies Group (Doc. 1-224/79).

The urgency is agreed.

I propose to the House to enter this motion for a resolution on today's agenda for joint discussion with the statements by the Council and the Commission on the same topic.

Are there any objections ?

That is agreed.

I put to the vote the request for urgent debate on the motion for a resolution tabled by the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-227/79).

The urgency is agreed.

I propose to the House to enter this motion for a resolution on today's agenda for joint discussion with the statements by the Council and the Commission on the same topic. Are there any objections ?

That is agreed.

President

I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure on the motion for a resolution tabled by the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-228/79).

The urgency is agreed.

I propose to the House to enter this motion for a resolution on today's agenda for joint discussion with the statements by the Council and the Commission on the same topic. Are there any objections?

I must now consult Parliament on the urgency of the motion for a resolution tabled by the Socialist Group, the Group of the European Peoples Party and the Group of European Democrats, on the amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament (Doc. 1-225/79/rev.).

I call Mrs Bonino.

(Vigorous protests)

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am asking, as always, that the Rules of Procedure be complied with. Rule 14 stipulates that one speaker for and one against the motion shall be heard, so that I am exercising a right laid down in the Rules which were adopted by others before we became Members.

Madame President, I wish to state that we are opposed to urgent debate on this motion for a resolution since we consider that pursuant to Rule 54 (1) of the Rules of Procedure motions to amend the Rules should first be considered by the committee responsible, which has not yet been constituted. I therefore believe that there should be no urgent debate on the Rules of Procedure.

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

The urgency is agreed.

I propose to the House to enter this motion for a resolution on today's agenda for joint discussion with Mr Luster's report on the same topic.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I consult Parliament on the urgency of the motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of European Peoples Party, Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the Group of European Democrats, Mr Bangemann, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr Amendola, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group and Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the number and composition of Parliamentary committees (Doc. 1-235/79).

The urgency is agreed.

I propose to Parliament to enter this motion for a resolution as Item 5 on the agenda for this sitting. Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I consult Parliament on the urgency of the motion for a resolution by Lord Bethell, on behalf of the Group of European Democrats, on the arrests of dissidents in Czechoslovakia (Doc. 1-234/79).

The urgency is agreed.

I propose to the House to enter this motion for a resolution as the last item on Friday's agenda.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I consult Parliament on the urgency of the motion for a resolution by Mr Ansart and others on the political situation in Nicaragua (Doc. 1-236/79).

The request is rejected.

I call Mr Klepsch for an explanation of vote.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, I should just like to give a brief explanation of vote. We have rejected this request for urgent procedure because we had actually agreed between the groups that we did not want to place any further urgent debates on the agenda in addition to those to which we have already agreed. As regards the motion for a resolution, our view is that there is no justification at all for urgent procedure ...

(Protests from the extreme left)

... as it does not deal, for example with the replacement of the Somoza régime but with altogether different matters.

For the rest, I can only say that the matter was agreed between the groups and I can announce straight away that neither will we be voting for urgent procedure for the next motion for a resolution, as we feel that there is no room on the agenda for these items and there is no justification at all for discussing these matters at length.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

President. — As urgency has not been agreed, the motion for a resolution will be referred to the competent committee pursuant to Rule 25.

I call Lord Bethell.

Lord Bethell. — I simply wanted to explain my vote on Nicaragua. I, myself, am in favour of a discussion on the situation in Nicaragua at the earliest opportunity, but the reason I request urgent procedure for the motion on Czechoslovakia is that the trial of the ten persons concerned is expected in a very few days. They are denied legal representation. It is a matter on which this House must speak in order to influence something that will happen in a few days' time. The case of Nicaragua is also of very great importance, but is not in my opinion, quite in the same order of urgency.

(Protests from the extreme left)

President. — I consult Parliament on the urgency of the motion for a resolution by Mr Coppieters and others on nuclear energy.

I call Mr Griffiths.

Mr Griffiths. — Madam President, I should like to point out that I and a number of other people have not received this particular motion for a resolution, and I did look in my pigeonhole only a few moments ago.

President. — It is Document No 237 of 18 July. I regret that it is not among your papers, but I imagine that this is simply an oversight, since all the other Members of Parliament appear to have received the document.

The document will be distributed as quickly as possible and the vote on the request for urgency can be taken this afternoon.

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (N) Madam President, as proposer of this motion, I invoke Rule 14. The document has been distributed in the same way as the other motions; I now request the floor and I ask you to put this motion for a resolution to the vote together with the other motions. I see no reason why this document should be treated differently.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — As the document is very short perhaps we can vote on it at once.

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (N) Madam President, under Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure I am allowed to speak for three minutes as the person making the request; I shall in fact be even briefer. There are three reasons for having an urgent debate. First, it is rather odd that the European Council found it necessary, some weeks before the European Parliament assembled for the first time, to publish a quite unambiguous document on energy. Second, there are fears that the energy crisis will damage the fabric of our society; and last but not least, there is the legitimate and profound disquiet of the public in our Member States. That is why I am requesting an urgent debate.

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

The request is rejected.

As urgent debate has not been agreed, the motion for a resolution will be referred to the competent committee pursuant to Rule 25.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting suspended at 2.40 p.m. and resumed at 3.35 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I should first like to give an explanation concerning the projectors which are about to be switched on.

Yesterday some of you found them annoying and asked that they be switched off. I also find them unpleasant, but I must remind you that they are required for the television cameras. I think that we all wish that our work be given adequate coverage, so, I have authorized the television projectors to be switched on under certain conditions and by way of exception, but I have also asked that this should only be for a very short period and only for the purpose of recording the highlights in the speeches, so that we are not obliged to spend all afternoon under the glare of the projector and that a limit be placed on the use of energy.

10. *Composition of Parliament*

President. — Mrs Leonilde Iotti has informed me in writing that she is resigning as a Member. Pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 12 (2) of the Act on the election of Members of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage the Assembly notes that there is a vacancy and shall inform the Member State concerned without delay.

11. *Political groups*

President. — I have been informed by Mrs Spaak and Mr Gendebien that they have left the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

12. *Council statement on the programme for the Irish presidency — Council and Commission statements on the European Council meeting in Strasbourg*

President. — The next item is the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the programme for the Irish presidency, and the statements by the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission on the outcome of the European Council meeting held in Strasbourg. A debate will follow.

I call Mr O'Kennedy.

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — Madam President, Members of the European Parliament, ladies and gentlemen, first of all let me say that the honour which this is for me to address you has been even heightened by the expectation I have had this morning in waiting for this opportunity.

(Laughter)

Let me also say that I do appreciate the fact that Parliament has been able to arrange its business for today, and maybe even the early hours of tomorrow morning, in such a way as to enable me to address you at this stage: I would therefore like, in the first

O'Kennedy

instance, to express to all of you my appreciation of the fact that you have been able — after some discussion and, I am sure, not a little difficulty — to arrange your business in this way.

May, I, Madam President, offer to you and to your colleagues, the distinguished Members of this Parliament, my compliments and very sincere congratulations on your election to this august body.

Today a page of European history has turned. I begin on this somewhat rhetorical note for a deliberate purpose. The average European reads the daily press, watches the news on television and witnesses the gradual development of the great European experiment. However, the fact that the progress of all our endeavours together, toward the targets we have established, is often on a daily basis characterized by great complexity, by small advances after sometimes tortuous debate, and the seemingly endless daily and nightly round of harassed debate wherein national interests are reconciled with overall Community interests apparently always in the last resort, perhaps distracts attention from the overall progress made towards a great common goal. It is understandable that the daily observer could sometimes forget that small matters of seemingly remote personal relevance can as a whole add up to a great overall purpose.

I wish, therefore, to herald today our arrival at one of those major interim stages when, as now, a President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers rises to report for the first time to the newly-assembled, directly-elected European Parliament on the most recent European Council, and to present to you what is proposed as the programme of work for the incoming Presidency. Some of the issues are of the utmost gravity and concern to all of us and they demand a realistic, balanced and united approach. For me personally, and for Ireland, it is a singular honour — albeit a coincidence — that it is during Ireland's Presidency-in-Office that you should embark on the historic task of giving here, in the directly-elected European Parliament, a new European dimension to the aspirations of our citizens. The meeting of this Parliament represents one of those major interim stages on the road to the overall goal to which we are committed.

Yesterday the Taoiseach, Mr Lynch, speaking as President of the European Council, conveyed to you a message from his colleagues — the Heads of State and of Government — expressing their conviction that the due and welcome assumption by the European Parliament of its intended salient role among the Community institutions will be a major factor in achieving the overall European objective. On behalf of my country he reiterated our overwhelming national trust in, and commitment to, the European aspiration. Ireland is committed to ensuring that the role and relevance of the European Parliament are recognized and respected. I am very conscious that moulds harden

quickly into their original forms, and I am conscious of the corresponding importance that therefore attaches to the primary moulds. For this reason, I wish to convey to you the priority which the Irish Presidency attaches to the need to establish and maintain cooperation between the Council of Ministers and this European Parliament. The Parliament, through its opinions and advice and through the exercise of its powers must be a major tributary to the flow of European policy, and I intend to ensure that under the Irish Presidency due weight and gravity should be seen to attach to the Parliament's salient role. You have been directly elected and represent strands of thought and concern from all parts of our nine nations. The Europeans you represent will no doubt perceive increasingly the great opportunity they have — through you as their elected representatives — to help shape the future of Europe. The citizens of our Member States have now, through their chosen representatives in the European Parliament, a new window on the decision-making process. They will, through their vote and their personal contact with you, have a greater participatory role in moulding the future of our Community. It is stimulating to reflect on the breadth and depth of opinion from all over the Community that you collectively represent — some of the breadth and depth I have already, albeit on a preliminary basis, witnessed this morning — and this will no doubt be a powerful factor to be weighed in all of our debates. It is in this sense that I reiterate my belief that this opening part-session marks one of the major intermediary stages on the road toward the achievement of our great overall purpose.

As I mentioned earlier, I am highly conscious of the fact that primary moulds harden quickly. It is my purpose over the next six months to ensure close contact between the Presidency and the Parliament. I will, therefore, during Ireland's Presidency — a period which spans a vital, inceptive stage of our relations — welcome all views on how best we can ensure common direction and complementarity in the work of our respective institutions.

(Applause)

I would like now to report to you on the European Council which met in this historic city on 21 and 22 June.

Our immediate major preoccupation at the Council was, of course, energy. The era of growth fuelled by oil consumption has ended. We must face head-on the fact that oil can no longer be relied upon to meet our energy needs. Recent events in the Middle East have precipitated world vulnerability in the energy field and have heightened our alarm with regard to the future situation. Our economic foundations have shifted, and the greatly-narrowed margin for manoeuvre in all of our States' economic policies has had unavoidable repercussions on our programmes and

O'Kennedy

plans for the welfare of all of our peoples. Our overall Community growth-rate may fall next year to 2.8 % from this year's level of 3.4 %. Without sufficient energy for sustained growth, the spectre of mounting unemployment begins to take form.

These are the bald and inescapable facts before which the European Council demonstrated tangible solidarity. We faced head-on, because we had to, the implications for all of us of inaction, or cosmetic action. We saw the danger of large-scale economic and social crisis and this underprinned our determined resolve to maintain our oil imports at the 1978 level until 1985. The immediate external response to this grave Community decision may be gauged by the major industrial powers' agreement at the Tokyo Summit on a common strategy to reduce oil consumption and hasten the development of other energy resources. The important decisions on energy put forward by the President of the United States very recently are a welcome reinforcement of the measures agreed at Tokyo.

The successful outcome of these policies is vital for the Community, and on our resolve depends the welfare of all our people. Let us also remember that not only our future depends on the global energy balance. The energy crisis has highlighted the fact of global interdependence. This must be recalled in our relations with oil-producing states. Let us all remember also the crushing burden which an energy crisis poses for the world's developing and least developed countries. Their efforts toward progress and self-reliance can be seriously damaged. Our efforts through Community development cooperation policies, aimed at assisting development countries in their struggle toward growth and well-being can be frustrated or even rendered worthless. There is an international balance of responsibilities in the field of energy, which must not be overlooked and will not be overlooked by the Irish Presidency. There is too much at stake, and I believe that all partners in the energy debate must form their policies in order that all of us — producers and consumers alike — avoid the pitfall of global economic recession, the impact of which would leave no country unscathed.

The European Council established frameworks for the Community's role in dealing with this problem in the short, medium and long terms. We must immediately reduce consumption, regulate the spot market and take all possible conservation measures. In the medium term, we must emphasize a much greater use of coal and gas and the exploitation of all resources within the Community. The European Council agreed that it is imperative that we develop further nuclear energy and make continued advances in nuclear technology. Examination of our long-term energy strategy for coming decades must include all these elements

and, of course, consolidated Community efforts in research toward improving the use of our existing resources and developing new ones. We must harness and employ the sun, the wind, the waves and any other source of energy where we can detect a positive balance of advantage by doing so. In the research field, we hope to have approved during our Presidency the new Joint Research Centre programme for the next four years and the new thermo-nuclear fusion programme. In those cooperative efforts, as in the interconnection of utilities, I would stress the special value of a consolidated Community approach: it is imperative that we work together and assist each other rather than proceed in isolation. A planned, forward-looking Community approach must, and can, result in a long-term energy strategy tailored to the specific needs of the Community and its Member States. I view as a priority this Presidency's task to press forward these policies within the Community.

The customary consideration by the European Council of the economic and social situation within the Community was, of course, on this occasion undertaken in the light of the constraining implications of the energy problem. We called for closer intra-Community economic coordination to offset inflationary trends and the serious implications for growth and employment. We decided that a real note of warning was needed, and so we stated clearly that the answer to oil-price increases and attendant difficulties does not lie in increases in incomes, which would in the event prove more nominal than real.

I have hitherto been largely concerned with Community aspirations in a number of areas of very great concern where the successful fulfilment of those aspirations must be pursued with great vigour. One tangible manifestation, however, of what the Community can actually achieve when a resolute political will creates the necessary solidarity is the newly created European Monetary System. I view this as an auspicious portent for our endeavours in other areas of vital Community interest. From an address to the European Council by the Governor of the Banque de France, and subsequent discussion in the Council, it was clear that the arrangements are functioning satisfactorily so far. I earnestly hope that they will continue to do so and that during the Irish Presidency we shall be able to welcome a decision by the United Kingdom to join and thereby complete the system.

(Applause)

The European Council noted the ECO/FIN Council's report to it on progress towards economic convergence. It asked for a study-paper from the Commission on the consequences in each Member State of applying the budgetary system. It is intended that this study will be examined by the ECO/FIN Council and that, in the light of guidelines adopted, the Commis-

O'Kennedy

sion will make proposals in time for decisions to be taken by the end of the year.

On the continuing and worsening trade imbalance with Japan, the Council agreed that, far from seeking a solution in any form of protectionism, the Community should endeavour to broaden and strengthen cooperation with Japan in all fields, giving high priority to cooperation in industrial policy, economic and monetary policy and development policy. The Council hoped that the continuation of regular consultations between the Commission and Japan would rapidly result in wider openings for EEC export on the Japanese market and enable broader and more equitable relations to develop between us.

The European Council also discussed the problem of the Indo-Chinese refugees, and I hope to go into greater detail on this issue later during this part-session.

You will have noticed that already I have been obliged, in reporting to you on the European Council, to make more than passing references to the work which confronts the Community over the next six months. Before going on to look in greater detail at these commitments as I see them at this point, may I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the achievements of the previous French Presidency, which was a model of vision, determination and efficiency. In the words of our Irish poet, W. B. Yeats — father, indeed, of a Vice-President of the former European Parliament — it may be said of the French Presidency:

What they undertook to do they brought to pass.

I will presume nothing for our part, but only express the hope that the Irish Presidency will in its turn be seen to discharge efficiently the tasks entrusted to it.

I should like to take a moment to explain our approach to the work programme and our views as to what is feasible at this moment in the Community's gradual — but, I hope, inexorable — progress towards European union.

The lesson to be learned from the European Council's handling of the energy problem is, I am convinced, that the Community is capable of showing real solidarity and cohesion when confronted with grave dangers. Further, that solidarity enables us to speak to the outside world forcefully and effectively, and we find that our words and our example carry weight. In fact, the first duty I was called upon to perform on the first day of our Presidency was to address the Foreign Ministers of the ASEAN Nations on the refugee problem and on their relations with the European Economic Community in general. I could not but be struck by the importance they attach to the Community. Their keen desire to forge links between the EEC and the ASEAN nations was unmistakable, and their interest in the Community and its achievements

was striking and most encouraging. It reminded me once again what an impressive — even formidable — structure the Community can be when viewed from outside. It recalled to me the grounds on which my own country, together with Denmark and the United Kingdom, had applied to join the Community and the reasons which prompted Greece, Portugal and Spain to take the same momentous step. That solidarity is something to which all Member States, great and small, contribute. It can, and will, entail some sacrifice of narrow national interests, but such sacrifices are amply rewarded and in tangible terms. We sometimes forget, until reminded by our friends outside the Community, how much we have already achieved. The *acquis communautaire* is not just a cliché, it is a solid achievement which we have created in the face of considerable odds and which we must never take for granted. Not only must we show solidarity in our relations with the external world, we must also express it in maintaining the institutions and the policies which the Community has built up over the years. We must be mindful of the care and the painstaking matching of interests which have gone into the fabrication of every important element in the Community construction — for example, the Customs Union, the Common Agricultural Policy, the Regional and Social Policies, the European Monetary System. We must safeguard the existing *acquis* as a solid foundation for use in the further development of the Community, even if slight modifications to the original designs should prove necessary here and there. We must recognize the essential and fundamental tasks and learn to concentrate on them.

It is in this spirit that the Irish Presidency will endeavour to direct the work of the coming six months and endeavour also to ensure that the Community is united and consistent in its efforts to tackle the major problems facing it. I attach importance under the Irish Presidency to seeing movement towards eliminating regional imbalance with the Community.

(Applause)

While very specific problems affecting individual Member States may call for special attention, we must recognize our overriding objective — long since stated — to achieve a greater balance between the economies of all Member States through common action based on common instruments. We have had for some time now the Commission's guidelines in this area, and we have made progress in areas such as the European Monetary System. It is clear that we need now to reactivate movement on the important question of internal balance. I would be gratified to see the Parliament with its new role and authority, also giving this objective its closest and constant attention.

O'Kennedy

What are the main problems and the more important issues to which we must direct our attention in the next six months? (It is clear that in this address I cannot refer to all of the matters before the Council.) Apart from energy and the EMS, and the other issues I have already touched upon, I would attempt to list them as follows:

First, enlargement. Now that the Accession Treaty with Greece has been signed and arrangements are in hand for associating Greece with Community business, we shall be concerned to see meaningful progress in the negotiations with Portugal and Spain.

Where Spain is concerned, the Community is engaged in preparing common positions on customs union, fiscal questions and agriculture. It is planned to have a meeting at ministerial level in September, at which substantial issues will be discussed, and, in the period between that and a subsequent meeting at ministerial level in December, to make significant progress. I have already had very useful discussions towards this end with Commission Vice-President Natali and with the Spanish Minister responsible for the negotiations, Mr Calvo Sotelo.

In the case of Portugal, preliminary statements have been made in three policy areas — customs union, external relations and the Coal and Steel Community — and I shall remain in close contact with the Portuguese authorities with a view to advancing the negotiations.

It will be the Presidency's objective to give momentum to the negotiations and to ensure that the agreed schedule of negotiations is adhered to. There will, of course, also have to be active progress as regards the strengthening of the Community, both economically and in its institutions, as part of the preparation for enlargement and in order to ensure its success. If we are to have a strong Community of Twelve, then it goes without saying that this strengthening process of the existing Community must be given priority.

Second fisheries. The finalization of the Common Fisheries Policy has proved to be a difficult political issue and progress has been painfully slow. It may be that recent political changes have created a better climate, and there are some signs, I think, of a growing determination to reach a solution. The Presidency is hopeful of progress and will support the Commission's efforts to achieve a settlement.

In so far as the external fisheries régime is concerned, we will direct our efforts with the Commission towards securing agreement with a number of third countries on reciprocal or non-reciprocal fishing rights for 1980. We shall also endeavour to negotiate suitable fisheries agreements for Community access to the waters of certain developing countries. We will use every effort to make progress within the framework agreements with developed countries.

Third, the budget. The adoption of the 1980 Budget is a matter of great importance where the Council and the Parliament each has its responsibilities. The Presidency's aim is to be of assistance to both institutions in their common objective and to do everything possible to ensure that each institution's valid role is both recognized and discharged to the full with the object of concluding this important question. I have already had the honour to convey this personally to your distinguished President in conversations I had with her yesterday afternoon.

The problem of financing the Community when expenditure outstrips present resources is a matter on which there has been some preliminary discussion. The Commission is to present proposals for new 'own resources', we hope, very soon. It is the Presidency's intention to begin work on this vital question without delay. Certainly I would wish to see some real progress on this very complex question during the Irish Presidency.

We must also implement the European Council's guidelines regarding the coordination of Member States' budgetary policies for 1980, as a factor in encouraging growth and combating inflation.

With regard to the employment situation within the Community, I am sure that you, as parliamentarians, will agree with me that very few of us here today can fail to regard this as a matter of most pressing concern, and therefore, in the Presidency's approach to social affairs, questions of employment, especially youth employment, will be given particular attention. The issue of work-sharing, which has been the subject of a series of discussions at tripartite meetings and at Council level, will be further examined, with special emphasis on the regulation of overtime and the phasing of education and training for employment. There is an Irish proverb which says, 'Mol an óige agus tiocfaidh sí', which can be translated as 'Show respect for youth and they will respond'. Today we should jointly commit ourselves to show this respect in all our deliberations and policies. Their will be the task to surmount many of the problems I touch upon today: ours, at least, to launch them towards the summit of achievements. The Irish Presidency will also give special attention to improved arrangements for dialogue with the social partners, and at least one meeting of the standing Employment Committee is proposed. The ILO is holding a European Regional Conference in October, at which youth employment will be a major topic: the coordination of participation by EEC member countries in the Conference will be undertaken by the Irish Presidency. It is also hoped that progress will be made on various items arising from the Community's programme for the safety and health of workers, notably a draft directive on protection against toxic substances.

O'Kennedy

While recognizing the gravity of many of the problems we face, I might, before commenting on the situation in the field of agriculture, remark in passing how great a pleasure it was to see again on my way to Strasbourg the great natural wealth we in Europe have as a gift of nature. We must obviously bend our minds to the great problems of energy, unemployment and so on, but at this very time the harvests are ripening all around us. Indeed, this is a source of more than abstract pleasure and satisfaction; for despite the technology we can bring to bear on all our labours, the successful harvests upon which we depend have a major impact on the Community and its policies. The harvest is a great gift to us and is a potent and commonly-shared strand in our European civilization. We should not forget the vast regions of the world whose civilizations and progress have been so utterly rescinded by adverse climate and the almost insurmountable obstacles it can pose. Agriculture is a cornerstone of our civilization and of our Community of nations, where it is, in the Common Agricultural Policy, recognized as such.

(Applause)

A major question for the Community, the fixing of agricultural prices for the 1979/80 marketing year, was successfully concluded under the French Presidency. Other important questions in this sector are now ripe for settlement, and the Irish Presidency will seek to ensure that they are dealt with effectively. We wish to make progress in examining the Commission's proposals for revisions of the farm modernization, farm retirement and disadvantaged areas schemes, and we note and welcome the fact that the Council has committed itself to settling these matters during the Irish Presidency. The Presidency will make every effort to assist in achieving these objectives.

With regard to Community industrial policy, we all recognize, of course, the new realities of international competition. Our main restructuring policies now being formulated relate to the steel, shipbuilding and synthetic fibre sectors, and they may be presented to the Council early in our Presidency. A review of the steel anti-crisis measures is likely to require considerable attention in the Council in November and December. We shall also, of course, be dealing with ECSC budgetary problems and with import arrangements with third countries. In all these measures we are reacting to severe competition in major sectors from outside the Community. Rationalization in these sectors is necessary in order to cope with the difficulties, and we shall continue with the work in this field. In the long term, however, our interests would perhaps be best served by greater concentration on anticipatory action in industrial restructuring in this age of technology rather than, as is generally now the case, reaction in the teeth of the event.

The harmonization of legislation, including the removal of technical barriers to trade, is a manifesta-

tion of Community policy which to the public eye may seem to take rather unpredictable and bizarre directions at times and, indeed, receives a bad press in many of our Member States. However, there is, of course, a purpose in what is sometimes seen as harmonization for its own sake — the purpose being the freer flow of trade within the Common Market. Harmonization has the effect not only of establishing Community regulations for manufacturers, but also of providing a consistent standard of protection for the consumer throughout the Community. Some examples of the draft directives on which we hope to see progress and perhaps see adopted relate to such a variety of developments as safety devices on tractors, noise-levels for industrial and domestic equipment and consumer and industrial safety measures in the chemical and electrical sectors.

To turn to external relations, it is clear that this will be one of the major areas of Community activity during the next six months, and one in which this Parliament has a very important role to play in its own deliberations and in its friendly and constant contacts with other Parliaments. The greatly increased activity in this field is a development which is, of course, welcome to the Community as a measure of the recognition we are being given from abroad. We must acknowledge, however, that an adequate Community response to this wider recognition and to invitations to more extended partnership with external countries requires in turn a corresponding strengthening of the Community itself.

While this is important in all our external relations, it is particularly relevant in the context of our relations with developing countries. If we are to be able to provide a continuing and broadening response to their needs, we must ensure parallel internal Community development which can make such a response possible. Relations with the United States are of major importance to the Community, not only because of our economic interdependence but also because of our shared responsibilities. Our relations assume a particular importance in the current energy crisis. We shall be concerned to ensure that during our Presidency relations are maintained at all levels so that misunderstandings can be avoided — for example, in the finalization of the multilateral trade negotiations.

I have already spoken of the Community's relations with Japan and the attention we must pay to them.

The conclusion of a trade agreement between the Community and China was an event whose consequences will be far-reaching. At this very moment, the first meeting of the Joint Commission with China is in session in Peking, and the Chinese Head of State will be making his first visit to Western Europe before the end of this year.

O'Kennedy

As regards relations with Comecon, we trust that the difficulties which have delayed the negotiation of an agreement between that organization and the Community are coming to an end and that substantial progress can be made during our Presidency.

The Community's relations with the developing countries of the Third World have intensified very considerably in recent years. Both in terms of the Community's own development cooperation programme and of its involvement in the global dialogue on international cooperation for development, the Community has been in the forefront of efforts to establish a more just and equitable international economic order. It will be one of the objectives of the Irish Presidency to continue the promotion of close and harmonious relations with the developing countries, taking fully into account in particular their urgent need for economic and social development.

The evolving relationship between the Community and the developing world is a reflection on the increasing interdependence of the global economy. Our policies must therefore be aimed at giving tangible expression to this reality in an orderly and rational way. While the economic outlook at present is far from propitious, the Third World's demand for greater equity in their economic dealings with the developed world cannot be seriously disputed. In the case of the poorest developing countries there is a clear moral imperative to help to alleviate the conditions of absolute poverty in which such a large proportion of the world's population is, seemingly, hopelessly trapped.

(Applause)

It is against this background that I feel the Community must help to facilitate progress on a broad range of specific current issues while at the same time contributing to the formulation of new orientations and directions for the development process in the 1980s.

I am pleased to be able to report that we have recently concluded an intense series of meetings and negotiations between the Community and the 57 African, Caribbean and Pacific States for a successor agreement to the Lomé Convention. It is a great tribute to the former French Presidency that agreement was reached on a very broad range of negotiating issues. I was pleased to have been able to assist in the closing stages of the negotiations. Because of the intensity of the pace of negotiations over the past few months on such a broad range of highly technical issues, it is understandable that our ACP partners require some time to consider the overall outcome. I believe that we have negotiated a worthy successor to the Lomé Convention — an agreement that retains and consolidates the progressive features of the present Convention while, in its turn, introduces a number of new elements both in the light of the experience we have

gained and in response to the specific needs of our ACP partners. It is our hope that there will be a favourable decision on the part of the ACP States so that we may dispose of the necessary procedures and enable the new Convention to take effect on schedule.

The Community will devote special attention over the next six months to the further development of its multilateral and bilateral relations with other developing countries. In the case of Turkey, an associate of the Community, it will be our aim to consolidate and strengthen the association and to contribute as effectively as we can to international efforts for the improvement of the very difficult economic situation in that country. Negotiations for the conclusion of a cooperation agreement will also be pursued with Yugoslavia, as will trade negotiations with Rumania. In the case of existing cooperation agreements in the Southern Mediterranean framework, it will be our intention to proceed with the conclusion of the necessary adaptation protocols arising from the accession of Greece to the Community. Relations with ASEAN, to which I referred earlier, will be pursued with a view to putting the Community's partnership with this increasingly important regional association on a more formal and permanent footing. Particular attention will also be paid to the so-called non-associated developing countries, and I hope that the conciliation procedure which has been initiated on this issue will yield a satisfactory conclusion as expeditiously as possible.

I should now like to touch briefly on the process of political cooperation among the Member States of the Community. Although political cooperation is outside the strict Treaty framework and takes place in an inter-governmental context, in my view it adds an important political dimension to the Community's activities in the external field. Political cooperation now covers a wide range of topics and provides a useful and pragmatic means of extensive consultation among the Member States on key foreign-policy issues. Undoubtedly this process will continue to grow and develop. We should not forget, however, that there are constraints on the process of political cooperation as it now stands. The task of reconciling different national positions based on historical and current interests is not always an easy one. Yet I am convinced that, despite such constraints, it will become possible to extend progressively the number of policy areas on which the Member States will be able to speak with one voice and thus enhance the weight of Europe's presence in world affairs. In the course of the Irish Presidency I will seek to avail myself of any opportunities that may arise to achieve further progress on a practical and realistic basis.

During the second half of this year, the Nine will have to consider a number of very important political issues. First, the situation in the Middle East remains a cause for widespread international concern. Most

O'Kennedy

recently, on 18 June last, the Foreign Ministers of the Nine recalled the basic elements which, in our view, must be included in any peace settlement. The Nine will do all in their power to promote a comprehensive settlement, which can be the only true guarantee of a just and durable peace.

Second, the Nine will be following closely developments in Africa and will be concerned to encourage the emergence of conditions that will allow for stable political development in Southern Africa. Unless there is adequate progress towards the establishment of basic human rights in South Africa and independence and genuine majority rule in Namibia and Zimbabwe-Rhodesia, there will be the risk of continuing armed conflict with unpredictable consequence.

(Applause)

Third, the problem of Indo-Chinese refugees will continue to be a matter both of humanitarian and political concern to the international Community. Tomorrow I shall present the viewpoint of the Nine at the important meeting which will take place in Geneva under the auspices of the United Nations.

Fourth, a wide range of political, economic and human-rights issues will arise at the 34th Session of the United Nations General Assembly later this year. The Nine will endeavour to seek a common position on these issues. The ability of the Nine to coordinate successfully on such issues is an important factor in increasing the influence and weight of the European Community in world affairs.

Fifth, *détente*, economic cooperation and humanitarian questions will be considered in the continuing preparations among the Nine for the next follow-up meeting to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), which is due to be held in Madrid next year. Intensive consultations in regard to the CSCE process, in all its aspects, remain a prominent area of active political cooperation and are characterized by a close identity of interest and common perceptions of the Member States of the Community. The Nine are determined to ensure that the principles enunciated in the Helsinki Final Act will be respected and that its programme of cooperation will be implemented fully. They hope to see the Madrid meeting give a fresh impulse to the CSCE process and thereby maintain the vitality and relevance of the Final Act.

These are some of the main issues which will continue to be the subject of political consultations among the Nine. Other issues also will undoubtedly arise as political cooperation strives to keep pace with changing developments and realities.

I would also like to mention here that I expect that during our Presidency the Nine Agreement on the Suppression of Terrorism will be opened for signature in Dublin.

Over the next six months, as new developments in political cooperation occur, I hope to report fully on

progress among the Nine at each of your part-sessions. I look forward to the opportunities that will arise for a dialogue with you during your debates, during replies to your questions and, in particular, on the occasion of the two colloquies with the members of your Political Affairs Committee, which I shall have the pleasure of welcoming to Dublin during the Irish Presidency.

Before concluding, let me say that we are looking forward with the greatest interest to receiving the report of the Three Wise Men on the functioning of the Community institutions in the context of enlargement. Their report is due in October and will be considered by the European Council at the end of November. I am sure we can rely on three such eminent personalities to produce proposals which will be at the same time imaginative and practical. The Presidency will do everything possible to expedite consideration of their report and agreement on its implementation.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as I have said, each of you here represents strands of interest and concern from our individual Member States. Your obligation in the European Parliament, and mine in the Council of Ministers, is to reconcile national, regional and political interests. Our overall purpose is the Community's gradual — but, I hope, inexorable — progress towards European union. It follows naturally that it is incumbent upon us in our respective institutions to harmonize our roles in order to contribute effectively — and to be seen clearly to do so — to that greater purpose. It is with single-minded purpose that at this vital, inceptive stage in relations between our two institutions, I declare my intention to cooperate most firmly and fully in the establishment of real dialogue, both formal and informal, between us. We have set a great common objective. Let us now marshal our collective energies toward that objective.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your attention and your patience.

(Loud applause)

President. — I call Mr Jenkins.

Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission. — Madam President, I rise, as in the past has been customary, to supplement from the Commission point of view the report which the President-in-Office of the Council has given.

No doubt, with this new Parliament, some of the customs of the past will be in the melting pot, and some new ones will quickly evolve. In general I welcome this atmosphere of change, though I venture to express the opinion that what will emerge will be a framework for the conduct of the business of this Parliament in an atmosphere of order and not disorder.

(Applause)

Jenkins

But I believe that one of the customs of the past which has advantages is this dual report. The Commission, with its more continuing role than the six-monthly coming and going of the Presidency of the Council, attaches great importance to its interlocutory relationship with the Parliament and looks for stimulus from this interchange. It may sometimes, indeed often, have a different point of view from the Ministers, whether assembled as Heads of Government in the European Council, or in the more traditional Council of Ministers. It is in no way the servant or the secretariat of such gatherings. It has its own distinct responsibilities and obligations, and its own special relationship with Parliament.

(Applause)

Furthermore, on this occasion it is possible for me to supplement a report on the Strasbourg Council with a report on the Economic Summit in Tokyo, where I, together with the previous President of the Council, represented the Community as a whole, including the five Member States who were not individually there present. And on this occasion there was a particularly intimate relationship between the Economic Council at Strasbourg and the Economic Summit in Tokyo. The Community position was prepared immediately before the Tokyo Summit, which gave us much greater cohesion and strength in working with our other Western partners than would otherwise have been the case. I would also like, briefly, Madam President, as this arises naturally out of the themes of these two meetings, to cast a brief glance ahead to the major and menacing challenges facing the Community during the term of this Parliament and beyond.

The energy problem was central to Strasbourg and wholly dominant at Tokyo. This was natural. There was little doubt in the minds of any of the participants at either gathering that the energy problem, if mishandled, could not merely damage our economies, but bring them into a state of dislocation verging upon collapse within the course of the next decade. 1973 was the warning attack. When the attack receded, although with some consequences remaining we did not greatly heed the warning. We continued to go on much as before. If we react to the second warning in the same complacent way, we are unlikely to have a third chance or any further period of respite.

No action on our part can avoid the fact that through recent price increases we have already suffered a substantial transfer of real resources away from us, that our incomes have been reduced, and that growth, the containment of inflation and the reduction of unemployment have been made more difficult. The question is whether, by our action or perhaps more likely our lack of action, we add to this now unavoidable blow additional, self-inflicted and still avoidable wounds. None of the participant countries at Tokyo is immune from this threat, not temporarily oil-rich

Britain within our Community, nor the great natural resource countries of the United States and Canada outside it. Even if they could solve their own supply problems alone, what chance would they have of surviving as prosperous trading islands in a sea of industrial confusion and penury? Furthermore, we should not forget that such transfers of resources, such constraints upon economies, while menacing for the richer parts of the world, can mean virtual strangulation for the poorest economies of the Third World. Some are already spending nearly the whole of their total export earnings on oil imports. As Mr O'Kennedy has rightly said, this is preeminently a problem of mutual dependence.

Against this background, Madam President, what should be our appraisal of Strasbourg and Tokyo? First, the achievement at Strasbourg of a firm Community commitment to a medium-term goal was the springboard which enabled the other Tokyo participants to arrive at firm parallel commitments. It was a striking indication of how much we can achieve through solidarity and a prior common position. In particular, our position was of major significance in persuading the United States to adopt specific commitments for 1980 and 1985. Since then President Carter has carried forward and widened the commitments of the United States in a fashion which we must welcome and applaud. We wish his programme all possible success.

Second, while what has been worked out at Strasbourg and Tokyo is the first concerted response to the new energy crisis, our words have still to be turned into actions. The objectives we have set must be maintained and our progress towards them rigorously monitored. At Tokyo we created a mechanism, in which the Commission will participate, to review progress on a regular basis. It is essential that this mechanism be made to work.

Third, what was agreed at Tokyo in no way prejudices the position of the five Community countries not individually represented. They, of course, had all accepted the overall Strasbourg target of ensuring that oil imports from third countries do not exceed 470 million tonnes — the 1978 figures — up to and through 1985, and they are not committed beyond that. The next step will be for the four Community participants at Tokyo to recommend to their five partners that they undertake national commitments — as the four have done — within the overall Strasbourg total, and that agreement on this should be sought not later than at the Dublin European Council at the end of November. I would not expect great difficulties; we have always had a fairly clear idea of individual country targets within the Strasbourg framework.

But, Madam President, the test for the Community and for the Western world as a whole will be our ability over a limited time-span to break the link

Jenkins

between economic growth and the consumption of oil. This is not an inherent or pre-ordained link. It has existed only for about 25 years or so — little more than a tenth of the period since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. But the sundering of this link is essential. Those countries or groups of countries which fail to do so will find themselves dinosaurs of the industrial world of the 1990s.

The penalties of failure can themselves be a stimulus; all will depend on our capacity to respond. That response cannot be made by governments alone. Throughout society and at every level we have to create a greater sense of joint responsibility, a greater willingness to share sacrifices and to take decisions together. This will require much wider understanding of the issues which face us, of the fragility of our economies and of the vulnerability of our society as a whole. In no way are we more vulnerable than in the failure which present levels of unemployment represent, above all for the younger generation, on whom, as Mr O'Kennedy said, responsibility for our future, the future of our society, will rest.

Over most of the troubled decade of the seventies we have sought — so far without success — a dynamic impulse to replace that which was given to our economies in the fifties and sixties, first by the needs of post-war reconstruction and then by the spread of what had previously been thought of as privileged, middle-class standards of living to the mass of our populations. We have not recaptured that during the last 5 years. The investment demands of energy conservation and of a massive exploitation of alternative and renewable sources of energy could greatly contribute to such an impulse. It could be a stimulus comparable with the onset of the railway age in the middle of the nineteenth century. It could enable us to find the elusive key to higher investment and lower unemployment.

But we cannot find this impulse only in the old industrial countries. Already the Community, more than the other major trading blocks in the developed world, depends on its trade with the third world. The recovery of our own economies cannot be dissociated from the development of the poorer countries, and the growth in world wide demand, both now put at risk by the increase in oil prices. Rarely have events so clearly demonstrated the essential interdependence of the modern world.

At the European Council in Strasbourg, we also had a first look at the prospects for the Community in the world up to 1990. This was on the basis of a Commission paper which we had been requested to provide and to which the European Council will, I hope, return at the end of November.

In this paper we identified a number of important trends and dangers for the Community in the world.

First, demographic. The enlarged Community's share — i.e. of the Community looking forward to 12 members — of world population is likely to fall from around 7½ to 5 % by the end of the century. But it will do this unevenly. Until 1985 about a million more young people will each year seek to enter the Community's labour market than there will, in the normal way, be old people leaving it. These numbers coming in will be particularly high in the poorer regions of the Community, and even more so in those countries seeking entry. In these regions and countries the growth of the labour force may indeed continue after 1985. But in the Community generally the year 1985 will mark a sharp change of trend in all likely predictions. Thereafter we will be faced with an ageing population, and a stabilization and then diminution of the work force available to sustain the dynamism of our economies and to support this ageing population.

These population trends, with their geographical distribution, and their sharp mid-period change of direction, increase the complexities of dealing with our unemployment problems. In the early years at least the difficulties of providing employment for all those seeking it will certainly not be diminished. But in the later years we would find ourselves with a labour force which could be inadequate in relation to the total population whose standard of living it has to sustain. The present weakness of the labour market naturally encourages demands for shorter working periods, whether over the week, the year or the lifetime, and these can be approached with understanding and sympathy. But at the same time they must be seen in the context of the peculiar problem posed by the change of pattern in 1985.

It is also likely that, even on reasonably favourable assumptions, the Community's share of world trade will shrink over ten years from about 20 % to around 15 %. This is in sharp contrast with our achievement over the past two decades, and has major implications for Community industry and for our influence on world trade policy.

How should we approach this prospect? First, it is imperative for the Community to develop more specialization within the areas on which employment within our economies is still heavily dependent. Second, we must face up to the need to be competitive through improved productivity, continuous adaptation to market requirements, and constant modernization of industrial plant. Third, we shall need more effectively to deploy the strength we have through our common commercial policies in the Community if we are to exercise the weight we should in the world trading system.

I wish also, Madam President, to draw particular attention to the silent revolution in our affairs represented

Jenkins

by the advance of high technology into our daily lives. It is often said that we have no option but to accommodate ourselves to this revolution. I go further. We have to master it. Already it dominates a whole range of industries and services, computers, communications, vehicles, banking and finance, machine-tools and engineering and precision instruments. At the moment — we should be in no doubt about this — our major competitors in Japan and the United States are ahead of us, and their lead is increasing. This represents a challenge to the Community as a whole which has not yet been fully recognized. If we do not meet it, I see a real risk that in the next decade we shall find ourselves squeezed between our more successful and adventurous competitors on the one hand and, on the other, developing countries which have acquired the skills and equipment which still generate much of the wealth and employment within the existing Community.

The Commission therefore believes that it is urgent that we work out a Community strategy for advanced industrial technology. Its cost and range are of an order beyond the capacity of any one of our Member States to undertake on its own. Separate national markets, separate national procurement policies and duplicated research programmes are simply not good enough. Hence we believe that we should elaborate a Community-wide research and development programme based on a common procurement policy and an open European market for electronic goods and services based on common standards. Obviously we must examine the social consequences and find means of avoiding the dislocation which is already becoming apparent in some areas. This is not the time to pursue these ideas in detail; but you may be sure that this House will hear about them from us and will be invited to contribute to what I believe is an indispensable and urgent enterprise if the Community is to remain among the leaders of the industrial world in the next century.

This combination of developments — change in energy, change in demography, change in trade patterns and change in technology — presents a formidable challenge to the Community and its institutions. Our ability to meet it depends critically on our ability to resolve some of the internal problems which have faced us for too long. Here I make two points.

First, we know that, as a result of the Council's recent decisions, the cost of the Common Agricultural Policy will continue to increase at an alarming and, in the Commission's view, an unacceptable rate.

(Applause)

It is now quite probable that next year will be the last in which the Community's own resources in their existing form will suffice to cover the budget in which agriculture counts for such a large and dominating part. This state of affairs calls for the most serious

attention if we are to avoid a major crisis affecting the long-term future of the common agricultural policy.

Second, we must ensure that the budgetary system, in its effects on the situation of individual Member States, is fair. At the request of the European Council, the Commission has embarked upon an objective study of the budgetary situation, taking into account the economic, financial and social effects of each Member State's participation in the Community. After the Council of Economic and Finance Ministers has been seized of our study, the Commission will bring forward proposals for dealing with the problem. This will be in time for the European Council in Dublin to be able to take the necessary decisions.

The Community, Madam President, has already achieved much for its citizens over the past twenty years. We have shown ourselves capable of evolving and developing within a common institutional framework. We face major problems today. But we should certainly not be overcome by a sense of immobile depression. 1979 after all is the year in which we have put in place the new European Monetary System, which was a considerable achievement and can be a great platform of advance for the future; the year in which we completed the negotiations with a view to welcoming one new Member into the Community and got down to the negotiations with Spain and Portugal; the year when we have brought to a conclusion major trade negotiations in GATT and with the ACP countries; the year above all when direct elections brought a new and powerful democratic impetus to our Community framework. Whatever else it is, this is not the picture of a stagnant or static Europe. It is the Commission's task to identify what can be done and what should and can be done as a Community for the Community. In that task we look forward to the encouragement and the spur of this House in what I believe will be a partnership based on shared ideals and common objectives.

(Prolonged applause)

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

Mr Brandt. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as a German Social Democrat speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group, I must admit to a mixed feeling of anger and humility at this moment. I shall try to cast aside the feeling of anger, because when I leave the artificial atmosphere of this Chamber and emerge into the fresh air of Strasbourg, I feel more strongly than ever before that this is where the heart of Europe is beating. This city is living testimony to the reconciliation and the subsequent friendship that has been forged between the German and French peoples, and which has brought progress to the whole of Europe, and not just to our two peoples. This, indeed, is the heart of our beloved, battered and resurrected Europe, whose future is now once again under

Brandt

threat. Europe belongs to every one of us, and we are all entrusted with its Christian, humanist and socialist heritage. There are things we must tackle together for this, our Europe, and I hope that, once we have got over these first teething troubles, we shall manage to get together to reach sensible decisions with relatively broad support in this House in more than one field.

Madam President, we have just heard from the representatives of two of the Community institutions; the representatives of a third institution now have the floor, and I realize of course that there are other institutions beside these. During the first direct elections and in the immediate post-election phase, we heard frequent complaints — and I must admit I had some sympathy with these views — to the effect that the broad masses of the peoples of Europe, and particularly the young people of Europe, felt the Community institutions to be remote from their everyday lives. Most of them knew very little about the old European Parliament, and those who did not have a very high opinion of it. Let us not delude ourselves into thinking that most people have any real idea of the future work and the potential of the new, directly-elected Parliament. We — and I do not mean simply the few who were out to throw down a challenge to the rest of us — have proved incapable of getting this Parliament off to a good start in the eyes of the people of Europe ...

(Applause)

... we shall get nowhere by relying on institutionalized impotence ...

(Mixed reactions)

... and it is something we cannot expect the people of Europe to put up with. A great deal of harm has already been done, and now it is left to the Socialists' spokesman in Europe to use his speaking time of 38 minutes — after 270 minutes of what amounted to nothing more than procedural wrangling, and after listening to one and a quarter hours' worth of statements — to make a few remarks, as it were, on the side. Some of us are used to rather different procedures in our national parliaments. Let me thank you, incidentally, for the statements we have just heard. But let us not forget that the people of Europe have sent us here and have given us a great chance and, at the same time, a great deal of responsibility. I can sympathize with those who wondered whether a directly elected Parliament might not perhaps be premature. On the other hand, I think there are also grounds for wondering whether these direct elections did not in fact take place too late in the day ...

(Applause)

... The answer posterity gives to these questions will depend on the quality of our work. In other words, as we heard yesterday, we must be clear in our own minds as to what role Parliament should play. We must not simply go on just as before, this House must

become a forum for serious discussion. In other words, we must make this House a forum which will attract the interest of the broad masses of our peoples, particularly the younger generation. And let me say, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, that in my opinion our committees should not make exaggerated or indiscriminate use of the instrument of public hearings ...

(Applause)

... because the judicious use of hearings could mobilize a lot of informed opinion and attract the attention of the media and public opinion on a broad front by clearly stating what problems Europe and its citizens will be confronted with in times to come.

Let me give you one example of what I mean. The next Helsinki follow-up conference on security and cooperation in Europe is due to take place in Madrid in the autumn of next year. Our countries will be taking part in this conference on an individual and an inter-governmental basis, and the European Community as such will also be involved. I think it would be worth the Political Committee's while holding a hearing this autumn to see what kind of specific cooperation is possible at present and what chances exist for such cooperation in the future, so that we at least get a bit further than we managed in Belgrade the year before last. This is not just something for diplomats — it is precisely the kind of thing that we, as elected representatives, should be doing.

(Loud applause)

If there is some substance to our work, if it serves to reinforce European consciousness and if we come up with forward-looking solutions to the problems affecting our peoples, the Council and the Commission will have no option but to take Parliament more seriously than hitherto, and to accept a sensible balance between the institutions in the coming years. And so that there is no misunderstanding on this point, let me say that this development must come about solely on the basis of the Treaties.

Let me add too that there are enough different opinions represented in this House without artificially cultivating more of them. I am very much against opinion in this House becoming unnecessarily polarized, with the result that we burn up all our energy without achieving anything other than to debase the institution as such. No Member of this House has a sole claim to the principles of liberty, and the same goes for nations. No one would wish to deprive my former and — thanks to a quirk of fate — new colleague Michel Debré of his pride in everything French. Indeed, who would dare to make the attempt? But the rest of us all have our sense of national consciousness and our personal and cultural roots, even those of us from such a difficult homeland as Germany.

(Applause)

Brandt

We have the great French Socialist Jean Jaurès to thank for the fine symbol of the flowers, each standing for one of the peoples of Europe, which together could form an attractive European bouquet, or 'Strauss', as the German has it, and I hope this will not give rise to any inappropriate analogies . . .

(Laughter)

. . . not even with the other kind of 'Strauss' — the ostrich with its head in the sand.

Let us please not forget that we are becoming increasingly concerned with the Europe of the regions. The Community must, in the opinion of my Group, do more for the weak regions . . .

(Loud applause)

. . . so as to create a better regional balance. And let me add that the Community must also be alive to people's non-economic hopes and aspirations.

I should like to pick out three questions which cannot be answered today, but which should receive our attention in the future. There is the economic aspect referred to by the President of the Commission, the political — I would say security — aspect alluded to by the Council representative, and thirdly, let me put to you the following question: What — if anything — do we have to say to the young people of Europe? On the first question, dealing with the economic and social aspects, let me say that the reports on the Strasbourg and Tokyo Summits were interesting. I thought Roy Jenkins's reference to breaking the link between oil and what I would call humane growth constructive, and I was impressed by his brief reference to the chances of using the changed energy situation as a stimulus for renewed progress in Europe. This is something that is worth thinking and talking about, so that we can make an energetic and thoughtful contribution toward formulating a European energy policy worthy of the name. What the gentlemen from the Council and the Commission have so far achieved in this field hardly merits a pass mark.

(Applause)

What we need then is an energy policy which will enable our economies to continue to grow — as they must do — and which will take account of other factors like security — the protection of the natural environment and, last but not least, job conservation. I think that after the summer break, and after thorough preparation within the various committees and political groups, we should have a full-scale debate on energy policy, rather than a discussion based on the reports from the other two institutions. It would be a good idea, though, if we could base our discussions on one of those anticipatory reports that Mr Jenkins referred to in his speech on Wednesday.

Let me say first of all that, in the opinion of the Social Democrats, of the democratic Socialists — and probably other people share this opinion — we must give

serious thought to how, in this period of radical change, we can protect the existing social security systems and extend and harmonize them wherever possible. I think it is worthwhile dusting off the outlines of a social union proposed seven years ago, in October 1972, under the chairmanship of President Pompidou . . .

(Applause)

. . . Of course we cannot simply take the matter up again as if nothing had happened in the meantime. The whole thing will have to be adapted to take account of what has happened in the intervening seven years.

While I am on this point, I should like to draw your attention to the final resolution passed by the recent Third Congress of the European Confederation of Free Trade Unions in Munich, copies of which were sent to all Members of this House. A number of important proposals were put forward in this resolution, and I hope that these ideas will meet with a favourable response not only from my own Group. The same goes, ladies and gentlemen, for the absolutely essential task of introducing genuine and lasting democracy into the giant industrial companies and, particularly, the multinationals.

(Applause)

My Group feels that we have a special duty towards women, not only because they form the majority of the European electorate, but also because in their families and in their jobs — or vice versa — they are the principal victims of all these crises and upheavals which will still be with us for some time to come. Quite apart from what was said earlier today in another context, my Group is in favour of creating an ad hoc committee to produce a report on the current situation with regard to women's rights and on proposals designed to expedite the attainment of *de facto* — as opposed to *de jure* — equality . . .

(Applause)

. . . The Chairman of our Group will be putting these proposals to this House, and we hope, ladies and gentlemen, that you will give them your support on every possible occasion.

Moving on to the second major area I referred to, the question we have to ask ourselves is: What is the political status of Europe? The Council's report referred to this question — rather stiffly, I thought, but I know from my own period in government office how that kind of thing comes about. If fully sympathize with the Council, but should this prevent us from speaking our mind freely? So what is the political status of Europe and what about the security of Europe? I should just like to point out that we should not cast our gaze simply on the Community and the imminent membership of Greece, Spain and Portugal. We must also devote some of our attention to improving

Brandt

cooperation with the neighbouring states and — however difficult this may be — to continuing the policy of détente between East and West in this part of the world ...

(Loud applause)

We can do without any new rifts in our economic relations with Northern Europe, including Finland, or with Austria or Switzerland, and we must take steps to formulate a constructive treaty with Yugoslavia. But the representatives of the Council must first of all give the Commission an improved mandate for action so that we can do everything in our power to overcome the current stagnation in the negotiations between the European Community and Comecon, although of course, many of the problems are no fault of ours.

Europe also has a vital political interest in participating in the supervision and — in a subsequent phase — in the limitation and reduction of armaments. We are all acquainted with the figures — over \$ 1 000 million a day, including this very 19 July 1979. I do not think I am going too far in saying that the world is quite capable of arming itself to death by the end of the century.

(Loud applause)

This can easily happen if we — together with the two super-powers — cannot reconcile our treaty obligations with our own view of ourselves as mature Europeans, and if we do not make a major effort to put an end to the senseless race to equip ourselves with the lunatic means of self-destruction. I already referred briefly to the conference that will take place in Madrid next year. While I am on this point, I should just like to point out to you that here in my Group, just a few rows away from me, I see my colleague, Jiri Pelikan from Czechoslovakia ...

(Loud applause)

... who has been sent here as a Member of this House as a citizen of Italy by the Italian voters. This is another aspect of European reality, and I think I have more than a moral duty to take this opportunity on behalf of my colleagues to send our fraternal greetings to those men and women in Prague — and elsewhere — who are forced to suffer because they — like us — are concerned about such things as peace, freedom of opinion and coexistence in Europe.

(Loud applause)

My third question was: How can we fulfil the expectations held by the young people of Europe? Madam President, many sections of the younger generation are going through a shift in consciousness, characterized by a changed world around them and by widespread insecurity and dissatisfaction, and caused by what many feel to be an over-powerful governmental apparatus and a ubiquitous bureaucracy which often tends to talk down to people.

To counteract this trend, we must show our young people that there are ways and means of achieving a

larger measure of responsibility and co-determination, ways which will lead us to make humane progress and which will lead us away from the false idols of uncontrolled economic or bureaucratic growth.

(Applause)

We should lend a serious ear to those who feel that our planet may not survive a continuation of the present rate of industrial development. The point at issue here is much more than environmental protection, however important this may be. It is also much more important than making prudent use of our natural resources. We shall have to rethink our attitudes to the form our industrialized societies should take. We shall have to rethink the course to be followed by the countries of the Third World, and, above all, we shall have to give much more thought than we have done so far to how we can establish genuine solidarity between the peoples of the world. And in so doing, we Socialists, we Social Democrats shall have to be just as much on our guard against nebulous idealism as against rigidly established thought patterns.

The point at issue is not so much mutual dependence as mutual interest, in both senses of the word. Our own jobs, and those of our children and our children's children, depend on the pace of developments in other parts of the world, and this is something on which peace itself also depends. I am not the only person here who, twice in his life, has experienced at first hand how war gives way to hunger. I hope we can help to spare the younger generation the experience of how the million-fold hunger in the world can give way to war and chaos.

(Loud applause)

And finally, ladies and gentlemen I think — and I hope this will not be taken as inappropriate criticism of what has just been said — that to speak of a crisis is to play the situation down. By referring to a 'crisis', we may be deluding ourselves in to thinking that everything will soon be back on an even keel. What we are confronted with now is more like an upheaval than a crisis. This upheaval involves the collapse of outdated doctrines, economic mechanisms and the international currency system, accompanied by the struggle for a new international political order, an energy crisis — which is far more than it appears at first sight — enormous challenges to our very civilization, and still more.

There is one comforting thought in the face of all this, and one thought from which we can derive fresh courage. The people of this world are growing closer together. I think one can feel everywhere in this House how the South-East Asian refugee tragedy and the thousands of deaths in Nicaragua before a new political order emerges are really felt by the people

Brandt

here in Europe. I hope that this House will in future not content itself with passing lame resolutions, but will be more cautious in what it says and will then examine conscientiously how we can use our admittedly limited resources to match fine words with action.

We would draw your attention to the European Community Charter of Human Rights, which the previous European Parliament decided to formulate at the instigation of the Socialist Group. I cannot go along with everything the old Parliament did, but I certainly can in this case.

I said just now that there is one thing from which we can derive courage, and that is the younger generation's Europe, which has been growing up quietly but steadily. During the months the doctors kept me out of the political arena, I was able to witness for myself in what a gratifying way friendship has grown within Europe, particularly between Germany and France.

What my colleagues and I have to say to the younger generation is that they should continue to take their courage in their own hands, exploring new paths and not being fobbed off with backward-looking remedies. What we are out to achieve is — in the words of that resourceful, unforgettable Labour politician, Aneurin Bevan — 'a society with freedom from fear, with hope and reasonable chances for the young generation'. The young generation is looking to us for a lead.

(Loud applause)

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

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by thanking the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission for their reports, which form the basis for this discussion. Those people who voted for the Christian-Democratic politicians in the European People's Party both support and demand the further political development of this Community. Of course, we do not want to get bogged down in a sterile battle of outdated dogmas, ideologies and semantics. We now stand at the crossroads in terms of the development of the Community. Today's challenges cannot be met with yesterday's ideas, methods and systems. The only way we can meet these challenges — which are common to all Europeans regardless of national frontiers — is by acting as a true community, in the widest political sense of the word. This was the intention of all our supporters in voting as they did. They have given us an extremely difficult mandate, but we are determined to turn this moral, democratic and political potential into reality. We have a golden opportunity to make real progress, but on the other hand, there are great problems still to be overcome. This is something of which we are fully aware.

These problems undoubtedly stem from the limited nature of the formal powers we have had so far and in the resistance to any attempt to extend these powers. The resistance comes, on the one hand, from central government bureaucrats trying to hold on to their existing powers, even when those national powers can clearly no longer cope with the outstanding economic and social problems. On the other hand, some of the resistance comes from the fact that not all voters and parties have yet realized that only the European Community can solve the basic problems confronting our peoples. What we must do is stand back a little, so that we can see where national parliaments can no longer cope with the pressing problems of our age. We can manoeuvre unencumbered by the historical traditions which, in many of our Member States, have degraded parliamentarism to nothing more than futile political shadow-boxing. We do, however, realize that close cooperation between this House and the national parliaments may be of decisive importance in helping us to solve our problems. The hopes of large sections of the population who are prepared to think in a European dimension are pinned on the Christian-Democratic parties and the Members of the European People's Party. We intend to give political expression to these expectations in close cooperation with all the committed democrats and Europeans in the other political groups. We hope thus to work towards a European constitution, not by means of some kind of legal *tour de force*, nor by means of empty, pompous phrases, nor even by sterile hair-splitting, but simply on the strength of the political will of our peoples, who voted for us as their legitimate representatives within the Community on 10 June 1979 ...

(Applause)

... In these new political circumstances, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, a programme of action covering six months — however sincere it may be — can of course be no more than a short-term measure. In such a short period of time, we cannot possibly do justice to the great challenges facing us today, chief among them being the problem of energy.

Mr President-in-Office of the Council, you told us that the European Heads of State and Government meeting here in Strasbourg were fully aware of the gravity of the situation facing the Community caused by the uncertainty of world-wide energy supplies. The European Council, you said, had recognized the need for a world-wide energy strategy and was determined to make a contribution to such a strategy. This is the kind of thing we have heard before here in this House. Ever since 1974, the European Council has regularly been coming out with declarations of intent. Unfortunately, the fine words have not been backed up by action on a genuinely Community scale designed to facilitate a global solution ...

(Applause)

Klepsch

... We still have no real Community energy policy. Even the Community resolve expressed in June of this year in Strasbourg to regard indigenous oil and coal as common Community resources did not survive the World Economic Summit in Tokyo, at least not in the form originally intended.

Mr President-in-Office of the Council, it is high time we saw some concrete action to back up the many declarations of intent, including the most recent ones from Strasbourg and Tokyo.

(Applause)

... The same goes for President Carter's statement of last Sunday. It is crystal clear what line the Community should be following. The citizens of the Community must, as a matter of course, use energy sparingly. But savings alone will not be enough. The development of alternative energy sources is still too slow to meet our needs, and it must be given a decisive boost. As far as the nuclear energy option — currently our most important alternative energy source — is concerned, we must state quite clearly and categorically that the development of nuclear energy must take full account of all safety and ecological factors. Recent experience calls for a thorough re-assessment, but on the other hand, we cannot simply ignore the clear option we have before us. We must work out a uniform policy on energy for all the Member States in terms of the European Community's foreign policy relations with the OECD and the countries involved in the North-South Dialogue. Internal solidarity and external unanimity is the only way in which the Nine can ever hope to solve its energy problem. What we do today, or what we fail to do today, will have a decisive effect on the situation in 1990, the turn of the century and beyond. That is why it is now high time we had a genuine Community energy policy.

Despite the present slight fall in the number of people out of work, unemployment in the Community remains a source of concern. Inflationary trends have been given a boost by the price increases in the energy sector. Social and economic problems, which must be solved before we can ever return to a policy of full employment, have so far always been tackled in terms of national social and economic policy, but these problems too are increasingly taking on a European dimension. This year there are one and a half million young people looking for a job — more than there are jobs becoming vacant by older people retiring. The social and moral consequences of the failure of a large proportion of school-leavers to find a job are a great cause for concern. These young people are bound to feel superfluous in our society. We believe that work is an important element in personality development, and my Group regards it as one of its prime tasks to help in overcoming this economic

and social crisis and creating a free and socially responsible economic and social order in the future. Our criterion in carrying out this work will be the maintenance of stability and progress in a free and democratic Europe. We must, of course, take account of worldwide changes and not try to hold on to structures which have outlived their usefulness. This is not only economically sensible, but also reflects the obligations on the Community as a result of its expressed willingness to accept changes. We aim to unleash and make use of every individual's regenerative powers rather than to stand at the helm of a drifting ship ...

(Applause)

... It is our experience that the current crisis cannot be tackled by any single Member State on its own. We must draw the right conclusions from this national impotence. But without the political determination to seek genuine Community solutions, we shall never get the better of the problems of unemployment, inflation and economic growth.

The European Monetary System can make a decisive contribution to this process. In the course of the second half of the year, we shall be carrying out a first stocktaking of this system and we shall assess how efficiently it is functioning in the light of experience gained so far. We hope that — as has already been mentioned today — the next few months will see the right conditions being created for the entry of the United Kingdom into the European Monetary System. We must, however, insist more forcefully on the inclusion of elements of economic policy, so that we can attain a greater degree of convergence of economic development within the Community. These elements include the necessary back-up measures, which my Group regards as an essential component of any such policy. What we need is more individual and collective solidarity, because freedom can only really come about where solidarity already exists. That is the basic thought behind regional policy, social policy and the achievement of Economic and Monetary Union.

The President-in-Office of the Council has allotted this House a special rôle in this respect, and judging by recent experience, I am sure that he was right in doing so. This call for solidarity will become all the more imperative with the accession of three new and economically weaker Member States. Let me say here that my Group thinks that this House should be properly involved in the process of ratifying the treaties of accession — starting with Greece ...

(Applause)

... Indeed, we feel that this House should have a greater say in all the international treaties concluded by the Community ...

(Applause)

Klepsch

... Both yesterday and today, we have heard repeated references to the Community's role in the world and its responsibility beyond its own frontiers. Mr President-in-Office of the Council, you told us that you would be intensifying the dialogue between the Council and Parliament in the next six months, particularly in the sphere of political cooperation, so as to establish as much contact as possible between our two institutions. We are grateful to you for your efforts. We need a strong and unified Europe, not only to safeguard our own independence and freedom and to advance our own legitimate interests throughout the world, but also to enable us to fight the good fight for freedom and liberty, solidarity and justice, and to fight it successfully ...

(Applause)

... These principles must apply equally to the countries of the Third World. It is for this reason, for instance, that we think it right to initiate an agricultural development plan for the poorest countries, because this is after all one of their most pressing problems. We recognize that political cooperation on a European basis has enabled us to make remarkable progress, but in the long term, coordination alone is not enough, because coordination can always go wrong and lead to failure. And, in solving our future problems, failure is something we must seek to eradicate. We can only do so by advancing step-by-step beyond the simple coordination of activities to a genuinely outward-looking Community policy. This is a basic tenet, going far beyond the narrow field of European political cooperation.

These are some of the great tasks, the great challenges, with which we are now faced. As I said before, the individual countries alone can no longer meet these challenges — either from within or from the outside — not even within the framework of a simple customs or economic union without any political foundation. For this reason we need to make further progress towards political unification. We need to make a breakthrough on the road to European Union ...

(Applause)

And we must make a new, determined attempt to achieve this breakthrough. As Mr Brandt said just now, the Heads of State and Government recognized the need for such a breakthrough — albeit in a different field — as long ago as 1972, and reiterated their view after receiving Mr Leo Tindemans's report on European Union. But they were victims of their own indecisiveness. Indeed, they did not even manage to give any external sign of Community solidarity, by which I mean the kind of psychological measures which have been mooted again and again, such as the creation of a European passport, which should have been in universal use from 1 January 1978, and about which we now hear nothing.

Mr President-in-Office of the Council, we would advise you not to underestimate things like this, and we appeal to you to break the bureaucratic deadlock and deliver the goods our peoples have so often been promised.

(Applause)

Leo Tindemans referred yesterday to the psychological effect of things like European Summertime or a European driving licence. These are all things which would cost very little, but which would show the peoples of Europe that the common element in their lives is growing all the time. We must, however, go beyond purely psychological achievements and get to the central point, which is the need for a new, determined attempt to achieve European Union. Leo Tindemans has shown us the path to follow, which is still the one agreed upon in principle by the Heads of State and Government. We want the Heads of State and Government to get to grips with this question again, and to this end, we need direct relations between the European Council and the European Parliament. The need is all the more pressing, the more subjects and decisions are removed to the level of Heads of Government and thus out of this House's control.

We want to involve the European Council in the positive and dynamic efforts the European Parliament must and will develop, and we expect the President of the Council to come and answer questions in this House after every meeting of the European Council.

(Applause)

Mr President-in-Office of the Council, we know that the Irish Presidency remains faithful to the European ideals. We have never had any doubts on this point. We know what your political priorities must be, and we know that the Council is often forced, against its will, to agree on the lowest common denominator, if it is to reach any decisions at all. But this is no way to attain our essential political aims, as bitter experience since the mid-sixties' crisis has taught us.

My Group, the European People's Party, sees its main task — backed by the mandate given us by our voters — as using all the political and democratic means at our disposal to achieve what we think is necessary for the European Community. We are sure that, by seeking to attain this goal, and by acting as the spearhead of the process of European unification, we shall win over broad sections of the population for the European idea, as the new dimension in our political life.

It is in this critical and maximalist spirit that we offer our cooperation to the Council. We shall do everything in our power to force the Council to go beyond the lowest common denominator — which is normally bound to be its highest level of ambition — to a forward-looking, independent and dynamic Community position. This, after all, is what the voter has given us power to do.

Klepsch

Mr President-in-Office of the Council, from this day on, you will have to reckon with a European Parliament of a different mettle and with a new sense of political self-awareness. The Council and the Commission can no longer expect an easy ride in this House; we will no longer content ourselves with saying yes when what we mean is no, and we shall be quite prepared to grasp the political nettle with both hands.

(Applause)

You have offered us cooperation, and I would say to the Commission that we should like to see it adopting the initiatives taken by this House as basic elements in its own proposals.

You may rest assured that my Group will lend you its full and unstinting support in anything which will take us further on the road to European unification.

(Loud applause)

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

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, as has already been said by Mr Brandt, this is indeed a historic moment and a historic time and I am glad to have the opportunity, on behalf of my group, to welcome the extremely helpful and the constructive approach adopted today by the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers and indeed by the President of the Commission as well. If I may say so, I thought their speeches were helpful and constructive over the whole field. There are obviously points at issue which are going to be controversial and which we are going to have to take up over the months ahead. That is as it should be.

I was particularly glad about the emphasis that the President-in-Office placed on political cooperation in the field of foreign policy. This has been referred to in particular by Mr Klepsch for the European People's Party in his speech just now. It is an area to which we are going to pay increasing attention, and my group will pay great attention to the way the Council behaves and indeed the way that the President-in-Office carries out this task of reporting back to this House events of importance, not only when Council of Ministers' meetings take place but when the various negotiations are about to take place as well.

While we are on the subject of political cooperation, I hope we will pay heed to the suggestion made yesterday by Mr Tindemans that we in this House and the Council should not turn our backs on the questions of security. We in Europe depend a great deal on our security — I do not need to underline the obvious — and it would seem to me that one of the things which we cannot ignore and should not ignore is what is happening as regards the SALT II talks. We are not involved in them but we do have a view and we would like to hear the view of the Council of

Ministers before it is too late and final decisions are taken by the United States and the Soviet Union.

(Applause)

I would ask the President-in-Office if he would consider seriously whether in the autumn, at an early opportunity, he could come and initiate a debate on the security of Europe and the Council's reaction to what is taking place elsewhere.

If I may turn to another matter in this same field: in my group particularly we look forward to seeing Greece coming into the Community in 1981 and I know they are going to make a very significant contribution to the work that we do here, dedicated Europeans as they are. The Council and the Commission have to continue the negotiations with Portugal and Spain. Now I do not need to reiterate what I said yesterday, but this Parliament must be involved in that process. You cannot and you must not, gentlemen, ignore us...

(Applause)

You must not present us with a 'fait accompli'. We are part of the institutions of the Community. I will not labour the point — I think I have made it sufficiently. We welcome these negotiations and hope they will be successful and that the two applicant countries will before long be members of this Community and of this House. May I say a word of warning to the Council and to this House. It would woe betide us if, whilst these negotiations were being carried on, we forgot that other countries in the Mediterranean are deeply involved in what happens. I refer, of course, to countries such as Turkey, Israel and other countries which have special agreements with us. Let us not at any time forget that their interests will be affected — I do not say damaged, but I say affected — by what happens in the negotiations with Spain and Portugal and Greece's entry into this Community. Let us take care to do what we can to help these countries over these difficult months ahead, particularly the associate country Turkey.

I now turn from foreign affairs — apart from saying that I hope we shall have the opportunity of debating the report of the Three Wise Men — on questions of trade, which are of paramount importance to us. I and my group feel that there is a danger that not only the Community but the whole world is liable to become increasingly more protectionist as these difficult economic times — emphasized by the President of the Council, and emphasized twice by the President of the Commission — unroll ahead of us. The temptation is to look inwards, to try to protect ourselves against these strong winds, the cold winds that are affecting us. It is too easy for us, the biggest trading block, to adopt that policy, to put up trade barriers. This is the temptation, but we must resist it.

(Applause)

Scott-Hopkins

In the Council and the Commission we must resist it. We must set an example in leading this resistance to becoming protectionist again. It is against all our interests to do so.

But if we are going to do that externally, let us look to ourselves internally here. The Members of the Commission are quite aware of the numbers of non-tariff barriers, the technical barriers that all of us — and I turn to you Mr President of the Council — that all Member States have been putting up against internal trade within the Community. Let us set ourselves the task, please, during these six months of your Presidency, of sweeping these particular non-tariff, technical barriers to trade away, or at least doing our very best to do so. That would really be a worthwhile task.

(Applause)

Turning briefly to the question of agriculture, I do not need to tell the House of my deep interest in this matter. I will not go into details, because I think honourable friends of mine will probably be raising this question. This House and the Commission have to take initiatives in this field. We cannot go on as we are, building up surpluses, storing them, wasting energy in doing so disposing of them — at a cost to our taxpayers throughout the Community — to Communist and other countries, and indeed also disposing of them to developing countries and damaging their trade and their economy in the process. This is lunacy. Everybody knows it. I will not go on about it, but the Commission really have not done terribly well up to now. The Council have done even worse. Nor do I think this House has anything to congratulate itself on either, in trying to deal with this problem. I would set a limit of between now and 1 January 1980 for the Commission to come forward with constructive proposals for dealing with this particular problem. Let us debate it in October or November when we have time apart from the budget considerations, because they are linked to it. Let us then consider how we can constructively begin to cope — and it cannot be done quickly — with the impossible situation that we have in the agricultural sector. The balance is wrong between guidance and guarantee, the structures are wrong as well. Let us come forward with a constructive approach — not co-responsibility, that is merely tinkering with the problem — but something really fundamental. We shall play our part that I promise you not only as a group, but I am sure as a House as well.

There is a need, as has been said already, to deal with the situation of employment. I just as much as Mr Brandt, and indeed my honourable friend Mr Klepsch, am worried about the unacceptably high unemployment in all our countries, by the young people who are out of work. It is absolutely disastrous that this situation should be able to go on. Once again, neither Council nor the Commission have so far been particu-

larly forward-looking in any of the proposals put before this House. I think we really have to get down to considering and putting forward new proposals, not only for the restructuring — as Mr Davignon has been doing — of certain industries, steel, coal, shipbuilding. We have to go much further than this. We are at the beginning of a technological revolution in this western Europe of ours. We have to organize that as best we can to meet the future and the needs of bringing employment not only into urban areas, but also into rural areas and perhaps using something such as a rural fund to do it.

There are many other subjects to discuss, such as energy, and emphasis has been paid by every speaker up to now on the need to have a common energy policy. In my country we are no better placed in the long term than anyone else in Europe. We have a short-term advantage, granted, and we intend, I hope, to use it as best we can in the interest of Europe. It is obviously necessary to have an energy policy and great importance must be placed on this and on getting a debate going in this House as soon as possible. Mr Brandt asked for this to take place in September. I think he is over-optimistic, but if we can have it before Christmas, or indeed before Easter, on a proposal from the Commission, I think we would be moving fast.

In conclusion, Madam President, we have a prosaic series of work projects ahead of us which are going to keep us busy. But that is not all. As I said when I started, this is a historic moment. All our constituents and the citizens of this Europe of ours are looking to us to see what we can do, to see whether we can make the Community work to their benefit as a whole. I believe that we, in carrying out the work programme which has been placed before us and in dealing with the political issues which are there, can bring people's eyes up above the level of the price of butter or how much or how little we are going to pay in this or that subsidy — important though those matters are — to what this House is really about, to the fact that nine nationalities are sitting down, round this Chamber where forty years ago we were fighting each other — pray God that we shall always be sitting here and talking and being constructive. That is why I am here and this is what my group wants to do: to build this House into something which is constructive and in the interests of all our citizens.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR BRUNO FRIEDRICH

Vice-President

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

Mr Amendola. — (*I*) After the pyrotechnics of the first few days, we have now belatedly begun our real job, which is the examination and control of the Council's activity and the state of the Community. We have begun badly, but I now hope that we shall not be prevented by head-on confrontations and a spirit of sectarianism for examining more calmly and without ideological preconceptions the problems which face us, Europe and the world — problems whose extreme seriousness cannot be overemphasized.

I must express my disappointment that the President of the Council did not show in his report a full awareness of the seriousness of this situation and especially of the rate at which it is deteriorating. He spoke of deadlines of two, five or ten years, when there is in fact great urgency and we have before us not years, but terrible months in which to face up to this task.

Mr Jenkins appeared to me to be more aware of the gravity of the situation. Indeed, he said that we must move from words to action — but there is an urgent need for action, and this action cannot be brought about or prepared by conferences to take place in one or two years' time. These are problems which will come to a head next winter! Indeed, it seems to me that the results of the Strasbourg and Tokyo meetings are already out of date. A recommendation for lower energy consumption has been made, but such appeals do not appear to be being heeded. In the last few months there has been a further increase in energy consumption. Moreover, I do not think anything positive can be achieved by appeals, partly because they are addressed to countries whose circumstances vary enormously. For example, Italy has to import 85 % of its oil, while Germany and France have their own resources to the extent of 50 % and 40 % respectively. These appeals are therefore unreal and have no effect in practice. Since the Tokyo meeting, however, there has been President Carter's speech. It is true that Carter, too, has recommended and prepared a plan to reduce consumption. Nonetheless, this speech has aroused a storm of protest. And what was its first effect? An increase in inflation, a fall in the value of the dollar and hence probably new increases in oil prices since, as everyone knows, the prices of oil exports of producer countries go up as the dollar goes down. We are therefore faced with a possible worsening of the situation.

All this demands greater awareness of the present serious position. The European Monetary System itself cannot resist the pressure of a dollar inflation which is increasing at such a vertiginous rate and which threatens to change the framework within which the Monetary System was established.

In spite of the exhortations to reduce consumption, the prospect before us is not merely of an economic crisis, which perhaps at this juncture is disguised by a certain seasonal buoyancy in the economy, but of a

real upheaval affecting the relations between Europe and the rest of the world. If this problem is not tackled at its roots, our other problems cannot even be approached. This demands a transformation of the economies of our countries, an economic planning policy worked out by the Community, and the transformation of the existing situation, instead of the retention of present privileges combined with a policy of restricting consumption. This very building is a perfect example of waste of resources.

I am not, of course, blaming the architects, but it is a fact that this building devours energy. Our former, more modest building, in which we worked well for many years, was much better. The obsession with grandeur is not conducive to savings. And this is how we go on in every field: we recommend savings, but they are never made — indeed the opposite is done. The present situation is indefensible. Take unemployment — in addition to the six million unemployed in Europe, there are the 12 million emigrants. We cannot build the future of Europe on the growth of emigration, i.e. by forcing increasing numbers of people to work in conditions of slave labour in order to make life and work easier for another section of the population. There must also be a radical change in inter-class relations, which will enable all citizens of the Community to participate with equal rights in the development of a different economic system based precisely on economy of resources, productivity and work.

How, then, is it possible — as Willy Brandt asked in his vigorous and impassioned speech — to envisage the future? Let us look at the central and basic issue, that of détente and disarmament, certainly a difficult process which must occur in stages, but one necessitated by the present waste of \$ 440 million per annum on armaments. In contrast, only a few tens of millions are granted to the countries of the Third World, and these sums are then reabsorbed by the industrialized countries through the sale of industrial products and arms which brings them new profits while increasing the disparities between the individual countries.

So, ladies and gentlemen, how do we imagine that our Europe can attain more advanced goals by 1990 or 2000 if these disparities are maintained? Around us there are three and a half thousand million people living in subhuman conditions of hunger and disease. The famine and the crisis in these countries are contagious. These nations are forced to acquire goods on unjust terms of trade which benefit the industrial countries, and this can only prepare the way for a general upheaval in the form of local wars and a population explosion accompanied by stagnating production. In this situation, we have choice of two roads to follow. The first is that of cooperation: we can provide these countries with the best fruits of our civilization — technological expertise and education —

Amendola

i. e. we can demonstrate not economic dominance but real assistance which will then also provide an outlet for our energies in the construction of a new economic order. The other road is that of withdrawal to a kind of 'white fortress' with adequate armaments and the means to defend itself against this encircling world. But for how long? This would involve, within such a fortress, the destruction of our democratic systems and would bring about authoritarian, xenophobic and racist policies. We oppose such a prospect, not only because it seems to us insane and suicidal (indeed, in the long term, Europe must give way to the pressures which will become ever more insistent, unless we learn to create the conditions for cooperation), but also because it would lead to the destruction of our way of life.

Protests are constantly being made about the disregard for democratic rights in most of the world. It is true that three and a half thousand million people live under single-party systems, but we must ask ourselves what are the historical causes, and what are the responsibilities of our continent, our countries, and our colonial policies for leaving these countries in ignorance and failing to create the necessary framework for their independence. Then let us look at our own history. We have achieved a democratic system over centuries of massacres, from the Inquisition to the Thirty Years' War and to the barbarism of the Nazis. I therefore maintain that this reactionary prospect of a 'white fortress', hoped for by many, must be rejected by this Parliament, in which I know there to be a majority of anti-fascist democrats of all persuasions, who will now unite, just as in the Resistance they united to fight the barbarism of the Nazis, to give Europe a new function of promoting peace and disarmament in the world.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

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

Mr Pintat. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, I must congratulate Mr O'Kennedy on the full and thorough way he has just presented the programme of the Irish Presidency, which comes at a particularly important moment in the history of Europe.

I cannot, of course, in the limited time available, dwell on all the points in your speech. For my own part, therefore, I shall confine myself to two very important aspects which you mentioned: the Common Agricultural Policy and, above all, the common energy policy, which loomed large both in Mr O'Kennedy's speech and in that of Mr Jenkins.

As you pointed out, Mr President-in-Office, it was under the French Presidency that the Luxembourg Agreement on farm prices was adopted. Some of the advocates of a freeze on prices would have preferred a

breakdown in negotiations instead of the compromise solution arrived at by the Council of Ministers. My Group, on the other hand welcomes this belated agreement, for failure on farm prices so soon after direct elections for this Parliament would have had a catastrophic effect on public opinion in our various countries, where direct elections have given people a particular awareness of these questions.

However, this agreement has solved nothing with regard to the underlying problems. It will be up to the Irish Presidency to initiate the debate on the difficult problem of surpluses, in particular the milk surplus. Ideas are in the air, along with a vocabulary which people have been unwilling to use up to now. Some people envisage a system of contracts laying down quotas above which agricultural holdings would be deprived of public assistance unless they found outlets for their surpluses.

Others envisage a return to a sliding scale of rates and the introduction of absorption taxes. This is an open question, but it is quite clear that, in consultation with the trade, we shall have to take responsibility for actions which are bound to affect farmers.

Since, like others who have spoken in this debate, we are in favour of a Europe of regions, it will also be necessary, Mr President, to provide improved guarantees for Mediterranean products. The Mediterranean regions in fact represent 30 % of the farm population, produce 18 % of the crops and receive only 6 % of the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF. The only way of coping with enlargement will be to make a thorough reappraisal of the Common Agricultural Policy since, as Mr Jenkins so rightly said just now, we are approaching the limits of our budget.

Lastly — to keep my remarks on agriculture brief, as my colleague Mr Rossi will be discussing the budgetary aspect tomorrow — my Group thinks we should give greater attention to defining our policy on the export of foodstuffs. Indeed, the Community's policy up to now seems to have been to dispose piecemeal of quantities of produce which are described, often without justification, as surpluses. It is just as if exporting were a sort of shameful adjunct to the intervention system.

We in the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the other hand, take the view that — considering the principles, requirements and machinery of its agricultural policy and the current and future needs of the world market — the Community must have a political plan with regard to external trade and must provide itself with the means of putting it into effect.

I am very glad that in his speech Mr O'Kennedy, as did Mr Jenkins, gave an important place to the problem of energy and the proceedings of the European Council in Strasbourg. I in fact regard the energy problem as the great political and economic problem of our time and the key factor in future development.

Pintat

Energy is to the world economy what blood is to the human body. Whatever you may say, the energy consumption curve in a given country is parallel to that of the growth in its gross national product, and will continue to be for a long time. But without growth of the order of 4% per year we can do nothing about the tragedy of unemployment. We thus have an urgent need for energy in order to save jobs, for the current levels of unemployment are nothing short of intolerable.

The second energy crisis we are currently going through is essentially political. In strictly economic terms, as the participants in the Tokyo Conference noted, there is no justification whatever for the OPEC decisions. But it would be a grave error to forget that the background to this crisis is one of shortage. Of course, there is still oil to be had. No one denies that. But at what price and how quickly? That is the problem.

In addition to the economic necessity of preparing for the change-over from oil, it is imperative for us to diversify in order to increase the security of our supplies. Broadly speaking, it can be said that up to now the efforts made by the industrialized countries in this field have been derisory — and I am choosing my words carefully. At present, the United States import the approximate equivalent of Saudi Arabia's whole output. Whereas ten years ago they imported practically nothing, they are now importing nearly half the oil they require, which amounts to nearly 500 million tonnes per year or more than a million tonnes a day! It is greatly to be hoped, for all our sakes, that President Carter's energy programme will finally be put into effect, for all the countries in the world dip into the same basket for their energy, and unfortunately this basket is becoming less and less full.

In the energy field there is first of all a short-term problem. Our stocks were severely depleted last winter because of the crisis in Iran. We hope they can be quickly replenished in their entirety so that we can get through the coming winter. Can we really be assured of this, Mr President?

In the medium and long term there is a particular problem because everything relating to energy is a question of money and of time. It takes practically ten years to launch a programme of any size; it takes eight to ten years to build a nuclear power station or to discover a new oilfield and bring it on stream. In terms of energy, we are no longer in 1979 but already in 1990; the countdown has already started. The future is mapped out to 1990 and what we undertake now will already be in preparation for the year 2000.

Investment in this field is increasingly onerous and costly. Instead of millions of francs for investment we are beginning to talk about millions of dollars. The development of a common energy policy will, I think, be the acid test of our political will to build Europe. We must therefore lose no time in obtaining all the

large amounts of finance needed, and here Europe can and must be of assistance. This Parliament has a duty to put forward simple and practical ideas and solutions; theoretical and sterile debates on this subject would be harmful for our image — and as for ideas, we have a few to offer Parliament.

For our part, I should like to put one idea on record this evening. In our view it is essential to launch a massive European loan of several thousand million units of account to constitute a European energy fund and this must be done without delay. In view of the formidable challenge we are faced with, Europe must respond with a major effort and take to heart the fine maxim that God helps those who help themselves. No-one else can do this for us.

This challenge must, on the contrary, be for us a source not of difficulties but of progress.

It is better for us to spend part of our money right away on useful and productive investments rather than waiting and spending it later in the form of oil purchases which bring us no real benefit. This massive investment programme will help us all to tackle the scourge of unemployment, not only by the jobs it will create directly but also by giving us that vitality which is indispensable for growth and thus for the jobs of tomorrow. This gives us scope for financing an investment programme directed above all at energy saving, for while it is fine to talk about saving energy we should not forget that this is an expensive business and large amounts of money are needed to save energy. We shall thus be able to finance a programme for the gasification of coal, a programme for new sources of energy, in particular solar energy, studies on the use of biomass and the beneficiation of alcohol, not forgetting the nuclear power programme which, while it is not sufficient, is very necessary.

More traditional forms of investment will also be very useful for developing the electricity supply lines and the gas and oil pipelines that will be needed, and above all for adapting our oil refineries, which produce too much heavy fuel oil and not enough petrol and lighter products.

A great deal remains to be done, but this programme is the only way the countries of Europe can achieve some credibility in their attempts to develop international consultations, which we regard as desirable and indeed essential. We must receive and increase contacts between producers and consumers and also involve the countries of the Third World in planning the future. We must not come to the meetings empty handed, and this great development programme, reflecting Europe's will to make an effort, is the only way of giving these meetings a chance of success. With a view to international consultations, therefore, we think that this major energy loan envisaged by the Liberal Group can provide, Mr President, the resources for a major European policy, for without resources there can be no policy at all. That is what

Pintat

we want and we shall always, Mr President-in-office, support your efforts in this direction.

(Applause)

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

Mr Lalor. — Mr President, Mr President of the Council, colleagues, this is an extremely pleasant occasion for me since my friend and former colleague Michael O'Kennedy, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland is assuming the onerous task of President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. I would like to welcome him here today and to congratulate him and wish him extremely well on behalf of my colleagues. The people of Ireland are very proud that their representative will preside over the Council of Ministers of the EEC during the next historic six months, and I am confident that the Council will have an able and adroit President. Naturally, I regret the fact that, on the other hand, Ireland will not have its own representative on the Bureau here, a loss that it shares with Luxembourg, and one which marks a historic break with established tradition.

At such great moments in the evolution of the European Community, the words which launched the EEC concept have the strength and significance of a prophecy fulfilled. In the words of Robert Schuman, 'Europe will not be built in a day; nor as part of some overall design. It will be built through practical achievements that first create a sense of common purpose.' The Treaty of Rome which became the blueprint of Schuman's thinking defined the political principles and the institutional framework which together form the structure around which the fabric of the EEC has been put together piece by piece. Envisaged in that blueprint is our Assembly: a representative parliament elected by the universal suffrage of the peoples of the states. Parliament has made a valuable contribution to the work of the Communities since 1952. Yet no one looked forward more to today's historic moment than the succession of distinguished nominated Members who themselves made history both here and in the Luxembourg Chamber. I would like, Vice-President, with your permission, to pay special tribute to our former colleagues for the excellent work they have done and for their patience in scrutinizing and contributing to the legislative progress in Europe down the years.

Perhaps there could be no more significant expression of solidarity between the citizens of Europe than the fact that 62.8 % of them voted together in peace and freedom, thus showing an explicit renewal of commitment to the ideals of the EEC's Founding Fathers. What, in fact, is expected of this directly elected Assembly? Firstly let me say that I think it is reasonable that this Assembly should be a forum where the

political options facing the European Community should be debated and a definite political consensus should emerge to tackle the very serious and urgent problems facing our economies. The citizens of our Member States will not tolerate constant wrangling over procedural matters. We must do, and be seen to do, a job of work that will improve the social and economic fabric of our Community. We must insist on this, and those who have the responsibility for legislating, the Council, should do just that, and not pay lip service to resolutions or opinions expressed by this Parliament.

The energy question is an area where immediate effective action is necessary. We must face the fact that oil can no longer be relied upon to meet our energy needs. The recent crisis is threatening our economic foundations. The overall EEC growth rate is likely to fall, we are told, to 2.8 % from this year's level of 3.4 %. We must therefore work together to find a common solution to this problem, to reduce consumption, to regulate the market and to take the necessary conservation measures. We must also consider the special requirements of some Member States whose energy consumption is low and who are affected in a particularly grave manner by the present crisis. A long-term strategy for a Community energy policy should lead to energy sharing and conservation.

Economic growth and regional development must receive more serious attention from the European Commission. For far too long we have voted resolutions on the regional disparities that exist within our Community. This Assembly has consistently tried to increase the Regional Development Fund and expand regional policy to distribute more equitably economic prosperity in the Member States. The Treaty of Rome itself speaks of uniting all in equal prosperity. However, the Council has consistently refused to create an adequate, structural unemployment and removing glaring disparities in standards of living. We cannot afford to allow this situation to continue and I am confident, Mr Vice-President, that every Member of Parliament here will ensure and recognise the importance of increasing the Regional Fund.

Inflation is again raising its ugly head and threatening the employment programmes and growth possibilities in the Community. Combating inflation must remain one of the primary objectives of economic coordination between the Member States. I was happy to hear the President of the Council inform us that the newly-created European Monetary System is a success and there are hopes in some quarters that the United Kingdom may join shortly.

In addition, Mr President, I would like to refer to two problems on which the Community has taken a stance. May I congratulate the President and the Council of Ministers on their handling of the recent refugee problem in South-East Asia. The human tragedy and

Lalor

suffering of these people is reminiscent of the suffering of the people of our own countries in a period of war.

The Community has acted well on this question. Firstly, we have made known to the countries concerned our utter determination to ensure that these people receive a fair deal. In addition, the Council has—quite correctly—linked the question of food aid to some of these countries with their treatment of these refugees. Finally, efforts have been made which perhaps could be augmented to accommodate some of these people in the Member States.

Every Member Parliament agrees, I am sure, with the President of the Council, when he says that questions of employment, especially youth employment, should be given particularly urgent attention. I believe that we will be failing in our task as elected Members of the European Parliament if we simply pay lip service to the frightening signs of discontent resulting from the large numbers of unemployed in our countries. I would hope that the question of work sharing would pass the point of discussion and that regulation of overtime and the phasing of education and training for employment will become actual realities.

On the question of the common agricultural policy, this group will remain steadfast in its defence. It is not that we want to adopt an unreasonable approach, but when unreasonableness seems to be the tactic of those who are opposed to the common agricultural policy we will fight to the bitter end. There are no food queues in Europe, as there are in very many parts of the world. We must not forget that there is more and more evidence of world food shortages, and that food production must be the basis of our agricultural production. My colleagues and I hope to see immediate revision of the farm modernization scheme, the farm retirement and the disadvantaged areas schemes. I was rather worried this afternoon at hearing Mr Scott-Hopkins creating an impression that feeding the hungry would interfere with Third World improvement.

Finally, let me say, Mr President, and I address myself to Mr O'Kennedy, that I am sure that under your presidency we shall indeed witness a very harmonious and fruitful relationship between the Council of Ministers and this European Assembly. I think it is true to say that all the Institutions, the Commission, the Council and this Assembly have succeeded in making the most of the creative possibilities that spring from the tension between ambitions on behalf of the citizens of Europe and the limitations set by the Community Treaties. While ensuring that the balance between the Community's Institutions continue, we look forward to real dialogue between the Council of Ministers and this Assembly. This Assembly must be accorded its rightful role in the legislative process.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, having listened to the ceremonial speeches which have been delivered since the opening day, I really ought to echo the hopes expressed concerning the unification of Europe. What is important for us is that there should be greater democracy in the European Communities, which until now have had no truly democratic institutions. Many people not represented here cherish great hopes concerning Europe. When the President referred to the *autorité nouvelle*, I was reminded of Novalis, who said that the lasting things are created by the poets. The President's words are poetic, but we have a long way to go before they represent reality.

Firstly, we are not really a 'European Parliament', but the Assembly of the European Communities. Why aren't we a real parliament? Because we are merely a consultative assembly with no legislative powers. We only have limited supervisory powers and are certainly not 'government making'. So until the situation changes we shall have to regard the title 'European Parliament' and the lofty appeal delivered by our oldest Member as somewhat mere poetic licence. Secondly, this House does not represent the individual identity of millions of Europeans in the Member States. We federalists believe in a strongly supranational authority, provided that the Member States treat the regions as individual entities and recognize the individuality of their peoples. Indeed, the identity of certain groups today is not merely ignored, but is even regarded as suspect in some Member States.

This is a time of hope. I read in today's newspaper that an agreement may be reached in the next few days concerning autonomy for the Basques who are a tragic example of the lack of understanding of free Western Europe, which is incapable of granting autonomy to its own ethnic and cultural groups. I am referring to the optimistic text of the Bordeaux Declaration of the Council of Europe convention issued at the end of 1978, which outlined great prospects for the regions and regional communities.

Today's speeches have been concerned with the elections, and I must say some very bitter questions arose in my mind. Energy was also discussed. My request to have my motion for a resolution debated by urgent procedure was not accepted, but I should like to repeat forcefully that the European Council was premature, indeed tactless in speaking out so strongly in favour of nuclear energy, when the long-promised debates on this have not yet been held in our national parliaments, at least not in all Member States.

I also wish to comment briefly on the economic and social situation. It is considered the done thing to say the House must allow itself time to discuss the major issues. But our arguments over the Rules of Procedure also concern basic democracy. And we are certainly not afraid of discussing the major fundamental issues. Here again, however, I should like to refer to the regions. It is ludicrous to suggest that in the field of

Coppieters

employment, unemployment and all the other major problems the European Community can do what the Member States have failed to do. They have failed because they did not involve the regions sufficiently, if at all. Parliament must therefore constantly uphold the ideal that the opinions of the regions, their power and the solidarity existing between them should have a direct influence in this House.

In conclusion, I would like to comment on the international dimension, as this point has also been raised today, both in the speeches and indirectly in some of the motions for resolutions. I am convinced that the democratic Europe which is now uniting can help to safeguard peace not only in Europe but in East-West and North-South relations, as well as in world relations as a whole.

We must clearly conclude, in the context of the Atlantic alliance, a world agreement with the Third and Fourth Worlds, but one in which the American accent is much less marked and the European character much more prominent, otherwise we will fall victim to political blackmail. Such an agreement should relate both to raw materials and to the division of labour. I am convinced and earnestly hope that the more we find our own identity the greater the prospects for peace will be, as this will open the way to détente and thus benefit our fellow Europeans in Central and Eastern Europe.

In brief, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the misunderstood and oppressed nationalists and regionalists, as well as all federalists, will derive hope from our efforts to embark on the road to democracy.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think I can deal properly, in the few minutes available to me, with the vast problems raised here by the President of the Council of Ministers, Mr O'Kennedy, and by the President of the Commission, Mr Jenkins. I shall therefore confine myself to saying on behalf of my colleagues, who represent two and a half million Italian and European electors of the European Right, that throughout Europe, but especially in Italy, the election of this Parliament by direct universal suffrage has led people to hope that with the aid of this institution a political Europe may quickly be built.

I am well aware that our task is extremely difficult and will perhaps take a very long time, but I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that we must not at any stage betray these hopes and that, with our different political outlooks, we must devote all our energies to this high and noble endeavour.

We should ask ourselves straight away what sort of Europe is to be built and what problems need to be

tackled. It is certainly a difficult thing to admit, but there is no doubt that we cannot — as the President rightly reminded us just now — envisage continuing to build only the Europe of pigmeat, cheese and beetroot; as has been said, we must make every possible effort to build the Europe of individuals, i.e. the Europe of men and women, but above all of the young. We must see if we can succeed in building in Europe a society capable of meeting the requirements of future generations. We must give those generations more reason for living in our society than there is at present; we must give them reasons for living and working to build their own destiny and their own future.

But while we shall do everything in our power to try to build this Europe, this reality, to work for this political integration, we cannot forget that there are immediate problems — and many of these urgent problems have been mentioned here — which we have a duty to tackle with every available means and with a determined will to solve them — to make a serious attempt to get out of the critical situation in which Europe and a large part of the world find themselves.

It has been said — and we are in complete agreement — that there is a need, for example, for an outline law on terrorism. I mention this because I represent a country which is a prime sufferer from this terrible evil and afflicted by outbreaks of violence, cruelty and criminality which our Government and our forces of law and order have not succeeded in containing or defeating on their own.

There is no doubt that the roots of terrorism extend throughout Europe, and draw their sustenance from left-wing doctrines which are widespread in this continent. It is necessary to draw up an outline law and study joint measures in order to carry on a struggle which will really protect the life and future of European men, women and children.

Then there are the labour problems which have already been referred to in this Chamber. The unemployment problem has been mentioned — six million unemployed, perhaps more. The emigration problem has been mentioned, and we wish once more to stress to Parliament and to Europe the appalling position of the emigrant workers, to whom perhaps we owe the great economic wealth which we have attained in recent times — that great economic development which perhaps makes us want to become giants in the political sphere also. But to whom do we owe this great economic development? Not only to the ability of the producers, but largely to that of the workers of the countries which lead this great process of economic development. To whom do we owe this development, if not also largely to those workers who live in many countries of our Community in conditions which are degrading not so much for them as

Romualdi

for us who have forgotten every principle of humanity and civilization ?

With your help, we want to tackle also — as was stressed here a short while ago — the problem of regional policy, of the underdeveloped areas of Europe. We often try to take action — as is our duty and our noble mission — to improve the lot of underdeveloped peoples and give them better living conditions, but what about the conditions of poverty, squalor, demoralization and ill-health afflicting vast sections of the European peoples ? What can we say about the economy of the South of Italy ? We want to raise this problem here. Our Government has failed to solve it.

In thirty years we have apparently spent a fabulous, astronomical sum on the South — one hundred thousand million units of account. Do you think that this expenditure has solved any of the problems ? Do you think that the gap between North and South has narrowed ? No, it has widened, and the condition of the Mezzogiorno is pitiful. It is a scandal which now casts its shadow over the whole of European civilization. We wish to stress this problem together with the other great problems which have been stressed here, and we want to solve it together with the problems of the other depressed regions of Europe. Since I have heard mention of a fisheries treaty to be concluded with third countries, I should like to know if this also includes the possibility of treaties with three countries bordering on the Mediterranean — Libya, Tunisia and Algeria — countries with which the poor fishermen of our Mezzogiorno have often come into sharp conflict.

I conclude by saying that the representatives of the Italian National Right will devote all their energies to attempting to build Europe and especially to solving the troublesome problems of our continent.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the ten minutes remaining to my group I shall confine myself to mentioning certain aspects of the problem of energy, in particular in connection with the role of the multinationals.

The energy policy of the last twenty years has been marked by subservience to the general desires of big business, by its dependence and by the absence of a long-term Community policy.

After everything had been sacrificed to oil, a sudden change of course is taking us now too far in the direction of nuclear power.

Following the first oil crisis of 1973-1974, the Council, on a proposal from the Commission, decided to introduce a 'crash programme' for the construction of nuclear power stations. Only a fraction of this

programme has been carried out, owing to technical difficulties and the pressure of antinuclear feeling among the public. Today however, the European Council, which met on 21 and 22 June last, wants to make a further push towards nuclear energy.

This decision by the European Council is difficult for us to accept. After the Harrisburg accident, at the request of the Socialist members of the Committee on Energy and Research, a resolution was adopted by the European Parliament at its April part-session calling on the Commission to report to Parliament on the accident at Three Mile Island and its effects on the Community's nuclear programme. The Commission undertook to submit this report to Parliament by the end of the year. By having already adopted a position in favour of a forceful nuclear policy, the European Council has prejudged the issue before the debate has even taken place.

(Applause)

Mr President, the Socialist Group has always laid emphasis on the problems of safety. Our position on nuclear power remains the same : we put safety first. Even if, in the short term, it is necessary to resort to nuclear power, safety requirements must be complied with and our energy needs must in no circumstances be used as a pretext for a more rapid and uncontrolled development of nuclear energy. For this reason, the socialists advocate public control and management in this sector. Furthermore, the use of nuclear energy must not mean an end to the search for new forms of energy.

It is also necessary to ensure the security of our oil supplies and to resume the dialogue between the Community and the OPEC countries, which was broken off following the statements made by Mr Brunner.

Urgent measures must be taken to ensure a more restrained and more rational utilization of oil, as advocated by the European Council on 21 and 22 June last.

In the field of energy, we Socialists would also like to see the full development of the public sector alongside the private sector. In this connection, we must pay particular attention to the problems of the refining industry.

Above all, we must secure, as far as possible, our independence. To do this, the Community must formulate its own policy independently of foreign powers. On several occasions the Commission has submitted proposals along these lines, but they have not been taken up by the Council. The Council's attitude in this respect is, to say the least, deplorable. We Socialists propose the creation of a European Energy Agency, one of whose objectives will be to control the multinational oil companies.

(Applause)

Glinne

This agency ought to be able to negotiate supplies directly with the producer countries without our having to go through the grasping multinationals.

The profits of multinational companies have increased substantially since the beginning of the 'crisis' — this crisis which is growing increasingly serious and which the workers are expected by certain quarters to accept as inevitable. However, the multinationals have tightened their control over other sources of energy (particularly nuclear energy), funding their action out of their sharply increased profits on European markets. Exxon's 1973 profits were 59 % up on the 1972 figure, and Texaco's went up by 45.5 %. These profits have continued to rise. Profits recorded in 1978 by the American multinationals were even higher than in 1977.

Leaving the oil sector, we find that Alcoa's profits in 1978 were up by 97 % over 1977, Kaiser Aluminium's by 90 % and these of Reynolds Metals by 146 %.

Virtually all world trade is currently controlled by less than 1 000 multinational companies, over two thirds of which are American. The bulk of their operations are between parent and subsidiary companies, and they do not engage in independent transactions between buyer and seller. The prices operated between parent and subsidiary companies (transfer prices) thus represent the result of the maximizing of company profit on a world scale, and not the relationship between supply and demand on the market. Who can dare, in such a situation, to speak of a 'free market' economy which some people prefer to the democratic socialist model on the grounds that the latter would kill free enterprise ?

(Applause)

At Community level, the Nine have never come up with even the beginnings of a common policy on multinationals which would have made it possible to reduce the immediate harmful effects of the situation. Admittedly, some years ago the Commission submitted a number of suggestions and proposals to solve the problem of the control of multinational companies at Community level. A few isolated measures have been introduced, but the crux of the problem remains unsolved. For this reason, the Socialist Group of this Parliament, through one of its distinguished members, Mr Erwin Lange, recommended the drawing-up of a draft agreement at international level, known as the Gibbons-Lange Report, within the framework of our relations with the US Congress.

The Commission has in fact done what it could with the means at its disposal to combat the malpractices of the multinationals. It recently imposed a fine on Hoffman-Laroche, the pharmaceutical company, for a

breach of the rules on dominant market positions. As a matter of fact, it was helped to do so by documents supplied by a Swiss citizen, a Mr Adams, who was arrested and imprisoned for his pains. He is still suffering the consequences of his European public-spirited action for Europe.

Some may say that this is an insignificant incident, but it shows the extent of the multinationals' power. For this reason the Socialist Group has frequently raised this matter in the European Parliament and will continue to work for a fair solution. There is no genuine common policy with which to oversee the single market formed by the European Community, and the multinationals have thus succeeded in evading any effective supervision at European level and in thwarting national controls.

In this connection I would like to draw attention to a situation which is often neglected by the press and which provides a revealing commentary on our present energy shortage, namely the links between banks and oil companies, about which more should be known. The Chase Manhattan Bank, whose chairman is David Rockefeller, is the largest shareholder in Exxon, Mobil and Texaco. The big banks are also represented on the boards of all oil companies, which enables them to control their activities. We can therefore talk of 'oil banks' with a vested interest in higher oil prices. Profits made in oil are reinvested in other types of energy, including the nuclear power industry, which give the oil banks a hold over the whole energy sector. It is no coincidence that Gulf Oil is one of the major shareholders in Westinghouse, and that Chase Manhattan, First National City and the other oil banks own General Electric.

Finally, the oil companies disclaim responsibility for the rise in oil prices, and blame it on decisions taken by OPEC. However, it is not by chance that the oil industry in Saudi Arabia, which plays a key role in OPEC's price deliberations, is controlled by Aramco, whose principal shareholders are Exxon, Mobil, Southern California, Texaco and a Saudi Company, Petromia, and that Aramco's bankers are none other than the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Thus, Mr President, the rising oil prices line the pockets of the multinationals, and some people are trying to use this as grounds for penalizing the workers.

Mr President, these brief comments were prompted by the fact that energy has been a central issue in major Council discussions held very recently and that public opinion is being polarised in its anxiety over energy.

In the coming debates in Parliament the Socialist Group will certainly take the opportunity to return to this subject in greater depth, putting forward the solutions which we advocate.

President. — I call Mr Diligent.

Mr Diligent. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am in rather a quandary because I was also intending to discuss energy and shall have to try to avoid repeating the points made so forcefully and ably by some of the previous speakers, in particular Mr Pintat. Indeed, I by no means disagree with much of what was said by Mr Glinne.

I was intending to deal with energy and say a few words on agriculture. Unfortunately, Mr Pintat has again said precisely what I was proposing to say, so I shall confine my remarks to energy. A moment ago our eminent colleague, Mr Brandt, commented that what had been done so far hardly merited a pass mark. I shall be somewhat kinder, though hardly less critical, for I have before me the text of the European Council's Strasbourg declaration, the text of the Tokyo agreement and extracts from Mr Carter's recent speech. But I have another document here which I would recommend you to read; it suggests to me that we shall have to work a lot faster, cover much more ground and be much more painstaking, and that we are not here to pat each other on the back or to make sweeping and lofty declarations of intent.

I believe this document was distributed the day before yesterday — I am referring to the report by this House's Committee on Energy and Research. I began my reading of this report with apprehension and ended it in sadness, for it recounts the activities of the various institutions and outlines what Europe has done in the field of energy.

The accuracy, number and forcefulness of its criticisms are quite striking. I shall refer only to a few comments made in this 80 page document, whose authors deplore the irrational way in which certain Community activities are organized and describe the gloomy spectacle of the imbalance between tasks and powers, the successive decisions not put into effect and the pigeonholding of reports which have not been examined by the competent bodies. In brief — and I am sorry to have to use this word — it amounts to an acknowledgement of failure.

What is the cause of this failure? Some people, like the committee in question, think it is due to the complete inadequacy of the Community instruments. Moreover, the committee emphasizes that the institutions were set up at a time when 90 % of the Community's energy needs were met by coal — this figure surprised me, but it is repeated several times.

Others, on the other hand, will say that we do have adequate means at our disposal — they are provided for by the Treaties and exist in the institutions. They say that what we have lacked so far is a real policy.

Ladies and gentlemen, from now on our responsibilities will be truly daunting. We shall have to have the

courage to follow the thorny path of truthfulness, otherwise, if the report is correct, the situation over the next ten years, even with no unexpected upheavals, could — according to the most conservative forecasts — reach a stage where alternative energy sources, including nuclear energy, are not an adequate substitute for energy imports. It is forecast that in ten years time Community will be experiencing real shortages in supplies with all the economic and social disruption this would entail, especially increased structural unemployment.

Or worse still, other international problems could arise in the form of embargoes, import cuts or the sabotaging of the supply routes. Europe will then suddenly be faced with a situation comparable to that which existed 50 or 100 years ago, with all the consequences which this could entail for our independence and liberties.

The Presidents will therefore appreciate — and I have the greatest respect for them — why the questions I am about to ask sound rather like a challenge. I hope they will be answered during a debate in the near future: this should not be postponed until next Easter but should begin in the next months. I shall put these questions very precisely in the hope that the replies will be equally precise.

Firstly, I shall refer to a matter which we have often discussed, namely the Community loan mentioned a moment ago by my friend Mr Pintat. This was in a financial context, but as far as the oil market is concerned, how do you intend to ensure that the promises made by each Member State concerning import cuts will be kept? How have those in authority decided to use the Community's negotiating power to conclude long-term contracts with the producer countries and to offset the effects of speculation? How do you intend to promote an effective policy for coordinating stocks and work out an effective plan to cope with any emergencies? What resources do you envisage using in this field? With regard to research and new technologies, how do you propose to coordinate and extend measures already taken both by certain Community bodies and the Member States themselves? How do you intend to inject greater cohesion and coordination into the following fields, some of which have already been mentioned: hydrocarbon prospecting, the extraction of gas and liquid fuels from coal, geothermal energy, solar, wind and tidal energy, energy storage, combined heat and electricity production and the re-utilization of heat, to mention just a few examples?

In the field of safety, an issue raised by Mr Glinne, are you in favour of the European safety standards applied to the construction of breeder reactors, and to the reprocessing and disposal of radioactive waste, as this would give these standards greater credibility?

Diligent

As far as the economy and investment are concerned, do you not think that there should be harmonization at Community level of speed limits and consumption standards in the motor industry? What is your programme for improving incentives for the recycling of certain products, as such a programme would permit considerable energy savings? What is your opinion on the longstanding proposal, repeated in this document, for a Community plan to modify and provide thermal insulation for dwellings in order to reduce energy consumption? According to the proposal, the plan would affect 30 million old dwellings and 3 600 000 offices — impressive figures, which I believe are accurate. The plan could provide a boost for the building industry and lead to very considerable savings in energy in the medium term.

Finally, how do you propose even greater success with the joint coal policy than in the past? Mr O'Kennedy has just spoken of Europe's little-known wealth, and I immediately thought that chance — some may call it providence, and others the will of men — has maliciously ordained that Europe has certain resources which highlight both its potential and its limitations. These resources are considerable, but none of them are sufficient to enable us to face the long-term future and to enable the countries which possess them to overcome all their difficulties. Great Britain — I am pleased to say — now has oil, Germany still has coal and lignite, as has Great Britain, and the Netherlands have natural gas, Italy has hydroelectricity and its magnificent sunshine, while France is leading the way in nuclear power. None of these countries can base its long-term future on these resources alone, as they are in any case only supplementary.

But even with all these advantages, solidarity is still our mainstay in energy matters, and before winding up I should like to quote a sentence from the memoirs of Jean Monnet — 'When nations face a common danger, the various factors affecting them should not be dealt with separately.'

I therefore hope that in the very near future, at any rate in the next three months, this House will hold a major debate on energy and that the Presidents will offer some concrete solutions to this fundamental problem. There is not a minute to lose: the energy crisis — and I shall wind up on this point — has great symbolic significance. It could either bring the Community closer together, or it could lead to disintegration; if national selfishness should prevail in such a sensitive and highly important area, this would be a very heavy, if not fatal blow to the Community. If, on the other hand, a joint overall policy was devised and became a concrete reality, it could re-awaken the Community ideal and symbolize Europe's unity at last

in confronting the tremendous dangers threatening its people and their triumph in overcoming them together.

(Applause)

President. — I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — Mr President, Presidents of the Council and the Commission, colleagues. I too want to deal with the hard economic problems which we face. We meet this week in a time of growing economic depression with the hopes of hundreds of millions in Europe counting on us. And because the European Community has become the dynamo of world trade, the hopes of thousands of millions living at subsistence level or starving depend on us too. We must recognize the urgent message of the President of the Commission who has told us that our economies face major and menacing challenges; he is absolutely right. Whatever else we do in this Parliament, we have got to tackle these challenges, because only the Community is strong enough in the world to do it. We must therefore give priority to what only we can do.

Now we do not as a Parliament have much future in an economic failure. If the hopes that have been put on us die, we will die with those hopes. So in the next five years our future as a Parliament depends entirely on our solution of these economic problems. It is to that goal that we must give overriding priority, despite all the other interests that we have.

This Parliament, of course, does not have many powers, but it does have the power, through the committees, to summon all the expertise available throughout our entire Community, to debate advice and to produce a broad consensus which is politically acceptable and effective. It can put its policies to our fellow citizens to get their agreement for what has to be done. The new problem that we face — and it is a new problem that cannot be met by the old clichés — is the vicious combination of totally unacceptable rates of unemployment, especially high for the young, together with a rate of inflation and a degree of uncertainty about supplies of energy and vital raw materials which prevent investment in the creation of new jobs. That is the problem we face; that is the problem that has not been faced before in the industrialized world; that is the problem with which we must deal.

We have got to tackle these problems together, and, as Willy Brandt has said, with open minds, for there is no simple, single, overall solution. We must avoid achieving one objective at the expense of another — expanding trade at the cost of destroying strategic industries on which we depend, or achieving sound money at the cost of soaring unemployment. Surely our starting point must be the further expansion of world trade; because it was the expansion of world trade that in the first fifteen years of the Community

Sir Fred Catherwood

brought record wealth and employment to Europe. But if we in the Community are the dynamo of the world economy, then we have really got to point out to the other trading nations and trading blocs, whose incomes have risen so fast from the expansion of trade with us and with each other, that they must, as they prosper, reduce the heavy barriers that they continue to retain against our exports. And they must also assure us of continuity of vital supplies, without which we cannot move our economies forward either. It is with the lowering of these barriers that the drive for expansion of world trade must begin. We have got to have full reciprocity from the new industrial countries, and we can say to them that what has been good for us will be good for them too. We have the power and we have the weight in the Community to do this. No one else has that power. We have gone as far as we can in the reduction of barriers to trade, and this is where we must take the strongest initiatives, speaking, as the President of the Council has said, forcefully and effectively, to get world trade moving, to give hope to the Third World, and new jobs and hope and vision to our own rising generation. We can succeed in this Parliament, and we absolutely must succeed.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR : MR VONDELING

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Ansart.

Mr Ansart. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, according to some people 10 June of this year was to be a landmark in the history of Europe. The elections have in fact demonstrated what we have always maintained, namely that the people of Europe are basically indifferent to the European Community. My colleagues and I feel that in the Community's present grave crisis, the prospects described by the President-in-Office of the Council are not enough to win the popular support which the Community has lacked since its inception and without which it cannot hope to achieve progress.

Over the past two days we have heard many speeches, some of which have expressed the usual lofty sentiments concerning Europe, mankind and the future. Listening to them, we are tempted to say — and this is no cheap sarcasm — that fine words never fed anyone.

The European Parliament does not and will not draw its strength and its political and moral authority from the mere fact that it is elected by universal suffrage. It will draw its authority from its proposals for the people of Europe, especially the workers, the underprivileged and those millions who do not share the benefits of social and economic progress.

Where are we going? What do the Council of Ministers and the Commission have in store for us? This could be expressed in the words 'the Europe of austerity'. Still more austerity under the pretext — for it is only a pretext — of the energy crisis, a crisis dramatized as much as possible in order to make the workers' renewed sacrifices seem acceptable and to mask the real causes. It is in fact the inflation in the Community which has caused the oil producing countries to increase their prices. The unemployment we experienced in our youth, this gloomy and depressing concomitant of capitalism, has now re-emerged with a vengeance on the national and Community scenes.

In the speeches of both the President of this House and of the President of the Council of Ministers, reference was made to facing the challenges which confront us. But what really effective measures have been proposed or carried out to cut back unemployment which, with over 7 million unemployed in the Community, is an enormous and persistent problem? Nothing has been done in the social sphere, at least nothing decisive.

To be more precise, further plans for the structural reorganization of industry have been put forward, like those for the steel industry, textiles, and shipbuilding, which are putting tens of thousands of workers in my own country out of work. In the name of Europe these workers and their families are being placed in an appalling position in disastrously run-down regions, and no serious proposals are being made to safeguard their future. This is the fate of large areas of France, for example the north and Lorraine, which have been hit hard in the very nerve centre of their prosperity by Community decisions taken without the French National Assembly and Regional Councils even being consulted. These bodies have been presented with a *fait accompli*, and none of their proposals — although they were quite reasonable were examined.

We do not accept these plans: they are the plans of big business trying to get its own way, like the steel trust Eurofer, re-established despite the bans, and whose decisions have the effect of destroying viable works and increasing industrial upheaval in which people have been affected on an unprecedented scale. Moreover, unemployment in France's overseas territories is assuming proportions far greater than what we are experiencing in Europe: their entire economies are in a critical state, and no serious solutions taking account of their aspirations for real development, freedom and responsibility have been proposed.

We do not accept this policy, because far from being a remedy, only aggravates the economic and social situation. And we are very much afraid — and this is why we have laid great stress on this point — that the enlargement of the Community to include Greece,

Ansart

Portugal and Spain will further worsen our difficulties and, in the same way, those of the applicant countries. Hasn't it been said that after these countries join the Community we shall have another 3 million unemployed? But nowadays democracy and social and economic progress are inseparable. Can we talk about economic progress when the economic position of those who produce our wealth in return for a mere pittance becomes disastrous even when they are not the victims of all this upheaval? This upheaval causes millions of people to live in a state of anxiety and uncertainty, in which there is no longer any security for anyone, especially job security. Without work, human dignity and freedom are out of the question: there is no freedom for the unemployed.

The only approach now adopted for reducing inflation is further austerity, which benefit only the big financial and industrial concerns which dominate the Community. It is symptomatic that this year's balance sheets have shown a great boost in profits, while the oil companies are indulging in blatant speculation. The Community has not made any serious attempt to put a stop to this scandalous practice, which is now carried out quite openly, as in Rotterdam. A trade unionist from my country has described the plans by big business to reduce the purchasing power of workers as the 'confidence trick of the century.'

We deplore the fact that one of the features of the renegotiation of the Lomé Convention was the Community's desire to interfere in the internal affairs of the ACP States. Contrary to the claims of the President-in-Office of the Council, the results of the negotiations were not what the ACP States had hoped for. The former French presidency should not really be proud of what it has done for the developing countries, especially as the Community joined the United States and Japan in opposing the demands of the third world countries made at the UNCTAD and Tokyo-Round negotiations.

In brief, is this the new and imaginative policy which will inspire our young people? The world economic situation is now referred to in aggressive and dramatic terms which are quite disturbing. People talk about 'economic war' and say that unemployment is the fault of the Arabs!

No proposals have been made concerning our new relationships with these countries, especially those which have recently gained their independence and are starting — or, in some cases, restarting — their national history. Europe must open its doors unreservedly to these new countries without any desire for neocolonialist domination, because we also want our own countries to be independent and great. We are sensitive — indeed, very much so — to the same wishes as other nations. Independence and national sovereignty are the great factors in modern society.

In the face of these omissions and refusals to take decisions, we Communists are even more determined to pursue our activities as Members of this House in our own countries. We must and shall take up the case of the millions of workers who have a natural interest in uniting at national level and in joining forces internationally to fight big business. We shall do our utmost to conquer unemployment, which — far from declining — is spreading and undermining social progress and the aspirations of our young people. Unemployment is a challenge to modern society. It will not be overcome by words alone but by new and bold social measures, such as the boosting of purchasing power, especially for those in greatest need, to reduce the glaring inequalities in the world and to cut working hours to a reasonable level enabling men and women to work without working themselves to death which all too often happens.

We are henceforth completely in favour of the 35-hour working week. Moreover, the age of retirement should be lowered in view of the enormous wealth produced by each worker over decades of hard work — they have to work for 50 years before being able to enjoy their retirement.

It is better to pay the retired than 20-year-old unemployed workers.

In connection with this, the position of working women and mothers should be reappraised in line with modern thinking. A feature of the present age is the massive and, we feel, welcome — increase in the number of women in all walks of national, social, political and cultural life. Furthermore, we must deal with inflation by getting to its roots and putting a stop to the bumper profits of capitalism, to wastage and to the poor use made of production equipment, and by overcoming the monetary disorder which has brought about the dominance of the US dollar and of the USA, which is always able to get its own way in monetary affairs. On this, we are fully agreed: Europe must remain independent.

However, I have noticed that the much-used expression 'to speak with one voice' is all too often applied by those who claim to be above national interests, including those of my own country. We do not accept this. We French Communists reaffirm that all aspects of French policy must be prepared and decided on in Paris, and nowhere else.

France is nevertheless willing to help and join forces with all those who want to achieve progress by launching a bold policy which makes full allowance for present realities and the new approach to dealing with the major problems of the day. The Community must respect the independence and sovereignty of its Member States. We believe that agreement and treat-

Ansart

ties can only be significant and valuable if they are agreed upon by sovereign and strong nations, otherwise — and experience bears this out — they will be vulnerable and their validity will always be called into question. For this reason, we reaffirm our desire that the unanimity rule applied to the Community's reports and decisions should be retained.

Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my colleagues I want to affirm that we shall make every effort in this House to ensure that the millions of workers without whom the Community would be nothing, will be heard, and that account will be taken of the claims they make through their trade union organizations. In our debates and discussions and wherever decisions are made, these organizations must be treated as equals and given a greater role to play than in the past.

We shall defend the interests of the workers under all circumstances, together with all those who have opted to join us in the struggle against the stifling dominance of the multinationals, and with all those who, in the struggle for a democratic and progressive Europe, defend national independence and sovereignty.

To sum up, we are ready to cooperate with all those who have decided to join us in the struggle for a workers' Europe which is forward looking and whose people work together and are equal in peace, freedom and national dignity.

President. — I call Miss Flesch.

Miss Flesch. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to add to the comments made by Mr Pintat on behalf of our group by turning briefly to a subject which I feel has had an important bearing on the Community's activities in recent months and which will be important in the months to come, that is during the Irish presidency. I am referring to the subject of development aid.

The conclusion of the new convention with the African, Caribbean and Pacific States, which has been discussed in the speeches we have been listening to, was indeed an important political event. We shall no doubt have the opportunity to examine the precise content of the agreements in detail at a later date. However, I should now like to draw attention to a few aspects of the new convention which I regard as particularly important.

Firstly, I should like to stress the extent of the Community's financial commitments, which have risen to 5 607 thousand million units of account, an increase of 62 % over Lomé I, or as much as 72 % or more if we reckon in dollars.

Without wishing to indulge in self-praise, I feel we should emphasize the extent of the Community's involvement in view of its present situation.

The recent agreement also included other innovations, for example, the 'ore system' known as the 'Sysmin' which does not incorporate a compensatory mechanism for export losses like the familiar 'Stabex' system, but a guarantee system geared to the specific problems of ores. This is another original approach which I feel is particularly appropriate for this sector. The aim is clearly to help the ACP States who want to build up competitive and dynamic mining industries while preserving what they have already achieved and bolstering their potential.

I should also like to mention the system for promoting and protecting investments. The ACP States have agreed that on or after concluding an agreement for the promotion and protection of investments with a Community Member State, they will treat the investments of the other Member States in the same way. This is most important for the smaller Member States. On a personal note, Mr President, I would add that the Council and the Commission are sometimes better able to defend the interests of the smaller Member States and their citizens than Parliament itself.

In connection with the convention, I would also like to draw attention to the agreements on joint financing, the 'snowballing' effect of which makes it possible to increase the flow of funds to the ACP States. For the first time the convention deals with sea fishing in a joint statement, which comes as no surprise. This sector did not fall within the Community's sphere of competence until 1976, and even more recently we have been confronted with the problem of the extension of the fishing zones of most of the ACP States to 200 nautical miles. It was therefore a worthwhile step to deal with this sector in a declaration.

However, Mr President, the Community's request for a reference to human rights to be included in the preamble was not acceded to. On this matter I shall adopt a different position from that of Mr Ansart, as I feel that recent events, such as those in the Central African Empire, show how regrettable it is that such a reference was not included in the preamble to the convention.

A second point which I felt was also unsatisfactory is that no decision was taken to include the European Development Fund in the budget in order — as far as I could understand — not to exceed the 1 % rate of VAT, I think that Parliament should maintain a firm stand on this position, which it has always upheld in the past. The inclusion of the Fund in the budget offers us much greater guarantees as far as budgetary transparency is concerned. A better balance will have to be struck between agricultural and other expenditure if the budget is to be monitored effectively and democratically.

Flesch

I shall address the main part of my closing remarks to the President-in-Office of the Council, to remind him that Lomé I was signed under the Irish presidency. The new convention will also be signed under your presidency, Mr President, and we welcome this continuity, which is not altogether devoid of significance. We feel that the agreement which is about to be signed is the logical successor to the one signed four years ago; this was quite a remarkable prototype, indeed it was the only prototype in the field of institutionalized relations between the developing and industrialized countries. There is in fact a striking contrast between the achievements of Lomé and the results of the fifth UNCTAD conference held in Manila in May of this year. After a month of difficult debates in Manila between the rich and poor countries, no progress had been achieved in establishing a new and more equitable economic order. A complete breakdown in the North-South Dialogue was avoided only when the rich countries made a few concessions which called for very little in the way of sacrifices. Furthermore, the third world was sadly left unmentioned in the election campaign which ended on 10 June. It would have been an opportune moment, however, in view of the negotiations on the Lomé Convention and the UNCTAD conference in Manila, to state that the tasks of the future Assembly would include the revival of the North-South Dialogue and a new start to research on the new world economic order, especially since the next special General Assembly of the United Nations on this subject will be starting next year.

We believe, Mr President, that an initiative by Europe could prove fruitful and might be emulated by the other industrialized countries. This is, in any case, our wish. However, I do not want to wind up my comments on the Lomé II negotiations and their successful outcome without congratulating the main architects of the convention, in particular the Commissioner responsible, Mr Cheysson. This is an important and original element of Community policy which has helped to launch new ideas on development. It is a good thing that in this field, at least, the Community can achieve progress. May it continue and persevere!

President. — I call Mrs Ewing.

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, Mr President of the Council of Ministers, Mr President of the Commission, I would first of all like to say that I must congratulate the lady President we have elected, Madame Veil, on her mix of serenity and firmness, and couple with

that my congratulations to the magnificent Madame Weiss whom I can only describe as being 86 years young.

(Applause)

France must be very proud to have two women in these positions. The Chinese like to give every year a name, and I would suggest it might be appropriate that we say in this new and exciting and dynamic Parliament, that in Europe this should be the year of the women. We have very many of the seats in this Assembly; many of them are held by friends from the past days when I was here for four years, many are friends, I am sure, of the future. There are more women voters than men. I would like to ask this Parliament to decide that in our term of office as Members, we all of us set out to eliminate all inequalities against women in all our Member States. Every Member State has inequalities, some legal, some fiscal; everyone has inequalities, all of them different. What a wonderful thing it would be if we could say to all these women voters; this is one thing we are certainly going to accomplish in the next five years.

I have met very many famous people in my life, and had the honour to be the newest woman member of the House of Commons on the fiftieth anniversary of votes for women. And I met on the same platform all the then surviving suffragettes. These women could hardly have imagined a woman Prime Minister of Great Britain. That is now a fact, and I think we should take all this into account.

(Applause)

To conclude my feminist remarks, could I say to you that there is a very easily accomplished simple task: let us all eliminate the inequalities that remain in our systems before the five years of office is up.

You will have noticed that I am now a member of a political group. Formerly I sat for four years in a fairly solitary position as a non-attached Member. I would like to say that as a non-attached Member I had nothing but fairness from this forum. President Spénale joked with me once, and said I was the most privileged Member here. That was the regard with which this Chamber treated the minority. I am now in an international group, with a Dane, with Frenchmen, with Irishmen who have been broadminded enough to take a Scot in. With the Danes we have the North Sea in common, with the French, for reasons which I will not trouble the English with, we had a very, very old and necessary alliance for hundreds of years, and with the Irish — you can only say we were the same people. I have a daughter called Annabelle for the French, a son called Terence for the Irish, and a Scottish son called Fergus for the first King of Scots. I did not manage any more — Madame Weiss reproached us with our small birth-

Ewing

rate — I only managed three. I am sorry about that — otherwise, perhaps, I would have been able to use a name from some other nation.

In the speeches that have been made today, I have found very little to disagree with. I think it is a wonderful thing that we have managed today to have a debate in which the things that join us and unite us have been dominant. I was very pleased to hear a speech by the very famous and distinguished Mr Brandt in which he talked of the Europe of the regions; to hear our President of the Council of Ministers emphasizing the importance of the Regional Fund. I would like to make one point that has not been made today. I urgently believe in the right of the regional authorities within states to have a direct access to the Regional Fund. I know that will mean extra administration, but I know how efficient the administration of the Regional Fund is, and I feel absolutely certain that they will be prepared to take this on. The guidelines of Member States who often eliminate perfectly satisfactory applications from regions are very often different from the guidelines of the regions. Who knows better what proposals should be put to the Regional Fund than the regions themselves?

I would ask all the parties to give that point due consideration. Part of the problem we have in regions is our understanding of each other's problems. There is no way that anyone who had not visited my vast constituency could understand the problems of distance. How can you harmonize lorry drivers' hours on single-track roads, or require farmers to take lambs from Skye to the nearest market overnight? These are the kind of things that I am sure speeches here will bring us all to understand and will help us to get justice for our regions.

The President of the Commission, Mr Jenkins, my former colleague in the House of Commons, said today that Britain had the wooden spoon. I would just like to tell this House — and I am sure he would not mind my saying this — that my constituency had the highest turnout in the whole of Britain, by a considerable margin. Only the islands — I have very many of those, nearly a hundred inhabited, the Orkneys, Shetlands and the Western Isles, who voted against the proposition of remaining in Europe — had a very low turnout. In my own ex-constituency, which I carelessly lost recently, as you possibly know, we had a turnout of 55%. I feel reasonably proud of that, Mr Jenkins, and I should like to suggest there are reasons for the high turnout in what is the largest constituency in Europe, except for Greenland. I am very pleased that our colleague, Mr Lynge, is here to represent Greenland, but apart from Greenland I have the largest constituency, larger than Belgium comprising very many different areas and many islands. The reason why I think they turned out, despite the distances they had to go to vote, was because we

far-way as we are, have the front-line issue there — fishing I am not going to say much now, because it is a regular subject of mine, and I am sure that the Commissioner, Mr Gundelach, and I will be at that subject very often in the future.

Could I make one point that has not been made today? The Scottish Fishermen's Federation have asked me to ask you all to remember that imports from third countries are causing enormous hardship to the fishing communities right across the board. Perhaps the matter could be looked at. I would also ask you all to remember when you are trying to establish a common fisheries policy, that there is a great danger in thinking that any sum of money will compensate a man who wants to be a fisherman for looking out at the sea from a deserted harbour and a deserted, dead town. Strange as it is, and dangerous as it is, this way of life is one of the strands of culture which you cannot allow to die. I have literally hundreds of communities with no alternative, no jobs and no other way of life that they wish. I would just make this appeal today. I have no doubt you will hear me again.

Secondly, oil lanes. We are much troubled by oil tankers that behave irresponsibly. We have had a very bad disaster in Bantry Bay. We have seen a disaster off Brittany. We have had a disaster recently in Shetland, not so bad as some of the others. We have sheep that were born white that are now black. We have beautiful white beaches that are now black beaches. We have a tourist trade that no longer exists in the Shetland Islands for this summer. These require you as a Parliament to say this very simply, as Lord Bruce said during his chairmanship of the Committee on Regional Policy, Regional Planning and Transport: we must have a code of conduct for the behaviour of oil tankers, or we shall pollute all our seas and there will be no fish for anybody.

(Applause)

Could I also say that I am in the front line on energy. You perhaps know that in my remote and faraway place in Caithness, I have a nuclear energy station called Dounreay. And it may interest you to know that this is a happy community who face up to the hazards of this dangerous industry, apparently without fear and with confidence. But I would like to say this. These people, the people in my constituency, are blessed — or perhaps not blessed — by a great deal of stuff called granite rock. But we are not prepared for any of you to decide that our granite rocks will be a very suitable place for all of you to come and dispose of your nuclear waste.

I was interested that Mr Glinne said there should be no nuclear development — I quote him, I hope, accurately — without proper public control safeguards. I have experts disagreeing, but they all assure me that there is no foolproof way yet known of disposing of nuclear waste. This is a problem we all have to take

Ewing

extremely seriously. Multinationals are leaving my area; and they have all been given aids by the Member State I come from, with no social obligations. Many of them are now moving out despite making huge profits. Perhaps this is also the kind of issue that could be looked at across the board of Member States: infrastructures are built up, families are encouraged to go and hope for a new life in faraway places and all of a sudden the multinational decides it is going to move, because whatever the profit is, it is not enough.

We must have more openness. We have no particular secrets in our committees, why do we not let the press in?

(Applause)

So far as the other matters are concerned, if you wish youth to be interested, I am sure you have to respond in a most positive way to all the moral things that so many speakers have said better than I can. But could I suggest a practical thing? We have these boat refugees, we have a Third World where a third of the world is starving, we all care terribly about this, we have huge youth unemployment. Could we not set up a programme throughout Member States to give our youth a practical role to play in the Third World, so that they could have jobs and also help? I think that is the kind of thing that the young people could understand. Mr Brandt talked about a bouquet of all the flowers of Europe. The flower that Scotland has is not as fragrant as the English, it is not bright as the daffodil, it is not as beautiful as the fleur-de-lys—but it has prickles; it is called a thistle. I do hope this forum will find a place in the European bouquet for the thistle of Scotland, because recently a majority of my country voted for a small step in self-determination and the rules were changed against us.

(Protests)

The rules were changed against us; that did not apply to the referendum on the Common Market, on Northern Ireland, on Gibraltar. As I say, Sir, I am certain you will find a place for that Scottish flower in your bouquet. Thank you.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Blaney.

Mr Blaney. — Mr President, President of the Commission, President of the Council, may I first of all congratulate my colleague, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, on his elevation to the presidency, even if it is only for a short six months. And straight away may I say that the programme which the Commission has drawn up for the duration of the Irish presidency falls far short of what I would have hoped, and indeed what the electors who sent me here would have sought.

The constituency which I represent is very similar to that which has been talked about by the last speaker. Indeed, if one didn't identify the speakers, one would

not know the difference between the two constituencies insofar as the descriptions are concerned. My supporters in the constituency of Connacht/Ulster voted for the concept that was sold to them very effectively, during the referendum some years ago, and that was not only a levelling up of their way of life to match that of the better-off areas in our own country of Ireland, but a levelling up of Ireland's way of life to equal that of the better-off countries here on the continent, such as Germany or France. Far from that happening, the gap has widened. Despite the undoubted truth that people everywhere within the Community are now better off than they were five or six years ago, the gap, relatively speaking, has widened between those in the disadvantaged areas and those in the rest of our country and between our country and the better-off countries here.

The fault seems to lie in the failure to provide sufficient funds through the Regional Policy and indeed the application of that policy leaves a great deal to be desired. As for the social policies and Social Fund. Again we have heard little of them and seen less during these past years. As I say, the gap is widening, and so far from the concept, which is a grand concept, of the Community's levelling up process being realized, the reverse, is true.

We also have in the same constituency and in the west of Ireland the matter of the disappearance of many of our small farmers, despite the fact that the overall income from farming has increased by leaps and bounds over these recent years. The fact will be illustrated if I give you these figures: seven or eight years ago, there were 112 000 creamery milk-suppliers in Ireland; today there are fewer than 68 000. This means in effect that the numbers on the land are dwindling, the small farmers are being gobbled up, and more's the pity! This is again in total contradiction of the entire concept under which we were given to understand we would find our future within the EEC. I am for the common agricultural policy and will support it in every way at all stages, but I would say that a very close scrutiny should be made of the manner of its distribution, and that some means should be found for directing a greater part of the monies flowing from that policy on a differential basis towards the smaller farmer so as to close the gap, to make his way of life more enticing, to keep him on the land, to keep his son on the land and thereby keep our population in the country, which would have, in particular, the effect of creating a social fabric, which for many years has been disappearing owing to a very heavy rate of emigration. The same applies to the way in which we are producing mountains of butter and at the same time are failing to give sufficient support to beef production. If we did this, we might perhaps import less from third countries. Certainly in my country it is not an economically attractive proposition to be in beef these last few

Blaney

years: the milk flows freely, the number of suppliers goes down, the quantity goes up and overall it is not a very happy position.

In the speech, which we heard a short while ago, the President rightly referred to human rights all over the world. I would say that we could in truth say that this problem exists on our own door step, namely in Ireland, and I put this on the record so that the Members of this Parliament may be aware that we do not have to go to the other end of the earth to find violations of human rights.

With regard to the overall provision of aid, which is already being carried out on a large scale it is not in my estimation being applied or, if it is, it is not being applied in the proper manner or in the right quarter to give us that levelling up that we had so ardently wished. The area, the very parliamentary constituency which I come from produced the highest percentage vote of any part of the country of Ireland both during the referendum and, strange as it may sound, in the election for this Parliament, when the turn-out, exceeded 74 %. That was not matched in any other constituency in Ireland and it is something that I think Members here might reflect upon, in order to eliminate any misconception, that either I, who represent this vast constituency on the western coast of the country, or the people within that constituency or indeed within our country, but particularly in that constituency, are anything other than pro-Community. This, I think, should be noted because it may be felt that I come here merely to protest; indeed, it has been suggested that that is how I got here. This is not so. I fought successfully to enter the Community, with the results I indicated; I fought to come into this Parliament, and I was not aided by any money from here or elsewhere and indeed was denied many other facilities that my running mates had available to them. So, nobody should get the idea, which may have been put abroad after the result of our elections in Ireland, that I or, indeed, some of my non-aligned colleagues have come across here as a protest. We are here because we wish to be here, because the people whom we represent have always wished from the very first to be part of this Community, and if I come here today seeking to have things changed, it is not as a protest but as an attempt to realize the concept which I and others sold very very freely and well during the referendum that gave Ireland a voice in this Assembly and about which we do not have any regrets. Do not have any doubt about that. At the same time, there is much that can be done and much that should be done, and I make the appeal and put it on record as my first-ever intervention in your debates that these are the sort of basic things that my constituents really need and really want. They fall within the concept of

levelling up, of closing the gap between the not-so-well-off and the better-off, first, within our country and then between our own country, Ireland, and the better-off countries in Europe. These are the sort of things that I believe we should be looking at.

I am glad that today the President-in-Office also mentioned that a fisheries policy would, he hoped, be enacted as an urgent priority in the not-too-distant future. This again I am most concerned about, because many of my constituents are indeed the backbone of the fishing industry in Ireland, and it is one on which we depend a very great deal for employment, both at sea and on land. With that, Mr President, I presume I am well beyond my time.

President. — I call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, I believe I have five minutes and one of my partners three more.

I welcome the importance and urgency given to the energy crisis by the President of the Council and the President of the Commission. However we have had words before but very little concrete action: there has been very little concrete action towards a European energy policy. I must agree with Mr Brandt that there has been very little progress so far. We must change this situation urgently; otherwise the whole prosperity of the Community, which depends on energy will collapse and the ideal of a united Europe will die with it.

I am confident that our new British Government will change the policy of antagonism to a European energy policy, which was the policy of our previous Energy Minister, for five years, Anthony Wedgewood Benn. I am sure that Britain will now cooperate in future in the development of a Community energy policy and in taking the urgent action that is necessary, particularly in the field of investments for the modernization of our coal industry in order to bring down the price of our coal: this is vital.

I welcome the statement by the President of the Council that we must deal with the energy problem in the short, medium and long term. In the short term, conservation and energy-saving are the only solution, and this will need very strong government action. But conservation must be carried out by all members of the Community and by all oil-consuming countries of the world: unless every country acts on conservation, the crisis will continue. I am worried because President Carter's new short-term energy-saving measures will not be enough. He plans to spend 88 billion dollars on developing oil substitutes, but it has been stated authoritatively that much more than this is needed to bridge the energy gap in the USA, and unless the USA can reduce their oil consumption effectively, the rest of us will be wasting our time.

Seligman

In the medium term, we have no alternative but to develop coal and nuclear power. Nevertheless, the capital cost of nuclear power is extremely high for developing countries and is also under a cloud as a result of the Harrisburg accident.

I am confident, however, that this cloud will soon blow over and nuclear power will be regarded by the masses as a safe and essential source of energy. After all, Mr President, it is much more dangerous to cross Piccadilly Circus than to walk past a nuclear power-station.

In the long term, however, we must invest urgently in research and development in inexhaustible, renewable sources which will be available perpetually. These are nuclear fusion from deuterium, motor-fuel from biomass, solar and space-reflected energy, hydrogen fuel — where the Americans are a long way ahead of us — and ocean thermal energy conservation (OTEC). But these require massive investments of money in research and development before we even know whether they can be economically competitive with traditional sources of energy. This needs large amounts of risk capital, many billions of units of account, which will have to be spent and possibly be lost. It therefore calls for a joint Community effort and joint Community finance. If we act separately, we shall be too poor to succeed. Nor can we leave all this pioneering work to the Americans and the Japanese. Europe must mobilize all her resources to win this energy battle and retain her independence from these other superpowers. As a practical suggestion, I recommend that our Committee on Energy and Research start work to quantify the sums of money needed to develop substitute sources of energy so that we at least in this Parliament can know what we are up against in putting forward this long-term policy.

Finally, I would call on every one of us to go back to his constituency and his home and bring maximum pressure to bear on his government to join wholeheartedly in an effective European energy plan.

In conclusion, I should like to draw attention to the fact that the President of the Commission has been here all the afternoon and I think we should thank him very much for giving this debate the attention which he has given.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr de Ferranti.

Mr de Ferranti. — Mr President, President of the Council, President of the Commission, there was one virtue in the British system of election: it meant that each one of us fought a single, individual European constituency. This meant that we had direct personal contact not only with our constituents but, also with the firms we visited. Time and time again, I found,

when visiting companies during the election campaign and particularly when talking on the shop floor, that there was a first-hand knowledge there of the importance of Europe in terms of jobs. There was a first-hand knowledge there of the importance for job prospects of removing the so-called technical barriers to trade, which cover a wide variety of practices. In the sales office there was the realization that the complications of trade procedures made it difficult to export from one Member State to another; but it was on the shop floor itself that there was real understanding that future jobs depended on the removal of technical barriers to trade.

Perhaps even more significant for future jobs was the consciousness in the design office that unless they had a great European market of 250 million consumers to supply they could not design the product in such a way that it would be competitive throughout the world. It was the recognition of the importance of the size of the market in so many different instances that struck me particularly forcibly.

This phenomenon — let's face it — really is well understood. It is well understood by the Commission. It is well understood by the Economic and Social Committee where there is a chance for employers and trade-union organizations, for consumers and farmers, to put across their point of view. In these smaller circles it is well understood, and it certainly was an advantage for me, as a member of the Economic and Social Committee, to understand how well the problems have been grasped and how much effort is going into dealing with them. I am glad, as President of the Economic and Social Committee, to have had the opportunity to explain it further, and I am glad to have five colleagues from the Economic and Social Committee here in this Parliament to put across the same things that we discovered. How much has been done! The tremendous work done by the President of the Commission, for example, in launching the idea of the EMS, taking it as far as he has and seeing it now within a short distance of real success. How much has been done in the field of government purchasing — still uneven in its success, but it has been done and there has been some real progress.

I believe that it is being increasingly understood by people beyond the magic circle of Brussels that this subject really matters. I notice the President of the Council used a phrase in his speech:

The removal of technical barriers to trade is a manifestation of Community policy which to the public eye may seem to take rather unpredictable and bizarre directions.

That indeed was the case, but I think it is changing. I think the public is beginning to understand the importance of the subject, and I wish to urge my colleagues

de Ferranti

in this Parliament, each and every one of you, to understand the political importance of this subject and to promote it. In a sense, this subject has been rather relegated to the kitchen, the cooking of Community politics. We must promote it to the drawingroom. We must increase its political standing, so that those of you who have made speeches such as we have heard today about the need to preserve jobs also do some real work in actually helping the process of removing the barriers to trade. Don't respond just by making fine speeches: we need action. Don't, above all, respond with protectionism: we need to get on with removing these technical barriers.

Commissioner Davignon has written a letter to all the Member States of the Community. That letter is a blueprint for action. Now we must show to those who displayed such an interest in this subject during the election that we are not just here to talk; we are here to get things done.

(Loud applause)

President. — I call Mr de Goede.

Mr de Goede. — *(NL)* Madam President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, Mr President of the Commission, in the five minutes allocated to me in writing by Mrs Veil I should like to make a number of constructive comments, as I have so far only been able to speak on procedural matters.

Mr President, Mrs Dekker and I represent Democrats '66, a party founded twelve or thirteen years ago in the Netherlands. We may be regarded as a liberal party left of centre in the Dutch political spectrum. I think it cannot be denied that our party has prompted innovations in Holland in the fields of democracy, peace and security, and in Third World and environmental affairs, and has repeatedly emphasized the need for fair distribution in welfare matters. We exert a constructive influence on Dutch politics, and we wish to do the same here. For four and a half years we have participated in the centre-left cabinet of Den Uyl, of which I was privileged to be a member. The minister for European affairs in that cabinet was a fellow party member, Mr Brinkhort. We are a pro-Community party, a fact rewarded by the voters in the elections to this Parliament, in which we had the support of 9 % of the electorate. Why are we a pro-Community party? There are two main reasons: firstly, I believe that, despite all the ups and downs in the Community's development, the human misery of the past hundred years — I need only mention three dates: 1870, 1914 and 1939 — is now banished because the people of Europe, brought together in this House, have reached the firm belief — a belief which they must continue to hold — that our future can only be founded on cooperation.

The second reason is that we are aware that the major problems can no longer be tackled on a national scale,

but on an international and therefore European scale. Employment, energy, environmental and monetary affairs are examples of this. In her opening address yesterday, Mrs Veil applied three fundamental concepts to Europe: peace, freedom and prosperity.

Who could object? But we must ask ourselves what we mean by these ideas. We all want peace in Europe, but not the peace of the grave-yard: we want a Europe which intends to be an active promoter of peace and security and which helps to preserve and stimulate peace in the world. Europe has a duty to concern itself with the world's trouble-spots, like the Middle East and southern Africa. I fail to understand why we in this House discuss security so little, security not only in Europe but also in other parts of the world. We should realise that the East-West confrontation of the past thirty years has been based on mutual distrust. What is there to prevent Parliament from taking initiatives to establish dialogue with parliamentarians from the eastern bloc countries in order to systematically eradicate this distrust?

We should also concern ourselves with the Third World. I am convinced that, if we fail in the coming years to bridge the gap between the Third World and the rich countries, to which Europe belongs, this gap will ultimately only be bridged by an explosion of violence. I am convinced that Europe, situated as it is in the frontline of East-West confrontation, could come to occupy a similar position between the North and South if we do not succeed in bridging this gap.

Freedom, yes, but not the kind which allows the laws of the most powerful to prevail. We must help the backward regions and the weak in Europe, and we cannot go against our democratic convictions by using democracy as an instrument of power, as we also have a duty to uphold the law. When I say that Europe must be founded on democratic principles and on the eradication of discrimination, and that fundamental social rights must be securely anchored, I mean that, to achieve this, Parliament must take the initiative in the drafting of a European constitution or charter.

The Community institutions must be democratized and strengthened. In the Netherlands we play 'blow football', and in observing the Commission's behaviour of late I couldn't help feeling that the Council has been playing blow football with it: the ministers blow the Commission around and the Commission allows itself to be blown around. I believe that Parliament's direct mandate could result in a new alliance between it and the Commission because if the Community does not become a force to be reckoned with, the Council will still have the last word, and recent events have shown that we cannot continue in this way.

One final point: we want to leave the benches of the 'unattached' as soon as possible. But we can only do

de Goede

this when the way in which Members actually vote shows us where our allies are. The 'socialism' and 'liberalism' labels cover a wide range of practices and views. I hope that voting patterns in the near future will show us where our allies are seated: they will have to be pro-European and progressive.

President. — I call Mr O'Kennedy.

Mr O'Kennedy, *President-in-Office of the Council.* — Mr President, distinguished Members, during the course of this debate and during the course of statement made to Parliament yesterday, on many occasions there was great emphasis laid on the need for solidarity, both within the institutions and indeed within this institution: solidarity in the face of the problems and crises that we face, and the challenges that we hope to surmount. I must say that having listened to this debate this afternoon, that solidarity has become very evident here in this Parliament, across the spectrum of political opinion that is represented here. Because the general response of this Parliament in the areas of most immediate concern and urgency, particularly the area of energy and the need for an effective and consistent energy policy, I think is evidence of the solidarity that was asked for at the ceremonial opening yesterday, and that other speakers referred to here today. In this, perhaps, we all have a common theme that will guide us in the future.

First of all, I am not going to suggest that the Community has made great achievement in the area of a common energy policy, much less established one. Two years ago in this very place, my predecessor, the distinguished Belgian Foreign Minister, Henri Simonet, at this very time, referred to the decision taken three years earlier by the Council of Ministers, in October 1974, to establish a common energy policy. He was speaking here in July 1977, three years later. He said, and I think I can quote him without referring to the record: 'Never was the adage "*festina lente*" taken more literally'. It was true then; I would like to illustrate the fact it is not quite so true now. As I said in my opening statement, we faced this at the European Council, if for no other reason than because we had to. The alternative to, adopting a common position on an energy policy, or at least common positions on energy strategy at this time would be as has been pointed out by myself, by many speakers and by the President of the Commission, world economic recession of a level and nature that would be totally unacceptable. We did therefore come to firm decisions at the European Council. It may be four years too late, it may be even 10 years too late, but nonetheless we came to firm decisions. We did not suggest that we had reached all the conclusions there that we should reach, because that was really only the beginning of a new sense of urgency. We did not suggest that it was the end of the Community's commitment,

or the Council's or this Parliament's or anyone else's, to the need for a common energy policy. So if some colleagues seemed to detect what they felt was a lack of urgency, because of the fact that it faces us now, I would like to remind you that I spoke of the plans of the Council for the immediate, medium and long-term.

And immediately what can be done, and must be done, is of course to undertake the actions that we can take in our own Member States by way of common accord within this Community, even before we have a common energy policy: to reduce consumption, to regulate, as I said, the spot markets, but also — and I say this particularly to Mr Glinne who was obviously concerned about the role of the multinationals, and I gather it is not the first time he mentioned multinationals in this Parliament — we also mentioned in the conclusions of the European Council that it would be a function of the Council henceforward to consult, not just with the oil-producing countries, but also with the major oil companies. I do not know if all that Mr Glinne would attribute to the major oil companies is accepted by every Member of this House, but I do want to say this — the purpose of the European Council's approach, and the Council of Ministers' approach, is to reduce the dependency of our peoples, and particularly those in need of energy for their growth and development (a) on oil producing states who may have, for one political reason or another, posed problems for all of us, and (b) on major companies who do not show a sense of responsibility where the welfare of our peoples is concerned. These are the targets that are clearly underlined in the common action proposed by the Council, and adopted subsequently in Tokyo and — this I want to stress particularly — to be followed up by the Council of Ministers. I want to tell Parliament that even now there are proposals for the next stage in the monitoring and implementation of the decisions taken both at Strasbourg and at Tokyo.

With the time available to me, I do not think it would be appropriate for me to go into the technical detail that would be more appropriate to my colleague, the Minister for Industry, Commerce and Energy, who will be President-in-Office of the Council of Energy Ministers, but I want to say particularly that in the area of research there are very specific proposals from the Commission before the Council, which will enable us — and the Parliament will obviously be aware of these, and will have to consider them — to make provision for those long-term development programmes; because these can only be long-term. I am speaking now of solar energy, geothermal energy, all of these areas that may not benefit us for 10 years or more. This is a matter that we must tackle now.

I want to say also that some of the ideas that have been expressed here this afternoon on the need to

O'Kennedy

provide funds for research generally, is something that I will bring back to my colleagues. I think I can tell them that if there was one common theme in this debate this afternoon it was that this Parliament, representing the people of Europe at this level, is very conscious of our vulnerability, of our dependency and of our need and our determination to reduce that dependency and that vulnerability. We are talking particularly of employment for our people. I saw a certain level of apparent inherent contradiction in some arguments against nuclear energy, particularly when some of those who argue most strongly against it were also arguing most strongly in favour of employment for our people. The reality is that even if the oil-producing countries agreed to maintain or even to increase the present level of production, they would not be able to provide sufficient oil to fuel our economic growth at the rate at which we have been consuming energy. The fact then is that we do have to look for alternative sources. Those who are concerned particularly about our workers, our young people, the future generations in Europe, the less well off, should recognize that we cannot provide job security for them, we cannot provide anything for them, unless we develop sources of energy other than oil in the medium and long term.

I want to say particularly that it is the weaker sections and the weaker countries who are most vulnerable here, because as pointed out by many speakers, for one reason or another many of the countries, are not as dependent on imported oil as some of the smaller countries, or even some countries at a lower level of development. Some countries have been able already to re-allocate their energy programmes to develop nuclear energy, to have arrangements on a bilateral or other basis for oil supplies for some considerable time. But it is those countries who are most dependent, because their demand is higher. It is they particularly who need a common energy policy in this Community. And here may I appeal to each of you to adopt the example suggested by Mr Seligman who said that you have a very important influence to bring to bear on your parties and your governments. I think I can say quite clearly and without qualification that the views expressed here by almost every representative who spoke will not be reflected so urgently by the Member Governments of this Community.

I am not criticising my colleagues in the Council. I know that there is a sense of urgency. But because of the two-way process which we are all now engaged in, those of you who could influence your governments to introduce the right type of proposals in the short medium and long term now have a great opportunity to do so as a consequence of what has been said here. I think we will see that reflected then in the develop-

ment of what all of us recognize as essential to the development of this Community — a common energy policy.

I want to say to those who went into considerable detail which is of great help to us — and I do not want to indicate any special names here — that the points mentioned have been noted, and it is only for brevity and because of the fact that energy is not my immediate responsibility that I do not refer to some of the precise points that were made. But I can tell you that I have been encouraged and reassured by what has been said in this area, and I hope that together we can move now, though five years after the date the Council first decided — October 1974 — towards the formulation of a common energy policy.

That brings me to my next point; you cannot in this day and age, at this stage of our development, have an economic community without a common energy policy. Indeed, I think it is fair to say that it would be a contradiction in terms. The European Council recognized the impact of the energy crisis on our whole economic development programmes and the constraints it imposed on us. This is, after all, a European Economic Community, with economic and social policies. If we are going to build those economic and social policies on foundations that will not have at their base a common energy policy, I am afraid our aims and targets in any area — be it regional, social or economic, or even in our relations with other countries — will be built on very shaky foundations indeed. I think it is almost, as I suggested, a contradiction in terms to think in terms of economic policies that are not firmly based and rooted and guaranteed in a common energy policy, though it will take some time, let it be acknowledged. There are obvious problems, but at least the process must get under way, and I think that what the Council has done in Strasbourg and what the energy Ministers and this Council will follow with, and what this Parliament, I hope, will follow with will now lead clearly in that direction.

I think Mr Klepsch has perhaps heard this rhetoric before. So have I, though perhaps not as often as he has. But I think the day for rhetoric is long past, the time for action has now arrived, and I think the evidence is there of that sense of urgency and commitment. Fairly soon, I believe, you will see further evidence of it from the energy Ministers. We will after all have to report to you on this the most essential element in the continuing deliberations in the Council of Ministers and at the European Council. If we fail, then it will not be just the failure of the Council, it will be the failure of Europe; and you certainly will be entitled to question and to hold us accountable for our failure.

O'Kennedy

This brings me to another theme that, I noted, ran through almost all the speeches that were made here this afternoon, and that was the need to re-activate the development of Europe throughout the regions as an economic community. I repeat again that this cannot even be contemplated until we have that energy policy base. But that being said, I was encouraged to hear figures of every status, particularly of such major status as Willy Brandt, all united on this in this Parliament. It is time that we developed the economic policies that were proposed by the Commission to eliminate the regional imbalances within this Community, to bring about that cohesion and internal strength that I referred to in my opening address not just for the sake of this Community but so that this Community can be strong enough internally to embrace the new Members who will join us over the next few years, and also so that we would be strong enough to meet the just demands of our Mediterranean neighbours, of the developing countries, of countries from ASEAN and China, right across to our own borders ; to do that and to play the role that we want to in promoting a just balance in the world.

We have, of course, to ensure a parallel and fair development within our own Community, in order to encourage the development of the potential of our regions. That, I am glad to note, is something for which I can rely on this Parliament in the light of the views that you have expressed here this afternoon on developing real policies. I remember that the progress chart was meant to be the elimination of regional imbalances, leading towards economic and monetary union, leading towards European political union. Well, if we are even going to start on this stage, the first step must be the elimination of the imbalances within this Community. It is, after all, not just a common market ; not one of us joined a common market, we joined a European Economic Community, and a community does have policies in the economic and social and regional areas. I think, therefore, by definition, and under the Treaties, we must and will implement those policies to make this Community stronger internally. That was an important theme of my speech and that of the President of the Commission. We must be able to deal more effectively with the problems outside our community that face us more and more urgently at this time.

There was a sense of urgency which I welcomed in everything that was said here this afternoon particularly in relation to the unemployment of our young people. I want to assure those who may have perhaps, for one reason or another, detected a lack of urgency in my opening remarks that there is no lack of urgency ; there cannot be in the face of the problems that our young people are going to face — the competition from outside, the fact that we are going to have to live with the reality of competition, that we will

have to restructure our industry and that the young people that we place our hope and trust in must find a place in Europe. Of course, we must not be engaged in sterile debate, either here or elsewhere, and we must by common action ensure that there will be programmes to tackle unemployment.

A new member from my own country, Mr Blaney, spoke. I might be forgiven for wondering whether or not he had heard what I said, or had written his speech before I spoke, because he claimed that there was no reference to the elimination of regional imbalances, whereas I think it was quite clear throughout my whole speech. He detected a lack of reference to the social policies that were necessary, and I think I went to some considerable length in my opening address to deal with this. You will forgive me for making reference to the home ground. I wish to make it clear that these are the issues that all of us must face together.

I want to say in relation to unemployment that it is only very recently that this Community as a Community has become conscious of unemployment. Some regions of this Community have known chronic unemployment for very many years, but some areas now face it for the first time in certain sectors : steel, shipbuilding, textiles. Well, even belatedly, this has meant that the Commission and Community and those of us in the Council are now prepared to tackle unemployment, when three years ago this was not regarded as a priority. I note that there is again here a common commitment in this Parliament, which I can report back to my colleagues in the Council, to maintain a consistent programme in this area and to ensure particularly that we will not just react, as I said, to the problems in structural areas — although that is important — but will also look at the development of our own industries, introduce new technologies to ensure that the Europe of the future can not only survive, but will in fact grow stronger as part of an overall world community which will also allow access to products from the developing countries to our markets.

On the common agricultural policy, could I just briefly refer to the question, of anomalies. Of course there are anomalies, and the anomalies of surpluses are those that will be tackled in our time and subsequently. But what I think we are all agreed upon is that you do not attack the policy, which has been well established, simply because there are abuses or anomalies. Someone said recently that it is perhaps bad enough that we should freeze last winter or this coming winter. It would not, I think, be very prudent to suggest that we should starve also. At least we do not have food queues in Europe any more, and at least there is a guarantee that we have that very basic element to fuel our economic programmes. But I want to assure this Parliament that the anomalies that exist in the common agricultural policy will be tackled by

O'Kennedy

this presidency and, I am quite sure, by succeeding presidencies.

Can I just make two points on development policy: I want to thank Miss Flesch particularly for a reference to the achievements of the community in our development and cooperation programmes. I want to say especially to Mr Ansart that the Community in its relations with the developing countries has a standard that is second to none; if other major countries or power blocs in the world followed the enlightened example of the European Economic Community in its relationships with developing countries, then the problems of these developing countries would be a lot less critical than they are at this time. While Mr Ansart may be impatient with the Community's achievements in the Lomé negotiations, I want to assure him, as I said before, that it is an example of cooperation which could well be followed by other countries, in Europe and elsewhere, who would give more time and attention to development and cooperation policies with these starving nations. Hopefully the example given by the Community will be followed by Japan, China, the Soviet Union and elsewhere, who can also help these countries to reach the standard of living that is their right and our obligation to achieve.

I come finally to the question of European political cooperation which was touched upon in response to my references to it. Let me reiterate that I intend to engage in the most constant and detailed consultations with this Parliament on European political cooperation, and on all the range of issues that come within the scope of that topic. But let me also state that that does not mean, as some I think have suggested, that there is at this point a common foreign policy in the European Economic Community. Because I would have thought that before you could even have a common foreign policy, you would have to have a common political entity which could then express a common foreign policy. We are some distance yet from the political union that most of us aspire to in Europe; and when we have that internal cohesion, economically and politically, then perhaps as well, *pari passu* we can express externally a common foreign policy of that particular community. But we are some way from that as yet. That is not to say that we should not in the meantime strengthen and develop, as I have said, the European political cooperation process.

There were some references to the need to discuss security. I will not suggest that security is not important to all of our lives, but let me just here appeal to the Treaties, which many of you will be more familiar with than I have been. It is not covered by the Treaties. It is not part of European political cooperation,

and it is not something that I would either have the authority or right to discuss with you here in any consultation, or even amongst my partners in the Nine. As I have said, we can of course take account of certain realities, but I think we should not put too many demands on what is in fact a growing and strengthening process between us, hereby creating expectations which we cannot match and then criticizing our lack of achievement.

I am conscious of the fact that I have taken some considerable time in replying, and that there are many points that have been raised that I have not replied to. Let me just say in conclusion that I have found this, my first experience at this newly-elected Parliament, a very stimulating one. I want to say that I never would imagine that the Irish presidency is the beginning or the end of any experience that happens to coincide with the beginning of this Parliament. The European Community did not begin on 1 July, and it will not end at the end of December when I pass on the baton to my Italian colleague. All I would hope is that whatever decisions may be taken in our time, at least we will have acted consistently on the range of areas that you and I have identified together, and that if the time is not right for decisions during this six months, at least the groundwork will have been well laid for decisions in the next six months, or in each succeeding six months, as this Community develops and grows even stronger. We all of us have an interest in the success of this Parliament. So much public attention has been attached to it that if this Parliament, for one reason or another, were to fail, Europe would find it very much harder to succeed in the achievement of our aims. To that extent I, representing the Council for the time being, share with you the interest in ensuring that your success will be our success. I would like to thank you for the opportunity of exchanging these opinions with you this afternoon.

(Applause)

President. — I note that no one else wish to speak. The proceedings will now be suspended in accordance with this morning's decision.

I call Mr Klepsch on a point of order.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Mr President, there is a point I should like to raise. You tell us that the sitting is to be suspended. The agenda is such that I fail to see how we can justify an adjournment. I should like to know if there are any objective grounds for suspending the sitting now. If not, I should like to oppose the idea because I cannot imagine — unless the Bureau can enlighten me — how we are going to get through the agenda that we fixed for today.

(Applause)

President. — As far as I am aware, there are two objective reasons for suspending the proceedings until 10 p.m. The first is that the House was informed right at the beginning of the afternoon of the intention to suspend the sitting between about half past eight and ten o'clock. Many of us planned accordingly.

A second objective reason, which is perhaps more important, is that it is established practice to suspend the proceedings for the benefit of the staff. We sat for four and a half hours this morning and we have since been sitting for another five and a quarter hours. We are likely to have another lengthy session tonight. Going by the experience in my own parliament, I can well imagine that the Members will want to keep to the arrangements and grant this request so that the staff can have a break.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Thank you for your explanation, Mr President. With regard to the first reason, let me say that my group knew nothing about the intention to suspend the proceedings at this point. So much for the first reason.

With regard to the second reason you gave, I am not sure whether it is better for the staff to be on duty here until four in the morning or to get the sitting finished without a break. I wonder...

(Interruption: But the rules say that there must be breaks!)

... the honourable Member will no doubt learn — he can take my word for it — that Parliament arranges night sittings but that those of us who are here are among the exceptions who, when a night sitting...

(Interruption)

... precisely, the staff have to sit right through a night sitting, even if there are just the two of us here. As far as the breaks are concerned, you can rest assured that there is every opportunity to organize them. On other occasions we have worked right through. As I see it, the point at the moment is how we can justify a break in the light of our agenda. We took it on ourselves to discuss Vietnam and we have to see this motion through to the end. A specific amount of time has been allotted to the debate. If we do not want to discuss the matter, it would be a good idea to say so now, instead of pretending we can stage a major debate on Vietnam before midnight, with all the repercussions it has. I make no secret of the fact that I find it rather depressing that we are already a day behind our schedule, Mr President. We are a day behind and I should not be surprised if the staff and the Members were asked to stay on for a sitting on Saturday.

(Interruption)

You heard the honourable Member: we have to set up the committees, or how are we going to explain away

the hold-up to the public? As far as I see it, the straightforward question — which I have already put once before — is how the Bureau thinks it is going to get through the agenda if we have a break of an hour and a half.

(Applause)

I cannot see how it can be done, but I suppose those who have made the proposal know what they are doing.

President. — The proposal to suspend the proceedings until 10 p.m. was mine, and I made it on the basis of the information I had been given.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) I formally propose that we begin the debate on Vietnam now.

President. — I call Mrs von Alemann.

Mrs von Alemann. — (*D*) Mr President, I wish to speak against Mr Klepsch's proposal. I have the impression that at the moment there are quite a lot of people who have left in good faith, thinking they were letting the staff have a break. All the Members of the Group of the European People's Party are here — perhaps that is a bit of an exaggeration, but most of them are here. I am in favour of suspending the proceedings until ten o'clock. This will not mean a break of an hour and a half but — if my calculation is correct — of one hour and seven minutes.

President. — I put to the vote the proposal by Mr Klepsch that the sitting be continued without interruption.

The proposal is adopted.

(Applause)

I call Mr Lange.

Mr Lange. — (*D*) Could I just say something? A number of colleagues have assumed that an adjournment was scheduled, as announced by the President earlier. That was before...

(Interruption)

... that has nothing to do with it now. The fact of the matter is that several Members made the assumption with the result that we are now missing the speakers for the debate on Vietnam. All I am asking is that we wait until these speakers can take part in the debate and suspend the sitting until ten.

President. — Mr Lange, the decision on this point has just been taken.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) I merely want to say to Mr Lange that I fully appreciate the point he is making but that some of the speakers are in fact here. We can begin with them and in the meantime see to it that the others are summoned. I agree Mr President, that the decision has been taken and there is no point in discussing the matter further.

President. — I call Miss Brooks.

Miss Brooks. — To avoid confusion in future and to avoid the confusion that has taken place in the last ten minutes in this House, Sir, might I suggest that if a decision has been made, it be communicated to all groups sitting in this House well before the end of the time allowed? I think we have added to the confusion tonight and we have added to delay. If in future the President gives a time and decides on an adjournment, and that decision is communicated to all groups, then what has happened in the last few minutes will not happen again, Sir.

(*Applause*)

President. — I assumed that the announcement had been made publicly. I was under that impression.

I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (*I*) Mr President, I am very sorry to say that because of this misunderstanding we thought that the sitting was to be suspended. Mr Cheysson has left the Chamber precisely because he thought there was going to be an adjournment. Since somebody said that we ought to check whether those who are down to speak are present, I felt I should apologize for Mr Cheysson's absence. He will speak at a later stage, but I must point out that we thought that the sitting was going to be suspended.

President. — I am sorry, but Parliament decides its own agenda, and this we have done.

(*Applause*)

13. *Position of South-East Asian refugees*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on

- the statements by the Council and the Commission on the position of Indochinese refugees
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-223/79/rev.II) on the tragedy of the Indochinese refugees
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-224/79) on the dramatic situation of the Vietnam refugees
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-227/79) on the plight of refugees in South-East Asia

—the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-228/79) on the plight of refugees in South-East Asia.

I call Mr O'Kennedy.

Mr O'Kennedy, President-in-Office of the Council. — Mr President, Members, I welcome this opportunity to make a statement on the very grave problem of the Indo-Chinese refugees and other displaced persons in South-East Asia, which has now become a matter of such serious concern to the international community. As you are probably aware, Mr Cheysson and I will be attending the conference in Geneva tomorrow on this very urgent and important problem.

This humanitarian and political problem was discussed initially by the Foreign Ministers of the Nine meeting in political cooperation and subsequently by the Heads of State or Government in the European Council in Strasbourg. At the ministerial meeting we called for an international conference of the kind being held in Geneva tomorrow and the following day under the auspices of the United Nations, which would discuss practical measures to alleviate the plight of the refugees and the serious situation which now faces the countries in which the refugees are arriving. In calling for an international conference my Community ministerial colleagues and I stressed the great urgency of the problem, the grave responsibility of Vietnam and the need for a more widespread and generous response from the international community. I feel that the character of this Parliament and its direct responsibility to its electors require that it should, at this stage, respond on behalf of the people of Europe to this grave problem.

We pledged to do everything we could to ensure the success of the conference which begins tomorrow, and we decided to approach the Government of Vietnam on all aspects of the question. The Council made it clear that, while they support a principle very dear to everyone in this Community, namely, the right of people freely to leave and re-enter their own countries, they are gravely concerned by the immense human suffering created by this situation in Indochina and by the disorderly exodus of refugees from Indochina, which has caused severe problems for other countries in the area.

The Community cannot but be moved by the inhuman and intolerable suffering of the refugees. For that reason I welcome the opportunity of opening this debate and of reporting on the project proposed by the Council and Commission. Mr Cheysson will reply to the debate and report to me so that we shall have a clear and comprehensive view of Parliament's thinking when we address the Conference tomorrow morning. Some of our countries have at various stages in their history witnessed the tragedy of refugees from their own lands and this must further strengthen our determination to alleviate the plight of these our suffering fellow human-beings.

O'Kennedy

The Community has therefore responded with concern and determination. We have called for the international meeting which starts tomorrow in Geneva under UN auspices, with the intention of creating a basis for global action to tackle the problem at its source, i.e. in Vietnam and Cambodia. What we need are practical measures to resettle the refugees elsewhere and to relieve the heavy burden now carried by the countries of the region. But we must also, I believe, try to prevail on the countries of origin to accept their responsibilities in relation to the exodus now taking place from their countries. Our aim must be to seek every means open to us to relieve urgently the suffering on the seas, in the neighbouring States and in the refugee camps and to find a haven for the refugees in new homes throughout the world. By working to achieve this at the Conference we can give further proof of the weight and effectiveness of our common action as a Community in the face of urgent world problems.

The nine Member States of the European Community have already tried, according to their capabilities, to alleviate the problem by admitting refugees for resettlement by contributing to humanitarian aid programmes, such as those of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees. In addition, the Community as such has undertaken significant financial action to remedy the disastrous situation of the refugees. The Member States are prepared to make further commitments, additional to those already given, in regard to admitting refugees and making financial contributions. In doing so we wish to make a contribution that will enhance the prospects of success of tomorrow's meeting, encourage other countries to take similar action, and help ease the heavy burden which countries in the area are bearing. As a further instance of our commitment, the European Community and each of the Member States is currently examining how we can best translate our concern into practical effort through the operation and adaptation of our various aid programmes.

As I already pointed out in presenting the programme for the Irish presidency, on the first day of my presidency I attended the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) in Bali where I was invited as a guest in my capacity as the President of the Council of Ministers. There I had first-hand detailed reports from the Foreign Ministers of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand on the dimensions of the problem and the burden it placed on these countries. They stressed the gravity with which they view the problem and the very great strain it places on them. In return I relayed to them the extent of European concern at the problem. It put our perception of it in terms of its source, its symptoms and its solution and outlined the efforts the Community has been

making, and will continue to make, with regard to these three aspects. I urged, in view of certain statements made by Ministers in those countries prior to the international meeting and other efforts to get to the source of the problem, that they should not refuse landing rights to refugees at present on the high seas. I endeavoured with the Foreign Ministers of Australia, the USA, New Zealand and Japan who were present at the meeting to convey the seriousness with which we view the humanitarian aspect of the problem. The ASEAN Foreign Ministers were gratified and encouraged by the extent of the Community's concern with the crisis and the active steps we are taking to help alleviate it and, I think I can say that they responded favourably to the strong representations that we, their visitors, made to them, particularly not to turn refugees back from their shores, particularly in view of our commitment and of the proposals we hoped would emanate from the Conference which starts tomorrow.

I have outlined to you briefly the action taken by the Community since the matter was brought to the attention of the Foreign Ministers of the Nine some weeks ago and the action taken by the Member States to deal with this tragic problem which has deeply moved public opinion in all our countries. I am sure that I can count on the strong support of Parliament for the efforts of the Community to reach a just and equitable solution to the origin of the problem as well as for compassionate measures needed to alleviate the immediate suffering of the refugees and the difficulties posed for the other nations in the region.

Finally, let me assure Parliament that in providing aid to relieve the suffering of these refugees, we have made it clear, and will continue to make it clear, to the countries concerned that this should not be seen as acceptance by the Community that this disorderly exodus should continue. We are ready to assist, but we are not prepared to condone the inhuman expulsion of these people from their countries. I hope that the Conference will produce the conclusions all of us are determined to reach.

(Applause)

President. — Thank you, Mr O'Kennedy. I am sure the House will not take it amiss if the President-in-Office of the Council leaves now, because he had not reckoned that this item would feature so late on the agenda. As Mr Cheysson is not yet here, I propose that we continue with the next speaker on the list.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Mr President, it is not the first time that the situation has arisen whereby someone has arrived late and has not spoken until then. This has frequently happened here in the House. However, we have on the list speakers who could be called now.

Klepsch

It is up to the House in which order they speak, and the decision is yours. I am in full agreement.

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

Mr Griffiths. — I admit that I am new to the proceedings of this Parliament, but I did hear the President saying this morning that there would be an adjournment this evening. Now, under Rule 8 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, the President has the power to adjourn the sitting. What I should like to know is: if it has been recorded in the minutes of today's proceedings that there would be an adjournment, can the House overturn the ruling made by the President earlier on today?

President. — I have not consulted the Rules of Procedure. I accept that what you say is correct, but after the decision which has just been taken here, I shall certainly not use this power.

I call Mr Jenkins.

Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission. — Mr President, I only intervene briefly, in order to say that I am sorry that Mr Cheysson, who would wish to intervene at this stage, is not here at the moment. I do not think that it is his fault. He will arrive in the course of the debate and will intervene as soon as he can. I do not presume to judge between different methods of procedure. The tradition of the parliament which I have been used to over nearly 30 years is that we never adjourn for meals, we go through with our business to the end, but I do not say that that is necessarily the best tradition. But what I had hoped for from this new Parliament was that we might have some certainty from hour to hour, from day to day.

(Applause)

If that certainty is there, then I shall undertake, as far as lies within my power, to produce the appropriate Commissioners at the right time. But if there are sudden changes of timetable, then I fear events like the present are bound to occur. I apologize for the fact that the Commission is not represented as it should be. Mr Cheysson will be here as soon as he can be found, and will come to this House and will be very anxious to speak at an early stage. But I very much hope that in the future, whatever is right, whatever is wrong in this particular incident, we can have some certainty from hour to hour and indeed from day to day, because I believe on that will depend a great deal of our ability always to have the appropriate Commissioner present at the right time.

(Applause)

President. — I am sure everybody will understand your position. As soon as Mr Cheysson is here, I shall give him the floor.

I call Mr Griffiths.

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, I am not happy. I have asked a question and, as I say, I am not over-familiar with the Rules of Procedure. I would like to

know, if the President did in fact say there would be an adjournment this evening, under which particular rule we have the right to overturn that ruling of the President?

President. — I have answered to the best of my knowledge. We shall now continue with the business of the House.

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

Mr Cohen. — *(NL)* Mr President, the plight of the refugees in Indo-China has shocked us more than we could have imagined a few weeks ago. We have come face-to-face with the full horror of the situation there, and various groups in this House have been occupied with this problem. Several motions for resolutions have been tabled, as we are all concerned about the fate of the refugees and hope that the Community will help to solve this appalling problem, for which our policies over the past 20 years may have made us at least partly responsible — of course, we don't admit this openly, yet I think we feel it in our heart of hearts.

It is our duty — as I think we in this House all agree — to do our utmost to ease the lot of the refugees and to see to it that in the short and long-terms — especially, of course, in the long term — conditions in Asia can return to normal.

The motions before us this evening are all based on the conviction that this is Europe's duty and that we must do something in both the short and long terms.

The Community can help to solve this problem by first of all ensuring that arrangements are made to receive the refugees. However, it is far more important that we should try to make a success of the Geneva Conference, which opens tomorrow. The conference will have, in particular, to define the long-term policy designed to ensure that such situations never recur. The Community will also have to contribute to the discussions.

All we can do in the short term is provide food aid. This lies within the powers of the Commission and of the Community, and that is why the Socialist Group's motion places such great emphasis on food aid. We stressed this point because, as I have just said, the Community is directly empowered to provide such aid, and we can thus directly alleviate the needs which have arisen as a result of the refugee problem, but also because we feel that the Commission — for the first time in its existence — is at present trying to handle food aid politically and turn it into a political weapon. In the past 20 years the Community and Commission have never done this. Food aid to Chile and Uganda has not been discontinued.

Cohen

Other forms of aid have been delayed or withheld, but food aid has purposely never been used as a political weapon — and the Commission has always been quite categorical on this point. For the first time in its history, now that the refugee problem has arisen in Indo-China, the Commission is using food aid as a political weapon. Quite apart from situation in South-East Asia, this is a dangerous precedent against which the Socialist Group wishes to protest.

But that is only a secondary aspect of the Socialist Group's motion. The Socialist Group is mainly concerned that the Community should make arrangements to provide food aid as quickly as possible, for that is the only way the Community can help solve the problem in the short term; and secondly, the Community should wherever possible, at the Geneva Conference and elsewhere, do its utmost to ensure a satisfactory long-term solution.

(Applause)

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

Mr Poncelet. — *(F)* Mr President, I should like to put it on record that the circumstances of this debate are quite unfair. If I may repeat what others have pointed out, the Chair announced quite clearly that there would be an adjournment. If any more proof were needed, we have it with the hurried return of Mr Cheysson who has been called back to the sitting.

It could happen in the future that some chance majority at a particular moment makes far-reaching changes to our order of business to the detriment of the agenda as a whole. What has just happened is that a temporary majority has altered the agenda which was established at the beginning of the sitting and announced by the President. This means that a fair number of Members — just look at the empty benches — are missing some fine speeches. Because they are not here, they will not be able to contribute to the debate, which they would certainly have done after hearing some of these speeches. Mr President, this is not a proper manner of conducting our business. It does not augur well for the subsequent business of the House.

President. — Mr Poncelet, those who are here had every opportunity to take into consideration what you have said. The House reached a decision and you cannot reopen the matter now. I appreciate your views but it is the duty of the President to implement the decisions of the House, and I ask you to accept this. I cannot give the floor to any other speakers on a point of order concerning the decision that has just been taken. I shall call anyone who wishes to speak for some other reason.

I call Lord Bethell.

Lord Bethell. — I must protest at the fact that almost all the Members of this House have been

informed that there was going to be a recess shortly after 8.30 p.m. and were going to reassemble at 10.00 p.m.

President. — I am sorry, Sir. We discussed this problem already.

Lord Bethell. — I have been summoned at short notice in order to come back for the Vietnamese debate. Almost all my colleagues are away. I was told clearly, Mr President, by your staff that the Vietnamese debate would begin at ten o'clock. We cannot have these changes in the agenda every minute if we are going to have serious debates on matters of life and death. How many people are dying while hundreds of people are away wining and dining out in Strasbourg? We were told that this debate was going to take place at ten o'clock. Let us have the debate on Vietnam at ten o'clock when we were assured, Mr President, by your staff that the debate would take place. Then we will know where we are. Then we can make our speeches on this vital matter of massive life and death.

(Applause)

President. — Sir, your remarks are not fair. We made a decision on this point. We could not go back on that. I call Mr Irmer.

Mr Irmer. — *(D)* Mr President, I wish to make a formal proposal that the sitting be suspended until 10 p.m., and I shall justify this request. The fact of the matter, ladies and gentlemen, is that the procedure in this Parliament ...

President. — We have already discussed this and reached a decision.

Mr Irmer. — *(D)* ... there is an additional point I should like to make ...

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, the point of order I want to raise is perhaps a shade more specific than it might have been a moment ago. You were quite right, Mr President, to point out to us that, legally speaking, the decisions of the House are final. Thank you for making this clear to us. However, when another Member makes the same point before the House, even if he is not the chairman of a group, he has every right to propose what Mr Klepsch proposed earlier and every right to be heard.

There is another formal point I should like to make. Last night it was decided unanimously — and this was the only thing that the Bureau decided unanimously — to have a serious and proper debate on this subject,

Pannella

using the information supplied by the Council and the Commission. Now, however, a majority in the House decided to start this debate without waiting for any of this information, and legally they are in the right. But now we are raising the matter again, and the House, although it took a decision ten minutes ago, can change its mind. I support the proposal put forward by the Member who has just spoken but at the same time, Mr President, now that you know that Mrs Veil made this announcement, I ask you to use your discretionary powers and not to put the matter to the House again. I am confident in requesting this, Mr President, because you said earlier that you were unaware of Mrs Veil's announcement. Now you know, and so with due regard for the subject of Vietnam and disregarding the conniving and the speechifying of some, let us have a proper debate with all those who want to take part, because many Members are absent not through any fault of their own but because of what they heard from the Chair.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Mr President, it will not take me a moment to say what I have to say because I find Mr Pannella's comments contemptible ...

(*Applause*)

... Speaking time was allocated by the Bureau yesterday. The decision by the Bureau was based on the assumption that we should have the Council debate this morning and the debate on Vietnam in the afternoon. It never occurred to the Bureau that we should be discussing Vietnam at this god-forsaken hour. It was thanks to Mr Pannella and his delaying tactics that the whole morning sitting was wasted ...

(*Applause*)

... and we could not discuss the political issues to which he sanctimoniously refers. I have nothing but contempt for such ploys ...

(*Applause*)

... which seek to paralyse and undermine the work of Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Balfe.

Mr Balfe. — Mr President, this is the second night that I have come back to this building because it appears to be impossible for this Parliament to organize its business with any semblance of common sense. We spent most of this morning on procedural wrangles which would have been a disgrace to a sixth form. We spent most of this evening thinking that we were supposed to be in recess, and we are now back here told that a debate is about to take place. What I put to you is this: if we can't run this place efficiently, I think it is high time we set up some sort of Committee to look into ways of organizing it slightly better.

You may well wave at me. I am a bit fed up with being called back to this place again and again because you can't organize it. Let me put that, quite bluntly. Let us say this. We were told and there are many people at another place who were told — that a debate would commence at ten o'clock. I invite those people who are here to filibuster until ten o'clock to get at least one decision that has been announced carried out, so that it actually happens at the correct time. Because the way this organization is behaving at the moment, if you wanted to feed grist to the mill of those people who want to bring this Parliament into contempt you could not have written a better script. Please for goodness sake sort yourselves out!

(*Applause*)

President. — When we have finished this discussion, you can have the opportunity of making a personal statement in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, with which you are obviously familiar, Mr Pannella.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

I call Mr Pannella for a personal statement.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Mr President, as you correctly said, the Rules of Procedure permit the chair to choose the moment, and I should like to thank you for this remarkable example of compliance with the Rules of Procedure.

In fact, Mr President, my personal statement is a parliamentary one. I want to make it clear, here and now, that the statement by the honourable Chairman of the Christian-Democratic Group concerning his contempt for another Member of this House is an example of tactics which I reject. I shall not say that I feel contempt for Mr Klepsch because I feel that, for the sake of democracy, I must respect the voters who sent him here. As far as I am concerned, the honourable gentleman — whatever his talents or non-talents might be — is a representative of the electorate, even though it may sometimes make a mistake. I shall reply to the insult, Mr President, by saying that I respect the honourable Member, even if he is Mr Klepsch. I want to point out, however, that at the meeting of the Bureau yesterday evening, after we had spoken, Mr Klepsch and other colleagues agreed to have this debate on Vietnam before the debate on the Luster report, instead of as Klepsch himself would have wished. This is the point I am trying to make. Let me just say in conclusion that Parliament was disrupted today by unconstitutional tactics. We did not want this discussion; it was you who forced it upon us.

President. — My apologies, Mr Cheysson. Would you care to take the floor now?

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) First of all, I should like to apologize to the House for not having been here from the start of this debate, to which the Commission attaches a great deal of importance. Indeed, we regard it as very significant that the first specific debate, the first debate which is neither of a general nor of a procedural nature in this elected Parliament, concerns the refugees in South-East Asia, as if this elected Parliament wanted, instinctively, to emphasize in its very first part-session that the construction of Europe is inseparable from the protection of man, the defence of human rights and the need to intervene when people's physical existence is threatened, as Willy Brandt said this afternoon.

This is very encouraging for us in pursuing a policy, or a series of policies, to which we attach great importance, namely the humanitarian policies Mr Cohen referred to just now.

Mr President, before talking about the refugees in South-East Asia I should like to remind the House that for a number of years the Community has in fact been involved in a policy of providing food aid. One figure will suffice to show the scale of this policy. In the 1979 budget, 640 million u.a. — I repeat 640 million — have been set aside to cover the supply of food to countries where it is needed. That is a substantial figure, and the policy is clearly defined. We provide our food aid to countries which meet certain objective criteria of poverty, food requirements and balance of payments difficulties. This is a humanitarian policy and, to take up what Mr Cohen said just now, I should like to state that this humanitarian policy has never been linked and — in so far as it is in the Commission's power — will never be linked to any political stipulations of whatever kind.

Mr Cohen was right to recall that in difficult circumstances, when Allende was assassinated, we maintained our policy towards the people of Chile. He was right to recall that while Idi Amin, as you know, was creating world-wide indignation we none the less maintained our aid to the people of Uganda. In each case, however, we acted in conditions for which we are answerable to the European Parliament and to the people of Europe, the taxpayers and voters: in other words we assured ourselves that the aid was actually benefiting those for whom it was intended, i.e. the people who needed it. We have thus in fact been obliged in many cases, as Mr Cohen said, to interrupt for a time the operation of certain programmes in order to check that those most in need were actually benefiting from them. Unfortunately, Vietnam is among the eligible countries. I say unfortunately in that it is a country which has suffered a great deal: it has suffered from war, in the course of an heroic struggle, and it has recently suffered from floods which have devastated part of its crops. Vietnam is thus among the countries which have been receiving

our food aid for some years now. Let me remind you that in 1977 33 million u.a. and in 1978 67 million u.a. were set aside for aid to Vietnam — and these are very sizeable amounts, while in the 1979 budget there is provision for 54 million u.a. for food supplies to Vietnam.

The programme was carried out normally under the 1977 and 1978 budgets and at the present time two shiploads of food for the Vietnamese people are still on their way to Vietnam. A Greek ship is waiting off Haiphong to unload food for Vietnam.

The 1979 programme has not been initiated — and this is only normal, as a certain amount of time always elapses between finalizing the budgetary appropriations and the start of the operations. It is in fact this 1979 programme that has been suspended by the Commission, while the previous programmes are being carried out. It is this 1979 programme that we shall have to discuss at a later date in the light of what happens in Geneva.

Mr President, there is one particular aspect to this intervention by means of food supplies, namely the possibility of taking very quick action in emergencies, which includes the possibility of operations for the benefit of refugees. Unfortunately, a large number of various migrations are going on in the world today, which leads to desperate situations and means there are refugees who need help if they are to survive.

At present, three and a half million refugees around the world are receiving aid from the Community, including Palestinians, Africans — one and a half million Africans — and in the past three years the Community has spent 115 million u.a. on refugees. So, when this great flood of refugees from South-East Asia developed, the Community naturally took action and in the 1979 programme you will find 12 million u.a. for refugees from South-East Asia, to be used — since we are not in a position to take direct action out there — via international organizations, the Red Cross, the World Food Programme and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees. Then, Mr President, at the beginning of this year the flow of refugees suddenly increased. According to the report by the High Commission for Refugees which is to be examined tomorrow and the day after in Geneva, the number of refugees from South-East Asia increased by 155 000 between 1 January and 30 June. At present there are 400 000 refugees who are described as being 'in transit', in a terrible plight on islands or, worse still, on ships which are doomed to sink. 190 000 come from Vietnam and 210 000 — the majority — from Cambodia and Laos.

I should like here to pay tribute to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, which performs a worthy and truly thankless task around the world. We cooperate closely with it in all parts of the world: in Latin America, Africa and Asia (in Burma

Cheysson

and South-East Asia). When, two or three months ago, the High Commissioner for Refugees told us how worried he was about the resources needed to provide the bare essentials for these refugees who are arriving in greatly increased numbers, the Commission decided to take such action as it could. We thus allocated 5 million u.a. in cash to meet various requirements for medical supplies and for foodstuffs which cannot be found in Europe. These 5 million u.a. were paid in their entirety between March and June. However, the simple food needs had increased far beyond what was provided for in our budget and we, the Commission, have thus proposed to the Council that half of the food requirements of the refugees from June to August should be covered immediately by emergency decisions.

In order to cover half the food requirements, these decisions had to involve 1 500 tonnes of milk powder. These 1 500 tonnes were available under the budget and did not present any problem: we took them and they have been put to use. Decisions were also needed on 8 000 tonnes of rice, the equivalent of about 20 000 tonnes of cereals. But we do not have cereals available because — and I am sorry the President in Office of the Council is not here to hear me say this — while our Ministers never tire of declaring that Community food aid in cereals must be increased, every time we get down to the budgetary details we are met with a refusal, and Community food aid in cereals has not increased by a single kilogram in the last five years. So we did not have any cereals at our disposal. That is why our proposal provided for the 8 000 tonnes of rice to be charged under a different heading of the budget, since we are expected to follow normal budgetary practice. These 8 000 tonnes of rice are to be charged in the budget against an existing item, namely the amount set aside for Vietnam, which was in suspense pending a decision on how this food aid can be put into effect in proper fashion, in accordance with the criteria we have applied for some years. That is what we have done. It is not a point of particular interest.

I think it is more important, Mr President, to talk about what is to happen subsequently. There are 400 000 refugees — and the flow has perhaps not been stopped — 400 000 refugees, a large number of whom are living, or rather subsisting, in appalling conditions. This had to be discussed at international level; that was the view taken by the United Nations and the opinion of the countries of the Community; the President in Office of the Council went into this in detail just now. Tomorrow and the day after, therefore, there is to be a meeting in Geneva, under the chairmanship of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to discuss what can and must be done for these refugees. This meeting is in the tradition of previous meetings, particularly the one held last December on the same subject. The report drawn up by the High Commission for refugees, which is to be

the basis for our discussions in the next two days, brings out the three aspects of the problem. Firstly, there is the departure of the refugees. All of us find it unacceptable that people should be driven out to sea or induced, in a state of despair, to depart in the conditions we have seen. The departure of refugees who want to leave their country must be arranged in an orderly fashion. The proper organization of departures will thus be the first point on the agenda. On 30 May an agreement was reached between the United Nations High Commission for refugees and the Vietnamese Government. This agreement must now be put into effect and applied in normal and reasonable conditions. I am sorry that no such agreement is in sight with regard to Cambodia. The Community must, in our view, give all possible support to the High Commission for refugees to see that this agreement is put into effect and that the material costs resulting from these organized departures are met by the international community and more particularly by us in the European Community.

The second subject, the most dramatic and urgent question, is what is termed transit, in other words the question of what happens to these refugees between their departure from their country of origin and their ultimate arrival in a final place of refuge. Mr President, the Council of Ministers has accepted the Commission's proposal, which means the Community is prepared to provide half the food requirements of these refugees during the transit period. As I said, under the emergency measures we have taken this has been taken care of up to the end of September. We hope to continue this operation in the following quarters. We also hope to be able to grant aid in cash via the High Commission for refugees, to provide for these refugees' other needs, as I mentioned just now. Intervention by the Community must be in a clear and unmistakable form: as I just said, it must include this material commitment which will make it possible for the High Commissioner for refugees to organize their transit in the best way.

Will this be sufficient for this intermediate period? Personally, I take leave to doubt it. And I would suggest that certain problems will probably have to be dealt with by other bodies as well, in particular by non-government organizations. There is not just the need to feed the refugees who are in the transit camps and to build these camps in decent conditions, there are also more specific, more detailed operations such as the ship for Vietnam that we have heard about. Here, I think, if this House cares to adopt certain suggestions put forward by the political groups, our intervention alongside the non-government organizations could perhaps open the way to considerable progress.

The third, and clearly most important, aspect is the final place of refuge, the refugees' new home. Mr President, this question is not the Community's responsi-

Cheyssou

bility, it is a matter for the national governments. It is for each of them to decide how far they feel they can go in opening their doors to refugees, to all refugees, without distinction: men, women and children, they are all in a similar plight. It is thus up to the governments, the national governments in the Community, to decide — and it must be acknowledged that they have already made a considerable effort, since I note that of the 200 000 refugees who have found a permanent home outside South-East Asia the Community has welcomed 60 000. But 60 000 or 200 000, compared with the 400 000 in distress, who are now likely to die, compared with the hundreds of thousands who may well be following them, is too low a figure. The Community — or at least the Commission — hopes that in Geneva the member governments will be able to improve their offers. It is also hoped that other countries will be able to offer assistance. And if certain countries offer to accept refugees, the Commission feels something should be done to improve the material conditions in which these refugees and their families arrive. Thus, if the international community were to decide to give financial assistance to countries in the Third World who are willing to give a permanent home to refugees from South-East Asia, the European Community should in our view play its part in this financial operation. If the countries of the Community agree to give a permanent home to an increased number of refugees, we feel the Community budget should, through the existing channels — the Social Fund, for example — contribute to the financial burden involved.

Obviously, Mr President, the corresponding budgetary measures can only be proposed and adopted after the Geneva Conference. It is therefore on Tuesday 24 July that the Council will be asked to decide, as a matter of urgency, on the first measures to be taken and to give consideration to the others, which naturally includes the question of what should be done with the aid intended for Vietnam, i.e. this food aid which is currently in suspense and will have to be allocated, with regard in particular to what it proves possible to do about organizing departures from Vietnam.

That, Mr President, is a very bald factual account confined to the one problem of refugees. I am very happy to have limited my report in this way, since the aim of the United Nations Secretary-General and those who have convened the Geneva Conference is that in Geneva political discussions should be avoided, because above all it has been, is and will continue to be our intention that the humanitarian problems — emergency assistance and food aid — should be completely separated from the political problems.

This present debate, only a few hours before the Geneva Conference, is in our view of great importance. It is, as I said before, a significant event; it marks your sympathy as newly-elected Members of

Parliament, in other words the sympathy of the peoples of Europe, for men and women who are in terrible distress and who, even if we manage to relieve their suffering, will still be in a wretched position, for they have had to abandon their country, their past, their heritage. They are to become exiles. Let us therefore, show our sympathy for all these people. We must first ensure, with regard to elementary survival that the best possible arrangements are made, and on this point I am sure we are all agreed. And we should remember what this great departure means for the refugees, far from their homes, far from the world they know, far from their culture, their past and their heritage.

All this must, of course, be done in a way that takes account of the balance of the region, of the countries in South-East Asia as a whole, for nothing could be more dangerous than for certain countries to be isolated while the others feel threatened by this situation. This is a peculiarly difficult question which I am sure we shall have occasion to discuss again. It is a question with political aspects which will certainly have to be raised in this House.

But today it is perhaps best for us to confine ourselves to considering the fate of these people and of those who, since they feel obliged to leave, will be following them, and to recommend concrete, practical and immediate measures to relieve their suffering.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL
President

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

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution put before you under the urgent procedure once more calls your attention and that of the public to the fact that Parliament has the institutional duty to consider the distressing problem of refugees in South-East Asia, and in particular those from Vietnam.

Indeed, it is not the first time that Parliament has concerned itself with this problem, in which human dignity and the right to a life worthy of the name are at stake. As early as 1975, more precisely at the sitting of 10 April 1975, the European Parliament debated the situation of the Indo-Chinese refugees and passed a resolution in which it declared itself 'appalled by the scale of the human tragedy which has befallen the peoples of South Vietnam and Cambodia', and asked the Commission of the European Communities to help relieve the distress of the refugees by providing substantial material aid as tangible evidence of the sympathy of the people of the Community with the sufferings of Indochina.

Cassanfnagnago Cerreti

More recently, at the sitting on 18 January 1979, the European Parliament once more took up the problems of the refugees from Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam, and passed a resolution urging the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting in political cooperation to make a joint demarche to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and to the Vietnamese Government with a view to putting an end to this exodus of biblical proportions.

With today's motion for a resolution, Madam President, we wish first and foremost to draw attention to the gravity of the problem of the Vietnamese refugees and to the urgency of finding adequate solutions, and to ensure that this gravity and this urgency become the concern and responsibility of all. We also wish to highlight a situation which conflicts with the most elementary respect for basic human rights, and is aggravated by the violation of the rights to life, human dignity, health and a worthwhile existence. We have spoken many times in Parliament about civil rights, but the problems have remained substantially unchanged because of bureaucratic obstacles which cannot be immediately removed.

If we then consider that the victims of this fearful exodus from Vietnam include not only adults but also children who are being deprived of their basic rights to family life, education and the development of their faculties in an environment suited to their age, we cannot but note in bitter irony that all this is happening in the very year designated by the United Nations as the International Year of the Child.

Madam President, our motion for a resolution is above all an appeal to the civilized world to put an end to this tragedy, which is all the more shocking because of the cynicism and intensity with which the refugees who land in trepidation and hope are turned back out to sea. Madam President, we appreciate the very serious problems which have arisen for countries such as Malaysia which have felt the impact of this enormous mass of refugees. Even so, our democratic and Christian conscience refuses to condone such policies. Our concern is increased by the fact that Malaysia has not officially renounced the policy of sending back to sea a large proportion of the refugees who had been allowed to land on its territory, while preventing incoming ships crowded with refugees from approaching its coasts.

And what, Madam President, can one say of the present Vietnamese Government which is 'managing' this exodus of thousands upon thousands of people, with all the dangers it involves for the equilibrium and stability of the rest of the world? Madam President, we maintain that our Community cannot and must not remain passive in the face of these events. The West must act with the greatest urgency to give refuge to as many victims as possible of this tragedy which has shocked people everywhere. This would

make it possible to alleviate to some extent the crowded conditions in the refugee transit camps and to improve the sad lot of those on the open sea who await an act of human solidarity.

This motion for a resolution, Madam President, reflects the attitude which the European Parliament has consistently taken throughout its existence in defence of basic human rights. It has always fought for respect for these rights, not only within the European Community but throughout the world. 'We wish to be citizens of Europe, but in order to become responsible citizens of the world'. The joint declaration of 5 April 1977, which on Parliament's initiative was signed also by the Council and Commission, obliges our institutions to respect basic rights in the exercise of their powers and in pursuing the aims of the Community — hence not only within but also outside the Community, since respect for basic human rights is an indivisible obligation.

The Community cannot remain indifferent and insensitive to this situation, which so profoundly affects the destiny and basic rights of so many people. For this reason, Madam President, we are not confining ourselves to urging the Council and Commission to consider the most suitable forms of assistance to these refugees, but we are also calling for this very serious problem to be tackled realistically with a view to restoring in their entirety the basic rights of the victims of this tragedy, starting with the right of establishment in a free country and of integration into normal life.

In the face of this vast tragedy, the initiative we are proposing to the Community is not only humanitarian — if the Commissioner will forgive me — it is also political. We are taking a political decision to act primarily to protect the right to life of so many human beings, and we are making a political judgment in condemning what is happening in Vietnam.

The conscience of the world is already unanimous on this. These distressing events must lead us to ponder once more the significance of the recent history of Indochina, and to question the interpretations which, although simplistic, nevertheless aroused the emotions and commitment of so many generous and sensitive young people some time ago. There is no doubt that events in Indochina require a political solution, that they require pressure by democratic governments on the Vietnamese Government to ensure that it adopts a different policy on human rights in Vietnam. However, the humanitarian commitment of the Community is an essential aspect of this political pressure, which is justified and legitimized precisely by the strength and moral commitment which it expresses. This, Madam President, is the hope that we express on the eve of the international conference opening in Geneva tomorrow, at which the Community must show its solidarity with the South-East

Cassanmagnago Cerreti

Asian refugees, as well as its determination to defend human life and dignity. And I trust that the President of the Council and the President of the Commission will allow me to stress once more the importance and urgency of practical measures — something which was calmly side-stepped with an argument about the availability of cereals in Europe while the main question of the urgency of giving aid was avoided.

(Applause from the centre)

President. — Before I call Lord Bethell, I want to explain to the staff who are being subjected to exceptional demands that the decision not to suspend the proceedings was taken in view of the seriousness of the problem and because we want the outcome of this debate to be known before the Geneva Conference opens tomorrow.

We are fully aware of the demands which are being made and I hope that on future occasions the agenda — and especially the conduct of business in the House — will not make such demands on the staff. I know that it is a tremendous strain for those who are not in a position to leave the sitting. But the problem of the Vietnamese refugees is a very special one, and there is also the deadline imposed by the Geneva Conference, which opens tomorrow and which has meant that the President-in-Office of the Council has had to leave. He asked me to apologize for the fact that he could not stay until the end of the debate, but he had to leave because the Conference starts tomorrow morning.

The circumstances are exceptional and I trust that the staff will understand this. We fully appreciate the problems and the strain they have to cope with.

(Applause)

I call Lord Bethell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lord Bethell. — Madam President, earlier this evening I spoke on the telephone to a representative of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and I had a fairly lengthy conversation with him about the present problems of refugees in Indochina. He gave me certain facts and figures; one of which was that 'according to his best estimation, during the month of June, 100 000 boat people from Vietnam had perished on the high seas. I will repeat that figure — 100 000 people, twice the number of refugees that had in fact arrived in Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia and other countries near the China Sea. He explained to me that large numbers of people were continuing to die, at the rate of several thousand per day, either because their boats are badly constructed and disintegrate because they are forced to put to sea without fuel or food, or because they are attacked and pillaged by pirates on the high seas.

Because of that I was particularly anxious to speak in this historic debate during this historic week which, by a happy coincidence, happens on the eve of this important conference in Geneva which will try its best to ameliorate the position of the very people I was discussing. For this reason, Madam President, I was particularly glad to hear your soothing words before I got up to speak. I must confess that with your well-known charm and diplomacy you did to some extent calm my anger. I found it almost insupportable, first, that the debate on this matter should have been brought forward by an hour from the time that was communicated to me by members of your staff. Secondly, that this debate should take place in the absence of a member of the Council of Ministers to open this debate. I appreciate that Mr O'Kennedy has to be in Geneva tomorrow, and I appreciate the difficulties he had to put up with this morning from people up there who made his life and our lives very, very difficult. But, Madam President, we all have our crosses to bear, we all have our things to put up with.

We have all had to stay up late because of the ladies and gentlemen on my right and I would put it to you that this is hardly the time for a minister, a President-in-Office, to leave the European Parliament. It is not appropriate for him to leave these premises at such a time and before such an occasion.

(Applause)

However, I will not elaborate on that. I will indicate a few things that I hope will be communicated to the President-in-Office by Commissioner Cheysson and by a member of the President-in-Office's staff tomorrow in Geneva.

What can we do? Various speakers have suggested we should continue our diplomatic pressure on Vietnam to desist from their racist policies, indeed we should, and Commissioner Cheysson has indicated to us some of the food aid that has been given to Vietnam over the past year or so. I wonder, Madam President, whether it would not be more appropriate in the next few months to divert this food aid from the Government of Vietnam to the relief of the refugees?

(Applause)

In particular, Madam President, I wonder whether the Community might use its influence to see that the Red Cross, which I understand may soon be able to establish an office in Cambodia, should receive considerable aid in order to relieve the refugee problem there — the so called foot people — and should have at its disposal some of these funds. It would I suggest be appropriate both from the political and from the humanitarian point of view.

Also it might be possible to use some of the funds that are available to assist outside countries to admit and accommodate some of these refugees. I am

Lord Bethell

thinking particularly of countries in South America, Brazil, Venezuela, that might be able to accept and find space for large numbers of people who otherwise would have no home and indeed would probably perish because they would be sent back into the seas and would drown. Could not funds be made available to underwrite their settlement in certain large countries of the world? This is of course on top of large numbers which, I hope, will be accepted by the Nine. France has accepted in the region of 50 000 and I hope other countries will accept substantial numbers in order to indicate that we wish to set an example in this matter.

Tomorrow, we shall, in Geneva, speak with one voice. We spoke with one voice on this matter in Strasbourg during the European Summit. Let us speak with one voice tomorrow, but let us speak out with strength on this, the most severe, cruel and tragic population movement and act of mass murder since World War II.

(Applause)

I put it to you, and I put it to this House, that the word genocide is not too strong a word to use.

(Applause)

And let us not repeat the mistakes of the past, whether it be the massacre of refugees from Asia Minor in Smyrna in 1922, when refugees were turned back from ships and drowned, or whether it be Jewish refugees who were unable to escape from Hitler's tyranny because certain countries in the free world found it inconvenient, impossible to accommodate them and to find a home for them, or Russian refugees who, in 1945/46, were forcibly repatriated to Stalin's labour camps to be murdered in huge numbers. Let us not repeat the mistakes, the crimes, that we in the free world have committed; these are the refugees in this century.

(Applause)

I put it to you that in this tragedy we see the most ugly face of Communist tyranny.

(Applause)

A country is prepared to use human life on a massive scale to destabilize an area and soften up an area for political reasons, because this is not only a humanitarian issue, it is also a political issue and, let there be no mistake about it, we know what they are up to. It is mass murder and it is racism of the worst sort: it is something that brings back many echoes of 35 years ago: a racial minority, suspected of disloyalty by a vicious government and treated accordingly in the most cruel possible way. It is the worst possible vestige of Hitlerism or Stalinism, and it is totally contrary to every ideal which this Community stands for.

(Applause)

I could quote many sentences from the Treaty of Rome which would indicate exactly what I mean. Let us speak with one voice tomorrow, Madam President, let the Council, let the Foreign Ministers of the Nine know exactly how this House feels, and let there be no doubt that we in this House intend to do something about it, believe that something should be done about it and will not tolerate that the Nine, unlike the Good Samaritan, should be allowed to pass by on the other side.

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

Mr Fanti. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not wish to — indeed I cannot — explain in these few minutes the ideological and political reasons which led us, the Italian Communists, to put before you the motion for a resolution signed by Mr Amendola and Mr Ansart on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group. I have no time to develop the arguments adequately, and therefore I do not wish to contribute even involuntarily to the sort of ideological and sectarian conflict which some would like to be the basis of relations even amongst us. I only wish to try to contribute to serious and responsible consideration of a subject which involves human lives. Without being presumptuous, I think I can make this contribution because — alone, I believe, of those present here — I had the opportunity to go to Vietnam at the beginning of this year. The mission which I carried out for my party, after the entry of Vietnamese troops into Cambodia, involved collecting on-the-spot information, trying to understand what was going on, and openly expressing the concern and criticism which events in South-East Asia had aroused in those who, like us, had strongly supported from the start the heroic struggle carried on for decades by the Vietnamese people for its independence and freedom. But apart from the discussions which I had and the disagreements which were expressed on the events which had damaged the image acquired by Vietnam in the eyes of the democratic public, and particularly of the younger generation — that generation which throughout the world described itself as the 'Vietnam generation' — apart from the way in which the Vietnamese leaders spoke about the tragedy of the refugees, the causes of this tragic new wave of emigration — which, we should remember, is the third in 20 years — and how to deal with it with the assistance and agreement of the UNHCR — apart from all this, I should like to be able to tell you of the conditions — unbelievable in my view — in which millions of men, women, old people and children live, work and try to build a life worth living only four years after the end of a terrible war and a short time after the floods which the Commissioner mentioned earlier. Unfortunately time does not permit me to do so. I can only tell you that, from a European standpoint, these condi-

Fanti

tions can only be described as inhuman. Such conditions can only give rise to further tragedies, tensions and waves of emigration, until they are improved — instead of being worsened by senseless attempts to make propaganda or by irresponsible measures such as the proposal to cancel the aid to Vietnam stipulated in the peace treaty of 1975 and which has been provided only in part in the last few years.

We must ask ourselves this question: are we to go on merely handing down judgments from our citadel of wealth and bestowing a pittance of aid, or should we not ask ourselves whether we Europeans, who are trying to create a better future of peace and freedom for our peoples and our states, also bear a heavy and direct responsibility? We Communists are aware of this responsibility, and point it out because only in this way is it possible to ensure that solidarity, aid, and attempts to find a humane solution to the urgent problem of the refugees are approached realistically and with lasting effectiveness. For this reason, we share the hope that the Geneva Conference opening tomorrow may lead rapidly to positive action, while at the same time maintaining and even intensifying economic, technical and cultural cooperation with Vietnam and the other countries of South-East Asia, by taking part in efforts to provide the international aid essential for the reconstruction and development of those countries. These, in our view, are the real tasks which we must face with all our intelligence and ability, since on the fulfilment of these tasks depends the fate of the whole of mankind.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

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

Mr Edgar Faure. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as Mr Cheysson — whom I should like to congratulate on his speech — remarked just now, it is fortunate that, by a unanimous decision of the Bureau, this debate is being held this evening, albeit at a late hour. We shall thus have the chance of finishing on an historic note the first day of our work which seemed to start in such a halting and disappointing fashion.

We thus have the chance of proclaiming, on this first day of debate, that our European Parliament, the first multinational parliamentary institution, has the authority to deal with any major issue. What more striking and worthwhile occasion could there be for that than this particularly tragic and urgent question?

Words, ladies and gentlemen, are often ironic, and their irony is often a cruel irony. The motion we support, tabled by my Group together with two other Groups, bears in its title the word 'refugees'. This is a pale reflection of the present tragedy. For normally the refugee is someone who has a refuge, but we are

dealing with refugees with no refuge, who cannot find asylum and are being refused the right of asylum. In reality we should not be talking about 'refugees' but about 'outcasts'. We used to talk about stateless persons, but a stateless person is one who is deprived of his homeland. These people, on the other hand, no longer have anywhere on earth they can call their own.

Just now, Lord Bethell quite rightly made a comparison with genocide. There seem, in the world today, to be new elements in the tragedy. Genocide itself once seemed a novelty; what we are seeing now is a sort of extermination in the literal sense of the word, i.e. the act of expelling beyond the borders, which can, however, very easily be confused with 'extermination' in the popular meaning of the term, i.e. elimination pure and simple. I was very moved, Lord Bethell, by the figures you were kind enough to give us just now after collecting your evidence at the beginning of the evening.

The Liberal and Democratic Group is particularly concerned about three points: the humanitarian aspect of our intervention, its practical aspect and lastly the general aspect of establishing rights.

Its humanitarian aspect — and here again I should like to thank Mr Cheysson for having read my thoughts — must be dissociated from the political aspect. As far as the political aspects are concerned, which are a matter for diplomacy, we are in a position to give advice, to express opinions and to make suggestions, but this is nonetheless the domain of the national governments. With regard to the humanitarian aspects, we are fully in our element, since this is a question of our ability to pass moral judgments. That is why we insist on the need to consider the humanitarian aspect of this problem and not to get directly involved ourselves, especially with regard to pronouncing condemnations of this or that government, nor to pass judgment on international relations.

But unfortunately the word 'humanitarian' all too often evokes the idea of speechifying and pious but ineffective demonstrations. We were thus concerned to put some concrete substance into our motion, and while this aspect may perhaps appear, second-rate it was necessary to raise concrete issues and we were concerned to do this in terms of quantities and figures, which are the language of hard facts.

We were concerned to urge implementation of this programme for the supply of 8 000 or 10 000 tonnes of rice and 15 000 tonnes of milk powder — but I must apologize to Mr Cheysson, as I think there is a misunderstanding here. I appreciate that 15 000 tonnes of milk powder are indeed in excess of the amount we wanted. What I want is for the Commission to be able to go beyond the 8 000 or 10 000 tonnes of rice.

Edgar Faure

I was shocked to learn that, whereas we have always been told that there is too much farm produce and we have been asked to restrict the work of our farmers and perhaps their numbers, when it comes down to making use of these surpluses, which have been built up into such a dreadful problem, to produce a little happiness and well-being, the surpluses have disappeared. If our agriculture is in surplus, it needs to be restrained, but in that case why is there no grain available? If, on the other hand, our agriculture needs to be supported, I do not see that there would be anything immoral or illogical in ensuring at one and the same time the livelihood of our humble workers on the land and the survival of men women and children who are threatened by starvation.

(Applause)

It is one of the functions of this Parliament to denounce such contradictions and demand an end to them.

There are also the financial aspects. Here, we have made a very modest proposal which could, however, be symbolic: one million units of account to be taken from our own parliamentary budget, plus 5 million which we ask the Commission to add to its budget. I do not wish to imply thereby that the Commission has not already incurred expenditure of 5 million u.a.; if I understood Mr Cheysson correctly, this figure has already been reached and even exceeded, perhaps by as much as a factor of 10. But I would like these five million to be the beginning of a supplementary operation in addition to what you have done so far, an operation which would be directed more particularly at the seaborne exodus, as envisaged in our motion for a resolution. This sum would make it possible to initiate direct action on the part of the Community, involving in particular the chartering of a ship by the Community. I make no secret of the fact that I would have liked this to be a Parliament ship, but my group decided to give preference to the Community. Every day we receive a number of requests; I cannot vouch for them, you must check them for yourselves. They come from people of good will who are prepared to hire ships. We need to be able to help them, the Community must take direct action on this question. Even if it does not match the whole scale of the problem it will at least be a start in the right direction.

(Applause)

But if we are setting an example in concrete terms, we seem less keen to do so in matters of principle. Therefore, this motion in the name of the Liberal and Democratic Group, the European Democratic Group and the European People's party makes one important point quite clear: namely that refugees should be taken in by Europe, by the countries of our Community, the countries which come under our parliamentary jurisdiction. We have called for this operation not

to be limited by quotas. We did not want to decide on some dubious figure such as one for every so many inhabitants, regarding it as normal that refugees should be taken in in approximate proportion to the population of the respective countries.

In our view this operation must not be restricted; we believe we must have the courage to accept that this is a question of life and death — this is no place for restrictions. It is not as if dead bodies were inoffensive and excusable above 50 000 and a matter of genocide up to 50 000.

What objections can there be? Budgetary and financial objections? Can this be so, when we are all maintaining substantial military budgets in an attempt to sustain some sort of balance in the world? Is this not an affront to that balance, a veritable war which claims numbers of victims every day? Can we not find enough money to save lives right away, so that we can defend them later?

There is yet another argument of which I am well aware. You are listening to a man who once managed the economy and the finances of France for 30 months and its agriculture for an equal period: I am therefore not speaking with my head in the clouds. You may well argue that a flood of outcasts, arriving here as refugees, could aggravate our problems of redundancy and unemployment. But can you really say that it is because of the refugees from South-East Asia that we have these problems of redundancy and unemployment? There are other ways of dealing with these problems, and we shall be discussing them. Parliament must demand — since it is within the bounds of possibility — that Europe should take the necessary measures to ensure that no young European wanting to take up employment is faced with a notice saying: 'Leave your address, you will be contacted'. But this is another question which we shall be dealing with in due course — sooner, I hope, rather than later. No considerations of economic equilibrium or unemployment can stand in the way of the need to save human lives, which is something that must be done.

I appreciate that we do not have executive power: this is in the hands of the governments and the Commission. That is why our motion is directed at the Commission, whom we address with a combination of authority and respect, in that the Commission is being invited, not ordered to act, but this is a precise invitation. I think, however, that we can count on the agreement of the executive organs, for if we, the European Parliament, take a decision with this whole weight — someone, I think it was Mr O'Kennedy, was talking just now about the weight of the Community — this Community influence of which we represent the Parliamentary aspect, then I think no one will want to oppose this heartfelt expression of our joint determination.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Dienesch to speak on behalf of the European Progressive Democrats Group.

Mrs Dienesch. — (*F*) In the moving and memorable speech she made to this newly elected assembly on Tuesday, Mrs Louise Weiss delivered a fervent appeal in defence of fundamental human rights and our European civilization.

She did so in particularly forceful and courageous terms, linking her appeal with the cruel tragedy of the refugees in South-East Asia. I shall therefore not dwell further on the fate of these men, women and children who are at the mercy not only of the hostile elements — the sea, sharp rocks, waste land or minefields — but above all of the hate of their fellow beings, the hate of other men.

Faced with these scenes appearing daily on our screens, at this late hour — nonetheless it is worth speaking in this debate — words seem almost indecent. Yes, of course, we must make our principles clear, but if they are not to be simply an alibi words must be transformed into deeds. The real priority is to help the victims as quickly as possible, wherever they may be. It is therefore these deeds that we must support, so that action should be as concrete, prompt and above all as effective as possible. Every day lost means an added price in human lives and accumulated suffering; every empty phrase is in a sense another life lost.

Of course, we all joined in calling for the international conference which is to open tomorrow in Geneva. This conference will be in position to handle the size and complexity of the problem. But how long will it take, after the conference, to achieve practical results? The procedure of any international conference is inevitably very slow and ponderous. Let us not lose any time in doing our European duty!

I note, Mr President-in-Office — and we appreciate your conscientiousness and your willingness to act — your desire to arrive at practical measures. You listed the Community's financial measures and food aid operations, the sole aim of which, in our view, continues to be to ensure the survival of the hungry.

Our Group will be going into the financial objectives more thoroughly tomorrow on the occasion of the debate on the draft budget.

In an international tragedy such as this, with its many overlapping aspects. I think we are all agreed that over-spectacular or hasty declarations are more likely to hamper the operation than to help it. We trust in you, Mr President-in-Office to keep the public properly informed and to confirm your final decisions.

We deliberately chose not to raise other problems in our motion for a resolution, which is aimed essentially at providing assistance. In particular, we call on all the Member States not only to open their borders but also

to mobilize the people, the local authorities, the various associations which are so willing to play an active part, and the individual citizens who, through these grass-roots organizations, are in the best position to welcome these unfortunate families who have deep and long-standing links with Europe and, in a humane fashion and above all often very quickly, to house them and reintegrate them into everyday life.

Public opinion has been aroused, and action has been taken in a large number of cases. Our country — if I may say so — has already taken in 50 000 refugees in the past two years, and the capital, Paris, has taken responsibility for nearly a thousand of them in recent months, paying for travel and lodging for them. Many other towns — in all parts of the country, I think — have made a similar effort. Of course, the people have responded with great enthusiasm, but there is a need to support the efforts which have been made so far. They must be extended, avoiding the lassitude of modern sentiment which is so often assailed by pictures of human cruelty.

With this vote, ladies and gentlemen, we want to lose no time in demonstrating the solidarity and the generosity which Michel Debré invoked on our behalf in such noble words yesterday. We must not allow a genuine humanitarian impulse to lose its force in a maze of casuistry which sometimes end up splitting hairs about law and legality. Let us take as our guide the spontaneous feeling expressed by our peoples!

I hope that in voting on these motions for resolutions, which are specific and urgent, we shall not become entangled in parallel discussions which have their proper place elsewhere.

I have just heard speeches on behalf of a number of political parties. How close our positions are! Would it not be desirable, Madam President, for us to agree on a joint text concentrating, in concrete fashion, on the essential points — the relief of suffering and the saving of human lives? I should like to see this House set an example and, after so many hours spent on frustrating procedural points, put all its moral weight, which is the most precious thing it has, unequivocally behind a cause which we are all unanimous in regarding as profoundly humanitarian.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Pannella to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Madam President, we have taken note of the statements and communications which have been made to us. They were made, as the majority wished them to be made, at a time when most of the Members were unable to listen to these undoubtedly important documents and reports. The

Pannella

majority of the Members present decided it thus, and whether this is to their credit or discredit must be left to the individual to decide. The fact is that the French television, which has been allowed into this chamber, informed the French people — I'm not sure whether this is true, Madam President — that only 30 Members were present for the Vietnam debate. This is the information which the French people heard, and we have to thank the Chairman of a certain group for this. That is what was reported, and that is the image of our Parliament which was given — a correct image, thanks to the decision by the Members present that it should be so. However, Madam President, on such an important subject I can only confine myself to saying humbly that, before the power groups of this Parliament and before Europe, we take note of all these fine words, good intentions and laudable commitments. I heard the sincere and impassioned words of Mr Faure. Well, in a few months' time we shall see. We hope that all this is true and that something else, Madam President, is also true: we hope, indeed we are certain, that no-one would wish for ignoble partisan motives to make political capital out of such a tragedy. We are sure that this is not the case. I have only one reason for concern, Madam President, as a believer in non-violence, as a radical, as a pacifist and as an opponent of class distinction. When I hear these heartfelt speeches, and at the same time the distinct sound of laughter, I reflect, Madam President, that in places only a few hours' flight from here millions of innocent people are dying of hunger or malnutrition. And there are tens of millions of them every year, men, women, children and old people. A few hours' flight from here, but do not know how distant from our easily acquired good consciences as Christians, Liberals, Socialists or indeed believes in non-violence. So I, as an agnostic, hope that the miracle will indeed come to pass and that the consciences of the powerful hitherto indifferent to the obscene holocaust of the fifty million murdered through hunger — because your political parties want four hundred thousand million dollars a year to be spent on armaments, and every one of those dollars represents an ounce of bread snatched from the mouths of those dying of hunger — may be shaken out of their indifference. As an agnostic, I pray that it may really be possible for your political consciences and your power to save these Vietnamese, while you do nothing to prevent this year — proclaimed the International Year of the Child — from being what it in fact is, the international year of the murder of the child for reasons of class or indifference — reasons which cast dishonour upon our Europe and upon our consciences.

President. — I call Mr Petronio.

Mr Petronio. — (*I*) Madam President, I expected this debate, called for with such urgency, to take a more realistic course not only in quantitative but also and

above all in qualitative terms. The speeches I have heard so far seemed like business discussions, about rice, powdered milk, units of account, even ships which this Parliament — turning for some obscure reason into a shipping line — was supposed to charter in order to help the refugees on the seas off China, Malaysia or elsewhere. And I even heard it said by the representative of the Commission that this Parliament should not discuss politics, but rice and other cereal products. But I maintain that as this is a Parliament, indeed the first European Parliament elected by universal suffrage, there is an urgent need for it to show a political will of its own and certainly not to concern itself with the embarkation or disembarkation of refugees which are naval operations best left to sailors. After disbursing the funds — if we have the generosity to do so — we should entrust these refugees to the international organizations which for fifty years, starting with the Red Cross, have been operating in this field. I think it essential for a Parliament which describes itself as European and Western to express an opinion of its own on this exodus and genocide which is not the fault of floods, tornadoes, tidal waves or earthquakes, but the fault of political régimes which have inexplicably not been named in this Chamber. There are refugees, relatives of those killed and people in despair whom we shall help and who must be helped morally and politically by us, first and foremost by condemning those Communist governments — for this is the only phrase that has not been heard in this Chamber — which have presumed, on the basis of abstract ideologies, to overthrow or uproot traditions, civilizations and cultures in Asia to replace them with Communist, Stalinist or Marxist states of the worst kind, wreaking the havoc which we now see.

If this Parliament has its own political will it must express it. For it is not true that only the aid is urgently needed, there is also an urgent need to let the world know that Europe is prepared to help Africans, Palestinians, Asians, Indians or anyone else, but that it condemns, from the noble eminence of its thousand-year-old civilization and of the political system it has developed, those Communist governments which have brought those states, nations and peoples to this pass. I state this on behalf of the National Right Group.

President. — I call Mr Lomas.

Mr Lomas. — Madam President, the resolution of the Socialist Group expresses our deep concern at the 'inhuman situation confronting the more than 300 000 Indochinese refugees in South-East Asia who are living under disastrous conditions from the point of view of health and food supplies'. We express our concern and our support for all the initiatives that have been taken to help these refugees. We now urge

Lomas

the Commission, Council of the EEC and the governments of the Member States to grant all the additional aid that is so urgently needed. We call and we ask for a determined effort at the International Conference, due to take place this weekend, to try and get a complete and lasting solution to the problem of refugees in South-East Asia.

I am sure that everyone here would agree with these sentiments. For whatever reasons, the refugees are leaving various countries in Indochina, whoever is responsible for their desperate flight — and here I must refer to the grave responsibility of China, whose invasion of Vietnam inevitably led to the difficulties for the Chinese ethnic minorities who are living there. China has exacerbated the problem by playing on the fears of the Chinese community in Vietnam with scare stories of what could happen to them, and they are urging them to leave even if that is done, as it is being done daily, quite illegally.

Whatever the reasons for the refugees, we surely all want to give whatever aid we can. I hope that all the bodies concerned in this matter will do everything that is within their power, because the plight of the refugees is indeed serious. Suffering, dying on overcrowded boats whilst the industrially advanced rich nations of the Western world are doing little or nothing. We call for action, not just palliatives, but a lasting solution; and that can come only from a determined effort by all concerned to discuss the problem in a rational way and in a less distorted and hysterical atmosphere than has so far been the case.

Lord Bethell, speaking earlier tonight, and suddenly concerned about the actions of the Vietnamese Government, although earlier today he was not at all concerned about the butchery going on in Nicaragua, has only added to that hysteria.

(Applause)

In our motion for a resolution, Madam President, we say something about aid which is not in any of the other motions. We refer to the necessity of continuing food aid to the people of Vietnam, those who wish to remain in their homeland. Let us not forget that Vietnam itself is giving a considerable amount of aid to the half a million refugees who fled from the terror in Kampuchea. I have already referred, Madam President ...

(Protests)

I am not in the least worried about the Conservative Group's heckling — they care nothing for human rights, for the Vietnamese, for the Nicaraguans or for anybody else.

(Applause and protest)

I am hopeful, Madam President, that at Conference this weekend real progress will be made. But we are not going to help that progress by petty, shabby acts like stopping food aid to the Vietnamese people,

whether by the EEC or by national governments, but rather as our motion for a resolution says, by maintaining that aid and not allowing it to be used as a political weapon.

Vietnam has already attended a conference held recently in Djakarta specifically called to deal with the problems of refugees leaving their country. They are working closely now with the UN High Commissioner, and I was pleased that Mr Cheysson earlier paid tribute to the work that he is doing. They have agreed now to a seven-point programme for the orderly departure of refugees, which includes supervision by UN personnel.

(Protests)

You ought to keep abreast of the facts. They have now agreed to UN personnel being in Hanoi and Ho Chi Min City to help with the supervision of the departure of refugees. There are a number of issues I now believe the Vietnamese Government can agree to at Conference this weekend if the situation is not exacerbated by the extreme actions proposed by at least one speaker in this debate tonight. I am hopeful that we can have real, positive steps taken. It would not only be inhuman, it would be politically inept to stop aid for Vietnam at this crucial point in time. We should be helping to improve the conditions for the Vietnamese people, not worsening them.

The countries of the EEC not got a good record on Vietnam. France was directly involved there for many years in a bloody war, others, including my own country, have a shameful record of support for successive acts of aggression against that country. And we, more than anyone else except perhaps for the United States, should be doing all we can to help those Vietnamese people who want to stay in their homeland. The Commission's proposal, whether it is carried out or not, to stop food aid to Vietnam without any attempt to consult this Parliament was as insulting to us as it was degrading and inhuman for them.

What are we asking for, Madam President, when we ask for food aid to Vietnam? There are millions of tons of food piled up in the Common Market in the infamous food mountains. Millions of pounds will be spent on making that food unfit for human consumption. What sort of people would rather do that than send it to people who are in desperate need? That idea is not only inhuman, it is barbaric.

Madam President, I end by saying these few words. I was in Vietnam during those appalling days when the United States Army and Air Force were devastating that beautiful country. I saw the results of that devastation. I saw the villages, the towns, the cities — the British Conservatives seem to find this amusing — bombed day after day, night after night: crops destroyed, defoliation, wholesale destruction of food supplies — and if you find that funny, well laugh away!

Lomas

(Applause)

I saw men and women maimed for life during that war. Now is our chance to at least say that the pathetically small supplies of food that we send to Vietnam should not be stopped by any action of ours. In the name of humanity I ask this Parliament to support our motion for a resolution.

(Applause to the left)

President. — I call Mr Battersby.

Mr Battersby. — Madam President, whilst this situation is being debated here in this House, hundreds of lives especially of young children are being lost due to cholera, enteritis and other diseases caused by the crowded insanitary conditions in the camps and the exhausted state in which many of the boat people reach shore. I would plead that concerted action be taken now to ensure that emergency practical medical aid is organized and dispatched as a matter of urgency. We are faced with an inhuman, cynical man-made catastrophe, and we Europeans must take the initiative and we must take the lead in the great Christian humanitarian traditions of Europe.

There is no point in waiting for the unbelievers. My own government, the British Conservative Government, has just taken in another 10 000 boat people, and the unbelievers, Madam President, have done nothing. It is also essential that the supplies that we send reach the refugees, these poor Chinese people, and that these supplies do not get syphoned off into the black markets of South-East Asia, both inside and outside the camps. These poor refugees, Madam President, have suffered too much. Therefore, I would plead that as a matter of urgency, parallel administrative control be established in the field, manned by officials responsible to the Commission. Otherwise, the refugees, especially the children, will continue to die. Our supply statistics will look very good, but the mortality statistics will look distressingly bad. It is not enough to give we must make sure that any aid we give is received by those who desperately need it, and who need it now.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mr Denis.

Mr Denis. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in our view our peoples, our countries and this House have a part to play in helping to find solutions to the tragic situation affecting so many human beings in South East Asia. This, indeed, is also the humanitarian purpose of the Geneva Conference on the refugees which is about to open and to which we wish every success. On the basis of non-interference and mutual respect, leaving aside any sort of crusading spirit the prospects are reasonable. It is blatantly obvious that that is not the prime concern behind

certain speeches made here. The public outcry at the terrible fate of so many people is perfectly understandable. But we can hardly overlook the fact that, while this should be a large-scale humanitarian effort to save lives, what we are seeing is a situation being exploited for political ends in the form of an odious campaign. The objective is revenge. The very people who bear overwhelming responsibility for the present situation hope to achieve, by starving a people, what they failed to achieve in the course of 30 years of colonialist adventuring.

Yes, this must not be forgotten. The origin of the situation was decades of atrocious wars, waged first by the French and then by the Americans who, in Vietnam alone, left 8 million dead and injured. When I hear certain of my fellow members describing, with a wealth of detail, the emigrants' suffering — and we are well aware of this suffering — I cannot help thinking that they have never had a word to say about the women, children and old people slaughtered by the napalm of the colonialist war. That was genocide. The United States have never honoured their commitments under the Paris agreement to make reparations to a country ravaged by them which, let us not forget, counts as one of the 20 poorest countries in the world.

This serves further to stress the revolting nature of the measures taken by the Commission. How can it explain and justify decisions of which the most obvious result would be further privations for countless human beings? Is starving people a way of saving them? It is scandalous. And this sort of behaviour must be denounced for what it is. Is this the image of Europe we want to give the world? That is what Mr Cheysson described just now as being of little interest. But behind these figures there is suffering. If I understood correctly, he confirms the incredible news we had been given from other sources to the effect that an allocation of 8 000 tonnes of rice for Vietnam planned for 5 July under the food aid programme has already been cancelled at the Commission's request. As you can see, no time is being wasted, and this haste is very different from what happens when it is a question of imposing sanctions on racist and fascist governments. This is simply a policy of putting pressure, of seeking revenge on the Vietnamese people — as, indeed, representatives of the unashamed right have blatantly admitted here today. However, ladies and gentlemen, such behaviour ignores the increasing importance of a new international order. This House should be contributing to this great movement of our time, and we Communists remain faithful to an unchanging attitude of solidarity with all peoples who are struggling for their independence, progress and freedom. And here we find ourselves face to face with those who have always opposed this just cause by every available means, including napalm.

Denis

As a Frenchman, I cannot fail to stress the responsibility of my country's successive governments, the responsibility of the political groups who today are weeping crocodile tears. And yet, what country could have more reason to see it as its duty and in its interests to further close cooperation with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam? It is for all these reasons that I call for the adoption of the motion for a resolution tabled by the Communist and Allies Group which, like a number of Member States and various leading figures, calls on the Council of the Communities to cancel the measures taken by the Commission to suspend all direct food aid to Vietnam, which is urgently needing humanitarian aid, so that our countries may contribute to the success of the Geneva Conference and, with a view to reconstruction and development, closer cooperation in all fields with Vietnam and all the other countries in South East Asia.

(Applause from the left)

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

Mrs Lizin. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall not make a long speech on the Vietnamese situation since, as you said, we are running out of time.

I think that among the younger Members of this House I am one of those who feel that, while words have no doubt already asserted their position, insufficient attention has been given to deeds. I therefore propose to confine myself to the deeds we envisage to help Vietnam.

These, I think, must be of three kinds. Firstly, the need to accept refugees in greater numbers than the Member States are taking at present, and when we leave here we must ask each government to increase its quota. Secondly, the question of transit: we cannot expect Vietnam's neighbours to shoulder the whole of this burden alone. They are also developing countries in a very precarious situation. We must assume the cost of this. The Council and the Commission must offer to do so. And lastly, direct assistance, food aid. Here the Commission must, in our view, propose additional and significant funds to be granted to the High Commission for Refugees for carrying out the proposed operations in the region.

We also, however, think that since the Commission is here it is worth taking the opportunity of proposing that the amount it sets aside for aid to non-government organizations should be increased by means of a supplementary budget to be devoted to organizations involved in this Vietnam operation.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is my first time here as a Member of this Parliament. I think it would not be

too much to ask each of us to contribute one day of these expenses which, I admit, I was surprised to find myself entitled to, to provide concrete assistance by transferring them to a special item in Parliament's budget to be paid to the High Commission for Refugees. This is a concrete proposal that I put to you, on my own behalf, and I hope it will be accepted by everyone here today.

An important conference is to open in Geneva tomorrow. We, as a Community, must play a distinctive part there, an active and positive part. We must have the courage to say which country is responsible for this running sore. That, I think, is a responsibility we cannot refuse. This exodus is clearly the work of an intolerant regime. But since it is happening, and since we Socialists are no doubt in the best position — in that we have challenged the Eastern Bloc countries' policy of closed frontiers — to say that it is normal for the opponents of a regime to be able to leave the country, it should be equally normal for them to be able to do so in an orderly fashion. We must, however, keep the door open for negotiations with this country. That is why our motion for a resolution expresses the desire to avoid isolating Vietnam. We must keep our options open for playing a role in this area and for doing so in a balanced fashion. With this in view we must not compromise our ability to enter into a dialogue with that country concerned — we must remain on speaking terms with everyone. That is our role as Europeans.

And that, Mr Cheysson, is why our motion contains a phrase addressed more particularly to the Commission. In our view, while development aid is direct aid to a government, food aid cannot be considered as a political weapon. We must not turn it into an instrument of disapproval. There is too great a risk that we would then appear to be hostile not to a regime but to a people. That is why we have expressed our regret at the terms of your proposal. The Vietnamese people have suffered. None of us in the Socialist Party — and in particular, of course, we young Socialists for whom Vietnam was the beginning of our political involvement — is indifferent to that fact. The Vietnamese people need this aid from Europe.

The people of Chile continued to receive this aid after the coup. Why must we doubly penalize a people in distress and give them the impression that Europe does not care? By your leave, Mr Cheysson, we regret this proposal, which involves a risk of isolating a country with which we must necessarily negotiate. Using development programmes as a political weapon is something we did at the time of the invasion of Cambodia. That is our role. But doing the same with food aid is beneath our dignity.

Lizin

It remains, Madam President, for me to hope that this House will be able to close this debate by demonstrating a unity of purpose which can be communicated in Geneva tomorrow.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Ferguson.

Mr Ferguson. — Madam President, the nearest I have been to the boat people of Vietnam was while taking clothes and toys to some of the first to have been settled in my own country. I know they are real only because they were the ones who were not drowned. I wish to emphasize two features of the motion for a resolution, both conspicuous for their absence, though Mr Loams over there does not seem to have noticed it. One is that the resolution does not explicitly condemn the government that is perpetrating, this crime against humanity... *(Applause)*

...

But let no one suppose that condemnation is absent from our hearts.

The second is that our resolution does not require the Soviet Union, supporter of the Vietnamese Government, to cause that government to cease its inhuman behaviour. But let the Soviet Union take note of the disgust with which the free world once more...

(Applause)...

views the wilful obliteration of an entire people. And let the Soviet and Vietnamese Governments and all who think as Mr Lomas does, reflect on what for them is the uncomfortable, damning truth that the principal places in the world from which vast numbers flee are the totalitarian regimes and tyrannies and that the principal places where they seek and find refuge are the lands where true democracy and private enterprise survive, where citizens come and go where they please, can think as they wish and say what they want...

(Applause)...

Madam President, Western Europe is the great sanctuary of freedom. I regard it as singularly fortunate that the first session of this new Parliament should have presented such an opportunity to ask the nine countries of our Economic Community to act as one, to demonstrate to the world our compassionate face. I beg to support the Commission and this resolution.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Boserup.

Mrs Boserup. — *(DK)* Madam President, the lateness of the hour forces me to be very brief. I speak as a member of the Socialist People's Party in Denmark. I agree fully with the Italian and French members of our group in their analysis of the causes of the tragedy under discussion here. I also fully support my group

and the Socialist Group in their opinion of the Commission proposal to stop all food aid to Vietnam. This proposal is improper and outrageous and should be rejected. Furthermore I am of the opinion that all technical and economic aid to the refugees, to Vietnam and to other South-East Asian countries, can and should be granted by the individual Member States themselves. Commission involvement leads, as we know from experience, to delays and red tape. The Danish government will undoubtedly, in accordance with the wishes of the Danish people, wish to continue its aid to the refugees and to the countries involved. We refuse to use hunger as an instrument of pressure. We in our country wish to fulfil our humanitarian obligations without Commission interference.

With this reservation, I can support my group's motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Motchane.

Mr Motchane. — *(F)* Madam President, there is no need, I think, to say a great deal on this subject in order to get down to the essential points. There are four connected ideas in my Group's motion for a resolution which give it its specific character. And they all devolve from this first one: humanitarian aid is directed at the individual and does not distinguish between persons. Is it not, however, apparent that on the pretext of extending the solidarity we owe the refugees from Vietnam the situation is being exploited, for obvious reasons, for political ends.

The second point is that food aid, humanitarian aid, cannot be turned into an instrument of political pressure. But is this not what the Commission has done? That is why we regret — and if we use the word 'regret', Madam President, we naturally do so in order to take account of the particularly public position we are in here — deeply regret this decision, with which the Commission seems to have given its blessing to a process of making political capital which has a twin purpose.

The first part of this is to draw attention away from our responsibility towards a people which has suffered, firstly at the hands of French colonialism and then under American imperialism, a degree of aggression such as no other people has suffered this century, except at one time the Jewish people and perhaps, to a certain extent, the Palestinian people today. It is not for us Europeans, therefore, to pose as preachers of morality, although we must express our concern and our disapproval of the responsibility the Hanoi government evidently bears for the tragic situation these refugees are in.

The fourth reason — and this, Madam President, has to be said here — is that what is happening, in my country at least, is that a humanitarian operation is being transformed into a political propaganda campaign and that human rights are being exported

Motchane

to the detriment of our own responsibility with regard to freedoms at home. This House should know that two bills under consideration at the moment will leave 4 million foreign workers at the mercy of the police. You may say, Madam President, that there is a difference between the physical extermination threatening the refugees from Vietnam and these forms of social extermination affecting a significant and increasing number of the foreign workers we have brought into our countries; indeed, there is a difference of degree, but there is no difference of principle.

(Mixed reactions)

That is why...

President. — Mr Motchane, you have greatly over-run your speaking time.

Mr Motchane. — *(F)*... we would ask a number of our honourable colleagues to show a little thoughtfulness, a little consideration, perhaps also a little decency *(mixed reactions)* and that is why I would ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to give our Group's motion for a resolution the support it deserves.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to begin by echoing Mr Cheysson's sentiments — as other speakers have already done this evening — in applauding the fact that Parliament's first substantive debate is concerned with this highly important issue rather than with procedural or formal matters. And we are justified in debating this problem by urgent procedure.

Tomorrow this House will have to come up with some positive decisions to help these people in their extreme distress. On a more general note, however, we would urge the Community to avoid any form of cooperation which is inward-looking. 'Fair shares' is a motto which applies not only within the Community, but also as regards the rest of the world; and the Community has an added responsibility in that it is far wealthier in many respects than many other parts of the world.

Madam President, the motions tabled by the Socialist Group and by the European People's Party, the Liberal and Democratic Group and the European Democratic Group do admittedly differ, but we feel that they complement each other, and we shall therefore be voting in favour of them. There is, however, one major difference which we would like to draw attention to, as we feel it is highly important: the motion tabled by the Socialist Group contains the fundamental declaration that food aid must not be used as a political weapon. This approach has our wholehearted support.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, *Member of the Commission (F)* Madam President, I should like to thank the House

for this debate, which has clearly been very useful and significant in preparation for tomorrow's conference. As I shall have the privilege of speaking tomorrow, following the President-in-Office of the Council, to the Geneva Conference, I shall be able to pass on the feelings that have been expressed in the House and, as the President-in-Office said, our authority will be all the greater for that.

The major impression I have from this debate, Madam President, is of Parliament's desire to see action taken without delay. I am thus surprised that certain members should have been shocked at the Commission's desire to act quickly.

Should we, when the High Commission for Refugees told us in April that the situation was becoming critical, have replied that we would wait for this House to meet before taking any decisions, before allocating a not inconsiderable amount of cash and releasing suitable amounts of grain or milk powder? I do not think so.

Should we, Mr Denis, have wasted two months in transporting 8 000 tonnes of rice? We had indeed had a use in mind for this rice, but we cancelled that allocation — and I am proud of this — because the High Commission for Refugees asked us to purchase this rice locally in order to save two months. I do not think we acted wrongly here either.

(Applause from various quarters)

Rapid action, concrete action.

I was amazed that one member, Mr Petronio, should express surprise at hearing people talk about rice, milk, rescue at sea, about concrete problems, but what should we be talking about at the present time? About saving lives. In order to save these lives, we have to talk in concrete terms, we have to talk about food supplies, and about the funds needed for these people to survive.

This is not the time to embark on a great political debate but to take concrete decisions.

Just now, in my first statement on behalf of the Commission, I outlined to the House the proposals the Community would be making tomorrow and the day after with a view to organizing the departure of refugees, under the supervision of the High Commission for Refugees, within the framework of the agreement reached with Vietnam on 30 May. I said I would like to see discussions on organizing departures from Cambodia as well, so that transit could be arranged with as little distress as possible. The proposals we have made, Mrs Lizin, are specific, precise and concrete, and represent a very considerable increase in the offers and guarantees available to the High Commission for Refugees. I outlined these proposals in my previous speech.

Cheysson

The support of our member governments will also be needed for a number of demands to which the High Commission for Refugees attaches great importance in order to ensure respect for the right of rescue at sea — which was a basic element of the law of the sea only a few years ago — so that tankers and merchant ships do not callously ignore junks carrying refugees. Attention must be given to the call by the High Commission for Refugees for the right of disembarkation to be respected, on the understanding that the whole cost will be borne by the international community via the High Commission for Refugees.

Of course, this operation to help the refugees must cover the whole region. Since one of the speakers mentioned the Red Cross, I am glad to report that we always cooperate with that organization and have already provided it with substantial funds and I would add that we shall of course also offer all the help we can if the Red Cross is given permission to operate in Cambodia, for help must also be given to the refugees returning to Cambodia.

The third group of proposals, as I indicated before, relates to the aid that must be given to the countries which agree to offer permanent refuge, whether Community countries or, more particularly, countries in the Third World which could not bear the cost themselves. This applies to Latin America as well as to other regions.

These are the concrete problems that must be discussed, and they must be discussed in a concrete fashion, separating this humanitarian approach from any political questions. Otherwise we shall be unable to make the necessary progress, the progress we owe to these men and women in their plight. The Geneva Conference must not become involved in a great political debate. That does not mean this debate is not important. That does not mean that this House must not, one day, enter into the political debate. But today it is the refugees we are talking about. If we indulge in political discussions we are liable to delay the help we can give them. Please, therefore, just as we are all determined that food aid must never be a political question or a political weapon, let us ensure that this debate ends on a non-political note so as to improve the prospects for the Geneva Conference, which the Secretary-General of the United Nations and all those directly and physically responsible for the operation in South East Asia hope will be as free as possible of political elements, so that it can achieve concrete results.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now consider the votes.

We begin with the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-223/79/rev. II), tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of

the European People's Party (CD), Mr Bangemann on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr Scott-Hopkins on behalf of the European Democratic Group: *The tragedy of the Indochinese refugees.*

I put to the vote the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 8.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 8 are adopted.

On paragraph 9, Mr Ryan has tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Stresses, moreover, that humanitarian aid from the EEC must be supervised by recognized international organizations to ensure that it reaches the people it is intended for.

I call Mr Sieglerschmidt.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — Madam President, I have not received this amendment. If others are in the same position, I believe that in accordance with the Rules of Procedure it cannot be considered.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — The amendment is withdrawn.

President. — The amendment is withdrawn.

I put paragraph 9 to the vote.

Paragraph 9 is adopted.

I put paragraph 10 to the vote.

Paragraph 10 is adopted.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, many Members of the Socialist Group intend to abstain from voting on the motion which has been tabled by Mr Bangemann, Mr Scott-Hopkins and Mr Klepsch on behalf of their groups and also on the motion which has been tabled by the Communist Group. The point is that they feel that both motions fail to cover a number of points which they consider of fundamental importance as regards the humanitarian reception of and support for the refugees and the search for a long-term solution — and I mean long-term. We must make every effort not to isolate Vietnam from the international community. It is only in the motion by the Socialist Group that there are sufficient guarantees to prevent this and to make a success of the conference which begins tomorrow in Geneva.

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole. The resolution is adopted.¹

(Applause)

¹ OJ C 203 of 13. 8. 1979

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution (Doc. I-224/79) tabled by the Communist and Allies Group.

I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso for an explanation of vote.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (*F*) I could not vote for the motion tabled by Mr Klepsch, Mr Bangemann and Mr Scott-Hopkins, nor could I abstain.

There is a simple reason why I shall vote for the motion tabled by Mr Ansart and Mr Amendola. Freedom is indivisible and you cannot separate these problems. The refugee problem is extremely important, but it is linked in political terms to aid for Vietnam. I am extremely sorry to say — and this is probably one of the first occasions — that I disagree entirely with what Mr Cheysson has just told us.

As an independent, I shall vote on this motion after very careful consideration. The two problems cannot be separated, and our motion recognizes this in my view.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote. The motion is rejected.

* * *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-227/79) tabled by the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

I call Mr de la Malène.

Mr de la Malène. — (*F*) Madam President, I should like to outline very briefly our views on the matter.

We have absolutely no desire to confuse political issues, which are out of place in this debate, with humanitarian ones. But we do not want fine words to hide desire to do nothing at all.

What is important? It is important that nations open their frontiers and do something more than offer words and speeches and meetings. Let them open their frontiers and take in their quota of refugees!

(*Applause*)

Secondly, the cities and towns in the Community — once the refugees have been allowed in by the Member States — must put into action the feelings of the people and organize the reception of the refugees.

This is what we are seeking: that our frontiers be opened and that the public play its part in granting this humanitarian aid.

We do not want any political scheming in this debate. We did not like the clumsy and damaging role of the Commission in this affair. We stress this point because — whether the Commission likes it or not — political overtones crept in. We state quite bluntly:

we do not want any political meddling, we simply want to help the people who are starving to death.

President. — I call Mr Vergeer for an explanation of vote.

Mr Vergeer. — (*NL*) Madam President, we feel that an explanation of vote on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party is called for, now that the motion tabled by the Group of European Progressive Democrats is about to be put to the vote. The resolution which has just been adopted — and which naturally gets our full support — makes me feel that a second resolution on this subject should not be adopted.

We have had a significant and rousing debate this evening. On behalf of my group I feel I must express our very deep regret that it was impossible to achieve a common position on this matter. Madam President, we feel that it is essential to lay tremendous stress on the humanitarian aid, because this is what has top priority at this time. We do not shy at any political debate, but this is neither the time nor the place. We agree one hundred percent with the arguments of Mr Cheysson. This means that my group feels that the best course, in spite of the fact that we are sympathetic to much of the motion tabled by the European Progressive Democrats, would be to abstain from voting.

President. — I call Mrs Groes for an explanation of vote.

Mrs Groes. — (*DK*) Madam President, I should like to say that I fully support the manner in which the Commissioner summed up the House's views on aid to the refugees. It seems to me that both the humanitarian and the practical content of his proposals is quite first rate. However, since all the motions for a resolution before us today very much embellish matters with various political arguments, and since I am of the opinion that we should not try here to exert any form of pressure on UN policy, I will abstain from voting.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The motion is rejected.

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-228/79) tabled by the Socialist Group.

I call Mr Sieglerschmidt for an explanation of vote.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — (*D*) Madam President, I intend to abstain from voting on this motion, because I cannot give my support to paragraph 3 which censures the Commission.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mrs Focke for an explanation of vote.

Mrs Focke. — (D) Madam President, there are two reasons why I shall abstain. Firstly, I cannot accept the paragraph which criticizes the Commission. Secondly — and this is the more important reason — it grieves me that it was impossible for Parliament to work out a common approach to this matter. This was thwarted by procedural wrangles, and I should have found it much more appropriate if we had at least attempted to reach agreement here tonight on the eve of the Conference.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Segre for an explanation of vote.

Mr Segre. — (I) Madam President, I simply want to say that the Communist and Allies Group will abstain from voting on the motion tabled by the Socialist Group.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote. The motion is rejected.

14. *Amendment of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on

- report (Doc. 1-193/79), drawn up by Mr Luster on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, on the amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-225/79 rev.), tabled by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and Mr Scott-Hopkins on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament.

I must inform the House that paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution contained in the Luster report should be amended to read as follows :

Decides that the Rules of Procedure thus amended shall enter into force immediately.

The paragraph will be put to the vote as amended.

I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster, rapporteur. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we are rapidly approaching the witching hour, and so I shall try to keep the length of the introduction to my report in inverse proportion to the number of times it has so far been cited here in this House. I shall try to make my speech as unadorned as possible, as befits a report on rules of procedure, and I would beg your indulgence for this abrupt change from the lofty and important political

issues we have so far been discussing to the prosaic essentials of procedure.

The motion for a resolution before you recommends the incorporation of a new Rule 7 A into the rules of procedure. The aim of this Rule 7 A is to make the quaestors — an institution which this House created for good reasons in 1977 — in future advisory members of the Bureau. This goes back to a proposal put forward by all the political groups in the old Parliament. The proposal also refers to the term of office of the quaestors.

Rule 7 A amounts to an addition to the existing rules of procedure, whereas the second point dealt with in my report amounts to a modification to those rules. The aim in amending Rule 37 (5) is to raise the minimum number of members comprising a group from a single Member State from 14 to 29. Hitherto, where members of a group came from at least three different Member States, a group could be formed by ten members. It is now proposed to raise the minimum number in such a case to 21, provided that they come from at least two Member States.

The two motions for a resolution seeking to amend the rules of procedure are self-explanatory. The second motion arose from the initiative taken by only five — as opposed to the full complement of six — groups represented in the old Parliament. These motions have now gone through the normal channels of discussions, having been tabled at the plenary session of 9 May 1979. On that same day, they were discussed by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. I had the honour of being nominated rapporteur, at a time when no-one realized what it would mean in this Parliament, myself included. We discussed the matter in plenary session on 10 May, when two amendments were tabled. The whole matter was then referred back to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, which discussed the two amendments — one of which sought to prevent the introduction of Rule 7 A, and the other of which sought to lay down a standard minimum group strength of 21 members — rejected them, and thus reverted to the original motion for a resolution. I now have the honour — on behalf both of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and of the Group of the European People's Party — to recommend the adoption of the two amendments to the rules of procedure.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Ewing.

Mrs Ewing. — Madam President, I rise to address the House only on the matter of the size of a group, and not on the matter of the quaestors. I thought the

Ewing

impression was given by the last speaker that there was unanimity among all groups on both matters. My information is that there was unanimity among the chairmen of the groups on the matter of the quaestors but not, indeed, unanimity on the matter of the size of the group, because the then representative of this group, Mr Yeats, did not agree with the others. So I am in a sense following the same position which was taken up by Mr Yeats.

At any rate, I speak to you on the basis of two rather strange experiences. You know, I think, that until very recently I was a non-attached Member of this House for four years. I said in my speech today that I was treated with the utmost fairness. I have also had the strange experience of being a member of a party of one — which is not a party of course — in the House of Commons, where there are over 630 members. I would say to you that in the Luster report there are two examples of what we in Scotland would call in the courts of law special pleading. I would ask you to look at them. First paragraph 4: 'This amendment has become necessary as a result of the doubling of the number of Members of Parliament'. There is no explanation why it is necessary; it is not necessary just because somebody says it is necessary: this is not logic by my legal training. The second example of special pleading is in paragraph 6: 'Unless the provisions of rule 36 (5) are amended, mini-groups of 10 could spring up, with all manner of undesirable consequences'. But there may be nothing undesirable about a group of 10. There may be something undesirable about a group of 10, or 21, or 29, or 109, but the fact-that somebody says so does not make it true.

These are examples of what I think is most illogical special pleading, and from my two experiences of the Houses of Commons — and I have been in and out of that place — I would say this to you: I was a party of one person, which is not a party. Then I went back as one of a party of 11. There was once a party of six Liberals. They were treated with the utmost fairness in the House of Commons; there was a party of 11 Ulster Unionists; they were treated with fairness in the House of Commons, and at two times in my life there was a party of seven members of the Scottish Nationalist Party, and later 11, who were treated with fairness in the House of Commons. There is now a party of two members of the Scottish Nationalist party who were treated with fairness in the House of Commons; and that is a House with 635 members, and we have 410. What is so special about the fact that we have become 410, that all of a sudden you are afraid of 10 people?

I would caution you all: do not rush into a sudden change of rules unless your motives are really totally honourable. The world is watching you. Even the phrase used here, 'mini-group', has a certain ring to it suggesting there is something wrong with a small number of people. What is so great about a maxi-

group? It will all depend on how the group behaves, whether it is mini or maxi, and that will be something we will all have to find out in the fullness of time.

I would remind you that we are all here now, every one of us, as directly elected Members; none of us are nominees, and behind us are lots of people. I would also remind you that we all have different systems of voting in our different countries, some fairer than others — but, that is a matter of opinion. In the United Kingdom, you know, we have the system of first-past-the-post; that makes it difficult for minority parties. But we accept that whatever the rules are, we have to work within the rules. We can advocate a change to proportional representation as the Liberals in the House of Commons do, and as my party does. But we do it within certain confines. You all have different systems of voting, and as you know, independent Members from some of the Member States have already had to overcome difficult hurdles to get here. Some of them have had to overcome the hurdle of the 5% rule, and they are now here. And behind them are their electors. Most of them have more electors than I have, because I have a sparsely populated constituency. And I would say that, having overcome these hurdles, having come here, having decided they would like to be recognized under the old rules, which were perfectly satisfactory for the four years I was here, why all of a sudden are we so afraid? Speaking as a former non-attached Member who, for reasons I find valid, has decided to join a group, I feel I have something to contribute to this debate. I would ask you all to be fair to minorities, to live up to that tradition, to let the old rules apply, not to change them suddenly. Because I think you will be judged badly, your motives will be suspected even if they are pure. I would really argue to allow the old rule with regard to the size of the group to apply.

(Applause)

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

Mr Cecovini. — *(I)* Madam President, it seems to me that this amendment is composed of two distinct and entirely different parts: it is proposed to add a Rule 7 (A) and then to modify Rule 36 (5).

The subject matter is different and therefore the desirability of these measures can be differently assessed. Some of the members of our Liberal and Democratic Group — I speak only of some members and not of all — have formed different opinions on the first and second proposal. On the first we would have no comment to make; on the second we have doubts — which have already been expressed by the previous speaker — about the desirability of the increase envisaged. Such an increase would undoubtedly prevent some small groups from constituting a formal Group accepted as such by Parliament.

Cecovini

We do not believe there is a danger of a proliferation of mini-groups. On the contrary, in practice there would be a very limited increase in number which would not create much trouble. Discrimination, however, could cause those excluded to feel that they had been victimized. Such victimization cannot be remedied by conceding — as another amendment seeks to do — some privileges which groups normally have.

We therefore think that there is no reason to amend Rule 36 as proposed, but that it would be better for good relations among the Members of this Parliament to leave Rule 36 as it is and allow those who qualify under the existing Rules to form groups under the same conditions as hitherto.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to introduce the motion for a resolution which has been tabled by the groups.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, I shall be brief in view of the hour. My sole purpose in rising is to introduce the motion for a resolution standing in the name of Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the European People's Party which was accepted for debate by urgent procedure by this House earlier on.

My group feels very strongly that the rights of the minorities must be safeguarded if we are, as I hope, going to be able to pass the Luster report and I would congratulate the rapporteur on the brevity and conciseness of the presentation of his report. Indeed, it is important that this House should take those steps which are necessary to safeguard the minorities' rights. Mrs Ewing, who has just spoken, has made a passionate plea for safeguarding these rights and I believe that if we follow the terms of this resolution we shall indeed be able to accomplish that.

What does it say? It says that a small group of parliamentarians having a clear political identity shall be accorded a number of facilities in respect of speaking-time — of course they must have adequate speaking-time in this House they have had more than adequate speaking-time today and yesterday, but one must safeguard their right to continue to have a fair proportion of speaking-time — ; the maintenance of a joint secretariat if they so wish and the appointment of rapporteurs — of course they must have their fair share of the rapporteurships for the various committees dealing with the reports which are presented to this House : that is only fair again — and also other facilities.

I hope that the Rules of Procedure Committee will treat this matter as a matter of urgency and report to this House as soon as is practicable, bearing in mind whatever administrative problems of translators, of interpreters, of getting together there may be. I hope that, when they have been duly constituted this

evening, they will be able to report the results of their deliberations to this House at the earliest possible moment.

I would have thought therefore, Madam President that what we are putting forward to you now in this resolution and putting forward to those people who feel that they are unable to join one of the established groups' does in point of fact safeguard their rights as far as is possible : speaking-rights, secretarial help, a fair share of rapporteurships and other financial aid which they may need — I cannot think there is anything else that these ladies and gentlemen, honourable Members that they are, can ask this House to give. They are, and they have by their political persuasions decided to be, what they are : they are in a minority and we must look after them, but they also must respect the rights of the rest of the honourable Members in this House. I am sure they would wish to do that.

In that case, Madam President, I have pleasure to move the motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Coppeters.

Mr Coppeters. — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in view of the speech just delivered by Mr Scott-Hopkins, we now seem to be discussing two things at once — the Luster report and the motion for a resolution. Needless to say, I am very much in sympathy with the objectives of the motion tabled by Messrs Glinne, Klepsch and Scott-Hopkins. Madam President, in your opening address you spoke of a 'new authority', but this is going too far: the report drawn up by Mr Luster on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions is dated 9 May 1979, and is therefore the work of the old Parliament. The present Parliament is a new institution and has yet to appoint its committees. It is therefore inappropriate that we should already be amending the Rules of Procedure of the new institution on the basis of a report by the previous one. It has been clear from the outset — and also since this morning — that the appointment of new committees from the newly elected House is carried out by the House when it is formed. It is therefore premature to debate the contents of the Luster report, as some speakers have been doing.

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — *(I)* Madam President, we of the Italian National Right listened with interest to the motion for a resolution presented just now, albeit in a brief and general way, by Mr Scott-Hopkins, and I wish briefly to explain our attitude, since in our view the debate on the Luster report has been — and I say this without wishing to criticize those colleagues who felt they were protecting their rights — distorted from the start by the attitude which Mr Pannella and the others in his group saw fit to take up.

Almirante

I think that the whole Parliament believed it was a question of deciding whether to accept or to eliminate more or less legally the group formed by Mr Pannella. In fact the issue is a different one — not the protection of minorities, but the protection of the rights of Members. In your introductory speech, Madam President, you stressed the legal continuity between the last Parliament and this one. We can accept the concept of continuity, but if continuity were interpreted to mean identity, neither we nor anyone else accept such a concept, since this Parliament undoubtedly constitutes a different legal entity from the previous Parliament. And, more precisely, each of us as a Member of this Parliament constitutes a different legal entity from that of the Members of the previous one. On 10 June a new legal entity came into being throughout Europe in the countries of the European Community — that of a representative with a democratic and national mandate, a legal entity which did not exist before so that each of us is responsible not only to his conscience, his party and his group, he is directly answerable, — he has the right and the duty to answer, and must be given the opportunity to answer, to his electorate. That is why the legal, political and, I would go so far as to say even the moral, position of a Member of this Parliament is different from the political, legal and moral position of those who were Members of the previous Parliament on a different basis, with different rights and duties.

Having said that, the concept of a non-attached member is meaningless. It had some meaning in the previous Parliament, but all of us here are bearers of the political ideas, principles, themes and commitments which we have derived from our electors, to whom we are responsible now and throughout our mandate. Thus we cannot be non-attached, and each of us should belong to a political group, even if it consists of only a few like-minded people.

Having established this principle, which seems to me incontrovertible and should be generally agreed, the Scott-Hopkins motion, which we have not had a chance to examine in detail, seems to us acceptable in principle as a basis for discussion since we — as we have shown by our attitude up to now and by dissociating ourselves from any obstructionist manoeuvres, as well as by adhering wholeheartedly to what seemed to us to be the moral interests of the majority and of Parliament as a whole — have no intention of asking for privileges or even of claiming any right — only want to be able to do our duty. Parliament must give us, too, the opportunity to do our duty to our electorate and meet our political commitments.

If the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins is intended to achieve this we shall accept it. We have tabled amendments — of course, before we knew of this motion — to Mr Luster's motion for a resolution, and these have been printed, distributed

and translated. We shall move these later on, but if they can be incorporated in a motion for a resolution enabling us to do our duty fully, we shall be pleased not to create difficulties and to accept an agreed plan for cooperation.

President. — I call Mr de Goede.

Mr de Goede. — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I have now spent three days in this House, after seven years in the Dutch Parliament, and I must say that I have never been frustrated as often as in these past three days — never in those seven years, not even as a member of the government, although we too had our rules of procedure.

I shall explain why I am so frustrated. On the one hand, I can appreciate why the old Parliament's policy of encouraging the formation of groups was taken to its logical conclusion in the Luster report. And I agree that in view of the increase in Members from 198 to 410 the raising of thresholds should be proposed automatically. However, I think the authors of the report made a serious omission in not bothering to consider whether, in view of the election results of 10 June last, which showed that the number of non-attached Members in this House would increase from three to 24, other Rules of Parliament's procedure should not also be amended.

I feel this is a serious omission, Madam President. Rule 28 of the present Rules of Procedure, for instance, deals with the allocation of speaking time which, if applied, is divided into two fractions: a) an equal fraction for all Groups, and b) a fraction proportional to the number of group members. Now we come to the first discriminatory element: Article 28 of both the old and new Rules of Procedure stipulates that the speaking time allocated to Members not attached to a group is equal to that allocated to each group in (a), except that no account is taken of (b). This was not such a disadvantage to non-attached Members of the old Parliament, because, if my information is correct, there were only three non-attached Members in the House. But now we are being discriminated against more severely because the present 24 non-attached Members have to share out the same speaking time as was allocated to the three non-attached Members in the old Parliament.

As you will have noted this afternoon Madam President, the situation is further complicated when the non-attached Members, who have no political, technical or perhaps even personal affinity one with another, are required to agree among themselves on how to share out their speaking time. Just a few minutes ago Mrs Dekker nearly fell foul of this curious system, since you said that another non-attached Member had already used up the total speaking time of ten minutes.

de Goede

I would like to take the liberty of mentioning seven or eight examples which suggest that the Rules of Procedure really need to be amended. The first is speaking time. Of course, all the non-attached Members cannot claim sufficient time to speak exhaustively in every debate, but a very practical solution might be for you to allocate a number of minutes to the non-attached Members not per debate but, for example, per part-session, so that they can choose for themselves the debates in which they wish to use their speaking time.

In connection with speaking time, I would point out that you also discriminated against the non-attached Members yesterday by not allowing them to speak in the ceremonial part of the sitting. There is not a single Rule to support such an action in the present Rules of Procedure, Madam President, in fact it is in conflict with them: although yesterday you invoked Rule 28 — which does in fact empower you to allocate speaking time — it does so in accordance with the criteria specified in that Rule. It clearly stipulates that you must also allow non-attached Members to speak. You did not do this, a fact which I still resent.

The motion for a resolution before us has been combined with the Luster Report. Fortunately, Mr Albers has tabled some amendments, which I shall of course support. However, I cannot see why this motion was linked to the report. Will the problems cease to exist in the unlikely event of the report being rejected? Of course they won't. Their linking is therefore fundamentally misguided.

The motion for a resolution states that the small group of non-attached Members are in principle entitled to be appointed as rapporteurs and that they clearly must have technical assistance at their disposal.

But there are other problems too, Madam President. Why, for example, are all the non-attached Members seated on the back benches? Why have they not been given a row from the front to the back? Whenever the non-attached Members rose to speak in the televised debate yesterday, the television commentator did not even mention their names. There is an official seating plan which indicates the positions occupied by the various Groups; however, the non-attached Members are again completely ignored, even by the information media.

These examples suggest that there is something wrong with people's attitudes to the recognition of minorities and their rights. I call upon all Members to put an end to this situation and to respect the fundamental rights of these minorities, particularly with regard to speaking time.

To turn to the Luster Report, even if I vote for the motion tabled by Mr Glinne, Mr Klepsch and Mr Scott-Hopkins, I shall not be able to vote for the raising of thresholds. However, we shall have to wait and see the outcome of the motion.

Once again, I find the proposal to link the acceptance of the motion with that of the Luster Report misguided, and shall therefore be voting in favour of Mr Albers' amendments.

I shall be very interested to see whether the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions succeeds in the short term in coming up with other, more wide-ranging proposals.

In conclusion, I really cannot see how this final example of discrimination which I shall mention can be continued. The Groups have now been discussing the membership of the committees for over a week. The former President, Mr Colombo, replied to our perfectly reasonable written request by saying that, since there were 24 non-attached Members out of a total of 410, the non-attached Members were entitled to 6% of the seats on the committees. We were therefore able to spend last week sharing these seats out. Today, however, I was told by Parliament's administration that we were not allowed to do this, as the big groups had to allocate their seats first. We have therefore had to make do with the crumbs from the table of our more privileged colleagues.

I find this unacceptable, Madam President. This is the last example I shall give in support of my argument that we must put an end to discrimination against minorities in this House.

President. — I call Mr Lyngé.

Mr Lyngé. — (DK) Madam President, I had better introduce myself, because I am sitting in the wrong place in the House. I am sitting with my friends and comrades here in the Socialist Group because I just recently became a member of that group here. I represent the constituency of Greenland, and I mention this because I consider myself perhaps the most typical minority representative in this Assembly. The country which I represent covers — in square kilometres — 60% of Community territory, and I alone represent this 60% and a small population of 50 000 inhabitants. I know what it is to be a minority. I am glad to say that I am a member of the Socialist Group. It is a large group, a strong group, but I sympathize to a large extent with those who had difficulties this morning and who were faced with indignation and apparently even a bitter attack. That saddened me.

I should like to say, concerning Mr Luster's report and this explanation, that I agree completely with Mrs Ewing of Scotland when she said that this so-called explanation is in fact no explanation at all, but rather an allegation. The reason given is that the change from 10 to 21, as the minimum number of members in a group, has become necessary following the doubling of the numbers of Members of Parliament. Why this is so is not stated, nor is it stated with regard to other points in the report. I should like to say that it stands to reason that an Assembly which has such a

Lynge

diverse background as the European Parliament will have a very large number of non-attached Members unless small groups are permitted.

A group of 10 is a small group in an Assembly of 410 but unless it is allowed there will be a very large number of non-attacheds, and it could also happen that some of these would be forced to join half-heartedly one or other group for practical reasons or out of necessity — which is an unpleasant situation in which to place colleagues. I could see this morning, as we all could, that this discussion aroused bitterness and gave one the feeling that a power struggle was taking place. I say 'feeling' because I do not want to stand here and allege that such was the case. I do not wish to assert that the big were trying to crush the small, but I note that this was the feeling of some of our friends and colleagues in this Chamber. This cannot be tolerated. Such a situation is alone sufficient to lead me to ask a question, since I know very little about the procedures in this Assembly. Is it possible, to vote separately on this proposal to change the minimum from 10 to 21? By voting on it separately, I mean removing it from the Luster report and voting on it on its own? I will personally vote against the proposal to raise the minimum to 21, and I will also call on others to vote against it, because this will not solve the problem. It will create even more problems and the worst problem will be the change in atmosphere, which would be intolerable. Let me say also that, should this solution not be possible, I would recommend that the Luster report be referred back to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure for two reasons. Firstly because we want to hear a better justification than the allegation made. The drawbacks have not been outlined, only the advantages, that is the alleged advantages. The second reason is that this will allow time for tempers to cool down, even if we have a warm summer.

President. — I call Mr Bettiza.

Mr Bettiza. — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to make a practical proposal on the basis of this long debate on the Luster report. First and foremost, I wish to thank Mr Luster for his rapid and clear summary of his report. Nevertheless, I think I understood from his words that, since he worked on this report during a period in which certain political problems had not yet arisen, he was the first today to express bewilderment at the flood-gates which he had unintentionally opened. Moreover, I noted, for example, that the attitude of the Socialist Group, which helped to draw up the Luster report, was also divided and bewildered. Equally, listening to Mrs Ewing, I noticed that she — who, although non-attached, sits with the British Conservative Group — also expressed certain doubts of her own about the

protection of the rights of minorities in this Parliament. Then, listening to the speech by the Liberal Member Mr Cecovini, I noticed that he too expressed some doubts without arriving at the practical conclusion which I shall outline in a moment. Mr Luster, in his excellent presentation of his report, divided it into two parts — the first concerning administrative arrangements (Rule 7A), and the other concerning the political composition of this Parliament (Rule 36, paragraph 5). Mr Cecovini followed his example, as — unwittingly — did Mrs Ewing.

Therefore, Madam President, I would urge you strongly to take account of all these contradictions which have emerged in a long day of debates in this Parliament, and bear in mind that we are discussing a report composed of two parts — one concerning, so to speak, the executive of Parliament, and the other the life of Parliament, I therefore suggest that we vote separately on the two parts, namely Rule 7A concerning the quaestors, and Rule 36, paragraph 5, concerning the formation of groups.

That said, I should like to know whether it is true that the group led by Mr Pannella has tabled a hundred amendments. Mr Panella, some Liberals, although not the whole Liberal Group have had much sympathy for your position today. May I say one thing to you: you are wrong if you think you can exploit the friendship of the Liberals, who are not your personal friends but simply agree with you on some questions of principle. I am not prepared to let this happen — that is to allow this Parliament to be surreptitiously and artificially paralysed by a hundred amendments. Since I too am defending you, I would ask you to bear in mind that you should not confuse the method with the substance. I do not approve of the method you are using, but I agree with the substance of the questions you are raising. So do not think you can use any liberal as a willing tool; we are men of principle, and I speak to you now as a man of principle. I therefore repeat my proposal that we vote separately on the two parts of the Luster report.

(The sitting was suspended for technical reasons at 12.45 a.m. and resumed at 12.50 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed. I call Mr Fellermaier

Mr Fellermaier. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we tried this morning to reach a compromise with the other Members of this House in a spirit of fair-play. Mr Scott-Hopkins has once again pointed out that what we are looking for is a solution which will in no way discriminate against Members of this House in the exercise of their democratic duties, even when they do not belong to any of the established political groups.

Fellermaier

It is in this spirit of fair-play that I should like to make the following statement on behalf of the Socialist Group, the Group of the European People's Party, the European Democratic Group and the Liberal and Democratic Group. The Members of all these groups undertake to take steps in the new Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to ensure that a proposal is put before this House in September 1979, guaranteeing the following rights to non-attached Members or groups of Members :

1. Speaking time ;
2. A secretariat ;
3. Participation in the nomination of rapporteurs ;
4. All other technical and financial facilities in proportion to the number of non-attached Members.

I would thus appeal to the non-attached Members to show that they are prepared — in a spirit of cooperation — to accept the offer I have just made on behalf of the four political groups, and which will be set out in writing.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Ferri.

Mr Ferri. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to express on behalf of many members of the Socialist Group, mostly Italians, total disagreement with the motion on which Mr Luster is the rapporteur and which seeks to modify Rule 36 of the Rules of Procedure, i.e. to change the minimum requirements in Rule 36, paragraph 5, for Members of this Parliament to form a Group.

Mr Fellermaier, on behalf of the Group to which I have the honour to belong, explained and illustrated the commitment contained in the motion for a resolution tabled and presented by the Chairman of the European Democratic Group Mr Scott-Hopkins, the Chairman of the Socialist Group, Mr Glinne, and the Chairman of the European People's Party Group, Mr Klepsch. I must say very frankly, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, that in my view this motion shows the untenable, or at least inopportune, nature of the Luster motion and points out that, although inspired by good intentions which I respect, it is profoundly contradictory. It asks Parliament to approve a new rule of supreme importance, while at the same time promising, that, within a few months, the negative effects of this rule, whose approval is so strongly urged, will diminish. I repeat, this is a contradiction which in my view is an admission of the mistake — I think it should be so described — inherent in the Luster proposal to modify Rule 36.

At this late hour, I do not wish to abuse your forbearance, but — since it is always difficult to decide and

vote differently from the Group to which one has chosen to belong and on whose programme and ideas one has been elected — I feel duty bound to tell Parliament briefly the reason for my position.

We all know the historical and political origins of the Groups. They arose in modern parliaments as extensions of the political parties, and their advent coincided more or less with the transition from the old parliaments with restricted suffrage confined to oligarchic groups to the democratic parliaments elected by universal suffrage. But the Groups, which were initially an extension of the political parties increasingly acquired the nature of true organs of a parliament, and their role has become increasingly important and decisive in the organization of parliamentary work, so that today we can say without exaggeration that, apart from the basic rights of participating in the work of parliament and of voting, the elected members are not fully performing their function unless they belong to a political group. But I should also like to add that it is in the overriding interest of the proper functioning of a parliament that the largest possible number of its members — or indeed all of them — should belong to political groups. The position of a non-attached member — or as occurs in the Italian Chamber of Deputies and Senate, of the members of the Mixed Group — is a full-back position, if you like, in the absence of other solutions, but it is undoubtedly a minority position which does not help the proper functioning of parliamentary work.

Now, at this stage, we have the Rules of Procedure drawn up by the previous Parliament — I do not wish to broach the problem of legal continuity, which may indeed exist, but there is certainly no political continuity. There can be no political continuity between a Parliament described as an 'assembly of delegates' and this Parliament made up of elected representatives whose legitimacy, rights and duties derive from universal suffrage.

I think the numerical limits laid down in Rule 36 of our Rules of Procedure are already sufficiently high, and that they should therefore be retained unchanged. The real problem is — and we should be attentive to this — that the Groups formed in Parliament are expressions of parties or political groupings, political positions, which are not merely groupings of convenience formed to make parliamentary work possible. If we then bear in mind the multinational composition of this Parliament, and the fact that, because of this disparate sizes and populations of the Member States of our Community, there are countries represented by 14 or 15 Members — not to mention Luxembourg which has only 6 — then the present limits of 14 Members if elected in a single country, or 10 if elected in at least 3 countries, are already a more than adequate barrier and a more than valid guarantee against the risk of proliferation.

Ferri

That is why, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I and the like-minded members of my Group are convinced that we are following the best traditions of democratic socialism, the history of which in Italy — if you will allow me to remind you — includes the glorious action of Prampolini and Bissolati, who at the turn of the century did not hesitate to disrupt the polling to prevent a conservative and reactionary majority from bringing in changes in the rules designed to restrict liberties, and who were supported in this by the popular vote.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

We think we are being faithful to our principles and our commitments in expressing our total disagreement with the change in Rule 36 of the Rules of Procedure proposed by the Luster report. As to the search for a solution which would respect the principles and make it possible for Parliament, to which so many have looked and still look with such great hopes, to begin its work more constructively, I think such a constructive solution can be found. Mr Bettiza hinted at it, and so did the Member for Greenland who has joined our Group. There is the possibility — natural, clear, indeed I would say of an obviousness which it would be difficult to ignore — of referring the proposed change in Rule 36 back to committee for careful consideration. I do not see there is any urgency about the matter. We can understand that it is desirable to decide today on the question of the quaestors and then to define the number of committees. But what urgent need is there, ladies and gentlemen, to adopt this restrictive rule increasing the number of Members required to constitute political Groups in Parliament? I associate myself with those who rightly appeal to Marco Pannella not to abuse a method which may be legitimate in some circumstances, but to which recourse must be had only in really exceptional cases. But the same appeal must be made also to the overwhelming majority of this Parliament — not to abuse the strength and, if you like, also the legitimacy conferred by sheer numbers. I hope that this call, this appeal, will be accepted, and that therefore either the change in Rule 36 proposed by Mr Luster will be rejected now, or at least the solution may be accepted — one which is honourable and decorous for all — of sending the proposal on Rule 36 back to the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Petitions which is about to be formed.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as Mr Ferri has said everything that I wanted to say, I do not wish to speak at the moment.

President. — I call Mr D'Angelosante.

Mr D'Angelosante. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, at this stage in the debate on the Luster report, I wish to speak on behalf of the Communist Group, with the reservation that I, or rather my Group, may express an opinion on the subordinate motion tabled by the Socialist, Christian-Democratic and Conservative Groups, when the full text of this motion is known. More than once I have had occasion, Madam President, to express the position of my Group, which is clearly and firmly opposed to the Luster proposal. Moreover, you could hardly expect it to be otherwise, since my Group was the first to taste the delights of the administrative hurdles imposed by this Parliament. It was the first to be discriminated against, and at the time when these rules were being applied against us we had very few friends to support us. We had to wait for years for certain national rules to be changed, thus allowing us to come here in sufficient numbers to constitute a Group. Even now we are not given equal treatment with the others on certain questions. This seems to me sufficient reason not only for our consistent defence of the freedom of minorities, but — I would like to add — also for our interest in the elimination of certain administrative hurdles. That said, I do not need to speak for much longer, but I wish to make a very brief observation reply to a question put to me this morning if I remember rightly, by Mr Klepsch, who asked me why we are adopting this position today. The reason, as other speakers have pointed out, is universal suffrage — i.e. the fact that this Parliament has been elected by the peoples of the Community. From this fact, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, derive two consequences to which I would like to draw your attention. The first is — as I already mentioned earlier — that there is no uniform electoral system for some of our countries use proportional representation and others do not, some of our countries use the 5% hurdle and others do not. To ask for the number of Members necessary to constitute a group to be kept high is tantamount, in my view, to rewarding the unfair systems, i.e. the non-proportional ones, and discriminating amongst the various national electoral systems.

The other consequence, ladies and gentlemen, is that it is necessary to decide what is more important for in justifying the formation of a Group — the votes represented or the Members here present. This too must be discussed. I know five members of the non-attached group — I think it is called that — five fellow countrymen of mine who together obtained a number of votes equal to about a third of that obtained by one third of the groups present here. There are countries where two million votes give a party five members, and there are other countries where six million votes give a party 64 members! I realize that, from the point of view of legitimacy, all this is irreproachable, since each country has passed its own national electoral law, but I maintain, Madam President, that one cannot go so far as to suggest that certain elements,

D'Angelosante

which are in fact the essence of democracy, should be ignored. In my view these are important reasons which prevent us at this stage from supporting a proposal which, if it had any meaning would have applied to the previous Parliament. Within that Parliament, as direct elections had not yet taken place, there were not the striking, serious and inadmissible differences which now exist in certain respects. All these reasons lead my group — as I have already said — to take a firm stand against the motion for a resolution contained in the Luster report. We have repeatedly expressed our position against this motion and in favour of its being referred to committee. As I said at the beginning, we are waiting to know the full text of the subordinate motion about which Mr Fellermaier spoke and which is receiving a precise formulation, as stated earlier on. We are waiting to see what it says, just as we are waiting to hear the opinion on it of those concerned.

President. — I call Mr Puletti.

Mr Puletti. — (*I*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I did not really wish to speak, but the speech made by my comrade and friend Mr Ferri has obliged me to do so, and my intervention is also partly a belated, but still I think a clear, explanation of the way I voted this morning.

When the first and second amendments tabled by the group led by Mr Pannella were presented, I voted against, although I belong to the Socialist Group and to the same party as Mr Ferri. I would like to say that I have always maintained that, in principle, the defence of minorities seems to me to be legitimate and should be the task of anyone who holds to the principles of democratic socialism. However, the form of obstructionism employed from the very first exchanges which took place in this Parliament, and of which the Italian press as is its custom, has published very full accounts, led me to wonder whether it was only a right which was being claimed or whether there was an attempt to gain publicity in this Parliament for political views which sometimes cannot be shared. That is why the proposal which arose in the course of the debate, made by the Chairman of the Socialist Group, Mr Glinne, and now repeated more fully, and might I add, with greater generosity, by Mr Fellermaier, seems to me to be the ideal proposal to get us out of an impasse, since on the one hand it envisages the defence of a principle and a right, while on the other it maintains the dignity of this Parliament.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Maher.

Mr Maher. — Madam President, I was elected in my own country as an independent Member and I got the highest vote in my country. When I came to Stras-

bourg and enquired how I could participate in a relevant and useful way in this Parliament, I was told that unless I became part of one of the groups I could get no position on any of the more important committees. Madam President, I must say that I was dismayed at that because under the rules of the election I was entitled to go forward in my own country as an individual, as a citizen; that right was recognized. But when I came to this Parliament I was told that unless I was part of a group I would not get a meaningful position. In my view, in the future, if this Parliament is to justify its existence, it will from time to time have to defend the rights of minorities, wherever those rights are being infringed, and even to defend the rights of individuals. How can we be credible in defending the rights of individuals and minorities in the outside world if, at the same time, it could be seen that inside our own Parliament we do not respect the rights of individuals and minorities?

I would appeal to the Members of this House to agree to refer this whole matter back to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and let it report to this Parliament, without us at the same time trying to tell the committee what their findings ought to be. In that way I would say that we will be acting in a credible way and we will be showing the public that in fact we have a sense of fairness within this House and therefore we will be recognized when we speak out on matters relating to minorities or individuals among the general public.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — (*I*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am sorry to have to speak again, but it was said just now, that those concerned should give their opinion. We are directly concerned, and with reference to what Mr D'Angelosante rightly said, allow me to remind you that we four members represent 2 million votes, indeed rather more than 2 million votes obtained in Italy, where the percentage turnout was extremely high — and as an Italian I am truly proud of this. We represent a distinct political group, clearly identifiable and with a policy which you may like or dislike, but for which we are responsible to our electors. Allow me therefore, Madam President — and without being presumptuous I think that my questions may be useful to Parliament as a whole in enabling it to continue and conclude its work rapidly — allow me to ask for some more detailed information. Firstly, will the proposal put forward by the European Democratic Group, the Socialist Group and the European People's Party Group be put in writing and then voted on? It is not that we do not have confidence in a political and moral commitment, but it seems desirable to us that such a proposal should be put to the vote in the form of a precise text. If I under-

Almirante

stand it aright, the text is intended to give the non-attached Members, or a number of them, certain rights, by means of the phrase *or a number of them*. The stipulation of a specific number, having been eliminated by unanimous agreement in July, could still be reintroduced in September. I therefore ask, first and foremost, whether it is intended to formalize the proposal put forward by the aforementioned groups and with which I think the Communist Group has just associated itself. Secondly, in what text might it be formulated, since we — as non-obstructionist tablers of amendments — have the right and the need, if we are to withdraw our amendments, to know what the alternative is?

We therefore ask whether the text to be voted on will be clarified, and whether this proposal as an alternative to the Luster proposal — which would in that case be withdrawn — since if both the Luster proposal and the one put forward by these Groups were to be referred back to committee the situation would be extremely confused.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you not to regard as offensive nor as in any sense detracting from our confidence in your word, the questions that I have put in order to be able to take a responsible political decision on behalf of a party representing 2 million electors. As Secretary of that party and as a member of the Group I think I need to make this courteous but firm request for clarification.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*d*) Madam President, I think it is now quite obvious that what is going on here is not the legitimate use of the democratic rights available to any Member of a House like this, but an attempt to block the work of this House. For this reason, I should like to make the following point on behalf of my Group and ask you to abide by it. According to Rule 29 (1) Parliament may — on a proposal from the President — fix a time-limit for the tabling of amendments. I know that some amendments have already been tabled, but I would ask you to fix a time-limit for any further amendments. As something like 100 or 130 amendments have already been tabled, this time-limit can be a short one — say a quarter of an hour — and when that time-limit has elapsed, no more amendments should be accepted. Secondly, I would ask you — once the time-limit has elapsed — to interrupt the sitting to give you and the Secretariat the chance to decide which of the amendments tabled so far should be admitted. According to Rule 29 (2), amendments must relate to the text it is sought to alter. The Luster Report seeks to amend only Rules 7 A and 36 (5).

It therefore follows that amendments which do not relate to this text should not be admitted. I would ask

you to indicate which amendments cannot thus be admitted. Thirdly, I would ask you to put it to the House that a vote be taken on these amendments in accordance with the final paragraph of Rule 29 (2), without the amendments having first been printed and distributed in all the official languages. The rules of procedure expressly allow for such a decision, and I would ask you to proceed along these lines. I hope that your Secretariat will advise you in the light of these provisions, and I would also ask you to limit speaking time — in accordance with the third paragraph of Rule 31 (2) and Rule 31 A — to 3 minutes and to allow no-one to speak more than twice on the same subject.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (*NL*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it is clear from the numerous speeches, including that of Mr Ferri, that the proposals contained in the Luster report are, to say the least, premature. Moreover, it was, as I understood it, Mr Ferri, and not the Technical Coordination Group — and that is not just Mr Pannella and his friends — who proposed that the report should be referred back to the committee responsible. This request has our full support. However, if it is still not granted, we will also put an end to all the secrecy: three amendments have been tabled on behalf of our Group whereas Mrs Bonino has tabled a few dozen; there is no need to make a secret of this. We do feel, however, that Mr Fellermaier's statement was so important that we would like to make a further request for the sitting to be suspended for a different reason from that given earlier.

President. — Mr Bangemann has made a number of proposals regarding the amendments. In particular, he has asked that there be a time limit for tabling amendments.

We have about 100 or 150 amendments, which were tabled in Italian at about a 11 p.m. In view of the number of translators who were available at that time, it has not yet been possible to translate all the amendments into all the languages. I fail to see how we can discuss them at the moment.

(*Applause*)

I am not even sure if these amendments are in order. They were handed to the Chair this evening, although they are dated 11 July. They could have been tabled, translated and considered beforehand. They are now being translated, and I am inclined to suspend the sitting to see how far the translators have got with their work, but I should be very surprised if they were finished.

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, if what you say is the case — and there can be no doubt that it is — this is quite clearly an act of sabotage. In circumstance like this...

(Applause from the right)

... in these circumstances I request that you ask the House — so that the blame will not be laid solely at your door — if it is ready to rule that every one of these amendments is invalid since this is an obvious case of abuse of rights.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mrs Castellina.

Mrs Castellina. — (I) Madam President, in my opinion these amendments were tabled in strict accordance with the Rules of Procedure which currently apply. There are many of us — perhaps not everyone in the group, but a fair number — who have no desire to discuss 100 amendments but who want to find some real agreement. I believe that the debate we have had and the proposals by Mr Bangemann, the chairman of the Liberal Group, with regard to the possible solutions to be found, offer a solid basis for Parliament to come to a real agreement. If this is what the Members of the House really want — rather than merely being a majority wish — I think it would be a good idea to ask for an adjournment so that there can be some attempt at an agreement, on the basis of which we could then carry on more speedily with our work. Otherwise, we should need to twist the rules in order to avoid discussing amendments which have been tabled in a correct fashion.

I appeal to the House: let us reach an agreement which ensures — and this has been said by many speakers who are far from being Members of our Group — that the Members who do not belong to the major political groupings can carry out work properly and on an equal basis with the rest. Are we going to reach this agreement or are we going to have to carry on at each other's throats? I believe that there is a basis for agreement. I ask you to bear these points in mind, Madam President, and grant an adjournment so that we can work at getting a swift solution to this problem.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

(Protests)

Mr Pannella. — (I) Madam President, I was intending to say something in connection with Mr Fellermaier's proposal, but in view of this intolerant response and the incredible suggestion I heard a few minutes ago, I prefer to sit down again.

President. — I have just been informed that it is quite out of the question to have these amendments translated and printed at once in all the official languages.

The third paragraph of Rule 29 (2) states that *unless Parliament decides otherwise, amendments shall not be put to the vote until they have been printed and distributed in the official languages.*

(Uproar)

In these circumstances, I wonder if the House ought to take a decision on whether or not to disregard the fact that the amendments have not been printed.

(Applause from the right and the centre; loud protests from other quarters)

I call Mr D'Angelosante.

Mr D'Angelosante. — (I) Madam President, in my view there is no justification for your reference to Article 29. If this reference of yours were justified, the basic right to table amendments would be dependent on how the staff worked, how feasible it was to translate the amendments and how willing people were to translate them. In practical terms, this means that a parliamentary majority and the bureaucracy that derives from this majority could prevent any Member of this Assembly from fulfilling his role in tabling amendments. If the amendments cannot be translated in reasonable time this evening, they can be done by tomorrow...

(Loud laughter from certain quarters among the Group of the European People's Party)

... Mr Aigner, there is no point laughing. Why don't you go and laugh at Strauss?

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group; protests from the right)

President. — The sitting is suspended for five minutes.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.35 a. m. and resumed at 1.45 a. m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr de Goede on a point of order:

Mr de Goede. — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall quote Article 32 in justifying myself: *A Member who asks leave to speak for a procedural motion namely — and this is simply what my purpose is — to move reference to committee, shall have a prior right to do so.* Madam President, the fact that I had to leap around like a cat on a hot tin roof to attract your attention and that you nevertheless declined to let me speak, whereupon we had an adjournment, means that I am again asking leave to speak in accordance with this article.

Why am I quoting Article 32? I have been led to understand that 100 amendments have been tabled and that they are still to be translated. You have not said with regard to the tabling of these 100 amendments that something has happened which is out of order and in conflict with the Rules of Procedure. The

de Goede

mere problems of translating them would be reason enough, as Mr Bangemann proposed, not to take these amendments together. I want to point out that Mr Bangemann's proposal is contrary to the Rules of Procedure. In my view, we are going to get nowhere with this debate on the Luster report, the 100 amendments and the motion in question. The only sensible thing we can do at the moment is to refer the whole matter back to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. I think this would be one of the few sensible things we have done this evening.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it would be shameful if we got carried away in the present circumstances. I also think it would be rather unfortunate if we were to set a dismal precedent on the basis of a rowdy all-night sitting.

What I think is that we ought to have translated and printed as quickly as possible the valid amendments, by which I mean those that really have something to do with the Luster report, and then vote on them when we resume the sitting in a short while at 10 o'clock, if this is acceptable.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Glinne, I should have put forward this solution if I had been able to know which amendments were valid. They were all submitted in Italian, and they will have to be translated before we decide. I shall ask the Secretariat and the translators what the situation is. The sitting is suspended. The Bureau will meet.

(Uproar)

(The sitting was suspended at 1.50 a. m. and resumed at 3.30 a m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

With the Bureau's agreement, I propose that the deadline for tabling amendments be fixed here and now. Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I propose that the House vote to decide if the amendments which have been tabled may be discussed, whether they have been translated or not.

Mrs Ewing. — How many?

President. — There are about a hundred. They are being scrutinized to see whether some of them do not cancel each other out, in view of the contradictions that might arise.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* I am very sorry to have to disagree with you, but in the present circumstances the least

onerous solution would seem to be to implement Rule 32 (1) (d) of the Rules of Procedure and adjourn the debate at this stage. It is impossible to work under these conditions.

(Mixed reactions)

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* I reject this motion, Madam President, because it is not going to get us any farther. If we postpone the debate, we shall just go through the same thing again in September. In accordance with the third paragraph of Article 29 (2), I ask you to put the matter to the House and let it decide that these amendments can be voted on without their having to be printed and distributed in all the official languages. This is a decision that the House can take.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* I second Mr Bangemann's proposal and must confess that I am disappointed at the suggestion that the debate be deferred, when people have been requesting it for so long. We have to conclude this debate tonight, because I have no desire to sit through another sitting of Parliament while it discusses such matters.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Gredal.

Mrs Gredal. — *(DK)* Madam President, I find it unacceptable that one major group here is throwing its weight about. We have a right to have all official documents translated into our own language, and I do not wish to discuss these proposals if they are not available in Danish.

President. — I call Mr Fellermaier.

Mr Fellermaier. — *(D)* Madam President, there was little response from a considerable section of the House to the attempt by the chairman of our group — at half past four in the morning, Mr Bangemann — to find some way out of this impasse by stretching the Rules of Procedure to consider amendments which, as the Danish Member just said, are not even available in translation. In accordance with Rule 33 (4), I therefore ask you, Madam President — and my request has the support of over 30 Members of my group — to determine whether there is a quorum in the House. If the result is that there is no quorum, it follows by virtue of the same Article 33 that the vote will be placed on the agenda of the next sitting, which is scheduled to begin at 10 a. m. later today. I am asking that Rule 33 be applied.

President. — I shall ask the Secretary-General to check that we have a quorum. The quorum is not

President

present. The vote will therefore be deferred until ten o'clock this morning.

I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster. — *(D)* Madam President, the proposers based their motion on Rule 33 (4). Insofar as Rule 33 (4) is being applied, I request that you inform the House if the Bureau has the names of the 30 proposers who are required in accordance with paragraph 4 of the Rule.

(Applause)

President. — I believe that Mr Fellermaier's request was made on behalf of his group.

I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster. — *(D)* Madam President, it is true that Mr Fellermaier made a request, but I did not hear him make it on behalf of his group. If this were the case, the Rules of Procedure provide for various possibilities in the most varied circumstances. In a particular situation the Rules state that motions are valid if they are tabled by a group or a given number of Members. In this situation the tabling of a motion is not dependent on the condition that the motion be tabled by a group, but rather that 30 Members are required. This is a difference which is often made in our Rules of Procedure. In my opinion — and I should be grateful if the President would check once again with her advisers — the requirement of Rule 33 (4) has not yet been satisfied.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Madam President, you may quite happily leave the decision open, since the matter in question was simply the proposal by the Socialist Group to defer the vote. Since there is absolutely no doubt that the vote on this matter is controversial, you can assume that it is not feasible. Consequently, the motion is not adopted. By virtue of Rule 33 (2), however, a quorum exists when one third of the current Members of Parliament are present...

(Mixed reactions)

... This is so. We can therefore vote on all the other motions, but not on the motion — and I am even following an interpretation which is in line with its author's intention — to defer the vote. That is all. I now ask that the question of reaching a decision without having the documents in all the official languages be put to the vote without further ado.

(Mixed reactions)

President. — I call Mr Vondeling.

Mr Vondeling. — *(NL)* Madam President, I do not think there is any basis for the initial interpretation that the motion was not tabled on behalf of 30

Members. It appeared that considerably more than 30 Members shared Mr Fellermaier's view. I have not drawn the conclusions that a majority of the Members in my group have reached, but it cannot be denied that he was within his rights in doing so and the simple fact is that the request was indeed tabled by at least 30 Members.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, in my view we can forget this matter of the 30 Members. What I should really like to know is whether your staff has ascertained that fewer than a third of the Members of the House are present. I should think it unlikely. I am convinced that a third of the Members are in the House...

(Applause)

... and by virtue of Rule 33 (2), a quorum shall exist when one third of the Members of Parliament are present.

(Applause)

President. — I have just been handed a list of 30 names. Since the requirements of the Rule have been satisfied, we must abide by it. Before voting has begun, 30 Members have requested that it should not take place.

I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — In accordance with Rule 33 (4), not only does the establishment of a quorum have to be demanded by at least 30 Members present — if we accept that, very well — but a vote shall be valid only if a majority of the current Members of Parliament have taken part in it. So unless this vote takes place first we cannot say whether it is valid or not. So I demand an immediate vote to have the numbers proven to Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Madam President, I believe — and I trust that no one is going to laugh at this — that for some time now, in spite of the vast support from the majority of the Members here and from your advisers, and in spite of your renowned legal ability, you have constantly had to go back on what you have said.

We realize that this is a result of the fatigue which is affecting you, as well as us. We are hardly working in ideal conditions. I ask myself — and I am not trying to score a political point — whether the European Parliament can carry on like this when considering issues of extreme importance. Could I just point out, Madam President, that while you are forced to be vague and to change your mind, at the same time this

Pannella

debate of ours is taking place without translated documents to hand and with hostility on both sides.

Let me say this, Madam President. If there could be a proper basis for discussion at ten o'clock tomorrow morning, when we could resume the proceedings with you in a better condition to chair the House and ourselves better able to discuss things properly, we should strive as far as most of these amendments are concerned ...

(Loud laughter from Mr Bangemann)

It is all very well for the Chairman of the Liberal Group to laugh while I am trying to explain to him, or at least to the Liberals — and when I say 'Liberals' I mean anyone who feels he comes into that category; it is not just the boss who has to be Liberal — that we would make every effort, Madam President, to help your work and ours by drastically reducing the number of amendments which have been tabled, if only we were allowed to work properly.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Madam President, I want to have one last try. The Socialist Group tabled a motion seeking to defer the sitting and the consideration of this matter. Subsequently 30 Members of the Socialist Group requested that we ascertain by means of the vote on this motion whether the majority of the Members of Parliament are participating in the vote. This can be ascertained very quickly while we are voting, since you have the figures. The motion was then rejected. In any case, you are well aware that in accordance with Rule 33(2) there is a quorum in the House. I now ask you, after this vote on the motion tabled by the Socialist Group, to consult the House on whether we can vote even though we do not have the documents in all the official languages.

(Loud applause)

President. — I call Mrs Groes.

Mrs Groes. — *(DK)* I am not worried about the heckling from the right of the House. Let me say that Rule 33 must be understood as follows: paragraph 1 is the principal part, paragraph 2 follows it, then comes paragraph 3 and after that paragraph 4. The fact is of course that paragraph 1 should be interpreted as meaning that, if Parliament can muster the number of members stated in paragraph 2, it has a quorum. This point is of course overridden by paragraph 4, because this is what paragraph 4 is intended to do. Mr Bangemann knows this very well if he gives the matter any thought, because legislation is obviously drawn up so as to protect minorities. This is why there is legislation, and every lawyer knows this, and every skilled parliamentarian also knows it, and I regard Mr Bangemann as a skilled parliamentarian. That was what I wished to say as regards the form. May I also say some-

thing on the real fact of the matter. The fact is that we have spent a whole week on this issue, we have discussed the idiotic Luster report in plenary session, in the corridors, in all the groups. We all know what is involved. We all know that what is at stake is whether to give 10 people the right to form a group. May I ask whether this is a kindergarten or the European Parliament?

President. — I note that the quorum is present. However, the vote cannot take place because the requirement of Rule 33(4) has not been met.

I call Mr Combe.

Mr Combe. — *(F)* Madam President, if 30 of the Members asked for an adjournment, it means that they were in the Chamber at the same time as we were. They have to be added to the number of those who voted.

(Applause)

President. — May I remind you of Rule 33(4), Mr Combe:

If so requested before the voting has begun by at least thirty Members present, a vote shall be valid only if a majority of the current Members of Parliament have taken part in it.

They did not take part. It is not enough to be in the Chamber; they have to take part in the vote.

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Madam President, the motion ...

(Mixed reactions)

... tabled by the 30 Members was a motion seeking to defer the sitting ...

(Interruptions)

... yes, they did; they wanted to defer the vote on this matter. That was the motion tabled by the 30 Members.

(Interruptions)

I disagree! These 30 Members did not want the vote on this matter to take place. And we voted on this motion. And it then became apparent that the majority of the Members of Parliament were not present, so that the vote on this motion is not in fact valid. This is correct, as you pointed out, Madam President. However, since a third of the Members of Parliament are present, we still have a quorum, since Rule 33(4) refers to a specific motion. This motion — to defer the vote until ten o'clock this morning — has not been adopted. Nevertheless, there is still a quorum in the House, and more than a third of the Members have just decided that we can consider these documents without the translations. In my view this is what we ought to do now.

(Applause)

Bangemann

Since we are probably all in agreement that it is pointless to discuss any further the Rules of Procedure ...

(Interruptions)

... yes, I am well aware of that, but I do not wish to take on the role that has been played in this debate by the Socialist Group ...

(Applause)

Even though in my view we could carry on voting, I should like to request, Madam President, that we defer the vote in fact until ten o'clock, i.e. until the start of the next sitting, and also ensure that, after all the speeches for and against that we have heard at great length this evening, there is no further speech whatsoever. A great number of people have already spoken for and against this motion and we really ought to vote at ten o'clock on the dot without any other Member being allowed to speak on questions of procedure.

President. — Does the House accept this proposal?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, including those at the back, what Mr Bangemann said may be the right course in coping with this situation. However, the decision which the President has taken regarding Rule 33(4) sets a bad precedent for future cases. There can be no complaints about the correctness of this decision. Nevertheless, if we want to avoid in the future similar situations which could be fatal for this Parliament, Madam President, let us consider the thinking behind Rule 33(4), which, as I see it, is as follows: if there are

30 Members in the House who want to participate in the vote but who feel that the vote will not be very convincing because fewer than half the Member of the House are present, these 30 Members who are present and who want to vote should have the right to table a motion in accordance with Rule 33(4). Madam President, this has nothing to do with the decision you have just taken. My intention is to warn Parliament that not only Mr Pannella but a whole group can obstruct the work of Parliament.

(Loud applause)

President. — The Committee on the Rules of Procedures and Petitions will decide on this matter, Mr Luster.

The debate is closed.

15. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will take place today, Friday, 20 July 1979, at 10 a.m. and 3 p.m., with the following agenda:

- vote on the motion for a resolution contained in the Luster report and on the motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others on the amendment of the Rules of Procedure
- motion for a resolution on the membership of the committees
- membership of the committees
- presentation of the preliminary draft budget for 1980 (followed by a debate)
- motion for a resolution by Lord Bethell on the arrests of dissidents in Czechoslovakia.

(The sitting was closed at 4.05 a.m.)

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 20 JULY 1979

Contents

1. Approval of minutes	155	<i>Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Bangemann; Mr Dankert, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Notenboom, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mr John D. Taylor, on behalf of the European Democratic Group</i>	163
2. Petitions	155		
3. Amendment of the Rules of Procedure — Vote on the motion for a resolution contained in the Luster report (Doc. 193/79)			
Point of order: Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Glinne; Mr Bangemann; Mr Klepsch; Mr D'Angelosante; Mrs Bonino	155		
Mr Luster, rapporteur	157		
Point of order: Mr Bruno Friedrich; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Almirante	157		
4. Number and membership of committees — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-235/79), tabled by Mr Glinne 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 Bange- mann on behalf of the Liberal and Demo- cratic Group, Mr Amendola on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group and Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the number and membership of committees:			
Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr de Goede; Mr Bangemann	158		
Amendments to Section I:			
Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Aigner; Mr Scott- Hopkins; Mrs Bonino; Mr Gendebien	160		
Point of order: Mr Blumenfeld	160		
Amendment after Section II:			
Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mrs Bonino	161		
Explanations of vote: Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Pedini; Mr Chirac; Mr Kirk; Mr Brøndlund Nielsen	161		
Adoption of the resolution	162		
Mr Bangemann; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr de Goede	162		
5. Preliminary draft general budget of the Communities for 1980 — Introduction by the Commission:			
		<i>Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Bangemann; Mr Dankert, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Notenboom, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mr John D. Taylor, on behalf of the European Democratic Group</i>	178
		6. Documents received	178
		7. Preliminary draft general budget of the Communities for 1980 (resumption):	
		Mr Spinelli, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Rossi, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Poncelet, on behalf of the Group of Euro- pean Progressive Democrats; Mr Balte; Mr Gendebien; Mr Robert Jackson; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Harris; Mr Ryan; Mr Hutton; Mr Colla; Mr Delatte; Mr Sutra; Mr Almirante; Mr Bersani; Mr Moreland; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Herman; Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Notenboom; Mr Tugendhat	179
		8. Arrests of dissidents in Czechoslovakia — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 234/79) by Lord Bethell:	
		Mr Ripa di Meana, deputy mover; Sir Fred Warner, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Haagerup; Mr Irmer; Mr Konrad Schön, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); Mr Aigner; Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission	201
		Adoption of the resolution	204
		9. Membership of committees	204
		10. Verification of credentials	204
		11. Dates of next part-session	204
		12. Approval of minutes	205
		13. Adjournment of session	205

IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

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. *Petitions*

President. — During its meeting of 16 May 1979 the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions examined petitions Nos 11/77, 2/78, 5/78, 17/78, 18/78, 19/78, 20/78, 25/78, 30/78, 31/78 and 1/79. Petition No 11/77 has been forwarded to the Council. Petition No 2/78 has been filed without further action.

Petition No 5/78, which had been referred to the Bureau, has been referred to the Commission and the Council.

Petition No 17/78 has been filed without further action.

Petition No 18/78 has been referred to the Commission and, for information, to the Committee on Regional Policy, Regional Planning and Transport.

Petitions Nos 19/78 and 20/78 have been filed without further action.

Petition No 25/78 has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for their opinions.

Petition No 30/78 has been filed without further action.

Petition No 31/78 has been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for its opinion.

Petition No 1/79 has been referred to the Committee on Social Affairs, Employment and Education for its opinion.

I have received from the St Roch parish, Andrimont-Dison, Belgium, a petition on refugees from Vietnam, and from Mr Volker Heydt a petition on reduced off-peak telephone charges for calls between the Member States.

These petitions have been entered under Nos 3/79 and 4/79 in the register provided for in Rule 48 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, and they have been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

3. *Amendment of the Rules of Procedure*

President. — The first item on the agenda is the vote on the motion for a resolution contained in the Luster report (Doc. 193/79) on the amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, after the very long night sitting we have had and the results of that sitting, or rather I should perhaps say, the lack of results, it would seem to me that the most sensible course, in the light of all the events, and one which would accord perhaps with the dignity of this House, is to ask the House if we can send the Luster report to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and ask that committee to examine this report with the utmost expedition.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, pursuant to Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure, for precisely the same reasons that Mr Scott-Hopkins has just put forward, we also ask that the matter be referred to the appropriate parliamentary committee.

In my view, this is the only solution which will save wasting any more time and will accord with the dignity of this Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Madam President, I hope that the procedure with which is now being followed with the support of my group — which in any case made the same proposal some three days ago when we were all still getting to our beds at a reasonable hour — will induce those Members who do not like this report to rethink their attitude, as regards procedure in the plenary sitting, after we have had a thorough discussion in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. There is no doubt that when this matter comes up in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions we shall have to confine ourselves first of all to the points in the Luster report. At the same time, however, we shall have to start looking at all the other Rules of Procedure.

(Applause from various quarters)

The two are not directly connected. The necessary provisions which have to be adopted immediately will probably be adopted during the September sitting. But I think we should then examine our Rules of Procedure to ensure that this Parliament will be able to get on with its work.

(Applause)

Bangemann

Madam President, a true democracy is based on one important fact, that minority groups must be protected. I myself said, when I spoke at the opening of this Parliament, that a society and a political system are judged by the way in which and the extent to which their minority groups are granted rights. But democracy also means, Madam President, that those who enjoy rights must also realize that majority decisions must be accepted.

(Applause)

If we cannot manage to achieve this, and if it is not possible, I can only regard it as sheer hypocrisy when certain Members go on about rights which they themselves constantly disregard.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

President. — I have received a request seeking to refer to committee the Luster report and the motion for a resolution tabled by the political groups on the Rules of Procedure.

Pursuant to Rule 32 (3), the mover of the motion, one speaker for and one against the motion may speak, for three minutes.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, there is something I do not understand. You have let the chairmen of three groups speak. Why are you not allowing the other three to speak, and saying that there must be one speaker for and one against the motion? In my view this is not normal procedure. I feel it would be right, now that you have called the chairmen of three groups, to give the others a chance to speak. In any case, I indicated I wanted to speak.

President. — You may speak now, Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, in view of the situation in the House, by which I mean that it is obvious to us all that the issue of the quorum on Fridays causes considerable difficulty, in view of the fact that we should waste a lot of time if we tried to get through the whole agenda, and in view of the fact that my group supported the motion tabled jointly by all the groups, because we feel — and our opinion has not changed today — that the motion is perfectly reasonable and fair and that together with the motion for a resolution tabled by the groups it could have led to an equitable and lasting solution, I am all the same in favour of the course of action which has been proposed, because we do not believe that it could be adopted today and we should only be wasting our time.

However, I want to be quite frank and to the point in repeating that we think it is a pity that an idea we were all more than ready to support — after all, the idea of the six groups on adapting the Rules of Proce-

— dure to the new Parliament were far from absurd — could provoke these delays in the business of the House, as a result of all these regrettable arguments, and prompt us to wonder whether Parliament is actually capable of getting through the scheduled agenda or not.

These are the reasons why I support the motion by Mr Scott-Hopkins. It is important in our view to deal with the scheduled agenda of the House. In this sense I go along with Mr Scott-Hopkins' motion. At the same time, however, I want to make it clear that our group is dismayed by the spectacle we have seen and by how the Rules of Procedure can be used in such a way that the business of the House can be manipulated and disrupted.

(Applause from the right)

We trust that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions will not review the three paragraphs which we felt would be enough to start with, but that they will consider the many other points in the Rules of Procedure which are contradictory and susceptible to misinterpretation, so that we shall be able to conclude the matter at the September part-session.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr D'Angelosante.

Mr D'Angelosante. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Communist and Allies Group suggested right at the start of this fuss that this matter be referred to committee. As a result, we naturally support the proposal which has been put forward. There are just one or two comments I want to add. It would be a good idea, in our view, not to read too much into what has happened. In the final analysis, it is true that a Parliament has to function but, in general terms, it has to function without being hide-bound by rigid rules. Frank, open and lively debate, offering a variety of views, is very often a sign of vitality and is not a bad thing. In view of this, I should like every Member to take a cool and dispassionate look at the situation. And I say this because — quite apart from the motives which prompted the non-attached Members to join issue as they did and quite apart from what anyone may think of their tactics — the House has to realize that we are on rather dubious ground if we let an elected body be governed by rules which were drawn up by another earlier body which had not been elected. You ought to have realized from the outset that a number of tricky problems would arise which could not of course, be pleasing to everyone. On the other hand, as far as our group goes, I want to make it quite clear that neither here nor in the Italian Parliament have we ever used obstructive tactics — and those who have worked with us will bear me out on this — because we feel that this would

D'Angelosante

be tantamount to undermining our institutions. Be that as it may, there are occasions, when fundamental rights are at stake, when this weapon can be used, and on occasions it has been used. Everyone will have his opinion one way or the other on this matter. If I may make a suggestion, however, I should advise those who think they can adopt a condescending, imperious and — let me say — reproachful attitude, to change their approach. You cannot get up and say: 'You have been naughty and we are going to punish you; we are going to change not only Rules 7 and 36 but a lot of others, too.' This is not going to get us anywhere. We have no truck with such an attitude, but shall give our support to a speedy and sensible solution, as in the past.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we naturally go along with this solution because it seems to us that it is the most appropriate and because, in addition, it seems to be the only way out in accordance with Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure. I should like to say that we shall cooperate as much as possible on this committee and, furthermore, when it comes to applying and respecting the Rules of Procedure, you will find that we shall be helpful and cooperative, albeit watchful if not meticulous. The simple fact is that we want to have some say in how the game is played. If the new committee in this new Parliament is ready to adopt new rules, we shall abide by them.

President. — I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster, rapporteur — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, given the circumstances, I naturally dare say nothing against the proposals which have been made here with regard to the Rules of Procedure. I shall go only as far as to say that yesterday's debate was characterized by the fact that those who asked to speak were almost all critics of the Rules, and in fact it should have been up to me as rapporteur — and accordingly I made known to the Chair in good time that I wanted to speak — to reply to the counter-arguments. That cannot happen now. No one in this House should have got the impression that any minority group should or could be deprived of their rights if what was proposed had been adopted.

Consequently, Madam President, let me outline the essential elements as regards minority rights: total active and passive suffrage, unrestricted right to vote, unrestricted right to table motions in the House and in the committees to which they have been appointed, unrestricted right to put questions, both oral and written, to the Council, the Commission and the Ministers meeting in political cooperation. All these rights would have been retained of course. There is also the same right to speak on matters concerning the Rules of Procedure — and we have had ample

proof of how this works. On substantive issues there is a minimum speaking time which would be proportionally longer than the time allocated to the Members of the political groups. They were to get travel and subsistence allowances and the same allowances for office and staff expenses. I should also have spoken yesterday, ladies and gentlemen, on the problem of the continuity or otherwise of this Parliament, since it is a legal question we have dealt with. We are a new Parliament, of course, but under Treaty law there is no break in continuity between ourselves and the preceding Parliament. I should have expressed this quite simply by saying that you cannot just have the cream off the cake. Every Member of Parliament is perfectly entitled to be independent, but if he opts for this, he cannot at the same time expect to have all the advantages enjoyed by those who voluntarily accept an often burdensome party discipline.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

You cannot be tied and a free agent at the same time. That is what I was going to say yesterday, ladies and gentlemen.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

We shall keep this in mind in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. However, Madam President, you said yesterday that Rule 33 (4) should also be thoroughly examined by the committee. We shall do so, and I hope that the result will be that in future we shall be spared spectacles like the one we had at the end of yesterday's debate.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — Several Members have indicated their wish to speak but I shall call on one speaker for and one against the motion. Other Members may speak for an explanation of vote.

I call Mr Bruno Friedrich to speak for the motion.

Mr Bruno Friedrich. — *(D)* Madam President, I am grateful that I have been called to support this motion, particularly as during yesterday's debate on the Rules of Procedure I was unable to give the personal explanation which I should have liked to give and for which I had put my name down. What I am saying now goes for my group, too. We feel it is a pity that during the debate on the Rules of Procedure last night we got ourselves into a situation which clouded the issue, and I should like to put things straight now. We reject the notion inferred by a number of people — and I am saying this for the benefit of Mr Pannella — that he can deduce from yesterday's events that a certain amount of agreement can be expected. What happened yesterday morning, especially what Mr Pannella got up to before the third vote by roll call, is a blatant example of obstructive tactics and is extremely damaging to the parliamentary system as a whole, especially in the case of a new Parliament...

(Applause)

Bruno Friedrich

We must be absolutely firm in rejecting such tactics, or else...

(Interruption)

... As this Parliament gets under way we really have to see — and I am prepared to start with myself or my group — whether ...

(Interruption from Mr Bangemann)

... Yes, Mr Bangemann, I am ready to look at myself in the mirror and everyone ought to look at himself in the mirror this weekend. That is a personal comment of my own.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

We have our doubts about whether Mr Pannella was quite serious, and we also know that his group contains smaller groups with whom it may well be easier to talk than with him. We feel this is a possibility for the future. Our decision last night — which can be traced back to the position of our representative in the Bureau — was not an attempt to disassociate ourselves from the Luster report. I want to make this quite clear. We were simply sceptical about the likelihood of reaching a decision this week and so getting through the agenda. We are well aware that the President has had a hard job of it this week. We are ready to cooperate so that this Parliament can get on with its work and so that the President can do her job properly. It is our belief that, when we all set off for home shortly, we have to think things over and that those who are willing to cooperate — despite all that has happened this week — must find some common ground for discussion so that the majority in the House, while respecting the minorities, is in a position to achieve a functional Parliament which matches the expectations of the voters who sent us here. We support the Scott-Hopkins motion.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

Mr Scott-Hopkins — With the greatest respect to you and to the House, Madam President, a proposal has been made and indeed seems to have received general support. We have a very full agenda. Would it not be possible to ask the House now if we could vote on that proposal? And when we are giving explanations of vote, could we merely say why we are going to vote and in what way? But could I appeal through you to the House to get on and do this now?

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

(Protests from certain quarters)

Mr Almirante. — *(I)* Madam President, I want to take less than three minutes to give an explanation of

vote. It is my right and it is also my duty, because we have tabled three amendments which cannot in any way be construed as being obstructive and which to some extent concord with the spirit of the text prepared by the groups. I have a very straightforward explanation of vote to give: we shall vote in favour. We have not been a party to obstructive tactics and never do we intend to be a party to such tactics. What we are hoping is that our amendments — and might I point out that there is provision in the Rules of Procedure for this? — be referred to committee along with the Luster report and that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions take a serious look at the motion for a resolution, Doc. 1-225/79, tabled by the groups. The wording in the first paragraph of this motion is not very different from either the spirit or the letter of our amendments. That is all I wanted to say, Madam President. I ask that due note be taken of this and I would ask the honourable Members of the majority groups to appreciate that in this way I am exercising a legitimate right of the minority groups.

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution seeking to refer to committee the Luster report and the motion for a resolution, tabled by the groups, on the Rules of Procedure.

The resolution is adopted.

(Applause from various quarters)

4. Number and Membership of Committees

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-235/79), tabled by Mr Glinne 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 Bangemann on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr Amendola on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group and Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the number and composition of parliamentary committees.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, I beg to move the resolution standing in my name and that of Mr Glinne, Mr Klepsch, Mr Bangemann, Mr Amendola and Mr de la Malène.

President. — I call Mr de Goede.

Mr de Goede. — *(NL)* Madam President, I trust that you will listen carefully to my statement, because I do not want to be accused unfairly of obstructing this item on the agenda.

de Goede

The Dutch Members here today know that never, in the course of my 12 years in politics, have I subscribed to obstructionist tactics or the like and I do not want to be accused of doing so here today.

Madam President, what I want to say is that, on 29 June, I wrote to your predecessor, Mr Colombo, putting forward two proposals for the creation of new parliamentary committees.

First of all, we believe that the European Parliament should take the initiative in setting up a European Emancipation Committee with the general aim of stimulating the process of emancipation. Extensive explanatory notes were attached to that proposal.

Secondly, we asked you to give your attention to the question of formulating a European Constitution under the auspices of the European Parliament. We believe that a European Constitution should lay down the basic principle that European cooperation must proceed on the basis of democracy, elementary human rights and the outlawing of discrimination, with express reference if possible, to economic and social principles.

In our letter, we asked the President of the European Parliament whether the groundwork on a European Constitution should be entrusted to one of the existing parliamentary committees, or whether a new committee should be set up for this specific purpose. We indicated that we would favour the setting up of an entirely new committee. We deliberately did not set our ideas out in the form of formal proposals, because we wanted to adopt a constructive attitude over this matter and keep an open mind. On 28 June — and I would ask you to note that date carefully — we came to the conclusion that we should wait to see whether a discussion in the Bureau called at the instigation of the President would lead to the realization of our ideas. On 9 July, I received Mr Colombo's reply, in which he said that my letter had been forwarded to the political groups for their information. I was also told that the Bureau would be meeting this week in Luxembourg and in Strasbourg to discuss, among other things, this very matter.

Madam President, I think that both I and this House have a right to know what has happened to the letter written by myself and Mrs Dekker. Has it in fact been discussed by the Bureau? I really think I have a right to know the Bureau's reaction to this letter, which was written almost a month ago now. To those who complain that the session will have to be adjourned, yet again, I can only say that it really is no fault of mine if this is the only way we can get things done. I think I have a right to insist on the Bureau's stating its opinion on our letter of 28 June containing proposals for two new committees.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, I trust no one will think, if the vote goes in favour of their

motion for a resolution, that the political groups have not bothered to give any thought to these matters. We have, of course, discussed a number of particular problems which also affect the organization of the committees. There can be no doubt that questions like the future constitutional development of the Community, and in particular the drawing up of a common electoral system, as well as specific problems such as equal social and political rights for women in the Community, justify the creation of special committees. There are two ways of setting up such committees: either we opt for separate committees, or we set up sub-committees within the appropriate existing committees.

There are two reasons why we opted for the second course. Firstly, we do not want to take this work away from the existing committees, because there can be no doubt that an issue like the electoral system is of importance to both the Political Affairs Committee and the Legal Affairs Committee. Secondly, we want to avoid giving rise to unnecessary expenditure by needlessly inflating the administrative machinery, in other words, our secretariats.

For this reason, Madam President, all these questions will be the responsibility of the proposed 15 committees, where we shall create sub-committees to deal with these matters objectively and without unnecessary expense. I would therefore call on this House to pass the motion for a resolution in its original form.

President. — We shall now vote on the motion for a resolution. On Section I, Mr Aigner has tabled Amendment No 5 seeking to amend the order of the Committees as follows:

1. Political Affairs Committee
2. Committee on Agriculture
3. Committee on Budgets
4. Committee on Budgetary Control
5. Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs
6. Committee on Energy and Research
7. Committee on External Economic Relations
8. Legal Affairs Committee
9. Committee on Social Affairs and Employment
10. Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning
11. Committee on Transport
12. Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection
13. Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport
14. Committee on Development and Cooperation
15. Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions

What is the position of Mr Scott-Hopkins, spokesman for the authors of the motion for a resolution?

Mr. Scott-Hopkins. — Against, Madam President.

President. — I call Mr Aigner.

Mr Aigner. — *(D)* Madam President, the thinking behind this amendment is as follows. Control over Community expenditure is one of Parliament's most important tasks and the priority of this should be clearly expressed. Secondly — and I think that every Member who has been involved in this matter will agree with me — parliamentary control is inseparable from the budget debate. This means that control has to be exercised during the budgetary proceedings as well as by subsequent supervision. This has also been made clear by the fact that the secretariats of both committees, the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Budgetary Control, should be linked under one roof. This is the thinking behind this amendment, and I should be grateful if the House would vote in favour of it.

President. — I put Amendment No 5 to the vote. Amendment No 5 is rejected.

Mr de Ferranti, Mr Patterson, Mr Prag, Mr Pearce, Lord Bethell, Mr Christopher Jackson, Mr Seligman, Mr Nord, Sir John Stewart-Clark and Mr Welsh have tabled Amendment No 6 seeking to rename committee No 4 as follows :

Committee on Industrial, Economic and Monetary Affairs

What is Mr Scott-Hopkins' position ?

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Against, Madam President.

President. — I put Amendment No 6 to the vote. Amendment No 6 is rejected.

I put to the vote the name of the committee in its original form.

The name is approved.

On Section I, I have three further amendments :

- Amendment No 1, tabled by Mrs Bonino, seeking to add a new committee to the list of 15 committees : Committee on the Rights of Man
- Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Gendebien and Mr Blaney, seeking to add a new committee to the list of 15 committees : Committee on Fishery Problems
- Amendment No 3, tabled by the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, seeking to replace the last paragraph of Section I by the following :

All the committees of the European Parliament shall be composed of 39 Members.

Since these three amendments are not mutually exclusive, they can be taken together.

What is Mr Scott-Hopkins' position ?

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, we are against.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Madam President, I proposed that a new committee — on the Rights of Man — be set up because I had the impression that other Members were as convinced as we are by the importance of such a committee.

I feel it would be a serious mistake if Parliament decided against setting up a committee of this kind. To avoid this possibility and to avoid the risk that Parliament might express a negative opinion, I shall withdraw the amendment seeking to add this committee to the list. Naturally, there will be a better moment to discuss this, but for the time being I should be happier — considering the tremendous importance of this subject — if Parliament were not to take a decision.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — Amendment No 1 is withdrawn.

I put to the vote ...

I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien. — *(F)* Madam President, it was a feeling of European solidarity which prompted me to sign along with another Member an amendment seeking to create a Committee on Fishery Problems. The Committee on Agriculture deals with fishery problems, but it is well known that this committee has an awful lot of work. In view of the significance of fishery problems for a fair number of Member States and their regions, I think it would be useful to set up a separate Committee on Fishery Problems. This would have the added advantage of lightening the load on the Committee on Agriculture.

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

Mr Blumenfeld. — *(D)* Madam President, it is not customary to call speakers in the middle of the voting. I would ask you to adhere to the usual procedure.

President. — I had not seen Mr Gendebien, who is sitting at some distance.

I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I put to the vote Section I in its original form.

Section I is adopted.

I put Section II to the vote.

Section II is adopted.

After Section II, Mrs Bonino has tabled Amendment No 4 seeking to add a new Section III as follows :

President

A temporary committee known as 'Committee on the Rights of Women' composed of 39 Members.

What is Mr Scott-Hopkins' position?

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Against, Madam President.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it was I who tabled this amendment seeking to set up a temporary committee to examine and to prepare a report for the House on the position of women in the various countries of Europe.

This was not my idea but came from other lady Members with whom I had talked. Since we do not want Parliament to turn the proposal down at this stage, we should prefer to resubmit it on another occasion, perhaps after discussing it together. For this reason, and with the agreement of the others, I withdraw the amendment.

President. — Amendment No 4 is withdrawn.

Does anyone wish to speak for an explanation of vote?

I call Mr Newton Dunn.

Mr Newton Dunn. — I would like to give an explanation of vote. I am unable to vote against this motion because doing so, I believe, will not help with the difficulties of the fishing port of Grimsby, which lies within my own constituency of Lincolnshire. The people of Lincolnshire have suffered severely from the absence of a satisfactory Community fishing policy, one that would ensure proper control of fishing, proper conservation of stocks and a sufficient area of water set aside exclusively for our fishermen. I consider that the vital interests of Grimsby would not be best served if I opposed this motion. I shall therefore abstain.

President. — I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini. — *(I)* Madam President, I should like to give a very brief explanation of vote to express my support for this motion for a resolution. I am quite sure that the committees have been organized with due regard for the new requirements emerging as the Community evolves and for parliamentary traditions and institutions.

While intending to vote in favour of this motion, I wish that the committee — and Parliament, too, for that matter — could get some efficient and suitable technical equipment. Anyone who knows anything about the work of this Parliament will know how difficult it is to keep track of committees which are always on the move around Europe. If these committees cannot operate properly, Parliament itself is not going to be able to function smoothly.

If you ask me, many of the problems you had to deal with yesterday, Madam President, can be attributed to

the lack of technical equipment — here in the Chamber and perhaps outside as well — which would facilitate our work.

Therefore, Madam President, I urge you and your advisers to take a look at the technical aids so as to improve the efficiency of our committee work. Perhaps we could introduce electronic systems to cope with the greater amount of work in the House, because there are far more of us now than there were before. True, yesterday there were political reasons why it seemed that people had difficulty in identifying their groups, rather like Pirandello's six characters in search of an author. Nevertheless, it is also true that unless we have the proper technical resources, we shall be hard-pressed to carry out our political work properly, and the demands of this work are increasing because of the legitimate but complex problems put to us by the voters. In making this suggestion, Madam President, I also want to take the opportunity of thanking the staff who, in spite of everything, did their best to help you yesterday and to make our work less arduous in these difficult circumstances.

President. — I call Mr Chirac.

Mr Chirac. — *(F)* Madam President, there is nothing I object to in this motion but I am nevertheless going to abstain. The fact of the matter is that it is a serious oversight in my view if, as someone pointed out earlier, there is no committee on fishery problems. We have seen in the past that failing to separate the problems of fishing and agriculture has meant in fact that the Community has had no real policy on fishing. It has also meant that the various Member States have not had a chance to outline and explain the difficulties which beset them in this sector. This is why I am stressing this point. When the time comes, we shall bring this up again via the temporary committees, so that fishery problems may be considered by a separate committee.

President. — I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk. — *(DK)* I should like to say that I also wish to reserve my position on the vote on a Committee on Fisheries, since I support the remarks expressed by Mr Chirac and others to the effect that no real and satisfactory solution to the fisheries problem has been found to date here in the Community. This is one of the areas which we should strengthen. I would very much like to recommend that, should we be unsuccessful in setting up a special Committee on Fisheries, then a powerful sub-committee should be set up under the Committee on Agriculture, so that we can really tackle the very serious problems facing us in the fisheries sector in the Community.

President. — I call Mr Nielsen.

Mr Brøndlund Nielsen. — (DK) Madam President, I would like to propose that we continue with the arrangement we have had to date with a Committee on Agriculture and Fisheries, whereby fishery issues were prepared and dealt with in a special sub-Committee. In my view this worked well, and I fully support the continuance of such effective efforts. For the sake of form, I should like to say that no one here should take what has been said on this point as an indication that Parliament is in any way responsible for the lack of a common fisheries policy. Over the years this Parliament has worked extremely hard, submitted many reports, held many debates and has taken a very clear line on fisheries policy. The reason why the urgently needed common fisheries policy has not been implemented must be sought elsewhere. That is where the responsibility lies. I wish to make this very clear despite my remarks concerning the setting-up of a special committee.

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

The resolution is adopted.¹

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, I have already mentioned this to you informally. Nothing has been done, and I now wish to make a formal request for these lights to be switched off. It is like being subjected to the third degree, as we sit here and stare up into these lights. We really cannot go on working in these conditions.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — A different point of order, Madam President. I have waited until now to raise it. My group was meeting in Room No 1 this morning, and when the House assembled the bells did not ring up there and neither was there any information on the internal television. Could you ask the administration to examine why the bells are not working, and to put them and the television right?

President. — I note the complaints voiced by Mr Bangemann and Mr Scott-Hopkins. The necessary steps will be taken to solve the problems to which they referred. Since we are discussing matters of a practical nature, I should like to say that estimates have been sought for the electric voting system which someone requested earlier. In my view, Parliament ought to have the right equipment where this is concerned.

(Applause from various quarters)

¹ OJ C 203 of 13. 8. 1979.

I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — At some point, Madam President — and I think this is the best point — someone ought to thank you for your patience with these procedural motions in the last few days. We thank you very much for all that you have done and hope that in future sittings you will have a better time.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — Thank you. I call Mr de Goede.

Mr de Goede. — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the next item on the agenda is the adjournment of the plenary session for a meeting of the enlarged Bureau. Perhaps you would tell me when the plenary session will resume.

My second question concerns item No 6 on the agenda — after resumption of the plenary session — that is, nomination of the members of the parliamentary committees. I pointed out yesterday that intensive discussions went on in Luxembourg last week, and have continued here, on the composition of the various committees, in the course of which names were naturally mentioned. On 27 June, I wrote to the President of Parliament setting out our preferences in this matter. In his reply, Mr Colombo said that vacancies on the various committees would be allocated to non-attached Members as a result of discussions between the political groups, the Secretariat-General and the non-attached Members. From Monday last week in Luxembourg right up to yesterday here in Strasbourg, I have made a point of asking your official every day when the meeting would take place. I foresee enormous difficulties if you come along this afternoon with a proposal for the nomination of members of committees, without first having consulted the non-attached Members, whereas the other political groups have had two weeks to think over the matter. I would ask you to realize that we too will need time to find an appropriate solution. I am perfectly well aware that the political groups want to reserve the pick of the committee jobs for themselves, leaving only the crumbs for the non-attached Members.

Madam President, I would ask you to give special attention to this point, so that this afternoon we are not once again accused of using obstructionist tactics. Let me repeat that, since Monday of last week, we have been offering our cooperation in an attempt to solve this problem, but our offer has been spurned. I would ask you to come up with a reasonable proposal this afternoon, and to submit it first to the non-attached Members, so that we can make a start on achieving some measure of agreement.

President. — I was coming to that, Mr de Goede. According to today's agenda, in fact, immediately after the vote on the motion for a resolution on the parliamentary committee the sitting was to be suspended and there was to be a meeting of the Bureau to consider appointments to the committees. In view of the fact that we are running behind schedule, however, I think it would be a better idea — if no one has anything against it — to hold this meeting during the adjournment for lunch or when the groups are in a position to submit their proposals. We could save time if we went on to consider forthwith the preliminary draft budget.

(Applause from various quarters).

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

5. *Preliminary draft general budget of the Communities for 1980*

President. — The next item is the introduction by the Commission of the preliminary draft general budget of the Communities for 1980. A debate will follow.

I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat Member of the Commission. — **Madam President, you have had a gruelling part-session in which you have dealt with a number of very complex and difficult procedural motions. You have also dealt with a number of very emotive and difficult issues, and now the Parliament is getting down to what you, Madam President, said, in your opening address to the Parliament, is the central issue of the budget, the central issue on which Parliament has perhaps the most highly developed of its powers, the greatest influence in Community proceedings. I have no doubt at all that the budget which we are beginning to talk about today will dominate much of the proceedings of this Assembly between now and Christmas-time, and that Parliament will make its views felt very clearly and very fully, just as it has done in the past, but now with the enhanced authority that the mandate it has received from the electorate provides.**

The budget for 1980 must inevitably be set in the context of the budget's past development and future prospects as well as the economic and political prospects facing the Community as a whole. Much has been said during the course of our earlier discussions about the fact that this Parliament, different as it is from the last, is nonetheless a continuation of the last. Many of the precedents which were established in the last Parliament and many of the practices and procedures which were developed in the last Parliament will therefore no doubt apply in discussing the budget which we have today.

The budget which we have today is in itself the financial expression of much of the Community's activity. It enables us to bring together, to compare, and to some extent to change the effort which the Community devotes to its different policies involving expenditure. Thus, the annual budgetary debates reflect the essential political judgements on which the Community is based. Inevitably, much of the budget is dry, much of it is difficult to follow, the procedures are extremely complex; but nonetheless, the budget does represent the expression of the political will and the political priorities which the Community as a whole wishes to follow.

We must keep in mind, I think, that the budget is very small — at least the economic impact of the Community budget is still very small. The budget amounts to less than 1 % of the Community's gross domestic product, and to less than 3 % of central government expenditure in the Member States. The cash size of the budget has grown very greatly in recent years, particularly since 1977 with the expansion of agricultural expenditure. Nonetheless, its size in relation to the gross domestic product has grown a good deal less rapidly. It has indeed increased from 0.5 % in 1973 to 0.8 % in 1979.

Thus, the budget's effect on essential problems such as regional or sectoral imbalances, unemployment or energy can only be very limited. Only in one area — that is, of course, agricultural market intervention — does the Community have exclusive competence for expenditure, and, not surprisingly therefore, this sector represents by far the most substantial part of the budget. In all other areas Community expenditure takes place alongside, and normally indeed is only a small addition to, existing national programmes.

The Commission believes that areas other than agriculture should be developed in which Community expenditure would be an exclusive, or at least the main and determining, source of funds. I stress, Madam President — and this is a very important point, and a point on which I hope there can be no misunderstanding in the future — that we, in the Commission, do not wish to see Community expenditure increased for its own sake. We want to see such developments only in areas where this can help the basic objectives of the Community, or where Community intervention can be more effective in tackling a common problem than uncoordinated national programmes, or an uncoordinated mix of national and Community measures. Often, in our view, Community expenditure, can and should, replace national expenditure, because it is more effective or more economic. In other cases, Community activity may involve additional expense to tackle a problem which has not previously been adequately dealt with. The essential point, however, is that in either case the Community taxpayer should not, indeed must not, be asked to bear a double burden, and I think it is very important indeed that

Tugendhat

this philosophical approach to the Community budget should be clearly understood, not just in this House but in the Council and indeed in national parliaments as well.

This point is particularly important when we look at the financing of the budget. This Parliament will be even more aware than its predecessors that the budget is financed by the ordinary taxpayer, in other words by the electors who sent you here, and those electors are entitled to expect — and I have no doubt at all that they will receive — exactly the same degree of budget scrutiny that each Parliament gives to national expenditure. At the moment, however, the burden of financing the budget that the taxpayer must bear is limited by the Own Resources Decision of April 1970, a decision which has the force of a treaty. This defines the resources of the Community as, essentially, customs duties, agricultural levies — both of which are, of course, a clear consequence of Community policies on the common external tariff and the CAP — and the yield of a rate of up to 1 % on a common base of VAT. This decision did not fully enter into effect until this year, and there are still, I regret to say, three Member States who have not yet adopted the common VAT base, but expect to do so in 1980. I have no doubt at all that the Parliament will be following this question very closely, and I do wish to emphasize that it really now is a matter of very considerable urgency that these three Member States should fulfil their obligations as soon as possible. Even so, the decision sets a limit to the amount of the Community's revenue, and in no abstract fashion. This year, the Community has a rate of VAT of 0.74 %. Consequently, only 14.9 % of the total resources potentially available to the Community actually remain unspent: only 14.9 % of what is actually remaining to the Community is not yet, in one way or another, committed. The prospect of exhaustion of Community revenue is therefore something which is now very imminent, and the timing of this exhaustion is a point to which I will shortly revert.

The Commission itself is, of course, extremely conscious of this Sword of Damocles which is hanging over us. The Commission does not believe that a limit on resources decided nearly 10 years ago, in very different circumstances from now, should be allowed to hold back the development of the Community, let alone that it should lead to a dismantling of any of the progress so far achieved. This may be the result if desperate measures are taken to keep within the present ceiling. The Commission has announced that it intends to make a formal proposal to increase the Community's resources, and to do this by the end of the year, because of the elaborate procedures that a change in the 1970 Decision requires. I was pleased to hear the welcome which the President-in-Office of the Council gave to our intentions in that respect. We

also believe that when own resources are increased, the effect of own resources — customs duties and agricultural levies apart — should no longer be regressive; in other words, that the effect of own resources — those two elements apart — should not bear more heavily on countries with a relatively low economic capacity, which is, of course, the case at the moment. Indeed, we believe that there should be a study of the possibility of some progressivity, in other words a study of the possibility that these countries with relatively high economic performances should bear a greater burden than others.

(Applause)

Whatever may result from the work on convergence and budget balance now put in hand at the request of the European Council, a move away from regressivity and perhaps towards progressivity may help the effort towards adapting the impact of Community policies through the budget to better match economic realities. The future of own resources is clearly a central issue on which the Parliament will wish to concentrate. That, I think, if I may say so, Madam President, came over quite clearly in your inaugural speech.

If the scale and past growth of the Community budget and the prospect of the exhaustion of own resources were part of the background against which the Commission decided its 1980 budget proposals, we also, I must say, took into account the general economic situation of the Community and of the needs of individual policies within the Community.

The difficult economic circumstances we face require restraint as much at the level of the Community as at the level of the Member States. The economic difficulties to which President Jenkins referred and which have cast a shadow over all our proceedings must influence decisions taken at the Community level just as much as they must influence decisions taken at the national level; but the Community's policies are much more selective than the vast range of actions undertaken by a national government, so that the scope to meet priorities within a given limit is very much reduced and the economic difficulties which we face make the case not only for economy but also in some areas for increased action where the Community can help to relieve the problems which are causing so much distress and difficulty in all our Member States. This, I think, is a point that needs to be very carefully borne in mind. We must not only tackle waste — and I will come to waste in a moment — we must not only tackle an excessive expenditure in some areas, we must also seek those possibilities, those programmes, those potentialities where expenditure at Community level can help to relieve problems which are to be found in all our Member States and indeed in regions throughout our Community.

To show that we are ready to tackle waste on a major scale, to demonstrate that we are acutely aware of the

Tugendhat

need for economy, acutely aware of the need for the Community's coat to be cut according to its cloth, the Commission included in its preliminary draft budget the full implications of its proposals for agricultural prices. Normally, these are, of course, decided before the Commission puts forward its budget ideas. On this occasion, for various reasons, they were not, and therefore our budget included the full implications of our proposals for agricultural prices. Indeed, we believe that a major effort should have been made in this year's price decisions to limit production in certain sectors where there are already major surpluses — surpluses which are a cause of concern throughout our Community, in all countries and in many sections of society.

(Applause)

We believe that in budgetary terms the effect of our proposals must be to curtail expenditure. And indeed, the effect of our proposals would have been — I unfortunately have to speak in the past tense — to hold down the growth in agricultural expenditure to only 3 % instead of the 20 % rate of recent years. This is because surpluses are the major source of cost to the taxpayer, the more so as agriculture is such a large part of the total budget. This year the milk sector alone accounts for 27 % — 27 %, Madam President — of the whole budget. When one thinks of European construction, when one thinks of what the European Community is about, I think it really is incredible, it is beyond belief, that 27 % of our Community budget should be spent on milk and its various derivatives!

(Applause)

We therefore put forward proposals to tackle surpluses in this and in the few other types of product which have a direct and major bearing on the budget. These proposals for curtailing expenditure on surpluses and bringing agricultural expenditure under control are necessary, not only to sustain and, reinforce the common agricultural policy, which will otherwise be in grave danger of collapsing under the weight of its own problems; they are, of course, also very necessary on budgetary grounds, because, as I have said earlier, we are acutely aware of the imminent exhaustion of the Community's own resources. Indeed, the principle determining when we exhaust our own resources is, of course, the amount of money which is spent on agriculture. On this basis, the Commission's preliminary draft budget for 1980 involved commitment appropriations of some 16 625 m EUA and payment credits of 14 997 m EUA, with a significant increase in non-compulsory expenditure offset by only a modest rise in compulsory expenditure, to produce an overall increase in commitments of 13.1 % over 1979. This pattern of growth would have been — and again, with regret, I must speak in the past tense — in marked contrast to that of recent years, in which the budget

increased very largely as a result of rises in agricultural expenditure, rather than because of the development of new Community policies.

This is another point, Madam President, which it is important to remember. I often hear, Members of Parliament will often hear, that the Community budget has risen at a faster rate than national budgets in recent years. And so it has. But it has risen at a faster rate than national budgets in recent years because national Ministers of Agriculture have heaped Pelion upon Ossa when it comes to the settlement of agricultural prices. The result of this has been to curb and curtail the amount of money which was available for other programmes, which all of us in the Community wanted to see developed. Of course one must not have unlimited public expenditure. As I myself have emphasized earlier in my speech, we have a very restrictive view indeed on the way in which budgets should increase, and that is why we place such emphasis on the need to curb these very, very substantial sums of money.

Madam President, since we made our proposals the Council has, of course, decided on this year's agricultural prices, and the result, as we all know, is an increase in the budgetary cost for 1980 of some 1 300 m EUA, or some 8 % of the total budget over and above that which we had initially proposed. I hope that those governments who talk about the rate at which the Community budget increases, who talk about the need for economy and restraint in the regional, the social, the industrial, the energy and all the other spheres, will look very closely at their agricultural colleagues before they launch into too hefty a denunciation of our proposals in these other spheres; because, of course, what the Agricultural Ministers have done entails a rise in the rate of VAT from 0.75 % to 0.88 %. That is not our wish, that was not your wish, it was the result of the decisions taken by the Agricultural Ministers. Even more important, of course, is that this last charge brings with it the clear prospect of inadequate own resources in 1981 — only 18 months away — even if the Farm Ministers are more restrained next year than they have been this.

So the question of the exhaustion of existing own resources and the development of new own resources is something which is not for the distant future, not for some period when the Parliament has settled down; it is going to be something which will be high on your agenda — as it is on ours — during the course of next year.

The Commission, of course — as is now well known — felt compelled to dissociate itself from these decisions of the Council. The main reason for doing so was not just that, in our view, these were bad decisions in terms of the common agricultural policy because of the surpluses, above all of milk, but also of sugar and cereals. We believe that the problems posed in those

Tugendhat

areas had not been given the attention they deserve, had not been tackled to the degree that was required.

But in addition to these purely agricultural considerations, there was, of course, also the question of the waste of resources, the waste of public money, the public expense involved in maintaining the surpluses and securing their disposal, and all the other costs and difficulties that arise. I believe it is of profound significance for our Community that the decisions taken by the Agricultural Ministers on agricultural grounds very largely ignored the budgetary consequences and the budgetary costs. This, I think, is a point which all of us need to ponder extremely carefully.

(Applause)

At the joint council of Foreign and Finance Ministers last April, many Member States did not accept the forecast made by the Commission of the exhaustion of own resources in 1982. They said the date could be put back: the Bundestag, for example, recently passed a resolution that the Community must live within its present own resources.

It is against this background of what the Ministers told us in April, of the resolution to which I have just referred from the German Parliament, that the Agricultural Ministers' decisions must be judged. It can be seen that these factors did not enter into their calculations to any very great degree.

Madam President, ever since I took on my present duties, I have been struck by the absence of coordination between Agricultural and Finance Ministers in the Community.

(Applause)

There has been some illustration of this, of course, in one important Member State in recent weeks. This absence is due partly to the lack of coordination in capitals, I think, and partly to the institutional independence of the different Councils. Now, however, that the ceiling on own resources is so close, this lack of coordination takes on a new dimension; and it is quite simply not acceptable. It simply is not acceptable that, rather than exercise direct and responsible control over their Agricultural Ministers, Member States should rely on the own-resources ceiling to do so. If this happens, it is likely that non-agricultural policies will suffer as agricultural expenditure goes on growing, and there are indeed signs, I fear, that such is already the case. I believe that this Parliament will wish to be on its guard against such a danger. It really would not be tolerable if agricultural expenditure rose to such an extent that everything else was pushed out of the window.

(Applause)

Agriculture, Madam President, is however, only one element of the Commission's budget proposals. If I have dwelt at some length on it, that is because of the scale of its operation and the proportion that it takes. But we must remember that agriculture is only one element of the Commission's budgetary proposals, and that the Commission has sought to develop certain other priority activities following ideas already explained to the joint Budgetary Authority, that is Parliament and the Council, in the spring, which were, I am happy to say, broadly approved. For internal actions, the essential theme of our proposals and this again, Madam President, I think, fits in very well with some of the remarks you made in your inaugural speech — is the reduction of structural divergence. The main element in what we are putting forward is a continued increase in the Regional Fund.

The Commission believes that the agreement of both Council and Parliament earlier this year to a figure for the Regional Fund for this year of 945 m EUA has created quite a new situation *vis-à-vis* the position when the European Council reached various conclusions at the end of 1977, when figures were fixed for the three years to 1980. Instead, therefore, of the figure for 1980 of 650 m EUA then envisaged, the Commission has proposed to continue the growth already accepted by this Parliament and, of course, by the Council of Ministers. We have proposed a figure for 1980 of some 1 200 m EUA. We also would like to see a steady growth in the Social Fund, above all to tackle youth unemployment, migrants, women and the handicapped. We propose an increase from 767 m EUA to 1 000 m EUA. I believe that all these priorities are not only ones on which money from the Community budget should be spent: they are also priorities which have been expressed in this Parliament, in the Council of Ministers, and, indeed, by the Heads of Government in the European Council, as repeated communiqués have made clear. We propose an increase, too, in the Guidance Section of the agricultural budget. Whatever our doubts and feelings may be about the Guarantee Section, we believe that the structural agricultural fund does have an important rôle to play. We wished to deal with the consequences which flow from the European Monetary System and the interest subsidies which were fixed in the European Monetary System. We have therefore included a provision for some 200 m EUA for interest subsidies.

Now, each of these areas that I have mentioned — the Regional Fund, the Social Fund, the EAGGF Guidance Section, the interest subsidies arising out of the establishment of the EMS — can all, in our view, make a direct contribution to correcting the structural difficulties of the Community on which our future growth and prosperity depend. I commend these proposals to the Parliament, and I believe that in doing so I find myself reinforced and encouraged by the priorities which you laid out when you launched your presidency just two days ago.

Tugendhat

In addition, the Commission has included in its proposals selected activities in the energy, transport and fishing sectors which, we believe, could make contributions significantly greater than the limited scale of their cost. Where progress in these areas involves an important programme of action, the budget cannot be a substitute for separate decisions by the Council on the specific proposals now before it on which Parliament has given its opinion. This is especially true of energy, where the importance of the sector is very clear as the Community strives to reduce its dependence on imported energy and to develop energy saving. Madam Weiss, in her formidable oration when we all gathered together here at the beginning of the week, set our minds very clearly along the right path. The proposals which we lay before the House are, perhaps, an inadequate response to the exhortations which she made, though I suspect they are proposals which, however modest they may be, are likely to be somewhat attenuated when they return to you after the deliberations which will occur at the level of the Council early next week.

The overall effect of the proposals which we are putting before Parliament and the Council, as the two arms of the budgetary authority, would be to improve the impact of the Community budget and its underlying policies. There is, I think, now general agreement that at present the budget is not adapted to economic realities. Indeed, the French Foreign Minister, Mr François-Poncet, when President-in-Office of the Council, reached, I think, a similar conclusion after the Joint Council of Foreign and Finance Ministers in April. To correct these imbalances will be a long process: even if the work on convergence and budgetary balance commissioned by the European Council in Strasbourg should lead to more immediate measures, it is important to start without any delay on the basic adaptation that is needed.

Policy objectives of this kind and our external policies — need more money than is voted in the budget. They also need, of course, staff to implement the programmes and to prepare the new developments as well as to provide the essential back-up. Members of the previous Parliament were all too aware of my feelings on the subject, but I would like to say a word about staff, because in addition to my responsibilities for the budget, I am also, of course, responsible for the personnel and administration of the Commission. Staff and administration is only a small part of the Commission's budget — some 4 % in 1979 because, contrary to popular belief, the Commission is a very limited bureaucracy. I do not simply say 'limited' and leave it at that: I should, perhaps, back up my statement by once again quoting a few figures. While the total staff we employ is some 11 650 people, 2 770 of them are engaged in scientific research; they are in fact, scientific workers rather than civil servants. Some 3 200 are engaged on language work or its

consequences. I think all of us here, especially those who are less proficient in languages, are aware of the vital rôle that the linguistic services play in the daily conduct of our lives. Of course people who speak Danish and Dutch have as much right as people who speak English and French to read what the Commission produces, and it requires a great deal of staff to provide for the needs of the minority languages as well as for the needs of the majority languages. This is something which it is important to remember.

So, when one takes away those who are engaged on scientific research and those who are engaged on language work, we find that only about 5 700 people are actually engaged on work normally associated with public administration to cover all the activities of the Community and the associated management support. Now 5 700 people is quite a lot of people, but a very modest number when compared with the great ministries which we see in London and Bonn, or even in The Hague, Copenhagen or Dublin. It is a large number of people, but compared with the public administrations of our Member States it is not so very great. Nonetheless, the costs, though small, generate a great deal of passion, particularly in the Council, who are, I fear, very reluctant to examine the reality of our staff needs. The Commission in the past has found the Parliament not an easy, but an open interlocutor on this matter, and I hope very much that when you press us to undertake new commitments, when you press us to answer questions more quickly, when you press us to follow up proposals more speedily, you will remember that all these things do actually require civil servants beavering away in the background, and without them, with the best will in the world, it will be very difficult for us to live up to your expectations.

To turn now, Madam President, to the Community's external policies, the Commission's proposals include a continued growth of our aid effort to non-associated developing countries as well as to non-governmental organizations and for the financing of cooperation agreements that the Community has with third countries. It is not only the Community that faces economic difficulties, and we in the Community have the capacity to help others harder hit than ourselves through financial and food aid as well as through non-budgetary measures such as the generalized system of preferences.

The Commission has also proposed that the new European Development Fund now being negotiated with the associated countries of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific should be brought within the 1980 budget. Under the Lomé agreement, the present EDF is financed by the Member States outside the budget; but there is no reason why such an important Community action should be outside the budget. The budget is, after all, the central expression of the Community's expenditure policies, for which clear rules are laid

Tugendhat

down in the Treaty, including the rôle of Parliament. The new EDF provides the occasion to make the change already foreshadowed by the presidency of the Council four years ago, when Ireland also held the Presidency. I should perhaps say, because I know there are some widely prevalent misconceptions about this, that the consequences of budgetizing the European Development Fund for the exhaustion of the Community's own resources are really only marginal, since less than 2% of the total budget payments is involved in 1981 and 1982. The Commission strongly believes that the change should now be made and much regrets that the Council appears at present to be moving away from this proposition. The question of the budgetization of the EDF — a point on which I know the honourable Member now leading the Liberal and Democratic Group on the floor of the House has expressed strong views in the past — is not one of budget costs, since of course the amounts are determined by the Community's negotiations with its ACP partners: these are matters of institutional procedure and inevitably each budget gives rise to a number of such issues.

Now, before dealing with these institutional matters, it is, I think, appropriate to recall how far the Parliament has already travelled in this field of budgetary powers. The original Treaties did not give powers of decision to the Parliament in the budgetary field, but the efforts of Members of earlier Parliaments — many of them, alas, no longer with us, and I think here particularly of my own compatriots, Michael Shaw and Donald Bruce, but also of President Spénale and Mr Cointat — have been very great. We are, however, encouraged to see a number of old and experienced campaigners in this field from the Federal Republic, Holland and Italy, and I have no doubt that the work of those Members who are not with us will be continued by even greater efforts and with even greater authority by those honourable Members from the countries which I have just mentioned who are still here in the Chamber today, because the work which Parliament will be putting in in this area will be a continuation of the labours and efforts undertaken in the last Parliament and the ones that preceded it.

Now, as a result of that work, a number of arrangements have been established which create the present framework of balance, giving the Parliament not only the power of final decision — to which the President referred — within its margin of manoeuvre on non-compulsory expenditure but also, of course — and this is an important point — the sole responsibility for the budgetary discharge. In addition, careful work on the successive revisions of the Financial Regulation and on issues such as budget commentaries have buttressed the basic structure with a very elegant set of security arrangements. It is against this background that the current issues have to be examined.

A major issue, on that Members of the old Parliament are certainly familiar with, is that of borrowing and lending. The Commission has again this year

proposed that the budget should contain a special part in which would be set out the borrowing and lending activities of the Economic and Euratom Communities, whose ultimate guarantee lies in the Community budget itself. Although the operations themselves are not of the same nature as the budget, it does seem to us right that other Community financial activities which could have an impact on the budget should be included there. The Council has doubts about this approach — I must frankly say — which has also been discussed on the basis of an amendment to the Financial Regulation to which Parliament has given its approval. This is a complex matter; it is a matter which requires very careful examination; it is a matter on which it is necessary to think a long time before one speaks, but nonetheless it is an issue on which we have thought it right to maintain the position we have taken in the past.

A second issue is that of the implementation of the budget. Indeed, this is really a complex of separate questions, which, though in appearance are of a general or horizontal nature, are often more meaningfully discussed case by case. For example, the question of the legal basis for expenditure. In other words, should the entering of appropriations in the budget by itself be an adequate basis for expenditure? The Commission believes that it depends on the action, though it rejects the view that there must always be a separate legal basis. We are comforted to note that Parliament also sometimes recognizes the need for a separate regulation. The case-by-case approach is also helpful in examining whether the Council can reserve to itself the final word in the implementation of agreed programmes, an issue on which in general the position of the Commission is close to that so far held by Parliament, but not identical.

This underlines the need, I think, to improve the consultation between the Council and Parliament on such problems, both by seeking to lighten the procedure for relatively minor issues and, perhaps, by conducting the discussions earlier than at present in the Council's examination of proposals. This is an area to which the new Parliament may wish to give urgent attention, in view of the large number of proposals pending decision now outstanding between the two institutions. The Commission is very ready to help in this discussion. I might add, indeed, that it would, I think, be helpful if there could be a dialogue, a discussion, with the Council, as well as with the Commission, during Parliament's examination of the budget. I think this might help to find satisfactory arrangements on some of these outstanding issues.

Finally, among the institutional issues is the question of the budgetary procedure itself. One issue is the classification of expenditure as compulsory or non-compulsory, to which I linked the question of whether the Council can decide, in the regulation setting up a

Tugendhat

programme, how much it can cost, thus limiting the scope for changing the amount during the budget procedure. Another issue is that of the problems which arose in drawing up the 1979 budget between the Council and Parliament. The Commission believes that these areas should also be discussed between Parliament and the Council, so that divergent interpretations of the Treaty rules do not again cause problems. By their nature, Parliament and the Council will not always agree. Indeed, I fear that Parliament and the Commission might not always find themselves in agreement. But it is important that the disagreements should be on important and constructive issues rather than on the rules of the game itself.

In presenting the Commission's preliminary draft budget for 1980 to this, the first part-session of the directly elected European Parliament, I have deliberately ranged very wide. I hope that I have succeeded in placing the 1980 budget in its general context of the past growth of the budget itself, of the future of own resources, of economic circumstances, of the problem — the profound problem — of how decisions are taken about agricultural expenditure of the Community's needs which should find budgetary expression and of the institutional issues inseparable from the budget itself.

For me, as the Commissioner specially charged with the budget, I can only say that I look forward to working closely with the new Parliament, as I did with the old Parliament, on these issues and indeed on the issues of the budgetary procedure. In this area, as was so eloquently stated by the newly-elected President, Parliament has special and clear responsibilities. It now has increased authority derived directly from the Community's electorate. I can assure you that in this field the Commission will do its best to work at all levels, not just with the Council — though certainly with the Council — but also with Parliament and with the committees that Parliament sets up. This is a technical and difficult area, which is hard to follow but in which much of the red meat of Community decisions, much of the substance and fabric of the Community which we are building for the future will really be decided, and I trust that the hopes which electors all over Europe repose in this Parliament, repose in your deliberations, will find their expression in the budget of the European Communities in the years ahead.

(Loud applause)

IN THE CHAIR : MR GONELLA

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Mr President, I should like to begin by congratulating Mr Tugendhat most

sincerely on his brilliant speech, in which he recapitulated the important problems facing us. I only wish that some of the Members who seem to feel that the question of the Rules of Procedure is a matter of life and death for this House had stayed to listen to what Mr Tugendhat had to say. They have all left the Chamber now, but if they had stayed on, they might have discovered what this House has managed to achieve in the past without debates on Rules of Procedure. I ...

(Applause)

... am now about to pass on my job to someone else. As rapporteur for the 1979 budget, I agreed — with the approval of the House — to prepare discussion of the 1980 budget up to today, and as soon as the Committee on Budgets has been reconstituted, we shall be nominating a rapporteur for the 1980 budget. It will not be me, and I must say — if I may be allowed this personal remark after my long involvement with budgetary matters — that, for various reasons, I rather regret the fact. There is practically no other field in which ideological confrontation is so unimportant, and in which the specialized nature of the work brings the various people engaged on it so closely together. I should therefore like to express my heartfelt thanks to Mr Tugendhat for his willingness over the last few years to cooperate with the European Parliament. He has always been available for discussion, and even when our opinions have differed, we have always managed to find a solution somehow. I should like to include in my thanks Mr Tugendhat's right-hand man, Daniel Strasser, who has always defended the Commission's independence with supreme elegance, but has at the same time been ready and willing to cooperate with this House. My sincere thanks go to these two men, and I hope that their willing cooperation will also be available to my successor. Mr Tugendhat has already referred to Members who are no longer with us. Those who know Georges Spénale and Michel Cointat will appreciate how much we all regret the fact that they — like Michael Shaw and Lord Bruce of Donington — are no longer in this Parliament. I particularly regret the loss of Lord Bruce, who — in his own cooperative way — always ensured that Parliament did not fall asleep at its Friday sittings, which were unfortunately almost traditionally reserved for debates on the budget. Lord Bruce always made sure we followed these debates very attentively.

However, you also mentioned the fact that several Members of the old Parliament — Erwin Lange as the former chairman and, I hope, new chairman of the Committee on Budgets, and my colleague Heinrich Aigner — are still here in this Chamber, so we may rest assured that our work will continue in capable hands.

Bangemann

I have just a few brief comments to make, Mr President. The spokesmen for the political groups will be presenting their own opinions, and Mr Rossi will be speaking on behalf of the Liberal Group.

Firstly, the question of own resources. As the Commission was quick to notice and point out, we shall soon have reached the ceiling of 1 % on a common base of VAT. Mr Tugendhat has already described the almost incredible ignorance with which my own national parliament, the Bundestag, has discussed this problem. I was the only Member of the European Parliament who took part in this debate, which, incidentally, also was held shortly before midnight. Otherwise, the floor was left entirely to German budgetary experts, and I should like to say here quite clearly and categorically that it seems to me to be enormously difficult to tie in the political work of the national parliaments with our own House. If the relationship between the national parliaments and the European Parliament is to be determined by the kind of ignorance which came out in the Bundestag debate, we are bound to tread on each other's toes. So you, Mr President, and the Bureau of the European Parliament, must come to an agreement with the presidents of the national parliaments to ensure that there are sufficient opportunities for cooperation and the exchange of information so that we do not gradually drift apart. We absolutely must find a solution for the time when our own resources will no longer be adequate. Mr Tugendhat has already explained that the imminent shortage of funds is due not to a spendthrift attitude on the part of the European Parliament, but that the Council has itself contributed to the present situation. The Council of Finance Ministers cannot on the one hand take decisions involving additional expenditure to the tune of two or three thousand million units of account, while the self-same Ministers then stand up in their national parliaments and claim that the European Parliament is such an irresponsible body that it must be prevented from increasing its expenditure faster than its income rises. That is pure nonsense and the Council therefore bears a certain political responsibility here. We shall remind the Council of its responsibility in the course of the conciliation procedure and in public debate.

There are three reasons why an increase in the expenditure side of the Community budget is — regardless of the pattern of expenditure on the Common Agricultural Policy — both predictable and desirable.

Firstly, there are a number of matters which are of an essentially European dimension — what Mr Tugendhat referred to as the 'red meat'. Let me take the example of European regional policy. How are we to remove the regional differences in the Community if not by a specifically European policy? These differences have resulted from the fact that national policies are widely divergent and we have found no means of

working together. What we have here then is a problem which is of a genuinely Community nature, and which can be solved in no other way.

Secondly, when national responsibilities are transferred to the European Community — development policy, for instance, — it is not inevitable that expenditure should increase; indeed, the very opposite may be the case. When nine countries pursue nine different development policies, there is bound to be a considerable loss of both effectiveness and prestige. This being so, it is virtually certain that the effect of transferring such tasks to the Community will be more efficient use of less money.

The same applies to research policy. We would not all need to go in for technological research if we could only agree to pool our resources. There is no need for every country to pursue its own programme of energy research. If we could agree to do it together, the costs would be lower. In other words, it is perfectly possible for an increase in the European Community's budget to go hand-in-hand with a reduction in costs as far as the taxpayer is concerned, and indeed, this is what will actually happen in most cases.

Thirdly, if you look at the Community budget in terms of the gross domestic product of the Community as a whole or in terms of the Member States' national budgets, it is not difficult to see that the size of the budget bears no relation to the tasks entrusted to the Community, quite apart from the fact that this budget has to grow for other reasons in specific economic situations.

I think then that Mr Tugendhat was quite right to draw our attention once again to the importance of the Community's borrowing policy. There must be some good reason for the fact that every national budget includes as a matter of course the financing of particular projects by public borrowing, because, in the first place, it means that future tax payers are being made responsible for an investment which has been made in their own interests, and secondly, Mr President, because such borrowing may in fact make good commercial sense. If, for instance, we succeed — as we have set out to do with the Ortolí Facility — in combating unemployment by means of public borrowing, it is quite possible that the investment may in the long run turn out to be financially worthwhile, because the Member States would then save on the payment of unemployment benefit, so that the original loans could be repaid without any difficulty with the money thus saved. In the circumstances, I really cannot understand why the Council is still holding back on this point. If the Council wants to save itself the trouble of having to ratify new sources of regular income by a long-drawn-out process, the easiest solution would be simply to agree to the Commission's proposals for introducing public borrowing into the Community budget.

Bangemann

I should like to refer very briefly to the horizontal problems and certain sectoral problems. I shall keep my comments short because this is, after all, my swansong. I apologize for the inappropriateness of the analogy — I probably do not cut a very convincing figure as a dying swan — but I could not think of anything better on the spur of the moment.

The horizontal problems are, Mr President — I say this for the benefit of new Members — at least as important as specific sectoral expenditure. Let me take as an example the inclusion of the European Development Fund in the budget. I realize that this is a controversial point, but I think it is something this House must insist on, for two reasons.

Firstly, the point at issue here is the serious problem of relations between Parliament, the Commission and the Council, and the ancillary question of whether we can rely on publicly pronounced political opinions. For years now, the Council, the Commission and Parliament have been claiming with a single voice that this problem could be tackled in a positive spirit as soon as a number of minor technical points had been cleared up. Let me issue a warning to the Council: just as last year we had a set-to over a problem which had been around for a long time, namely an increase in the Regional Fund, we could very well be faced with the same kind of situation this year, because, here again, the Council has been aware for a number of years that the Commission and Parliament have adopted a common stance, one which the Council has never rejected in principle. I would ask those representatives of the Council who are here today to take this problem seriously, so that, next time we get into a tricky situation this House will not be accused of failing to support joint attempts to overcome budgetary problems. As Mr Giolitti brought up the point, I should also like to draw your attention to another important problem in connection with these horizontal questions, namely the utilization of resources set aside for actual Community programmes. Mr Tugendhat has pointed out again and again that the unsatisfactory utilization of funds is largely due to the fact that the Member States themselves do not make the necessary arrangements for financing projects. If this is true, we shall have to set up our own Community projects so that we can be sure of controlling the utilization of funds ourselves.

I think that what the French call *actions intégrées* could be a suitable means of getting to grips with this problem. There is one other horizontal problem I should like to refer to, Mr President, since by our decision this morning we have just created a Committee on Budgetary Control.

I think that, by paying more serious attention than we have done in the past to the transfer of appropriations from the reservation to items in the budget and to

specific projects, this House has a highly effective means of applying its budgetary powers effectively, without running the risk of having its decision blocked by the Council.

I think the newly created Committee on Budgetary Control could perform an important function here by keeping an eye on, and perhaps even itself formulating, these essential decisions during the implementation of the budget. At any rate, I feel this would be a very sensible solution. Finally, Mr President, I should like to comment on a few sectoral problems, the most important of which undoubtedly concerns agricultural policy. I should like to point one thing out to all those Members who rightly emphasized the fact that the common agricultural policy is not only an important European policy, but has also become the guarantor of a lot of people's livelihoods. If we do nothing to tackle the problem of surplus production, this entire policy will totally collapse in the next two years, because it will simply be impossible to finance it. It is in the agricultural sector's own interests for us to combat surplus production, because otherwise the policy will simply cease to exist.

One final word on what Mr Tugendhat had to say about the Commission's staffing problems. I entirely share his views on this point, and as I said again and again during the election campaign, any complaints about bureaucracy in European politics should be addressed not to the Commission but to the Council in Brussels. The Council's Permanent Representatives, for instance, are a real bureaucracy, and I beg their pardon for having to call them that. They do not have to take any responsibility; they can simply hide behind ignorant ministers, who sit round the Council of Ministers' table and argue for or against decisions that they know little or nothing about, whereas the Permanent Representatives are knowledgeable on the subject discussed, but have no political responsibility. If that is not a perfect description of bureaucracy at work, I do not know what is. The Commission is prepared to come here and discuss points with us; the Commission is frank and open to dialogue. That is not what I call a bureaucratic attitude; that is, in my opinion, a highly political and democratic attitude.

Mr Tugendhat was also quite right to point to staff levels in the national civil services. Ladies and gentlemen, when I hear that a local authority in the Federal Republic of Germany, which is responsible for something like 180 000 to 250 000 people, employs as many officials as three or four of the Commission's directorates-general, which have important political functions to perform, I wonder why we keep bearing the old chestnut about the top-heavy bureaucracy in Brussels, compared with the situation at home, where all is sweetness and light. In fact, the opposite is true, and this is something we should acknowledge when we come to take decisions.

Bangemann

Mr President, these were just a few random comments I wanted to make, and I would really not like them to be regarded as a kind of last will and testament, because they really were a bit too terse and off-the-cuff for that. I shall continue to take part in these debates in my capacity as chairman of my group, and I hope it will not be taken as a sign of discourtesy if I now have to leave the Chamber to join a meeting of the chairmen of the political groups, who have already been for the last ten minutes discussing the composition of the parliamentary committees.

I should like to thank all the Members of this House for their attention and my thanks also go to those who have put in so much work in this field in the past. I hope that the new Parliament will continue along the path which the old one mapped out. By no means everything we did was bad. Of course, I readily admit that we could have been a bit more careful in drawing up the Rules of Procedure. But the fact that this Parliament at least has firm ground to stand on in terms of its budgetary powers is due to the efforts of the old Parliament.

(Applause)

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

Mr Dankert. *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I was beginning to think that Mr Bangemann, whom I had already congratulated on being elected chairman of his group, had managed to convince yet another group of his personal merits, and had taken over the chairmanship of the largest group in this House. But now I realize his reasons for speaking before the spokesmen of the larger groups.

Mr Tugendhat and others have pointed to the fact that the President of Parliament attaches exceptional importance to Parliament's budgetary powers. That is something I entirely agree with. I only hope that we are not expecting too much in this respect, because the budget must of course be the instrument *par excellence* by which we give concrete expression to political priorities, and also because the budgetary powers bestowed on this House are the best means of settling once and for all the question of whether this is an Assembly or a Parliament. It is also the best means of proving to tens of millions of voters that what counts here in Strasbourg, Luxembourg or Brussels — and I shall always make a point of mentioning all three of these places — is not so much words uttered by politicians as their actions in the field of regional policy, social policy, industrial policy, agricultural policy and all the other policies which in fact can only be given a truly European dimension by European financing.

The old, indirectly elected European Parliament — as Mr Bangemann pointed out just now — made what I

feel was a great contribution to the development of those powers which we can now put to use. But, in the first place, the process is still far from completion and, secondly, by no means all the rights we have acquired — particularly those dating from 1975 — are safely under lock and key. It must be obvious to everyone that the foe is lurking everywhere: in the Council, sometimes even in the Commission and certainly in that new instrument — the European Council.

A majority in the Council of Ministers — under the leadership of France — takes every chance going to place as narrow an interpretation as possible on the powers bestowed upon Parliament by the Treaties. This last winter we witnessed an attack on what is to us the highly important Article 203. Now a fresh attempt is being made to introduce financial ceilings into the Council's decisions, so as to prevent Parliament performing its rightful functions. And there have been blatant attempts to bring that part of the European Commission's expenditure which is monitored by the European Parliament under the control of the Council through the device of management committees. In short, the Council is everywhere trying to tamper with powers that have already been allotted to this House. The result of all this is that the parliamentary pillar of the budgetary authority consisting of the Council and Parliament appears to be rather shakier than some legal analysts maintain.

The conciliation procedure agreed in 1974 — which was supposed to be an instrument for resolving serious conflicts between the Council and Parliament over important aspects of the budget — is working badly. The Council is almost permanently unready or unwilling to take part in negotiations, and we recently had the unique situation that the possibility of conciliation over interest subsidies on EMS loans in the sphere of concurrent measures was not even considered. I assume that this is because what is at stake are powers the European Council would like to get its hands on. My group is afraid that this development may have something to do with our own powers, because the powers of the budgetary authority as such conflict with the European Council's own idea that there is a higher budgetary authority than the budgetary authority itself. It goes without saying — and I think we made this point clearly enough in last year's debate on the Regional Fund — that my group will resist any such attempts by the European Council, and we should continue to offer stout resistance, whether it is regional policy which is at issue or anything else.

I have already sketched out the main areas in which we — and I hope this whole problem of relations with the Council will be taken up by the national

Dankert

parliaments as well — must take on the Council of Ministers and the European Council. Fortunately, the Commission is usually on our side.

The old Parliament consistently held — and this is something Mr Tugendhat pointed out as well — that budgetary powers are in effect legislative powers, in other words appropriations can be paid out as soon as they have been properly approved. The Commission's attitude to the budgetary powers is rather more careful, and we constantly come up against the problem of which of the appropriations the Commission has included in the budget it thinks it can pay out, which items it is prepared to risk political controversy over; and which amounts one may assume it is not prepared to fight for. This explains the enormous difference left over at the end of each budget year. Despite the Commission's sympathetic attitude to our views, I must nevertheless point out that — with the single exception of aid to non-associated countries — the Commission has never really tried to pay out appropriations included in the draft budget without the Council's approval, and that the legal arguments advanced by the Commission have always taken second place to the Council's own views.

That is how we got into the pitiful mess which Lord Bruce describes in his report on the implementation of the 1979 budget, namely that, however much Parliament amended, even when it kept well within the margin laid down in Article 203, a large part of the appropriations approved by Parliament was never in fact paid out. In short, we have been completely wasting our time in that respect. The Commission is responsible for drawing up the draft budget, but whenever Parliament reinstates the original amounts proposed by the Commission after they have been chopped around by the Council, it regularly happens that these amounts are simply not paid out.

This is an intolerable situation, because Parliament, which is given a certain financial room for manoeuvre within the budgetary process, cannot thus put its money and its policies where its mouth is. It is for this reason that I would ask Mr Tugendhat to bring a little more clarity into this whole question, starting from this present budgetary procedure. We want to know what sums will actually be paid out, what might be paid out, and what will not be paid out, either because the Council has failed to come to a decision or for some other reason. It is highly important that the European Parliament's powers should have real teeth and that Parliament itself should be able to decide where its priorities lie.

Furthermore, I believe that this year, even less than in previous years, we can not permit ourselves the luxury of approving appropriations which will not be paid out because — as was said earlier — the Commission and Parliament have less and less room for manoeuvre as a result of the near exhaustion of our own resources.

Mr Jenkins said yesterday that we were almost at a point where the Community's own resources would no longer suffice to cover the budget. I have no bone at all to pick with the Commission over the comments made just now by Mr Tugendhat on the attitude adopted to this question by the Ministers of Agriculture. No criticism can be too strong in this respect, and I fully endorse all the criticism expressed by Mr Tugendhat. What has happened with the 1.3 thousand million units of account is nothing short of scandalous.

I do not intend to go into detail about what we should do about the 1.3 thousand million units of account, but what I would say is that this House should give serious consideration to the question of whether we can approve the additional funds the Ministers of Agriculture are asking for without taking serious steps to reduce the size of the present agricultural surpluses and without a *quid pro quo* from the Ministers of Finance in the form of an agreement to increase the Community's own resources.

If we do not achieve an increase in own resources, the budgetary process in the community will inevitably grind to a halt. At this moment, I can see no sign of the Council stumping up the required new resources, and Mr Tugendhat rightly drew attention just now to the resolution passed by the German Bundestag. In the light of this, we in this House must give some thought to the question of own resources and consider what steps we should ourselves undertake and what options are open to us.

This is all the more necessary in view of the fact that Parliament is in the odd situation of having been given budgetary powers initially to spend — rather than to collect — money. Normally, a parliament's budgetary powers are based on its right to collect money.

We must be extremely cautious about the question of increasing the Community's own resources. Any such increase would, for example, be virtually unacceptable if it did not go hand-in-hand with fundamental changes in the budgetary procedure, and if Parliament did not get a tight grip on the increasingly important field of borrowing and lending policy. I fully agree with what Mr Tugendhat had to say on this point.

I have given you a rough idea of what my group feels should be our priority areas. Let me now enlarge a little on this point. The socialists in this group — just like the socialists in the old Parliament — will continue to emphasize the fact that public expenditure must play an extremely important part in creating new jobs and that the Community should have control over the basic instruments for removing the discrepancies in income between the various regions of the Community — in other words, over

Dankert

regional and social policy. The Commission's line on this is the same. This policy must be given more muscle, but we shall probably be able to reach agreement on this question and anyway, the decision taken last year has also given the whole thing quite a substantial boost.

This is of course an essential development, and only the Community budget can — provided it pays more attention to the redistribution of resources than it has done so far — play an important part in reducing the differences in standards of living between the various regions of the Community.

But then we must investigate how the instruments function and how effective they are, especially in view of the impending accession of Greece, Portugal and Spain. The discrepancies in incomes that do exist are to be found between the northern European countries and those countries now applying for membership. It seems to me that the whole range of instruments we now have at our disposal — and this applies as much to the EAGGF as to the Social Fund and the Regional Fund — must undergo a radical change, because there is a very great danger that the new Member States may not even have the administrative infrastructure they need to make effective use of these resources, and so what we need is a certain amount of flexibility, and that is something which is at the moment conspicuous by its absence.

My group thinks it is unacceptable for the expenditure of large amounts of money to be blocked simply because certain Member States are either unable or unwilling to spend the money effectively. This criticism of the Community seems to me to be perfectly valid; it should be taken seriously, and appropriate remedies must be found quickly.

There are also areas which are not yet fully developed, and where money could be spent directly. I know for a fact that the Commission is thinking in terms of the further development of these areas, which include research and development, not just with reference to the energy problem, but also to the question of industrial renewal. In this context, I am thinking also of the question of development aid, although there is one critical comment I should like to make in this respect. It is intolerable that a proportion of the real costs of the common agricultural policy should be entered under Title 9 of the budget, namely 'Cooperation with the developing countries and non-Member States'. Agricultural subsidies rightly belong under agricultural expenditure. This present situation just goes to show that, despite all the progress that has been made in recent years, the Community must still do more than it does at the moment in the field of cooperation with the developing countries. In particular, the Community's policy *vis-à-vis* the non-associated countries — and Mr Tugendhat has just said that the Commission's proposals included continued growth of our aid effort to developing countries — must take a

great leap forward, qualitatively speaking. This is something we tried to do last year and a number of years before that, but every effort in this direction is inevitably blocked by the Council.

In conclusion, I would say that we have now made a start on a budgetary procedure which looks like being a particularly difficult one, thanks to the limited room for manoeuvre still remaining to us, the problem of CAP expenditure and the uncertainty resulting from the intensified discussions between the governments over how the system is currently working — in other words, the problem of the net contributors and the discussion which is scheduled on this subject for the Dublin Summit. I do not know what is likely to come out of the Dublin discussions — probably no one knows that — but if decisions are in fact taken at Heads of Government level, we might well be faced with a completely different situation as regards this whole budgetary procedure. This is further evidence of the fact that relations between the European Council and the budgetary authorities are difficult, to say the least, and this will no doubt become evident in the discussion on the budget we can expect for this autumn.

The 1980 budgetary procedure will, in my opinion, be at least as important a political matter as it was in 1979. The Socialist Group will make a responsible contribution to the whole process. We are not out for any unnecessary confrontation, but if the attitude of the Council, and the inability of the Council to formulate a policy worthy of the name, do not change, we shall not hesitate to use the weapons available to us under the Treaty. If I have correctly understood Mr Tugendhat's statement, I think we can reckon on having the Commission on our side in any battle with the Council.

(Applause from the left)

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

Mr Notenboom. — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like first of all to thank Mr Tugendhat for his excellent speech.

The first phase of the 1980 budgetary procedure has now got under way — at least as far as this House is concerned — and there are plenty more important phases in the offing. We are setting to work on the basis of the 1979 budget, whose definitive existence is now universally acknowledged, although that had been the opinion of this House ever since December 1978. I sincerely hope that the procedure for the 1980 budget will take a rather more pleasant and proper course than the last one, which is still so fresh in my mind.

Notenboom

We are not exactly over-confident of this happening, however, because there is still no clearly established interpretation of Article 203 of the Treaty. The Council has still to take an effective and unanimous decision on this. There is at least one Member which keeps a careful eye on the acquired rights of Parliament in this respect to make sure they are not tampered with. The question of the interpretation of Article 203 gives none of the Community institutions the right to block the progress of the budget. Both Parliament and the Council have the right to participate in the decision-making process — each in its own way — but neither of us has the right to block the budget, and both of us have a duty to ensure that the budget comes into force. At this juncture, I would appeal to the Irish Presidency to avoid any errors in this respect and to persuade the Council to reach a decision on Article 203.

Nor — as Mr Dankert pointed out just now — have we reached agreement with the Council over the question of whether — whenever the Commission allocates appropriations to certain items — it can in principle pay out this money if there is no specific Council Regulation applying to these particular items. That is something we shall to give some thought to in the course of discussions on this budget. Under the rapporteurship of Mr Bangemann — whom I should like to thank for his preparatory work — we have managed to find what Mr Bangemann himself called the 'magic formula'. However, because all the amendments which contained this formula have since been withdrawn to enable us to concentrate on the important amendment dealing with the Regional Fund, nothing more has come of this magic formula. I believe that we should proceed carefully, item by item, to see where it can and where it cannot be applied. In this respect, I entirely agree with Mr Tugendhat, although Parliament and the Commission may not necessarily see eye to eye on the items to which it relates. However, I do agree with Mr Tugendhat that we should proceed item by item to reach a consensus.

Mr President, quite clearly — and this goes for practically every aspect of the budget — the directly-elected Parliament contains far more Members than the old one did, and a lot of these Members may not be fully acquainted with the intricacies of the matter. I hope the new Members will put in a good deal of careful homework both during and after the summer recess to acquaint themselves with the attitudes developed by the old Parliament. Of course, we have not reached that stage yet. It may be that this House will think differently from the old Parliament on a number of points, although I have not yet noticed any such change in attitude in my own group.

At any rate, I would ask the Council most sincerely not to abuse the fact that we are still 'running in'.

The House will of course need a certain time as we have noticed over the last few days — before it is in a position to start taking decisions and passing resolutions. The budgetary procedure and the situation surrounding the votes in October and December are — as the old hands know — extremely complex and time-consuming. I hope then that the Council will not seek to exploit this situation.

This House should base its work not only on a faithful interpretation of the Treaties, but also on the spirit which originally gave rise to those Treaties. I am grateful to Mr Tugendhat for remembering our highly esteemed former colleagues, who played such an important part in working out the powers we can now claim, although I fully agree with Mr Dankert that there are indications that the powers we think we have acquired are not always so readily acknowledged by others.

It is likely to be quite difficult to form a new team of Members of Parliament who are prepared to go beyond whatever different political opinions they may hold to develop reasonably harmonious ideas and attitudes to enable this House to play its rightful part in its relations with the Council, which forms the other half of the budgetary authority. This will depend on the quality of our investigations, our reports, our speakers and our attitudes. Nor will it be an easy matter to obtain the qualified majority provided for in the Treaty to enable us to flex the muscles the Treaty has given us *vis-à-vis* the Council. That is something we are going to have to concentrate on, starting from now.

Mr President, I should also like to say to the Council that it should not regard the conciliation procedure as a kind of hearing, whereby a Parliament delegation is graciously admitted to what are felt to be internal discussions within the Council, is allowed to recite its party piece and is then politely ushered out again to allow the Council to get on with its internal affairs.

Those are not the kind of negotiations we envisaged, and, indeed, that is not what always happened in the past. The conciliation procedure is a bilateral 'happening' with a dash of sporting competition, whereby the two sides in the budgetary authority meet with the aim of establishing creative contact, and of finding solutions for which both are prepared to accept responsibility. That is, in our opinion, a real conciliation procedure. But in practice over the last year — and this is the impression I get from listening to those Members who have taken part in the procedure — the whole thing has become less and less meaningful.

Notenboom

Mr President, I cannot touch on all the subjects which come under this heading. Doubtless we shall have opportunity enough to discuss them all as time goes on. We are, however, rapidly approaching the ceiling for our own resources, and this is something Mr Tugendhat and all the previous speakers have given a great deal of attention to.

In my own opinion — we have yet to discuss the subject in our new group — the ceiling should be raised, albeit on a number of strict conditions. The budget cannot be regarded as a panacea for all the Community's problems, but it does testify to our political will to try to find solutions to the problems. The point has been made a number of times — and it was made again here this week — that the individual Member States can only successfully tackle the burning questions of the day by acting in concert. That is why we need to give our immediate attention to the problem of the future source of budgetary funds. The employment situation is crying out for it, as is also the situation regarding a Community energy policy. And the same goes for restructuring in global terms, and hence also the need for an industrial policy. And in my own personal opinion, I think it is made all the more necessary by modern concepts of development cooperation and the interdependence of our own economies with those of the Third World. I think this is a realistic way of viewing the future of the Community budget, and I do not feel that to take this view in any way betrays a demagogic attitude or a lack of realism.

Of course we must try wherever possible to reduce the amounts provided for in certain sub-sections of the present budget. There must, for instance, be a reduction in monetary compensatory amounts. That will lighten the load for a start. Incidentally, great effort will be needed in the agricultural sector to get a better grip on expenditure than is currently the case. In this respect, I go along with what Mr Tugendhat said earlier.

It might also be a sensible measure to investigate the effectiveness of the programmes, to see whether they are really all still necessary in the light of our new priorities. I understand that a certain Member State has proposed that the Court of Auditors should carry out an effectiveness study. Certain other Member States seem to take this as meaning that the Court of Auditors will be assuming a political role. That, however, is not the case. At least, it is not how I see it.

The political decisions are taken by the Council and Parliament on the basis of proposals submitted by the Commission, following studies carried out by the Commission, with the help of the Commission, and not of the Court of Auditors. But the Court of Auditors should be able to gather material.

Perhaps you can see what I am getting at, Mr President. I am not claiming that the Court of Auditors can solve all the budgetary problems by carrying out an investigation of this kind, but it can at least help us in our task.

I wholeheartedly agree with what Mr Tugendhat just said about the need to ensure that the Community taxpayer should not be asked to pay twice for something. Perhaps Mr Tugendhat will recall that I tabled a written question on this point, on the question of the Europeanization of a number of policy sectors, and that I urged a step-for-step approach to this problem. I had hoped for a rather more detailed reply than I in fact got, but at least Mr Tugendhat thinks along the same lines as I do. It may interest you to know, Mr Tugendhat, that I put the very same question to my own government when I was still a member of the Dutch Parliament. Our Finance Minister was willing and eager to discuss the question and promised to devote a special paragraph in the very next budget to the question of what items appear in the national budget, when they should in principle form part of the European Community budget. This is the kind of double expenditure Mr Tugendhat was referring to. It would perhaps be a good idea if others were to follow the Dutch example, because it is at least one way of tackling the enormous problems we are faced with. Given that there is a ceiling — I realize the enormous difficulty involved in increasing the Community's own resources, although I personally think it necessary — given this ceiling over the next few years, obligatory expenditure is bound to take precedence over non-obligatory expenditure. Of course, the obligatory expenditure — all other things being equal — will look after itself; it will grow on its own, leaving the non-obligatory funds to fall victim to the guillotine. And these are precisely the funds this House can use to make its powers felt and to extend those powers, quite apart from the fact that these funds are also vitally necessary to combat unemployment and to finance energy policy, development cooperation and all those things we need to give some real shape to Europe, which is something most of us here want to do. But the money cannot be paid out if nothing is done. It therefore follows that every possible method — small as well as large — is needed to help solve this problem. Even if we do succeed in getting our own resources increased, the whole process is bound to take years, in view of the fact that the decision has to be ratified by all nine national parliaments — ten, in the near future — before this extremely cumbersome procedure is completed.

I would draw your attention to the need for the borrowings and loans to be included in the budget, although I do not think that loans can in the short term serve to finance the Community's current expenditure. That is, my opinion, not a feasible proposition

Notenboom

in the present European context. However, the budgetization of loans and borrowings is highly important from both a psychological and a political point of view. It is high time this House got down to tackling the problem of the Community's own resources, and indeed, this point was made by our President in her opening speech. That is something I should like to thank her for. The Commission submitted a communication on this subject last year. To my great regret, we did not give it our attention. On a number of occasions, I made modest attempts to get something done about it, but either there was insufficient time or simply no opportunity to do so. I appreciate why nothing has happened so far, but the fact remains that we have left the matter untouched for too long. It must now become one of our top priorities. I also hope that the Commission will come up with even more specific proposals this year, because it is now time we investigated the whole process.

Mr Tugendhat has come out in favour of some degree of progressivity in the Community's own resources. Our group has so far had no opportunity to discuss this subject, and I personally am open to any ideas and any proposals. We shall give them our attention. Personally, however, I believe that solidarity as regards expenditure is more realistic and also fairer than the same kind of solidarity with regard to income. That does not mean to say, however, that I shall not study the proposals with great interest.

It is of course a matter for great regret that three Member States have still not fulfilled their obligations to adapt their own national legislation to the Sixth VAT Directive. Let me just add that Mr Tugendhat knows how frequently in the past I have pressed for appropriate action to be taken. It saddens me that now in July 1979 there are still three Member States which have not kept their promises.

Finally, let me just comment on what is really the most important point. As far as I am concerned, the total planned expenditure is perfectly reasonable. The draft budget provides for a 13% increase in commitment appropriations and a 9.3% increase in payment appropriations, and that was even before the proposal was submitted. There is also a significant and substantial increase in the Social Fund. Let us not lead the people of Europe to believe that we can combat the problem of unemployment simply by budgetary means. To arouse undue expectations in this way would be dishonest. But we must use the budget to do what we can to alleviate the unemployment problem, especially unemployment among young people. That is why a substantial increase in the available resources has been proposed, and it is something we very much welcome. There are other things which equally meet with our approval, but there is insufficient time remaining for me to go into any more detail. I would,

however, appeal to the Council to refrain from their usual practice of paring down a budget which I think provides for a perfectly reasonable level of expenditure, but which is of course much too low, given the work that still has to be done in Europe. If the Council were to get out its pruning shears, it would generate a very bad atmosphere, and this could cause a great deal of trouble.

I would really appeal to the Irish Presidency to take note of the debates which were held in the old Parliament in April this year on the matter of priorities, and to take note also of the universally welcomed proposals submitted by the Commission and of the comments which have been forthcoming here today from the various political groups. I hope that, in October and December this year, we shall then — despite extremely difficult circumstances — see the budgetary procedure come to a successful conclusion in this House.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr John D. Taylor to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr John D. Taylor. — Mr President, I think I can fairly say that by the standards of this Parliament my remarks will be brief. None the less they are sincerely offered as a contribution to this debate.

May I first acknowledge those previous speakers who have paid tribute to Mr Michael Shaw and vouchsafe to them that I will pass on those kind remarks to Mr Shaw in London.

Mr President, in her magnificent opening address, the *doyenne d'âge* referred to that British play in a Danish setting and in particular quoted from Hamlet's soliloquy 'To be, or not to be'. I think it is unnecessary for me to say that my group in this Parliament intends to be. We want to take a full, active and responsible part in the affairs of the institutions of the Community and in particular in this Parliament, not least in its role as joint authority with the Council for the Community budget. We noted carefully and welcomed the President's own words in her opening address urging upon this Parliament the importance of developing its role in the supervision of revenue-raising and receipts. That is, as she reminded us, part of the cardinal role of parliaments throughout history, but that is not to say that the elected representatives of the people should not also closely scrutinize the quality of expenditure. The Community must be seen by its citizens to be giving them value for money.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

For myself, I have taken some measure of the Community budget for 1980, so eloquently spoken to by Commissioner Tugendhat, and for all its length, its weight and its gravity, I do not believe that it poses

Taylor

any more than four fundamental political questions. — More questions perhaps, but four of them truly fundamental.

Firstly, what is the right total quantum or total size of the Community budget at a time when we are struggling to reconcile the need to contain public expenditure on the one hand and the need to explore the opportunity for achievements which may be more efficiently realized on a Community scale?

Secondly, we are posed with the problem of examining the priorities within that total scale of the budget, and many of us feel that energy problems, the security of Western Europe and regional policy, to which once again the President made reference, should be accorded an increasing priority in the affairs of the Community, whilst at the same time it is very strongly felt by many people that agriculture is consuming too much of Community resources in a way that frankly needs correcting.

The third problem concern the shares or proportions in which the partners meet the cost. We know that it is better to give than to receive, and we recognize that there will always be circumstances in which some countries are net contributors, but occasionally some of the Member States may wish, gently and in good Community spirit, to say to their partners that there must be limits and there must be seen to be fairness.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Finally, the fourth problem, which is the problem of the future. As the Community's budget threatens the 1 % VAT ceiling, no one yet seems to have any clear or enlightened view on what future revenue resources the Community will look for to supplement agricultural levies and customs duties unless it be the simple but not especially attractive expedient of increasing the share of the VAT. Here, certainly, is scope for further imagination and investigation, and I think many members of my group would want to share with the Commission an inquiry into the possibilities of using energy consumption as a basis for taxation.

For the moment, Mr President, I shall content myself with crystal-gazing no further than next week. For the present, I wish the Council of Finance Ministers well in its deliberations, and may I couple with that an expression of the very warm appreciation by this group of the work which Commissioner Tugendhat is doing and our hopes of working harmoniously with him.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m. The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.55 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR MØLLER

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

6. *Documents received*

President. I have received the following documents :

(a) from the Commission, a report (Doc. 1-238/79) on the financial situation in the European Communities as at 31 March 1979,

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

(b) the following motions for resolutions tabled in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure :

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-239/79), tabled by Sir Fred Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the European Parliament's role in Community development policy,

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

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-240/79), tabled by Mr Newton Dunn on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on small and medium-sized firms,

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs ;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-241/79), tabled by Mr Kellett-Bowman on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the effect on employment of protectionism in world trade,

which has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations ;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-242/79), tabled by Mr Moorhouse on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on civil aviation,

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

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-243/79), tabled by Mr Sherlock, Mr Johnson, Miss Hooper and Mr Newton Dunn on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on whaling,

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

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-244/79), tabled by Mr Kirk and Mr Turner on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the clarity of Community legislation,

President

which has been referred to the Legal Affairs Committee as the Committee responsible, and to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment for its opinion ;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-245/79), tabled by Mr Curry on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the agricultural policy,

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

- motion for a resolution (Doc 1-246/79), tabled by Mr Curry on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the fisheries policy,

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

7. Preliminary draft general budget of the Communities for 1980 (resumption)

President. The next item is the resumption of the debate on the preliminary draft general budget of the Communities for 1980.

I call Mr Spinelli to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Spinelli. — (I) Mr President, I think the first Parliament elected directly by the European people deserves to be presented with a better and rather different budget. A budget which really sets out to tackle the problems of the Community must reflect both expenditure policy and revenue policy, instead of confining itself to listing the measures which it is intended to take to obtain the necessary revenue. In a Community in which the citizens pay their taxes to local and regional authorities, to the Member States and to the Community, the Commission should have felt duty bound to submit a budget taking account of the total fiscal burden on citizens, the way in which it is distributed, and the reasons justifying any differences in distribution according to the policies to be pursued. If this information is not given, if it is not stipulated that certain increases in Community taxation must be balanced by certain reductions — preferably in national, regional or other taxes — it means that the Community has reached a point beyond which it cannot develop further.

This is the third consecutive year that we have drawn the Commission's attention to the need to begin to tackle the problem in these terms, but it has been consistently deaf to our requests. Following the conflict which has arisen in the last few months between Parliament and the Council over the maximum increase, I have once more pointed out to the Commission the need for it to indicate why it is necessary to increase the total revenue of the Community by a certain amount. Failing that, the Council will continue to be no more than the sum of national viewpoints and will fail to achieve a European perspec-

tive. Mr Tugendhat assured me that he would give this indication, stipulating only that he would do so orally rather than in writing. At all events, I note that this has not been done either in writing or orally.

I think that we are in very difficult situation, all the more so since we are approaching the point at which the VAT 'ceiling' will be reached — as all the speakers have pointed out. There is already talk of a possible return to contributions from Member States or to special appropriations outside the budget intended for specific measures.

I must say that we are standing by rather passively while the most central and important of the structures of the Community — the financial structure — is being attacked.

The Commission has really delayed too long, since it has not yet submitted proposals on what the new taxes or the new percentages of taxes should be. I must say that the Green Paper which has been published and which has not been debated here does not really tackle the issue. It says that, from now on, new taxes must not be designed to penalize progressively the richer citizens, but to penalize progressively the richer countries. I must point out that, in a fair taxation system, the rich citizen of country 'A' and the equally rich citizen of country 'B' should pay the same tax, regardless of whether country 'A' is richer or poorer than country 'B'. There will merely be more rich citizens in country 'A' who will pay more tax. But we must impose a greater tax burden on those who are more well-off in the various countries, so as to avoid creating tensions within our Community which would be impossible to control.

To deal with this issue, the Green Paper proposes taxes on cigarettes. This is not the way to tackle the problem. On the contrary, it is necessary to distribute taxes fairly according to the incomes of citizens, and establish the principles of company taxation, of which a proportion should go to the Community, if we want to get a serious revenue policy going. Another problem to be tackled — and which shows no sign of being tackled as yet — is that every budget of a public body draws its revenue partly from taxation and partly from credit. The principle is beginning to be accepted that the Community can take up loans, but it is hedged about with so many qualifications that it is virtually ineffective, and indeed the Commission even refuses to give a precise description of it in the budget.

All the things that I have mentioned are missing from the submission of the budget for 1980. The Commission and the Council must therefore realize that the chances of Parliament rejecting the budget are great if this defect is not remedied.

But this is not the only defect. The irresponsibility continues, indeed worsens, with regard to expenditure.

Spinelli

With special reference to the agricultural policy proper, that is the policy of aids for agricultural restructuring, the Commission itself has reduced expenditure — I do not know what the Council will do with it. The expenditure for price support has been disproportionately increased, so much so that we are debating a draft budget in the full knowledge that an amending letter is on its way asking for 1 300 million units of account extra to meet the needs of the Guarantee Fund.

I think that this fact should be enough to justify rejection of this budget, since it is an irresponsible budget. The only remedy for this would be the very clear and 'fixed' insertion of a commitment to modify the agricultural regulations by the end of the year so as to eliminate the irresponsibility at present characterizing the prices policy. We could then say 'Good, if we are still tied to the existing regulations for a year, they are at least about to be changed.' The Commission's promise to change its plans for next year — it will perhaps propose lower prices, freezes, etc. — is not enough, because we know that it means nothing. When the Commission has made its proposals, the agricultural lobby, through the Ministers of Agriculture will re-establish high prices and irresponsible expenditure. This, then, is the most negative aspect of the draft.

I would like to deal briefly with the other expenditure. First and foremost, we should consider the problem of the obligatory expenditure. The Council — and the Commission pretends not to notice this — has in a sense taken advantage of the fact that the old Parliament, being near the end of its term, did not have the authority on this subject that it had previously, and of the fact that the new Parliament was not yet elected, to include an item of expenditure — 200 million units of account for credits to investment in the context of the EMS agreements — on the content of which Parliament had already agreed. Such expenditure is not envisaged in the Treaty, nor is it envisaged by commitments deriving from the Treaty, but is a new act of policy which was in fact included in the budget even before there was any corresponding regulation. The Council decided that it should be regarded as obligatory expenditure, i.e. as expenditure on which the Council would have the last word. And it is somewhat shameful that the Commission should have acquiesced in this ploy. Instead of maintaining that this could only be non-obligatory expenditure, the Commission — which meant to be the guardian of the Treaties — itself proposed that it should be obligatory expenditure. Parliament therefore asked that there should be consultation. The Council, taking advantage of the situation of *'vacatio'* between old and new Parliament, decided that it was a special case and not a measure of a general nature — I fail to see what could be more general than promoting investments!

— and that it could therefore be decided without consultation. The only reason why the decision has not yet been taken is that there is another form of consultation which the Community is obliged to carry out — consultation with the ex-associated country — no longer associated and not yet a member — Greece, which must obligatorily be consulted.

Well, the Council understood that it must respect the commitment to Greece, and we have no objection to this. As for the commitment to Parliament, it thought it could ignore it. I think that on this point Parliament must firmly maintain that we are dealing with a question of principle and that it will forcefully reject any budget in which the expenditure for new policies is regarded — against any formal or substantial logic — as obligatory expenditure, when it is obviously non-obligatory expenditure, for which the procedures laid down must be followed, involving more real and substantial control by Parliament.

Another serious problem is that I think Parliament has been saying for too long that the present situation is unsatisfactory and that we must put a stop to it. We should instead threaten to stop approving items of this kind.

We are waging the Commission's battle against the will of the Commission itself, for we say the Treaty lays down that the affairs of the Community should be administered by the Commission. Yet, whenever there is a problem or a new regulation on expenditure to be drawn up, the Commission inserts a clause setting up a so-called advisory committee, whose advisory capacity is such that it can block the decisions of the Commission and transfer the decision-making power of the Commission to the Council. This is inadmissible and must not be allowed in future.

Ladies and gentlemen of the new Parliament, I maintain that if our bark continues to be worse than our bite, as was the case in the old Parliament, in which we protested and annulled that clause but then always accepted the opposite decision, we would be wronging ourselves. But we shall have only ourselves to blame.

The policies of the Community as a whole should have an overall aim to be identified. What are the central problems of Community policies at the moment? Obviously the policy for use of resources, and the problem of reviving investments to get the economy going again, because these are the bases for the subsequent fight against unemployment of young people and so on. If the economy is not reviving, all the rest will merely amount to fine — or not so fine — words or corporatism. Aids will be given to this or that industry, so that a collection of sickly industries will be maintained.

On the contrary, investment policies require a basic choice. Above all there must be organic planning of policies and investments directed towards the deve-

Spinelli

loping countries and the backward regions, since they must constitute the driving force whose planned development gets the whole economy moving again.

What, on the other hand, have we got? The Commission has proposed that the regional policy fund — i.e. the modest fund required for an investment policy in this sense — be increased from 1 000 to 1 200 million units of account. The Committee of Permanent Representatives — take note of this — disregarding everything that took place last year between us and the Council, is now deciding to bring the Regional Fund back to 600 million, that is to halve it. This is the way in which the Council is preparing to take account of the European Parliament — let us bear it in mind.

(Interruptions from some quarters of the Centre and Right)

President. — Mr Spinelli, your time is up.

Mr Spinelli. — *(I)* Mr President, I have almost finished my speech. In any case, the previous speakers went on beyond the time allotted to them, and so I hope I too may be granted a few extra minutes.

What is the extent of the other expenditure to promote development in regions outside the Community? Development aid for the non-associated countries is reduced from 60 to 27 million. Next year about 200 million — a derisory sum — will be allocated to the Regional Development Fund. Any real policy of development is lacking, and all the rest is therefore weak and insubstantial. One final point: no attention has been given to a problem which was considered serious five or six years ago, but is now completely neglected — that of the environment, ecology. Every year we pay dearly for this neglect, for every year new ecological disasters take place, but in spite of this there has been no substantial increase in appropriations. In particular, I see no substantial increase in funds for research to develop 'clean' forms of energy, that is forms of energy which do not create the same problems as nuclear energy. I think nuclear energy should not be abandoned, but I think it will remain a marginal form, mainly experimental, until the problems arising from the danger of contamination have been solved. This means that research efforts on other forms of energy must be increased, but there is no trace of this in your report.

I can assure all the new Members of Parliament that there was consultation with the Council, and that the Council was already working out its opinions within COREPER, although it wants to give the impression of having no ideas and claims not to be aware of our ideas, with which in fact it is familiar because it is physically present here as an institution and because all our proceedings are public. I maintain that this way of governing must change...

President. — Let me say once again that we shall not be able to get through the agenda unless we confine

ourselves to the time allotted for speaking, that is fifteen minutes for the rapporteur and ten minutes for other speakers. I call Mr Rossi to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Rossi. — *(F)* Mr President, in our group's view the most important by far of all the powers of this Parliament is indisputably the budgetary power which it has held jointly with the Council since the 1970 and 1975 Treaties. This is the result of the development which we owe to the perseverance of the old Parliament. The reason behind this essential phase in the democratization of our Community was that, once the national parliaments had relinquished part of their financial sovereignty, it became necessary to endow the European Parliament with some at least of the powers they had lost. I should like here to pay tribute to the outgoing rapporteur, our friend Mr Bangemann, for his competence and his excellent analyses.

Mr President, I should like, very briefly and within the time allotted to me, to set out the main priorities defined by the Liberal and Democratic Group at the start of the budgetary procedure for the 1980 financial year.

This budget must outline clearly the policies and trends to be developed during our five-year mandate. This is why we insist above all on the political role of the budget, a budget which cannot be confined purely and simply to the implementation of political decisions already taken, but must indicate the Community's political priorities and play an active and clear-sighted part in initiating Community action — what the President has called 'Parliament's role as a driving force'.

Our second observation concerns the current budgetary procedure and the need for this to involve a constructive dialogue within the budgetary authority itself. Nothing could be more serious than to run the risk of isolating ourselves from the legislative authority. As we have seen in the past, this leads in particular to the accumulation of certain appropriations which, although they have been voted, remain unused. Thus it is by means of conciliation that we must try to settle the difficulties which are bound to arise between the two sides of the budgetary authority. This reminds me of the serious conflict which occurred at the time of the vote on the 1979 appropriations for the Regional Fund concerning the interpretation of Article 203, and more particularly the question of fixing a new rate of increase for non-compulsory expenditure

Without dwelling on the past, I must none the less remind the House that, while a compromise was reached on the final appropriation for the Regional Fund, the fact still remains that the Council and the Parliament have not altered their positions as regards

Rossi

the interpretation of this article which — there is no doubt — does not provide for all eventualities. In the course of the conciliation I mentioned we should, therefore, in our view, lose no time in starting discussions with a view to defining the conditions of application of Article 203, so as to avoid a repetition of such a crisis in the future, and these discussions should in our opinion extend to the classification into compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure. For our part we approve the initiative taken in this field by the Commission in the presentation of its new budget.

My third observation — and this is something which will come to a head from 1981 onwards — concerns the problem of resources and the risk of the Community's losing a financial autonomy so arduously won and which it has enjoyed only since 1 January last. It is in fact clear that, with such increases in expenditure, the ceiling of 1 % will be reached in 1981 — let me remind you that the rate is currently 0.88 % and that there is at present no prospect of an increase in resources from customs duties or levies. Thus, ladies and gentlemen, the 1981 budget will need to exceed the one we are debating today by only 1 200 million EUA for the Community to lose the autonomy which it acquired only a few months ago.

It is therefore up to the various institutions, including obviously our own, to give some thought to new resources without delay, and this question will, I hope, be one of the main points of the coming budget debate.

This problem, Mr President, is not unconnected with the recurring question of how to include borrowing and lending operations in the budget. To date, each category of borrowing has been entered under a separate budget heading. For the 1979 budget the Commission had already proposed, unsuccessfully, a second part in which the loans contracted and amounts lent would be recorded. In the preliminary draft before us, the Commission repeats this proposal. Although this would not in itself mean an increase in expenditure, some people may fear that the purely superficial impression it would give of an increase in the volume of the budget might lead to public criticism.

We believe on the contrary that it is better to ensure budgetary transparency and thereby make it easier for Parliament to appreciate the new measures which need to be taken. I will return to this later in relation to the energy loan, which our group intends to support.

I now come to the financing of the European Development Fund, which Parliament has long wanted to see in the budget. However, the fact is that the Council feared this would bring forward the moment when own resources would no longer be sufficient to finance Community expenditure, although the

Council of Ministers had given its approval in principle to the inclusion of this item in the budget. Today, however, its position is clear: the Fund will continue to be financed ex-budget, according to a formula which has, in fact, been modified at the request of our British colleagues.

Thus this is a problem which will also have to be discussed, weighing up on the one hand the reasons of principle, what I would call the parliamentary reasons, which militate in favour of inclusion in the budget, and on the other hand the two foreseeable disadvantages: rapid absorption of our remaining margin of VAT receipts, and the damaging effects of all Community agreements on the implementation of the new Lomé Convention.

To conclude this series of observations, I should like to remind you that, as my group has always maintained, increased coordination between the economic policies of the Nine, as decided by the European Council in Strasbourg, presupposes also more effective coordination between the budgetary policies of the Member States. It is important in our view for the present mechanism to be reorganized and for the Commission to submit without delay more effective proposals in this area, although in this respect the triennial financial estimates which it now presents to us should facilitate this coordination. Mr President, as time is short I shall not be able to examine all the sectoral policies, but I should like to start with agriculture. On this point, it will be no surprise to Mr Tugendhat that I do not agree with his analysis or with the rather pessimistic light in which he sees the future of the common agricultural policy.

The agreement on agricultural prices reached, very belatedly, by the Ministers of Agriculture in Luxembourg on 22 June has, ladies and gentlemen, all the merits and faults of a strictly political compromise.

Merits, because it satisfies everybody's restrictions and requirements, and has made it possible to avoid the worst, that is a breakdown, which would have been serious. Faults, because it does not provide even the beginnings of a solution to the grave economic problems facing European agriculture. Our group, as you know, has always been opposed to putting a ceiling on agricultural expenditure. However, no consideration has been given to the question of surpluses, or to that of the financial imbalance between the Guarantee and Guidance sections of the EAGGF. Short-term considerations have completely overshadowed the long-term questions. None the less, contrary to the views expressed within another institution, our group welcomes the agreement arrived at in Luxembourg, because a breakdown in negotiations so soon after direct elections to this Parliament would have had a catastrophic effect on public opinion in our various countries.

Rossi

The budgetary consequence of this has been the presentation by the Commission of a letter of amendment to the preliminary draft which in effect alters very substantially the initial impression we had of the budgetary situation. The increase in expenditure over the preliminary draft will be 1 300 million EUA, or 14.3 %, which brings the increase between the 1979 and 1980 budgets to 22 % for commitment appropriations and 18.9 % for payment appropriations. The share of the EAGGF Guarantee Section alone in the preliminary draft will therefore be 61.4 % for commitment appropriations and 66.7 % for payment appropriations.

The increases in expenditure due to the Luxembourg compromise will directly affect the budget estimates for the next three years. Even assuming restraint in agricultural expenditure, with a linear increase in guarantee prices of 6 % per year and a gradual dismantling of compensatory amounts, the ceiling of own resources is likely to be exceeded in 1981, whereas in previous estimates this was put at 1982 or 1983. It has been suggested, however, that this prospect of exceeding the ceiling may be taken as a pretext for reconsidering the machinery of the common agricultural policy.

I repeat that my group has always been against placing a ceiling on agricultural expenditure, but it considers that, without calling into question the fundamental principles of the policy, its present course should be corrected.

The debate on the problem of surpluses — in particular that of dairy surpluses — must begin without delay in September and here it will be Parliament's duty to put its mind to this problem, since it is of prime importance to get agricultural expenditure under control, though this must not be sought at the expense of farmers and their livelihood.

I now come very rapidly, Mr President, to the question of energy — and the fact is that, after twenty years, the Community still does not have an energy policy. This is why we have had no real answer to events in the oil sector since 1973. Happily, the Strasbourg European Council has now put an end to these two decades of uncertainty and inactivity. It is now up to the Member States to agree to enshrine these objectives in the Community budget.

We must therefore get away from the budgetary habit of defining objectives and then constantly revising them downwards, not forgetting the frequent examples of unused appropriations. The appropriations in the 1979 budget were so small that the increase envisaged for 1980 does not appear very significant. We also consider that the appropriations should be concentrated in priority areas. This obviously means

in our view, above all energy saving and the development of alternative sources of energy. I would emphasize this point. It is precisely in this area that we must confine our efforts to the most effective sectors. The Community ought to make a substantial contribution to research into solar energy, the viability of which has been proven and which, after the year 2000, will be able to provide some 5 to 6 % of energy supplies. As for the development of nuclear energy, we regard this as indispensable in order to make up the energy deficit, but while the nuclear option is inescapable, it is one which can only be put into effect under extremely stringent conditions regarding reactor safety and, accordingly, the protection of the populace.

After the Three Mile Island accident, greatly increased funds should be devoted in particular to research into accidents involving reactor coolant loss and also into the management and storage of radioactive waste.

Another priority, Mr President, is coal, which is a field for which the budget still only contains token entries. Accordingly we ask for the inclusion of a special item for research into the liquefaction of coal.

The 101 million units of account in payment appropriations and the 120 million units of account in the Chapter 103 reserve will, it must be admitted, scarcely be able to contribute to the realization of all these objectives. Even if we were to commit our whole working margin, that is 13.8 %, or almost 400 million units of account, we would still be far from meeting the investment requirements. This is why our group supports the idea of raising a large Community loan to be used for energy investment projects.

Mr President, just now I had occasion to mention regional policy in relation to the problems which it posed in 1979. In its preliminary draft budget, the Commission proposes a sum of 1 200 million EUA, which actually represents an increase of 26 %. Thus we now have a far more significant level of appropriations to help reduce the regional imbalances within the Community. But I should like to draw the attention of the House to the need to improve the actual effectiveness of this Fund. Our group would thus be grateful if the Committee on Regional Policy, Regional Planning and Transport could reflect on this problem and put forward proposals for the debate on the budget in October.

Mr President, since I cannot, for lack of time, touch on all sectors, I shall conclude with a few words on social policy.

On a strictly budgetary level we find that with 1 000 million EUA the European Communities have increased expenditure by 30 %, which is a welcome increase. But in political terms we should remember

Rossi

that in each of our countries our election was an opportunity to bring to the fore our concern with the modern tragedy of unemployment and to draw attention to the role which the Community could play in the fight against unemployment, and particularly against unemployment among young people.

Ladies and gentlemen, I beg you not to limit yourselves in this debate simply to the accounting aspects of the Social Fund as it now stands. Let us show some imagination, let us try to consider what contribution it can make to reducing unemployment and what new tasks it can be given to achieve this end. It is heartbreaking to see how, owing to the unwieldiness of national procedure, only 49 % of the 1978 appropriations for payment in this sphere were actually spent! For lack of time, there can be no question today of entering into a discussion of principle, either concerning national or Community procedures, or concerning the future activities of the Fund. In our group's view, what we must do is to make a solemn promise to open this debate on unemployment at the next part-session in September.

Ladies and gentlemen, to conclude this rapid analysis of the preliminary draft budget — to which, as I have said, we shall return in more detail at the first reading, in particular in defence of a number of amendments — I should like to sum up my group's views.

We are aware of the importance of the budgetary powers this House has. Our group will therefore be constantly attentive and alert in defence of our budgetary powers in the course of this long and complex procedure. It will watch over this all the more scrupulously since it considers the adoption of the budget to be the most important of all our political acts. For this reason we will debate this budget both as parliamentarians aware of our responsibilities — and this is why we are not afraid to give prominence to the difficult problems of new resources — and, at the same time, as parliamentarians aware of the fact that it is the budget that gives expression to the new policies the Community needs.

For 20 years we have had a managerial Community. It was a period of boom and growth which some people thought would never end. In reality we are now experiencing not a traditional crisis but a veritable change in the world. The demands of energy and raw material producing countries, the legitimate awakening of the developing countries, the emergence of certain technological quasi-monopolies around the world, oblige us both to depart from old patterns and to develop a more Community view of our future. The managerial Community I mentioned must be succeeded by a Community of great changes. And it is our budget that must reflect the guiding principles and initiatives we adopt to cope with these changes.

Ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament needed the stamp of democratic respectability in view

of the budgetary powers entrusted to it. This we have had since 10 June. Now it needs moral authority, which it must win, and it is on the thoughtfulness, imagination and the resourcefulness with which it handles its first budget that it will be judged by public opinion, so that it can become truly, in people's minds, the Parliament of Europe.

(Applause)

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

Mr Poncelet. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the preliminary draft budget presented to us by the Commission of the European Communities calls for some comments on our part, both concerning the pattern of Community policy it reflects and — and for us this is the more important aspect — concerning the behaviour of the Commission itself.

The main part of my speech will focus, and this should be no surprise, on the agricultural sector. However, I should like to mention briefly those sectors in which, in our view, progress is being made.

First of all social policy, on which the Community has been stepping up its efforts in the past two years, this being reflected, in the draft 1980 budget, in an increase of almost 30 % in the Social Fund. Community action in this sphere must obviously — and who would dispute this? — give priority to the long-awaited fight against unemployment which the public expects.

However, these measures must not replace government action, which is indispensable; in our view the Social Fund can only be a complementary, a supplementary element, since the Community cannot, either now or in the future, make up for what governments fail to do in this field. As regards aid to deprived regions or regions in difficulties, this must continue to be one of the Community's principal concerns.

As for development cooperation, this policy must continue to have a high degree of priority and, while demonstrating of course, Europe's solidarity with these countries, also show its generosity. European dynamism in this sphere is evident not only in the very substantial increase of more than 20 % in appropriations — which we welcome — but also in the fact that a very important milestone has been reached in the Community's political and budgetary history, namely the renewal of the Lomé Convention and the inclusion in the budget of the fifth European Development Fund, this latter measure being one which we ourselves have long been in favour of. This House knows the importance which my country has always attached, and attaches today more than ever, to solidarity between Europe and Africa.

However — and I now come to the central part of my speech, the positive elements in this preliminary draft

Poncelet

budget should not lead us to forget the threats to the only true common policy which exists, namely the common agricultural market. Indeed, for some years now — as others too have belatedly come to realize — there has been a slow disintegration of the common agricultural policy, which has become the favourite target of certain political groups, even within the Commission itself. Alas, this process of subversion is reflected in the preliminary draft budget, and I must own that I do not find the remarks made by Mr Tugendhat this morning very reassuring.

One of the first signs of this subversion of the Community's agricultural budget is the change in the classification of certain agricultural expenditure, thereby changing the distribution of power within the Budget Authority. To date the whole agricultural sector has come under the heading of compulsory expenditure, i.e. that on which the Council, the true executive, has the last word. However, the Commission has changed the classification of part of the expenditure for the Guidance Section of the EAGGF. This involves Chapter 80, projects for the improvement of agricultural structures, and Article 860, common measures to improve the structures of inshore fisheries — which is a problem on which Mr Chirac made some very apposite comments this morning. About 200 million units of account in commitment appropriations have been transferred from compulsory expenditure to non-compulsory expenditure, that is entrusted to Parliament, which will thus have the last word. In our view, this clearly shows the Commission's determination to attack the common agricultural policy indirectly, having failed for the moment to impose its will on the Council.

(Applause from the Group of European Progressive Democrats)

The Group of European Progressive Democrats cannot allow the Commission, by means of procedural tricks, to change the distribution of budgetary powers between the Council and Parliament, since this distribution was one of the decisive elements in the ratification by the national parliaments of precisely that part of the Treaty which relates to the budgetary powers of this House. This was the element which made it possible to wrest ratification of this Treaty from our national parliaments, and today an attempt is being made to reopen this issue.

(Applause from the Group of European Progressive Democrats)

We must also emphasize the illogical character — and I stress that it is illogical — of the letter of amendment presented by the Commission following the recent decisions of the Council of Ministers of Agriculture. We are all aware of the indicative nature of the budget estimates for the agricultural sector, since the factor on which expenditure depends is none other than production itself. This is why, traditionally, the

Commission has wisely waited until September before drawing up the budget estimates which result from the fixing of agricultural prices, so as to have a better idea of the size of crops, the level of production and the adjustments dictated by particular short-term economic trends. This was, I repeat, a wise stand. However, this year the Commission, with a haste which, I feel, is not without ulterior motive, has suddenly rushed to draw up the letter of amendment on the basis of obviously artificial figures. In our opinion this is an obvious manoeuvre: it aims, once again, by taking examples based on known but exaggerated data, to point an accusing finger at the common agricultural policy, thus refusing to consider that the development of European agriculture is, in the present difficult period, one of Europe's great opportunities.

(Applause)

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in view of the many attacks made on it this morning, the Members of this House must be reminded that the end of the agricultural policy in its essential features — in particular its Community-wide application, price support, and competition on an equal footing — will undoubtedly mean the end of the common market. The necessary correction of certain abuses which we never tire of denouncing must not obscure our firm resolve in this sphere. There cannot be a free European market without a common agricultural policy. Mr Debré said this here on the very first day at the inaugural sitting. We fully support his statement, which closely reflects — of this we are sure, indeed convinced — the point of view of the French farming community and of the French people.

(Applause)

There is all the more reason for us to express our concern at this stage in the budget debate in that there are other threats to this agricultural policy, both for the long term and for the immediate future.

With regard to long-term threats, how can one speak of a common agricultural policy or of a common agricultural market when there are no longer common prices? The existence and the preservation of compensatory amounts is, as you know tantamount to the creation of actual customs duties within the Community. Since the Community is divided into monetary zones, the compensatory amounts create new barriers and hinder intra-Community trade by giving rise to distortions of competition.

Of course — and we do not dispute this — we know that they were introduced ten years ago at the request of the French. However, at the time it was understood that they were a temporary measure and would be abolished. As those who were involved at the time can confirm, they were indeed abolished during the 18 months following their introduction. Later, at the

Poncelet

request of certain other Member States, they were reintroduced. We say today to these States that they must do as we did before and quickly abolish these compensatory amounts, in particular the positive compensatory amounts which represent not only a very heavy burden on our Community budget, but also a barrier to the free movement of agricultural products and a terrible handicap for some farmers as compared with others.

Ladies and gentlemen, what would you say — at least some of you — if compensatory amounts were introduced for industrial products, resulting in a distortion of competition and creating windfall profits for some? Firms at a disadvantage would rapidly go bankrupt and the unemployment situation would deteriorate further.

Another long-term objective is in our view absolutely essential: the adoption by the Community of a genuine and significant export policy for agricultural surpluses. We have, ladies and gentlemen, the means for such a policy. What we must do is choose the products judiciously on the basis of world market demand and production costs. For example, we should develop meat production, which is particularly well-suited to our geographical situation and our human resources. But this is only possible if short-term decisions do not thwart the long-term objectives and if we do not reduce the outlets for Community producers by allowing certain Member States to get their supplies at low prices outside the Community.

(Applause from the Group of European Progressive Democrats)

Ladies and gentlemen, is not the Commission itself in fact supporting those States who seek outside what they should normally get within the Community? In particular, it has just reduced substantially, too substantially, the levies on New Zealand butter imported to Great Britain, which — as I am sure my French colleagues will agree — makes farmers justifiably angry and imposes a further burden on the Community budget, which we are told is already insufficient. Similarly, this budget also bears the burden of the excessive and untaxed imports of soya and manioc which Europe has been accepting, for some time now, despite our repeated denunciations of this practice. The result of all this, ladies and gentlemen, is that the financial solidarity of the Member States will itself soon be in jeopardy. In fact, it should be acknowledged that solidarity among Member States has been replaced by the financial responsibility of the farmers themselves. Of course we appreciate that the surpluses, in particular dairy surpluses, must be reduced. Let us not forget, however, that the price of milk constitutes the salary of millions and millions of farmers in most of our countries, and in particular that of the smallest farmers. This means that each year their incomes — and they are painfully aware of this

— are threatened by this determination to impose a coresponsibility levy which is contrary to the principle of the common agricultural policy.

It is true, and we do not deny it, that the dairy sector poses a problem. But to solve this serious question, we must return to basic principles and in particular re-establish the unity of the market. Meanwhile, it is those who receive the 'higher' price who are responsible for the surpluses. It is they, and not the small producers, who must pay, at least up to the level of the compensatory amounts, from which they in fact benefit.

We have, as I have said, other short-term anxieties, for example the organization of the market in sheepmeat. Such a market organization must not wipe out sheep farming in certain Community countries, which is some people would like, more or less insidiously, to achieve. We cannot accept that and we are convinced that such is not the desired objective. We hope a reasonable solution will be possible here. For our part, rest assured that we will be particularly vigilant on this point.

We are also concerned — and we are not alone in this — about our Mediterranean products, and in particular fruit, vegetables and wine, whose market organizations, as you know, are extremely precarious. A special effort must be made to improve them, in view of the future accession of Greece and, more especially, the possible accession of Spain and Portugal. However, we find nothing, or too little, in the Community's budget proposals to prepare for this accession. Any enlargement must be preceded by real guarantees which respect the legitimate interests of producers in the South, so that the advent of new countries in the Community does not aggravate the existing imbalance, thereby posing a real threat to European integration. The strengthening of the organization of markets in Mediterranean products is — and I say this as a solemn warning — a precondition for the enlargement which some people desire.

Finally, I should like to draw the House's attention to certain operating expenditures of the Commission, in particular in the field of data processing. In 1976, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission decided to replace the CII and IBM computers in the Computer Centre by a British-built ICL computer. The conversion of the programme from IBM to ICL was contracted out by ICL to other firms. This conversion began in 1978. It was agreed that work should finish with the departure of IBM, which was to be in July 1979, that is now. Today you can see by simply looking at the budget before you that this conversion has already cost more than Bfrs 500 million! The Commission's 'data processing' budget for 1980 should normally therefore, return to a level similar to that which preceded conversion, for which, in fact, special appropriations had been requested amounting to about Bfrs 211 million or almost 4 million EUA.

Poncelet

But what do we find? For 1980 the Commission is asking for 16.5 million EUA, or some Bfrs 665 million which, curiously, are entered under Chapter 21. The Commission must explain how it justifies such exorbitant expenditure, which is contrary to the undertaking given.

Finally I have one last question. What became of the marketing by ICL of the 2980 model purchased by the Commission? I think the Court of Auditors should look into this excessively costly matter without delay and present us with a report. Is it not our prime duty, ladies and gentlemen, to watch over the proper utilization of public funds?

I have just outlined, all too briefly, our priorities concerning certain social agricultural and financial problems. I feel, however, that it would be particularly grave and dangerous if Parliament were to take an interest only in material matters and devote itself to the cult of the consumer society.

As we have seen in the last few days, this consumer society has revived an evil which we all, as democrats, thought we had banished — that of intolerance and violence. Let us not forget that throughout the world there are millions of starving people, and that this is the real face of violence. I should like to warn Parliament and the Council that we must waste no more time, not a single day nor a single instant, considering how to destroy our agricultural surpluses, but that we should, on the contrary, while ensuring that farmers receive the essential reward for their work, seek a way of using this overproduction to feed these peoples, who are looking to Europe and for whom Europe should be a symbol of generosity, a beacon to show them where freedom and humanitarian principles are to be found, to demonstrate to them that we Europeans are not motivated in our actions solely by selfish, commercial considerations, but rather that we are concerned always to introduce into our actions a human dimension, the dimension of the heart.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Balfé.

Mr Balfé. — Mr President, let me begin by placing on the record my tribute to Donald Bruce, who was my immediate predecessor as the Labour nominee to the Committee on Budgets. I think he did a splendid job on that committee, although politically there is some difference between us within the confines of the Committee on Budgets; there is nothing I would like to say to detract from his considerable contribution.

Secondly, let me say to three people in this Chamber that the reason why we object when they run over

time is that according to the British way of carrying on politics we believe in setting time-limits and sticking to them. If we want to break the rules, the Britisher is as good at breaking the rules as anyone else; but I would point out that the last three speakers have all exceeded their time-limit by a considerable amount. I hope that is not going to become the pattern for the way things get done in this House.

(Applause)

Those are the last claps that I shall get from the benches opposite.

(Laughter)

Let me make clear the policy position of the British Labour movement on the budget. Stated simply, it is this. We consider that the budget should be reduced in real terms, that there should be no increase in the Parliament's powers and that the budget should be rebalanced to shift the emphasis from agricultural spending to spending from the Social and Regional Funds under the overall ceiling which I have just mentioned.

Let me look first at agriculture. The basic problem in this sector is that demand within the EEC is not increasing fast enough to sustain the current agricultural population and give them the same expectation of increased living standards as is enjoyed by the rest of the population. One of two things can happen: either the market will respond to overproduction with depressed prices and the standard of living of the agricultural sector will not keep pace with that of the rest of the population, or price guarantees, while maintaining the standard of living, will usually increase productivity and, in the absence of increased demand, surpluses will accumulate. These surpluses can only be eliminated by moving resources out of agriculture. It is not the policy of the Labour movement to impoverish workers, whether they be in agriculture or elsewhere, but neither is it our policy to tolerate the wanton waste and destruction of food when many people in the world, even in our own EEC, lack proper nutrition. Let me give an example which is local: it is completely unacceptable to me that in my constituency there are families in the working-class areas of Bermondsey and Deptford that go without a Sunday joint whilst in their midst stands an EEC intervention store packed full of good red meat. That is not a policy, that is a disgrace. It is also an insult, and a grave economic assault on the poor nations of the world, that the rich EEC should subsidize to the extent of dumping on the third world, and unlike the last speaker, I would say our sugar policies are a disgrace and are impoverishing many of the cane-sugar producers. Yet we continue to encourage sugar-beet in spite of the damage that it causes to others. In 1978, nearly 40% of the budget was used for the

Balfe

payment of export subsidies a further 35 % was used on the domestic market, and half a billion pounds was used for the cost of storing and looking after surpluses. This is a policy of lunacy, these are the priorities of lunatics. Let us challenge the Council of Ministers to heed the voice of the workers of Europe, who I believe, would condemn this system out of hand.

Let me look briefly at the Regional and Social Funds. Recent decisions by our Tory Government at home are going to make it even harder to get money from the Regional Fund, because reducing the number of areas where it can be paid will make it harder than ever. If less money goes in, that will put up the cost of the EEC even more. The Regional and Social Funds are the poor relations in this Parliament — on my calculation, some 8 % of the budget.

If we are going to look for new resources, we have got to look for rebalancing. Let me add my contribution to the things which have been said about the need for new resources. Are the politicians of Europe seriously expecting the Socialist movement in Britain or elsewhere to start campaigning to get extra funds for an organization which wastes so many billions of pounds in the agricultural sector? it is not on! It is not a possible permutation. We are now almost at the ceiling of VAT. I, in common with many of my colleagues, want to see more money spent on the Regional and Social Funds, but we do not see a need for any new resources in the budget. We think that the budgetary crisis — and it will be a crisis — should be used to force some rethinking. What would this House say if we were piling up Leyland motor-cars? Would it approve? Would it have intervention stores full of motor-cars? Of course it would not! The agricultural policy is a disgrace.

Let me close by saying that it is now, I think, accepted by everybody that Britain's share is too high. But even within that share there are people in Britain, ordinary working people who are severely disenchanted by the Common Market. They are disenchanted because most of what they saw as being possible within it has not come to pass. The only money that has gone into my constituency, which is one of the poorest in London, is my salary. That is what the constituency has had out of the EEC. If you want to make Europe work, if you want to build a Europe for the future, you had better build a Europe which starts taking account of the ordinary working-class people in the Community, in Britain, because those people who support the Common Market in Britain are the few who have done well out of it. The average British family has done very badly out of the Common Market. They have seen nothing from it except bills and the cost of food, especially, going up.

(Protests from the right)

So I challenge the people in this House and especially our own Conservative party. Let us see something for the working people of Europe in this Common Market and let us get away from this rich, precious man's club which is being used as another arm — and I am going to say it — of international capitalism to screw the workers down. And I'm within my ten minutes!

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien. — *(F)* Mr President, Members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, I am speaking as a Walloon autonomist, as a European and as an independent progressive. In my view, there is no contradiction between these three dimensions; indeed, to my mind they even complement each other and are just as rich, just as legitimate as, for example, adherence to a bureaucratic, centralized nation state.

The subject of my speech today is, of course, the discussion on the budget and, while reserving the right to speak at the next part-session on the essential issues of regional policy, employment, scientific and technical research and energy policy, today I should like to concentrate on the Common Agricultural Policy. It is my view that the new policies of the Community, those which I have just mentioned, must be developed using new financial resources and not to the detriment of current agricultural expenditure. This means that we say no to anything which might in any way resemble an attempt to dismantle the Common Agricultural Policy, which does not, however, prevent us from being concerned to see better political and budgetary control of agricultural expenditure in the Community, so as to avoid a more or less geometrical increase in this expenditure.

However, to reply to those who might be tempted to adopt an aggressive attitude vis-à-vis the Common Agricultural Policy, let me remind them that it is at present practically the only sectoral policy of any importance in the Community and that, while it is true that it represents more than 70 % of our budgetary expenditure, this expenditure in itself represents less than half a percent of the overall gross domestic product of the nine Member States. This puts things in their proper perspective. Our basic principle, therefore, is that the Common Agricultural Policy should be preserved, but we believe that it should be corrected and, to a certain extent, revised in line with a number of criticisms that have been levelled at it. Without myself embracing the criticisms which are directed at it from some quarters, in particular the United Kingdom, I can say that it is regrettably true that after more than fifteen years of Common Agricul-

Gendebien

tural Policy, Europe remains to a very large extent dependent on outside sources for its food supplies. I would also point out that in more than fifteen years we have seen almost nine million farmers leave the land in the Community, with all the imbalances to which that gives rise in rural areas and all the social and human tragedies which it involves. And while we have also, generally speaking, seen a certain increase in farmers' standard of living, which was one of the aims of the founders of the Common Market, it must be acknowledged that this increase in farm incomes has been very unequal among the various regions, categories and types of farm.

Finally, the relatively high consumer prices present a problem. In particular, the fact is that owing to the excessive length of the chain of distribution, with a large number of middlemen taking their shares between producer and consumer, the final price is often too high.

In a more positive vein, I should like in addition to make some suggestions to the Commission concerning the necessary reappraisal of the Common Agricultural Policy. First of all, of course we say yes to an internal Community agricultural policy, but we also say yes to an external Community agricultural policy. I should like to expand somewhat on this particular point, taking up on my own behalf the view expressed some months ago by Mr Cheyssson, who quite rightly regretted the absence of an external Community agricultural policy. Indeed, when we compare the situation of Europe with that of the United States, we find a fundamental difference: the United States are net exporters of agricultural products, and on what a scale! They export roughly five times more agricultural and food products than they import, whereas in Europe the reverse is true: we import three times more agricultural and food products than we export.

In our view this situation merits consideration, and perhaps a change in policy, because in the years to come international trade will be affected more and more by the problems of agriculture, and it would be in Europe's interests to progress beyond a policy which I cannot help regarding as short-sighted. This external agricultural policy of the Community should have two major objectives: first of all to reduce Europe's dependence, which is especially scandalous with regard to imports of certain secondary cereals, vegetable protein and ingredients for manufacture of animal feedingsuffs. I believe that this is an enormous task which must be tackled, since both the independence and the security of Europe *vis-à-vis* the outside world are objectives which many here share.

Finally, we must not be content to reduce or eliminate our dependence: we must also, in a more aggressive

manner, export more agricultural produce. In this respect, the Community should take all the decisions needed in the sphere of price structures and market organization to ensure a substantial increase in its agricultural exports within the framework of food aid to the Third World, because not only will the world's population be 6 000 million in twenty years' time — almost 2 000 million more than today — but the year 2000 is just round the corner and we must start preparing for it now, preparing for a change in international relations, in the balance of power between countries where hunger is not a problem and those where this problem is going to become dominant and decisive. And if, in addition to world food aid, we still have surpluses, let us use them as part of a policy of exchange, you could almost say a policy of barter, with the countries supplying those raw materials of which we have the greatest need.

In conclusion, I would sum up by saying to the Members of the Commission that, in developing a common external agricultural policy, Europe would have a great economic advantage, but also a tremendous political advantage, in its relations with the rest of the world.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Robert Jackson.

Mr Robert Jackson. — Mr President, this morning my honourable friend from the Midlands East constituency gave an able sketch of the main themes relating to the 1980 budget, upon which work is now beginning. My remarks will have a wider focus. They concern the possibilities for the development and expansion of the budgetary rôle of this Parliament. And here I would like to refer in passing to some remarks of the Honourable Member from the London South (Inner) constituency, who unfortunately has had to leave, which brought out very clearly the radical flaw in the whole approach of his party to the question of Europe: full of criticisms of the Community, but determined that we in this House should not have any power to do anything about them.

(Applause)

Mr President, in raising this matter, I hope that my old friend, Commissioner Tugendhat, will not mind if I refer, not so much to his eloquent speech this morning, but to our new President's equally eloquent speech earlier this week. Madam Veil was, if I may say so, absolutely right to devote some time to this question in her opening address after taking up her new office.

The budgetary arrangements which were agreed in principle at The Hague Summit in 1969, and which were embodied in the budget treaty of 1975, are only now coming into their full effect. But already they are

Robert Jackson

obsolescent and the need for new arrangements is being borne in upon us. This presents a very great challenge to the Community and to this Parliament — a great challenge but also a great opportunity.

The Community's present budgetary arrangements are obsolescent for a variety of causes. The most obvious is that the Community is nearing the 1 % limit on the VAT element. This will oblige it either to make radical cuts in obligatory spending, notably in agriculture, or to reduce non-obligatory spending, or to introduce new own resources. I believe that the solution we in this House should press for consists, on the one hand, in a rationalization and reduction of obligatory spending in the agricultural sector and, in on the other, the addition of new own resources.

Speaking for myself, I believe that the Community's budget is essentially the expression of the Community's dynamism, and I do not believe that any of us in this House — and I am sure this will in due course include the Member from London South (Inner) — will be able to accept that the Community's future growth should be constrained for all time within the corset of the existing own resources. If the overall amount of public expenditure in the Community is not to grow unjustifiably, it will, of course, be necessary for us — that is, the Commission, the Council and the Parliament — to identify those public spending functions which can most effectively be carried on at Community level and to transfer to the Community responsibility for those spending functions.

Another reason, Mr President, for the obsolescence of the Community's present budgetary arrangements lies in the fact that it is now becoming clear that the Community's budget bears inequitably upon some Member States. This was, for instance, one of the principal issues in the European election campaign in my country. There is, to my mind, no doubt that the solution of this serious problem will involve radical measures affecting the structure both of the Community's revenues and of its expenditures and ; this again will provide many occasions, which I hope this House will be able to seize, to make its new weight felt, both in the cause of equity and for the sake of its own future growth and development.

So, Mr President, over the next two-and-a-half years, which I hope will be the term of our new President's mandate, both the fundamental character, the scope and the scale of the Community budget will come into question. We in this Parliament must rise to the occasion that this will give us to expand our influence in the Community's budgetary process.

We must, of course, preserve intact the principle of own resources, but at the same time we must also see to it that the Community's budget is not only just, but is seen to be just by the European tax-payers whom we represent.

We must, as Madam Veil suggested in her important speech the other day, seek to extend our rôle on the revenue side but above all we must build on what has already been achieved in the budgetary partnership between the Council and the Parliament to ensure that this partnership becomes a genuinely balanced one. In due course, in my view, this must mean new formal powers for this House. But for the time being, it must rather be a question of the spirit and the conventions by which the complex dialogue between the institutions is carried on. In this we count upon a positive attitude and a positive spirit on the part of the Council, and for our own part I am sure that all of us in this House will recognize that it must be for us not only to seize our opportunities but also to deserve, by our own merits and by our own sense of responsibility, the rôle to which we aspire.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Christopher Jackson.

Mr Christopher Jackson. — Mr President, I want to reflect first of all the considerable concern in my constituency, and indeed in many parts of the Community, that the Community budget acts too frequently to take funds from the less wealthy Member States to give to the more wealthy Member States. I welcome the European Council's initiative on this and I particularly welcome Mr Tugendhat's words this morning as well as the whole tone of his address on the preliminary draft budget.

There are two points on which I would seek funds from a larger regional budget for my constituency, Kent East. To take its most famous landmark, I might say I represent the White Cliffs of Dover, which have in the past been a symbol of the separateness of Britain, but today represent a welcome to over 10 million people who each year pass through the ports of my constituency as Britain's gateway to the rest of Europe. They come, however, only to discover that the roads in my constituency are inadequate for their role as major arteries of communication for goods and people travelling between other parts of the Community and Britain. Improvement of the transport infrastructure is one point on which I would seek regional aid.

The centre of the constituency is the historic city of Canterbury, the cradle of Christianity in England and an important part of Europe's cultural heritage. But in other parts of the constituency, industry as well as tourism are important, and unemployment is well above the national average. For these parts and similar disadvantaged areas in other parts of the Community I seek a larger Regional Fund, to which such areas should become entitled to apply for measures to encourage wealth-creation and thus aid employment.

Christopher Jackson

In examining this draft budget I had some sympathy with the legendary gentleman from Ireland who, when asked the way to Tipperary, said 'If I were you, I would not start from here'. As Mr Tugendhat pointed out, our Community's own resources are strictly limited and it is intolerable that 63 % of our budget should go on agriculture, which employs only 8 % of our population in the Community and contributes only 4 % of our gross Community income. Agriculture is indeed of vital importance to the Community and to my constituency, but if the Council does not aid the Commission in making adequate progress in the reform of the common agricultural policy, then — and I say this to encourage the Commissioner — I foresee that this new Parliament may next year feel compelled to use one of its ultimate powers, namely that of rejecting the budget, to make the point that progress has to be made.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, like my colleague, the Member for Kent East, I also want to say a few words about regional policy, and, like him, I do so largely because of a constituency interest. He represents, as he has told us, the White Cliffs of Dover. I represent Land's End, and that, I think, is a good point to start from when dealing with the whole question of regional policy, because it is an area of high unemployment and it is an area, like many other of the peripheral regions throughout the Community, which does need regional aid. And I believe, like some of my colleagues on these benches, that there must be a recasting of the budget eventually, so that the emphasis is taken away from agricultural support and moved to such sections as regional development and the Social Fund.

May I stress here that I am speaking quite personally, and what I say may not be in total agreement with the view of some of my colleagues. I recognize that one's view of the Regional Fund is coloured, at least to some extent, by the area which one represents. I think the peripheral regions throughout the Community will be looking increasingly to the Regional Fund for proper help, for proper support and for proper encouragement, and I see the Regional Fund acting as a catalyst, in a very positive way, for imaginative but sound schemes to rebuild the economies of the regions.

I welcome in particular one point of Mr Tugendhat's speech. He said that Community taxpayers should not be asked to pay twice, and I accept that, and, like the Commissioner when he was a Conservative Member, I fully believe that we must cut out waste in the Community budget and in public finances generally.

I believe that the Regional Fund has a particular importance for the life of people in communities such as the one I have the honour to represent. We have just fought this election and, we must be frank, it was a difficult election to fight, particularly in England, and our problems in fighting that election were not helped, if I may say so, by our colleagues the Socialists from England, who went about that election in what I believe was a rather negative way. We on these benches want to play a constructive rôle in this House and that is one reason why we deplore the happenings of yesterday. We want to make improvements to the whole range of Community policies, particularly starting with the budget. One idea which I believe we should be pursuing, particularly in the Committee on Regional Policy — and I hope to have the privilege of sitting on that committee — is a means of giving regional communities direct access to Brussels and to Community funds. Of course there may well be a need for national governments to play a part in the allocation of the Regional Fund, but I would like to see local councils from my area of the country coming in increasing numbers to Brussels and looking to Brussels for help in starting imaginative schemes. I believe it would play a big part in making our membership of the Community far more real if local people in the West Country, say could see their leaders coming to Brussels and, with the help of their European Member, pressing for funds for sound schemes. I believe this could help to transform the attitude of a lot of people towards Community membership.

I hope very much that all the rules of the Regional Fund will be examined, particularly by the Committee on Regional Policy, because they will need to be reexamined, for the simple reason that the Community is about to expand and the new entrants will also have a particular interest in the Regional Fund. So I hope the Commissioners will come forward with at least some outline of their proposals for this area.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Ryan.

Mr Ryan. — Mr President, I would like to express, on my own behalf and that of my colleagues, our thanks to Commissioner Tugendhat for his very succinct presentation to Parliament of the principal problems which face us as we now enter this long period of consideration of the estimates and budget for 1978. It does help us in our work that we have a Commissioner with the knowledge and sympathetic disposition of Mr Tugendhat, and we look forward to having a useful exchange of views with him.

It is a matter of some disappointment to us all — and to myself in particular — that we do not have in the House, for this very important opening debate, a repre-

Ryan

sentative of the Presidency of the Council. I have had the privilege of playing in both teams: both the Council and Parliament. I know something about the distance between Council and Parliament. I know that the attitude of Council is, to a large extent, that it is all very well for Parliament — that bunch of do-gooders — to demand more money, but they play little part in putting up the money to meet the demands. I am not going to criticize the Council for its past errors in this regard, but I think it is a pity that at the commencement of a new life of Parliament, when we have a Parliament with a direct and very serious mandate from the electorate, we do not have a representative of the Council of Ministers here present to hear what the disposition of the new Parliament is — particularly in a year following a major confrontation between Parliament and the Council of Ministers, such as we experienced in the closing months of 1978 and the opening months of 1979.

Now I do not blame the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland. He was kept waiting for ten hours yesterday by a Parliament which showed discourtesy to him and, in relation to some of its activities, a lack of appreciation of the work which this Parliament had to do. I think it is significant that when we are now working for the future, those who caused most trouble and obstruction yesterday are notable by their absence.

(Applause)

But we are now facing the future, and I hope that the Council will show a change of heart, particularly ministers from countries which have been net beneficiaries, and will be for the remainder of this century. I hope there will be a disposition on their part to appreciate that the Parliament in the past has been — and, I suspect now, and in the future, will be — the friend of those in need. I therefore think it is very important that we have a more effective dialogue and consultation between Council and Parliament, not merely here in plenary sitting but also when the consultations take place and inevitable differences arise in the course of the next few months. We hope the senior Ministers of the Council will meet senior representatives from Parliament, and not have a situation such as occurred in the past where officials were asked to see some of the most senior, and most sincere and competent Members of the Parliament who were endeavouring to reach an agreement on some matters of fundamental interest to our electorate.

I know there is a problem here. It is a problem partly of the Institutions, and one of the frustrations which I experienced — and I am sure many of you experienced — throughout the election campaign was from time to time that of having to cover up for the inadequacies of the Institutions of the Community. But the time for the cover-up is over. There are weaknesses in our Institutions: let us correct them. One of the weak-

nesses I, as a former minister and as a parliamentarian, would identify is what Commissioner Tugendhat touched upon in his excellent address when he indicated that he thought there was some weakness whereby the Council of Agricultural Ministers could make serious decisions costing vast amounts of money without involving the Ministers for Finance. I agree with him. I think there is something wrong in our decision-making process when ministers in charge of one particular limited area of responsibility can make fundamental decisions affecting the whole budget and financial structure of the Community, and other areas as well, without involving the people who have direct responsibility in other areas. Our national governments do not act in that way. No Chancellor of the Exchequer, no Minister in charge of finance can make decisions without involving his ministerial colleagues with responsibilities for the disciplines concerned; but in Europe decisions are made which have effect in areas extending far beyond the limited areas of those who make the decisions. Something has to be done about that.

I was disappointed to hear Commissioner Tugendhat and others seemingly set up the agricultural budget for the purpose of knocking it down, and hold the size of agricultural expenditure up as the villain of the piece. I do not regard it as such. I know there are defects in the agricultural policy. I know it leads to surpluses which we should not allow to develop — but remember that the whole basis of the agricultural policy, the whole idea of intervention, is a system which can cater for surpluses, so that those surpluses can be available when scarcities arise for natural reasons. That is one of the uncertainties and difficulties of agriculture: you have your booms and you have your slumps. Even allowing for that natural feature, there are defects in the agricultural policy, but it should not be held forth as a scandal. The reason why it is comparatively large in relation to other expenditure of the Community, the reason why agriculture amounts to 75% of our expenditure, is that we do not have adequate Community policies in the industrial sphere. We do not have worthwhile policies for expenditure in the regional and social spheres. Take steel for instance; in the years of the last recession — and I can talk of the last recession now that we are entering upon another, I am sorry to say — it was decided that considerable funds should be made available to cater for inevitable redundancies in the European steel industry. Once we started moving out of recession, all these good intentions were abandoned. Now we face in 1980 and 1981 a massive bill and a massive social problem — in the steel industry, for which we have not provided the funds, because we lacked the political will. Shipbuilding, textiles, footwear; these are other areas of difficulty. Were we but providing in these areas the kind of money that we have properly provided in the agricultural area, then

Ryan

we should not be holding agricultural expenditure forth as a scandal, as something that needed to be cut down or avoided.

Of course the Commissioner and others are right in saying that the budget has very little economic impact. We should realize that, and even as we become engaged, as we very properly shall in forthcoming months, in dealing with the detail of expenditure, we should not either ourselves forget, or allow our electorate to forget, that Community benefits are a lot greater than anything that ever comes into the budget or goes out of it. We are all enjoying a Europe which will, I believe, never be divided militarily within its own borders, a Europe which is enjoying a market of 260 million people — shortly, we hope, to become 300 million — and all the benefits that flow from such an open market. That is where the main benefits of Europe arise; let us never forget that, and let us constantly remind our electorate of that.

Of course I do not have to say that I share the desires of others for a massive and significant improvement in the Regional and Social Funds in 1980. Here again I would like to recall that the Commission has, on other occasions, expressed the view which Parliament endorsed in 1979 and 1978, that the presence of a recession was no justification for cutting back on the Regional Fund, for limiting the kind of aid which ought to be given. The European Economic Community is not, and was never intended to be, a good-times club: it was born out of difficulties, to help the people of Europe to overcome difficulties, and do not let us hear, in the recession of 1979-81, a repetition of what was said in 1974-76: We cannot do more, because poor times are upon us. When times are poor and difficult is the time for Europe to offer European solutions and for the well-to-do in Europe to share their means with those less well off, so that Europe can move forward with the spirit of brotherhood in which Europe was born.

I would conclude with this thought. I believe that Western post-war democracy, as we know it, is in danger, in Europe and elsewhere. I believe it will not survive if we allow the gap between the public's demand for expenditure and the public's willingness to contribute to it to grow. No politician likes to have the responsibility of imposing a tax, because it is not the most popular activity and does not endear him to his electorate. At the same time, can this Parliament command respect if it does not assume, or is not given, the responsibility of taxation? I believe it will not have a sufficient power to command the respect of the Council of Ministers, of the Commission or of the people of Europe unless it also has more direct responsibility than it has had in the past for collecting

revenue. It is only when those who should accept that responsibility — with all the unpopularity that it may attract — do so and then distribute the proceeds that this Parliament will generate the respect which I believe it must generate if Europe is to move forward. That is a thought for the future. I am sure we are far from achieving that situation in the next years, but we should not put it out of our minds altogether. We ~~should~~ not, as a Parliament, be persistently demanding more expenditure under many wonderful deserving heads, unless we also suggest ways and means of collecting the revenue to meet this expenditure. I believe that is where Parliament is going to assume a new responsibility. That is a new challenge; but together, if we act in a responsible way, I think we can meet it; and in so doing we might produce in the direct election of 1984 a more generous response from the electorate than that which was received in 1979.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Hutton.

Mr Hutton. — Mr President I represent one of the biggest, certainly the most beautiful, parts of the Community — the South of Scotland. It is very big in area, but it is very small in population, and finding work for the people there is one of the most pressing problems in the area. I was delighted to hear Mr O'Kennedy and Mr Jenkins yesterday, and Mr Tugendhat this morning, emphasize the importance of the regions in the Community.

The great danger is that the people who live in my beautiful area will get fed up with having no work and with the extra financial pressures on their daily lives, and will simply drift away towards the big run-down cities and exacerbate the already ghastly problems which they have. So, Mr President, may I thank the Commissioner for his thoughtful and realistic speech, and ask him to bear in mind the proposals which the members of this group in the old Parliament made for a specifically rural policy. It would be a great deal more than tragic if urban deprivation were to squeeze out of our thinking and our budget that handful of people who perform such a valuable rôle in Europe by living in, and maintaining, our wild and difficult regions.

IN THE CHAIR: MR VONDELING

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Colla.

Mr Colla. — *(NI)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if the idea of Europe is to come to frui-

Colla

tion, and particularly if we hope to generate rather more public enthusiasm for future European Elections over the next five years, the European Parliament — and also the Council and the Commission — must put forward a number of specific measures designed to bring home to the people of Europe that the European Community is a useful social institution. What I have in mind are specific measures which will affect the everyday lives of the citizens of the European Community. I believe that this concern must also be reflected in the Community budget, and I should like to give you a few examples of how this may be done.

It is all very well to talk about protecting the environment and the consumer, but, from a practical point of view, it would undoubtedly be much more effective to ensure first of all that we are equipped with the means of so doing, rather than the somewhat meagre sum of less than 1 % of the total budget, which is what is currently spent in this sector.

To take a second example, it is time some specific action was taken to institute a Community social policy. In percentage terms, the money available for such a policy is not really all that great. The important thing is that, here again, we must work towards very specific goals. Perhaps I could give you an example of what I mean. It is a striking feature of our so-called welfare state — and this applies to all countries, regardless of political factors — that a horrifying number of people are still forced to work in nerve-shattering, dirty and unhealthy conditions. It must surely be possible to find some alternative to the purely academic method of tackling the problem via the existing Foundation. The Community should give a lead in a drive for more humane working conditions.

As far as my third example is concerned, I would underline the Commission's proposals providing for more and better assistance in 1980 to solve the problem of unemployment among young people and to combat poverty.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me just emphasize a second point in our discussion of the coming year's budget. In view of the current economic situation and the extremely high level of unemployment, the need for a short-term economic policy should be universally acknowledged. From a personal point of view, I am also convinced of the need for a fairer sharing-out of the work available through measures like a shorter working week. However, we must recognize that we in Europe are currently faced with the problem of outdated, unsuitable and often inefficient production capacity. It is an appalling thought that we are still to all intents and purposes without a coherent European industrial policy. The desire to change this situation must likewise be reflected in the Community budget. What we are witnessing at the moment is undoubtedly a structural crisis with its roots in a new division

of labour throughout the world, but also in the policy pursued by employers and in financial circles, a policy which has proved to be pretty short-sighted in the past.

I think we must acknowledge the fact that the Treaties around which our work is built are at present no more than a rather forlorn shot at an economic policy, and that the dynamic — and hence also industrial — aspects are conspicuous by their absence. But I am sure we can get somewhere by adopting a pragmatic approach in this sector as well. What I have in mind then is an industrial policy which would be simultaneously defensive and aggressive — defensive in terms of job preservation, of rescuing and rejuvenating problem-hit sectors in the European Community.

There are enough examples of such sectors, ranging from shipbuilding and ship-repairing through textiles, steel and leather to the paper industry. I would draw your attention in particular to the international senselessness of laying people off here and applying protective measures there, restricting activities here and creating new capacity there, in one and the same industry.

The second element of an industrial policy must be an aggressive policy aimed at improving our own development potential. I think this can be done in three directions. More so than at present, we can set ourselves up as important suppliers of capital goods, especially to the developing countries. Then again, we can and must develop our potential as full partners in a number of advanced sectors, like the aircraft industry and data-processing. Thirdly, we must learn how to use our own domestic development potential better so as to stimulate activities in sectors like urban renewal and public housing projects.

There is one more point I should like to make in parentheses, so to speak, because a number of speakers have already referred to regional policy and the Regional Fund. The Commission recently earmarked 5 % of the total Fund to enable it to pursue its own regional policy, while the remaining 95 % remains tied to a national quota. I would appeal for the 5 % figure to be increased, so as to enable the Community to pursue a genuine regional policy of its own, with the European Parliament being given genuine control over this part of the Regional Fund.

Finally, on the main question of industrial policy, I should just like to say that, in view of our energy problems and the relative scarcity of raw materials in the Community, we must realize that our hopes for long-term survival lie in our industrial and technological creative potential.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Delatte.

Mr Delatte. — (F) Mr President, just now, Mr André Rossi, speaking on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, remarked on the pessimism of the Commissioner's report on the question of agricultural expenditure. Mr Rossi declared that the Liberal Group did not agree with putting a ceiling on agricultural expenditure in the budget.

Since the EAGGF accounted for a very large portion of the Community budget, I think it is important to put forward some comments and observations on the Common Agricultural Policy. Allow me, therefore, to draw the attention of the House to some of the problems of this policy.

My first point is that we must first restore order to the Common Agricultural Policy by rapidly abolishing compensatory amounts. I am sure the British Members will not take it amiss if I add that it is also essential for the funds which make up the Community budget to be raised in a uniform manner in all countries.

Secondly, the Common Agricultural Policy is the most important, indeed practically the only, common policy which exists. If you were to compare the cost of this policy with aid to industry in each Member State — whether this be subsidies granted to industry within each country or subsidies granted for setting up in other countries, whether these take the form of reduced-interest loans, subsidies or preferential interest rates — I am sure you would find that European agriculture does not cost any more than European industry!

Thirdly, the development of European agriculture, which has been spectacular in recent years, has enabled Europe to become self-sufficient in food, and this is of paramount importance. We in Europe must have security of food supplies! We would also point out — and this can be clearly seen around the world at the present time — that food products are strategic products, that they are absolutely indispensable to each country and that in order to have enough, one has to produce too much! That is a well-known fact.

Furthermore, we know the cost of importing agricultural or food products when we need them, because there is no question then of enjoying the dumping prices which we are wont to apply on outside markets. We must undoubtedly steer our production so as to limit certain surpluses, that is clear, but we must also export agricultural and food products and become, at European level, permanent exporters on the world market! A place exists for us and it is with Europe as a well organized Community that we shall be able to take this place. Let me add that we will thus earn the foreign currency we need in view of our lack of natural resources.

If we make a survey of agricultural surpluses around the world, the list is a short one. There are surpluses,

it is true, in North America and at present also, to a small extent, in South America. We have some surpluses in Western Europe; but of what importance are they in relation to the world's known requirements? We also find food surpluses in Australia and in New Zealand, but elsewhere surpluses are really very rare. In the rest of the world there is a food shortage, let us remember this. It is by virtue of an organized farming industry, by virtue of an organized market, that we shall be able to direct products to the countries which need them.

While industrial technology may make rapid progress in the developing countries, we cannot ignore the fact in these same countries agriculture will develop far less rapidly. Once they achieve a slight improvement in their purchasing power, what will their requirements be? They will need food products which they are not yet themselves capable of producing. This we must also bear in mind. This is why I defend the Common Agricultural Policy and why I am convinced that we must further increase our production.

At yesterday's formal sitting, very great emphasis was placed on employment, not only in Europe but also in the world, and also on the economic difficulties looming on the horizon. A figure was quoted just now; it was said that 8% of the active population was employed in agriculture, which is true. But if one considers employment arising indirectly from agriculture, that is all those who are employed upstream and downstream of agriculture as well as those in agriculture itself, one finds that more than 20% of the active population lives from agriculture. This is also worth remembering!

While the Common Agricultural Policy might appear to cost a lot, let us remember that it costs less than the payment of unemployment benefits. It is absolutely essential for us to continue to help agriculture develop. For Europe this is both an economic and a social need.

Agriculture can compensate for our present lack of raw materials in Europe, because it produces natural resources which can be exported and can bring in foreign currency.

Before putting a financial ceiling on aid to agriculture in Europe, we must consider the matter very carefully and above all we must remain realistic. Let us remember what an asset an organized system of agriculture which, as I said just a moment ago, has proved its worth, already is and what an asset it can be in the future. It is indispensable for the economy; it is indispensable for the balance of society and it is also necessary if we are to meet the world's food requirements, which are growing faster than production. Let us bear this in mind!

Delete

That, quite simply, Mr President, is why we do not agree to a ceiling being placed on EAGGF budget expenditure.

President. — I call Mr Sutra.

Mr Sutra. — (*F*) Mr President, I should like to say a few words concerning the manner in which Mr Tugendhat presented the budget earlier today.

It appears to me that in his concise and well-documented report he fell prey to an obvious danger which lurks in even the most reliable figures. That is the danger of comparing a policy which exists with policies which do not, or which do not yet, exist. To my mind, comparing the budget figures for the agricultural policy, which has been in existence for 20 years, with those of the research policy which we hope to create next year or with those of the regional policy on which a start was made this year, leads us into a spurious debate. And I was not surprised to see the honourable Members of the Conservative Group rush headlong into this spurious debate and all man the battlements, one after the other. It is not, I think, in this spirit that matters must be presented if we are to have a constructive debate in September.

We want a debate; we are ready to discuss the Common Agricultural Policy. For us it is not a 'sacred cow'! We are prepared to recognize its errors, its shortcomings, its sometimes serious blunders with regard to Mediterranean agricultural policy, for example in the wine, fruit and vegetable sectors and on the question of Mediterranean fisheries.

This problem sometimes takes on disastrous proportions and it will become especially acute in relation to the southward enlargement of the Community.

We are willing to discuss, but we believe the debate would be getting off to a very bad start if in September, November and December we were to proceed solely on this note.

If the only way of creating new policies was to abolish the only existing common policy, I do not believe that would serve the cause of Europe! Making a few savings, which will be very difficult to achieve in an existing budget, is no way of endowing Europe with the great energy research policy it needs. Besides, this is not the way our predecessors went about creating the regional policy last year. It was by having the courage to create a regional budget that progress was made! A little cheeseparing here and there on the budget of the only policy which at present exists is not going to help us create the other policies which Europe still needs.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this will be a very brief, almost schematic, speech which I admit was prompted by some

speeches by British Members, to whom I listened with great interest and who rightly spoke on behalf of their electors and constituencies.

I was particularly moved by the speech made by a young British member who, in speaking about his constituency, referred to the white cliffs of Dover and the large number of European tourists — among whom I humbly include myself — who very frequently visit those beautiful shores. Well, I am in a similar situation as I am a European Member for the constituency of Southern Italy, a constituency which includes regions and places which are undoubtedly known, and, I think, dear to you. I speak here on behalf of Naples, Amalfi, Sorrento, Bari, and the Calabrian coastal areas, on behalf of a constituency which gave my party 700 000 votes out of the 2 000 000 which it obtained in the whole of Italy. I blush to tell you — but I can do so because the British Members spoke of their constituencies and their votes — that my constituency gave me 530 000 preferential votes, since in Italy we have the preferential vote as well as the party vote. So I am here to try to repay a debt towards those who voted for me and for us, and I think I can pay that debt only here together with you, thanks to your goodwill, understanding and sense of responsibility.

As you know, Southern Italy is a great belt of underdevelopment — one of the most sadly underdeveloped areas of Europe, not of course from the standpoint of civilization, but undoubtedly from the economic and especially from the social standpoint. And we believe that the Community budget must be based on social considerations. I greatly appreciated the words of the representative of the Gaullist party in this connection — I know that you favour a Europe of social participation, and we too favour such a Europe, rather than a Europe of big business, about which much, indeed too much, has been said up to now, perhaps wrongly. This great belt of social depression which has existed in Southern Italy for thirty years constitutes the most serious social and economic problem, and hence the most serious problem of civilization and morale, which concerns and sometimes troubles the Italian people. There has been talk here also — perhaps somewhat rhetorical but I think humane — of the children who are dying in so many parts of the world and to whom we must give aid. As an Italian, it is with sorrow and shame, but truthfully, that I tell you that the highest rate of infant mortality in the whole of Europe is to be found in Naples, in a poor district called Secondigliano where 149 infants out of every 1 000 die every year. I think we should consider those infants, not just because they are Italian, but bearing in mind that they are Italian. I think we should consider the Italian infants and those of all the other underdeveloped regions which unfortunately, are not lacking in Europe. That is a source of shame to us, but it will be an honour for us to try to solve these problems. On behalf of the civilized and generous

Almirante

people whom you know and love, because they give you sun, warmth and joy when you come to Italy — and we are honoured and happy about this — to spend your holidays — whether short or long — on behalf of those men, women and children, I call upon this Parliament to be more attentive to the regional problem, and I do so with some apprehension because I heard in Mr Spinelli's speech — you must excuse me, I was unable to prepare my speech and have had to improvise it — that there is a threat to cut back the Regional Fund by no less than half this year, from 1 200 million to 600 million units of account. I hope that this apprehension is unfounded and that the information is wrong, and I trust that the Regional Fund will be increased. I repeat, the problem to which I am drawing your attention is a European problem, because of its extent and its importance, and because Italy has not succeeded in solving it over the last thirty years. I am and always have been in opposition in the Italian Parliament I could therefore say 'the successive Italian governments have been unable or unwilling to solve it.' However, I think it would be fairer to say 'they have been unable to solve it because it is a problem on a European scale.' Therefore, on behalf of my, of our electors, of our brothers in Southern Italy, I place my trust in the understanding and human and social sensitivity of this Parliament, I place my trust in Europe, because I am sure that this very serious problem can be solved at the European level.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — I call Mr Bersani.

Mr Bersani. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Tugendhat, I too will make a very brief speech on the main lines of policy proposed in the new budget. I should like to say at once that we are all very well aware of the political and moral importance of the budget debate. It suffices to recall the almost dramatic turn taken by our very hard-fought debate last December.

I would also like to say that a serious new problem of budgetary policy is obviously beginning to come to a head. In earlier years, Mr Tugendhat, we fought not so much against you as against the Council especially over priorities, over qualitative decisions, in order to transfer appropriations from one heading to another and thus meaningfully define fundamental options linked to clearly defined prospects.

But the problem now facing us, and which day by day is becoming the dominant one, is that resources are now too small to cover the essential development of activities already in progress, not to mention the new activities which the exigencies of Europe and the world oblige us to undertake.

Mr Tugendhat, I am sure you are aware of the position of all the federalist groups who have now made this question of increasing the resources available for

financing the budget perhaps the main plank of a debate intended to set more ambitious goals for European integration.

There is, therefore, this enormous problem, which I think arises in this debate in much more vigorous and substantial terms than in the past. But, that said, I too am prepared to admit realistically that we are probably half-way between, on the one hand, the attempts to find a way to deal with the budget problems of the last few years — i. e. the problem of more meaningful decisions — and, on the other, the aim of gradually increasing the volume of resources and making our commitment more adequate to the needs which face us.

Turning then, to the subject of qualitative decisions, I would say very briefly, that we are certainly still in the thick of that complicated problem which Mr Jenkins likes to call the problem of convergence of our budget policies as an aspect of a new found convergence and solidarity of the economies and currencies of our Community.

It is in this context that regional policy acquires a new dimension, and instead of being merely a policy of emergency aid to meet pressing social needs, becomes, I would say, the touchstone of a policy based on solidarity rather than on egoism, separation and fragmentation of the Community system. Moreover, the memory of the battle to increase the Regional Fund, still fresh in our minds, induces us to pay considerable attention to what the scale of the regional fund will be, and must be, in the context of the new budget.

In this framework, obviously, the question of the Social Fund, that of employment, and that of the vital links between the various funds — which are still too separated, indeed isolated, in the absence of a common strategy — remain before us as a problem which Parliament, too, cannot avoid and for which it must increasingly seek to find a precise solution.

All this is clearly linked with one of the great themes of today's debate, namely the future of the agricultural policy. The budget proposals are undoubtedly substantial when taken as a whole. The large proportion of resources allocated to this sector is maintained, for, as we have so often stressed, this sector is the cornerstone of European integration not only of the economic integration of one sector, but of the economic social, and also political integration of our Community.

To sum up very briefly, I would say that I agree with those who think that the problem must be solved not by restricting the resources for agriculture, but by re-allocating our resources as a whole. Agriculture remains the basic element of the whole edifice. It is the mortar holding the bricks together. Apart from the great problems of our self-sufficiency in foodstuffs, or our

Bersani

strategic independence in this vital sector, of employment, of the quality of life, of the development of rural areas, of the world responsibilities which we have in the face of the serious crisis arising from the likely deficit of 150 million tonnes of cereals in five years time — a likelihood confirmed by the almost disastrous outcome of the FAO conference which ended in Rome yesterday — apart from all these there remain in practice the role of agriculture as the model for a more balanced way of life, and the service it can render in giving society a more human dimension, enriching its values and increasing its ability to encourage forms of participation and responsibility.

The crucial points, then, are familiar to us — a more balanced relationship between the structures and the markets, the problem of a fairer balance between agriculture in the Centre and North and that in the Mediterranean region, the problem of an adequate and radical reform of the systems which led to permanent surpluses, by means of drastic measures which have now become essential — to sum up, the problem of achieving a much more harmonized concept of our system.

Of course, there remain the prospect of world-wide shortages and the need for a wider interpenetration of world markets, to which are also linked our raw material requirements as well as our duty to show international solidarity. There remains this problem of increasing our export capacity, not to dump on others absurd surpluses created for lack of a well thought-out policy, but in an attempt to adjust the kind of production we want to maintain to the pressing and increasingly urgent needs of the world.

Let me conclude by stressing that the cooperation sector, both by its direct presence in the budget structure, and because the global cooperation policy — as Mr Cheysson reminded us yesterday — is a component of the other global policies, retains its role as a driving force, of which we have always been convinced. We must hope that in the next few days the new Lomé Convention will be drawn up, we must hope that the globality of our approach may be strengthened, and we must see in this one of the most important touchstones of the strength, moral authority and democratic responsibility with which we approach the other peoples of the world.

President. — I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, fellow-Europeans, like many other speakers, I, too, am concerned about the level of unemployment in certain regions of Europe. I believe that the level of unemployment in such places as Scotland, Ireland and Southern Italy is unacceptable and that it is the duty of all of us as Europeans to ensure that this anomaly is removed. But having said that, Mr President, I must make a few comments about the effectiveness of the Regional Fund to remove these anomalies.

I represent a constituency in the West Midlands of England which is just outside the Assisted Areas of England. I must say to you, quite frankly, that we lose jobs to other regions of our country because of national and European aids. I accept the need to create new jobs in the regions, but I do not accept that the regions should pinch jobs from other parts of Europe.

(Cries of Heat, hear!)

Therefore I think it is essential, when we review the budget, that we look at the effectiveness of the Regional Fund. We must make sure, when we look at each item of expenditure, that it is really going to create jobs and that the money is not being spent because there has been a lot of pressure from a local authority for, shall we say, a new road or a new water system, or other types of infrastructure which are being pushed not really for job reasons but for local political reasons. We must make sure that any money spent under the Regional Fund is being spent effectively, and we must see the jobs at the end of the line.

Secondly, we must make sure that the money spent from the Regional Fund is additional money spent on the regions and not money that gives the excuse to governments to cut back on their own expenditure. So I say to this parliament let us watch very carefully the Regional Fund, let us not vote extra monies without question.

I represent, as I mentioned, a constituency which is part of the county of Staffordshire, and both my colleague, Dr. Prout, and myself are proud to represent this particular area in the European Parliament. It is an area which is known particularly for one industry. I know that there are other parts of Europe which have thriving pottery industries. We think we have the best pottery industry in Europe, but what strikes us is that we hear so much about the other poor traditional industries of our country — shipbuilding, some textiles, cars — the industries that have let us down. This happens to be an industry that has grown. I won my election as a strong pro-Marketeer, because the people of my constituency saw that 60 million pounds' worth of exports from the potteries were coming here. I won, if I might say, in a town which is a well-known Valhalla of the party opposite, and I am told there are still black armbands on the Socialists in my constituency. I make this point in connection with regional aid because it is an industry that has thrived, not on handouts, not on the Regional Fund, not on governments giving them money, but pure enterprise and initiative, and if we are to stand up to the threat that the Commissioner mentioned yesterday of competition from Japan and the US, it is going to be by recultivating the enterprise and initiative of Europe and showing that we are really, all of us, world-beaters.

President. — I call Lord O'Hagan.

Lord O'Hagan. — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I speak tonight in exhaustion and in hope. — In hope that the President of our Parliament will soon be able to come to us and give us some news, and in exhaustion after the days and nights of endeavour that we have had together in this inaugural partsession of a former assembly that now has become for the first time a real parliament.

The first message I would like to give to you, sir, having given me the honour of speaking, is to pay a tribute to the staff of this House, to those who have served in the interpreting booths, to those who have served us in every way to make sure that this difficult and traumatic birth of the first real European Parliament has been, in spite of its difficulties and in spite of its chaos, a success.

(Applause)

And I thank Mr Tugendhat for staying here till now.

(Applause)

Mr President, you will be familiar, I hope, with that great poem of my country *Paradise Lost*. For me to be here tonight is indeed *Paradise Regained*. The 27th line of the Ninth Book of *Paradise Lost* contains the phrase 'long choosing, but beginning late.' I have chosen Europe, I have been chosen late by the party I now have the honour to belong to. It is the constitutional relationship of this House with the other Community Institutions that I want to speak about tonight in this budget debate, because the budget is the most creative and dynamic expression of the symbiosis of the major institutions. That is a long-winded way of saying that we in this Parliament, working hard through our budgetary activities, can drive the Community forward to success. There are many different views about the rôle of the budget in this House and in my group. There are many different views about the way we should go forward, but most of us believe that it is the budgetary relationship that gives this House the power and the opportunity to serve the peoples of the Community by whom we were sent here and to whom we are accountable at the end of our five-year period.

So the brief message that I wish to bring to you, Mr President, and to honourable and patient colleagues who are still here and who are having to listen to me, is that we look now to the Commission and to the Council to give more than a token of recognition of the change in our status. It is the relationship of this institution in its budgetary work with the other institutions which will set the seal on whether this Parliament is effective for those people for whom we speak and we work.

Looking forward to the future of the Regional Fund and all the other funds — and as a West Countryman

I have a great interest in those funds — I want to see before the end of my political lifetime applications, judged on the basis of a fair and proper budgetary contribution, coming from Yugoslavia, from all those other European countries which are European as we are and to whom we have a duty. When they send *their* elected representatives to speak in this Parliament in the budgetary debates of future years I hope we can hand on to them a good heritage, based on the process begun now through our budgetary work in this new Parliament.

Mr President, thank you very much for indulging me and allowing me to speak in this historic debate.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have listened very attentively to the many pleas that have been made here for a greater effort in the field of regional policy. Along with all these eminent speakers, I sympathize with the problems and concerns facing the crisis-hit regions, but I just wonder whether — at a time when the return of recession and inflation is being forecast and when thought is turning to the threats to our industrial survival — we would not be better advised to devote the paltry resources available to us in the field of regional policy — which would normally be used to bring about a better spread of economic growth — to the sheer survival of our economy and of our existing industrial structures. In this respect, I believe that the money earmarked for investment in the research, energy, industry and transport sectors — despite showing an increase over the 1979 budget — now represents an inadequate proportion of the total, namely 3.26 %. In my opinion, this is too little at a time when we already know that we shall be facing a major challenge in terms of energy supplies. It seems to me, therefore, that even more weight should be given to the effort which has clearly already been made to improve our activities in this field, because, if we fail to take precautions to meet the threats facing our whole industrial structure, there will be no more economic growth to spread around our various regions, and Members' fierce pride in their own constituencies will be to no avail if we do not take steps to preserve our only hopes of future growth, namely our investment in energy and research. I hope then that, once the discussion on the budgetary procedure gets underway, we can devote more attention to this particular objective.

(Applause)

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

I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — (*F*) Could we not hear Mr Tugendhat's reply to this debate?

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I thought that as the debate had gone on for such a very long time, and as I knew that many Honourable Members wish to leave, it would be for the convenience of the House if I did not hold up business any longer. If, of course, the House would prefer me to provide a response to the debate which we have had, I am, of course, at the disposal of Members to do so. It is entirely the choice of yourself, Sir, and of the Honourable Members present.

President. — I call Mr Notenboom.

Mr Notenboom. — (*NL*) Mr President, the convention is for us to receive a reply. I realise that it is late, but let us not forget that the reason why we have gone on until this late hour is because a lot of speakers naturally wanted to emphasize the importance of their own particular regions. I can sympathize with them, but Mr Tugendhat has had quite a lot to listen to, and we should appreciate a brief reply from him. If this would disrupt the agenda, then I will not press the point.

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — My first reaction, Mr President, to the debate which has taken place is one of gratitude for many of the comments which were made about my own speech and about the approach of the Commission to the problems which face us. I would like to thank the many honourable Members from different parts of the House for what they have had to say. My second reaction is that I think there is still some misunderstanding in some quarters of the House — I was particularly struck by the remarks in the speech of Mr Rossi, who, unfortunately, like so many other people who spoke, is no longer here — on what I had to say on the subject of agriculture.

The important point — and this was a theme which arose in a number of speeches — is not the question of being for or against something: that is not the question. As the last speaker from the Liberal Group made clear, it is a matter of the amount of money which is available; and this is the problem which we are up against in the Community. It was once said by a famous British Socialist, Aneurin Bevan, whom Mr Willi Brandt quoted during his memorable address yesterday, that socialism is a matter of priorities. I do not know about socialism, but certainly politics is a matter of priorities, and the problem which we face in the Community is that we now have a very limited amount of money at our disposal. We shall have to

decide. If we, the Institutions of the Community — the Parliament, the Council and the Commission — do not make the decisions, they will be forced upon us. We are going to have to decide on what our money will be spent and it is no good saying that one does not accept a limit.

I wish the world were like that. I wish we lived in a world in which, whenever one needed money, one turned on a tap and out it came. How nice it would be if we lived in such a world! The problem is, of course, that we are coming up against the limit of our own resources and we are going to have to decide whether we are going to spend more money on one thing and less on another. It would be impossible to have more money spent on everything. Even when we get — as the House, I know, agrees, from what was said in the opening speech by Mr Dankert and in the speeches with followed from all quarters of the House, notably Mr Ryan's interesting contribution — the new 'own resources', we are still going to be faced with a choice of how the money is spent and on what it is spent. It will be very difficult indeed to convince the taxpayers, to convince the people of Europe, that we can spend money on whatsoever we please. There is a question of priorities, and the difficult choice which will face Members of this Parliament, as indeed of other institutions, will be to determine those priorities. It is my painful duty to say that we are going to have to choose what the money is spent on. If we are to justify the additional expenditure, if we are to justify the additional resources, we are going to have to show that whatever we are spending our money on — be it agriculture, be it regional policy, be it industrial policy, whatever it may be — we are doing so in a manner that is effective, efficient, without waste and in the interests of the Community as a whole. That, I think, is the most important point that came through from the debate.

I was also struck — if I might refer to Mr Ryan's contribution for the second time — by the awareness shown in this Parliament of the difficulties that arise from the way in which the Council conducts its work; the fact that each individual Council operates as if it were some kind of self-contained empire with very little of the interchange between different Councils that we take for granted in the national governments. I have not been a member of a national government, as Mr Ryan and indeed many other people in this House have been, but it is inconceivable that in a national government decisions could be taken of the mutually incompatible variety which characterizes, unfortunately, much of what is done in the Community.

I listened, as the House can well imagine, with, perhaps, particular awareness, particular sensitivity, to the points made by Mr Bangemann, partly because it was, as he said, his swan-song and he and I have

Tugendhat

worked together now for quite a long time on budgets, but partly because he is one of those Members — happily there are still a number of them here — with much experience of the last Parliament, and the points he made about the nature of the Community's expenditure were, I thought, particularly apposite. I also thought that the points he made about some of the institutional problems facing us had a great deal of merit that we shall be returning to in the next few months.

Mr Spinelli, another Member who made a notable contribution but unfortunately is no longer here — and this is one of the reasons why I was doubtful about the advisability of winding up — drew attention to the need for the Commission to bring forward plans for new 'own resources'. As I said in my opening address, it is our intention — we have published this, we have said it in print and I say it again — to bring forward proposals for new 'own resources' by, I hope, the end of the year. There can be no doubt at all that in view of the decisions taken by the Council of Agricultural Ministers the need for new own resources is now very urgent and I can therefore assure Mr Spinelli that we shall be proceeding as we have promised time and again in the Committee on Budgets and elsewhere that we would.

So far as the revenue is concerned, this is, of course, a matter in which we shall have not only to think of the question of how the money is raised — and we have put forward our view that it would probably be best done through an extension of VAT from the present 1% to 2% — but also to consider the point as to whether or not there should be a prevention of the regressivity that is such an unfortunate characteristic of the budget at present. One or two Members spoke on that point and it is certainly one which, I think, will be a subject for a good deal of debate in the future.

Mr Notenboom, who particularly asked me to wind up, drew attention, as indeed I had done in my own opening remarks, to the fact that three of our Member States have unfortunately not yet passed the necessary legislation to bring 'own resources' into full effect. As I said in my opening statement, this really is a very scandalous state of affairs. At this stage of the Community's development, we are almost on the point of exhausting our own resources, and there are still three Member States which have not actually got the system properly in place. It is a matter to which the Commission, as I know Mr Notenboom knows, attaches very considerable importance and it is certainly a matter which, in my view, absolutely has to be resolved before the 1980 budget comes into operation.

Other points were raised, Mr President, from all quarters of the House, but I think I have tried to deal, briefly it is true — but the debate has now been going on for some seven hours — with the principal points which have arisen. All these points, I think, are likely to concern us a great deal between now and Christmas.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

8. *Arrests of dissidents in Czechoslovakia*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-234/79), tabled by Lord Bethell on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the arrests of dissidents in Czechoslovakia.

I call Mr Ripa di Meana.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at the request of Lord Bethell and other Members absent through no fault of their own at this stage in our proceedings, among them Jiri Pelikan, Mr Turner and the chairman of the Socialist Group, Mr Glinne, I now move the motion for a resolution tabled by Lord Bethell, which is substantially the same as the motion for a resolution tabled earlier on the same subject by Mr Glinne himself and by our comrade Jiri Pelikan. Both called for urgent debate, and both are similarly phrased as the result of many consultations among the drafters, especially Lord Bethell and Jiri Pelikan.

The urgency arises from the fact that the ten detainees, among them the writer Vaclav Havel, the journalists Jiri Dienstbier and Jarmila Bednarova, the Catholic priest Maly the worker Ladislav Lis and the psychologist Dana Nemcova, are charged, according to the official Czechoslovak news agency Ceteka, with violating Article 98, Paragraph 2 of the Czechoslovak Penal Code, which lays down a maximum penalty of ten years' imprisonment, for acts of hostility towards the State and damaging the international interests of the State.

In fact, these are Czechoslovak citizens who distributed within their country pamphlets criticizing government policy — citizens who are active in the 'Committee for the Defence of Unjustly Persecuted Persons' known by the initials VONS, and who even earlier supported the famous call for freedom of 'Charta 77' — in short, citizens who — according to

di Meana

the spirit and the letter of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference (Basket I), and of all the other international conventions on human rights to which the Czechoslovak government also is a signatory, dating from the distant past and from more recent years — are not only not involved in subversive activities, but are making totally legitimate demands for respect for the very Czechoslovak legal system of which those solemn international agreements are an integral part.

This is therefore a collective political trial — the first since the tragic political trials of the fifties, the grim shadow of which still hangs over us — a trial which is being prepared in defiance of basic defence rights through the exclusion of the detainees' lawyer, Mr Joseph Danisz, who in earlier trials defended other activists and signatories of 'Charta 77'; and who for that reason was expelled within the last few months from the Czechoslovak barristers' association.

That is why we are calling for the release of these ten detainees and of other detainees who have been in prison for months because of the same actions in defence of freedom — among them the two spokesmen of 'Charta 77', the university lecturer Jaroslav Sabata and the journalist Jiri Lederer. Moreover, should the Czechoslovak authorities refuse to release them or to suspend the trial, we demand that the trial should be held in public and be open to observers from the international lawyers' associations, to Amnesty International and, last but not least, to the world press. We are taking these steps in full awareness of the absolute necessity for détente and cooperation with Eastern Europe, and we think that such détente and cooperation should develop in mutual respect, in open relations between states, but at the same time in respect for principles. The forthcoming trial in Prague constitutes a flagrant violation of the Helsinki agreements to which that country and our countries, as well as our European Community, are signatories. That makes this initiative by the first directly elected European Parliament not only legitimate but a duty.

Let me conclude, Madam President, by drawing your attention and that of the elected European Members to the obvious fact that it is very important for the fate of the detainees that the resolution should be approved by the European Parliament as a whole. This is the earnest hope of the proposer of the motion for a resolution.

Let me add that this is also my hope as a left-wing Member, as a Socialist, who knows that many of the detainees and of those persecuted in Prague in the last few years belong to the socialist opposition in that country and in many cases were active members of the Communist Party for decades even if they have now been expelled and removed from public life.

In the hope of an unanimous vote by Parliament, I conclude my presentation by thanking you, Madam President.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

President. — I call Sir Fred Warner to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Sir Fred Warner. — Madam President, this motion stands in the name of Lord Bethell, a member of the European Democratic Group. It is of the utmost regret to him that he was obliged to leave this Parliament before he could present his motion, but he was indeed fortunate in having appointed the previous speaker to move the resolution in his place. A better case could not have been made and I am sure that all of us here, already deeply disturbed by these events in Czechoslovakia, will have been much encouraged to do something about them by what the previous speaker has said.

Firstly, I think it absolutely right that we here in this European Parliament should be speaking for our Czechoslovak brothers. As many people have said in the last few days, this Parliament is only a beginning. There are nine countries here, shortly there will be ten and then there will be twelve. After that there will be many more. One day, perhaps we may hope that members of the Czechoslovak nation will sit with us and when they do, it will be people like these ten men who have been arrested who will be here amongst us, because they are leaders of the true Czechoslovakia and it is men like these who have been wrongfully convicted who will be amongst us one day.

(Applause)

What is the nature of the offence with which they have been charged? It is to have said all the things which we here believe and have been saying for the last four days. They have been talking about freedom. They have been talking about the rights of man. They have been talking about the rights of citizens to a decent life, and that is what we have been talking about. But we gain credit for it. They instead are under arrest and are liable to a long term of imprisonment. And because they reflect our views we, above all people, should put in a plea for them and should do everything in our power to see that they do not suffer.

Who are these men? They are the best men of their time and their nation.

(Applause)

Sir Fred Warner

They are people whom we would thoroughly respect if we had them here today, and therefore we must support them in every way possible. It is unfortunate that this debate should have come about so late so that there are few of us here today, but I hope nobody will think that it is only a handful of Members of this Parliament who are interested in this matter and who are asking that these men be given justice and fair treatment. I know that there is not one Member of this Parliament who, if he were here now, would not vote for this resolution. So however many there are here at this moment, I am sure that this resolution stands for the will of the whole Parliament.

(Applause)

Finally, could I just say to you, Madam President, that if you are forwarding this resolution, as is suggested, to the Foreign Ministers, you should make the point made by the first speaker, namely that this is not just an expression of our feelings, we want to see practical measures. We want to see proper legal representation. We want full admission for the press, and we want every facility given to them which it is possible to obtain under Czechoslovak law. They should not be on trial, but if they are wrongly going on trial, then they must get every advantage which can be got for them in their ordeal.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Haagerup.

Mr Haagerup. — *(DK)* Madam President, owing to lack of time the Liberal and Democratic Group has not had an opportunity to discuss and decide on the motion tabled by Lord Bethell. My speech is therefore more in the nature of a personal statement than of an actual political pronouncement on behalf of of my group.

I should like to say that there is no doubt that all members of the Liberal Group, even if not many of us have had an opportunity to discuss the motion in depth, completely share the indignation expressed over the arrest of dissidents in Czechoslovakia and the forthcoming trials in that country. We also agree that attention should be drawn to these events in the course of our deliberations here in Parliament.

I must nevertheless say, — and I do so very regretfully since I fully support what the last two speakers have said — that I have misgivings about this new Parliament's introducing a practice whereby it adopts resolutions and pronouncements concerning events in which it has no real powers, or — I fear over which it has no great influence.

I should like to add that we do not deny that situations may arise in the future which make it necessary for the European Parliament to give an opinion, but in my view this should be the absolute exception, and such cases should normally be submitted to the

Committee on Political Affairs for prior discussion. I think it is very important that this Parliament, which is now directly elected and has just met under the public eye, should avoid becoming a sort of resolution producing factory — as is sometimes the case — with certain international organizations which shall remain nameless.

Personally, therefore, I think that a certain distinction must be made between this motion for a resolution and that which we adopted yesterday concerning the Vietnamese refugees, because in the latter case we have a situation in which the European Parliament and the European Community have the possibility and the responsibility of doing something concrete to help. Let me again stress that I personally — and undoubtedly also all the Members of the group who may not share my opinion on this matter — can support the strong and critical statements made by the previous speakers. However, while agreeing with these viewpoints I must say, that, purely for reasons of principle and with a view to future motions for a resolution of a similar kind concerning affairs taking place outside our own nine states, I will abstain from the vote.

President. — I call Mr Irmer.

Mr Irmer. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot go along with what was said by my colleague, Mr Haagerup. I do agree that this House is not a factory for the production of motions for resolutions. However, I think that the European Parliament, in its first session after direct elections, should be seen — and I think this should be a pointer to our future work — to accept its responsibility for the protection of human rights throughout the world, and particularly in Europe. I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that we have such a responsibility. As we have seen in the case of Europe, continents are divisible. However, human rights and our duty to ensure they are respected are not divisible. The history of Czechoslovakia has been one of untold suffering. Czechoslovakia lies in the very heart of Europe, and the fact that the Czech and Slovak peoples are not represented in this House can be explained by reference to the tragic history of their country. We, their fellow Europeans, have a duty to stand by those people whose rights are under attack, and I am sure that this House cannot shirk its responsibility. It is simply a matter of European solidarity that we directly-elected Members of the European Parliament should, in our first session, acknowledge our responsibility and make our position clear. As Members of the European Parliament, as representatives of the peoples of Europe, we shall at all times make it our business to defend human rights

(Applause)

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

Mr Konrad Schön. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I was still a boy when Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia, and I was still a boy when the repercussions of this invasion were eventually felt by the Germans living there. Since then, I think, all of us in the free part of Europe have become a little wiser. We in the European People's Party endorse what the previous speaker said. Human rights are indeed indivisible. Europe's greatness lies in the fact that it was European civilization, European culture, which developed the concept of human rights over the centuries. This is true even though — and as a German I would be the first to admit it — the great ideal of the uniqueness and the dignity of Man has perhaps nowhere else been so gravely violated as here in Europe. On the other hand — and this is the real measure of Europe's greatness — nowhere else in the world has the standard against which violations of human dignity can be measured been held so high as here in the free part of Europe. That is why we must, in my opinion, make our voice heard, really get to grips with these cases and protest against these violations of every principle of liberty, human dignity and justice — and here we must take account of how the Czechoslovak judicial system works. We must make our voice heard, and I would call on you, ladies and gentlemen, to vote for this motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Aigner.

Mr Aigner. — (D) Madam President, I should like to add something to the motion to the effect that we empower the Bureau to make funds available for sending lawyers to Czechoslovakia to defend the accused so that the rights of these innocent people can then be safeguarded.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, member of the Commission. — Madam President, this resolution is of course addressed to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States, and therefore I obviously cannot make a long statement about it. It is for the Ministers to respond to the extremely eloquent remarks that have been made in all parts of the House and in most of our Community languages. I would, however, like to say that the Commission wishes to place it on record that it condemns violations of human rights wherever they occur. The Commission hopes that all the signatories of the final Act of Helsinki will respect its provisions to the fullest extent and I hope very much that the

Council of Ministers will not only listen carefully to the points that have been made today, but will also take account of the very strong feelings which, I know, underlie what has been said.

President. — The debate is closed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

(Applause)

9. Membership of committees

President. — At the meeting which has just ended, the Bureau drew up proposals for the membership of the parliamentary committees, in accordance with Rule 37 (2) of the Rules of Procedure.

I have ascertained that all the political groups and all the non-attached Members agree to these proposals. I am delighted with the outcome, which means that the parliamentary committees can now be set up and start working.

(Applause)

In view of the late hour and of the fact a swift decision is needed on this matter, it has not been possible to print and to distribute these proposals. If you require details, the Secretary-General will read out the names of the committees and their Members.

Naturally, the changes which are bound to result from these appointments will be made to the resolution which was adopted this morning. The distribution which has been decided will give rise to some minor changes in the numbers on the committees.

Since there are no objections, these appointments are ratified.

(Applause)

10. Verification of credentials

President. — Several Member have submitted statements to the effect that they do not hold any office incompatible with that of Member of this Parliament. I propose that the mandates of these Members be ratified.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

11. Dates of next part-session

President. — There are no other items on the agenda.

The enlarged Bureau proposes that the next sittings be held at Strasbourg from 24 to 28 September 1979.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

¹ OJ reference No C 203 of 13. 8. 1979.

12. *Approval of minutes*

President. — Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to lay before Parliament, for its approval, the minutes of proceedings of this sitting, which were written during the debates.

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

13. *Adjournment of session*

President. — Before I declare the session closed, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to thank you all for your active participation during this session.

I also want to thank the representatives of the Council and the Commission for their contributions to our debates, and the press for their wide coverage of our

work. Special thanks, however, must go to the staff here.

(Applause)

We have asked a great deal of them. For my own part, I hope that during future sessions we shall make a point of suspending the proceedings at times which will enable the staff to lead more or less normal lives, at least as far as meals are concerned. The tremendous strain which the circumstances have placed on them ought to remain an isolated incident.

(Applause)

I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was closed at 6.30 p. m.)

