

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 250

January 1980

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1980-1981 Session
 Report of Proceedings
 from 14 to 18 January 1980
 Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Sitting of Monday, 14 January 1980 | 1 |
| Resumption of the session, p. 2 — Welcome, p. 3 — Membership of Parliament, p. 3 — Verification of credentials, p. 3 — Petitions, p. 3 — Documents received, p. 4 — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council, p. 6 — Authorization of reports, p. 7 — Order of business, p. 7 — Speaking time, p. 9 — Deadline for tabling amendments and closure of the list of speakers, p. 10 — Procedure without report, p. 11 — Welcome, p. 11 — Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament, p. 11 — Question Time, p. 13 — EEC supplies of mineral and vegetable raw materials, p. 25 — Steadily rising cost of housing, p. 27 — Urgent procedure, p. 34 — Agenda for next sitting, p. 34 — Annex, p. 35. | |
| Sitting of Tuesday, 15 January 1980 | 45 |
| Approval of the minutes, p. 46 — Urgent procedure, p. 46 — Decision on urgency, p. 46 — Employment situation in the Community, p. 49 — List of speakers for the debate on the Council statement, p. 60 — Employment situation (continuation), p. 60 — Deadline for tabling amendments, p. 84 — Employment situation (continuation), p. 84 — Speaking time, p. 110 — Agenda for next sitting, p. 110. | |
| Sitting of Wednesday, 16 January 1980 | 111 |
| Approval of the minutes, p. 112 — Documents received, p. 112 — Membership of committees, p. 113 — Decision on urgency, p. 113 — Decision on requests for an early vote, p. 114 — Situation in Afghanistan, p. 115 — Council statement on the Italian presidency, p. 133 — Urgent procedure, p. 146 — Votes, p. 146 — Invalidation of votes taken on the employment situation in the Community, p. 149 — Votes, p. 149 — Urgent procedure, p. 163 — Membership of Parliament, p. 163 — Agenda, p. 164 — Votes (continuation), p. 165 — Agenda for next sitting, p. 166. | |

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

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

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

Contents (continued)

Sitting of Thursday, 17 January 1980 167

Approval of the minutes, p. 168 — Documents received, p. 170 — Agenda, p. 171 — Decision on urgency, p. 171 — Agenda, p. 176 — Consumer and environmental protection, p. 177 — List of speakers, p. 180 — Consumer and environmental protection (continuation), p. 180 — Agenda, p. 188 — Regulations amending the Staff Regulations of Officials of the Communities, p. 188 — Programme on radioactive waste, p. 196 — Radiation protection programme, p. 214 — Directive on cocoa and chocolate products, p. 222 — Directive on intra-Community trade in fresh poultrymeat, p. 223 — Swine fever, tuberculosis and brucellosis, p. 228 — Agenda for next sitting, p. 233.

Sitting of Friday, 18 January 1980 234

Approval of the minutes, p. 237 — Documents received, p. 237 — Petitions, p. 237 — Committees, p. 237 — Procedure without report, p. 238 — Statement, p. 238 — Situation in Afghanistan, p. 238 — Trade between Southern Rhodesia and the EEC, p. 240 — Aid to Wales, p. 242 — Natural disasters in the Mezzogiorno, p. 244 — Aid to the island of Mauritius, p. 246 — Wines originating from Cyprus, p. 248 — Votes, p. 249 — Agricultural products originating from Turkey, p. 263 — Frozen beef and veal, p. 263 — Procedures for the exportation of goods, p. 264 — Duties on certain types of fish, p. 264 — Adult bovine animals from Yugoslavia, p. 264 — Goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products, p. 265 — Votes, p. 265 — Dates of the next part-session, p. 266 — Adjournment of the session, p. 266 — Approval of the minutes, p. 266.

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 14 to 18 January 1980 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 34 of 11 February 1980.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 14 JANUARY 1980

Contents

| | | | |
|---|----|--|----|
| 1. Resumption of the session | | <i>Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission ; Mr Debré ; Mr Davignon ; Mr Vergès ; Mr Davignon</i> | |
| <i>Point of order : Mr Pannella</i> | 2 | | 13 |
| 2. Welcome | | <i>Question No 2 by Miss de Valera : Training of teachers in consumer protec- tion :</i> | |
| <i>Mr Pannella</i> | 3 | | |
| 3. Membership of Parliament | 3 | <i>Mr Burke, Member of the Commission ; Miss de Valera ; Mr Burke ; Mr John David Taylor ; Mr Burke</i> | 14 |
| 4. Verification of credentials | 3 | | |
| 5. Petitions | 3 | <i>Question No 3 by Mr de la Malène : US oil imports :</i> | |
| 6. Documents received | 4 | | |
| 7. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council | 6 | <i>Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission ; Mr de la Malène ; Mr Brunner</i> | 14 |
| 8. Authorization of reports | 7 | <i>Question No 4 by Lord Bethell : Free medical care in the Member States :</i> | |
| 9. Order of business | | <i>Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission ; Lord Bethell ; Mr Vredeling ; Mr O'Connell ; Mr Vredeling ; Mr Collins ; Mr Vredeling ; Mr Beazley ; Mr Vredeling</i> | 15 |
| <i>Mr Aigner ; Sir Fred Warner ; Mr Paisley</i> | 7 | | |
| 10. Speaking time | | <i>Question No 5 by Mr Donnez : Introduc- tion of a European official holiday :</i> | |
| <i>Mr Pannella ; Mr de la Malène ; Mr Estier ; Mr Klepsch ; Mr Pannella ; Mr Patterson</i> | 9 | | |
| 11. Deadline for tabling amendments and closure of the list of speakers | 10 | <i>Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission</i> | 16 |
| 12. Procedure without report | 11 | <i>Question No 6 by Mr Habsburg : Policy of the Commission towards liberation move- ments :</i> | |
| 13. Welcome | 11 | <i>Mr Davignon ; Mr Habsburg ; Mr Davignon ; Mr John David Taylor ; Mr Davignon ; Mr Marshall ; Mr Davignon ; Mr Messmer ; Mr Davignon ; Mr Aigner ; Mr Davignon ; Mr Martin ; Mr Davignon</i> | 16 |
| 14. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament | | <i>Question No 8 by Mr Berkhouwer : Depor- tation to Cuba of 600 Congolese children :</i> | |
| <i>Mr Dankert ; Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission ; Mrs Kellett-Bouman ; Mr Tugendhat ; Mr Moreland ; Mr Tugendhat</i> | 11 | <i>Mr Davignon ; Mr Haagerup ; Mr Davignon</i> | 17 |
| 15. Question Time (Doc. 1-636/79) | | <i>Question No 10 by Sir Peter Vanneck : Implementation of the directive on the inspection of meat and meat products :</i> | |
| <i>Questions to the Commission of the Euro- pean Communities :</i> | | <i>Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission ; Sir Peter Vanneck ; Mr Gundelach ; Mr Collins</i> | 18 |
| <i>Question No 1 by Mr Debré : Conditions of access to the market for manufacturers in the French overseas department and the ACP countries :</i> | | | |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| <i>Question No 12 by Mr Nord: Staffing policy of the Commission:</i> | <i>debate by Mrs Moreau and others (Doc 1-611/79):</i> | |
| <i>Mr Tugendhat; Mr Nord; Mr Tugendhat; Mr O'Connell; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Beumer; Mr Tugendhat; Miss Brookes; Mr Tugendhat</i> | <i>Mrs Moreau, author</i> | 25 |
| | <i>Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mrs Moreau</i> | 26 |
| <i>Questions No 13 by Mr Carossino: Safeguard clauses in respect of floriculture — Regulation (EEC) No 3280/75 — and No 28 by Mr Diana: Standards applicable to the live plant and flower sector:</i> | | |
| <i>Mr Gundelach; Mr Carossino; Mr Gundelach; Mr Diana; Mr Gundelach</i> | 17. <i>Steadily rising cost of housing — Oral question with debate by Mr Blaney (Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members) (Doc. 1-614/79)</i> | |
| | <i>Mr Blaney, author</i> | 27 |
| <i>Question No 15 by Miss Brookes: Steel closure at Shottõn:</i> | <i>Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Desmond, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr McCartin, on behalf of the European Peoples' Party; Mr Møller, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Cecovini, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mrs Ewing, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Bonde; Mr Lega</i> | 28 |
| <i>Mr Vredeling; Miss Brookes; Mr Vredeling; Mr Griffiths; Mr Vredeling; Mr Collins; Mr Vredeling; Mr Rogers; Mr Vredeling; Mr Marshall; Mr Vredeling</i> | <i>Point of order: Mr Møller</i> | 32 |
| | <i>Mr Paisley; Mr Blaney; Mr Vredeling</i> | 33 |
| <i>Question No 16 by Miss Hooper: Dumping of steel baths:</i> | | |
| <i>Mr Vouel, Member of the Commission; Miss Hooper; Mr Vouel; Mr Purvis; Mr Vouel</i> | 18. <i>Urgent procedure</i> | 33 |
| | 19. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i> | 34 |
| <i>Question No 17 by Lord Douro: VAT on bloodstock:</i> | <i>Annex</i> | 35 |
| <i>Mr Burke; Lord Douro; Mr Burke; Mr Turner; Mr Burke</i> | | |
| 16. <i>EEC supplies of mineral and vegetable raw materials — Oral question without</i> | | |

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting was opened at 5.05 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament which was adjourned on 14 December 1979.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

(Laughter)

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* First of all I should like to convey my good wishes for the New Year to you, Madam President, and to all the Members of Parliament. Secondly, with reference to Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure which stipulates that the minutes

of the last sitting shall be approved at the end of the part-session, I want simply to state that I was unable to put forward any objections to the approval of the minutes of Friday 14, because the Rules of Procedure require us to approve the minutes without even reading them.

Madam President, had I read the minutes then as I have now at last been able to do, I should not have approved them because I consider that, like the rainbow edition of the Report of Proceedings, these minutes do not precisely and correctly reflect some parts of my speeches and a difference of opinion which I had with the President of the sitting on the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure.

President. — Mr Pannella, your remark has been noted.

I thank you for your good wishes and I should also like to renew the good wishes I expressed at the end of Parliament's last part-session.

President

These good wishes are conveyed to all the Members of Parliament and their families and to all members of staff and their families, but also to our entire Community. I hope that through our work we shall make a contribution to its progress and its prosperity.

2. Welcome

President. — Today, we have the pleasant task of welcoming Sir Billy Snedden, Speaker of the Australian House of Representatives, who has just taken his seat in the Official Gallery.

This morning he gave me a gavel and its stand. This sign of the President's traditional authority in the organization of the debates symbolises above all the desire of the Australian Parliament to be associated with the work of our Assembly. I see in this gift eloquent testimony to the bonds of friendship that link the European Community with Australia. On behalf of all of us I thank the Speaker and the Australian House of Representatives.

This gavel, which is made from a special Australian wood and is extremely light and easily handled, will be used by many of those who will succeed me in this presidential chair.

(Applause)

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Panella. — *(F)* Madam President, thank you for informing Parliament of the gift which you have received. I venture to hope that similar information will be given on every appropriate occasion in our respective countries.

(Laughter)

3. Membership of Parliament

President. — Mr Hauenschild and Mr Loderer have informed me by letter of their resignation as Members of Parliament.

Pursuant to Article 12, (2), second subparagraph, of the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, the Assembly shall establish that there is a vacancy and inform the Member State thereof. This will be done immediately.

4. Verification of credentials

President. — At its meeting of 13 December 1979, the Bureau, pursuant to the provisions of Rule 3, (1) of the Rules of Procedure, verified the credentials of Mrs Viehoff, whose nomination had been announced on 10 December, and found that her appointment

conformed with the provisions of the Treaties. The Bureau therefore proposes that this mandate be ratified.

Are there any objections?

This appointment is ratified.

5. Petitions

President. — I have received ten petitions:

- a petition from the Islamic Liberation Movement of Iraq (Europe) on terror in Iraq
- a petition from Mr Ball on behalf of form 5T of St. Joseph's Secondary School, Westway, Derry (Northern Ireland) on aid to deprived areas of the world
- a petition from students in class 2, section F of the Giovanni Pascoli secondary school, Matera, on the Sassi of Matera
- a petition from Mrs Suzuki and many other signatories on present proposed British immigration and nationality laws
- a petition from Mr Osterkamp on behalf of the Green Party of the Saar on cross-frontier pollution endangering lives and the natural environment
- a petition from the French department of the Ulrich von Ensingen Realschule (junior secondary school) in the district of Alb-Donau on the modification of the French syllabus
- a petition from the sheep farmers of the Lozère on importation of mutton and lamb from the United Kingdom into France
- a petition from Mrs Rizet on postal relations between France and Italy
- a petition from Amnesty International, Marburg, West Germany, on exile instead of jail sentence for the group 'Moreno and others'
- a petition from Mr Vissol on respect for human rights and democracy in France.

These petitions have been given numbers 28 to 37/79 and entered in the register provided for in Rule 48 (2) of the Rules of Procedure. Pursuant to paragraph 3 of that same rule, they have been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

At its meeting of 18 December 1979, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions examined petitions Nos 17 to 25/79.

Petitions Nos 17 and 24/79 have been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for an opinion.

Petition No 18/79 has been referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment for an opinion.

Petition No 20/79 has been referred to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport for an opinion.

Petitions Nos 22, 23 and 25/79 have been referred to the Political Affairs Committee for an opinion.

6. Documents received

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

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

- for a directive on the harmonization of provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action relating to the rules governing turnover tax and excise duty applicable in international travel (Doc. 1-607/79)

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

- proposals concerning changes in the common agricultural policy to help balance the markets and streamline expenditure (Doc. 1-610/79)

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

- for a regulation amending Regulation No. 726/79 as regards the granting of financial support for projects to exploit alternative energy sources (Doc. 1-627/79)

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

- for a directive amending Directive 72/159/EEC on the modernization of farms (Doc 1-628/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

- for a directive on health and veterinary inspection problems upon importation of bovine animals and swine and fresh meat from non-member countries (Doc. 1-629/79)

which has been referred to the Legal Affairs Committee ;

- for a directive on the protection of workers from harmful exposure to metallic lead and its ionic compounds at work (Doc. 1-630/79)

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

— proposals for :

I a regulation amending for the third time the Financial Regulation of 21 December 1977 as regards the use of the ECU in the general budget of the European Communities

II a regulation on the replacement of the European unit of account by the ECU in Community legal instruments (Doc. 1-631/79)

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

- for a decision introducing a Community system for the rapid exchange of information on dangers arising from the use of consumer products (Doc. 1-632/79)

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

- for a regulation on the arrangements applicable to agricultural products and certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products originating in the African, Caribbean and Pacific States or in the overseas countries and territories (Doc. 1-637/79)

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

- for a regulation extending the arrangements applicable to trade with the Republic of Cyprus beyond the date of expiry of the first stage of the Association Agreement (Doc. 1-642/79)

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

(b) from the committees, the following reports :

- report by Mr Combe, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 175/79) on the amendment for the seventh time of Directive 73/241/EEC relating to cocoa and chocolate products intended for human consumption (Doc. 1-618/79) ;

- report by Mr Combe, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-231/79) on the amendment of Directive 71/118/EEC on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultrymeat (Doc. 1-619/79) ;

- report by Mrs Cresson, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-543/79) for a directive prolonging, in respect of swine fever, certain derogations granted to Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom (Doc. 1-620/79) ;

- report by Mr Nielsen, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-406/79) for a directive amending Directive 64/432/EEC as regards tuberculosis and brucellosis (Doc. 1-621/79) ;

- report by Mrs Agnelli, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-541/79) for a regulation extending Regulation (EEC) No. 2862/77 concerning the levies applicable to imports of certain adult bovine animals and beef from Yugoslavia (Doc. 1-622/79) ;

- report by Sir David Nicolson and Miss Forster, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposals from the Commission of the

President

European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-249/79) for:

- I a decision on Community aid for restructuring or conversion investments in the shipbuilding industry
- II a decision on Community aid for restructuring or conversion investments in the textile industry, particularly in the man-made fibres industry (Doc. 1-623/79);
- report by Mr Helms, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-496/79) for a regulation laying down certain conservation and management resources for common fishery resources off the West Greenland coast applicable in 1979 to vessels flying the flag of Canada and repealing Regulation (EEC) No. 1277/79 (Doc. 1-624/79);
- report by Mr Damseaux, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the Eighth report from the Commission of the European Communities on competition policy (Doc. 150/79) — (Doc. 1-625/79);
- report by Mr Sablé, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-574/79) for:
 - I a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 939/79 laying down general rules for the supply of milk fats to certain developing countries and specialized bodies under the 1979 food-aid programme
 - II a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No. 940/79 on the supply of milk fats to certain developing countries and specialized bodies under the 1979 food-aid programme (Doc. 1-633/79);
- report by Mrs Squarcialupi, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-353/79) for a decision on the conclusion of the convention on long-range transboundary air pollution (Doc. 1-635/79);
- report by Sir Fred Warner, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the situation in Afghanistan (Doc. 1-638/79);
- report by Mr D'Angelosante, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 616/78) for a directive on information to be published on a regular basis by companies whose transferable securities are admitted to official stock exchange listing (Doc. 1-639/79);
- report by Sir Fred Catherwood, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-532/79) for:
 - I a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 805/68 on the common organization of the market in beef and veal
 - II a regulation opening a Community tariff quota for high-quality, fresh, chilled and frozen beef and veal falling within subheadings 02.01 A II (a) and 02.01 A II (b) of the Common Customs Tariff

III a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No. 950/68 on the Common Customs Tariff

- IV a regulation amending certain rates of customs duties for agricultural products and amending Regulation (EEC) No. 516/77 on the common organization of the market in products processed from fruit and vegetables (Doc. 1-640/79);
- report by Mr Sherlock, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 137/79) for a directive on the protection of workers from harmful exposure to chemical, physical and biological agents at work (Doc. 1-641/79);
- report by Mr Seeler, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-502/79) for a regulation temporarily suspending partially the autonomous Common Customs Tariff duties on certain types of fish (Doc. 1-643/79);

(c) the following oral questions with debate:

- by Mr Carossino, Mr De Pasquale, Mr Leonardi, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Ippolito and Mr Gouthier, to the Commission on the crisis facing the shipbuilding industry and restructuring and conversion programmes (Doc. 1-612/79);
- by Mr Davern and Mr Buchou, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, to the Commission on EEC policy on oils, fats and proteins (Doc. 1-613/79);
- by Mr Blaney, on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, to the Commission on the steadily rising cost of housing (Doc. 1-614/79);
- by Mr Sherlock, Miss Hooper and Mr Newton Dunn, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, to the Commission on the economic consequences of EEC consumer protection and environmental protection legislation (Doc. 1-615/79);
- by Mr Glinne, Mr Sarre, Mrs Salisch, Mr Delors, Mr Boyes, Mr Caborn, Mr Moreau, Mr Schwartzberg, Mr Walter, Mr Dido', Mr Peters, Mr Oehler, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Desmond, Mr Colla, Mr Von Der Vring and Mrs Lizin, on behalf of the Socialist Group, to the Commission on the employment situation in the Community (Doc. 1-616/79);
- by Mr Galland, Mrs Pruvot and Mr Calvez, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Council on the European Parliament's contribution to finding a solution to the British share in the Community budget (Doc. 1-617/79);
- by Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Ceravolo, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, to the Commission on the fight against drug abuse (Doc. 1-647/79);
- by Mr Zagari, Mr Lezzi, Mr Dido', Mr Arfé and Mr Gatto, to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation on Soviet intervention in Afghanistan (Doc. 1-649/79);

President

(d) — oral question without debate by Mrs Moreau, Mrs Lenz, Mr Filippi, Mr Jonker and Mr De Keersmaeker, to the Commission on EEC supplies of mineral and vegetable raw materials (Doc. 1-611/79);

(e) — oral questions pursuant to Rule 47A of the Rules of Procedure for Question Time on 14 and 16 January 1980 by Mr Debre, Miss de Valera, Mr de la Malene, Lord Bethell, Mr Donnez, Mr Habsburg, Mr Almirante, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Spicer, Sir Peter Vanneck, Mr C. Jackson, Mr Nord, Mr Carossino, Mr Bange-mann, Miss Brookes, Miss Hooper, Lord Douro, Mr Moreland, Mr O'Connell, Mr Baudis, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Battersby, Mr Nielsen, Mr Schwartzberg, Mr Deleau, Mr Remilly, Mrs Ewing, Mr Diana, Mr Messmer, Mr Muntingh, Mr Welsh, Mr Ansquer, Mrs Dienesch, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Spinelli, Mr Barbagli, Mrs Weber, Mr Pininfarina, Mr Balfe, Mr Turner, Mr Spicer, Mr Schwartzberg, Mr Provan, Mr Battersby, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr van Miert, Mr Flanagan, Mr Oehler, Mr Cariglia, Mr Buchou, Mr O'Connell, Mr Debre, Mrs Ewing, Mr Poncelet, Mr Tuckman, Mrs Dienesch, Mr Simpson, Lord Douro, Mr Muntingh, Mr Turner, Mr Normanton, Mr Lomas, Mr Berkhouwer, Mrs Ewing, Mr van Miert, Mr Schwartzberg, Lord Douro, Mr Paisley and Mr O'Connell (Doc. 1-636/79);

(f) the following motions for resolutions tabled pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure :

— by Mr Kavanagh, Mrs Desmond, Mr O'Leary, Mr O'Connell, Mr Hume, Mr Abens, Mrs Lizin and Mr Schwencke, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the crisis in the Irish fishing industry (Doc. 1-608/79) which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

— by Mr Tyrrell, Mr Galland, Mr Pfennig, Mr Pelikan and Mr Hord on the exercise of human rights on the occasion of the Olympic Games in Moscow (Doc. 1-609/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport for its opinion ;

— by Mr Capanna on the violation by the USA of the human rights and right of self-government of the Mohawk people and of the Six Nation Iroquois Confederacy (Doc. 1-634/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee ;

— by Mr Coppieters on events in Afghanistan (Doc. 1-644/79)

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

— motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Rumor, Mr Klepsch, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Vergeer,

Mr Diligent, Mr Herman, Mr Fischbach and Mr Ryan, on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples Party (CD Group), on the situation in Uruguay (Doc. 1-645/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee ;

— by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul and Mr Schwencke on fostering exchanges of young people (Doc. 1-646/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport ;

(g) the following motion for a resolution :

— motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Ligios, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the campaign against African swine fever (Doc. 1-626/79) ;

(h) from the Council, opinions on :

— the proposal for the transfer of appropriations No. 34/79 between chapters within Section V — Court of Auditors — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 1-539/79) — (Doc. 1-604/79)

— the proposal for the transfer of appropriations No. 33/79 between chapters within Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1979 (Doc. 1-538/79) — (Doc. 1-605/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

(i) from the Council :

— the annual reports (1979) on progress achieved towards European Union drawn up by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and the Commission of the European Communities (Doc. 1-606/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee.

7. Text of treaties forwarded by the Council

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

— act of notification of the approval by the Community of the protocols extending for the first, second and third times the Wheat Trade Convention and the Food Aid Convention constituting the International Wheat Agreement of 1971 ;

— agreement between the European Community and the Republic of Peru on trade in textile products ;

— agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Guatemala on trade in textile products ;

— agreement in the form of an exchange of letters modifying certain duty-free quotas opened for 1979 by the United Kingdom in accordance with Protocol No. 1 of the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Finland ;

President

- agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Singapore on trade in textile products;
- agreement between the European Economic Community and the Hellenic Republic on a concerted action project in the field of registration of congenital abnormalities (medical and public health research).

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

8. Authorization of reports

President. — Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Rules of Procedure, I have authorized various committees to draw up reports:

- Committee on Agriculture: report on the effects of the accession of Greece, Portugal and Spain to the Community on Community agriculture and fisheries.
- Committee on External Economic Relations: report on relations between the Economic Community and the ASEAN countries
- Committee on Social Affairs and Employment: report on shorter working hours
- Committee on Transport: report on transport relations between the Community and Greece
- Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport:
 - report on youth
 - report on the information sector in the Community in general and Parliament in particular
 - report on Mrs Weiss's proposal to create a European Institute
 - report on the working conditions of and social security arrangements for persons engaged in the arts (painters, musicians, etc.); on this last subject the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has been asked for an opinion.

9. Order of business

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

At its meeting of 13 December 1979 the enlarged Bureau, taking account of the arrangements with regard to the length of sittings to which we agreed at the part-session of December 1979, drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to you (PE 61.836/rev.).

Since they have not been adopted in committee, the reports by Mr Cronin on regional development and Mr Filippi on small and medium-sized undertakings in Portugal have been withdrawn from the draft agenda.

The chairmen of the political groups have informed me that they would very much like a debate on

Afghanistan to be held at the beginning of the sitting on Wednesday morning on the basis of the motions for a resolution to be tabled on this subject with request for urgent debate.

This debate would last about two hours, broken down as follows:

Council and Commission: not more than 30 minutes in all

Socialist Group: 15 minutes

Group of the European Peoples Party (C-D Group): 15 minutes

European Democratic Group: 15 minutes

Other groups, including the non-attached members: 10 minutes each.

Since the addition to the agenda of this new debate will curtail the time allotted for the items already on Wednesday's agenda, the Liberal and Democratic Group and the Group of European Progressive Democrats have agreed to postpone until the February part-session the oral question on the United Kingdom's share in the Community budget (Doc. 1-617/79), and the oral question on oils, fats and proteins (Doc. 1-613/79).

Are there any comments?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Aigner.

Mr Aigner. — (D) Madam President, I should like item No 161 — report by Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (Doc. 1-544/79) — to be removed from the agenda. During the discussions in the committees concerned a number of questions arose which remain to be clarified. I should therefore be grateful if this report — and I say this with the agreement of the rapporteur — could be held over to our next part-session.

President. — Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Sir Fred Warner.

Sir Fred Warner. — Madam President, on 18 December the Committee on Development and Cooperation considered the question of aid to refugees from Afghanistan. I believe that the matter has been the subject of a letter to you from Mr Poniatowski, chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation. Might I enquire whether it is your intention also to put this on the agenda? If not, could I please propose it as a matter of urgency?

President. — I was coming to that.

I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Madam President, will Question Time on Wednesday be guaranteed and will there be an hour and a half for questions?

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — This question has just been discussed with the chairmen of the political groups. The debate which has been put on the agenda for Wednesday morning will not affect Question Time, which will definitely last one hour and a half.

I have received several requests for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- from Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Vanderpoorten, Mr Bange-mann, Mr Calvez, Mr Damseaux, Mr Geurtsen, Mr Irmer, Mr Jürgens, Mr Louwes, Mrs Martin, Mrs Nielsen, Mr Nord, Mrs Scrivener, Mrs von Alemann, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Maher, Mr Delatte, Mr Haagerup, Mr Baudis, Mr Rey, Mr Galland and Mr Pininfarina, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, a motion for a resolution on the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union (Doc. 1-650/79/rev.);
- from Mr Fanti, Mr Segre, Mr Spinelli, Mr Amendola, Mrs Baduel-Glorioso, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Berlinguer, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Cardia, Mrs Caretoni-Romagnoli, Mr Carossino, Mr Ceravolo, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr De Pasquale, Mr Ferrero, Mr Galluzzi, Mr Gouthier, Mr Ippolito, Mr Leonardi, Mr Pajetto, Mr Papapietro, Mrs Squarzialupi and Mr Veronesi a motion for a resolution on relaunching the policy of détente after the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan (Doc. 1-656/79);

The reasons for these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves;

- from Mr Poniatowski, Mr Kuhn, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Cohen, Mr Enright, Mr Ferrero, Mr Geurtsen, Mr Flanagan, Mr Habsburg, Mr Haagerup, Mr Howell, Mr Jaquet, Mr Lezzi, Mr Michel, Mr Narducci, Mr Pannella, Mr Pearce, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Sablé, Mr Schmitt, Mr Sherlock, Mr Vergeer, Mr Vergès, Sir Fred Warner and Mr Wawrzik a request for urgent debate on the report by Sir Fred Warner on the situation in Afghanistan (Doc. 1-638/79)

The reason for the request for urgent debate is attached to the report (Doc. 1-638/79/Add.);

- from Mr Rogers, Mr Griffiths, Ms Clwyd, Mr Hänsch, Mr Seal, Mr Caborn, Mr Megahy, Mr Enright, Mr Boyes, Mr Fich, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mr Wettig, Mr Dankert, Mrs Van den Heuvel, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Abens, Mrs Weber, Mr Schmid, Mr Van Minnen and Mrs Vayssade a motion for a resolution on Community aid to Wales for flood damage (Doc. 1-651/79).

The reason for this request for urgent debate is contained in the document itself. Parliament will be consulted tomorrow morning on the urgency of these requests.

The agenda is therefore as follows:

This afternoon until 8 pm:

- Procedure without report
- Commission statement on action taken on the opinions and proposals of Parliament.
- Question Time (1½ hrs of questions to the Commission)
- Oral question without debate to the Commission on mineral and vegetable raw materials
- Oral question with debate to the Commission on housing costs

Tuesday 15 January 1980,

9 am to 1 pm and 3 pm to 7 pm

- Decision on urgency of three motions for resolutions and one report
- Oral question with debate to the Commission on employment in the Community

At 3 pm:

- Possibly, voting time

Wednesday 16 January 1980,

9 am to 1 pm and 3 pm to 7 pm

- Debate on Afghanistan
- Council statement on the Italian Presidency (followed by debate)

At 3 pm:

- Possibly, voting time

5.30 pm to 7 pm

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

Thursday, 17 January 1980,

10 am to 1 pm, 3 pm to 8 pm and 9 pm to 12 midnight:

- Oral question with debate to the Commission on consumer protection
- Lega report on the staff regulations of officials of the Communities
- Weber report on radioactive waste
- Ghergo report on radiation protection
- Combe report on cocoa and chocolate products
- Combe report on fresh poultry meat
- Joint debate on the Nicolson and Forster report and an oral question with debate to the Commission on the ship-building and textile industries
- Joint debate on two Cresson reports, a Ligios motion for a resolution and a B. Nielsen report on swine fever, tuberculosis and brucellosis

At 3 pm:

- Voting time

Friday 18 January 1980,

9 am to 1 pm and possibly to 2 pm

- Procedure without report
- Possibly continuation of Thursday's agenda

President*At 10.30 am :*

- Voting time
- Almirante report on Cyprus wines
- Caretoni Romagnoli report on agricultural products from Turkey
- Giummarra report on frozen beef and veal
- Lemmer report on procedures for the exportation of goods
- Seeler report on duties on certain types of fish
- Agnelli report on adult bovine animals from Yugoslavia
- Luster report on certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products (without debate)

At the end of the sitting :

- Voting time

Are there any objections ?

This order of business is therefore agreed.

10. Speaking time

President. — Pursuant to Rules 28 and 36A of the Rules of Procedure, I propose that speaking time be allocated as follows for :

- the debate on the oral question to the Commission on the employment situation in the Community

| | |
|--|-------------|
| The author of the question | 10 minutes |
| The Commission | 30 minutes |
| Members | 420 minutes |
| broken down as follows : | |
| Socialist Group : | 106 minutes |
| Group of the European People's Party : | 101 minutes |
| European Democratic Group : | 62 minutes |
| Communist and Allies Group : | 44 minutes |
| Liberal and Democratic Group : | 41 minutes |
| Group of European Progressive Democrats : | 25 minutes |
| Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members : | 15 minutes |
| Non-attached Members : | 26 minutes |

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, I am not protesting against the application of Rule 28 as such ; I think that the proposal which has been made for Thursday and Friday cannot be considered and put to the vote. Madam President, Rule 28 relates to 'une discussion' according to the French text, 'una discussione' in the Italian version and 'a particular debate' in the English text. Madam President, our Rules obviously only allow you to propose to the Assembly the application of Rule 28 for a single debate. It is not possible to apply Rule 28 to the sittings of Thursday and Friday when we shall have fifteen and ten items

respectively for discussion. I know that the enlarged Bureau has advised you to make this proposal and I understand the practical reasons for it, just as I am aware of the difficulties from which you are trying to protect us. But we clearly cannot overcome these difficulties — relating to staff and other aspects — by adopting an organization of our time which you know to be grotesque. To allow twelve or seventeen seconds, thirty-four seconds or a minute and a half for fifteen items is unacceptable : we would then no longer have debates at all. Madam President, it is for that reason that this proposal cannot be put forward and approved, even if I understand the reasons for it.

President. — Thank you, Mr Pannella, for your remarks, which afford me the opportunity to explain that we adopted this working method unanimously by agreement with the enlarged Bureau in the belief that it was the only way to enable the entire agenda to be dealt with without breaking up speaking time into excessively small fragments. It is true that if speaking time had to be fixed for each of the debates, one would be left in certain cases with only a few seconds per speaker, which was utterly impossible. It was therefore an anxiety to streamline our proceedings and introduce some coherence into them that prompted us to adopt the course we did. It is true that the Rules of Procedure do, in fact, provide that we can fix speaking time only for a single debate, but it also lays down — and this rule is just as important as the one you have quoted — that the President is responsible for proper conduct of our debates and for ensuring that the proceedings are properly conducted.

I call Mr de la Malène.

Mr de la Malène. — (*F*) Madam President, you spoke just now of the problem of urgent debates on Afghanistan. As things are going very quickly, I did not have time to ask leave to speak immediately, but I should have liked to say that we do not for the moment have a motion for a resolution because it had been envisaged just now that a joint resolution should be sought at least between certain groups in order to clarify our discussion. For that reason and for that reason alone, we did not table a motion. I hope that the groups which have not as yet tabled motions will not be deprived of the right to do so tomorrow. I hope then that tomorrow morning each group will be able to table its own motion like the others.

President. — Your statement has been noted, Mr de la Malène. You will not be debarred from tabling a motion for a resolution.

I call Mr Estier.

Mr Estier. — (*F*) Madam President, may I point out that the Socialist Group which had not yet tabled a motion for a resolution has now done so. It will accordingly be asking for its text to be the subject of a request for urgent debate tomorrow like the texts of the other groups.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Madam President, I am not speaking to claim our rights but I want to say that we have agreed between the groups that the representatives of the groups should meet at 5:30 pm in an attempt to turn the various motions into a single resolution. Since we shall not be discussing the matter until Wednesday, I think there will be no difficulties if my group does not table its text today but explains it first in the inter-group talks. If we so choose, we can decide on a general urgent consideration which means that if we cannot reach agreement today and only table the text tomorrow, urgency can still be decided formally on Wednesday morning. I would also say, as the previous speakers have done, that we should then hold a joint debate on all the motions on the same subject.

President. — If there are several resolutions, they will, of course, be discussed simultaneously. If there is only one, it will obviously be much easier to organize our debates.

I propose to divide up as follows the total speaking time available for the items on the agenda for the sitting of Thursday, 17 January 1980 :

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Commission : | 80 minutes |
| Authors of questions and rapporteurs : | 80 minutes in all |
| Members | 420 minutes |
| broken down as follows : | |
| Socialist Group : | 106 minutes |
| Group of the European People's Party : | 101 minutes |
| European Democratic Group : | 62 minutes |
| Communist and Allies Group : | 44 minutes |
| Liberal and Democratic Group : | 41 minutes |
| Group of European Progressive Democrats : | 25 minutes |
| Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members : | 15 minutes |
| Non-attached Members : | 26 minutes |

The total speaking time for the items on the agenda for Friday, 18 January 1980 will be divided up as follows :

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Rapporteurs : | 35 minutes in all |
| Commission : | 35 minutes |
| Members | 120 minutes |
| broken down as follows : | |
| Socialist Group : | 25 minutes |
| Group of the European People's Party : | 24 minutes |
| European Democratic Group : | 16 minutes |
| Communist and Allies Group : | 13 minutes |
| Liberal and Democratic Group : | 12 minutes |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Group of European Progressive Democrats : | 9 minutes |
| Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members : | 7 minutes |
| Non-attached Members : | 14 minutes |

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, although your explanation is reasonable, it has not convinced me as far as the provisions of the Rules of Procedure are concerned and I shall not be taking part in the vote. I still believe that this proposal could not normally have been made under the provisions of the Rules of Procedure.

President. — I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Madam President, it seems to me that strictly speaking, under Rule 28, Mr Pannella is perfectly correct. On the other hand, it is also stated in the Rules of Procedure that you have the right to call anybody to speak. It seems to me therefore that the correct procedure would be for you not to put this to the vote but merely to table these suggested speaking times as your suggestions, for the information of the House, and then to stick to that particular procedure. I am sure everybody accepts your discretion on this matter. That way we can allow Mr Pannella his point of order, provided we adhere to the allocation of speaking time as laid down.

President. — Mr Patterson, it is true that I am given a great deal of discretion in the matter calling Members to speak, but I may not limit speakers in the way in which our Assembly, pursuant to Rule 28, can do so by means of a vote. It was for the enlarged Bureau to allocate speaking time, since this is a very important decision for the organization of our debates.

Are there any objections ?

These limitations of speaking time are adopted.

11. *Deadline for tabling amendments and closure of the list of speakers*

President. — I propose that the deadlines for tabling amendments for this part-session should be set as follows :

— 6 pm on Tuesday, 15 January 1980 for the items on the agenda of 17 January,

— 6 pm on Wednesday, 16 January 1980 for items on the agenda of 18 January.

Are there any objections ?

That is agreed.

I also propose that the list of speakers in the debates of the sitting of Wednesday, 16 January should be closed at 12 noon on Tuesday, 15 January 1980.

Are there any objections ?

That is agreed.

12. Procedure without report

President. — The following proposal from the Commission to the Council has been put on the agenda for this sitting to be dealt with by the procedure without report provided for in Rule 27A of the Rules of Procedure :

- Proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending the list of countries and territories in Regulation (EEC) No 706/76 on the arrangements applicable to agricultural products and certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products originating in the African, Caribbean and Pacific States or in the overseas countries and territories (Doc. 1-558/79)

This document had been referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation as the Committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for its opinion.

Unless any Member has asked leave to speak on this proposal or unless amendments are tabled to it before the beginning of the sitting of Friday, 18 January 1980, I shall declare the proposal to be approved.

13. Welcome

President. — A delegation from the Spanish Cortes is at present visiting the European Parliament as part of the Second Meeting of the European Parliament-Spanish Cortes Joint Committee. Mr Ignacio Caminas, leader of the delegation, and his colleagues are at present in the Official Gallery. It gives me great pleasure to welcome them on behalf of the European Parliament. This is the first visit of a Spanish delegation to the European Parliament since our election by direct universal suffrage.

I hope that the meetings of the Joint Committee will be fruitful and that our relations with the Spanish Parliament will be thereby strengthened.

(Applause)

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

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

I call Mr Dankert.

Mr Dankert. — *(NL)* Madam President, the document that we have received from the Commission indicates that the Commission intends to adopt a new budget proposal on 13 February next on the basis of the budget which has been rejected and to make a statement in Parliament as soon as possible thereafter.

¹ See Annex.

I would point out that Parliament had asked for a new preliminary draft budget which is something rather different. I should therefore welcome further clarification from Mr Tugendhat.

I should also like to know in this connection what the Commission is intending to do about paragraph 38 of our resolution of 7 November last. That paragraph was the basis for the rejection of the budget by Parliament on 11 December. It contains a number of central observations, relating in particular to the control of the development of agricultural expenditure, the reinstatement of certain items of non-compulsory expenditure which had been cut back by the Council and the budgetization of the European Development Fund and of the Community's loan activities.

I should also like to know whether in the procedure that is to be followed now, the Commission will be working on a number of realistic proposals by Parliament in respect of non-compulsory expenditure, or whether it intends to return to the amounts which figured in the preliminary draft. A realistic approach to the budget, including the aspect of non-compulsory expenditure, could considerably facilitate the procedure.

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Madam President, with your permission and that of the House I shall make a brief statement in answer to the questions Mr Dankert put to me.

First of all, as he says, it is the intention of the Commission to decide on a new set of budget proposals at its meeting of 13 February. On that date the Commission will be meeting in Strasbourg and would like at that time to ask the permission of the House to make a statement concerning its proposals during the course of business on Thursday, 14 February. I think it is particularly appropriate that we should be able to do that while we are meeting here and then to make our announcement immediately afterwards. I know that this is a point to which the chairman of the Committee on Budgets has attached great importance in the past. I do not believe, however, that the Commission will need to take up a great deal of the House's time on that occasion. The document relating to the proposal will follow as soon as possible thereafter.

The Commission feels that in following this timetable it will be responding most effectively to the evident desire of both halves of the budget authority that it should take the responsibility for producing the first draft of the new budget. I think that this is one of the points Mr Dankert raised in his proposal. We believe that it is our responsibility to take the initiative in this matter and to produce the first draft of the new proposal. That is what we shall be doing during the course of the next meeting of Parliament in February.

Tugendhat

The Commission's objective is to find a new basis for agreement. In drawing up its proposal, therefore, the Commission will take into account the opinions expressed by both halves of the budget authority, particularly those put forward during the conciliation procedure of 12/13 December. It will also pay close regard to the important points contained in Parliament's resolution of 13 December. Mr Dankert mentioned in particular the resolution of 7 November. I agree that that is an important statement, one might say a definitive statement of Parliament's position. It follows from the fact that we shall be basing our propositions on what has been said by both arms of the budgetary authority that that document is something which is very much in our minds.

He asked me also whether we would put forward what I think he called realistic proposals for non-compulsory expenditure. By that I think he meant to ask if we would be putting forward something a good deal smaller than the proposals in the original preliminary draft budget. He nods in agreement. The answer is yes, we shall. There are two reasons for this. First of all it is quite clearly the desire of both arms of the budgetary authority, but certainly the desire of Parliament, that our proposals on non-compulsory expenditure should be modest. I think that after the discussions which took place during the night of 12 and 13 December we have a fairly clear idea what sort of range we need to be thinking in.

The second point I should make is that the 1980 budget will only be adopted some way into 1980. It will not apply to the full twelve months. For that reason as well, of course, there is a need to trim back some of the estimates, since clearly it would not be possible to spend as much money in however many months are available as would have been possible in a full twelve months.

The Commission's proposal will also incorporate within it the financial consequences of the agricultural proposals it made in November to curb expenditure, as well as those it will make on agricultural prices and connected measures for the next farm year. Our proposal will incorporate both those important things.

The Commission regards the adoption as early as possible of a budget for 1980 as a matter of high priority for the Community. An appropriate calendar for the examination of the budget proposals by the two halves of the budget authority now needs to be drawn up.

President. — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Madam President, might I make a suggestion to the Commissioner. He made the observation that as these proposals will not be adopted until later this year, it will not be possible to spend as

much as would have been spent in a full twelve months. However, the Community is being financed on the basis of the twelfths, so that many of the projects financed, for example, from the Regional and Social Funds will continue on the basis of last year's budget. Therefore, since the programme will already be in operation, there will be nothing whatsoever to prevent a substantial programme being implemented for the remaining months of 1980. I would therefore suggest that there is no need to draw back on those projects to which Parliament attaches particular importance, simply because the budget will be adopted rather later.

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — I do feel that in this matter we have to look at each fund on its merits and the capability of each fund, but I think that the same applies to Parliament itself. In the light of the clearly expressed will of Parliament last month, which was reiterated by the rapporteur a moment ago. I do feel that the views of Parliament on the level of monetary expenditure will certainly call for a certain amount of caution in some areas and it will, of course, be necessary for Parliament to make a choice in its priorities, but I would not presume to intervene in Parliament's own choice of priorities.

President. — I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Madam President, first of all, in paragraph 2 a comment is made on the favourable opinions. I think it should be noted that although three opinions were given qualified approval, no comment is made by the Commission concerning these qualifications. Could we therefore have a comment in this respect?

Secondly, Madam President, with regard to paragraph 3, although it is true that the original report by my colleague, Mr Newton-Dunn, differed considerably from the Commission's original report, Parliament did amend it back so that it was pretty well in line with the Commission's report, and therefore I am surprised by paragraph 3.

Perhaps finally, Madam President, I could ask a very basic question. It does seem to me that whenever Parliament agrees with the Commission, that is marvellous and wonderful, but that when Parliament disagrees or puts forward a qualification, we are told in polite terms that 'the Commission wished to maintain its original proposals'. Could we see in the future more respect given to the views of this democratic body?

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Madam President, concerning the matter of the Commission's giving the reasons why it has not been

Tugendhat

able to accept or in some cases fully to accept the views of Parliament, I would point out that the Commission makes its statements to this effect during the course of the debate on the issue itself. I can think of many occasions when I have taken part in debates, not only on my own subjects but also on other Commissioners' subjects, when the Commission has not felt able fully to accept the view of Parliament or indeed, has rejected it. The place in which we do that and are then questioned and forced to defend ourselves is, therefore, the debate on the issue itself, and I do not think that we could satisfactorily provide that form of information in a document of this sort, which is really meant as an *aide-mémoire* for the Parliament. There will, of course, be an opportunity during the course of Question Time which is to follow to cover some of the issues which are raised, and provision has, I gather, also been made for an exchange on the subsequent action to be taken as well.

15. Question Time

President. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. 1-636/79).

Today we shall take the questions addressed to the Commission.

Question No 1 by Mr Debré (H-157/79):

Is the Commission aware that under the Lomé Convention the conditions for industrialization of the associated countries are more favourable than for the overseas departments, since the former have automatic access to the markets of the latter, while the reverse is not true? If so, what measures does the Commission intend to take to rectify this inequality, the results of which may be disastrous for the overseas departments?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) I should like to confirm that the non-reciprocity between the Community and the ACP countries can be traced back to a political decision taken by the Council when the first Convention of Lomé was signed in 1975. At that time we saw to it that the situation of the overseas territories which was different from that of the ACP should not be negatively affected by this state of affairs and a first safeguard clause was written into the agreement. In the second Convention of Lomé which we have just signed and which is in the course of ratification, that precaution has been further strengthened, particularly in respect of agricultural products, by a joint declaration annexed to the final Act of the Convention.

Secondly, in order to improve the development of these regions and achieve fuller economic integration of the overseas territories into the Community, we have developed the action of the Community Funds: the Fund for agricultural structures, the Regional Fund and the Social Fund — all of these being instruments from which the ACP do not benefit.

Finally, a further action is intended to bring the overseas departments and the neighbouring ACP countries more fully into the context of regional cooperation.

Such are the measures available to the Community to ensure that this region which also forms part of the Community can benefit from its membership.

Mr Debré — (F) Does the Commission realize that its answer is in no way satisfactory? Does it realize that, leaving aside the theoretical explanations which it has just given and which apply in part to agricultural problems that have nothing to do with my question, the real situation is quite different?

Does the Commission realize that since 1975 industrialization has progressed in the parts of the world where there are both ACP States and overseas departments or territories? Does the Commission realize that when an industrialist wishes to set up in an overseas department or territory he will find it impossible to penetrate the market of the associated States unless he has first conducted negotiations or concluded safeguard clauses after months of discussion, whereas if he sets up an establishment in an ACP State he can gain immediate access to the market of the overseas territories and, under these circumstances, will have no hesitation whatever?

That is the true situation and the explanations we have just heard are entirely theoretical; I think the Commission is aware of the fact.

Under these circumstances, the Commission should not be surprised by the strong opposition which the Convention will arouse in many quarters because of this lack of foresight; it will elicit opposition from people who do not consider at all satisfactory the solution chosen or the embarrassed explanations which have just been given to us.

Mr Davignon. — (F) Rather than passing a judgment on the Commission's answer, I should like to draw your attention to the following point. The ACP do effectively benefit from access to the territory of the Community and to the Community market. But is it not reasonable to consider that the political stability and advantages which the overseas departments derive from their membership of the Community are no less comparable, in real terms, to those enjoyed by the ACP on the Community market? When decisions were taken in 1975 implying that there would be no reciprocity between the Community and the overseas territories and the ACP the conclusions should have been drawn from that political choice made at the time. The answer which I gave at that time related to the problem of determining whether, in terms of regional cooperation based on negotiations — and negotiations are not something theoretical to be taken lightly — it was possible to improve relations between the overseas departments and the geographically adjacent ACP countries.

Mr Vergès. — (F) The customs statistics show that between 1973 and 1978 imports from the Community countries to La Réunion rose in value from 160 m EUA to 343 m EUA, i.e. by 74 to 76 % in percentage terms; these were essential industrial products. The same statistics show that exports from the ACP countries to La Réunion rose between 1973 and 1978 from 17 m EUA to 22 m EUA, representing a proportionate percentage reduction from 8 % to 4 %.

Comparison of these percentages presents a problem and requires, in our view, an explanation. Without wishing to deny the problems faced by neighbouring underdeveloped countries, be they ACP countries or overseas departments, whose economies are often in competition with each other rather than complementary, it is nonetheless apparent from the percentages of the customs statistics that the difficulties in industrialization of the overseas departments are attributable to causes other than the Lomé Conventions, where the safeguard clauses can manifestly represent a barrier against a particular risk. We therefore wish to put the following question to the Commissioner: are not the reasons for the difficulties of industrialization to be sought elsewhere than in the Lomé Conventions, and rather in the relations of integration between the overseas departments and the Community?

Mr Davignon. — (F) The position of the Commission is that action must be pursued on a dual front, namely that of the ACP — as I said just now — and of integration with the Community. That is why in the past two years the programmes undertaken have been backed by visits to the overseas departments to exploit to the full the action of the Regional Development Fund and Social Fund in order to create the best possible conditions for the industrialization of this region.

President. — Question No 2 by Miss de Valera (H-182/79):

On the basis of a seminar held in 1977 on consumer education in schools, the Commission set up a working group on the training of teachers in consumer protection. What results have been achieved so far?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — As the honourable Member has pointed out, it was as a result of a colloquium on consumer education in schools, held in London in December 1977, that the Commission set up a working group on teacher training in this area.

This working group was set up during the course of 1978 and held its first meeting in April 1979. It has drawn up a three-year work programme and carried out a review of the situation in the Member States. It would be premature at this stage to try to draw conclusions from the work carried out so far.

Miss de Valera. — Could I please be given more information about the proposals that will come from the working group. What is likely to be done with these proposals; are they likely to be incorporated in further legislation?

Mr Burke. — As I pointed out to the House, my general conclusion is that it would be premature at this stage to try to draw conclusions from the work already done. I would point out also that, since it is very difficult to proceed by way of formal legislation in an area like education, which poses particular difficulties for a Community such as this, it may not be possible always to proceed by way of regulation. Nevertheless proposals can be put forward to the appropriate education committees for action in the various Member States.

Mr John David Taylor. — At which level of school education would these proposals apply?

Mr Burke. — They would be applied largely in the age group 10 to 12. Because education levels differ from country to country, I would prefer to refer to them by age groups rather than by level of education.

President. — Question No 3 by Mr de la Malène (H-189/79):

Can the Commission confirm that oil imports into the United States increased considerably in both volume and value during the early months of 1979 compared with the same period in 1978 and state whether this policy of strategic stock building puts pressure on the world market?

Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission. — (D) Oil imports to the United States did not increase in 1979 as compared with 1978. The United States pursued a policy aimed at the reduction of their strategic reserves. Consequently this policy did not disturb the world market.

Mr de la Malène. — (F) Has the Commission heard of an import tax of five dollars per tonne?

Mr Brunner. — (D) That is an entirely different matter and has nothing to do with the possibility that the level of imports in 1979 may have been slightly higher than in 1978. The Commission gave clear expression to its concern when this import subsidy was introduced. The United States have since announced that the subsidy is to be progressively removed.

President. — Question No 4 by Lord Bethell (H-198/79):

What plans have the Commission to simplify and extend the reciprocal medical services available to Community citizens on production of the E-111 form? Do they believe that eventually any Community citizen should be entitled to free medical care in any Member State on production of his passport or identity card?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. —

(*NL*) The Commission has published a series of clearly written leaflets giving insured persons information on their right to medical care; this right derives from the social security schemes when persons travel to other Member States. The purpose of Regulation No 1408/71 on social security is to coordinate the statutory provisions on social security existing in the various Member States. Free medical care for all citizens throughout the Community would require complete harmonization in this matter as well as a drastic change in the national regulations under which insured persons are required to make a financial contribution. The Commission would like to see the provisions which already exist for employed persons extended to new categories of insured citizens. It has therefore submitted a proposal which, after receiving a favourable opinion from the previous Parliament, was already submitted to the Council in 1978. That proposal dealt with the extension of the sphere of application of the regulation to self-employed persons and persons not in active employment. The intention is thus to offer health care insurance when the insured persons, if they are self-employed or non-employed, travel to another Member State. The relevant proposals are now with the Council and I can only repeat that, as I have indicated previously, there are certain difficulties in the Council which are delaying the approval of these proposals.

Lord Bethell. — I am sure the House will welcome the Commissioner's last remarks about the proposals which are now on the table with the Commission. However we were very disappointed to hear of the opposition that they are apparently encountering in Council. I wonder whether the Commission is aware of the very complicated procedures that have to be gone through by citizens of the Community if they wish to have free medical attention in other Member States or even the reimbursement of some of their medical expenses. A citizen in the United Kingdom, for instance, has to go to his local Social Security office, ask for a form, — a complicated form, comprising 15 paragraphs, — fill it in, then send it back to his Social Security office and get back an E 111 form. Then if he has the misfortune to fall ill outside his own country, he has to take it to the Social Security office in the Member State and be issued with another form before he goes to the doctor. This is extremely difficult not to mention embarrassing in certain circumstances. Is the Commissioner further aware that there are half a million individuals in the United Kingdom who are not entitled to this E 111 form? Can we not work out, as a matter of urgency, a system whereby citizens of the Community are entitled either to free medical attention or to the benefits that are appropriate to the Member State in which that person happens to fall ill, without this bureaucratic palaver.

(*Applause from certain quarters*)

Mr Vredeling. — (*NL*) As I have already stated, the procedures depend on the situation in the particular Member State. I am aware that in the Honourable Member's country medical care is free for everyone. That is certainly not the case in all our Member States. The existing regulation does not cover self-employed persons and non-employed citizens such as students and pensioners. We have proposed that this category should also be included, but the Council is having problems with this for a variety of reasons. I agree with the tenor of the question, to the effect that the procedures should be as simple as possible. There is a standard form applicable to all Community citizens.

The last question sought to ascertain which categories of person are entitled to social security benefits in their own country, the United Kingdom, but not when they travel to another Member State. The aim of our proposal is to give these persons the same rights in other Member States. It is now up to the Council to act, and I hope that under the Italian Presidency our proposal will be approved.

Mr O'Connell. — Could the Commissioner make available details of the health services in each of the Member countries, and could the Commission offices in the Member States inform the public about the availability of these services in the respective countries?

Mr Vredeling. — (*NL*) In the first place I would draw attention to the clearly worded publications which are available in every Member State from the Community's information offices and elsewhere. These publications give a broad outline of the available possibilities. However, I agree with the Honourable Member that people sometimes forget to ask for form 111 because they are not aware of its existence and I wish to take this opportunity to draw attention to the possibility of using that form.

Mr Collins. — I am very grateful for the concern of Lord Bethell on the need for the answers given by the Commissioner, Mr Vredeling. But I wonder if the Commission is aware of the irony of this question being asked in this way, from that side of the House, at a time when the principle of free medical care is being attacked in the United Kingdom itself.

(*Protest from the European Democratic Group*)

I wonder whether Mr Vredeling, in supplying the information that he has promised, would care to investigate and supply the information relative to the United Kingdom to the honourable Member who put the original question.

Mr Vredeling. — (*NL*) Yes, I am perfectly willing, Madam President, to act as an intermediary between the two Honourable Members, but I did have the

Vredeling

impression that the last question was meant more for Lord Bethell than for me. We shall not overlook his point when we publish data in our annual reports.

Mr Beazley. — Is the Commissioner aware of the unequal burden that falls on doctors within the Community because of the differences which we have been speaking about relating to patients?

Mr Vredeling. — *(NL)* I hesitate to reply to the question as to whether I am aware of unequal burdens resting on doctors. That depends of course on differences between the social security systems. In the questioner's country it is all much simpler than in countries where a great deal of paperwork is required because of the big differences between categories of entitlement. I realize that the differences between our Member States are still far too wide in this area of social security. Our efforts to achieve greater harmonization should lead to the disappearance of such differences.

President. — Question No 5 by Mr Donnez (H-201/79):

Since all over the world 8 May marked the end of the Nazi dictatorship in Europe, would it not be desirable to make this day a European official holiday which would be celebrated in all the Member States?

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Madam President, first of all, official holidays are primarily a matter for the Member States. Secondly, if, as I believe should be the case, the Community emphasis in this as in other fields should be on reconciliation, it should be borne in mind that 9 May is already a holiday in the Community institutions in celebration of Schuman Day.

President. — Question No 6 by Mr Habsburg (H-340/79):

Is there a political guideline within the Commission on contacts between its members and liberation movements?

If not, on what principles are the talks between individual members and the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe — Rhodesia or the PLO conducted?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — *(F)* Since a number of questions have been put in this connexion, the Commission considers it desirable to clarify its position fully.

The Treaties do not allow the Community to engage in talks with parties other than the governments of States with which the Community maintains links; this implies that the Commission cannot engage in actions for the benefit of liberation movements.

As regards official contacts between the Commission and the liberation movements, such contacts must first be rendered possible by the attitude of the Member States. For example, SWAPO is the valid interlocutor for Namibia.

There may also be occasions on which informal contacts between a Member of the Commission and a liberation movement are useful for our own information. Given the situation in Rhodesia, it was perfectly normal to maintain contacts with representatives of the Patriotic Front who have now subscribed to the accord on the organization of elections in Rhodesia.

Mr Habsburg. — *(D)* I should first like to thank Mr Davignon briefly for his answer which was no doubt correct in strictly juridical terms, but I want also to stress the fact that I consider this answer politically unsatisfactory. I was referring to specific contacts — by Mr Cheysson in fact — which, in strictly formal terms, were unofficial, but a Commissioner cannot simply say, 'I am speaking unofficially'. A Commissioner must always bear in mind the political impression which his conversations leave in the world. After talks were held with the PLO and Patriotic Front, to the exclusion of other political forces, an impression was created which is I am sure detrimental to the Community, and I want to repeat my question as to whether greater discretion on the part of the Commission would not be advantageous to Europe.

(Applause from certain quarters of the centre and right of the House)

Mr Davignon. — *(F)* I certainly do not wish to give the impression that I consider a Commissioner to be an unofficial member of any body whatever.

That being said, I want to confirm that it is perfectly normal for a member of the Commission to maintain relations under certain specific circumstances with representatives of certain liberation movements when those relations are useful to the work of the Commission and of the Community. Obviously, the Commission accepts the political consequences of this.

Mr John David Taylor. — Arising from the original reply to this question, is the Commissioner aware that the IRA is not a liberation movement but a terrorist group whose aims and atrocities are opposed by the vast majority of people in both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland? Will he confirm therefore that the policy of the Commission is that it will not enter into written or oral contacts with IRA terrorists or other similar Irish Republican movements?

Mr Davignon. — *(F)* The Commission is greatly surprised that anyone could believe that it might entertain relations of this kind with a terrorist organization. I confirm that this is quite impossible, but I am surprised that the question should have been put to us.

Mr Marshall. — Would the Commissioner please consider the Members of this House who would like to see much greater sensitivity in the relations of the

Marshall

Commission with these terrorist organizations? Does he not realize that contacts between the Commission, Commissioners and representatives of the fascists of the PLO are abhorrent to the vast majority of the people of Western Europe? These terrorists threaten freedom worldwide. This Community is based upon freedom. Can our individual Commissioners not use some *savoir-faire* in dealing with this particular problem and these bestial individuals?

(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)

Mr Davignon. — *(F)* The Commission has closely followed the points that were made in this discussion and will try to take account of the feelings voiced today.

Mr Messmer. — *(F)* Madam President, my supplementary question follows on from the question put by Mr Habsburg. Does the Commission not feel that the apparently systematic proliferation of contacts with certain movements — and I could easily give a much longer list than that provided today — leads, particularly in Africa, to the encouragement of a kind of destabilization which our governments, and, I feel sure, the Commission itself are trying to lessen?

(Applause from certain quarters of the centre and right of the House)

Mr Davignon. — *(F)* I want to assure Mr Messmer that the Commission is taking great care to avoid creating the impression that there is a systematic development of contacts. I want him to know that in this particular connection we maintain very close links with the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation in order to ensure that there are no differences between the attitude of the Commission and that of the Member States in areas falling within their sovereignty.

Mr Aigner. — *(D)* Mr Davignon, would you agree with me that if the Commission bears a collective responsibility, it cannot be within the discretion of an individual Commissioner to decide which contacts he proposes to make in his personal capacity since the Commission bears ultimate, overall responsibility? Are you prepared to ensure that in future a consensus is reached before such delicate contacts are opened by an individual Commissioner under his own responsibility?

Mr Davignon. — *(F)* In my answer to the initial question, I said that a Commissioner was inevitably bound by his mandate and that his acts have political consequences even if they are discreet. The Commission must accordingly organize its activities to take account of these consequences.

Mr Martin. — *(F)* Does the Commission not find it improper for a liberation movement which is recog-

nized by the United Nations to be insulted in this House: I refer to the PLO which represents the Palestinian people.

Mr Davignon. — *(F)* In none of the answers which I have given on behalf of the Commission did I pass judgment on one liberation movement in relation to another. On the contrary I said that our conduct was guided by decisions taken possibly by other bodies. I referred for example to SWAPO. I did not comment on the remarks made by individual Members about specific liberation movements, since the Commission does not have the right to do so. I referred simply to the general problem of contacts between the Commission and representatives of the liberation movements.

President. — Question No 7, is not being taken, since this subject is already on the agenda for Thursday. Its author will have a prior right to speak in that debate.

Question No 8 by Mr Berkhouwer, for whom Mr Haagerup will deputize (H-264/79):

To ask the Commission whether it will make representations to the Government of the People's Republic of the Congo about the combined Cuban-Congolese deportation of 600 children from the People's Republic of the Congo to Cuba for purposes of political indoctrination against the wishes of their parents, which constitutes a flagrant breach of human rights by a signatory of the Lomé convention?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — *(F)* The Commission shared the concern felt by public opinion in general when reports were published to the effect that children had been sent to another country against the wishes of their parents.

The Commission contacted in this connection the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation because it is they who have information on such cases through their diplomatic network. They have not yet confirmed to us that these children were sent away against the wishes of their parents and thus in contravention of human rights. Until this information reaches us we shall not be able to take up a position since the Commission has no means of making its own verifications.

Mr Haagerup. — *(DK)* I should like to thank the Commissioner for this positive answer and ask him whether he agrees that it would be as well to make sure that the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation persist in their efforts to obtain more information about the alleged deportations from the Congo.

Mr Davignon. — *(F)* That is definitely the view of the Commission, and its representative in political cooperation will continue to call the attention of the Member States to problems of this kind which may constitute particularly disagreeable violations of the Charter of Human Rights.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 9 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 10 by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-290/79):

Can the Commission confirm that its inquiry into the qualifications of non-veterinary personnel responsible for the supervision and certification of meat products establishments and their products is limited to the United Kingdom, or has it been extended to all the countries of the Community?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.

— (DK) The enquiries being carried out by the Commission into the qualifications of non-veterinary personnel responsible for ensuring that health standards are maintained in the production of a number of meat products does, in principle, cover all the countries of the Community. But they are obviously of special significance for the United Kingdom for the simple reason that there such supervisory work is to a very large extent, although not entirely, in the hands of special non-veterinary personnel, while in the other eight Member States it is mainly left to veterinary surgeons, who are, however, of course, assisted in certain ways by non-veterinary personnel; and these non-veterinary assistants, as I have indicated, are included in the enquiries.

Sir Peter Vanneck. — I particularly appreciate that the Commissioner has made himself aware of the fact that it is vital that enquiries of this nature be taken right across the board. However, is the Commission aware of the absolute necessity of parity of standards and hence comparability of relevant costs, if we are to achieve fair competition, and does it realize that positive proposals from the Commission are needed to arrive at this and that we need as a matter of urgency reports and decisions, which must be made public, in order to monitor the results?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) The purpose of the enquiries is naturally to establish a basis for solving a number of matters relating to public health by means of Community measures, to ensure, firstly, proper protection for consumers, but also to ensure — and this is a matter of expenditure — freedom of movement for goods in the veterinary field. When the enquiries are completed, the results will be published and the Commission will submit the proposal required to achieve these two objectives.

Mr Collins. — I should like to press the Commissioner a little further on the point raised by Sir Peter Vanneck. We are glad to know that this investigation has been extended to all countries, but I wonder if the Commission is fully aware of the uncertainty and insecurity caused by the fact that this report exists but has not yet been published. Will the Commission undertake to remove that uncertainty and insecurity by publishing the report as a matter of urgency and by

engaging in urgent consultation with the professional and trade union organizations concerned, and will it undertake to do this in an open fashion as soon as possible?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I am fully aware of the importance of this matter for the people concerned in the United Kingdom. The report has not yet been completed, which is why it has not been published. As soon as it is ready, which should be some time this Spring, it will be published, so as to provide a basis for the exchange of views which the Commission will be taking into account in its proposal. I stressed earlier that the enquiries have been extended to all Member States and I would emphasize again that this supervisory work is carried out in a different way there. In England, it is done mainly by specially trained personnel who are not veterinary surgeons, while in the other countries it is done by veterinary surgeons, so the enquiries are of a different nature. As far as the veterinary surgeons in the other eight countries are concerned, I should add that to qualify for the title of veterinary surgeon they must undergo a training which conforms to the requirements of the 1978 Directive on veterinary training.

Mr Patterson. — I am sure the Commissioner is aware that full implementation of the directive would involve considerable increases in expenditure, both for local authorities and for abattoirs in the United Kingdom, if the work currently done by environmental health officers in the meat inspectorate has to be carried out by qualified veterinarians. Now, does this enquiry also go into the matter of whether in other countries all the work which in the United Kingdom is done by the meat inspectorate and environmental health officers is, in fact, carried out by qualified veterinarians, because there is a suspicion in the United Kingdom that by implementing the directive the UK will in fact be putting itself at a competitive disadvantage?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) According to our information, there is no doubt that the supervisory procedures required by the proposal for a directive are carried out in the other Member States by veterinary personnel whose qualifications are in conformity with the 1978 Directive on the training of veterinary surgeons.

With regard to the special non-veterinary personnel who do this work in the United Kingdom, it is, of course, true that, if changes were introduced, they would involve increases in expenditure and many other difficulties. It is not a matter of making a particular title the criterion for correct procedure, but of ensuring that the work is carried out in a satisfactory way from both the health and the consumer angle, both there and in the other Member States. The purpose of training is not to establish dogmatic rules, but to ensure that a public service is performed satisfactorily in all the Member States, including, of course, the United Kingdom.

¹ See Annex.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 11 will be answered in writing.

Question No. 12 by Mr Nord (H-298/79):

In the recruitment of staff at all levels is sufficient account taken of the need for as broad a distribution as possible over all the Member States?

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — In appointing officials the Commission applies the provisions of Article 27 of the Staff Regulations, which stipulates that 'recruitment shall be directed to securing for the institution the services of officials of the highest standard of ability, efficiency and integrity, recruited on the broadest possible geographical basis from among nationals of the Member States of the Communities. Officials shall be selected without reference to race, creed or sex. No posts shall be reserved for nationals of any specific Member State'.

Mr Nord. — (NL) Does Mr Tugendhat realize that his answer will cause great disappointment in the Netherlands, if only because he has not really answered the question. Mr Tugendhat no doubt knows that the Commission's secretariat is substantially understaffed with Dutch nationals. Does he recognize this fact and if so what practical measures does the Commission intend to take to put an end to this situation which I hope he too will consider undesirable?

Mr Tugendhat. — First of all I cannot imagine how an article from the Staff Regulations could be a disappointment to any Member of the House, especially to a Member of the House who himself has had responsibility for recruiting to a Community institution. I believe that the principle enshrined in the Staff Regulations is a very important one.

Nonetheless I do recognize that there are certain nationalities — and I use the word in the plural, nationalities — that are under-represented in the Commission. I recognize that the Dutch are certainly one, particularly at the lowest levels of the A category of officials, and that the Danes and the British are also under-represented. So this is a problem which is not confined to one particular nationality. It concerns a number of nationalities and it is a problem which does concern us, because we believe that it is desirable and beneficial to the good working of our institution that there should, wherever possible, be a broad balance of officials at all levels.

We have received representations from the Dutch Government on this matter and have suggested that closer contacts should be developed between the Commission, the Dutch Civil Service and the relevant academics, so that suitable candidates are encouraged to apply for appointment to the Commission. In addition I have asked the Commission's services to pay particular attention, within the provisions of Article 27 of the Staff Regulations, to candidates from deficit

countries, including the Netherlands, when posts are being filled.

Mr O'Connell. — Firstly, could the Commissioner circulate details of the staff appointments, including details in respect of each country, and secondly, is he satisfied that the Commission's offices in the various countries are publicizing the vacancies in the Commission? Has he undertaken a study of the Commission's offices and if not, will he consider doing that?

Mr Tugendhat. — We are certainly always anxious to ensure that advertisements drawing the attention of nationals of Member States to the availability of jobs within the Commission should be as widely circulated as possible. It is a matter indeed which has particularly concerned us in the case of Ireland, and we have taken steps to ensure that there is the widest possible distribution of advertisements in the Irish press and elsewhere. I will certainly endeavour to see what can be done about the information which the honourable gentleman asked for within our normal practices, and I will try to communicate with him in due course about that.

Mr Beumer. — (NL) Mr Tugendhat has stated in answer to Mr Nord's question that he will make certain contacts. Is he aware that the Netherlands Government has repeatedly entered reservations on the budget in this connection and can he say when his intentions will be turned into practical action?

Mr Tugendhat. — Deadlines are not, I think, applicable in matters of this kind for a number of reasons. First of all, of course, we do not know how many new staff we are going to be able to recruit at any one time. Both arms of the budgetary authority are of course extremely restricted so far as recruitment or new staff is concerned, and that adds to the difficulties in rectifying the balance as we would like.

I must also make it clear that our statutes — and the statutes are very firm about this — make it absolutely impossible, and rightly so in my opinion, to practice discrimination of any sort. That means both discrimination against people and discrimination in favour of people. If we were to say that you could only select Dutchmen or Englishmen or Danes or Irishmen, for instance, for a particular job, because those are the deficit nationalities, then Germans, Belgians and Frenchmen and the others would be able to bring actions against us in the courts.

I think this is a point that needs to be remembered. I do believe that if there is goodwill on both sides — there is certainly goodwill on our side and I have no doubt at all that there is goodwill on the side of the Dutch authorities as well — then we can do more to encourage Dutch candidates to come forward and to bring more Dutch people into our exams.

Tugendhat

Certainly, when Dutch candidates do present themselves, they seem to have a perfectly satisfactory success rate in the examinations. I have drawn the attention of the Dutch authorities to some ideas in this field, and we are in constant contact about it. I know of the concern in the Netherlands, and it is a concern that we take very seriously indeed.

Miss Brookes. — May I thank Commissioner Tugendhat very much indeed for his answer. May I say how much I welcomed the advertisements that apparently appeared in the North Wales papers advertising jobs for the EEC. We are grateful for your attention to North Wales in this matter. Thank you.

May I ask you, Mr Commissioner, if you will continue to advertise all possible jobs in newspapers, particularly in North Wales, which is my concern?

Mr Tugendhat. — Yes.

President. — At the request of the Commission I shall call together Question No 13 by Mr Carossino (H-302/79):

Consequent upon the Lomé agreements of 1975, under which liberalization measures were to be applied to exports of floricultural products to the European market from 1978 onwards, would the Commission not agree that it should effectively implement the safeguard measures provided for in Regulation No 3280/75 in the event of disturbance of the market and that, in this connection, a system of protection that operated immediately and avoided long delays and exhaustive checks but was based on the current cost price and acceptable values, would better safeguard the interests of European floriculturalists?

and Question No. 28 by Mr Diana (H-361/79):

What conclusions does the Commission draw from the document adopted unanimously by the Advisory Committee on Live Plants regarding the modification of quality standards which was officially forwarded to it on 27 November 1979, having regard also to the consequences that failure to implement the safeguard clause provided for by the Lomé agreements with the developing countries has had on the Community live plant and flower sector in particular? What steps does the Commission intend to take to protect this sector within the context of the implementation of the recently renewed convention?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — The honourable Members' questions concern, firstly, the safeguard clause in the Lomé Convention. There is also a general safeguard clause on imports of flowers in the organization of the market in floricultural products. I would like to assure the two questioners that the safeguard measures are in force and can be applied at any time that circumstances warrant it. And that is when the quantity or prices of imports cause a serious disturbance on the Community's own market for floricultural products or create a risk of this happening.

This combination of factors on the internal market and the quantity and prices of the imports are the

determining factor. They must be examined in each individual case. It is a fundamental principle of the Community's external trade policy, and has been for many years, that, when safeguard measures are applied in the case of market disturbances resulting from imports, the connection between the disturbance and the underlying cause must be established. If this principle were not adhered to, a large part of the Community's exports, not least in the agricultural sector, would be in an extremely dangerous position on a number of important markets, including notably the American market. That is why these safeguard measures are in line with the Community's own fundamental principles, and they cannot be applied in a purely automatic way, ignoring the causal connection between import factors and movements on the market.

I would add that the administrative action we have taken makes it possible to intervene as required at very short notice and without too much bureaucracy.

The second question, that of Mr Diana, concerns quality standards for plants and flowers. This question is under active consideration in the Commission and in the group of experts employed by the Commission. In these deliberations the proposals put forward by the advisory committee are being examined very closely, but views within the Community are sharply divided as to the best solution. And may I point out that, contrary to what is said in the question, the advisory committee's report was not adopted unanimously, but embodied different opinions. Should standards be stricter, should the existing ones be kept, or should they be done away with? The Commission is trying to expedite this important task and, when the technical aspects have been cleared up, it will submit the necessary proposal to the Parliament and the Council.

Mr Carossino. — (I) To protect floriculturalists in the Community against competition which is often unfair by third countries, the safeguard measures provided for in the regulation must be brought into effect; these measures are not yet operative because the procedure laid down is often too complex. Simpler provisions must be introduced enabling timely action to be taken when the market is disturbed. Basic prices for floricultural products must also be fixed having regard to the true cost of production. These are reasonable proposals which have already been put forward for some time now by Italian flower growers. Can the Commissioner inform me who is opposing the implementation of these reasonable proposals and for what reasons?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) The safeguard measures have never been applied for the simple reason that the objective criteria for their application were not satisfied. These criteria include the prices on the Commu-

Gundelach

nity's internal market and the relation between them and the import prices, and the quantities imported compared with our own production. The fact is that we have had an increase in imports, but this does not necessarily mean that our internal market has been in constant danger. It was naturally only to be expected, when we signed the Lomé Convention and thereby opened our markets to large quantities of floricultural products, that large quantities would indeed be imported. After all, that was the point of the Convention. So we cannot just apply safeguard measures as soon as imports increase and go back on what we said when we signed the Convention. The decisive consideration is whether developments on our own market are normal and they are, despite quite a substantial rise in imports of certain types of flowers. Our own producers have in many cases gone over to other kinds of flowers and there does not appear to be any crisis in the sector.

Mr Diana. — (I) I am grateful to Mr Gundelach for the information which he has given us on this sector which is particularly important to my own country.

Commissioner Gundelach was of course correct in saying that the safeguard clauses exist; but Mr Carosino was also right when he said that in the majority of cases these clauses are not in fact applied. They are not applied, Mr Carosino said, because the procedures are excessively cumbersome and bureaucratic. I share that view, but I think that another reason for the non-application resides in the fact that the quality standards laid down for this highly varied production sector are not calculated to ensure proper implementation of the regulation on floriculture. Some time ago a procedure was set in motion to review these quality standards. The Committee on Floriculture was not able to agree on all the aspects of the regulation but did express a unanimous opinion last year on many points relating to the quality standards.

May I ask Commissioner Gundelach to see to it that the Commission takes due note of the opinion of the Committee on Floriculture and, above all, tries to gain time in order to lay down rules for this sector which is facing extreme difficulties at present.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) First of all, I can only repeat that it is not because of bureaucratic difficulties that the safeguard clause has never been applied. If circumstances warrant it, I can assure the honourable Members that it can be applied at twenty-four hours' notice.

I agree with Mr Diana that the question of quality standards is extremely important and offers the solution to a number of problems that could arise in this sector in future. I therefore agree with him that this work must be speeded up and that the Commission must, as soon as possible, be in a position to present a

definitive proposal on quality standards. This is what we are aiming at.

I do not share Mr Diana's optimism about the degree of consensus existing in the advisory committee. Two of the Member States most concerned in the floriculture sector do not agree with the views expressed by the other experts and shared by the floriculture industry in the other Member States. There is still quite a long way to go, I am afraid, before we get a reasonable degree of unanimity on which to base a Commission proposal which would have a fair chance of being adopted by the Council. As I say, I agree with Mr Diana that a lot of hard work is needed to solve this problem.

President. — Question No 14 by Mr Bangemann (H-310/79) has been withdrawn.

Question No 15 By Miss Brookes (H-316/79):

As a result of British Steel Corporation's decision announced on 9th November 1979, to close a section of Shotton Steelworks, 6 500 of its employees will lose their jobs, as will many other workers whose jobs depend on steel. Will the Commission take all necessary steps to mitigate the disastrous effect of this closure, in particular by making available all possible financial aid for the re-training of workers, and the future development of Deeside?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) In order to provide the maximum assistance to the workers who will be losing their jobs as a result of the closure of part of the Shotton steelworks by the British Steel Corporation, the Commission, acting on a request from the British Government, made available aid of 7.7 million pounds sterling at the end of last year. This money is to be used in cooperation with the British Government in order to guarantee an income for the workers concerned over a given period depending on their personal circumstances, possibly through early retirement measures or by defraying the cost of retraining and if necessary reaccommodation. This aid is being granted under the terms of the agreement arrived at between the British Government and the Commission on the subject of aid to workers in the steel industry who lose their jobs as a result of developments on the market for steel products.

The European Social Fund can also provide aid for retraining or payment of removal expenses of workers in Shotton other than the actual steelworks personnel. This measure is applicable in the first instance to workers in undertakings whose activities are related to those of the steel works, e.g. the staff of supplier concerns. Since the Shotton steelworks are located in an area eligible for support from the European Regional Development Fund, assistance from the Social Fund can also be extended to workers of undertakings outside the steel sector provided that they are threatened with unemployment.

Vredeling

For 1980, the Commission has received an application for aid from the Social Fund amounting to 4 million pounds sterling to assist 4 200 workers in the British steelmaking areas which include Shotton. More general programmes for the regional development of the Shotton area will of course be eligible for aid from the Social Fund and European Regional Development Fund, in so far as the United Kingdom makes an application to that effect.

Miss Brookes. — Indeed, I am grateful for the 7.7 million pounds that is coming to Deeside. Mr Commissioner, you have not mentioned one group of people that is not covered in your answer, namely, the young people and school leavers who have never been employed in the steel industry and therefore are not covered by Article 56 and have no provision made for them within the guidelines of the Social Fund. I ask you, Mr Commissioner, if you will give the assurance that you will take up the question of young people and school leavers who are not employed in the steel industry throughout the United Kingdom and the Community and see that they receive financial aid from the Social Fund and within the guidelines of the Social Fund, which are not met at the moment?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) Yes, I am able to confirm that the Commission is also giving consideration to the category referred to by the Honourable Member. However, the great difficulty here is that the provision of assistance from the Social Fund is restricted, by decision of the Council of Ministers, to persons who are seeking initial employment and are registered with employment offices. Often the category referred to by the Honourable Member does not meet this criterion. We therefore have the illogical situation that schoolleavers are not strictly speaking eligible for aid from the Social Fund, although their need for such aid is apparent.

When we submitted our proposal to the Council last November on sandwich courses we had these particular categories in mind and wanted the relevant regulations to be adapted. The Council refused to do so but we are doing all we can to bring this category within the area of application of the Social Fund.

Mr Griffiths. — I widen the scope of the question by asking if the Commission is aware of any progress being made in the Council to achieve agreement on those proposals of the Commission which included projects for job preservation in the steel industry. In this context, has the Commission received any approach from the British Government to provide Community aid for the British Steel Corporation to amend its plans announced a month ago to massacre the British steel industry, and those areas like South Wales dependent upon it, by throwing out of work some 30 % of its workforce within a year?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) Our proposals relate to the restructuring of the steel sector and are based on Article 95 of the ECSC Treaty; the Commission had entered an amount of 100 million EUA for this purpose in the preliminary draft budget. The Council deleted this entry but, as you know, Parliament reinstated an amount of 30 million last year. These proposals must now be examined in the context of the budgetary procedure. I should like to use this opportunity to draw the specific attention of Parliament to this point. You have indicated very clearly how necessary this money is, especially, but not solely, because of the problems in the United Kingdom.

The Commission is particularly concerned at the threat of redundancies, some of which have already taken place in the steel industry. In the course of this year, 52 000 persons will become unemployed. The British Government has not yet submitted any concrete proposals to us on this matter. The situation in the United Kingdom is extremely difficult at present. A major strike is in progress and, according to the newspaper reports this strike is only about wage increases and has no bearing on the redundancies — I find that fact rather strange.

Mr Collins. — I wonder if the Commissioner would agree with many of the proposals that we have heard about. As Miss Brookes has said, many of these proposals amount to locking the stable door after the horse has bolted. I wonder if the Commission would agree that the problems of the steel industry in general, and of the United Kingdom in particular, are being exacerbated by the determination of certain Member States, including the United Kingdom, to embark on lunatic experiments in monetarist theory.

(Protests from the European Democratic Group)

I wonder if they would agree that if realistic production targets were established in Member States, then the future and security of thousands of workers would be considerably improved.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I must of course reject the suggestion implicit in the question that other Member States are to blame for the difficulties faced by the British steel industry. No, that really is a little far-fetched.

The second part of the question related to the necessary adaptations in the steel industry. The reduction in production capacity is a painful but logical process. However, this process is necessary in all the Member States and not merely in the United Kingdom. We must not labour under the illusion that an increase in production capacity can help to solve employment problems. On the contrary, it would only make matters worse.

Mr Rogers. — Would the Commissioner not agree that the European Coal and Steel Community funds ought to be used for restructuring and modernizing the steel industry and retraining redundant workers and not, as is now the case in the United Kingdom, for purchasing jobs belonging to future generations, aiding and abetting the wholesale butchery of a basic industry by the original honourable questioner's Conservative friends, especially in view of the fact that recent proposals by her friends in Westminster would take out 6.5 million liquid tonne steel capacity in Great Britain over the next three months, more than was proposed for Europe in the next three years? As you said, Mr Commissioner, you do not understand these proposals and have not had them in detail, which is a terrible shame and indictment on my own government, but do you not think that the money ought to be used properly rather than in this wasteful way?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) The Honourable Member has really answered his own question. We have no information on the plans of the British Steel Corporation in respect, for instance, of management objectives. That is a great pity. We are therefore having to follow the situation on the basis of newspaper reports or information given by the social partners. We have not been officially informed of the planned closure or closures of steelworks in the United Kingdom and I cannot therefore answer the question as to whether the money could be used more effectively.

Mr Marshall. — Would the Commissioner not agree that the figure quoted — 250 000 job losses — is a figment of someone's imagination? Would he also not agree that the key to job preservation in the steel industry is making that industry competitive, and would he not agree that productivity in the British Steel Corporation is one-half of the productivity of the steel industry elsewhere in Europe; would he not agree that the British Government in the fiscal year 1981/82 will be providing £400 million of taxpayers' money to the British Steel Corporation, and would he not agree that if these redundancies do not take place, the British Steel Corporation will be even less competitive and its future will be very much at risk, and that these redundancies are essential to preserve a British Steel Corporation that is competitive in the world and is able to offer long-term security to its employees?

(Loud laughter from certain quarters on the left)

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I can only answer that the specific purpose of our proposals is to prevent workers from being made redundant without any aid measures.

As I have already said, I am not familiar with the detailed plans of the British Steel Corporation but our own intention in connection with the restructuring of the steel industry is to prevent cold rationalization involving redundancies without special assistance.

President. — Question No 16 by Miss Hooper (H-337/79):

Is the Commission aware of the complaints of British steel bath manufacturers that Italian manufacturers, (and in particular the firm of Merloni Igienico Sanitari S.p.A.) are being subsidized by the Italian Government and are dumping their products on the European market, causing factory closures and loss of jobs; and what action does the Commission propose to take on this?

Mr Vouel, Member of the Commission. — (F) The Commission is aware of complaints made by British manufacturers of steel baths. In 1977 it made a survey which led to the conclusion that there was no dumping by the Italian manufacturers. Consideration of a second complaint in October 1978 also showed that no aid incompatible with the rules on competition contained in the Treaty was being granted. Finally, in response to a third complaint put forward in 1979, the Commission established that the company concerned did not hold a dominant position on this market and the accusations of abuse of a dominant position on the market were therefore not entertained against it. In the light of these various enquiries, the results of which were notified in each case to the parties concerned, the Commission does not feel that it should envisage special measures in this particular instance.

Miss Hooper. — I would like to draw the Commissioner's attention to the fact that, as he rightly said, the original complaint was made as long ago as 1977. The replies to the interested parties did in fact take considerable time to come through and, I think, are not even now completely clear to those parties. In the meantime one factory has gone out of business and a further factory is on the point of closing, which leaves only one steel bath manufacturer in the United Kingdom. Would the Commissioner therefore like to assure us that in future, when complaints of this nature are made, the Commission will take steps to report immediately upon the complaints?

Mr Vouel. — (F) The first complaint about dumping was extremely complex and took time to look into. However, the company concerned was notified of the result of the enquiry as soon as it had been completed.

Secondly, it is not correct to say that the company in question is not yet in possession of the results of the last enquiry. That is not so. The company has definitely been informed of the results of the Commission's last enquiry.

Mr Purvis. — I find it hard to understand how the Commission could have taken so long to decide that there was no dumping, that there was no unfair competition, that there was, and is apparently, no dominant position when products were being sold by Merloni in the UK market at prices below the variable cost of production in the United Kingdom using the

Purvis

most modern processes. These interminable delays in getting answers, in investigating the matters, have in themselves effectively caused the elimination of all competition in this sector. What is the Commission going to do now to ensure that there is genuine competition in the steel bath sector? What is the structure of the current production in the Community?

Mr Vouel. — (F) To illustrate the diligence shown by the Commission in this case, I would point out that the complaint about dumping reached us early in 1977 and the Commission gave its answer in a matter of months.

As to the substance of the matter, the Commission, in this as in other sectors, has the task of maintaining competition. If you want my own opinion in this matter I would say that our enquiries conducted following complaints from British manufacturers showed that the competitive strength of the Italian firm did not stem from illicit practices contrary to the Treaty; the reason must be sought elsewhere. The Commission has no objection to make in this instance because its task is to maintain healthy competition.

President. — Question No 17 by Lord Douro (H-343/79):

Would the Commission indicate what steps have been taken to ensure that the French and Irish Governments comply with Community law in the application of VAT to the import of thoroughbred racehorses and to supplies of training services?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — Representations have been made to the Commission by a number of honourable Members and by a number of interested parties to the effect that certain aspects of the French and Irish VAT systems, as they apply to the imports of thoroughbred racehorses and to supplies of training services, may not be fully in conformity with the provisions of the Sixth VAT Directive. The Commission is currently conducting a detailed examination of the provisions in question, and of the particular conditions of their application to the sector concerned, with the authorities of the two Member States concerned. It will take whatever action may appear to be required at the conclusion of this examination.

Lord Douro. — Is the Commissioner aware of the damage which is being done to the British racing industry by the difference in treatment of VAT chargeable on the import of thoroughbred racehorses? My understanding is that the Commission is of the opinion that both the French and Irish Governments are contravening the Sixth Directive in relation to the import of bloodstock. That being the case, would the Commissioner not agree that the right course of action would now be to bring an action in the European Court, without any further delay, so that we can

have a definition of this matter, and in that way remove a serious anomaly which is putting the British racing industry at such a severe disadvantage?

Mr Burke. — In reply to the first part of that two-part supplementary I would indicate that since the United Kingdom Government formerly complained to the Commission about the allegedly unfavourable treatment of their bloodstocks, it is clear that they consider that damage is in fact being done. In regard to the procedure, I would point out to the House that the Commission has in fact taken an initial decision in this matter, and I can assure the honourable Member that in view of the importance of the matter there will be no undue delay in the further progress of the dossier. I would like to give the assurance that this is receiving the full attention of the relevant services and that a decision will be taken as soon as possible.

Mr Turner. — May I ask the Commissioner whether his case, when he eventually puts it forward, will be based upon the fact that it is unfair and wrong in law that the VAT should be based on the average value of all horses in a particular country rather than upon the particular value of the horse in question? And may I ask him whether he would welcome evidence from the British industry as to the appropriateness of the latter method of taxation rather than the former?

Mr Burke. — In reply to my honourable friend who, I understand, is a member of the legal profession, I think he would understand the delicacy of my position in replying to the first part of his supplementary. In regard to the second part, i.e. the evidence which might be made available, the Commission is always anxious to receive the fullest documentation possible and will give it its full attention.

(Laughter)

President. — The first part of Question Time is closed.¹

16. EEC supplies of mineral and vegetable raw materials

President. — The next item is the oral question (0-98/79) by Mrs Moreau, Mrs Lenz, Mr Filippi, Mr Jonker and Mr De Keersmaecker to the Commission (Doc. 1-611/79):

Subject: EEC supplies of mineral and vegetable primary materials

Is the Commission able to establish a precise inventory of the requirements of the Member States of the European Community with regard to mineral and vegetable primary materials, with the exception of energy products, and can it, on this basis, assess the principal elements of the security of our supplies of these materials?

I call Mrs Moreau.

¹ See Annex

Mrs Moreau. — (F) Madam President, economic activity in Europe was for a long time supported by the resources of our own countries. Today the situation is quite different. Europe has become heavily dependent on the outside world. The survival of our economic activity, the employment of our citizens and their standards of living are closely bound up with the world outside us. Europe has become as it were a factory ship. The dangers inherent in this situation are obvious and considerable. They result in sudden interruptions of supply, shortages and price rises. May I quote a few examples? The recent suspension of Russian exports of titanium, a highly specialized metal, led to serious apprehension about the manufacture of the European airbus. Is it not even more astonishing to learn that the Russians suspended their deliveries because they needed this metal to build a monument to Yuri Gagarin?

In my own country the deficit on mineral raw materials (excluding energy supplies), and without counting imports of vegetable raw materials, will stand at about 21 thousand million francs, or 5 thousand million dollars, this year. Why is this so? Because the boom of the Western economies since 1945 and the attainment of hitherto unknown growth rates engendered enormous needs. Because the requirements of the Western economies are being augmented, to an ever-increasing extent, by the needs of the developing countries themselves. Because Europe has not been able to find on its own territory the raw materials and energy sources open to it in previous centuries. 44 % of known world reserves are to be found in the industrialized countries, 33 % in the Eastern bloc and 27 % in the developing countries. But when we look into the distribution of particular reserves we find that 75 to 100 % of the reserves of certain raw materials are concentrated in three countries. Western Europe has practically no non-ferrous metals. The overall degree of dependence has been estimated at 75 % of the overall needs for the Community. If my figures are correct, the degree of dependence of the Community is 100 % for manganese, 100 % for chromium, 100 % for cobalt, 100 % for platinum, 99 % for tungsten and 99 % for vanadium. Lacking in resources of their own, the European countries are therefore confronted with a problem which will grow as the years pass. The Iranian crisis is opening the eyes of many observers and forcing them to admit that times are changing, that the international division of power is no longer what it was before, that serious political crises will arise unexpectedly in many raw material producing countries, that the developing countries will in turn be demanding a growing share of the available raw materials and that they will therefore increasingly come to pursue a policy of withholding their products from the market. When they do agree to sell, they will see to it that the prices are as high as possible, for the direct and often exclusive benefit of

their national economy. Our world is moving towards a division between major geo-political and geo-economic zones — Europe being one of the most important such zones — and not towards a united, peaceful and prosperous universe.

Europe is thus faced with an entirely new situation which is characterized, if I may take an image from the supply of electricity, by short-circuits and power cuts. It is not yet in the situation of a besieged fortress but it is already faced with the need to protect its lines of communication and rethink its supply policy. The concrete actions which I believe must be implemented include savings in the consumption of paper, textiles and mineral ores. We know something about this in the European Parliament. Other actions are equally imperative: recycling of raw materials, direction of production towards products involving low energy consumption and low raw material requirements, replacement of imported raw materials by European equivalents, development of existing European resources, recourse to new sources in the sea and the formation of stocks of sensitive materials.

First and foremost, we need an essential working instrument in the shape of an inventory of the needs and resources of the Community in the raw material sector. In 1951, the United States realized for the first time that their economy was liable to be endangered by the shortage of raw material supplies and they began to compile an inventory of their needs and resources. In January 1951, President Truman entrusted a committee with the task of preparing such an inventory — this gave rise to the Peel report, named after the committee chairman.

Whatever measures have already been undertaken, I consider that the European Community is in vital need of an inventory on similar lines to the Peel report. The inventory should comprise an analysis of needs for all mineral and vegetable raw materials consumed by the Community; an analysis of volume and sources of supply for each of these materials and a study of measures which could be taken to reduce Europe's dependence on outside supplies. This report should of course be drawn up in the light of the medium and long-term situation. Close attention should be given to the problem of costs. Finally, reference should be made to the fact that Europe not only imports but also exports mineral and vegetable raw materials.

The question which I have put today in turn raises several other questions. It concerns the role of the Assembly. Will the Assembly agree to meet my request? Is the Commission capable of taking responsibility for drawing up this inventory and how long would it require to call upon the service of international experts? The European Community is an economic giant with immense strength but it is also extremely vulnerable because of its dependence on

Moreau

imported energy and raw materials. Why should we not draw up, on the basis of the specific inventory which I am asking the Commission to compile, a Community plan for exploration and investment in the mining sector?

IN THE CHAIR : MR ROGERS*Vice-President*

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) I wish to thank Mrs Moreau for drawing Parliament's attention to this matter once again. I say once again because there was an initial debate at the last sitting prior to direct elections; on that occasion Mr Pisani drew our attention, in terms closely resembling those used by Mrs Moreau, to this problem. We are confronted here with a very delicate problem of analysis. Why? The first simple fact is that we do not have major resources of mineral raw materials in the Community — that fact is already known.

The second important consideration is to assess the extent to which this lack constitutes a danger or a need for immediate action. This is where the analysis becomes difficult, because the fact of a 75 % dependence on outside sources is not serious if the possible sources of supply are diversified and manifold; that is a situation with which we are perfectly familiar. On the other hand if our dependence, is, say, only 60 % while the situation is such that demand trends suggest a risk of shortages of the raw material, producers are in a position to exert economic or political pressure (the example of titanium and the change in the Soviet Union's export policy was quoted a moment ago), then it is difficult not to ask a number of questions rather than accepting the validity of the immediate explanations.

Continuous studies and analysis are therefore necessary in this respect. What stage have we now reached and what needs to be done? The Commission has drawn up an inventory of supplies covering 22 mineral raw materials based on a reference period 1975-77 in order to provide us with a valid statistical instrument. We are preparing similar surveys for vegetable raw materials which may, in some cases, present special problems; rubber and hides are examples — at one time the entire leather industry of the Community was in a difficult situation because it did not have access to enough quality hides.

Once we have this instrument at our disposal, we must effect an analysis and for this purpose we must

call upon experts to ascertain whether our projection is correct and also upon the economic operators who play an essential role in ensuring economic stability — I have in mind here university and professional research institutes, as well as the trade union research institutes because their contribution can influence the stability of industrial development and of employment. In consultation with the Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, I feel that we should define a working method to enable this analysis to be carried out jointly with the Commission, the Council and Parliament, if the latter so wishes. We should then have at our disposal an instrument which might be less spectacular than the one to which Mrs Moreau referred when she spoke of President Truman, but would nevertheless be useful; it seems to me a waste of time that analyses of this kind are conducted in isolation within the Community without the necessary coordination. I think therefore that in conjunction with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs we should develop a working method of analysis.

Without awaiting the resulting data, we have already — as I am sure Mrs Moreau will have noted — included in the second Convention of Lomé a proposal for the financing of guarantees for the development of mineral resources in countries where these resources are not at present being exploited because of a shortage of development capacity; this provision will apply to mineral ores which analysis already shows likely to be in real shortage. A period of ten years is of course needed between the time when prospecting begins and the time at which initial industrial-scale extraction is possible. That is the time-scale here and considerable amounts of money are involved which can only increase as technology advances.

To sum up, I would say that the Commission has, if I may be allowed to make the comparison, a raw material of its own which we wish to exploit. Perhaps we in the Commission and Parliament might pursue our consideration of this proposal before making, in eight or ten months time, an initial analysis of the repercussions of the new provision which we have included in the Convention of Lomé with a view for the first time to the development of external mineral resources.

As to the valorization and exploitation of the Community's own resources in this area, action is now underway; Mrs Moreau is familiar with that action but our funds for this purpose are more limited. Measures being taken include an analysis of reserves and a series of recycling projects, the aim being to make the fullest possible use of our industry and resources.

President. — I call Mrs Moreau.

Mrs Moreau. — (F) I wish to thank Mr Davignon because I believe that this problem really is important to our Community. I should not like us to be confronted in other sectors with the difficulty we are already experiencing with our energy supplies. I am quite satisfied with the Commissioner's answer, with the proviso that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs or the committee of which I am myself a member should begin serious work now because the time-scale is a long one.

President. — This item is closed.

17. *Steadily rising cost of housing*

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate (0-119/79) tabled by Mr Blaney, on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, to the Commission (Doc. 1-614/79):

Subject: Steadily rising cost of housing

In view of the obstacles to the development of backward and outlying areas resulting from the steadily rising cost of housing will the European Commission undertake the necessary urgent measures to enable the Regional Fund and, if possible, the housing programme under the ECSC Treaty to be used more extensively to meet this problem?

The speakers' list will now be closed.

I call Mr Blaney.

Mr Blaney. — Mr President, I have been prompted to table this question — and I am very glad to have the opportunity of speaking on it — by the rising costs of which everybody is so well aware, but also by the need to relate those rising costs to the absolute basic essential which housing is to our people, no matter what country they may be from or what region of any country they may reside in. I have been assisted in bringing this to the notice of the Assembly by the Technical Coordination Group, the group to which I belong, and some of its speakers may be coming after me.

I wish to say that I have had experience in housing. I was Minister of Housing for nine years in my own country, and after many years of those nine I succeeded in getting my own Government, back in 1966, to take a fresh look at the manner in which we were progressing in the housing and rehousing of old people and particularly the less well-off people, no matter what area or region they might come from. The result of this was that we then were enabled to provide housing aids out of State resources, which in 1966 were very scarce indeed. I say this merely to

underline the importance that my government and I, as Minister for Housing at that time, attached to enabling people to provide their own houses, owner-occupiers being the desired effect.

£900 was then offered, graded upwards and depending on the income of the persons applying for these grants, to enable them to provide their own houses, to build them, or to assist them in purchasing from the speculative builders. That at that time, I might say, amounted to the total value of the materials required, placed on the site, and was basically half the total cost of providing a three-bedroomed, modest, serviced house, i.e. a house with a 850 to 900 or 1 000 sq. ft. floor area. The result of all this, together with the previous efforts and lesser grants of years gone by, is that in Ireland at this moment we have a 75% owner-occupier situation. Out of a stock of 850 000 houses, three-quarters are owner-occupied, and from every point of view this is, I believe very sincerely, a very useful, desirable and, one might almost say, essential thing, especially if it can be maintained in the future. However, the escalation of costs and inflation mean that that £900 would today require to be approximately £7 000 in order to contribute in the same manner and in the same proportion as that grant did at that time.

This cannot be done by my Government nor, I fear, by any other national government of the less well-off countries, and it is for this reason that I make this appeal to the Assembly and to the Commission and indeed also to the Council and to some Member States here who are better off than some others of us. I suggest to them that this is something to which they could well lend their aid, in order that we would have people building their own homes, assisted by attractive grants that would enable them to build and thereby obviate the ever-increasing cost. The almost impossible position with which our public authorities and our housing authorities are faced is that, with the cost of housing gone up almost tenfold over these last 13 years, they are just no longer able to bear that sort of cost.

The idea behind these grants would be that we could, particularly in so far as the rural areas are concerned, expect people to do as they were doing in my country back in the late 60s, i.e. to build their own houses with the assistance of these grants rather than be dependent upon the public housing authority to provide the house for them at a greater cost, I might say, to the community than would otherwise be the case.

If we project the inflationary tendencies of today and our experience in recent years into the future, then we can look forward not just to an average cost for a small three-bedroomed house of approximately £17 500 back in Ireland, which represents about 1 million Belgian francs, but we can anticipate that by the year 1990 this price will have risen to about

Blaney

£50 000, maybe £60-80 000, and therefore we are talking, again in Belgian francs, of anything in the region of 3 to 5 million francs. This means effectively that we can now be quite certain that three-quarters of our population in the future cannot hope to own their own homes. They can never hope to provide and build their own homes as they have been doing in less-off times than these, and I say that this is not just a social matter. This is, a matter that involves regional development.

It involves particularly the agricultural community and the maintaining on the small farms of our deprived areas of those same small farmers that the agricultural policy would wish to take care of. If they do not have houses, then the younger and newer generations are not going to be there. They will flee from the land and will naturally tend to go to the better-off areas of their own countries and ultimately to the better-off countries. The plea that I make to the better-off countries, such as Germany, for instance is that it is good economics to try to provide these grants, this sort of assistance, so that they themselves do not ultimately have to pay much more in order to try to solve the problem being created by the inflationary tendencies of today and the extremely high costs that I have just mentioned.

We therefore need a coordinated policy. Hence, as well as Mr Vredeling, I should like to have seen Commissioner Giolitti here, but I understand he could not be here. Commissioner Davignon, who was and still is here indeed, I would also like to bring into this, because if we do not have houses for the people in the deprived areas — and we shall not have them in the manner in which we are going about it at the moment — we cannot provide industry, no matter what other aids we might give. So I would look for a coordinated policy.

I would also say that it is not a matter of confining these aids to particular areas so much as looking into people's needs. I would ask that, in addition to the grants being provided through the Community, assisted loans, such as the 7 % loan being provided in the Coal and Steel Community at the moment, should also be considered and added to the grants, in order that people's needs should be thought about and not just areas only. So I am saying to the Commissioner, who may be about to answer, that what I really want is realistic assistance from all the various sources that I have mentioned, and not just one only, to try, with the help of our national governments, to aim at providing grants of approximately £7 000 related to incomes — and I stress that again, related to incomes. In addition, I would ask that the 7 % assisted loans now being enjoyed by the Coal and Steel Community areas might also be thought of as part of the way in which this very essential commodity, this basic commodity, the housing of our people, could be attained at the least possible cost and with great social benefit to all.

President. — I call Mr Vredeling.

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, may I say in answer to the honourable Member that it is not the Commission's intention to take specific measures in order to check the steep increase in the cost of housing through financial support from the Regional Fund. The Regional Fund has a quota section from which no funds are used to finance residential building activities. As regards the non-quota section we have submitted a proposal to the Council which does indirectly include a measure for housing; this is an indirect, supporting measure for areas in which new jobs are created and in which the construction of housing is needed to provide accommodation for workers and their families.

In addition we have for many years had a residential building programme within the European Coal and Steel Community; we have recently renewed this in the shape of a ninth programme. An appropriation of 30 million EUA is available for the financing of certain residential building facilities, but only in the coal and steel sector. There are no such facilities in other sectors. I realize that this does not meet the wishes expressed in the honourable Member's question. I simply wanted to explain, for the sake of completeness, that the Commission's residential building activities have so far been confined of necessity to the coal and steel sector.

As regards the activities of the Regional Fund, we are able to grant certain facilities from the non-quota section; these facilities are not designed to compensate the consequences of inflation and the steep rise in building costs but to assist in the creation of new jobs. We must of necessity confine ourselves to action of this kind.

You probably know that there are many policy areas in our Community which do not yet form the subject of a common policy. residential building is one of them. We do not have a common policy for housing construction and urban improvement. We have no powers here except in the coal and steel sector. If the Community is to follow a comprehensive economic and social policy, residential building would naturally have to form part of it. We have not reached that stage yet.

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

Mrs Desmond. — This is a question which is of immense interest to those of us who represent the peoples of outlying regions in this Parliament. EEC policy has acknowledged that in the quest to preserve and to strengthen the communities in such areas, it is essential that the necessary infrastructure be provided in those areas.

Desmond

Such infrastructures have been thought of up to now, I believe, as including adequate water and sewage services, good road networks, proper development. But the very basic need to house the human beings who form the community, and who hope to work and live their lives in that community, have been overlooked to date.

It has always shocked me as very strange that the need to meet such a basic social need is overlooked. It is important that this issue be raised in Parliament, and I sincerely compliment Mr Blaney on raising it tonight. The stark fact is, as he has stated, that house prices have risen far above the financial capacity of the average wage earner or person on comparable income.

Inflation has hit the cost of housing hardest of all. With the advent of county development plans and the like, the price of land in these areas has rocketed, particularly in the areas where it is permissible to build a house in the first instance. With the increase in the number of young people and the falling marriage age, the young, in particular, have extreme difficulty in providing themselves with the living accommodation they require.

They are forced to provide in a very fundamental way, and many of them have to live in overcrowded, unsuitable conditions, forced after marriage to reside with parents and perhaps with members of a grown family. This presents an obvious danger to health as well as a threat to normal peaceful living. Overcrowding and bad conditions cause tensions and strains which human relationships very often cannot withstand.

We have just come through the year 1979, the International Year of the Child, and we cannot but be mindful that many children in the outlying areas of this Community live in families which are not properly housed. I think it is sad that no proposals emerged during the year to tackle that problem. A modest, three-bedroomed house in the most remote area in Ireland today costs in the region of £20 000. Grand schemes, as has been stated, are totally unrealistic as an aid to those seeking to erect a house for themselves.

Local authority housing loans in our country are limited to £9 000, which is less than half the cost of a house. With the application of normal loan charges, that loan costs between £20 and £25 a week in repayments, that is to those who qualify in the first instance. These loans are restricted to persons with incomes of under £4 000 a year, or less than £80 a week.

A loan large enough to purchase a home is often not available from any source to those on average incomes. Even if it were, the repayments would account for perhaps up to three-quarters of their total incomes.

If we are to seriously set about developing the regions, we must broaden the scope of the assistance schemes in operation to include and provide in particular for assistance towards the cost of housing. It seems to me that an expansion of the Regional Fund for this purpose is not only desirable but essential to the whole principle and spirit of regional development. I am glad to hear that the non-quota system can be used for this purpose, but I would make the point that this Fund will need to be very greatly increased if it is going to make the point that this Fund will need to be very greatly increased if it is going to make any impact.

We speak of building up human communities in the underdeveloped regions; the first requirement of the people who form those communities is housing, and unless we help them we cannot hope to succeed in our aims.

Subsidized loans under the European Coal and Steel Community Treaty have been mentioned. They have been of real assistance to those who qualify for them; they have been assisted to meet the cost of erecting homes and to reconstruct existing homes — a scheme such as this on a more widespread scale would help considerably.

The European Community had an elaborate and detailed scheme of grants and loans available for many and various needs which have arisen and been identified from time to time. The most basic of such needs is surely the very primary need of a home in which to live. This is the need that should, I think, have priority for consideration in 1980. I hope that the tabling of this question will set minds turning specifically in that direction, and I would make the point that we need a housing policy to cater for the human needs of our Community.

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

Mr McCartin. — Mr President, on behalf of the Christian-Democrats I should like to underline the fact that we see and recognize it as a basic human right that every family should have an opportunity to own and occupy its own home and we shall continue to pursue this objective as part of our policy both within this Parliament and in our respective countries.

However, with the cost of housing in the part of the Community that I represent rising at twice the ordinary inflation rate, I am forced to recognize that this basic right is becoming increasingly harder for the average citizen to achieve. Furthermore, as has often been pointed out in the past as a percentage of the total cost, the level of State subsidy available is constantly falling.

Mc Cartin

I am sure that all of us subscribe to the belief that every child and every person is entitled to an equal opportunity in life. However, I do not think such equal opportunity can exist unless children are brought up in a stable and healthy home, and the ownership and the occupancy of that home by the family involved is never in question in any way. If we compare housing with health, we find that in the health field we have in recent years, generally speaking, moved near to a situation of equal opportunity and equal standards as between the poor, the less-privileged and the better-off, whereas in the housing field the gap was widened noticeably between the very rich and the very poor. It is becoming obvious that in the decade ahead of us the resources and the concern of our Community must be focused on this problem since I believe that our success or failure in this area will have a profound effect on the way that our society in this Community develops and will determine the extent to which we are able to achieve and maintain social equilibrium, peace and harmony. I believe that it is that important.

Moreover, I should like to point out that contrary to what is becoming a more and more widely held view, there are in fact many young people, many young married women, who would be completely happy to assume the full-time responsibilities of looking after their home and of bringing up and looking after a family. However, the fact that the cost of housing was escalated to such an extent makes it much more difficult for a woman to devote her time to her family, particularly in the context of the present scarcity of employment. If, in fact, it were not so difficult for a family to buy and finance its home, more women would be prepared to stay at home to devote themselves to the full-time care of their family. Indeed, it is becoming quite obvious in the part of the Community that I represent that the cost of providing a home is preventing many women from actually pursuing the sort of life which they would choose if they were free to do so. I think that in view of all these things it is depressing to note that in the last five years up to 1978, there has been a steady decline in the number of houses built each year throughout the Community. My group believes that this whole question requires a comprehensive and in-depth study.

Finally, I should like to say that this issue calls into question the whole of the Community regional policy and the impact which the Regional Fund is able to make by way of levelling up opportunity within the various regions. I think that this calls for a stronger regional policy offering employment and opportunities to make a living, and a social policy which will guarantee those employed, thanks to whatever incentives and assistance we are able to provide, the basic human right of owning their own home and bringing up their family in the dignity and security of that home. I think that this is an objective which is going further out of our reach and to which we give our serious consideration in the immediate future.

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

Mr Møller. — (DK) Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Blaney for putting this question, with debate. Now he has done so on behalf of his group, the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, and that group interests me very much, not least because it includes four Danish Members, who were elected to represent the view that Parliament's and the Community's powers should not be increased beyond the limits originally intended in the Treaty. We have now heard the Commissioner state that a common housing policy, however much we might want such a thing, would mean that we were exceeding the Community's terms of reference. Now Mr Blaney asks how far we may expect to have a common housing policy, which prompts me to ask: Is that on behalf of the whole group, including, therefore, the Danish Members?

(Shout from Mr Bonde: No)

It appears not. But in that case I cannot understand how the question could be presented in this way, if Mr Bonde tells us that the four Danish Members of the group are not among the questioners. However, I wish to thank Mr Blaney and the Commissioners.

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

Mr Cecovini. — (I) Mr President, the question which has been raised is one of very great importance and I think that it does not relate only to Mr Blaney's country — although Mr Blaney obviously has direct experience of his own — but in fact concerns all of us. I am Italian and I can say that in Italy too the problem exists on the same scale and with the same gravity: there are constant requests for housing accommodation which cannot be met and there are families that have been waiting for many years for the assignment of a low-cost housing unit.

We in Italy — and I think the position is similar in the other countries — are essentially pursuing a fragmentary policy which seeks to solve day-to-day problems and has not succeeded in laying down a common direction. It is that common direction that we particularly need in Europe. The time has surely come for an overall approach to the problem.

The aspect of costs and inflation is not the only consideration. Costs are rising at a vertiginous rate: a person who today buys an apartment which is being built in the hope of occupying it in a few years time — that is now the rule — has no idea what the real cost will be when he takes possession. The cost will probably have doubled in the meantime and not everyone is able to cope when the time comes with a budget which is so out of balance with the anticipated cost.

Cecovini

On the other hand our way of life has also changed. This whole problem is therefore bound up above all with the evolution in our living habits. The old tightly-knit family has ceased to exist and children are no longer content to live with their parents; they do not wish to live with old people. Every young family now wants to have accommodation at once and is generally not in a position to purchase it. I therefore fully endorse Mr Blaney's comments on the urgency and seriousness of this problem.

Perhaps Community intervention could stabilize a market which is in a constant state of turbulence to the detriment first and foremost of young families and of the generations who are placing the hope of a better life in Europe.

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

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, I must thank Mr Blaney for raising this matter. I would like to thank other speakers for making some points saying I would like to have made and so saving me doing so.

Mrs Desmond mentioned the usefulness of infrastructure schemes. All of us in the Regional Committee would agree with her, and we will keep pressing, because that will help the problem.

Mrs Desmond also spoke about the industrial aspect of this. I reasonably would like to turn to the rural problems that I encounter in my vast constituency of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland and which I am sure are met with in other parts of the Community. Because it is such a beautiful area, where people can escape their problems and get away to mountains and lochs, with a lot of wild life and much beauty, we have some unfortunate results. One is that the stock of houses in villages, small towns and seaside areas tends to be depleted for the use of local people. To put it very simply, the problem is holiday homes.

I am not against holiday homes, but I would rather see them on the Scandinavian model, where holiday homes are away from the communities and loch sides and are intended for holiday recreation. We have villages where the whole stock of houses is out of local hands and where in the winter, and indeed most of the year, these communities become ghost towns. I think the Community should have a look at this because there should be some kind of policy to encourage existing communities to have their own stock of houses, through incentives or other means.

Another result of the great beauty of my area is that vast areas are being bought up by absentee landlords. One million acres in the last year have fallen into the hands of Arabs alone, who have no real intention of contributing anything whatsoever to this community, or to Scotland, or the UK. Many of these estates are

indeed ringed round by high fences. They are simply being kept in cold storage as a good investment — which I am perfectly certain they will be.

I wonder, Mr Commissioner, if anywhere else in the Community there is such a scandalous exploitation of land going on. Although some of this land is of poor quality it could be used, if put to its best use, to provide some kinds of job. Forestry provides few, but at least they are permanent and regular jobs, and in a very depopulated area even a few male jobs and a few families can often be saving of a village.

So I would like to relate the problem of the housing cost to the question of depopulation — not the question of attracting industry, which is also a problem, as has been mentioned by other speakers, but that of keeping what communities already have in order to survive. I would like to think that this Community would not allow communities to become ghost communities. That is happening as I stand here and speak.

Finally, in the UK economy the construction industry is used as an economic regulator, at least in practice. Every time there is a recession, the smaller type of building firm goes out of business. Enormous numbers of bankruptcies are occurring at the present time, and the skilled workforce that is built up in many local areas such as my own constituency disperses. The firm goes out of existence, the workforce disperses and goes into other employment, probably in the industrial areas, and that skill is lost. Then it is all the more expensive, once the recession is over, to try and start the whole procedure again. I would ask the Commissioner, then, if he intends to ensure that the situation does not deteriorate any further.

President. — I call Mr Bonde.

Mr Bonde. — *(DK)* Mr President, I can dispel Mr Møller's doubts. This debate was not called for by the group as such; it was called by Mr Blaney, who is a member of the group. Mr Møller could have answered his own question by listening to Mr Blaney's remarks, since he began by drawing attention to this slight misunderstanding.

But when Denmark was to join the Community, people told us that the high rate of interest on mortgages would fall and lo and behold, it fell from 11 to 17%. That means that a newly built flat which cost 1 100 kroner per month in 1972 costs 1 700 kroner per month today, simply as a result of the rise in interest. I am not suggesting that Denmark's accession to the Community is responsible for the high interest rates. I am merely observing that this promise of lower interest rates which was made by Community supporters is shown to have had no basis in fact. We did not get lower interest rates, nor the cheaper new housing that would have resulted from that.

Bonde

The Community subsidy for a few hundred steelworkers' houses in Frederiksværk cannot alter our people's impression that Denmark's housing policy has capsized in the years since we joined the Community. The number of houses built has declined by almost half. In 1972 we built 63 800 flats, in 1978 we built only 33 900. In 1972 we built more than any country in the Community, 12.8 flats per thousand inhabitants. In 1978 this had dropped to 6.6 flats begun per thousand inhabitants. This is not because we do not need new homes. I myself live in a fire-trap, and so do thousands of Danish families, while building workers are being thrown out of work.

Unemployment among painters was 4.9 % in 1973, in 1978 13.9 %. Among bricklayers it was 6.2 % in 1973 and in 1978 16.4 %. Among joiners and carpenters it was 1.7 % in 1973 and in 1978 10.2 % were jobless. That unemployment is a misfortune for the families concerned is plain to anyone who does not call workers 'loafers and scroungers' in times of economic depression and does not go around saying that the loafers and scroungers only work when there is full employment. But the number of unemployed in the building trade is also a misfortune for all those families who want a new home and for all the young couples, who want to set up house. It is a paradox that, while we have masses of unemployed workers in the building trade and masses of building materials and available capacity, the number of homes built in the years since joining the Community has been halved. I appreciate that behind Mr Blaney's question lies the wish to see funds made available for building, in particular from the Regional Fund, but for us piecemeal solutions are not the answer. What we need is simply the determination to build, the determination to break with the Community monetary system, and the determination to run our country on our own, so that interest rates can be reduced for the benefit of the building sector and for the benefit of all who regard the right to a home as one of the most important human rights.

President. — I call Mr Lega.

Mr Lega. — (*I*) Mr President, I wish to highlight the difficulties which my country too is facing as a result of the situation described by Mr Blaney in the Chamber today.

The problem is not simply one of increasing housing supply — as other speakers have pointed out — but also of improving housing conditions which for many people in many areas of the Community can only be described as sub-human.

It is therefore only proper to ask for the resources available under the Regional Fund to be used for action enabling this difficult problem to be solved from the angle of providing all the citizens of our

Community with the accommodation to which — as Mr McCartin has rightly said — they are entitled, and also from that of improving the living conditions of many of our citizens, a consideration which we Christian-Democrats view as a fundamental right.

In have in mind certain parts of the south of my own country; I am thinking too of the problem of historic city centres where the renovation of existing buildings requires massive intervention in the credit and primary financing sectors.

I want therefore to thank Mr Blaney for raising this matter, because the problem of housing is central to the economic and social integration of our Community.

House construction offers the possibility of an upturn in the activity of certain industrial sectors now experiencing a crisis throughout the Community while guaranteeing reasonable and dignified living conditions for workers who must not to bear an excessive cut in their earnings to purchase accommodation which they need.

I think that the Commission should address itself to this matter and draw up a proposal to be submitted at an early date for a political judgment by Parliament with a view to introducing an organic policy taking account of the need to find a social and financial solution to this difficult problem.

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

Mr. Møller. — (*DK*) I should like to ask your ruling, Mr President, on the following point, namely whether the agenda we have here in front of us is correct. The English version states that Mr Blaney put his question on behalf of his group and the Danish text says just the same — so it is not the translation that is wrong — namely, that Mr Blaney was speaking on behalf of the group. So this agenda must be wrong. I should like to ask you, Mr President, to ask the officials who draw up the agendas not to assume in future that Mr Blaney is speaking on behalf of the group, unless the group has actually given its consent.

President. — As I understand it, Mr Møller, a group can table an oral question with debate pursuant to Rule 47, without all the members of the group necessarily agreeing with the question. Mr Blaney did indicate at the beginning of his question that not all his group supported it. It is therefore for the House to debate the question.

I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, I welcome the fact that this important issue has been raised on the floor of this assembly. Mr Blaney and myself are poles apart as far as politics on the island of Ireland are concerned. In fact between us there is a great gulf fixed, so that they that would pass from hence cannot come, but I

Paisley

might say that on this matter we have a great measure of agreement.

I should like to underline that throughout the whole Community there are people who do not want their country to be members of this Community and the voice of those people must be heard in this assembly, if it is a democratic assembly. And I happen to be one in my country who believes that it would be better for my country to be outside the Common Market. But I still believe that as we happen to be in the Common Market we have a right to be heard, and that those that contribute financially to the Common Market should have a right to say how that money should be used. I should like to underscore that fact that Mrs Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, speaking last week, said she would be very glad if a large contribution made to the Common Market by the United Kingdom could in some way benefit Northern Ireland, which is part of the United Kingdom. And I would suggest to the Commission that Mr Blaney's proposal, applied to Northern Ireland, would be a most helpful suggestion.

I would like to mention that in Northern Ireland we have one of the worst housing problems in the whole of the Community, and I would like to refute the idea that this housing problem is restricted to one section of the Community. If I could take you to the Protestant heartland of the city of Belfast, you would see that there are atrocious housing needs; if I took you to the Roman Catholic heartland of the same city, you would see the same appalling housing needs. This is a problem in Northern Ireland which is common to both sections of the Community.

Now I believe that if the regional policy means anything, it should tackle the problem of housing. I am not suggesting that it should interfere with the sovereign government of the State, but I am suggesting that it should be prepared to be a handmaid to certain schemes that could be worked out in cooperation with the State to relieve the problem, and especially to deal with the steadily rising cost of housing. If this continues, Mr President, many of our people are going to be put completely outside the realms of ever being able to own their own house and, indeed in my part of the country, even to possess a house in which to live, and so I trust that this discussion will at least stir up this assembly to take a hard look at a problem that cries out for a solution.

President. — I call Mr Blaney.

Mr Blaney. — Mr President, might I first of all just say to the people who have spoken on this item and supported it in their various ways by elaborating their views on the problem and the cost of housing in various countries that I thank them for their support.

The Commissioner said, in so many words, that the Community does not have a policy on housing. I do

not want to thank him for that, but at the same time it is useful to have it on the record that this is in fact the case. I would say to the Commissioner, to the Commission as a whole, to the Council of Ministers and to the Parliament: why do we not have a policy on a matter as important, essential and basic to our wellbeing as housing? I would further ask that the Commission collectively — and I include the Commissioners responsible for social, agriculture, industry, regional and cultural matters or whatever else may affect employment — get together and formulate a coordinated policy involving all of those who are in any way connected with, or have any responsibility for housing.

Instead of going our separate ways and pursuing separate policies, we should realize that housing is essential to all that we have been attempting to do and that, due to the inflationary tendencies, due to the increase in interest rates, due to the widening gap between the better-off and the less well-off countries, there is a danger that in the future very few people will have any hope of ever owning a house of their own. I would ask the Commission as a whole to take up the matter and to formulate a housing policy.

To those who feel that they are not going to get anything from this, or feel that they are going to have to foot the bill for it, let me say to them, to the better-off countries, that it will be cheaper to do it this way. The other alternative is an exodus from areas where housing is not available to the better-off areas, or better-off countries, so that, in the last analysis, the better-off countries will eventually have to pay more than they are now being asked to pay to make it possible for people particularly young people, to own their own homes in their own countries, rather than be scattered throughout the world — as has happened to many people from my country in the past.

President. — I call Mr Vredeling.

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I pointed out earlier that, as things stand today, the Community has no direct powers in the housing sector. In the next annual report on the social situation in the Community countries in 1979, Parliament will find a chapter on the situation in the housing sector and in that of rental policy in certain Member States. Parliament will then be able to debate the matter on the basis of more concrete information.

Finally, I must point out that a number of questions put in the debate today, in particular by Mrs Ewing, related in fact to an area other than that of housing, i. e. regional planning — which is of course a further important subject. This sector too does not fall within the direct province of the Community but a policy is becoming increasingly necessary all the time.

President. — The debate is closed.

18. *Urgent procedure*

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

— from Mr Glinne, Mrs van den Heuvel, Mr Arndt, Mr Colla, Mrs Cresson, Mr Dankert, Mr Delmotte, Mr Estier, Mr B. Friedrich, Mr Gabert, Mr Hünsch, Mr Jacquet, Mr Lange, Mr Linde, Mr Linkohr, Mr van Minnen, Mr Muntingh, Mr Oehler, Mr Pelikan, Mr Percheron and Mr Schmid, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (Doc. 1-660/79).

— from Mr Tyrrell, Mr Harris, Mr Hord, Mr Forth, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mr Moreland, Mr Marshall, Mr Spencer, Mr Turner, Mr J.D. Taylor, Lord Bethell, Mr Prag, Mr de Courcy Ling, Sir Peter Vanneck, Mr Provan, Mr Curry, Mr Battersby, Miss Hoofer, Mr Normanton, Mr Patterson, Miss Brookes, Mr Pearce, Mr Dalziel, Sir John Stewart-Clark and Miss Roberts, on the situation arising out of the Russian invasion of Afghanistan.

(Doc. 1-662/79)

— from Mr Klepsch, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Schall, Mr Notenboom, Mr Vergeer, Mrs Cassanmagnano Cerretti, Mr Alber, Mr von Bismark, Mrs Moreau, Mr Barbagli, Mr Nothomb, Mr Schnitker, Mr Luster, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Michel, Mr Pursten, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Sälzer Mr McCartin, Mr Adonnino and Mr Dalsass, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) on the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union (Doc. 1-665/79)

— from Mr Druon, Mr Ansquer, Mr Buchou, Mr Chirac, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Debré Mr Deleau, Mrs Dienesch, Mrs Ewing, Mr Flanagan, Mr Gillot, Mr Labbé, Mr Lalor, Mr de la Malène, Mr Messmer, Mr Nyborg, Mr Poncelet, Mr Remilly, Miss de Valera and Mrs Weiss, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the situation in Afghanistan (Doc. 1-666/79)

— from Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mr Patterson, Mr Moreland, Miss Hooper, Mr de Courcy Ling, Mr Purvis, Mr Hutton, Sir Fred Catherwood, Mr Beazley, Lady Elles, Mr Battersby, Mr Provan, Miss Brookes, Mr Fergusson, Mr Møller, Sir Fred Warner, Mr Howell, Mr Harris, Mr Turner, Mr Dalziel and Lord Douro, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan (Doc. 1-667/79).

The reasons for these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves,

Parliament will be consulted on these requests tomorrow at the beginning of the sitting.

19. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Tuesday 15 January 1980 with the following agenda :

9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.

— decision on the urgency of eight motions for resolutions ;

— oral question with debate to the Commission on the employment situation in the Community.

The sitting is closed.

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

*ANNEX**Commission action on opinions delivered by the European Parliament
at the December part-Session*

1. At its December 1979 part-Session the European Parliament delivered 12 opinions in response to Council requests for consultation. In one case the no-report procedure was used and a favourable opinion delivered on the Proposal for a directive on the colouring matters authorized for addition to medicinal products.
2. At the December part-Session Parliament discussed eight reports and delivered favourable opinions on them :
 - Report by Mrs Hoff on the ECSC levy for 1980 ;
 - Report by Mr Schmitt on the proposal to open a Community tariff quota for frozen buffalo meat ;
 - Report by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli on proposals concerning :
 - the import of olive oil originating in Tunisia, Algeria or Morocco,
 - the import of certain agricultural products originating in Tunisia ;
 - Report by Mr Jürgens on the proposal for a regulation on the establishment of a common organization of the market in certain products listed in Annex II to the Treaty ;
 - Report by Mr Buchou on the regulation concerning export aids in the case of agricultural products eligible for special treatment when imported by third countries ;
 - Report by Mr Maher on the decision authorizing the United Kingdom to grant national aid to milk producers in Northern Ireland ;
 - Report by Sir Henry Plumb on the directive on the marketing of seed potatoes ;
 - Report by Mr Beumer on the proposal concerning the application of VAT to the hiring-out of movable tangible property.
3. In three cases the European Parliament proposed amendments to the Commission proposals and the Commission explained at the sitting why it wished to maintain its original proposals. The following reports were involved :
 - Report by Mr Giummarra on the proposal for a regulation setting up a Community system of reliefs from customs duty ;
 - Report by Mr Remilly on the directive on the emulsifiers, stabilizers, thickeners and gelling agents authorized for use in foodstuffs ;
 - Report by Mr Newton Dunn on the decision concerning chlorofluorocarbons in the environment.
4. At its December part-Session the European Parliament rejected the draft general budget for 1980 and asked the Commission to present a new preliminary draft budget for this year. The Commission is intending to adopt a new budget proposal on 13 February and may make a statement to Parliament directly afterwards.
5. At its October 1979 part-Session the European Parliament asked the Commission to make a grant towards repairing the damage caused by the disaster affecting agriculture in the Orkney and Shetland Islands. In response to this request, on 11 December 1979 the Commission awarded emergency aid amounting to 500 000 EUA to the Orkney, Shetland and Western Islands. The details of the award decision have already been communicated to the President of Parliament.

Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers.

Question No 9, by Mr Spicer (H-284/79/rev.)

Subject: Raw materials exports from and imports into Zaire and Zambia

What consultations has the Commission had with the governments of Zaire and Zambia with a view to improving transport facilities for their raw materials exports and imports?

Answer

The consultations held during the last few months between the Commission and the governments of Zaire and Zambia with regard to transport facilities for imports and exports of raw materials were mainly concerned with the Lobito route. Since 1979 these two governments, along with the government of Angola, have been holding discussions with the Commission on the resumption of international traffic on this route, which has been suspended since 1975. The route is served by a railway from Zambia to the port of Lobito in Angola, which passes through the province of Shaba in Zaire.

As a result of these discussions a project has been launched with a view to increasing the international traffic capacity of this route to bring it up to a total of 70 000 tonnes per month in a first stage. The funds necessary for this project, which have been estimated at 21.4 million EUA, include funds for technical assistance, together with equipment and spare parts, improvement of telecommunications and maintenance equipment and operational expenditures.

As a result of meetings in June 1979 between the governments of Angola, Zaire and Zambia on the one hand and the Commission, the Member States and other donors of aid on the other hand (meetings at which the financial arrangements already in force were also discussed), further discussions took place in November 1979 at which proposals for a second stage of this project were considered. These discussions also dealt with the general security problems related to the operation of the Lobito route.

The Commission also offered its support to Zaire and Zambia for other programmes and projects related to other import-export routes. The most important of these concerns the East African transport system (improvements to Tanzania's main railway line and to the ports of Moulungu and Kigoma on Lake Tanganyika), for which some 20 million EUA were earmarked under the heading of regional cooperation within the terms of the Convention, as a result of meetings between the Commission and the representatives of the governments concerned and other donor bodies.

As well as the abovementioned projects which have been the subject of wide-ranging discussions with all the parties concerned, it should be noted that the Commission has also granted aid for the establishment and improvement of other major communication routes in these countries, amongst them the Tazara route between Zambia and Tanzania, the Kazungula crossborder route on the Zambezi river between Zambia and Botswana and feasibility studies on the development of Zambia's communications. Finally it has also proposed that studies be carried out on the port of Beira in Mozambique. Furthermore, with particular reference to Zaire, the Community has agreed to play an important part in mapping out and coordinating operations for the development of the port of Banana on the Atlantic coast.

Question No 11, by Mr Christopher Jackson (H-295/79)

Subject: Famine in Timor

What steps is the Commission taking to relieve famine on the island of Timor?

Answer

With a view to coming to the aid of the people of Timor, the Commission has allocated to the International Red Cross Committee in 1979 220 tonnes of powdered milk valued at 132 000 EUA at world prices and 315 000 EUA at domestic prices. The quantities were distributed during November.

It was subsequently decided on 19 December 1979 to give emergency aid to the tune of 50 000 EUA in cash to the non-governmental Oxfam (Belgium) organization to provide essential supplies (food, medicine, seeds, etc.) and to send a medical team.

Question No 19, by Mr O'Connell (H-348/79)

Subject: Consumer affairs

Does the Commission propose a widespread TV information and education programme for consumers at peak viewing time each week, for all EEC countries, within the next year?

Answer

The Commission does not envisage making such a proposal. While it favours the greatest possible development of information and education programmes for consumers, the Commission cannot interfere in the setting of television programme schedules.

It will, however, continue to hold periodic meetings with the producers of televised consumer information and education programmes from the Member States' television networks.

The purpose of these meetings is to keep programme producers informed of work being carried out at Community level and to provide a forum for the exchange of experiences.

Question No 20, by Mr Baudis

Subject: Community legislation on the use of dipped headlights on motor vehicles

Can the Commission give details of the laws in force in the Member States on the compulsory use of dipped headlights on motor vehicles and state whether approximation of these laws is envisaged at Community level?

Answer

The use of dipped headlights on vehicles in built-up areas is obligatory in five Member States: Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany.

In Denmark, Ireland, Italy and the United Kingdom, the use of dipped headlights is not obligatory: use of side-lights is permitted.

The Commission does not envisage taking an initiative in the matter of regulations on the use of dipped headlights. This matter is being examined by the European Conference of Ministers of Transport.

Question No 21, by Mrs Barbarella

Subject: Producer associations

Can the Commission indicate why the procedures for implementing Regulation No 1360 of 19 June 1978 on the formation and encouragement of producer associations have not yet been adopted and state whether this delay is due to difficulty in determining the criteria for recognition of the associations?

Answer

The reason why the implementing provisions for the regulation on producer associations have not yet been put into effect is the large difference in size that has been observed between the various producer associations within the Community. It will in this connection be necessary to lay down minimum requirements concerning the economic activities of producer associations that are eligible for recognition. The Commission has therefore deemed it necessary to request an opinion from the Member States concerned, who will, of course, be required to finance 75 % of the aid to producer associations.

The opinion of the Italian Government, which is the one most affected by this proposal, has not yet been received. The Commission is continuing to press strongly for this opinion and consequently counts on soon being in a position to put forward a solution that takes account of the differences between the individual regions, while at the same time ensuring that it is the viable organizations that receive aid.

Question No 22, by Mr Battersby

Subject: The Community's relations with China

Following the acceptance by China of a low interest loan from Japan of \$1.500 million at 3 %, announced 7 December 1979, what steps is the Commission taking to ensure that Community firms can compete on equal terms with their international competitors in the China market?

Answer

The Commission has been given assurances by the Japanese authorities that the loan in question, which in any case amounts to only 200 million dollars, is subject to no conditions and that consequently China is not obliged to use this loan exclusively for purchases from Japan.

Question No 23, by Mr Jørgen Brøndlund Nielsen (H-388/79)

Subject : Price trends in agricultural production factors

What trends are forecast by the Commission in the price of agricultural production factors, for example, feedstuffs, fuel and fertilizers in 1980 ?

Would the Commission please make any such forecasts known to the European Parliament ?

Does the Commission expect that price rises for agricultural products — partly as a result of the Commission's price proposals will be such as to cover the price rise in production factors and, in addition, to allow a 6-7 % rise in agricultural incomes ?

Answer

The Commission is currently in the process of drawing up its agricultural price proposals for the 1980/81 marketing year. This will naturally involve an examination of the relevant economic, monetary and financial factors and an assessment of the market situation. The findings of these studies will be made available to Parliament jointly with the proposal concerning agricultural prices for the 1980/81 marketing year.

With regard to the actual price proposals, I can add that this year's exercise will be a very difficult balancing act. There has, on the one hand, been a substantial rate of inflation, which has affected agricultural production costs while, on the other hand, the market situation for several agricultural products is such as to rule out substantial price increases.

Question No 24 by Mr Schwartzberg (H-354/79)

Subject : Communications from the Commission on action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament

The Commission through its Commissioner responsible for relations with the European Parliament, traditionally reports each Monday of a part-session on the action taken on the opinions delivered by the European Parliament on proposals for regulations and directives submitted to Parliament pursuant to the Treaties.

Would the Commission kindly inform Parliament in future of action taken on all its resolutions, and not only on the opinions requested of it ?

Answer

In addition to the report which it gives on the Monday of each part-session on the action taken on the opinions of Parliament on proposals for regulations and directives, the Commission provides regular information on practical aid projects in favour of disaster victims, which it has carried out in response to appeals from Parliament.

As far as resolutions adopted on the basis of own-initiative reports are concerned, or the need to respond promptly to certain political events, the Commission does endeavour, in the plenary part-session or in the committees responsible, to state its position in the course of debates on these matters.

Because of the very varied nature and sometimes complex implications of these resolutions, the Commission does not consider it desirable to give its views in a systematic and therefore inevitably less informative manner at the beginning of each part-session.

Furthermore, the Commission is always prepared to provide Parliament with detailed information on any given subject on the basis of questions put to it.

Question No 25 by Mr Deleau

Subject: The Italian iron and steel works at Bagnoli

Seeing that the European iron and steel industry is already suffering from over-capacity, does the Commission deem the planned expansion of the works at Bagnoli reasonable, seeing that this could eventually accentuate the imbalance now in evidence in the flat-rolled products sector?

Answer

The general objectives of the steel industry for the years 1983-1985 and 1983-1990 make it clear that it is essential not to increase steel coil production from now until 1983. In view of the forecasts of a moderate increase in demand, it would seem that the Community's present capacity in wide-strip steel could not be profitably utilized before that date.

The last survey of investments shows, however, that there is a trend towards an increase in wide-strip steel mill capacity for which the production possibilities would go from 67.7 million tonnes in 1979 to 72.2 in 1983. This increase runs counter to the Commission's estimates and accentuates the existing imbalance in the flat-rolled products sector.

The planned wide-strip steel mill at Bagnoli accounts for one-quarter of the abovementioned increase. In a letter to the Italian Government the Commission, while acknowledging the importance of Italsider's efforts at restructuring, has not as yet delivered a favourable opinion on this investment, as it is required to do by the procedure laid down in Article 54 of the ECSC Treaty.

The Commission made delivery of its opinion subject to a prior verification on the Bagnoli investment. This verification will be carried out by a bilateral working party and will centre on the two following conditions:

1. consideration of production conditions in relation to market conditions at the time in question;
2. verification of the estimated economic balance of the investment and the arrangements for placing this investment.

Question No 26 by Mr Remilly

Subject: Action by the Commission to combat crisis in the iron and steel industry

Does the Commission contemplate informing the European Parliament of its intentions concerning a possible continuation of the Davignon plan in 1980?

Answer

1. Throughout 1979 the Commission kept the European Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs informed of the Community's steel policy, in particular at the joint meeting of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Committee on Social Affairs on 27 and 28 November 1979.
2. The Commission will continue to provide information to Parliament in the same way through 1980 and is of course at Parliament's disposal to provide all necessary information in this area.
3. At this stage, without going into details of the arrangements the Commission wishes to point out that Community action centres on the following aims:
 1. measures to allow for special, difficult situations facing certain undertakings engaged in the production and processing of steel,
 2. greater flexibility for the anti-crisis measures, particularly as regards prices.

With these aims in view, the following decisions have been taken in 1980:

- (a) suspension for 6 months from 1 January 1980 of the minimum prices for reinforcing rods and merchant steel, with the proviso that if certain circumstances arise during this period, the Commission may reintroduce the minimum prices by a simplified procedure,
- (b) maintenance of a minimum price for wide hot-rolled strip,
- (c) maintenance of the requirement for steel stock-holders to respect the scheduled prices of the manufacturers in the case of wide hot-rolled strip and hot-rolled plate and narrow hot-rolled strip, both of which products are for the most part derived from wide hot-rolled strip,

- (d) maintenance of the requirement for manufacturers and stock-holders of steel products to issue certificates indicating that the minimum price for wide hot-rolled strip has been respected.

Question No 27 by Mrs Ewing

Subject : EAGGF grants for fishing vessels

Will the Commission make a statement on its latest deliberations on criteria for and policy on EAGGF grants for fishing vessels?

Answer

The current rules on aid for fishing vessels are in the nature of temporary transitional arrangements.

The most important aid instrument for individual projects has up until now been Regulation 17/64, which has now lapsed. Furthermore, under this regulation aid totalling approx. 86 m EUA has been granted to the fisheries sector, of which 18 m EUA or 21 % to Scotland alone.

Although aid is now available under Regulation 355/77 for the processing industry and for marketing, the Council has not yet adopted the Commission's proposal for a regulation on the modernization of coastal fisheries, which would make aid available for fishing vessels.

This being so, the Council adopted in 1978 and 1979 annual *ad hoc* regulations which, within the limited amounts of 5 and 15 m EUA respectively, seek to meet the most acute needs for investment in aquaculture and the acquisition of new vessels for coastal fishing in areas of the Community where an expansion of fishing activity is possible. The fact that the regulation is limited to the acquisition of vessels is due to the limited finance available, the absence of a fully developed fisheries policy capable of serving as a reference framework for structural policy and the clearly temporary nature of the regulations.

If the present situation continues much longer, it is my view that the time may come when the Community must consider how the need for other types of investment than those at present covered by the annual regulations can be met.

Question No 29 by Mr Messmer

Subject : 'Europole' hovertrain link project connecting the North Sea with the Alps via Brussels, Luxembourg and Strasbourg

The 'Europole' project initiated under the auspices of the Council of Europe and intended to link Brussels, Luxembourg and Strasbourg, in addition to other towns, by means of a hovertrain which will travel at over 300 km/hour, could help solve the problem of the location of the Institutions of the European Communities.

Answer

The Commission firmly believes that the possibility of improving transport facilities on the Strasbourg-Luxembourg-Brussels link should be studied at the Community level : this view has been put forward in reply to written questions 158/71, 508/73 and 192/74.

As part of its programme to develop a Community policy for transport infrastructure the Commission has included a study of this link in the budget for 1980. Proposals for the improvement of the link including the Aerotraine would be examined in the context of their contribution to the development of an efficient Community transport network. Should the study be approved the results will be of wide interest although they will imply no automatic commitment to accord any priority to this route in terms of Community financial support.

Question No 30 by Mr Muntingh

Subject : Environmental action programme

In the second environmental action programme reference is made to a cartographic survey of the environment to be carried out in Europe. A pilot project to ascertain the best method of effecting such a survey is now under way in Ireland. The project is being carried out by the National Institute for Physical Planning and Construction Research in collaboration with AG Landschaftstechnik of Munich. The project should be completed in May 1980.

Would the Commission report on the interim results and progress of this study so that Parliament and the public may be informed about it at an early stage and have the opportunity to comment thereon and to what purpose does the Commission intend to put the eventual results of this environmental study project?

Answer

The study referred to by the honourable Member will be completed in the middle of this year and will bring to an end the experimental stage of ten case studies carried out with a view to launching a draft pilot method for an ecological cartography of the European Community.

When all the results obtained with the cooperation of the Member States have been collected, a summary report will be drawn up at the end of the year. This report which will explain the general objectives defined in the environmental programme and map out the opportunities for utilizing the proposed instrument at Community level, will form the basis of a proposal to be presented to the Council in 1981 for its approval.

Right from the beginning of this operation the Commission has been concerned to see to it that all the interested parties were kept adequately informed. It will continue to make this effort during the last stage of the work in progress, particularly by publishing all the results of these studies, to which the public will also have access, so that all points of view can be taken into consideration in drawing up the proposal to the Council.

Question No 33 by Mrs Dienesch

Subject: Adjustments in the application of the co-responsibility levy

In its proposal concerning the co-responsibility levy for dairy products, has the Commission provided for adjustments for each country based on the cost price of a kilogram of milk, the cost per farm of the agricultural support policy and the efforts made by each country to use skimmed and powdered milk for feeding calves for domestic consumption?

Answer

I would like to state at the outset that the question raised by the honourable Member gives rise to a debate which cannot be accommodated within the framework of Question Time.

The Commission's proposal for a co-responsibility levy for milk consists of two elements. The first element, which is a result of the Council's decision on prices for the 1979/80 marketing year, provides for a general levy of 1.5% with the exception of milk produced in mountainous regions and in southern Italy.

The aim of the second element, which the Commission regards as the most important, is to cover the costs entailed by increased production. This levy will be collected from individual dairies where an increase in production has been observed. The final levy will be in proportion to the recorded increase in production. There is, therefore, no question of any adjustments being made to this levy.

When presenting the proposal, the Commission undertook to examine any problems which the proposal might entail for small-scale producers. (In this connection I would like to make it clear at this stage that problems of this nature must be resolved through structural policy. Market policy cannot be conducted on the basis of different treatment for producers.)

Question by Mr Kavanagh (H-374/79)

Subject: Aid under Community Transport Policy for extension of Belfast-Dublin road to Wexford-Rosslare

In view of the Green Paper on Transport Infrastructure recently published, does the Commission consider that the continuation of the Belfast-Dublin road to Wexford-Rosslare would constitute a major link of Community interest, which could benefit from funds under the financial Regulation for projects of Community interest?

Answer

In its memorandum on the role of the Community in the development of transport infrastructure, the Commission quoted some examples to illustrate the sort of links which appear to merit special

attention from the point of view of the Community. Included among these examples is the link Dublin-Belfast-Derry.

As the Commission states in its memorandum, the list of links will have to be amended or completed later as and when the analysis of the quality of service over the whole of the Community network is refined. The link Dublin-Wexford-Rosslare will certainly find a place in this analysis.

It should be borne in mind that, under the terms of the proposal for a regulation concerning financial support for projects of Community interest, projects can only be considered for aid if they are submitted by Member States and after thorough examination with the assistance of the Infrastructure Committee, of their economic and financial aspects.

Question No 35 by Mr Spinelli

Subject: Conciliation between the Commission and Parliament in the preparation of the new preliminary draft budget for 1980

How does the Commission propose to involve Parliament in, or coordinate with Parliament the initiatives for the preparation of the new preliminary draft budget for 1980 which the Commission will have to submit following the rejection of the draft budget for 1980 by Parliament?

Answer

I would refer the honourable Member to the information provided during the discussion of the Commission's follow-up to decision of Parliament.

Question No 36 by Mr Barbagli

Subject: Distillation of table wine

In view of the exceptional wine grape harvest of the agricultural year 1979/80, what does the Commission intend to do to facilitate the distillation of adequate quantities of table wine so as to guarantee the stability of the wine market and the incomes of wine growers?

Answer

I can confirm for the benefit of Mr Barbagli that the 1979 wine grape harvest in the Community was exceptionally large. According to the Commission's forecast for the 1979/80 wine marketing year, drawn up as at 15 December 1979,¹ Community wine production is estimated at 167 million hl; this figure should be seen in the light of the nine preceding marketing years, in which the average was 145 million hl.

This figure of 167 million hl can be broken down as follows: 80.2 million hl for France, 79.0 million hl for Italy, 7.8 million hl for the Federal Republic of Germany and 65 000 hl for Luxembourg.

As regards Spain, the various estimates point to a figure of 43 million hl for its 1979 production; for the purposes of comparison, it can be stated that the average for the period 1970-1978 and the figure for the previous harvest in 1979 was 29 million hl.

Question No 37 by Mrs Weber

Subject: Thallium pollution

Following the detection of thallium pollution in Baden-Württemberg and North Rhine-Westphalia in the vicinity of a number of cement factories with defective purification filters, what measures does the Commission intend to take to control the use of this metal which is extremely harmful to man, his environment and his food?

Answer

The Commission has been informed of the instances of pollution mentioned by the honourable Member. It has also been given a report by the Government of the German Federal Republic on these incidents which were caused by traces of thallium in the minerals used to prepare certain special kinds of cement.

Having considered this report, the Commission does not envisage preparing any Community measures in this area.

The Commission also feels that it is a matter for the industries in question to check the effectiveness of their treatment filters.

¹ Published in OJ C 321 of 22. 12. 1979.

Question No 39 by Mr Balfe

Subject : Trade in live horses

Is the Commission aware that there is a considerable trade in live horses between Italy and Greece, and by which suffering is caused to the horses involved in this trade, and will the Commission use the opportunity of the Greek accession to ensure that the conditions for the export of live horses are substantially improved, so that this cruelty is ended?

Answer

The Commission is aware of the considerable export of live horses from Greece to Italy. We are also aware of the concern that exists at the treatment of these horses while in transit. The Commission will continue to insist that the Member States observe the Community's rules governing the international transportation of animals. In connection with Greek accession to the Community, Greece will need to change its legislation in order to bring it into line with Community regulations in this field.

Question No 40 by Mr Turner

Subject : Application of a measure contained in an order of the European Court of Justice

What steps are open to the Commission, which it considers practical, to ensure in accordance with Article 155 of the EEC Treaty that the measure taken by the European Court of Justice pursuant to the provisions of the EEC Treaty in its Order of 25 September 1979 relating to French importation of sheepmeat is applied?

Answer

A characteristic feature of the European Community is the Member States' large degree of interdependence in economic matters. This circumstance limits the need for legal sanctions as such; compliance with the provisions of the Treaty and decisions of the Court of Justice is in the common interest, and the Treaty accordingly confines itself to laying down in Article 171 the obligation to obey a Court ruling.

In the event of a ruling by the Court not being complied with, the only legal recourse available to the Commission is to bring a new action for non-compliance before the Court (and the Commission has decided to do this). The Commission has no powers to apply any real sanctions, lodge claims for damages on behalf of Member States, etc.

As regards the introduction of a common market organization for sheepmeat, the Commission will continue its efforts to find a solution to the difficult problems still outstanding. A solution is both necessary and urgent.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 15 JANUARY 1980

Contents

| | | | |
|---|----|--|-----|
| 1. <i>Approval of minutes</i> | 46 | <i>Panella; Mr Petronio; Mr Delors; Mr Van der Gun; Sir John Stewart-Clark; Mrs Boserup; Mrs Pruvot; Mrs Chourraqui; Mr Paisley; Mrs Vayssade; Mr Michel; Mr Prag</i> | 60 |
| 2. <i>Urgent procedure</i> | 46 | | |
| 3. <i>Decision on urgency</i> <i>Mrs Groes; Sir Fred Warner; Mr Harris</i> | 46 | 7. <i>Deadline for tabling amendments</i> | 84 |
| 4. <i>Employment situation in the Community — Oral question with debate by Mr Glinne and others (Doc. 1-616/79):</i> <i>Mr Sarre, author of the question</i> <i>Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Ortoli Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Vetter (S); Mr Macario (EPP); Mr Spencer (ED); Mr Bonaccini; Mrs Nielsen (L)</i> | 47 | 8. <i>Employment situation in the Community (continuation)</i> <i>Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mrs Scrivener; Mrs Dekker; Mrs Lizin; Mrs Gaiotti de Biase; Mr de Ferranti; Mrs Hoffmann; Mr Donnez; Mr Seal; Mr Croux; Mr Price; Mr Ceravolo; Mr Pininfarina; Mr Vernimmen; Mr Modiano; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Linkohr; Miss Hooper; Mr Seeler; Miss Roberts; Mrs Roudy; Mr Caborn; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Fich; Mrs Desmond; Mr Kavanagh; Mr Boyes; Mr O'Connell; Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission</i> | 84 |
| 5. <i>List of speakers for the debate on the Council statement on the Italian Presidency</i> | 60 | <i>Point of order</i> | 110 |
| 6. <i>Employment situation in the Community (continuation)</i> <i>Miss De Valera (EPD); Mrs Hammerich; Mr Almirante; Mrs Salisch; Mr von Bismark; Sir David Nicholson; Mr Frischmann; Mr Calvez; Mr Nyborg; Mr</i> | | 9. <i>Speaking time</i> | 110 |
| | | 10. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i> | 110 |

IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments ?

The minutes are approved.

2. *Urgent procedure*

President. — I have received, with request for urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, a proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation on trade arrangements between southern Rhodesia and the European Economic Community (Doc. 1-658/79).

The reasons supporting the request for urgent debate are contained in the document itself (Doc. 1-658/79/Add.).

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

3. *Decision on urgency*

President. — The next item on the agenda is the decision on the urgency of eight motions for resolutions and one report.

We shall begin with the seven motions for resolutions which are as follows :

- motion for a resolution by Mr Berkhouwer and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-650/79/rev.): Invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union ;
- motion for a resolution by Mr Fanti and others (Doc. 1-656/79): Relaunching the policy of détente after the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan ;
- motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-660/79): Soviet invasion of Afghanistan ;
- motion for a resolution by Mr Tyrrell and others (Doc. 1-662/79): Situation arising out of the Russian invasion of Afghanistan ;
- motion for a resolution by Mr Klepsch and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) (Doc. 1-665/79): Invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union ;

— motion for a resolution by Mr Druon and others, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-66/79): Situation in Afghanistan ;

— motion for a resolution by Mr Scott-Hopkins and others, on behalf of the European Democratic Group (Doc. 1-667/79): Soviet intervention in Afghanistan.

I propose that a single vote be taken as these motions all deal with the same topic.

Are there any objections ?

That is agreed.

I put the request for urgent debate to the vote.

The request for urgent debate on all seven documents is adopted.

In accordance with what was agreed yesterday these motions for resolutions will be the first item on tomorrow's agenda.

President. — I now consult Parliament on the request for urgent debate, tabled by Mr Poniatowski and others, on the Warner report (Doc. 1-638/79): Situation in Afghanistan.

I call Mrs Groes.

Mrs Groes. — *(DK)* Madam President, I should like to raise the question of the vote on the situation in Afghanistan. As I have made clear in previous discussions as to whether Parliament should concern itself with matters properly the responsibility of the UN, I do not feel that we can deal with foreign affairs, not covered by the Treaties, during the sittings of this Assembly. I shall therefore vote against our doing so.

President. — I call Sir Fred Warner.

Sir Fred Warner. — I would like to make it clear that what is now being proposed is not a political resolution. It is a resolution on aid to refugees and is of a humanitarian kind, although the situation has been brought about by savage political actions.

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

Urgent procedure is adopted.

I propose that the report be entered on Friday's agenda.

Are there any objections ?

That is agreed.

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent debate on the motion for a resolution by Mr Rogers and others (Doc. 1-651/79): on flood damage in Wales.

I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — I welcome this request from the Socialists for urgent debate, noting however that it refers only to Wales. Many parts of England were also affected by the severe storms before and after Christmas, particularly the West Country. I hope that the House will agree to an urgent debate. We on this side will be moving an amendment to widen the scope of that debate.

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

Urgent procedure is adopted.

I propose to enter this motion for a resolution on Friday's agenda.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

4. *Employment situation in the Community*

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-616/79) by Mr Glinne, Mr Sarre, Mrs Salisch, Mr Delors, Mr Boyes, Mr Caborn, Mr Moreau, Mr Schwarzenberg, Mr Walter, Mr Didò, Mr Peters, Mr Oehler, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Desmond, Mr Colla, Mr von der Vring and Mrs Lizin, on behalf of the Socialist Group, to the Commission.

Subject: Employment situation in the Community

In view of the extremely serious situation concerning employment, and the fact that there are over 6 million unemployed in the Community and the prospects for the future are even more bleak, it is important to establish which measures might be taken by the Commission.

Does the Commission not feel that a lasting improvement of the employment situation presupposes a recovery of demand, particularly in the fields of infrastructure and public services — in other words, a new type of sustained, planned and socially-orientated growth?

What measures is the Commission contemplating with a view to promoting recovery measures and public investment in the Member States?

Given that the control of concentrations and dominant positions, and of multinational companies is also essential for the planning of full employment, does the Commission not feel that investment should be made subject to the right of information and control by each Member State and its workers?

What action does it intend to take for the implementation of a structural policy, which would go further than short-term measures, to help threatened industries and would be aimed at creating the activities necessary for the development of all European regions?

Does it intend to propose and promote the implementation of employment programmes, particularly, to create jobs for young people and women?

Does the Commission intend to promote an employment policy based, in particular, on the reduction of the time spent at work, both over the year — with the introduction of longer holidays — and during the week — with the progressive reduction of the working week to 35 hours?

By the same token, does it not consider that bringing forward the age of retirement and introducing an additional team for shift and continuous work, are necessary elements in a social policy for the maintenance and creation of jobs?

What measures does it intend to promote in such fields as the improvement of working conditions, the development of trade-union rights, free bargaining between unions and management, and the extension of further education?

I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in debating the employment question, Parliament is tackling one of the Community's real problems. That is the real meaning of the oral question tabled today by the Socialist Group and it is a matter that concerns millions of workers in Europe.

It is clear from the various manifestations of the change that the system is now going through — the economic crisis, cultural crisis, social crisis, crisis of values and so on — that liberalism's traditional doctrines and solutions no longer work. Their ineffectiveness is exposed for all to see because they feed on contradictions.

There is a contradiction between reducing wage-earners' purchasing power and the policy of maintaining industrial investment. There are contradictions between the policies of austerity and the resolve to base growth on exports. The countries of Europe cannot all at the same time restrict domestic demand and bank on selling abroad. That would be absurd.

There is a contradiction between 'unemployment management' and the declared intention to put a brake on social expenditure. The cost of policies in which unemployment benefit is preferred to the creation of employment will never be emphasized enough.

Today, the full employment objective — one of the central subjects of the Treaty of Rome — is forgotten. Resignation and shortage management have taken its place. The old diagnoses and remedies lead to nothing but failure.

For Socialists, the time has come to talk a new language. Our answer to this crisis in the system is an all-embracing employment policy in which the first step would be to switch to a new type of organized social growth.

Demand is not stagnating because requirements are all met. On the contrary vast needs remain and others

Sarre

are developing. They could become the driving force of a new and different type of growth. First of all there are the public services: health services, community facilities, transport, child-care units, schools, housing, and so on.

Hence the importance of a forceful public investment policy with these sectors as the first priorities.

Encouragement for reflation and public investment measures in the Member States should be one of the Community's immediate objectives. It is impossible for the main directions of economic policy to arise out of the sum of industrial or commercial decisions. They need to be planned. There can be no guidance of production and consumption without this control over the future.

Planning efforts to achieve full employment implies real control of the investment process and knowing what is going on. Without this how can any correlation be imposed between investment and employment?

The situation of the multinationals is highly relevant. Through their decisions, often taken on the other side of the Atlantic, they have the power to undermine the industrial policies of the Community countries and this is why information and control are two prior requirements if our action is not to be just a series of statements of principle. Control over concentration and dominant positions should not be confined — as it is today — to a kind of anti-trust legislation or the stimulation of competition at the trade level. Their activity and growth and their big investment projects need to be controlled but above all, in the future, they need to be made to fit in with the medium-term policies of the Community countries.

It is also vital that the workers in the firms concerned should have the right to know about and examine investment and employment decisions. This would be the best way for workers to put pressure on the employers so that the creation of new jobs becomes a priority.

Intervention by the Community in industry is insufficient. Its attitude towards industrial redeployment plans is purely defensive, witness the latest proposals. In other words it is a static and resigned view of things in which the loss of tens of thousands of jobs is regarded as inevitable whether in the textile industries or in shipbuilding.

This view of things cannot be ours. It is vital that we do more than provide short-term aid to the threatened industries.

It is up to the Community to define a positive policy for the development of diversified activities. The diversification of Europe's productive resources is an asset

and we must not allow it to be swept away by the new division of labour. This would be a threat to employment and it would also be a threat to the ability of European economies to weather the crisis. On the contrary we need to diversify this industrial fabric because the first step in reducing unemployment must be to create jobs in industry. And this industrial policy must be pursued hand in hand with regional policy.

This must be a vital objective for the Commission. There is no hiding the fact that this will require great strength of political will in the face of the present concentration of capital and the industrial bargaining which is still today, for the most part, in the hands of the big groups and multinational firms.

A concerted policy to reduce working hours could be a major asset in the employment question as part of an overall policy. This is why efforts to reduce working time are, for Socialists, a constant battle. Even if the effects are not simply mechanical, this reduction is fully warranted by foreseeable trends in the active population between now and 1985.

A first objective is to bring forward the age of retirement and lengthen the period of annual holiday. But the crucial point, of course, is to reduce the working week. The support our Group gave to the action day organized by the European Trade Union Confederation on the 35-hour week shows how attached we are to this goal. A Community approach could help to reduce the impact of this measure on competitiveness. Our watchword is down with unemployment in Europe; a 35-hour week to create jobs and live better.

As for compensatory wage adjustment, we agree with the trade union organizations that it should be 100%. Reducing the overall purchasing power of wage-earners is not only unacceptable in itself it is also a very bad way to stimulate demand, and hence investment and employment.

Other ways of reducing the working week deserve mentioning including the introduction of an additional shift in shift-work jobs or continuous processes. In addition to helping to create new jobs, working conditions in these cases — often amongst the most severe — call for priority treatment and the Community has a duty to say so.

In what way could the Community intervene, ladies and gentlemen?

The Commission should take concrete initiatives for negotiations to begin. Everyone realizes what the impact of a tripartite agreement would be on this subject. The difficulties are enormous and the risks of coming to grief indubitable. It should, however, be the first step.

Sarre

Other measures, too, are necessary. Large-scale employment programmes need to be launched, designed specifically for women and young people, in which the public sector should play a leading role. As regards vocational training, the hopes expressed in the Treaty of Rome have been forgotten. Instead of a common policy on training we are offered a sprinkling of financial aid.

But concerted efforts at the Community level to bring out a resolution or a directive regarding a programme for reducing the time spent at work must not be in conflict with the principle of free bargaining between the social partners and that is the role of the elected Members of this Parliament. It is the issue in this debate.

The point is that a debate on employment cannot fail to touch on working conditions and the very content of work. From that standpoint, a decisive question is how the nature of work in factories and offices can be changed. This depends on the granting of new rights to workers and it implies re-establishing the protective and unifying role of the right to work and putting an end to the discretionary powers of management in employment questions.

The democratization of the economy would be a condition of a Socialist way out of the crisis we are passing through. In this field, workers' participation in the decisions concerning them is a right that has yet to be won.

This applies to all fields — definition of new products, energy conservation, choice of new forms of consumption, etc. — and to all levels. It is a decisive aspect as regards the form of planning that needs to be promoted. These new rights (right of expression and of association, trade union rights, etc.) that are being demanded today practically everywhere by workers in the Community form an integral part of an overall conception of employment policy.

Economic democracy is a necessary condition for the resumption of growth in the right direction. Of course we need to produce and work, but for whom, for what and how? The model of our growth and development is the concern of Europe's workers, too.

This is why, as a first stage, the Commission should produce proposals regarding the harmonization of social legislation based on the most favourable current provisions. It is surprising to find that Community policy on this point is at a total standstill. Apart from a few measures on health at work, the action taken by the Commission is practically non-existent.

For us, the right to work is a priority requirement. At this dawn of a new decade, the European Assembly should state this boldly. The debate we are now beginning will, we hope, enable us to regain the initiative.

On this condition, and on this condition only, will Europe begin to be, truly, a workers' Europe.

President. — I call Mr Vredeling.

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Madam President, I believe that it is extremely important that Parliament should today be holding a comprehensive debate on the problems connected with employment. Although the manner in which this subject has been raised has not allowed us to make preparations that we are otherwise able to make when the subject is first examined by the appropriate parliamentary committees, this matter is so topical that extensive preparations are not so essential. In their presentation the authors of the question have already pointed out that the number of unemployed in the Community has of late remained at a constant 6 million or so. But this figure naturally reflects only part of the truth. The 6 million are the registered unemployed, and we know only too well that there are also a very large number of unregistered unemployed, who are frequently in a far more difficult and hopeless position. As this concealed unemployment usually receives less publicity and less interest is taken in it, we do not know exactly how extensive it is, but we are certainly talking in terms of about 3 million unemployed. The people concerned are primarily married women, young people who remain at home for a longer period after their compulsory education, and the handicapped. In the case of this concealed unemployment, therefore, we are dealing principally with socially weak groups, who even in this age of prosperity are often forgotten, and the problem of concealed unemployment has by no means been overcome yet.

In the years before 1973 unemployment had been reduced to a minimum. Of course, there were certain regions in our Community — I am thinking of the Mezzogiorno in Italy and of a country like Ireland — where unemployment has really never been reduced to acceptable proportions, but on the whole, we had at that time unemployment figures which now appear almost ideal and to which it will be scarcely possible to return. Unemployment naturally creates all kinds of difficulties, particularly for those directly concerned. Tension arises. For society it is a completely negative phenomenon. The argument that it is just one of those things and that unemployment is a situation we must learn to live with is therefore, in my view, completely objectionable.

The questions which Mr Glinne and the others have put cover a very extensive area. As we have very little time, my colleague Mr Ortoli and I will have to keep our answers extremely brief. Where a given aspect is not dealt with adequately in the first instance, we will perhaps be able to provide a further explanation in the course of the debate.

Vredeling

As I have already said, the situation since 1973, the first year of the energy crisis, has become progressively worse, and worse than had originally been expected. Initially it was thought we were merely facing a temporary setback. But persistent inflation and the structural imbalances that have become increasingly apparent have made it clear that we are dealing here with a permanent phenomenon, a structural phenomenon. Even if we leave aside the substantial rises in energy prices, the problems are enormous. In 1980 there is expected to be economic growth in real terms, growth in the gross national product, which, as things now stand, will probably be below 2%. And the number of unemployed is likely to increase this year by another 700 000. Further rises in energy prices would, moreover, produce an even more unfavourable picture.

The prospects for the coming years, therefore, give no cause for optimism. If the traditional policy is maintained, economic growth will definitely be too limited to guarantee and above all to create sufficient jobs, particularly when the rapid growth in the working population in the first half of the 80's is considered. By 1985 the Community's labour force will have increased by about 500 000 to 800 000 a year. An accurate figure cannot be given because of an unknown factor, particularly the increase in the number of women looking for work. All this compels us to make a joint effort to change present policy and especially to ensure that the unfavourable forecasts that have been made of the pattern of employment do not become reality.

The Commission must not, of course, establish a given policy in an ivory tower. More than ever before it will need the support of the Council and of Parliament. Unfortunately, the resources available to the Commission to pursue a Community policy aimed at combating unemployment are limited. The most important resource reserved for this purpose is rather modest. It principally consists in urging the Member States to pursue a policy of convergence in not only the economic, but also the social sphere. This convergence must be achieved through the Council and through the European Council.

The European Council has, as you know, endorsed the idea of convergence, the last occasion being at its meeting in Dublin, when it stated that the fight against unemployment must be coordinated. It requested the Commission to put forward proposals for specific measures for stronger action by the Community in the fight against unemployment. In this we will, of course, as I have already said, need Parliament's support and also its monitoring activities. That is why it is important that Parliament should be informed at this stage that the Italian Presidency is considering convening a joint meeting of the Minis-

ters of Finance and Economic Affairs and the Ministers of Employment and Social Affairs to discuss the joint strategy that must be adopted to combat unemployment. It will then be possible at this joint meeting to discuss in greater detail the coordinated policy which is to be pursued and for which the Commission must therefore prepare proposals.

Of course, the two sides of industry should play a very important part in all this work. They should be involved at the earliest possible stage, because they have an essential function to perform in the fight against unemployment. That is also the reason why the Commission has in recent years increasingly cooperated with the two sides of industry and with the Council in tripartite conferences, within the Standing Committee on Employment and also through the maintenance of direct contact with the representatives of employers and employees organized at European level, so as to involve the two sides of industry in the policy. The Commission certainly did this on a large scale last year, for example with regard to the question of the redistribution of labour, to which I will revert briefly later.

The prospects are not very favourable, as I have just said, and this also applies to the development of wages in real terms. We can be almost certain that there will be very little chance of increasing real wage levels in the Community in the short term. Steps can, of course, be taken to ensure that price increases are not or not wholly matched by wage increases, so as to counter price inflation. This must naturally be done in consultation with the two sides of industry, particularly the Trade Union movement, but I would point out straightaway that such consultations cannot be restricted to a discussion of wages. All income brackets should be included. People with higher incomes must, in my opinion, be expected to make greater sacrifices to the benefit of social justice than those with lower incomes.

Nor is it enough to express the pious hope that price increases resulting from the rise in energy prices, for example, will not be compensated in terms of wage levels. Policy must not be concentrated on this one aspect: it must take a broader view. The general objective of the Community's policy must, of course, be to restore full employment while maintaining or restoring economic stability and price stability. For this moderation in the development of incomes is necessary. But we must realize that this policy can only be pursued if there is a shift in the power structure, resulting in particular in an improvement in the social climate, the relationship between employers, employees and governments. Other aspects must also be considered, of course. The course adopted must be such that jobs are created and account can be taken of the requirements of better environmental management and the necessary conservation of energy.

Vredeling

Such selective economic growth is naturally impossible if thought is not at the same time given to maintaining and, if possible, increasing domestic demand in both the private and the public sectors. Therefore, if domestic demand is to be maintained, and if possible, stimulated, there must be limits to incomes restraints however desirable they may be. The conclusion increasingly being reached, therefore, is that global measures alone are not in fact sufficient and that a specific approach is required for a number of aspects, which is also evident from the wording of the European Council's statements I have just referred to. These requested us to put forward proposals not only for global measures but also for specific measures aimed at a more vigorous fight against unemployment.

As regards investment policy it can, of course, be said that governments should exercise positive influence through subsidies, levies and legislation. In this the transparency of investments is particularly important, so that the public can have their say, examples being made to restructure industries that are in difficulty. But restructuring can only be regarded as a defensive policy.

The reorganization we envisage must result in an improvement in productivity and profitability and must be accompanied by measures that are beneficial to employment, that stimulate new activities. In the steel sector in particular the Commission is already pursuing a policy of this kind, assisted by the fact that the ECSC Treaty offers greater opportunities in this respect. Parliament is aware of our proposals we have put forward and of the policy we are pursuing in this field. Recently the Commission also put forward proposals relating to another sector, shipbuilding. However, the efforts being made to establish a Community policy as a contribution to the restructuring of certain sectors of our economy are unfortunately meeting with considerable resistance in the Council. But for the future it is very important that we should look not only at sectors in difficulties but also at the growth sectors. This is the case, for example, with advanced technology, and I would refer here to the document on data transmission which has just been forwarded by us to the Council and also to Parliament.

In addition, the social consequences of developments in micro-electronics will shortly be discussed at a meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment with the two sides of industry and the Council of Ministers of Employment and Social Affairs. By using this advanced technology responsibly, we must stimulate the creation of new jobs, particularly in the service sector, and we will take as a basis the outcome of the discussions in the Standing Committee on Employment. In view of the rapid increase in unemployment, especially among women, far greater atten-

tion must be paid to the service sector and above all to the financing required from the public sector.

In 1979 we examined another question in the Standing Committee on Employment, namely the imbalance and the qualitative discrepancy between supply and demand in the labour market. As a result the Commission will be drawing up for the Council a document laying down guidelines for harmonizing Community employment policy.

I should now like to say a few things about the question raised by the Socialist Group on the position of the multinational companies. I would begin by pointing out that, in contrast to what was recently said by UNICE, the European employers' organization, the Commission feels that employees are frequently not fully aware of what their position in the company is. The Commission's programme for 1980 therefore includes a proposal for a directive on multinational companies, the object being, as a first step, to give employees greater influence over decisions directly affecting their interests and to ensure that Member States' legislation requires management to inform and consult employees. It is a matter of particular importance for multinational companies to have establishments in various Member States, which is why the Community must pay particular attention to this subject. The top management of such international companies frequently takes important decisions without previously consulting the employees concerned and their organizations.

With regard to the topical question of the redistribution of labour I would emphasize that the Commission has never regarded this as the only or the principal means of solving the unemployment problem. It feels that in favourable circumstances redistribution of labour, including shorter working hours, can very definitely have a positive effect on employment. As such it can be considered a supplement to economic measures and even a necessary supplement. But it is not the principal means to be used in the fight against unemployment. The redistribution of labour and shorter working hours are also important because they make for a fairer distribution of the pleasures and burdens in the relationship between men's and women's work. In its communication to the Council of 9 May 1979 the Commission stated its position on the redistribution of labour. It proposed to the two sides of industry that framework agreements should be concluded at European level on the number of hours worked per year. As examples we referred to the suggestions that have been made with regard to the restriction of systematic overtime, shift work, the flexible retirement age, the development of education, training and permanent education. Reference was also made to the spread of voluntary part-time work and to the question of temporary jobs. Last year we discussed this whole problem in detail with the two sides of

Vredeling

industry and also with the Council. As a result the Commission drew up a resolution, which was discussed by the Council in November. This formed the basis of the resolution adopted by the Council in November. The Commission was instructed to prepare further-reaching proposals on the redistribution of labour.

In addition, the Council adopted at the November meeting a resolution on the significance of permanent education and on the involvement of the European Social Fund. At its meeting in Dublin the European Council requested the Commission to continue its consultations with the two sides of industry on the adjustment of working hours and although this gives a positive impression, I must say that I am not yet completely satisfied. We began discussing the question of the redistribution of labour at European level at a very early stage, in the spring of 1978. The Council's adoption 18 months later, in November 1979, of a very much watered-down resolution does not, in my opinion, point to a very high degree of determination. I admit that this is a difficult problem and that the Commission cannot force a solution on the employers and employees.

I should just like briefly to raise two points that I have not yet discussed or not yet discussed in sufficient detail. The two instruments available to us and our employment policy are the Regional Fund and the Social Fund. In 1979 special programmes for the creation of jobs for young people were for the first time established within the framework of the Social Fund. In this respect I found Mr Sarre's remarks on the Social Fund incomplete, since he did not pay sufficient attention to this last and extremely important point. The significance of the Social Fund has increased rapidly in recent years. Between 1973 and 1979 its budget increased no less than fourfold. In 1979 it amounted to 770 m EUA, and it was possible to assist over 1 million workers with retraining programmes financed by the Social Fund.

I should like to point out *en passant* that in the preliminary draft budget for 1980 the Commission submitted to Parliament we estimated Social Fund expenditure at 1 000 m EUA. The Council then reduced this figure to 876 m EUA and, as you know, the last word has not yet been said on the budget.

In 1978 we helped 300 000 young people through the Social Fund and 12 000 women through the special programmes for women over the age of 25. In 1979 300 m EUA was set aside for young people, including the amount for the new programme for this group, and 18 m for projects aimed specifically at women. The Commission's policy is aimed at paying special attention to categories encountering particular difficulties in the labour market.

In 1978 almost four-fifths of the Social Fund went to the regions, which are identical with the regions of

the European Regional Fund. Of this amount almost half went to the top-priority regions such as Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, southern Italy, Greenland and the French overseas departments.

The problem we face is no longer a question of analysis but increasingly whether we are prepared to solve the employment problem with a Community and a coordinated policy. That is why the Council must be persuaded to take the necessary steps. Parliament's role is decisive, and the Commission is therefore counting on continuing to receive Parliament's support so that its proposals may become a political reality.

President. — I call Mr Ortoli.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (F) Madam President, I must be very brief but I would like to add a few words to what Mr Vredeling has just said. I shall deal with two aspects, one general and the other specific.

My first comment concerns the problems facing us in restoring equilibrium in employment through adequate growth. It is a policy that the Commission has vigorously supported but it is one which presents problems and today has limitations largely because our margin for manoeuvre has been reduced by rampant inflation. In 1980 inflation will be worse than in 1979 because of the recurrence of balance-of-payments deficits in the Community and the stepping up of international competition.

That being said, to refer to the more general problem raised in the question before us, this has not prevented the Commission from proposing the most active growth policy possible and, with regard to the "public demand" aspect that has been stressed, we have proposed — and the Council has agreed — that the public finance deficit should remain at a relatively high level for 1980 — average of about 3.9 % of the Community's gross domestic product.

Also — continuing with the general aspect — we are doing our utmost to encourage joint action by the Member States to get the most out of their effort and to achieve some small additional growth through interdependence. I am referring here to a concerted action, the case for which I have defended on several occasions in this House and which had its first application in 1978/79. For my part — as we said in the economic report — I believe that if our development growth forecasts for 1980 were not to materialize there is no reason why we should not find it necessary, jointly and by concerted action, to operate a more active budgetary policy.

This brings me to a more specific aspect: the development of growth through investment and infrastructure development. This is one of the Community's principles which it upholds all the more strongly in that the

Ortoli

problems with which we have to contend are no longer purely cyclical but, indeed, structural. We can see this in the changing situation as regards competition, of course, and in developments in technology but it is also apparent in the tremendous problems of energy. This is why, for several years now, the Community has been stepping up its structural measures to a very considerable extent.

I shall not repeat the information that Mr Vredeling has just given you about the Social and Regional Funds but I would like to point out that, at budget level, there has been a continuous increase in these fields.

Similarly we felt that infrastructural investment was one of the keys to growth, to development and to the solution of employment problems and, for some years now, we have been actively building up the Community's borrowing and lending potential. We had doubled it between 1973 and 1975 and we doubled it again between 1975 and 1979. Today, our lending activities account for over 3 500 million units of account.

The point here is that these loans have more effect than the figure given above implies because it is often the fact of our participation that makes a measure possible even when we do not make ourselves responsible for all the loans involved.

We are also trying to focus this activity as far as possible on regions or sectors where the need is greatest and, in particular, on infrastructures in the most disadvantaged regions and the energy sector. You can therefore see that in its day-to-day efforts, the Commission is doing its utmost to promote the kind of infrastructure that will achieve the best possible results — and as soon as possible — in terms of competitiveness, I agree, and energy independence but also as regards employment.

President. — I remind the House that speaking time for this debate has been allocated according to group. It is therefore up to each group and to those who speak first to ensure that there is enough time for those at the end of the list of speakers.

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

Mr Vetter. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in tabling during this debate a motion for a resolution which deals in particular with the reduction of the working week as an important contribution to improving the employment situation in Europe, my group is under no illusions. We have not done so because we perhaps expect that more can be achieved by substantially reducing the working week immediately and in the medium term than by safeguarding existing jobs and creating new ones.

Reducing the working week is, as figures and trends in all our countries show, the only real way of reducing unemployment, if we leave aside the vague hope of improved economic growth. But it cannot eliminate unemployment, and it cannot restore full employment either. If that is to be achieved, we need a different policy, a different economic policy, a different industrial and technological policy and a different financial policy. I believe other members of my group will be discussing this specific point. I also agree with Mr Vredeling when he says that the Commission's resources are limited and that the government's, the Council's and Parliament's support are needed. As regards unemployment, I cannot share the wide-spread pessimism that rapid technological development can but lead to rationalization that eliminates jobs and leaves no alternative, that the role the State and society have to play is merely a defensive one in preventing the worst from happening and that we have no defence against a development, an industrial revolution, the price of which happens to be mass unemployment. On the contrary, I am convinced that we are capable of looking ahead and bringing under direct social control the aims and effects of the trend of which there are already signs. We must be able to prepare ourselves in terms of education and social policy for the possibility that new impulses may emerge from the new technical opportunities and that new jobs may be created. The contrast between detailed planning at the level of the individual company on the one hand and the comparative aimlessness of political planning on the other must simply be overcome. In the opinions and speeches delivered by governments and political parties, one thing is repeatedly stressed: the need for a common European, economic, social and industrial policy. I intend to raise only one point in this context. It was the European Trade Union Confederation which called for the holding of tripartite conferences at European Community level. The conferences so far held have had little or no effect. They were non-committal in preparation and non-committal in the conclusions reached, if we leave aside the usual solemn declarations and platitudes. Little advantage has been taken of the opportunities that undoubtedly exist for cooperation within the Standing Committee on Employment and the joint committees for the various sectors of industry. At present it looks not only as if no one is interested in the continuation of the tripartite conferences on a different, improved basis, but also as if some politicians and associations would like to destroy the structures of the tripartite conference, which have not yet been safeguarded by treaty, and the Standing Committee on Employment and the joint committees as well. That is the conclusion to be drawn from some, albeit as yet internal, reactions to the Spierenburg report.

What we need is the continuation of the tripartite conferences on a different basis, and it is unacceptable that the Council of Ministers should go on pretending

Vetter

that it is not involved. The more or less non-committal statements made at the Council's meeting in Dublin can do nothing to change our view. At these conferences the Council must, we feel, adopt a previously coordinated binding position on problems which, as things stand, can only be solved at European level or not at all. The present situation, in which the governments adopt individual and independent positions, simply condemns European conferences involving the two sides of industry to failure. The Council must accept its responsibility in the solution of European problems, especially where they arise in connection with the social and employment policies. All that has so far been offered to the workers and their trade unions — and I quote a headline that appeared last week in a German daily newspaper that is anything but close to the trade unions — a sackful of empty words.

So the top priority must now be the preparation of a tripartite conference on the subject of the reduction of the working week, with the aim of establishing a joint basis for the redistribution of labour in the Community which takes account of the differences that exist, respects the autonomy of the two sides of industry to negotiate wage rates and is sufficiently binding. But this is primarily a question of political will, because only then can an end be put to a situation in which reference to the competition from the rest of Europe is enough to stop the introduction of a shorter working week in a Member State. Only then can an end be put to a situation in which the autonomy of the two sides of industry in the conclusion of contracts is misused as an argument against a European basis for the reduction of working hours.

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

Mr Macario — (*I*) Madam President, I am addressing the House for the first time with considerable feeling because I came here mainly to voice my concern about the problem we are discussing. The subject-matter of the debate has a great deal to do with the attempt to find the correct attitude of mind in relation to European unity and our conception of it. Unless there is a common attitude in every field and, in consequence, a constructive unity of purpose in the social field, European unity will, for the vast majority of people, be a meaningless charade of summits.

All political groups of any size in the House have given solemn and, if not always very precise, substantial pledges to the electorate on the subject of unemployment and the fight against it. In particular, they gave them to the young, to women, to those living in the less-developed regions and to those who constitute to some extent 'the other community' of people who are treated as different and receive little or no consideration. Those pledges were renewed here ; I refer parti-

cularly to the inaugural addresses when we began work last July. I remember the speeches of Leo Tindemans and Willy Brandt, who seemed to compete in emphasizing the extent to which the European People's Party and the European Socialists and Social Democrats were representative of the communities who elected them. The majority of groups in this Parliament are very conscious of their responsibilities towards the unemployed.

In this debate, we must get down to brass tacks and think in terms of practical possibilities and, gentlemen of the Commission, fresh political action. No one needs to be convinced or reminded that unemployment is a widespread and deep-rooted scourge. We must concentrate on its special nature and the exceptional problems to which it gives rise. What makes the problem so difficult and, according to many people, so impossible to solve is the difficulty of keeping inflation within a single figure, the tremendous changes which have taken place on the international markets, the energy crisis and the vast scale on which reorganization and redeployment have been, will be or require to be carried out if we are not to be overwhelmed by the change in the international division of labour.

In all great upheavals, it is the weak suffer or, as they say, are the first to fall by the wayside. In this context and in so many others, the law of the jungle is raising its head, and we must be prepared to dispute its validity and make sure it does not prevail.

Apart from the economic factors I mentioned, we have to consider the disparities and lack of balance which exist between labour supply and demand in a world where successive generations are adopting a different attitude to work. Nevertheless, though there is now an often justified demand for work of a different kind and magnitude, the Biblical injunction, 'By the sweat of thy brow shalt thou earn thy bread', still applies to all of us, and work is still man's only road to achievement. It is also true that, at the present time and at least for some years to come, the deteriorating economic situation means that there is much less work than there should be — a state of affairs which is structural and not a passing phase.

Now that we can see the full extent of the situation we must, as stated in the document we tabled, create more work and we say that we should do so without watering down any of the general conditions on which the economic policy of the Community should be based. As very much more should be done than is in fact being done, this is the time to work out individual measures which cover all possible ways and means of increasing employment. We should not be sharing poverty as well as work. It is increased productivity, based on free negotiations between the employers and trade unions, which will reduce the time spent at work, in its various forms, on a basis of Community-wide harmonization.

Macario

Others have spoken about the measures set out in our document, but I should like to refer to a particular one to show that what we are doing today can be improved upon; I refer to the problem of the under-developed regions. It is frequently but mistakenly imagined that this is solely a matter of financial and economic resources; but it is not. Money alone will not assure the development of those regions. We must go into the facts of the situation and decide what possibilities of growth and what openings are offered by the new division of work in the world at large. If we do this and make a careful study of the economic options open to us, especially in connection with the regions concerned, we shall avoid the danger, which threatened textile fibres, of destroying resources of which the Community has urgent need.

And this, gentlemen of the Commission, raises the question whether it is better to plan for the restoration of the economy or to lay down, in the light of certain considerations, longer-term foundations for growth. The longer-term approach has, of course, some value but, in my view, it is not enough. The question, at this juncture, is who is to take action in the European Economic Community. Our document is clear and, I believe, reflects the general feeling of Parliament. It does not hide the fact that the action taken so far by the Council and the Commission has produced the most abysmal results. I sometimes get the impression that the Community institutions are marching round the walls of Jericho without bringing them down and getting at the problems which lie behind. Mr Vetter gave us an example of this when he referred to the failure of the Tripartite Conference which was so badly organized and in which the political contribution made by the Council and Commission was not enough to make the Tripartite a real meeting-point for the responsible bodies involved. Because the Tripartite has achieved so little, no one takes it seriously any more. Despite that, we appeal to the Commission and the Council to make a fresh effort to work out an economic policy to deal with the problem of unemployment though, frankly, I do not think this will suffice, so it is up to Parliament to find an answer to the problem. We have given it the fullest consideration in our group but we are not, at the moment, making a specific proposal to the House. I can, however, say that the group is convinced that it is for Parliament, and not only the Commission and the Council, to utilize its resources, examine in greater depth the possibilities that seem feasible and ensure that this Parliament acts more closely in accordance with the pledges given during the election. In this matter, it is we who must represent the wishes and expectations of the people.

This is why, in my view, it is neither necessary nor desirable to contemplate loading this issue onto the shoulders of the Committee on Social Affairs and

Employment. There must be a united effort by Parliament as a whole. We ought to enlist the help of several committees, such as the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, the Committee on Budgets, the Social Affairs Committee and the Committee on Energy and Research, and give them suitable terms of reference. This is only the beginning of the debate and, as the speeches have shown, we must continue it in greater depth so that Parliament can be in a position to find an answer to this problem this the minimum delay. It is only our duty. Of course, there are other important issues on our agenda affecting European unity. Nevertheless, we must not lose sight of the fact that genuine unity can only be based on genuine agreement and the freely given support of the mass of our peoples, especially the great mass of unemployed. If we fail to create a great, united Community based on social justice and equality, we shall cease to count in world affairs.

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

Mr Spencer. — Madam President, I do not think anyone in this Chamber can remain unmoved by the rising unemployment figures throughout the Community. They are a waste of resources, a source of social distress, and my group will try to set this problem in the context of the wider economic policies of Europe, because we believe that it would be folly of the worst kind to think that you can examine the whole question of the fight against unemployment without relating it to the parallel struggle against inflation. Only a healthy Europe can provide jobs for its workers, and we will seek to direct Community attention to policies which lead to new productive jobs, jobs with a genuine future.

I cannot but reflect on how different that is from the archaic world apparently conjured up by this Socialist motion which we are debating today. I mean, it has its charm and its simplicity, much in the same way that a medieval mystery play might have. There are simple villains, and they are chased across the field by simple heroes. Multinational companies are cast in the role of witches in a modern witchhunt. Jobs are to be parcelled out between guilds. Declining industries are to be preserved and the dead hand of the State is to rest on all investment decisions. It is a static, unchanging, myopic view of society that would have looked dated in the late Middle Ages. Taken together these measures would petrify our society. They are, one might almost say, a conspiracy to ignore all the facts and to continue to believe that the earth is flat.

Nowhere is this attitude clearer, than in the Socialist approach to the work-sharing proposals of the Commission. The European Democratic Group will reject the concept of legislated thirty-five hour week

Spencer

or the attempt to create an artificial shift. We are not even persuaded that they would achieve the objects they set out to achieve. We are persuaded that they will be expensive and damaging to competition.

Now we can see a role for work-sharing in a society of the future, when the new technology has given us the prosperity to pay for it, and we will therefore encourage the Commission and the Community at large to go on looking at certain areas, such as earlier and flexible retirement, and the alternative proposals. Several of these measures may well be commonplace by 1990, but their introduction is a matter for the social partners in each State and not for clumsy legislation by the Commission or anyone else.

I accept what Commissioner Vredeling has said about work-sharing being only a small part of our response to the problem of unemployment. I just wish that some of the colleagues opposite would listen more closely to what we say. There can be no one answer to unemployment because there is not just one kind of unemployment. We have youth unemployment, regional unemployment, inner city unemployment, unemployment induced by technology, unemployment induced by competition from cheap labour markets in the Third World. There is no one policy that you can legislate to respond to all these changes in society. All you can do is to encourage new jobs in new industries.

My group will introduce a motion, pursuant to Rule 47, to try to direct attention towards new initiatives that could be taken. Later speakers in the debate will look particularly at the creative role of small firms and new firms in producing new jobs, which is classically the experience of the American market. We will look for expanded actions in the field of job mobility and in retraining; we want Parliament to look again at the guidelines of the Social Fund, because it is criminal that such a mismatch could survive in this society at this time, i.e. a situation where vast numbers of vacancies remain unfilled, while 6.5 million people are unemployed. Above all we want to shift the Community's enterprises into a higher gear by raising substantially the limit of Community facilities for investment loans to industry, whether it be EIB loans or the Ortoli facility.

There are two further points which we will also seek to cover. We do not believe that the Commission has fully examined the unemployment effects of enlargement. Secondly, however, we welcome their document on telematics, because to our mind this is going to be the key to the employment questions of the 1980s.

So, to sum up, I have news for my Socialist colleagues — the earth is round, it spins, the law of the universe is change. It will be a tragedy if we lose confidence in the face of change. It was not a Conservative who said we have nothing to fear but fear itself, but surely that applies to all our policies in Europe, especially to

those policies in the field of employment. Given sensitive use of the Social Fund to smooth transition, change is the ally of employment, not its enemy.

IN THE CHAIR: Mr de FERRANTI

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Bonaccini.

Mr Bonaccini — (I) Mr President, finding the right answer to the problem of work and employment is one of the most exacting and valuable tests of the strength of democracy in our respective communities.

Quite different prospects have emerged from the report on the 1979-1980 economic situation which we discussed last month and from what Commissioner Vredeling told us just now: unemployment will continue to rise and this will certainly happen if the policies adopted by the majority are applied. I have considerable respect for Commissioner Vredeling and I found something to console me in his speech because his ideas on workers' rehabilitation reminded me of my youth, when such ideas were common.

The prospect is certainly not made any brighter by the meagre provision of aid for the reorganization of certain sectors and we are all too well aware of the difficulties which, in this House and elsewhere, lie in the way of a genuine industrial policy of our own. This is why this Parliament must adopt a much more vigorous approach and not go on assuming that the variables of the economic system are the same as they were a century ago, or that, once the bonds condemned by the President of the Italian industrialists have been removed, all we have to do is wait for the inevitable *Wirtschaftswunder*. I agree that, in some cases, a number of unnecessary restrictions are preventing the baby from breathing but this is no reason for believing that, if we remove the restrictions, our economic system will enter an era where San Gennaro miracles happen all the time. In that Saint's own city, the loosening of the bonds did nothing but produce moonlighting and widespread exploitation of the worst kind.

Apart, however, from economic changes, we should pause to consider whether there is not something else which has an even greater and more fundamental effect on the economies and social structures of the Community. A comparison, based on the three decades immediately following the Second World War, between increases in gross product and increases in total employment leave no doubt concerning the small extent to which employment reacted to variations in output. In Germany, there was a sharp drop in total employment between 1970 and 1977. Moreover, the figures for France, Italy and Great Britain for the same period do not exceed, respectively, 15 %,

Bonaccini

14 % and 7 % of the increases in GNP. Things were certainly no better in the previous two decades, except in the Federal Republic of Germany between 1950 and 1960, when a 23 % increase in output produced a corresponding increase in employment. In our countries, a GNP growth of between 4.5 % and 5 % is, with very few exceptions, barely enough to maintain the figure of total employment, even allowing for reductions in the general level of output among the population as a whole. I hope Commissioner Ortoli will note that to increase public and private savings and investment is, accordingly, of very great value in widening the foundations on which our countries' production depends, although this is not in itself the answer to the employment problems which face us today.

Emphasis has been laid on the need for an efficient labour market as a clearing-house for the resources available: it can cope with the difficulties caused at present by reduced or irregular production and go a long way towards matching labour supply with demand. This is why such importance was attached to what were described as constructive employment policies which were to be backed up to some extent by the appropriations (in the event, drastically reduced) for the European Social Fund and the appropriations (alas, all too few) for the benefit of workers in sectors involved in the redeployment of labour. This is also why we regard such measures as useless: left to their own devices, the market forces achieve no better results than those I have described and condemned, that is to say, moonlighting and illegal employment.

Experience in Great Britain goes to show that, even though the movements on the labour market have remained about the same, the period of permanent unemployment has more than doubled in the last ten years. Since 1966, the jobs available in British industry have fallen by 1.6 million, which compares with an increase of 1 1/2 million jobs in the service industries, but one million of the latter are only part time. Neither these nor the conditions in other Community countries are designed to produce favourable developments in the labour market or ensure any lasting increase in supply. This is so despite the fact that, as a result of the economic crisis and of widespread inflation, people want to supplement their earnings, women, with a natural desire to improve their status as individuals and members of society, have entered the market in greater numbers, and the magnitude of unemployment among young people is partly disguised by further education.

There was a time when, in the absence of a proper appreciation of the extent to which the present crisis is fundamental, some people thought that an imaginative employment policy could put fresh life into a sluggish market. There can be no doubt that my own country would benefit enormously from a sound occupational training policy, such as the one being applied in Germany and, to some extent, in Great Britain but

no Italian Government has so far provided for one. But to cope with a system which creates unemployment even when GNP increases (and, as Vice-President Ortoli reminded us this morning, growth is hard enough to achieve), even these measures, valuable as they are as a means of redeploying the work-force, fall short of what is required. We must, therefore, work out and support a constructive employment policy which will provide the essential economic framework in which to defeat unemployment. We have to lay down planning procedures which will supplement the existing machinery of the labour market; we have to make an objective assessment of the level of employment which is consistent with productivity; and ensure that that level is achieved after taking account of demand as well as the more obvious factor of supply, the extent to which labour is mobile and, finally, its true level of productivity. This means that the Member States will have to take those decisions on the period and organization of work which have long been called for by the European Trade Union Confederation and worked out by the Commission. The Commission itself must pluck up courage and show greater determination to get results. We need outline decisions and their intelligent application on conditions which have been freely negotiated with the unions. In our view, this is the moment to adopt, as we now suggest, a procedure designed to cope on a permanent basis with the task of raising the number of people employed to the highest possible level consistent with the flexibility required in the interest of the labour force as a whole.

What, in short, we are asking you to do is to stop thinking of employment policy as a subsidiary question which is merely concerned with securing better adjustment to the requirements of capitalist growth or stagnation. We are asking you not to follow the purely conservative arguments, advanced just now by Mr Spencer, which reminded us of the days of our youth and, no doubt, our ancestors of theirs. We suggest that our first priority should be to find some means of ensuring the employment of the whole working population and making jobs available on lines which would ensure that, in our plans for the economy, the weight now given to profitability would also be given to the factors which generate higher levels of productive employment at the time when decisions were taken on the organization of work and production and on new techniques and technologies. In this context, policy on the less developed regions will have an important contribution to make. We can also reasonably expect the change in favour of specialized crops and their maximum exploitation (not to mention the change which will take place in the lives and work of country people) to create a generally stable employment situation in those regions.

We believe that this debate will encourage the Commission and the Council to act. On its side, the House has the task of considering the proposals and

Bonaccini

provisions to be ultimately adopted and, as Mr Macario said just now, this will only be achieved by a coordinated effort by the committees of this Parliament, especially those on economic affairs and on social affairs. We should now get down to defining, in unmistakable terms, the general policy to be adopted and the specific procedure for its application. This is an obligation imposed on us by the present economic situation and by the changes which have taken place in our economic systems; it is expected of us by the great mass of working people and those still seeking work; and it is incumbent upon us in view of the exemplary role which our countries have so far played in the field of social progress.

As was said by the Socialist speakers and later by Mr Macario, Europe is being built with the freely offered help of its peoples and must live up to their expectations.

President. — To wind up the debate I have received six motions for resolutions with requests for an early vote :

- by Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-659/79);
- by Mr Macario, Mr von Bismark, Mr van der Gun, Mr Spautz, Mrs Moreau, Mr McCartin, Mr Michel, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and Mr Vergeer, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, (CD Group) (Doc. 1-661/79);
- by Mr Spencer, Mr de Ferranti, Miss Roberts, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Sir David Nicolson and Mr Prag, on behalf of the European Democratic Group and by Mrs Nielsen, Mr Calvez, Mrs Pruvot and Mr Pininfarina. (Doc. 1-669/79);
- by Mr de la Malène, Miss De Valera and Mr Nyborg, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-670/79);
- by Mr Bonaccini, Mr Ceravolo, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Leonardi, Mr Segre, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mr Veronesi, Mrs Barbarella and Mr Gouthier (Doc. 1-671/79);
- by Mr Frischmann, Mrs Hoffmann, Mr Ansart, Mr Fernandez, Mrs De March and Mr Piquet (Doc. 1-672/79).

These requests will be put to the vote at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

I call Mrs Nielsen to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Nielsen. — (DK) Mr President, I should like to begin by saying that we in the Liberal and Democratic Group take the employment situation extremely seriously. The high unemployment we have suffered for a large part of the 1970s is one of the biggest challenges we face.

The situation requires us all to abandon party political shadow-boxing, and concentrate all our efforts on solving the problems. Mr Sarre of the Socialist Group said at the beginning of his speech that we did not

need Liberal speeches and Liberal theories. If I may say so, we don't need exclusively Socialist speeches and Socialist theories either. It is up to us to learn to cooperate in the interests of the unemployed and of society as a whole. But I do not think we can exploit this situation, and use unemployment as a pretext for changing our society. For that is what the Socialists hope to do. They are using unemployment in an attempt to create a completely changed society, wholly forgetting the unemployed in the process.

We in the Liberal Group feel that it is vitally important that Parliament should give this subject the most earnest consideration. For the fact is that no country is in a position to solve its problems alone.

(Applause from the Liberal and Democratic Group)

Fortunately we do not live in a closed society. We are lucky enough to live in open societies, with the result that we are occupationally, commercially, socially, educationally and above all economically very much dependent on each other, and we therefore share the responsibility for finding a solution to the unemployment problem.

For most of the 1970s we in Europe and indeed the industrialized world as a whole have suffered unemployment higher than at any time since the 1930s. The economic recession and the fall in demand have had the unfortunate affect of putting hundreds of thousands of people out of work. Losing one's job is always a severe trial, entailing as it does serious problems, perhaps not all of a financial nature, for fortunately there are systems of financial relief. However money, although it can help, is not everything. In purely human terms it can be devastating to be told that one's services are no longer required, that in fact one oneself is no longer required. It is a severe psychological blow and can shatter a person's life, and his relationship with family and friends. Of course it is just as serious for those who are unable to find a job to start with. I am thinking here of the many unemployed young people who, after completing their education, and perhaps after training as well, are unable to find work as there are no suitable jobs for them. There are not enough jobs to go round.

This kind of start to what I would call the productive part of life can be quite devastating and affect a person for the rest of his days.

For how are young people who have never learned that they can actually be called on to make a contribution, and who have no experience of going to work every day, to understand, if they are subsequently needed, as we hope they will be; that something is required of them and that we all have responsibilities. A situation where no demands are made of a person, who simply has to kill time one way or another, is the worst imaginable start to life, and can lead to other evils.

Nielsen

But unemployment has not been the only serious problem we have had to face. Inflation is again flourishing in many countries, and our societies have been radically changed by the energy crisis which has been with us only since the seventies. Traditional methods no longer work today. We must therefore abandon our old ideas and adapt ourselves to the new situation, which in fact is not as new as all that, since it has been with us for nearly ten years now. We must learn that unemployment does not disappear of its own accord and is not dissipated by fine words. We must learn to shoulder our responsibilities in our respective countries. We must give much more scope to our productive industries. Unfortunately — and I would address these remarks especially to the Socialists, who seem anxious to portray themselves as the only party really keen to eliminate unemployment, and as having a monopoly of the solutions to the problem — the private sector has been pilloried, the idea of making money has been decried, and 'profit' has become a dirty word, despite the fact that, as we all know, or at least ought to know, only when undertakings are earning enough to invest and create new jobs, and only when we are competitive, can we hope to improve our balance of payments. Only then can we hope to solve our present economic problems.

We must therefore give productive industry, better conditions to vote in. The Socialist's habitual response, trotted out in speeches today and in the motion itself, of putting more and more into the public sector, is simply no answer to unemployment. These ideas must be discarded. For a continually growing public sector does not remedy unemployment. It worsens it, as less and less goes into productive work; and it is that which has to feed us all. It is disquieting to note that in many areas official posts are the plum jobs. One can imagine the absurd situation arising one day where it would be impossible to increase production in our export industries as the workforce, for a variety of reasons including prestige, preferred more administrative kinds of employment. We therefore feel that we must do all we can to divert the flow of labour from the public to the private sector, for if we do not, we shall face even worse difficulties in the future.

Reading the comments of the Socialist Group gives one the impression that this debate is a continuation of the campaign the European election. I must insist that, as we all know, there are no easy answers. There can be no lasting solution to the problem of unemployment if we do not at the same time get inflation under control and ensure stable energy supplies at reasonable prices.

The problem of unemployment cannot therefore be solved in isolation from the other problems facing our societies. In my view, we should ban all talk of easy solutions from this debate. I shall be considering a

couple of aspects of the problem and my colleagues will deal with other points later.

I shall first consider the effects of technical advance on employment, the implications of technology if you like. I sometimes feel that we over simplify matters. For years now we have seen what technical development has done for our society and the benefits it has brought. We need look back no further than the 1960s to see the progress we have made and the advantages we have reaped from the development of technology, but I do not feel that we can blame if for our present unemployment problems, for that is just not the case.

Firstly, we must not forget that the introduction of technology — I am referring here to computers — has enabled us to reduce the human element in many unpleasant processes. In many undertakings the result has been an improvement in physical working conditions, with a reduction or elimination of noise and other forms of nuisance. At the same time, we can now perform tasks which were once unbearably monotonous and time-consuming.

They can be done in a fraction of the time previously needed, and done much better. Of course one can ask what are the implications in other fields? Well, we can then move rapidly on to other processes and apply the same resources to problems where human participation is still required. We must also remember that such progress has enabled us to obtain better productivity and higher growth, which has been and still is, essential to the increased prosperity of our society. Automation, and technology as a whole, have therefore been largely instrumental in reducing working hours.

We cannot discuss the question of limited or controlled technology without considering the economics of the matter. What was the motive force behind technology in the 1960s? Was it simply technical progress for its own sake? Of course not. Wage costs were and are the major factor behind the introduction of labour-saving techniques. Wages rose sharply in the 1960s and early 70s, forcing many undertakings to take a new look at labour. Not only was it difficult to get hold of, but it was also so expensive that it could only be used where absolutely necessary. A great many simple manual processes were now wholly or in part automated. Various examples spring to mind, but I do not wish to waste time in listing them, and we can all quote examples where jobs have been simplified. But I should like to say that we can now draw the conclusion that the introduction of new technology to raise productivity does not increase unemployment. The fact is that the more technology we invest in, the more competitive we become and the more jobs we create in industry. Of course we must add that if undertakings modernize their production lines, become competitive, and are able to sell their

Nielsen

products then more labour can be taken on. This should be an objective. But if undertakings do not do so then sooner or later they may find themselves forced out of the market. They then have to close down and dismiss their workforce, and that is what increases unemployment.

Let me say in conclusion that all the talk about work sharing will not solve the problem either. Mr Vredeling said that the Council had adopted a feeble resolution on the 22nd. I take the view that it was good thing it was only a resolution. We must insist that it is for management and labour to decide between them on the various aspects of working hours. I do not believe that, simply because jobs are available in specific industries, that people will immediately appear, ready to step into them. We are not flexible enough, neither in terms of training nor mobility. It is vital that we should make an effort here. Only when we realize that fact will we be in a position to create jobs for the many people who require them.

List of speakers for the debate on the Council statement on the Italian Presidency.

President. — I propose that the dead-line for entering names on the list of speakers for the debate on the statement by the President-in-Office be fixed at 12 noon tomorrow.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

6. *Employment situation in the Community* (continuation)

President.—I call Miss De Valera to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Miss De Valera. — Mr President, unemployment is a social state of being which is now endemic not only in the EEC but world-wide. For the last few years, unemployment in the European Community has been in the region of 6 million. Such a high level of unemployment is a deterrent to creating the type of Community we want to see developing today and on into the future.

Unemployment deadens and weakens the spirit and can turn normally contented members of society into people without hope and without direction. Half-measures aimed at tackling unemployment are not enough. The Community must be fully committed to introducing a social policy which will ensure an optimum growth that will create and guarantee full employment as a fundamental right.

In our election platform for the first-ever direct elections to the European Parliament, we in the European Progressive Democrats constantly stressed this point. In Ireland the Government, despite the oil crisis and

inflation, has been working to create full employment. Their success to date has not been complete. Unemployment in Ireland as measured by the total live register, was around 87 000 on 16 November last. With due consideration for the extra pressure placed on Government resources as a result of the extension of unemployment assistance to single women and widows, this figure of just over 87 000 represents a fall of 12 000 over the same period in 1978. In addition, immigration to Ireland, a phenomenon in its own right, has made further demands. I shall return to this point later.

Ireland, situated on the periphery of the Community is in a unique position as far as unemployment is concerned. 50 % of the population is under 25. 15 % of Ireland's population has been born since the population census taken in 1971. This means that in Ireland for the foreseeable future there will be a growing demand for employment from our young people.

This is not the case in all Member States. In France, for example, the Government has been obliged to arrest the decline in population by introducing financial incentives to reduce the falling birth-rate. If the population of the Community is to increase, then measures must be taken now to provide full employment.

Another factor that has made Ireland's employment situation still more unique is the migration pattern. In the 1960s, about 1 % of the labour force emigrated annually. But since the 1970s, the pattern of migration has changed. Now there is immigration. The 1979 census has confirmed this. During the 1970s, the Irish population grew by an average of about 1.5 % per annum. This exerted even greater pressure on employment. Yet the startling fact of this net immigration increase is that it did not raise the unemployment level. In early October of last year, the registered unemployment level, which stood at around 10 % of the labour force, was at its lowest level since 1974. If immigration had not occurred, the level of unemployment would thus have been much less. I have referred to demographic considerations and the effects of net immigration in order to underline Ireland's unique situation in relation to unemployment.

Certain regions in the Community have constantly registered unemployment rates much higher than the national level. If one of the aims of the preamble of the EEC Treaty is considered, namely strengthening the unity of the economies of the Member States and ensuring, and I quote, 'their harmonious development by reducing the differences existing between the various regions and the backwardness of the less-favoured regions', then clearly that aim has not yet been realized. If the EEC is to live up to its ambitions, then part of its actions must ensure not only economic equality but equal employment opportunities in each region.

de Valera

Through instruments such as the Common Agricultural Policy, the Social Fund and the Regional Fund the Community can play its part in achieving these goals. Inflation must be curbed and faster growth pursued.

I would not agree with those who suggest that people should be given high incentives to move from areas of high unemployment to areas of low unemployment. Encouraging worker mobility should not be seen as a social objective in itself. It has been found in Dublin, as indeed in other European cities, that many of the unemployed are reluctant to move out of their area as there may be no guarantee of work in other areas. It is the responsibility of all of us here to ensure that people are not forced out of the area in which they live and have been brought up to seek employment elsewhere. With proper use of resources and planning, the social and psychological pressures that would be exerted on the worker as a result of this unwelcome change could be avoided.

Where there is inner-city unemployment there is a hidden asset in that there is a readily available pool of labour. There should be greater faith in a policy of incentives to investment in city areas. This applies also to regions where unemployment is high and where there is also a pool of employment readily available.

Unemployment might already have been reduced throughout the Community if sufficient attention had been paid in previous years to the need to educate people for the new technologies which are presently being established. Indeed, we find that there *are* jobs available, but there is no-one to take them up owing to lack of training and lack of foresight.

The word of the '80s is the micro-chip. Our employment task in the '80s is to train people how to use the microchip. It will revolutionize every sector of industry.

While training for the new technological age must be a priority, attention must also be given to the possible damaging effects of the microelectronics revolution. A study by the European Trade Unions Institute published last November stated that the microelectronics revolution would lead to an acceleration in the loss of jobs in certain key industries and services in Western Europe in the 1980s. The impact would be greatest in the manufacturing, finance, transport and communications sectors.

It is therefore essential that contingency plans be made now to prevent such losses occurring, by putting greater emphasis on the role of manpower policy in social and economic development, and that further attention be given to problems like the mismatching of labour supply and demand and the dissemination of information on career prospects in industry for young people. A radical reappraisal of education, beginning in the schools and continuing through tech-

nical college or university level, which will prepare people for work in the microchip age, is indispensable. Our experience of skills shortages in Ireland underlines this need.

Further employment planning cannot be separated from education. In view of equal opportunities for men and women there should be no sex stereotyping in the provision of training opportunities. Employment equality legislation has opened up new horizons for women in many new areas of work. As a result of the Social Fund's training programme women took up training courses which are traditionally considered to be male preserves. These courses included electronics, management, general engineering, machine tool operations, to name but a few.

More incisive Community action in the field of unemployment was called for by the Dublin European Council. There is nothing new in this. When are we going to have action?

The Community should immediately carry out an analysis of the effects of the oil-price increases on the economies of the various Member States. It is evident that there will be a further decline in living standards and a widening of the gap between the richer and poorer areas in the EEC unless the Council of Ministers agree on an action plan to eliminate the greatest evil of our time.

President. — I call Mrs Hammerich.

Mrs Hammerich. — (DK) Mr President, let me tell a true story from real life, away from this rarified atmosphere.

In 1972, before the Danish referendum on membership of the Community, the employers summoned their workers together, not for the purpose of industrial democracy, but to threaten them; if they did not vote yes to the EEC, the employers could not be responsible for the consequences. Factories might have to close, cut back their activities or move abroad. These local threats were followed by a nationwide scare campaign: unemployment would rise if the workers voted no to the EEC, while a yes would bring new jobs and full employment. Now we know that the EEC has become the European unemployment community. There are more than 6 million registered unemployed, to which must be added hidden unemployment and a million immigrant workers sent home. Women and young people have been hard hit.

Various ideas are put forward on ways to combat unemployment. But perhaps the problem is that unemployment itself is inseparable from the idea of untrammelled growth for the big companies, as unashamedly enshrined in the Treaty of Rome. We do not maintain that the EEC alone is to blame for the crisis which has struck ordinary people in our part of the world. But we have realized that the Community has been completely incapable of protecting us from

Hammerich

the crisis. We have also seen that our country has been forced to import everything produced in the Community, including unemployment. Yes, we have imported unemployment. Between 1973 and 1978 unemployment in the Community as a whole rose by 2½ times, while in Denmark it increased eightfold. It increased more in Denmark than in any other Member State and the figures come from the Commission's annual economic report for 1979-1980. In the same annual report the Community gives us in Denmark advice on our economy. The advice is wage restraint and financial stringency. Not everyone in Denmark agrees that stringency is a good way to reduce unemployment.

The Socialist Group's question shows that it does not believe in cuts as a way of combating unemployment either, but assumes that the Commission itself believes in cuts. What we find impossible to accept is that in future Community policy decisions should apply in our country.

As I have said, we are not claiming that the EEC itself is the root cause of unemployment. But we do note that it is hampering a whole series of steps which we could take in Denmark to counter unemployment, such as were used in the thirties for example. We in the Popular Movement are not agreed on these steps ourselves, but our task is to inform the public that the EEC is stopping us from using them, and how it is curbing the imagination required to meet this situation.

For example, it has been made difficult to institute large scale public works. If these are for over 7 million Danish kroner they have to be put to public EEC tender, which might mean that foreign firms would win the contracts. An exchange control office as we had once, supervising foreign exchange and imports, is not permitted in the Community, and bilateral agreements, trade agreements and subsidies to firms in difficulty are discouraged. Our membership of the Snake has also meant that the Danish kroner has been artificially pulled up by the Deutschmark. This and the rise in interest rates from 11 to 17 % since 1973 have played a part in worsening unemployment.

I would emphasize that I am not arguing for one economic policy or the other. There is of course much dispute in Denmark on the subject, and the Popular Movement does not endorse any specific economic policy, but we do say that it should be for our people and our politicians to discuss and decide, without interference from the EEC. That is the vital point for us. We know that social progress is achieved by a political and social struggle on the spot, where the people live and work. Only there can imaginative, constructive and realistic solutions be found.

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante — (I) Mr President, we discussed this very important subject in December, when Mr von

Bismarck submitted his admirable report. I am glad that we are doing so again and, thanks to the Bureau, for the whole of one day, because nothing less would do. If Europe does not go in for collaboration and careful planning but goes on being a community of unemployment and under-employment, all our other policy debates and any other action we take on the basis of considerations, however important, relating to the domestic or foreign policy of our countries or of the Community, will be of very little account.

I say this as a member of this Parliament and also of the Italian Parliament. In his report, von Bismarck quoted the staggering figure of European unemployed, now 7 million. I was, unfortunately compelled to point out that a third of that number are Italians, most of them from the South, and that to their number we must add the 2 million previously unemployed who, thanks to their host States, now live in the various countries of the Community and in every corner of the world. If they were to return to Italy or were compelled to do so as a consequence of recession in the Community, which is a regrettable possibility, the number of Italian unemployed would go up from 2 to 4 million. I hope this will be kept in mind by all political parties and the Member States.

While we are talking today, a general strike has been called in Italy. It will bring all work to a standstill and will probably cost the ordinary citizen, the taxpayer and the worker several hundred thousand million lire. I should not complain if it were a strike for better pay and conditions. However, it is a political strike organized by agreement between the three trade union confederations for an undisguised political purpose, the same purpose for which Mr Berlinguer is preparing to speak in this House, tomorrow or the day after, on the subject of Afghanistan in a speech which is awaited with interest and which, they say, will condemn Soviet imperialism. The Communists aspire to form the government of my country and they will stop at nothing to do so: today it is the general strike, tomorrow, better still, Mr Berlinguer's anti-Soviet speech, both with the same end in view.

I condemn this state of affairs in particular from the viewpoint of the population as a whole. The Socialist members of this House who, rightly and without any flourish of trumpets, campaign against a certain type of employer will, I trust, bear in mind that the so-called Italian multinationals have a lot in common with the Italian Communist Party and the left wing of the Italian Socialist Party. This was demonstrated recently when an important economic policy document on energy was jointly signed for the first time by the Confederation of Italian Industry — not to mention any names, by Doctor Carli on behalf of Doctor Agnelli as well — and by the three trade union confederations. This has never happened before.

Almirante

I cannot suggest any explanation, in social or economic terms, for this development but one was given in Italy by a fellow-member of the European and Italian Parliaments. This was Mr Amendola, who does not appear to be here today. When Italy heard what I should describe as the shattering news that the Confederation of Industry, the employers and the three labour confederations had put their signatures to the same document, Mr Amendola said: 'This is the party of inflation'. The fact is that inflation suits the book of a certain type of employer and of the trade union confederations of the left and far left.

So, our enemies are unemployment and inflation and we must fight them on the lines von Bismark suggested in December. They will not be defeated on the strength of Communist or Socialist austerity plans which (not always successfully) cover up disgraceful events involving the representatives of the international left and, in particular, the Italian left. They must be defeated by the application of a policy of full employment, incentives and productivity but there must first be an unequivocal, firmer and, I would hope, final rejection of the class war and those practices which in Italy go under the name of 'permanent conflict'. I say to members of all parties, especially the Socialists and Communists, that it is hypocrisy to preach war on unemployment and to press for a policy of planning, full employment, anti-inflationary measures and production incentives if nothing is done to stop the class war and permanent conflict and to work for a Europe based on collaboration and the social contract on which my colleagues and I on the Italian right place such high hopes.

I will leave it at that to allow time for other non-attached speakers.

President. — I call Mrs Salisch.

Mrs Salisch. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we must wake up to the fact that more people are today in the labour market than there are jobs and that while the number of people looking for jobs is increasing, the number of jobs is decreasing. But the feeling is that the economic experts in the various countries are sitting like rabbits confronted by a snake, evidently incapable of developing effective strategies for a new independent employment policy. For one thing has been clear since 1973, when the present crisis began. In the labour market our old economic theories and policies are outdated. Everywhere the full weight of economic policy is placed on anti-inflationary efforts. Rising raw materials prices are offered as an easy excuse here. But it is still true to say that despite a favourable short-term economic development the labour market is still characterized by

depressing trends, because it is not, of course, simply the unemployment — expressed in percentage terms — which is alarming: it is above all the number of those concerned which in fact makes it clear to us what unemployment today means.

Let me take as an example the Federal Republic of Germany, where the situation is regarded by the public as being relatively favourable. Of the more than 3 million people who became unemployed in 1978 each had been out of work one and a half times. Add to this those who had been unemployed for longer than a year and the latent reserve, and you arrive at a figure of almost 3 million different people affected by unemployment in one year. In my country that is every eighth worker.

This calculation really makes it impossible to belittle the situation. And we must realize what unemployment in fact means to the individual and to our society. To the individual it means firstly — despite social security — that he will suffer a substantial loss of income and also a gradual loss of social integration and self-respect. For society and seen from a general economic point of view, unemployment means a loss of prosperity which should not be underestimated, consisting of social obligations towards the unemployed, the loss of contributions to social insurance funds and of tax revenue, and of the reduction in net domestic product, since people and plant are not being used to capacity. We are talking here in terms of thousands of millions, which should be opening the way for a different employment policy strategy.

Seen in terms of the European Community, the situation is very much worse. Every sixteenth person of employable age in the Community is out of work. The proportion of persons gainfully employable in the Community is 41.5%. This means for all practical purposes that of the 165 million Europeans of employable age around 60 million — which is after all equivalent to the population of the Federal Republic, France or Italy — are not yet in gainful employment. And of these 60 million, 46 million are women. In all our countries the problems of the labour market are accompanied by an economic situation characterized by limited growth of industrial production, governments and central banks pursuing an anti-inflationary policy, increased concentration and centralization of capital, a systematic increase in uncontrolled investment incentives in companies and a corresponding reduction or even freezing of consumption and of domestic product in real terms. The result is that the countries of the Community are threatening to stop at monetarism and at the protectionism that is re-emerging and so to consolidate divergence in the Community, with the attendant danger of disintegra-

Salisch

tion into different economic and monetary areas. As I see it, this outcome would defeat the object of an economic policy excessively aimed at growth in production and investment. It in fact gives rise to the call for new economic policy strategies and above all for all economic action to be measured against the new requirements of the labour market and so for the proper social importance to be attached to employment policy, all the more so as we are facing a technological development which might well prove to be and is already proving to be a job eliminator. But the fact that the quantity of products manufactured in 40 hours in 1975 can today, because of increased productivity, be manufactured in less than 35 hours still does not adequately justify in my view, forcing on a growing number of people willing to work a reduction in income through the loss of their jobs, while on the other hand cost reductions achieved through rationalization lead to higher profits, which in our concentrated and to a large extent freely competitive economy by no means result in price reductions. Other alternatives are quite conceivable: improved production might lead to better supplies of goods and services, or the working hours saved might be paid for elsewhere, or — and this is the tenor of the Socialist Group's question — while leaving supplies at their present level, there might be a drastic reduction in working hours.

I am trying to make it clear that the threat does not stem from the nature of the technical innovation but the manner in which it has so far been used. The private sector has so far demonstrated its inability to convert the increase in the quantity produced per hour of work into an increase in the prosperity of the population at large and has thus shown itself not to be in any way a responsible guarantor of forward-looking economic action.

I should now like to refer to the reduction of the working week. From any analysis of the labour market we can see that if the unemployment problem is to be solved, either the gross domestic product must increase at an unexpectedly sharp rate or there must be a drastic reduction in working hours. If growth policy and reduction in working hours coincide, an active employment policy is possible. The reduction of working hours is however, not only a measure to be taken as part of the employment policy, but undoubtedly one of the most powerful means of humanizing working life, which is characterized by a high degree of stress, a constantly high number of hours of overtime, considerable distances to the place of work, an increase in shiftwork and a reduction in the average amount of leisure time available every day. Hardest hit by this are working women with small children.

In purely mathematical terms it has been proved that simply shortening the working week or doing so in

conjunction with a reduction in overtime does most to ease the burden on the employment situation. Nevertheless, the choice between the numerous possible ways of reducing work time — reducing the time worked throughout a worker's life or the time he works in a year, in a week or in a day, arrangements to give him breaks, additional shifts and so on — must undoubtedly be governed by the criteria of need as defined by social policy and of the requirements of the sector and company concerned.

As a rule companies can make good half to a third of the calculated reduction in working time by increasing productivity. Companies prefer to bring forward the retirement age, because then the pension funds take over, or to give longer annual holidays, because this necessitates only slight changes. But both these alternatives have comparatively little effect on the employment situation.

While five day's extra leave creates 250 000 jobs — I am referring here to the Federal Republic — the introduction of the 35-hour week produces more than one million new jobs. This makes it clear where the emphasis must lie in the Community. Even if all the other methods of reducing working time to safeguard employment are required, we need in the European Community a long-term labour policy concept which focuses on the introduction of the 35-hour week and changes in shiftwork. The introduction of the 35-hour week is essential above all in regions particularly hard hit by under-employment. The reduction of working time could therefore also be used as a regional policy instrument.

To conclude, structural changes in economic processes also mean structural changes in economic policy. In my opinion, this means changing the objectives of economic policy from the maximization of individual companies' productivity and profits to company activities guided by general social costs and benefits, in other words a move away from economic growth measured in terms of the gross national product alone towards the inclusion of degree of employment, productivity and other socially relevant quantities in the concept of economic growth. I see this as the basis for an effective employment policy, which will also encourage the integration of the European Community.

President. — I call Mr von Bismark.

Mr von Bismarck. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, with what I have to say on behalf of my group I should above all like to suggest to all the Members of this Parliament that the manner in which we debate this subject, which has been put on the agenda rather hastily, should differ from the manner in which debates are conducted in most parliaments

von Bismarck

in Europe. One of the previous speakers has already referred to this. The subject is too serious and ethically too important for us to use any form of propaganda here. I am a little sorry that it was not possible to prevent our Socialist colleagues from setting this debate in motion with what is in essence a propaganda question rather than making a start with another discussion. When we look at the resources at our disposal, all we can do is to ensure the insights gained here have a better effect by cooperating with the Commission and the Council and by bringing pressure to bear on our own national governments. What inhibits our own governments is that the many compromises reached by the coalition partners simply prevent them from taking the action recommended to them — very appropriately, as I see it — by the Commission in its last economic report. Italy is now attempting to implement the Commission's recommendation and to drop index-linked wages for a while. It is likely to be very difficult to overcome the resistance of a major group.

I should like to say to one of the previous speakers, Mr Vetter, that I very much welcome the fact that he has undertaken to set in motion again the 'concerted action', that is talks between governments, workers and their trade unions on the one hand and employers on the other, in what is a difficult situation in my own country. Mr Vetter, I also welcome your suggestion that the Tripartite Conference should be convened because I too feel that it is more fruitful to listen to the views of others than to speak as loud as possible.

To another of the previous speakers, Mrs Salisch, I should like to say that if she is going to start with 1973 in our country, she will, of course, tempt me to say a few words to Mr Brandt, whom I sincerely welcome here, about what happened under his Government. We let inflation run until 1973. Helmut Schmidt launched a massive attack on it, and 18 months later we, of course, had over 1 million unemployed, although the previous year we had set up a world export record of over 52 000 m. In other words, our unemployed did not simply happen: they were the consequence of the inflationary trend.

(Protests from the left)

If you think that is a non-Socialist view, I can tell you different. Let me quote Harold Wilson: 'Inflation is the father and the mother of unemployment.' and Mr Callaghan says: 'for a long time we tried and we believed we could use inflation through State expenditure, tax reductions and all kinds of support to create jobs.' He goes on: 'It only worked by injecting bigger doses of inflation into the economy followed by higher levels of unemployment at the next step.' I would regard that as only one dose. Ladies and gentlemen, what we have to fight are not the views of

others but the mistakes we have in common. When I look at the Socialist Group's paper, I am tempted to enumerate these mistakes. But I would only do so with caution, because, as I have just said, I want to appeal to us all to listen to each other a little better.

But I should like to begin by saying something about the reduction of working hours. Mrs Salisch has just worked out some astonishing figures. In fact the present situation in the Federal Republic, to which you referred, is that for every untrained worker there are two trained specialists. For our country this means that if you cannot increase the number of specialists, you cannot employ the untrained either. What I am saying is that we must be very careful before we state so categorically that what we believe is right. I cannot at the moment comment on everything you said, but we must be wary of advancing an argument that has not been thought out to its logical end, because that does not help anybody. All it does perhaps is help our own prestige, because we have been particularly outspoken.

If we now examine the possibilities open to us, all we can do for the time being is to establish together what can be done. In other words, Mrs Salisch, you are right to say we must find out what the structure is. What is it in fact? Where is help needed?

Secondly, we must realize that we must never consider taking individual measures in this difficult question without establishing the basic conditions. If we do not have the right basic conditions, we shall create more inflation, we shall not be able to face this evil whatever individual measures are taken. In our text, which unfortunately has not yet been printed — I am sorry that this has not been possible — we set out in paragraphs 3 and 4 what are for us, the Group of the EPP, the most important basic data. They are only the most important, but I should like to emphasize one point. If it is felt that a new job should be created, there is no denying that there must be somebody to put up the capital — in Germany an average of DM 160 000. We have to persuade people to make this capital available. Who is capable of doing this? Only those who have some capital of their own and ideas likely to persuade consumers to entrust them with their savings. If we do not want this, if, Mrs Salisch, we continue to decry profit-making on ideological grounds, we will not create a single new job, because the necessary capital will not be provided. In other words, if we cannot bring ourselves to give up once and for all the ideological and theoretical disparagement of profit-making, as has long since been done in Germany under Federal Chancellor Schmidt, a Social Democrat, we will not eliminate unemployment. I call on us all — and I am quite prepared to do this — to leave our ideological views at home when we discuss unemployment in this Parliament.

von Bismarck

A third point I should like to make is that it is, of course, very tempting, as one Member has already said, to look for public investment. But, ladies and gentleman, who takes this decision?

Do we really believe that lawyers and bureaucrats, however industrious they may be, know better what the market needs, what the citizen wants, better than businessmen who have been doing this all their lives and are under the constant threat of losing their livelihood if they make a wrong decision? Civil servants are not taking any personal risk if a firm purchased by the State subsequently has to be subsidized by the taxpayer. In such cases we have the senseless spending of the very money that should be spent to enable smaller undertakings in the tertiary sector, for example, to make some innovation. That is the last point I should like to make.

It is often overlooked — and those who have never had to take decisions in a company on products are perhaps not so aware of this — that markets become 'lazy' if we do not have any new products. This saturation effect is in the nature of us human beings. If we do not make enough capital and enough risk capital available for manufacturers to venture on to the market with new products, we shall not create new jobs for the workers who are waiting for work. There must be a new idea, new demand must be created for services or products. Then the market will revive, then a permanent job can really be created. If the idea is bad, there will very soon be no further demand for the product or service. Only if enough time and capital is spent on converting research ideas into practicable programmes, can we hope permanently to eliminate the many dangers to which jobs are exposed.

You are quite right. The dangers come from all sides, especially from our development policy, a policy we all support morally. It is after all we who provide the poorer, less developed countries with our technology so that they can manufacture products that we have hitherto manufactured. In other words, we ourselves create the pressure on our jobs, and we can only survive if our products become more intelligent, involve more technology and are manufactured with more computers. We must bear this in mind if we want to progress, which is the only way — I completely agree with you on this — of making every day a day worth living for all mankind, including those who have to do shiftwork. Anyone who has looked into this question knows that this is one of the darker aspects of life. But we can only eliminate it with improved technology, and that again means more capital. I feel therefore, we should first try within our groups to listen to each other more and to talk to each other more, so that even before the end of the first six months of this year, I hope, we can enter into very much more practical discussions with the Commission and Council on how we can utilize the

greater knowledge we have to bring about full employment and to come closer to achieving our aims. I believe we would be doing this Parliament a great service if we adopted this course.

President. — I call Sir David Nicholson.

Sir David Nicholson. — Mr President, unemployment is an evil which the Community can do something about, if there is genuine political will and if, for once, in favour of doctrinaire posturing is put aside for practical measures. We have got to face the facts and not indulge in fantasy. It is inflation, loss of business confidence, the advent of new industrial powers and changes in world markets which have caused decline and unemployment in many areas in the EEC, but we are also faced by a process of change involving new technologies which cannot be halted and must be faced. We cannot put the clock back; it is fatal constantly to resist change. What we have to do is to meet it and act accordingly, and to be flexible in finding new ways of adjusting to the circumstances, because the world always will be changing. In fact this produces opportunities to create new work, and this is where the solution lies and not, I beg you to believe, in all of us doing less work.

I do not want to continue speaking in general terms, because I think there is quite enough of that. I would like to make some specific proposals in one specific area, and that is the contribution to the problem which small business could make. I would like to start, Mr President, by giving you some facts which I think you will find interesting. In the United States in the 7 years 1970-1977 66% of all new jobs were created by businesses employing less than 20 people, and 88% by small businesses as a whole. 80% of that came from businesses less than 5 years old. If this were not enough to arouse your interest, may I add that it has been shown that small businesses produced 4 times as many innovations per dollar invested as large businesses. In the United Kingdom it has been estimated that the investment necessary job created is of the order of £10 000 in a small business but is usually 4 or 5 times this figure in a big company. So I believe the time has come for us to take the development of small businesses very seriously, and without delay.

In the United Kingdom we have 820 000 small businesses and it is interesting to reflect that if they each employed only two more people the number of jobs created would match the total national figure of unemployed people. This is a vital thing at a time when we face the fact that new technologies and faster machinery, whose introduction we should not and must not resist if we are to maintain competitiveness and thus living standards, will probably reduce employment in the bigger companies.

Nicholson

So what practical steps can we take? A prime problem is having somewhere where the potential small business entrepreneur can come for advice on how to prepare and present his proposals, where to go for finance and how to cope with the regulations and paperwork which will be inflicted on him by government and central authorities. Then there is the question of finance. Bankers naturally prefer to help well established concerns with a good profit record. They are not so good at the beginning of a business when risks are hard to assess, and therefore new jobs do not get created. In any case the high interest rates which persist today discourage small businesses from getting started. Frankly this task is not best tackled by governments or civil servants on their own either. What we need is a blend of local government and businessmen supported by the big companies and with central support and encouragement. It has to be done on a local community basis, developing community spirit and involving local people like the chambers of commerce and university business schools and also, of course, local urban and city areas in decline.

Now, the European Investment Bank has expanded greatly, as you know, and it has done much good work, but at present this is only of limited benefit to small businesses. Its loans or guarantees are limited to 50 % of the cost of fixed assets and are made through government, regional or other agencies. I believe the European Investment Bank should set up a small businesses division to provide loans or guarantees as indeed the United States Government does to a wide number of local community committees approved by their national governments, in order to stimulate specifically the creation of new enterprises and jobs, and this would create the confidence necessary to do it.

There are already some good examples in the Community of how this formula can succeed. In one case in northern England a local unit with very limited capital available to it has created no less than 700 jobs in the past 12 months. The expansion of government departments and information services will not do the job. It requires joint initiative with local business people, and if you really want to reduce unemployment, you should accept this fact.

I also believe that the Regional Fund should be used to help these local small business units by the provision of grants for interest rate subsidies until such time as we have learned how to control inflation and to cooperate to achieve economic convergence in our Member nations. The Regional Fund should not be cut back, as the Council of Ministers tried to do in the budget. It should be properly developed, planned and expanded to create work. I have tried to indicate this morning one way in which it could do so.

Mr President, I have spoken before about the need for leadership in this Community and I believe that here

is a real opportunity. I hope the Parliament can think sufficiently broadmindedly to accept it and to suggest constructive action, and that it will demand constructive action now in this area.

President. — I call Mr Frischmann.

Mr Frischmann. — (*F*) Mr President, we wish we could be gratified, as we were at the short debates on reducing total working time or harmonizing social legislation, at finding this Assembly finally tackling questions of direct concern to our workers. Employment is indeed one of these questions; it could even be said to have become the paramount question of the day.

But we see that the majority in this House is dealing with the question in a way which cannot possibly satisfy the workers or give them renewed hope. Do we really appreciate the inhuman significance of the enormous figures that the official statistics themselves reveal — nearly 7 million male and female workless, one million and a half of them in France. And these are just the declared figures and we know that unemployment statistics are scaled down. To come nearer the truth they need to be increased by a good third, more or less as the International Labour Office does. Rigging the figures, 'skimming off the fat' to use the horrible euphemism of certain technocrats does nothing to alter the intolerable truth — intolerable and unjustifiable, for no word is strong enough to describe this tragedy that millions of workless are going through, their human dignity broken, particularly the women and young people who are the principle sufferers.

The fact that there is no sign of an early improvement should be said more plainly and loudly. All the forecasts — by the Community, the OECD and the national institutes — are the same as are the admissions made this morning by Mr Vredeling and Mr Ortoli. We are coolly told to expect an annual increase of some 200 000 workless a year in a country like France and this will go on until the fundamental options taken up to now remain unchanged. Unemployment does not fall out of the sky, we have just been told. True, and it began to develop, it should also be said, well before oil prices started to go up. It is the direct and inevitable product of co-ordinated policies of austerity in all the capitalist countries. Clearly, the only result that reducing the purchasing power of the big working masses could have was to reduce consumption and therefore slow down production, resulting finally in mass unemployment.

At the same time, moreover, capital was invested in far away countries with manpower that was cheap because it was not entitled to a minimum living wage or any social rights, the way things were 50 to 100 years ago in our country. The only result that this redeployment, vaunted as a miracle cure to give capital record profits, could possibly have was to close down

Frischmann

plants, dismantle complete sectors of the economy, ruin whole regions and cause the disturbing decline of the big industrialized countries in the Community.

We have to have the courage to recognize that this is the result of the whole policy propagated from Brussels by the European Commission and supported by the vast majority in this Assembly and by the national parliaments and governments. That is where the responsibility lies. This is the policy that proved powerless to halt inflation and unemployment as it claimed to be able to do and, instead, has nurtured both these evils at once. This is the disease the Community is suffering from and France in particular.

We have to put an end to it once for all by identifying its origin and attacking it at the roots. This means declaring and ruling that the profit of the multinationals and the other big capitalist companies is not the only purpose of production for it is clear that profits have not been converted into tomorrow's investment and, later, jobs as we have been told. It is this fierce determination to secure, before and in spite of everything else, maximum profits for these big modern feudal systems that has reduced the very idea of Europe, your Europe, to a term synonymous with unemployment, a constant lowering of living standards and a threat to the social and other rights that the workers have won. The targets now are social security, the right to health and trade union rights as well as the right to work because it all goes together. We have to put an end, too, to this one and only solution, also invented in Brussels and again supported by the majority in this House, which consists purely in making a few loans to facilitate restructuring and redeployment measures that do away with jobs. This is the main thing missing, perhaps, from the Socialist Group's question with which we agree in everything else it says. This is where the responsibility lies, too, and these are the current crazy results it leads to. France, for example, is now importing more coal than it produces although it has ample reserves underground. More than 2 billion tonnes are going to be left unused in the Nord-Pas de Calais, Lorraine, the Jura and in the Central South, as well as the far larger reserves in deeper lying formations which could be exploited if modern gasification and liquefaction technologies were used. Instead we prefer to go for a 'nuclear only' policy, like yesterday's 'oil only' policy. Unfortunately, writing off coal means writing off hundreds of thousands of jobs as well.

The same crazy approach is apparent in the steel sector which is being sacrificed in France although it is the central foundation for the economic development of a country like ours and although demand will climb steadily up to 1985 at least when the steel shortage will make itself badly felt. The French Longwy and Denain steel workers and British steelworkers are therefore right to fight as they are doing. It is not

enough to recognize, as the French Minister responsible for industrial production does, that the battle for exports first has to be won on domestic markets. This is true, but to win it we have to take the necessary measures for the steel and coal industries, and for textiles, shipbuilding, transport and the other sectors that are also threatened by the Brussels decisions. In other words the time has come to denounce these acts of folly and the harmful nature of these policies for our countries' economies and workers. The time has come to take exactly the opposite decisions, stepping up production again immediately, resisting the winding up of companies and listening to the voice of the workers rightly fighting to defend the tools they work with because we, in contrast to the ever-negative reactionary response, hold that this is possible. It is possible firstly by raising living standards and increasing the lowest rates of pay, which are not a sufficient living wage in these times, as is the case in France where 50 % of workers do not have 3 000 F. a month to live on and the unemployed even less.

This is the first way to reactivate the domestic market and thereby create jobs in industry and in agriculture. Incidentally, we regret on this score too that this idea is not included in the Socialist Group's question. Secondly, more help could also be given to programmes for buying up and modernizing the main public services which no longer meet the requirements of the population. Thirdly, a real social policy needs to be developed that would both create jobs and meet the aspirations of the workers, e.g. reducing the working week to 35 hours, having a fifth shift, bringing forward the age of retirement, increasing holiday entitlements, etc. Fourthly, there should be State control over the activity of the multinationals and other big companies and in particular over the way they drain off public funds and over the restructuring and redeployment decisions they take in secret that are withheld from the workers and elected representatives of the people. Fifthly, effective concertation and real democracy need to be extended, precisely in order to frame a completely different policy. Lastly the resources to be used need to be marshalled, because they exist — reallocation of budgetary appropriations and public finance for investment, the elimination of excessive profits and super profits, a ban on the capital drain, radical reform of the tax system and real international cooperation based on a new international economic order.

That is what the workers want and it is why they are fighting. It is why we support them and it is also why they will enforce their demands which, as always, will otherwise be refused them.

President. — I call Mr Calvez.

Mr Calvez. — (*F*) Mr President, the preceding speakers have stressed the point that the existence of a very high unemployment figure in the Community is

a major risk for Europe and a considerable economic constraint.

We are not in this Parliament to woo electors, promise miracle solutions giving work to everyone, put the multinationals in the stocks, or to force our governments to invest in the public services but to make a lucid analysis of the situation and see what can be done in the framework of the Treaties governing the Community.

We shall not create jobs with slogans. The first trap to avoid is to give way to fatalism and *laissez-faire*. The only possible approach is to ensure that the whole of the body politic is informed, which is what the European Parliament is doing today in asking the Commission to tell us what it intends to do.

We have to be realistic and to formulate a number of proposals. The first requirement, I would say, is to get our facts straight; someone out of work is too often mixed up with someone looking for a job. They may sometimes be the same but transparency is needed in the relevant data and the same terminology in all the Community countries. The point is that, in spite of the statistics kept in the different countries, unemployment facts are not always accurately known and the official figures periodically give rise to controversy. Here I agree with Mr Vredeling and would ask him also to think about the lack of precision in the definition of 'white collar workers' in the various European countries, as a result of which there are no figures for the unemployed in this category although the people concerned are electors and, in the 50-55 age group, together with unskilled young people and women are part of the hard core unemployed. This needs to be put right.

One fact is certain and that is that, since the 1973 crisis, it is heavy industry that has lost most jobs and that it is industrial firms which first come to mind in most cases as a source of new ones. Here we have to try to answer three questions: which industries, which firms and what jobs?

The answer to the first two questions is easy. Jobs need to be created in competitive and economically viable industries and firms. It is about the types of job to be created that thought is needed. The proposals made by the Liberal and Democratic Group are based on two principles:

- firstly the need to provide a job to all who wish to carry on an activity consistent with their aspirations and aptitudes;
- secondly, the need for efforts to improve the quality of life in the Member States, to improve life at work, the coverage of social risks and general housing and transport conditions and also to improve the availability and use of leisure and to halt the deterioration of the natural environment.

But this employment policy is inseparable from economic and social policy on which the social partners insist on being consulted at the European level as well as at the national, regional and professional levels.

As regards economic policy, the present growth rate — about 1-3 % depending on the country — will have to be stepped up if employment is to be banished and the number of jobs increased. But you cannot decree a growth rate, it has to be achieved and the contribution of everyone working in our companies is essential. Strikes have not and never will improve productivity. As far as possible, they ought to be avoided.

The Liberal and Democratic Group therefore recommends:

- a policy of encouragement for investment primarily the potentially strong industries in high growth sectors filling slots in export markets,
- an easing of compulsory contributions — including taxation,
- a common export policy, and
- respect for the principle of free bargaining and the responsibility of the social partners as regards developments in wage rates and remuneration,

industrial employment remaining essential to bring about the creation of jobs in the other sector. We should not forget that industry is largely responsible for our exports and that recent American and Japanese experience shows that resolute action can put new vigour into the creation of jobs in industry.

Whilst it is up to business firms to take the strategic decisions determining the future of the activities for which they are responsible, it is the responsibility of the authorities to ensure that prospective research on international, technological and industrial matters is given its proper importance in a changing world and that working methods are improved in the forecasting institutions so that they can provide decision-makers with the support of a dense and reliable data network.

The public needs to be widely informed in order to mobilize savings. We should not forget that in Germany, saving funds account for 50 % of the short-term financing of small and medium-sized firms through cooperative banks and societies.

We need further-reaching studies to find out in which activities jobs have disappeared, been maintained, changed or created and whether the increase in the population able to work, the extension of the categories of jobseekers, production gains and reductions in working hours do not, of themselves, provide an adequate explanation of the situation and thus make it easier to define an employment policy.

In the field of health, education, sport and recreation there are vast demands yet to be met.

Calvez

Lastly, for several countries in the Community, agriculture and agro-food activities should hold a special place in our development efforts.

Aid for people in craft trades, for the diversification of this sector and to help young craftsmen get a start is an imperative need provided the aid procedures are simplified and the thresholds at which social charges and taxation are payable are lifted.

The battle for employment needs to be waged as close as possible to the firms and workers concerned. There are no worthwhile remedies to the unemployment problem without a persistent effort to develop, strengthen and create business firms and the small and medium-sized ones in particular or without the creation of new sound and lasting jobs and here I would stress particularly the need to promote the creation and growth of small and medium-sized firms which generate jobs.

A deliberate land-use planning policy is one of the most effective instruments both to correct regional imbalances and to reduce the extent to which foreign manpower is used.

Lastly, Community trade policy towards the third countries should be directed at the introduction of reciprocal trade and administrative measures and the taking of steps to combat the dumping resorted to by certain countries manufacturing low-priced industrial goods in direct competition with European products on the Community market. Europe may have to accept and adapt to a new world division labour but the same does not apply to unfair competition.

The Commission has recommended reductions in compulsory contributions including tax. I believe that we could have a recovery without it being inflationary and the social partners do not seem in favour of re-convening the Tripartite Conference that met last year. I have taken part in the four Tripartite Conferences that have so far been held. Our argument in favour of concertation is that discussion brings enlightenment and that an annual coming together at the Community level gives a chance to think and work out solutions.

I would be glad to see the Commission reconsider its position when it talks about the social partners. I have much sympathy for the European Trade Union Confederation but does it not have a veritable monopoly, *de facto* and *de jure*, being the only spokesman for the workers considered eligible by the Commission? That is a dominant position, Mr Commissioner. Could you not, to the table at which the representatives of the INCEE and the European Trade Union Confederation, the Members of the Council and of the Commission are seated, invite other organizations that represent workers and are in dialogue with employment ministers at the national,

level and which have a European, or even international, mission?

To my mind, what is important in a debate in which the psychology of those taking part, whether they be politicians or social partners, has a crucial importance, is to ensure that public opinion is very quickly given the impression of a coordinated action aimed at clear and resolute rather than ambitious objectives.

We must not disappoint those whose eyes are fixed on us. The Liberal and Democratic Group wants the struggle against unemployment to be the essential feature in the rallying together of Europe's social partners and the touchstone of Community fellowship. The cohesion and future of our society are at stake.

President. — I call Mr Nyborg.

Mr Nyborg. — (DK) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, unemployment is like bad weather; we all talk about it, but nobody does anything about it. We have been talking about it for years now. Every assembly in the world has been talking about it, but none of them have done anything about it. But that is what is needed.

The reduction of working hours has been mentioned as a possible solution. It will not solve any problems; it will simply transfer them. We hear talk about more investment in industry. That will not solve the problem either, unless the investments go into completely new industries. For when they talk about modernizing industry they mean more automation, to produce the same amount of goods with less labour. That is the way to increase unemployment.

But what are we to do then? We should try a fresh approach. Why do we have unemployment? Because we export too little. And when I say export, I mean out of the Community, across the Community's external borders. For there is no point in trying to export more to each other, trying to export unemployment from one Member State to another. If it is to be any use, we have to export outside the Community. We then wonder why exports are not as high as they were, and why we cannot increase them faster. It is simply because our prices are too high, for there is nothing wrong with the quality of our goods.

The price of a product is determined partly by the raw materials, by the capital market and the labour available. We cannot do anything about raw materials coming from outside the Community, and we have to accept rising prices as they come. This we have in common, relatively speaking, with all producer countries. We could take a couple days to discuss the capital system so I shall pass that over. But we ought to be careful that we do not raise interest rates too high within the Community, for that would raise the price of the goods we hope to sell on the world market.

Nyborg

We then come to the third factor, labour. How can we make it cheaper? We can do so by not over-burdening the economic productivity of the wage-earners, the workers. It is an accepted fact that workers in the Community are not paid too much, but that too much is taken away from them in direct income tax. They have to pay far too much to the authorities. We must therefore rationalize the administrative apparatus, both nationally and locally, so that we can cut income tax and thereby avoid wage rises over a period of several years. In this way we should be able to hold back the rising costs hitting all other producer countries. Once we have thus re-established our competitiveness on world markets our industries should be able to find opportunities to invest and the urge to do so for themselves. This would set the wheels in motion and provide the jobs we need. We should then be approaching a situation like that in the 1960s when there was actually a labour shortage.

So there is not much point in adopting the Socialist proposals for reducing working hours, as that would only increase the cost of the products we hope to sell on the world market. One might even ask whether we should not adopt a rather tougher attitude altogether, and start analysing the industries we are currently supporting in various ways, by national or Community aid schemes, etc., and say that those which do not seem likely to become self-sufficient in the foreseeable future should be abandoned and left to die. We must concentrate on those industries which are viable, which can increase our exports, which can help us get rid of unemployment.

Let us stop what we have been doing increasingly for years now, that is sapping the will to work, and to get things done. The tax system should not penalize those who work. Let us make it a little bit more expensive to consume rather than produce.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella.— (1) Mr President, a great many important points have been exhaustively made in this debate and in the growing volume of scientific, political and trade-union publications of various kind on this subject. It is, of course, necessary for us to discuss the occurrence of market and production developments but we are all aware, in this House, that we are gamblers who hold a chip or two in our hands but have to be clear about when we are allowed to make a throw; as these occasions are rare, I must make best use of the time available.

It is worth considering what we hope to gain by the way in which our proceedings are organized notwithstanding the nature of our work as a Parliament. Talking of work, you have organized your proceedings on the assumption that it is physiologically necessary,

if not inevitable, for there to be a certain proportion of absentees and you have decided that there should be a plenary sitting on only four or five days a month. This affects the organization and pattern of our work as members and it should be looked into in order to discover to what extent the productivity standards you have set yourselves are turning Parliament into a sausage factory which, instead of sausages, produces slices of speech. This example is intended to show how difficult it is to organize work and production.

But, Mr President, all we have to do is to remember some classical comments: why work, for example? When we hear Mr Nyborg make an apologia for work and for those who want it, we must remember that people often regard work as a sort of badge of respectability. In our society, according to you, there is no connection between the individual's interest and the work which he performs. A man is often forced to work because if he cannot, so to speak, produce a visiting card, he is regarded as a menace to society, especially if he practises a profession or a craft which is not recognized by the employers or the unions.

Come to think of it, all your processes of production, here in Parliament and in industry, are based on cost-effectiveness and are a reminder of the extent to which, as representatives of a particular class and type of State or private, capitalism, you have always laid great stress on energy. You closed the coalmines on the ground that coalmining was uneconomic because, according to you, the price per barrel of oil would continue to be what suited your economic book and not the price fixed by the oil-producing countries. Again, some industries, have an excessive appetite for labour and they, too, must receive attention. Industries such as the petro-chemical industry, which you hold up to us as models of development, are an example of uneconomic operation, given the cost to the country and to the environment and the price paid in terms of energy and of conglomerations which make the surrounding area unsuitable for productivity. You call them models and, at the same time, describe environmentalists as Utopians because they believe that anti-industrialism is the way to create jobs and not unemployment. If we were to use energy which is innocuous and went in for a democratically self-governing economy, with an industrial and economic structure based on the land and with every citizen taking part in the management of the production process, we might be in a position to regard full employment as a basic entitlement to be achieved with the object of revitalizing the economy. To do so, we should have to abandon the pretence, which even Keynesians must now be finding difficult, that employment and productivity can be handled by manipulating the money supply and non-essential aspects of the labour situa-

Pannella

tion. Here again, we have an example of badly organized work and an illustration of the need for Parliament to consider putting its own house in order before telling others to do the same thing.

President. — I call Mr Petronio.

Mr Petronio.— (I) Mr President, I think it is worth while spending one of the few gambling chips available to us in this debate which, though wide-ranging, must be finished in a day, to see whether, in dealing with employment and unemployment, we can get away from the old ideas and concepts which are still ingrained in the brightest and best of us and at least try to provide the basis for a new approach.

Long ago, when inflation was increasing because of unemployment and as a typical Keynesian cure for employment, it was said that the days of easy growth were over. The French philosopher and poet, Paul Valéry, wrote that the world had now been fully explored, navigated and travelled, that almost everything had been achieved and that, in short, we had reached the period of the *monde fini*. In up-to-date economic terminology, this is called stagnation or, to be even more up-to-date is known by the horrible word 'stagflation': in other words, inflation, stagnation and recession — a triple disaster — all in one. This strengthens the need to jettison old ideas and think things out on entirely new lines.

Like another French writer, André Gide, I believe that problems do not really exist. Man invents them, creates them and takes them on his shoulders but it is nature alone which resolves them and finds the perfect answer. Man is doomed to create difficulties and find solutions which in turn create fresh difficulties. Peace of mind is something which can never be attained and it is a good thing that the human mind should be for ever under pressure to find new and better answers to his problems.

Given the traditional and obsolete structure of the economy and of our industries and society and what is more important, given the development of new technologies the terrifying problem of unemployment must be capable of solution, at least in theory. Good government, a stable currency and cautious monetary policies can help to solve the first problem. I think the second problem can be solved provided that we concentrate on those sectors where unemployment is expected to get worse. This is not a contradiction in terms because I am referring to technological unemployment. We are developing more sophisticated equipment, which is increasingly labour-intensive, and, as they once did in the mills of Manchester, people protest against the unemployment which this equipment creates. Just as Europe once placed its faith in a nuclear future and pooled its work and resources in Euratom, I should like to see it take a

similar decision to become a Europe of electronics, informatics, software and hardware. These industries are entirely in the hands of Japan and the United States and in the dollar and yen areas. They must be put into European hands not, however, by the efforts of individual members (though France seems to be fairly advanced in this field) but by the efforts of the whole Community based on a grand concentration of brains, dedication and hard work with the object, among others, of reducing the youth unemployment which arises from the deficiencies and shortcomings of general education and from the lack of occupational training, which the schools are unable to provide. What the Community needs is staff, managers, and the pick of those who have completed their education to design, build and ensure the successful operation of equipment able to compete with the equipment from America and Japan which will otherwise flood our markets and create even more unemployment. While it is true that, in future, a single piece of equipment will be able to do the work of a hundred or a thousand men, it will increase the number of consumers and raise the level of skill, so the training establishments could form a vital and formidable part of Europe's technical armoury in the competitive struggle with the United States and other countries. Peaceful co-existence, etc. are fine words but, in the economic field and elsewhere, history has always witnessed conflict, confrontation and aggression and it is an illusion to think that things will change.

There will, accordingly, be an initial period of technological unemployment but this will be followed by other developments and by the promotion of new industries. We can make a start by trying to beat the American and Japanese hardware and software competition in our Member States. We can send exports to the Third World and elsewhere. In this way, we shall make up for what we may lose in one direction by providing services, an up-to-date technical organization, and exports. We shall, in fact, have what Keynesians would call induced technology and induced employment.

This is the optimistic note on which I conclude, in answer to the pessimism rooted in thinking which is twenty, thirty or forty years out of date. The Italian right looks forward to the future with an open mind and with confidence that, with courage, the problems which lie before us can be overcome.

President. — I call Mr Delors.

Mr Delors. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I hope I am not being too presumptuous in addressing my words to the Council and to our governments because I feel I must pay a personal tribute to the Commission for its untiring efforts over

Delors

the last three years to hold a debate free of any kind of passion on the splendid idea of work-sharing, in other words the fellowship that we should express towards those who are unable to get a job and are therefore less than full-members of society.

But first I must dismiss two ideas that have been voiced during the debate and which the Socialists cannot let pass. The first is that we are using it for blatant propaganda. It was not us, certainly not in France, that handed out the romantic nonsense, regarding the European elections, that Europe would be a miracle cure, that what we could not do in our individual countries could in Europe. And to the groups on the other side of the Chamber I say that what we propose is to discuss things with you. We want Parliament to be able to make public opinion aware of the consequences of lasting unemployment out of which could arise a society of fraud, injustice and waste. So what we want is to cooperate with them, but please spare us arguments like Mr Spencers this morning when he compared our situation with the middle ages. I must, incidentally, say that I had a different recollection of the middle ages than he. For me it was a period of intense spiritual creativity and profound change that led finally to the industrial society. So if being mediaeval means being uneasy in the mind about leaving our people without work, sharing their time between bistro and pin-table, then, yes, we are mediaeval. To conclude this point let me say that his speech — historical references being always in fashion — made me think of another period — the French Restoration.

Now I come to the essence of what I had to say and it falls under two headings: cooperation and solidarity. These are the two ideas that need be discussed in this debate on employment.

Firstly, cooperation. We are not hoping to bridge the gap in six months, we know that is not possible. But we want the countries of Europe to be members of the same team roped together to climb and master the mountain of difficulties they have at the moment. We have a fine example this year in the economic situation.

First of all, we can help you in the fight against inflation. If we succeed in proving that we can impose on our American partners a new world monetary order in which Eurodollar dispersion and inflation do not create factors of instability and if we manage by Community loans to sustain economic activity for the year 1980-1981 then we shall be fighting against both unemployment and inflation.

Because recession — and past events are there to prove it — has never been a lasting cure for inflation. On the contrary, it increases the country's overheads and therefore discourages innovation and the propensity to invest. We must not let this recession come.

There is a common sense idea to prove it and you do not have to be a brilliant economist to see it. One country's imports are another's exports. If every European country cuts back its activity and its imports, that must affect the others for one simple reason and that is that 45 % of European countries' exports are to countries within the Community. These internal European exports account for one-eight of the Community's GNP. I beg you, do not take that solution. It makes you think of a sinking boat in which one of the crew tries to save himself by climbing on top of the other eight. If, thinking 'European', we already had the idea of this elementary cooperation in our heads we would be able to do it. Community loans would be the easy way out, we are told. But it would in no way dispense each country from making the necessary effort to control inflation because inflation, I admit, does cause unemployment. Let us not accept recession without a struggle, it was never a lasting remedy. And what about the discouragement it brings, the depression in the worst affected regions?

My second heading is solidarity but not just as a moral idea. Solidarity between European countries is the realization that none of us, faced with the tremendous challenge of the new conditions of international competition, soaring energy prices, and new progress in science and technology, can make it alone.

And in this year, made so difficult by escalating oil prices, how can we think of continuing to discuss secondary problems when we already find it difficult to achieve simple pragmatic cooperation in matters such as industries in crisis situations, help for the most disadvantaged areas and measures designed to accompany the European monetary system and to come to grips with the vast potential of the future. We must not be any more afraid of technical progress in the 20th century or the beginning of the 21st than we were in the 19th century. We can — mankind has proved it in the past — create wealth and create jobs but we have to see things from the right angle. If every country said inwardly: 'help yourself and Europe will help you', solidarity would be simple.

Solidarity, however, ladies and gentlemen, is also sharing available work. It is also showing to our youth and to women that we are not just setting up a committee on women's rights in Parliament but creating job opportunities for them. Sharing work is not working less at a time when we need to work more to cope with the oil crisis; it is finding work for more people. Here are a few simple figures: 1.5-3 %, depending on the country, of the gross national product goes on unemployment benefit, in other words paying people for doing nothing. The earnings lost by these unemployed workers is equivalent to 3-5 % of the gross national product and, at a time when all our countries are faced with a deficit in

Delors

social security and when we are trying to keep the budgetary deficit within bounds in order to control inflation, do we have to be reminded that by putting hundreds of thousands of millions of Europeans to work we would have no difficulty in increasing our social security and budgetary resources. Our only real wealth is human potential and the best way to fight inflation is to mobilize the resources we have.

We are not asking for the moon or a magic 'Open Sesame' password — as in another story — to growth and full employment, we are simply asking that at every level possible — Community level, national level, industrial level and firm level — everyone should do his or her duty, that there should be a Community directive to initiate a continuous dialogue, that the independence of the social partners should be respected, that the diversity of situation be taken into account, that the measures introduced should be progressive so that there is time to train these young people and women for the jobs available and that priority be given to those working in the most arduous conditions, my reference here being to the extra shift for shiftwork.

I was shocked to hear that, after dismissing the measures at the social level for the steel industry, the Council has once again deleted all reference to the steel industry from the Commission's proposal.

Do you think we can show our faces in our respective countries and explain the highly sophisticated and, incidentally, useful measures to create a healthier market if at the same time we do not demonstrate our intention to help workers and if we pay out enormous sums to retire people at the age of 52? Do you know what it is like to be unemployed at 52? Do I have to tell you that being out of work is like being ill or in hospital? If you have not been through it you cannot know what it is like.

We are spending enormous amounts to finance early retirement whereas with one-tenth of the sum we could finance extra shifts and jobs in shiftwork.

If I were asked to conclude by defining Socialism in one sentence — which is not mediaeval but eternal — I would say that our essential priority has always been, to quote Olof Palme this: 'Society must be hard on the strong but gentler and more understanding for the weak.'

President. — I call Mr Van der Gun.

Mr Van der Gun. — (NL) Mr President, in the fight against unemployment the first consideration is by and large the creation of new jobs, the second the maintenance of existing jobs and the third the better distribution of available jobs. In the present economic circumstances — oil crisis, technological development, and demographic task, as Mr Vredeling said this morning — is an extremely difficult task. We will

succeed only if there is satisfactory cooperation between the authorities and industrial organizations or the two sides of industry. I believe it is illusory to assume that we can find a solution to these problems through politics, parliament and governments. In our view the most appropriate course is a joint approach by the authorities and the two sides of industry. And we will succeed here only if the governments and the two sides of industry are prepared to use not only words but also deeds in recognizing that the fight against unemployment is the No 1 priority.

I agree with Mr Vredeling that this is bound to entail certain restrictions. This means specifically that the employers must realize that incomes and the situation as regards worker participation cannot remain as they are. For the trade union movement it means realizing that not everything is possible and also that not everything is possible at the same time. In other words, it must become evident in practice that there is willingness to accept this as the top priority.

The creation of new jobs and the views of the Group of the EPP on this were discussed this morning by Mr von Bismarck and Mr Macario. I shall not therefore comment any further on this subject.

I should like to devote particular attention to the problems connected with the maintenance of existing jobs, especially as part of a structural policy. I, of course, completely agree with Mr Vredeling that this structural policy cannot be simply aimed at the maintenance of existing jobs: it must also be used to increase the number of jobs. But it is one of the European Community's weak points that it still lacks a general concept as regards this structural policy. In addition, consultation between the Commission and the two sides of industry on structural policy is still only very occasional. That is something to which the necessary thought should be given.

We can talk and discuss as much as we want, but if we want to achieve something at European level in this field, we must understand the situation as it exists in the various sectors. The expected developments in the various sectors and the question as to what developments we must stimulate must be clarified before we can tackle this structural policy. That is the condition which must be fulfilled before we establish the objectives we want to achieve in each sector and each Member State. Only then can it be decided what instruments must be used to what extent in each Member State in order that the competitive situation may not be adversely affected. When we have determined the Community objectives, the policy for achieving them can largely be implemented by the Member States. At present it is really only in the coal and steel sectors that we can use the means we consider desirable. In these sectors the Commission on the one hand is cooperating with the Consultative Committee on the other.

Van der Gun

When I say 'on the one hand' and 'on the other', this is in no way intended to imply opposition, but simply to point out that the responsibilities of the two sides can be discussed within the consultative body I have referred to. In this body the situation in a given sector can be discussed and a Community approach to the problems recommended. In our opinion good consultative bodies, equal to their task, should be set up in various sectors or rather in as many sectors as possible of the Community's industrial policy. For they can provide the basis for an understanding of what is economically possible and socially desirable in the situation. They also provide an opportunity for a discussion of the situation as a whole, including the overall employment situation, investment and so on. In such consultative bodies agreement can also be reached on the measures that should be taken. I place such emphasis on sectoral consultation because I feel it can play an extremely important role, if not a decisive role, in other respects too. We can talk about consultation between the Commission and the two sides of industry, in this context UNICE and the ETUC, but then we are dealing with the general outline, the principles, the general objectives. But the practical measures must be taken in the various sectors themselves as circumstances require.

I should just like to say a few words about the position of the medium-sized and small undertakings in the consultations between the Commission, UNICE and the ETUC. Little by little, it has surely been very generally concluded that where employment is concerned, medium-sized and small undertakings are more flexible and even offer greater opportunities than large-scale industry. It has therefore been asked whether there is sufficient consultation with the representatives of the medium-sized and small undertakings.

As regards top-level consultations, Mr Vredeling informed us this morning that the Italian Presidency of the Council intends to organize meetings between the Ministers of Social Affairs Economic Affairs and Finance. This is in itself extremely important, but it must be followed by some kind of tripartite conference. It is, of course, important to know what the Ministers and indeed what Parliament thinks of this, but it is in every respect necessary to know what the two sides of industry think of these problems. We cannot make do with a tripartite conference like the ones that have been held in the past. On that there is no difference of opinion between the Commission and us. The conference must be better prepared this time, more practical agreements must be reached and it must also be possible to make a better evaluation, on the basis of which certain things may have to be adjusted. But we are still talking about the broad outline, the principles. A tripartite conference of this kind is, of course, the right body for creating the right

climate. But in our extremely varied industry the practical measures must be taken in consultation with the various sectors. They are best able to assess the situation, they will in practice have to achieve the objective that we set. Just one more point in this context: the well-known discrepancy between supply and demand in the labour market. On the one hand we have tens of thousands of vacancies and on the other massive unemployment. Mr Delors has just referred to shift-work as a solution. But even then we will face this problem. In the Netherlands it has been very difficult to find enough people for the existing four shifts. Heaven knows how we would find people for a fifth.

Who better than the Commission, employers and employees in each sector to assess how the adjustment might in practice best be made at a given moment. I am also thinking here of training and retraining. The more the individual sectors of industry are borne in mind, the greater the chances of succeeding as regards what we want to achieve with training and retraining.

I am now touching on another problem, which we also talk about a great deal. What are we in practice doing to find places for young people and women in the various sectors of industry? This too is a matter on which there should be consultations in each sector in preference to the agreements that can be reached at macro-economic level as it is known.

And what do you think of the problems of adjusting working hours? This again must be the subject of consultation at sectoral level. We completely agree with Mr Vredeling that the importance of reducing working time must not be overestimated as a solution to these problems. Here and there the impression is given that we need only go over to 35-hour week to solve part of the problem. No, the effect of working time on employment is largely dependent on the way in which the costs associated with a reduction in working time are financed. We agree with the Commission that if this problem is not given the necessary thought, there is a grave danger that the remedy will be worse than the disease. After all, Europe cannot afford to do exactly what it likes in this area. There is still an America, there is still a Japan, there are still the State-trading countries and what have you. We must therefore go to work very carefully and we must establish how we can in practice as far as possible eliminate the costs associated with the reduction of working time so that they do not have an adverse effect on employment. There is point in a reduction of working hours unless it has a positive effect on employment. It seems to me that this again is a subject best discussed with the two sides of industry in each sector.

In the same context I should like to say a few words about early retirement. Interesting reports have appeared in the Netherlands on this question. This method has been used in practice and proved to be

Van der Gun

less costly than reducing working hours. But the effect of early retirement on employment very much depends on the guarantees that can be given that the resulting vacancies are in fact filled by new workers. Experience in the Netherlands has shown that this is by no means always the case. Only about one-third of the jobs which become vacant as a result of early retirement are filled by new workers in the Netherlands. The problem must also be examined in terms of individual sectors. In particular there must be the greatest possible assurance that such vacancies are filled and that they are primarily filled by young people and women. If this is not the case we will find that this remedy is not in practice producing what we really expect of it. That is why there must be consultation on all these points for each individual sector of industry. We would not take it amiss if the Commission exerted some pressure to this end by making its assistance, when requested, conditional on willingness to participate in organized consultation and to institutionalize such consultation. I would remind the Commission that the European Parliament has in the past expressed its views on this subject in very clear terms.

I am now coming to the end of what I have to say. I should like to refer to a problem which we must look at very carefully. According to press reports, at the meeting of the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs on 22 November 1979 the problems connected with the two sides of industry were discussed in some considerable detail during the debate on the Council's draft resolution on the adjustment of working hours. We rather have the impression that the term 'the two sides of industry' is interpreted in so one-sided and narrow a sense that it is taken to mean only the two sides of industry in the various Member States. Even the representatives of the Federal Republic are said to have adopted the position that in practice the adjustment of working hours is the sole responsibility of the two sides of industry. Agreed, but do UNICE and above all the ETUC not come under this heading then? Must we interpret the term 'the two sides of industry' so narrowly that it refers only to the two sides of industry in each Member State? We should like a somewhat clearer answer to this question because I also have the impression from UNICE publications that it is frankly admitted there is no agreement on this point within UNICE. I am referring principally to the Federal Republic. I find it a pity that Mr Vetter spoke before me because I should have like to ask him what the German trade unions, and particularly the DGB, the Federation of German Trade think about these problems. This is a very basic point. If we talk about the adjustment of working hours, we must after all realize that we have a choice. We can allow this adjustment to be made at national level, as has hitherto been the case, or we can try to come to some kind of framework agreement, as Mr Vredeling called it, at European level to settle the matter, giving the two sides of industry in each

Member State the possibility of choosing from among the possibilities set out in that framework agreement. For if we are not willing to accept this, I wonder, to be honest, what the Commission can do to increase employment and to combat unemployment, except by taking indirect action through the Social Fund and the Regional Fund. I also wonder what we Members of Parliament will be able to say to our constituents at the elections in four years' time about the contribution Europe has made to the fight against unemployment and about measures to increase employment. I should therefore like to have an answer from the Commission to my question about what else it can do if in practice the narrow interpretation of the term 'the two sides of industry' is adopted and if the idea of framework agreements is rejected.

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

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR FRIEDRICH

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

The next item on the agenda is the continuation of the debate on the employment situation in the Community.

I call Sir John Stewart-Clark.

Sir John Stewart-Clark. — Mr President, today I want to concentrate my remarks on the effects of microelectronics on employment in the Community. This century has witnessed the tremendous growth in the automation of production which has accelerated in the last thirty years. It is no accident that countries like Germany and Japan, which have modernized their factories and installed more automatic equipment, are today capturing the world markets in manufactured goods and have some of the lowest unemployment figures.

The latest generation of micro-electronics, consisting of microprocessors very high-speed integrated circuits and very large integrated circuits, will give rise to great strides in productivity improvement, and those industries and those services which invest in them will become more competitive. No doubt, as a result, the number of workers employed in many sectors will fall. However, I do argue that not to keep up with the state of the art will result in industries going out of business by being unable to compete. On the other hand, microelectronics can provide the basis for a whole new series of products and activities which in turn can create new jobs in both industry and the service

Stewart-Clark

sector. This has been proved on the west coast of the United States where new enterprises have grown up around what is known as 'Silicon Valley', the area where the new generation of microelectronics was born.

In Europe we cannot afford to wait. We are losing out rapidly to the Americans and the Japanese where terminals and microcomputers are concerned. We are supplying only 10 % of our own requirements in integrated circuits, and today we know that there will be in the future what is called the 'supersonic' chip, operating more than 100 times the speed of current electronic circuitry. This will require enormous investment. I must therefore ask the question: are we, as a Community, prepared to invest the sums needed? To allow the United States and Japan increasingly to dominate the whole area of microelectronics, and of many of the products produced from these, can only result in the loss of potential new jobs without however, preventing jobs being lost as a result of the introduction of these new technologies.

To date, national approaches to the electronics business have been uncoordinated. As a result, we have ended up with different designs, techniques, specifications and standards, and this has meant that the markets being served by each country have been too small, so that industry is finding itself unable to compete. This has to be changed. We must, however, recognize that we have, as a Community, to introduce new technologies at the rate at which world markets are developing. We should therefore develop policies which take account of human needs. This requires systematically studying the medium- and long-term technological and employment needs by region and by sector.

An effective programme of training and retraining must then be set up. Consultation with management and unions will be vital. We must arrange a series of seminars to help all sides of government and industry to understand the problems facing us and the measures which are being taken to deal with them. We must also take steps to develop Europe into a single market place for microelectronic products and their derivatives and to generate the business necessary to employ more and not less people. This means much greater harmonization of technical and quality standards to enable our own industries to cater specifically for our needs on a large-scale basis.

We must also ensure that, once these standards are being met, the governments of the Community give preference to those products of Community origin. But this will only be possible if our quality and reliability are excellent, if our price is competitive and our technology fully advanced.

Mr President, we cannot afford to bury our heads in the sand. Each month that passes is a month of lost opportunity, for unless we resolve as a Community

wholeheartedly to accept that the new age of microelectronics is upon and will not go away, then we most surely will lose out to our competitors, and this will mean that many of our industries will fall by the wayside.

The end of this can only be a much greater loss of jobs than would be the case if we decide now to invest and wholeheartedly support the whole new era of technology which is upon us.

President. — I call Mrs Boserup.

Mrs Boserup. — *(DK)* Mr President, what emerges most plainly from this debate is this Assembly's lack of power and influence. Every one has been able to get up on his hobby-horse, and all we have heard is the clatter of their hooves. So I do not see why I should not do the same. The Socialist People's Party which I represent does not believe for a moment that any resolution by this Assembly can relieve the problem of unemployment. We are now into the seventh year of the crisis. It is not a passing ripple on the surface, not a minor disturbance produced by the rise in oil prices. Capitalism, crisis and unemployment are inextricably linked, and the only remedy is a break with capitalism.

Many of our countries have had bourgeois governments for years. Others are ruled by Social Democratic parties, but they have never dared attempt to control capital. In my own country, far too much capital is unproductively tied up in land and real estate. And why? Because yields are greater. But if we are to fight unemployment, capital must be brought under control and directed to investment now in industry and more jobs. And if this is not done, no tripartite conferences will help. They are a waste of time. The unions representing workers in our country have fine traditions and experience of effective international cooperation. They can do without solemn, but not binding, declarations by tripartite conferences. But they do need freedom from government interference, freedom to fight for their own jobs and their members' living standards.

In Denmark a Social Democratic Government has assiduously followed the Commission's recommendations and hacked away at the workers' long established right to cost-of-living indexation of their wages. This is certainly not calculated to raise the workers' hopes that anything coming from the EEC, be they ideas, recommendations or resolutions, will help the working class, safeguard jobs or improve their standard of living.

President. — I call Mrs Pruvot.

Mrs Pruvot. — *(F)* Mr President, Mr Commissioner and ladies and gentlemen, I would first of all like to reply to Mr Delors by saying that whilst I share some of his ideas, he must surely agree, too, that it is easy to

Pruvot

tell happy-ever-after stories when you do not have the responsibility of government but not so easy when you do. In our country we have our fill — and more — of such irresponsible storytellers.

As regards employment, I shall confine my attention to the remedies that might be applied to problems concerning, more specifically, young people of both sexes, women, handicapped people and immigrant workers. Among the short-term measures that the partners have long been discussing I would briefly refer to reducing the time spent at work the application of a system for gradually reducing working hours towards the end of one's career, and early retirement. I do not believe, however, that there is necessarily a link between reducing working time and combating unemployment. I have heard of certain experiments, some in Belgium, which do not result in any jobs being created. To my mind, the improved organization of working time should be regarded more generally as a matter of social progress. Again, many jobs released through retirement cannot be filled by young job seekers because of the imbalance between manpower supply and demand which is almost certainly evidence of a qualitative disparity between the structure of the active population and the types of job that are offered. This, of course, raises the problem of how to ensure that training does more to equip young people for active life.

I would also like to raise the problem of retired people who supplement their pension by taking an another job. Does not the Commission feel that it should work out Community rules to prevent pensioners doing jobs that could be fully and satisfactorily given to young people? Among the short-term measures that could improve the employment situation for young people, whether handicapped or not, I would list the exchange of young workers among Member States in the European Community, training schemes in a foreign country allowing a language and trade to be learned in normal and acceptable pay and social insurance conditions and self-improvement opportunities in the form of short-term jobs in the nine countries of the Community with no nationality restrictions.

In the medium and long term, better preparation for active life raises the problem of suitable training. To give young people a liking for effort, the will to work, they have to be offered the kind of working conditions that will motivate them and give them a feeling of responsibility. Young people today, as no-one would deny, are more concerned about the quality of their life and hence the conditions in which they work.

Training must be geared to reality and the technological progress and automation in many industries and prepare young people for jobs of a new kind. Without disparaging the role of general education, I would like

to stress what needs to be done in the fields of vocational training and the learning of new technologies. Job-training alternation, combining practical and theoretical work, could be an answer. To improve the mobility of young people in Europe language-learning needs to be intensified too. This weakness in certain educational systems is a major obstacle to integration in active life by handicapped immigrant workers for whose children, incidentally, better arrangements should be made in the schools of the host country.

For young people, women and handicapped people, we need to be more creative and imaginative as regards jobs in the service sector and in the manual art and craft trades. We need to prevent our recreation activities becoming an excuse for commercial exploit, we need to prevent our rural people from wanting to leave their area and we need to give our town-dwellers the desire to settle elsewhere than in the big conurbations.

All this is possible if we can develop training in such things as woodworking, regional cabinet-making, the clock and watch trade, and pottery, by cultivating cultural activities and developing Europe's touristic assets, and holiday facilities on the human scale for all these young workers concerned about ecology and the quality of life. Here are some other sectors where jobs could be created.

Before I conclude, allow me to refer briefly to the case of cultural workers. Cases of high-quality cultural expression and manifestations are rare and yet this is a deep-felt need in every one of us today. The working conditions of those who could fill this gap, the intolerable insecurity of their social situation and employment, the almost complete absence of any satisfactory and serious training in these artistic and cultural occupations explain why many young people avoid this field. Is this not an area where more could be done to create jobs?

Finally, I would add that we have to throw off the old prejudice — fortunately under heavy fire today — that dressmakers, laundry workers, secretaries and typists have to be women and plumbers, bricklayers, sales managers, departmental heads and prefects have to be men. Let me finally say this: free choice of trade or job and the necessary education and training for that job are, in my opinion, essential conditions if the employment situation is to be improved.

President. — I call Mrs Chouraqui.

Mrs Chouraqui. — (*F*) Mr President, the debate that has begun today in Parliament is an interesting one. The general economic and employment situation in Europe is grave. The energy crisis, monetary instability and industrial growth in the young, developing countries have changed the conditions in which the world economy has to function.

Chouraqui

One result, as we can see all over, is slower growth at a rate which is only half what it was between 1960 and 1974. Another — referred to and explained by many speakers — is a series of difficulties for companies in general and above all a steep increase in unemployment in Europe. Six million people are looking for jobs today, at least 52 % of them women, plus the large numbers of young people arriving on the employment market for whom there seems no future, not to mention, of course, the people who have lost their jobs for economic reasons, particularly in the industries hardest hit like the steel and textile industries and shipbuilding. So we see that whilst the employment crisis in Europe is related to economic conditions, it also depends to a large extent on two social factors; demographic trends (the active population is increasing by a million and a half to 2 million young people every year) and pressure from women wanting to go out to work. The inflow of young people should level off around 1982 but it would seem wrong to bank on any backflow of women from the employment market. The replies to the economic and social problems will also have to be found in economic and social terms.

On the economic level, there can be no creation of jobs unless productive investment picks up again not only in the main sectors of the economy but in the new, high-technology industries. This is essential for European growth and survival. The specialists in Europe studying the sectors offering the best chance of creating new jobs naturally list the space industry, computers, telecommunications and oceanography. Very often they point out that, in this respect, the small and medium-sized firms possibly have more favourable structures for the future than large-scale industry. So we feel that public support should, in each country, give priority to small and medium-sized firms — small and medium-scale industry.

The Community can help. The main areas for Community are as follows: firstly, measures to combat distortions of competition such as undeclared work, non-harmonization of manufacturing standards, and the disguised protection of the American and Japanese markets; secondly, the gradual removal of legal and tax obstacles which is necessary for international economic cooperation; thirdly, a Community policy operated through the European Social Fund, one example being the creation of jobs in sectors of public interest such as infrastructure, housing and research (France is stressing the need to bring the increase in European Social Fund appropriations under control and to rechannel them into essential and effective programmes such as the recruitment of young people and women); fourthly and lastly, the pursuit of a vigorous Common Agricultural Policy to safeguard jobs in rural areas — do not forget, ladies and gentlemen, that we must not add agricultural to industrial unemployment.

On the social level, could a better distribution of total working time help to answer the problems we face? In this context of moderate growth and high unemployment the whole of Europe is arguing about the issue of reducing working time. The question is complex and difficult. From a comparative study of the situation in Europe two preliminary principles can already be deduced. Reducing working time is not a panacea, or the best answer to the employment problem. Creating new jobs will, first and foremost, be the result of a vigorous and astute investment promotion policy, but reducing working time is certainly one factor to be taken into account and it could even be a way of creating jobs in some industries and under certain conditions if productivity gains so allow. The objective is also a matter of social philosophy. There is, beyond question, a social demand in Europe for a reduction in working time which needs to be studied in all its aspects. In this context there is no overall answer. The reduction of time has several different facets: a shorter working week, early retirement, an additional week of paid holiday, part-time working and improvements to shiftwork. But, as I have said, there is no overall answer because the economic implications for companies will vary with country, industry and size of firm. Generally speaking, reducing working time will be more difficult in small firms. Lastly the success of an improved distribution of working time used as an instrument of employment policy will largely depend on what is done about the problems of wage compensation. We know that the answer to this question is not the same in the different countries. Any level of compensation in companies or by the State that exceeds productivity gains will be inflationary and could even have adverse effects on production and employment as recent studies in the Netherlands have shown. This is why dialogue at European level is necessary in this field. Everybody is agreed that the improved distribution of working time should be brought about by gradual and concerted action. Coordination at the European level is an obvious necessity for reasons of competitiveness inside and out of Europe.

Altogether, in this field, the Community could act in at least five areas: limitations on overtime, variable retirement age, part-time working for certain categories including women, old people and parents with young children, improvements to shiftwork and last and above all, training for young people and their introduction into the working world through alternation schemes including in-firm training.

The Community, ladies and gentlemen, could play an important part in ensuring simultaneous introduction of measures under national legislation or collective agreements reached in each country between the two sides of industry. Reducing working time is not specifically an answer to the employment problem today. The demand for it must, throughout Europe, be an

Chouraqui

overall strategy aimed at restoring the potential for growth, competitiveness and innovation. Its cost must be shared equitably between the parties concerned in such a way that future productivity gains are applied to reducing working time and improving standards of living. This will help to achieve the objective of all economic growth in Europe: social progress, in other words the well-being of the men and women in the population of Europe.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, in this House I represent Northern Ireland which is at the very periphery of the Community. Before the United Kingdom joined the EEC, Northern Ireland suffered from being on the periphery of the UK and geographically distant from London, the centre of power. Now when, in Community terms, the centre of power has moved into the continent of Europe, Northern Ireland is on the periphery of the periphery and suffers even more. The cancer of unemployment is eating the very vitals out of the well-being of the province that I represent. Absence of raw materials, transport and energy costs and world recession are responsible for this.

The hard, stark facts speak for themselves. Today in Northern Ireland 63 418 people are out of work. That is 11 % of the total available working population. That staggering figure is over 13 % of the male working population and 8.2 % of the female working population. At the end of last year 3 500 school leavers could not find jobs. When one goes across the River Bann to the west of Northern Ireland, one comes to the blackest spots. In Cookstown, for example, 22.6 % of the working population is unemployed, this is 24.8 % of the male working population. In the town of Strabane 22.6 % of the working population is unemployed, that is 28 % of the male working population. These very, very black spots contrast with the city of Belfast, though this is also a black spot with 9 % of the working population, i.e. 10.4 % of the male population, unemployed.

Two areas of employment are causing us very serious concern: one is the construction industry, which I spoke about last night, and the second is the textile industry. In the field of textiles the Community could do something positive but alas it is all too slow and in the meantime textile factories are being closed or seriously run down. In view of the fact that the worst unemployment in the Community is in Northern Ireland, I would call on the Commission this afternoon to institute immediately in harmony with the United Kingdom Government, a study into the way that membership of this Community has adversely affected the employment position in Northern Ireland and then to take steps to remedy this. I trust there will be something forthcoming and positive from the Commission this afternoon.

President. — I call Mrs Vayssade.

Mrs Vayssade. — (*F*) Mr President, ever since this morning we have been hearing lots of figures and reminders about the large number of unemployed in the Community. I would like dwell on one particular problem and that is the fact that the situation is perhaps aggravated by regional inequalities. In 1977 — these are the latest figures that the Commission could give me — regional unemployment in the nine-country Community ranged from about 10 % in Calabria and Northern Ireland to under 2 % in Hesse in Germany, the average for the Community being about 4.2 %. The figure given by Mr Paisley show that, since then, the situation has got worse, not better, and we all know of regional differences in our own countries. It is not, therefore, simply a problem of unemployment in certain industries, there is also a serious problem of regional inequality and tackling these regional inequalities will also help to solve the unemployment problem.

One of the principles set out in the preamble to the Treaty of Rome, is that efforts must be made to bring about harmonious development by reducing the gap between the various regions. We are a long way from achieving this objective. The gaps are widening and the regions in which capitalistic growth had long ago generated lasting underemployment and which were largely the peripheral regions in the Community are now joined by regions hit by the crisis in certain industries: the textile and steel industries and shipbuilding. I come from one of these regions, Lorraine, affected by crises in first the textile industry, then coal and then steel. There are other regions like it in the Community — in England, Belgium, Germany and the north of France — which have the same problems of industrial structure and which, like Lorraine, are struggling to preserve their traditional industries, keep the jobs they provide and diversify as well.

I would like to offer you a few thoughts on regional policy in relation to employment based on an analysis of my own region.

It is true that Lorraine has received Community aid totalling over F 450 million in grants and six times that sum in loans — no mean figure — between 1975 and 1979. But why are the effects of this policy so slight? To my mind there are at least three reasons. Firstly it is dispersed aid, secondly it is episodic and unplanned and thirdly it does not really supplement national policies — it is uncoordinated. In the first place it comes from five different sources with their own procedures: the Regional Fund, the 'guidance' side of the EAGGF, the European Social Fund, the ECSC Funds and the European Investment Bank. Each has its own objects and conducts certain types of operation that are out of phase in terms of timetable, operation selected and place to which the aid applies.

Vayssade

It is essential that the action of these funds be coordinated. I have received a report from the European Economic and Social Committee which analyses a project entitled 'Integrated operation: Lorraine' and proposes a package of Community aid for a typical region like Lorraine, a region going through a crisis and a frontier region in the heart of Europe. I feel there ought to be many studies of this kind and that coordination should become a rule which would multiply the effect of each type of aid.

It also means that there should always be a study on the overall regional impact of all Community action put together, particularly as regards the Common Agricultural Policy.

Secondly the aid is episodic. It is given when there is an emergency which is like calling on the fire brigade to put out the biggest fires. The net result is that in Lorraine, where 6 500 steel industry jobs are going to be lost in the Longwy area alone in 1980, we are promised new jobs with help from France and the Community to be available in 1983. Where are the workless going to go during those three years?

So aid needs to be planned. This would allow Community criteria to be established and action under the various funds to be incorporated in an overall programme designed to bring about balanced economic growth. So a far better knowledge of the economic and social situation of each region is needed. I was pleased to learn that, at last, we are going to have a report in 1980 on the social and economic situation of the regions in the Community. I told you earlier that, to prepare this speech, the most recent regional statistics I could get were for 1977.

Thirdly it is aid which does not really supplement national action. For my own country, at least, I can state that the aid relieves the central government of some of its contribution instead of being added to it to help regions in difficulty. So firstly we need to try to harmonize the system of State aid a little better and secondly to develop specification. In a press conference he gave last week, Mr Giolitti proposed that the ex-quotas should be increased from 5 % of the budget to at least 13.5 % or presumably more. I feel that these specific actions should be developed and that actions which can be financed should be diversified and linked to a broader concept of regional development. Industrial activities certainly need to be developed but so do social and cultural infrastructures. Lastly I feel we should increase the provision of information and our monitoring of the use made of these funds in all our European regions. I hope that when the new FEDER rules are drawn up at the end of 1980, they will take some of these problems into account. All these ideas are just rough outlines. One claim increasingly made by workers, at least in France, is that they want to live and work in their own country. The combat against unemployment therefore also implies a far more effective regional policy.

President. — I call Mr Michel.

Mr Michel.— (*F*) Ladies and gentlemen, the task of the Community as spelt out in Article 2 of the Treaty of Rome is:

'to promote throughout the Community a harmonious development of economic activities, a continuous and balanced expansion, an increase in stability, an accelerated raising of the standard of living ...'

Full employment is therefore a priority objective of European policy.

As we know, the whole of Europe is suffering badly from the crisis over 7 million unemployed including 2 million young people looking in vain for jobs. By chain reaction, the crisis is looking in affecting the self-employed, the liberal professions, shopkeepers, craftsmen, farmers and even entrepreneurs themselves, threatened with stagnation, if not bankruptcy, because in areas where big production and employment units close down it brings in its wake many different harmful and, unfortunately, lasting effects.

The scale of the crisis is currently generating lassitude, despondency and rebellion (as illustrated very recently in the area where the France, Belgium and Luxembourg borders meet). Confidence needs to be restored and that is our task. This will demand a change in mental approach and attitude but also in basic policy options in which the economic and social decisions to be taken must awake or release new types of initiative strengthening existing effective forms of solidarity and giving real priority to the weakest members of the population. Here I would like to dwell on a few aspects and at the same time say that I support, among other things, the programme of the European Trade Union Confederation that has already been given out.

But as Mr Macario said a moment ago, it is not a question, as far as we are concerned, of looking for equilibrium, so to speak, in poverty which is a very special kind of equilibrium, and in the sharing of shortages. On the contrary, real confidence among the citizens of our different countries and between the social groups can, to my mind, be restored only by developing and strengthening a genuine solidarity. As someone wisely said: 'There is enough in the world for everyone's needs but not for everyone's greed'.

At the level of Europe and the associate ACP countries, this solidarity needs to take the form of social, regional, Community and international policies interlocking with a new economic and structural policy.

I would like, very briefly, to put to you seven lines of thought.

Firstly, we have to recognize that economic and social destabilization is not confined to the industrialized countries portrayed as the victims of monetary insta-

Michel

bility and hence inflation, and of the rising cost of living and of raw materials, especially oil. This would make them the victims of the resultant unemployment with its harmful effect on the population, the other countries — and more particularly the Third World — being unaffected by these problems.

That is wholly wrong as you know and this brings me to my second point. This destabilization affects the developing countries just as much as our own. Apart from the oil-supplying countries, whom we know, the others are having the same difficulties as we are. They too, and even more than we, are experiencing the crisis and feel its daily effects on them and their populations — and for a very good reason. For them this crisis is not just monetary and the postponement, delay or freezing of their industrialization plans. It is also a food crisis. They have to buy practically everything they need and two-thirds of mankind are short of food, clothing and health services and also education and infrastructure. Unlike us, they have to import practically all their infrastructure from outside, in other words from us.

My third point, on this same subject of destabilization, is that although its causes are the same for our industrialized countries and for those of the Third World and although they are known (monetary, economic and financial speculation and oil speculation as well), they are even more serious for the developing countries than they are for us. For all of them they are accompanied by a stalemate engendered by a war-orientated economy, that is to say a profit-oriented economy unfortunately linked with a war-oriented economy permanently sustained in both private and State capitalist countries. The events we see today whether in Eurasia, Latin America or Africa, are highly instructive on this point. We could quote many examples showing that the determination to secure both profit and domination sometimes causes clashes and often arguments between those who have decided to share the world between them. The causes of poverty and of our difficulties are therefore correlated in many respects and we shall have occasions to investigate them as Europeans when we review the problems of world hunger.

But there are discrete causes as well. This applies, for example, to those of the world's grave food problems. The truth, here, is that the multinationals, about whom much has been said today, are not purely industrial concerns in the so-called developed countries oriented towards the developing countries. We do not simply shift or transfer our plants and goods to African, South American and Asian countries in order to exploit their cheap manpower so that we can then take back the finished products of increasing sophistication and sell them on our own markets at prices we cannot compete with, in other words prices for which we could not produce them ourselves with trade union-organized manpower.

No — we do more, and far worse, than that; today we are organizing, via our multinational agro-food indus-

tries, the world of hunger. Has not the International Labour Organization found that 66 % of the world's workers are currently in rural jobs? And yet two-thirds of mankind suffer from malnutrition precisely in these same areas called green zones. So in some parts of the world — and they are known — there are disorders that will surely have to be put right.

What is true of the agro-food industry is all the more true of the others. Shall we be able to satisfy the expectations of our young people who are rightly questioning us? What type of society are you building for the future? A society of corruption and domination or one of fraternal solidarity? A society that seeks to destroy humanity by the new holocaust that will surely come if we do not take care, or one that will induce young people to enlist in a development project on the grand scale, ladies and gentlemen, and in practical investment and infrastructure programmes designed to secure food, health, education and human progress for all? That is the challenge we face.

Young people — and this is my sixth point — expect new and large-hearted projects from us. It will not be enough just to give them the necessities of life, they need reasons for living and the present crisis is especially hard on those of them who will be the most defenceless, those with no general or specialist training. These young people without relevant training currently account for 90 % of jobseekers under 25 in France and Belgium and 2 out of every 3 people unemployed in Germany. I would stress that for the European People's Party, the only valid way to wage war on unemployment is to promote a new growth strategy at all levels which implies, particularly for young people, a policy of training and retraining courses and training periods both in private firms and in public administrations.

But how, my last point, can our concern about our own young people be valid if we forget what is going on today in the world? The number of youngsters — that is to say under 14 — in the world today is 700 million and little more than 370 million of those are at school. What does this mean? It means that there are over 300 million young people not at school. According to the International Labour Organization, over 200 million go to work before they are 14, 56 million in industry, 40 million in craft trades and about 100 million in family businesses and farms.

Unemployment amongst adults and adolescents is worst and most prevalent precisely in countries where the young work. I appeal to Parliament, this year of 1980 which follows the so-called Year of the Child, to take up this highly important problem of the international application of social norms, namely a ban on work before the age of 14 or 15 depending on the school-leaving age in the country, a working week totalling no more than 48 hours (the demand in our countries is for 35-36) and no racial, religious or sexual discrimination.

Michel

You may feel, ladies and gentlemen, that all this belongs to the past. Not so; child labour is not decreasing in the world but increasing. Look round you, not only at home but elsewhere, in other words among those with whom you are in fellowship, not just to criticize but also to make real improvements by introducing economic, social, educational and political measures to bring about the real promotion of the masses concerned, in both our European countries and the associate countries.

My final point is this. Far from being in conflict, as some would have us believe, the interests of European workers coincide with those of workers in the Third World. On either side, if you look, properly, you will find the same demands for social justice and for recognition of the right to human respect. There are the same claims for transparency in economic policy and for participation in the decisions by which they are the first to be affected. In the gradual establishment of a new international economic order, the social forces must be allowed to have their say and carry weight at certain levels where, up to now, only governments and economic and financial powers have been making the decisions. This should apply under the new Lomé Convention signed in late 1979 between the Community and the 58 ACP countries which thus showed their wish to renew this contract of association. The Convention provides for sectoral consultations between the European Community and the ACP in industrial fields presenting serious risk of conflict and sometimes other than normal competitive conditions. We cannot accept that the social partners — more or less ignored in Lomé I, except for the restricted activities of the Joint Committee — should not be fully involved in the sectoral consultations that are to take place. Let us ask the Commission to be vigilant in this respect. For my part, I am pleased to know that Mr Cheysson has undertaken to work out suitable formulae aimed at ensuring that the social partners both in the ACP and in Europe will be consulted on a free and operational basis. Let us hope that these consultations will be fruitful in terms of fairness, solidarity and progress for all.

President. — I call Mr Prag.

Mr Prag. — Mr President, it is difficult to know from the oral question of our Socialist colleagues whether they see themselves as new Tolpuddle Martyrs going into battle against the wicked multinationals, or as new Luddites determinedly destroying microchips, or, possibly, even as a resuscitated King Canute. For those who do not know English history King Canute was a Danish king of England who sat in front of the tide. One sees our Socialist colleagues perhaps as King Canute not only trying to stop the tide but sharing it out afterwards among his trade union supporters in the public sector.

Now, let me say straight away that where we diverge from our Socialist colleagues on this point is not on the question of the undesirability of the level of unemployment that we have at the moment. Nobody accepts or should accept 6% unemployment. It is not only a waste of resources but even more important it is a denial of human dignity. Where we diverge from our Socialist colleagues is in the way in which we believe unemployment can be genuinely reduced.

We do not believe that it can be done by pious words. We do not believe that splendid phrases such as a new type of sustained, planned and socially orientated growth really have any meaning at all. And we do not believe that employment programmes, whatever they may be, will produce the result that we want, and we do not believe that government-decreed additional shifts will do the job. These are decisions for industries themselves. As Mr Calvez said. 'We cannot fight unemployment with slogans and we cannot fight unemployment with dogma.'

That is why I want to make — very much along the lines of the Christian Democrat resolution and along the lines already advocated by our Liberal colleagues — two suggestions which I think are practical. They both refer specifically to the role of the Community and to a role which the Community has undertaken in small, inadequate measure and can continue to undertake. They are both in line with my belief that Community measures should not be bits of sticking plaster stuck here and there on national policies, but that Community measures should be real policies in themselves — policies with an impact — and in this field an impact which is aimed at speeding up, not slowing, change and innovation and the creation of new industries — new manufacturing and service industries.

Now the first of those suggestions is in the field of investment. I was amazed this morning to hear Commissioner Ortoli, Mr President, sound so satisfied with the Community role in the provision of investment funds for industry. Doubled and redoubled, the fact is that the total of Community funds is barely what it was years ago because of the effect of inflation.

It seems to me that the Commission has been lacking in ambition and courage. We know that all too often the government's concern is to keep the Community out of what they consider to be their pie.

But we have Community funds and for a start we need the tripling of the present limits. Commissioner Ortoli spoke of 3.5 billion units of account. That, compared with the total investment in machinery and equipment, is a drop in the ocean. It is 3.5 billion units of account out of an investment of perhaps 150 billion a year. At least we could restore it to what it would have been if inflation had not reduced it. The Commission should be trying to bring that amount — the amount of funds available for profitable invest-

Prag

ment in industry — up to 10 billion. Not this miserable little figure of 3.5 billion units of account, up from just over 2 billion in my own currency to over 6 billion. Then we might be talking about an impact on the provision of new activities, economically viable new activities.

Another advantage of course of Community loans is that they are at stable interest rates instead of yo-yoing interest rates which some of our countries have known.

Secondly, in this field of provision of funds, we have to move away from the emphasis on the big nationalized industries. Far too great a proportion of the Community's loan funds is going to large nationalized industries, certainly in my own country. All they are doing is replacing national funds. It is very dull if they are creating any new activity at all.

That is why I share so strongly the emphasis of our Christian-Democrat and Liberal colleagues in their resolutions, and the emphasis of David Nicholson, on the need for a much greater proportion to go to small and medium sized firms. There is need for a fundamental change in the emphasis and direction of those supposed loans. Then there will be some chance of the investment which they finance being new and additional and making some real impact on employment.

My second practical suggestion is that the Social Fund, which we know has done a great deal and financed a great deal — mainly projects which are backed by the national governments or other authorities in the Member States be turned into something more effective. It is extraordinary that at the same time as we have 6.5 million unemployed we have well over a million unfilled vacancies in the Community — the so called mis-match. In my own constituency there is a company which is looking for skilled labour in Australia. We should be creating those skills in the Community, and we are not doing the job effectively. That is exactly what the Social Fund is meant to do and it should be doing it with the sort of efficiency which would make it unnecessary for British aerospace to send recruiting teams to Australia.

In conclusion, Mr President, we have a right to expect action from our Community and we have a right to expect effective and positive action. We are, after all, supposed to be a Community and we should expect Community action. It is high time the Community put some real flesh on the skinny bones of its loan facilities, and it is time that it turned the Social Fund into a real instrument of effective employment policy. The Community ought not to be a factory for voluminous legislation and pious words. It should be a powerhouse of action for prosperity.

7. Deadline for tabling amendments

President. — I propose that the deadline for tabling amendments to the motions for resolutions tabled to

wind up the debate on the oral question on the employment situation in the Community (Doc. 1-616/79) be fixed at 6.30 this evening.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

8. Employment situation in the Community

(continuation)

President. — I call Mrs Cinciari Rodano.

Mrs Cinciari Rodano — (I) Mr President, in his speech Commissioner Vredeling had to admit, albeit indirectly, that the price for the economic crisis which is ravaging the countries of the Community is being paid by the workers and to a great extent by those whom he described as 'the weakest', including women and young people.

According to the December monthly statistics, unemployment among the total working population in 1979 was 1% higher than the corresponding figure for 1978. However, this overall average represents a reduction of 2% in male and an increase of 5% in female unemployment. These figures do not reveal the full gravity of the women's situation because the unemployment statistics do not distinguish between male and female workers in the case of young people under 25.

The position is even worse in some Community countries. In Italy, according to official Community estimates, unemployment among women has increased by more than 8% compared with a year ago; the level of female unemployment has, therefore, risen from 4% in 1974 to over 9% this year. The picture is blacker still, especially in countries like Italy, when account is taken of unemployment and of the number of women and young persons who are employed in sectors where casual or seasonal work is the norm. Nor, as we have heard, is the future outlook encouraging; on the contrary, it leads us to expect the worst.

As my colleague Mr Bonaccini pointed out, the tragic unemployment situation illustrates the intrinsic inability of the capitalist system in this part of Europe to tackle the problem of the use of the labour force and, in particular, the growing demand for jobs as the result of women's desire, on a greater scale than ever before, to make their individual contribution to the well-being of the economy and of society. Inability to cope with the situation is likely to throw women back into servitude and to halt the rapid progress being made towards their emancipation and liberation. The system has also proved incapable of meeting the demands arising from the new standards of skill which, thanks to a higher average level of education, the younger generations offer and this is creating increasing tension among our young people.

Cinciari Rodano

Private enterprise is, accordingly, losing the only thing which gives it any social value, despite its emphasis on maximum profits, which is, that it provides work. Yet Commissioner Ortoli's statement and some of today's speeches like those by Mr von Bismark and Mr Prag, showed no inclination to make any substantial change.

We cannot fight unemployment with slogans or doctrines. Nor will it suffice to try and cope with industry's energy and production problems by piecemeal reorganization policies, as in the case of textiles, which produce further redundancies, or to rely completely on the provision of aid, necessary as it is to help those who have lost their jobs.

We must make employment policy a priority and use it as the yardstick for our economic decisions, our investment policy, the policy for the removal of regional disparities and our policy on relations with the Third World. It is only under those conditions that special projects for the benefit of young people and women can operate effectively. The projects carried out to date, including those which are the responsibility of the Member State Governments, have proved to be disappointments, even failures, when viewed as attempts to raise employment levels in the sectors involved. Nor can we ignore the severity of the complaints concerning the use of the Funds which are made by the youth organizations of various countries and by the European Youth Forum.

A reduction in working hours is, of course, an admirable objective from the immediate standpoint of improving the workers' living standards. But it cannot be taken seriously as a cure or a means of sharing out what little work there is. We cannot conceal our uneasiness concerning the resolution of the Council authorizing an investigation into what are described as work-sharing schemes, with special reference to part-time working.

Even if such schemes, where they exist, are governed by contract and protected, there is reason to fear that measures of that sort may result in the codification, on a permanent basis, of conditions under which women are the subject of inferior treatment, discrimination and allocation to a subordinate role, given that, in the Community, part-time employment among women workers is 25 % of those employed, compared with 10 % in the case of all persons in employment. Measures of this kind are, at least in the less developed areas of the Community, also liable to encourage moonlighting and recourse to occupations which are unprotected by law.

If the Community proves incapable of helping to revolutionize the employment situation it will lose all claim to represent the great mass of workers in the Community. This is why I agree with those speakers who have emphasized the role which Parliament has to play in keeping a close watch on developments and dealing with them as they arise, so that today's debate

will have been the starting-point of a sustained effort to evolve a genuine operational plan for the fight against unemployment.

President. — I call Mrs Scrivener.

Mrs Scrivener.— (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my speech will be confined to a reminder of the initiative taken by the Liberal and Democratic Group in last November's debate on the budget.

It concerned the Social Fund; the Liberal and Democratic Group launched the idea of a youth employment pact at the European level based on the experience of certain Member States which already give companies grants and tax concessions as an incentive to take on young people. The purpose of a Community pact of this kind would be to enable young people, the first victims of unemployment, to go to other countries in the Communities for in-firm training, which would enable them to broaden their horizons, learn about other technologies and improve their professional skill. It would also help them to look for a job in their own country — I repeat in their own country, because the object would not of course be to export unemployment to another Member States. We feel, also, that this would be a way of cultivating the European identity so badly lacking at the present time.

We therefore tabled two amendments to the draft 1980 budget along these lines. The first proposed that appropriations be made enabling the Commission to produce a rapid preliminary study on ways and means of applying such measures at the European level. This was passed by a big majority in the House.

The purpose of our second amendment was to have a token entry in the budget which would enable the Community pact to be put into effect with all speed once the conclusions of the preliminary study were known. This amendment was thrown out because of the opposition of the Socialist Group. I do not want to start an argument on this subject — we know in any case the voting on the budget was sometimes rather confused — but I wanted, nevertheless, to stress that we must at all costs, in this House, avoid any partisan spirit in our dealing with problems.

For our part, we have supported proposals from various groups whenever they seemed right to us because we were in fact elected to try to find solutions at the Community level to the grave difficulties facing us. We were not elected to behave like political cliques.

Our proposal, relating to the sometimes tragic problems encountered by young people looking for their first job, did not deserve to be treated in the way it was. We shall table it again when the new 1980 draft budget comes up for consideration in the hope that by then we will be able to win the agreement of all the groups represented here. For us, ladies and gentlemen, employment is not a matter of political propaganda, it is a problem to be solved.

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, even if a growth of 2% is achieved in 1980, and Commissioner Vredeling considered this impossible this morning, the employment situation and prospects in the Community in the decade that has just begun are extremely gloomy, with all the painful consequences this entails for those directly concerned. We consider a growth rate of 2 to 3% which was until recently being assumed for Europe this decade to be the absolute maximum that can be achieved because of the environmental protection that is required and because of the shortage of energy and raw materials.

Two principal factors are responsible for this gloomy picture: firstly, the phenomena of saturation that have occurred at international level as a result of increased productivity and secondly, the demographic trend in the working population. Although, as Commissioner Vredeling recently confirmed, this demographic trend will begin to change in 1985, the post-war bulge in the birth-rate will mean that for the time being there will be about 4 million more people every year looking for work. In addition, we must adjust ourselves to a substantial increase in the female working population in the 1980s. In this respect there is a great deal yet to be done in the labour market, and I hope that the fact that more than half of the speakers in this debate are women is a pointer. And I must also point out that this unemployment, including concealed unemployment, which principally affects women, young people, old people, the handicapped and migrant workers is well above the average. This is also true of certain weak regions in Europe and certain branches of industry such as steel, shipbuilding and textiles. The clear movement of these sectors to industrially emergent developing countries, which will undoubtedly continue, also forms part of the political opinion I am voicing here on the need for a better international distribution of labour.

I now come to the European solution offered by D'66, the party which I and my colleague Mr De Goede represent here. I should first like to say that the EEC's abilities to establish an effective employment policy are at the moment extremely limited. If there is to be a European employment policy, there must first be more powers and instruments at European level to give such a policy shape. I will come back to this subject in a moment.

In the approach to the unemployment problem in the 1980s thought must above all be given to the difference in industrial structure in the USA, Japan and Europe. The developing countries are, of course, also important. But world trade very largely takes place between the three blocs have mentioned. In contrast to Europe, which consists of relatively small States often competing one with the other, Japan has seen an opportunity to develop a highly coordinated indus-

trial policy. Japan's inventiveness has paid off above all in a high level of organization at both national and industrial level. The USA is an enormously dynamic country. It features very rapid change in industry. Every year a large percentage of firms disappear, partly as a result of bankruptcy, only to be replaced by many new companies. A relatively large number of jobs are lost, but this is offset by the creation of new jobs.

The first conclusion to be drawn from this is that the major objection to the maintenance of firms facing structural or economic difficulties, all too often the case in Europe, is that workers are not available for new undertakings. The second lesson to be learnt is that the role of the low-wage countries, countries unable to supply high-quality industrial products, increases in importance, our competitive power lies in the manufacture of knowledge-intensive, high quality industrial products, in other words products with a high added-value.

How has European industry stood up to this pressure and how is it now trying to resist the powerful innovations emerging from the United States and Japan? Well, Europe is characterized, by the maintenance of economic traditions, by stubbornly protected small home markets, colonial tradition and social rigidity, in which the principle concern is the maintenance of group interests. As yet the EEC has unfortunately been able to do little to change this. Unlike the US and Japanese markets, the European market has not provided a powerful stimulus for innovation.

In various scientific and technological areas Europe has undoubtedly had an edge over the USA, examples being the optical, machine tool, pharmaceutical and dye industries. But Europe has lost this edge through a lack of functional and market-oriented thinking.

Europe must stop clinging so desperately to the idea of maintaining employment in specific sectors, such as steel, textiles and ship-building, because at times of major growth everyone wins the battle of competition. Even the weaker companies keep going, the demands of the two sides of industry can be satisfied and nobody's income is reduced. At times of limited growth, however, we face the moment of truth, and things become very difficult for structurally weaker companies. It must then be shown whether the will to redistribute incomes does in fact exist. Thirdly, all non-innovative industry must make a clean breast of it. I therefore ask the Commission whether it does not feel that it is through innovation and improvement in the quality of products and production processes, selective market research, financial support for promising innovation projects and close cooperation between government and industry that we shall succeed in finding solutions to the pressing social constraints such as unemployment and the problems connected with energy and the environment. Does not the Commission also feel that only if there is a European policy on innovation can Europe stand up to the increasing international competition?

Dekker

I should like to remind the Commission of the request I made in November during the budget debate, that Parliament should be informed at an early date of the state of the Commission's activities in the establishment of a Community policy on innovation and also that Parliament should be provided without delay with full details of the future policy.

For a genuine employment policy, which should in fact be the outcome of an industrial, innovation and a sectorally adjusted structural policy combined with an economic, regional and social policy, the existing European instruments are too fragmentary and too restricted.

I have already discussed the need for a Community policy on innovation in some detail. But I should like, briefly, to mention the other elements, beginning with the need to establish a European sectoral structural policy. For a number of sectors this policy has already been or is about to be introduced. For the weak sectors of industry it must entail restructuring with the aid of attendant social measures.

In addition, Community must develop a policy for the stronger sectors of industry which, in conjunction with the policy on innovation, is aimed at stimulating growth sectors.

A third important element is the creation of a better link with education and the labour market. Although we feel that education policy is and must remain a national responsibility, the Community has a part to play in ensuring coordination and the exchange of experience gained at international level, because we are dealing here with one of the most serious constraints in the unemployment problem. In almost every Member State the relationship between education and the labour market, in both industry and government, is far from satisfactory. Far greater emphasis must be placed in education on training in specific occupations, because research clearly demonstrates, for example, that young people who have been trained in a given occupation stand a far better chance of finding work. The promotion of the better distribution of available work is a fourth area in which European aspects are clearly involved. In view of the gloomy prospects for the next ten years, a better distribution of available work would certainly seem necessary, and it is also extremely desirable for reasons of emancipation. Unemployment is high among women in particular, and it is essential that everyone should be involved in society as far as possible. This means that different values must be attached to paid and unpaid work. Because of the limited time available, I cannot do more than point out that this is an important matter to which increasing thought should be given.

To be really effective, measures taken to achieve a better distribution of work, embracing both men and women and both clean and dirty work, must satisfy two conditions.

Firstly, they must result in the creation of new jobs, and secondly, they must in the final analysis result in an increase in labour costs. It would be a very good thing if well prepared experiments, monitored for their economic and social effects, were to be carried out in sectors of industry where there is a greater supply of labour than demand or where there are a large number of vacancies. I look forward to hearing the Commission's position on this.

My fifth and final point is that temporary measures must be taken for the transitional period until the more structural measures I have mentioned are introduced or until they produce the desired effect. In view of the seriousness of the situation there is every reason, I feel, to make more extensive financial resources available in this transitional period from the Community's existing financial instruments such as the Social Fund, the Regional Fund and the European Investment Bank. As the level of unemployment among young people and women is particularly high, it also seems to me obvious that special attention should be paid to measures aimed at finding employment for these groups when substantial financial resources are being allocated.

I have not been able to discuss matters such as the democratization and humanization of work and the improvement of worker participation generally. I hope to have an opportunity of doing so soon. But to conclude, I should like to say that if the EEC is expected, and I feel this is the case, to make a contribution to the solution of the unemployment problem, then the consequences must be accepted. This means that the Community must be provided with adequate powers and instruments for the purpose, powers which have until now been held by the national authorities alone. Only then can the European Community be expected to establish an employment policy which does not stop at combating the symptoms, but is primarily directed at combating the causes of unemployment.

President. — I call Mrs Lizin.

Mrs Lizin. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, with your permission I shall make two preliminary comments. First of all I note the absence of the Council — regrettable at the political level — from so important a debate. Our Assembly should point this out more often, when it occurs, and refuse to tolerate it. It is not impossible for a minister to attend a debate on such a subject on a Tuesday. My second comment which will perhaps win less unanimous support is that I much appreciated the speech by Mr Michel, my compatriot, although I regret, too, that it found little practical expression in the motion for a resolution tabled by his Group.

I now come to the subject of the debate itself. Although I am Belgian, I shall not hold forth today

Lizin

about the exemplary victory won by the working class in Belgium with regard to the reduction in working time at the ACEC, where the workers won through in their battle for the 36-hour week which the right in this House claimed was so impossible.

I shall not return to this subject which has already been very well covered by several speakers in my Group, I shall simply say a few words about a more specific problem, that of the share of women in the unemployment totals, for they do not constitute just one category among many. The average at European level is 40 % and the figures in Germany, France and Belgium are 51, 53 and 60 % respectively. In a way, they are the biggest factor in the problem, the one that should mobilize our efforts and be made an integral part of any solutions proposed. It has already been discussed in earlier speeches and I shall therefore not list out the reasons for this high number of women among the unemployed and among jobseekers. In my view, it is due both to the vulnerability of the sectors in which they are unemployed and to discrimination on the part of employers in both public and private sectors.

It might have been hoped that such figures, which need no comment, would be sufficiently eloquent in themselves to spur efforts to find the right solutions. But no, the statistics show that, in Belgium for instance, whereas male unemployment went down by 29 % in 1979, female unemployment went up by 9.4 %. These figures certainly reflect the greater mobility of men but they also betray a sociological reflex on the part of society and of employers who regard female unemployment as less important, a kind of second-class unemployment.

The Socialists cannot accept this inequality of opportunity to exercise the right to work. My Group demands from the Council — even though it is not here — and the Commission, measures to cope with this category of unemployment, taking its specific aspects into account.

It is true that some policies have been brought in by the Commission since 1970 as regards equality of opportunity but they are not sufficient to the extent that they have, up to now, been too exclusively legal. The figures I quoted, Mr Vredeling, call for other types of more direct stimulants capable of bringing about a change in attitudes. We demand more intensive action under the Social Fund for the training of women of all ages and occupational skills in order to bring an end the compartmentation of the labour market and more intensive encouragement to equal recruitment for training courses in the Member States. We demand more European involvement in education — and particularly secondary — education policies in order to end the segregation into female and male roles which deprives women of a substantial part of their capabilities and individuality. We ask for closer implementation of the directives on equality of treat-

ment, by setting up a special service to deal with this subject, in order to ensure genuine mixed employment; we want the pilot experiments under the Social Fund to be increased and a special unit set up to train officials of the employment services in each Member State in order to make them aware of the need to submit requests applying specifically to this training of women. Lastly, in the Member States applying special measures offering temporary work for the unemployed, such recruitment should compulsorily allow for the same percentage of unemployed women offered temporary jobs as their percentage in the total unemployment figure.

In addition, the European Socialists do not feel that these short-term measures designed to reduce the number of women out of work in any way reduces the value of structural measures to promote the employment of women and to facilitate their entry into the labour market, and refuse to regard the crisis as a reason for encouraging women to go back to the kitchen as the parties of the right so often suggest. Women's access to employment is no longer a more or less short-lived economic phenomenon. It is the most fundamental event affecting society over the last few years and the sign, at last, of women's access to freedom and independence. It is a social phenomenon, one of individual liberation and we insist that it be facilitated and not restrained by a profit-oriented society regardless of its momentary economic state. We therefore want there to be a structural framework as well and efforts to be made for the alignment of social legislations on the basis of the most-favoured working woman and in particular the review of aspects overlooked in the Third Directive on Social Security. We demand appropriate Community aid for Community facilities and services such as child-minding centres, which free women from certain household or child-rearing tasks. If part-time working is introduced it should always be on an exceptional basis, for men and women, and the social security advantages should be strictly commensurate with those applying to full-time working. The lack of community services, which may impel a working woman to take part-time work, should not reduce her to a cut-rate status with no entitlement to basic social rights. I come from a country which saw the first strike of women claiming their rights under Article 119 of the Treaty of Rome and I have always held the conviction that, if it wanted to, Europe was capable of perceiving the potential for creativity and future development that there was in women's desire for access to employment. We women Socialists are convinced that this movement is irreversible since its direction is towards freedom and each independence and the expression of his or her own desired pattern of existence. In spite of these economic difficulties, or rather because of them, Europe should help this living force within it because that force is Europe's future.

President. — I call Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase — (I) Mr President, while a debate on the subject of employment is a noteworthy event, we must not allow it to degenerate into just another routine. As my colleague Mr Michel reminded us, the growth of employment and a better standard of living for workers were two of the main objectives on which the Treaties based the structure of the Community. It is our job here to identify the means which this new European Parliament can, with that in mind, oversee and influence the actions of the other Institutions. In so doing, we must not be content with general appeals but make a concerted effort to identify causes, conflicts and solutions during a debate such as this, however valuable and wide-ranging.

The employment situation and its predictable — and predicted — worsening in Europe is a problem on which neither the Community institutions nor the Member State Governments have yet devised a strategy of any value. The present situation differs in many respects from that in previous years. It disturbs every section of political life in Europe but none of them appears able to take the plunge which the situation requires. The traditional ideological attitudes which, to some extent, have been adopted here by all the groups, the renewed suggestion that, with some retrospective trimming for the benefit of the working population, a new market would, left to its own devices, restore equilibrium and, once more the suggestion of Keynesian solutions based on increased public demand are all woefully inadequate.

The balance between a free market, which is essential for the decentralization of initiative, decision and economic vitality, on the one hand, and, on the other, intervention by the State to revive the economy and promote greater equality is not something which is struck once and for all. It has, in practice, to submit to constant adjustment in the light of changing economic circumstances, national and international, and this can only be done by adapting and improving theories in a spirit of scientific and political give-and-take, with circumspection and without any *a priori* rejection of the views advanced. We are convinced that the step forward which is called for can be taken only by this Parliament, and it can take it by a concerted effort based on the pooling of the experiences, failures, practices and methods of the countries themselves. No State can have its own strategy for recovery until there is a Community strategy covering the situation in each of the States.

It has been suggested that, because of the novel and different nature of the crisis, Parliament should conduct a systematic and thorough examination into all its aspects a greater extent than ever before, to coordinate the opinions expressed from time to time in our various committees. I rose to speak primarily to support this suggestion, which was made by Mr Macario this morning, when he urged us to coordinate all discussion on the employment issue and to do so with particular reference to the qualitative imbalance between labour demand and supply. I do not claim

that this is the only consideration to be taken into account, whether from the national, Community or international point of view: the crucial question is still the rate of growth. But whatever may be the factors mainly responsible for holding up progress in the fight against the effects of unemployment, such as the new distribution of work, technological development, dearer raw materials, the increased cost or shortage of energy supplies, the intensification of competition and monetary instability, unemployment is often accompanied by a chronic shortage of labour in some sectors. However the point to be emphasized is the qualitative imbalance between labour supply and demand. Theorists refer increasingly to 'segmentation of the labour market, by which they mean division into a number of diversified sub-markets, both on the demand and on the supply side, which are frequently out of touch with each other and cater for different segments, such as the adult male market, as distinct from the market for juveniles, for women, for immigrants and for older people, not to mention the handicapped. Further sub-divisions exist among juvenile categories and women's groups.

The tendency, at the expense of other categories, to think first of the needs of the adult male segment of the labour market in connection with guarantees and interventions, the rigid work-organization arrangements, which are based on it and compound its features, intensify the subordination of the weaker groups to which I have referred. If the solution of the question of reducing the time spent at work were arrived at on the same inflexible basis, covering the whole of demand and all categories, this would reinforce the existing disparity within the market. It is common knowledge that young people are finding it increasingly difficult to find work. In seven years, the number of persons under 25 years of age seeking work in the Member States has more than trebled in absolute terms and has risen from a quarter to a third of the total number unemployed. This is obviously the effect of the growing number of school-leavers coming on the market until the mid-1980s, but the decisive factor is the higher number of pupils at school and university during the last twenty years and the fact that no attempt was made to make the necessary adjustment to meet industry's requirements. There are two sides to the problem. The first is the general connection between inadequate training and the greater likelihood of being unemployed in many countries of the Community, which tends to confirm that good training gets people the jobs. The other aspect is that, in some areas, unemployment among young graduates is appallingly high. In many cases a high standard of education is not valued for itself or for the knowledge gained but because it puts the individual in a position to make good use of further training at the place of work.

Furthermore, as someone has pointed out, there has been a change of attitude among the young people of today concerning the value of entering a profession or

Gaiotti de Biase

taking a job; this has been called the culture of exclusion. It appears to produce a greater readiness to accept piece-work or temporary jobs so as to avoid settling down in permanent employment. Finally, there is a tendency to refuse or to leave manual work to other sub-markets, such as those for immigrants or women, and to show no interest in employment as specialized craftsmen.

The growth in the availability of female labour is now the main cause of the growth in the real demand for labour, expressed or implied. The recent OECD forecast that the present tendency for women's employment to increase is unlikely to be reversed during the next few years is, in my view, far too much of an understatement. Far from being reversed, it will be accentuated. Anyone who believes press suggestions that a reaction has set in and that women are returning to domesticity is forgetting that women have now become an essential part of the labour market. This is merely the external aspect of the structure of a system which is increasingly based on the pattern of trade rather than a system based on production for direct consumption.

Ideally, it might be of great sociological interest to suggest a return to work which is not for gain and the acceptance of unpaid employment. Even in the services sector, however, a departure of this kind is feasible only in so far as it is not conceived exclusively in terms of women, but as a possibility open to both sexes. As Christian Democrats, we have never exaggerated the importance of women's employment as part of their emancipation. But there can be no question of reviving discrimination between men and women as regards their right to work. Various factors will, in the short term, continue to exercise an influence: among them are age, hours of work, the ability to perform heavy physical tasks and family responsibilities. This, however, will be in the context of the development of a closer relationship between the expectations and plans of a young woman and those of young man. It is our duty to take full political responsibility for this development in the knowledge that it creates problems affecting the traditions and structure of our society and that we cannot put the clock back. The first thing we must do is to ensure the characteristics of the female subdivision of the labour market are not made worse by the relationship between demand and supply in such a way as to allow moonlighting, diminished respect for contracts or the segregation of women in the lower-paid types of job. Unlike Mrs Cinciano Rodano, with whom I agree and disagree in a long-drawn-out debate we are having in Italy, I believe that the proposed straitjacketing of all employment requirements in a single rigid code would, in the case of women, make moonlighting more widespread and tend to deprive women of the protection of the trade unions. This is not to say that we should not try to ensure that all the internal variations of the labour market are covered by contract or that collec-

tive agreements should conform in every particular with every standard agreement.

Even in the Community documents, I think there is a rather superficial approach to the question of premature retirement of older workers as a contribution to restoration of the balance between supply and demand. There is, in fact, a strong possibility that, during the eighties, older workers, especially women, will show increasing reluctance to quit work for good. I need not go into the price being paid for increasing reliance on immigrant labour. We cannot hope to stop the segmentation of the labour markets if we continue to encourage the mass movement of labour at enormous cost to the community. In all these segmentation developments, the subject of training is of the greatest importance. Is training policy meant to have an effect only on the supply of labour, by ensuring that its quality meets the requirement of demand, in accordance with the ideas which prevailed in the 60s? Is it just a variable factor dependent on the pattern of growth or recession or should we not, in the short-term, regard it, as I do, as a motive force conditioning the strength of demand? Although naturally limited and relative, should it have an active role in the revival of growth?

In this connection, I should like to make three points which tend to discount the basic conception of occupational training as a means of providing industry with the specialized skills it wants when it asks for them. In basic training we must attach increasing importance to entrepreneurship and individual initiative. Someone said this morning that the remoter and less advanced regions cannot be developed on the basis of investment alone. Nor will they be if investment is not backed up by efforts by the public authorities to foster the entrepreneurial abilities, initiative and inventive genius of the younger generation. It is vital that we should revive, albeit in radically different forms the motives which inspire the desire to work and that we should achieve a balance between young men and young women in relation to those motives and inject sociological, as well as economic, considerations into the re-discovery of work.

An increasingly important factor in occupational training is preparation for change and adaptability to new situations. Those concerned must be able to learn from and, above all, make good use of, their experience. There is particular need for the sort of training which enhances the worker's bargaining powers. This means that training must be less formal and compartmentalized and increasingly related to day-to-day experience at work in the formative years. Obviously, action to prevent segmentation of the labour markets on the supply side would not be sufficient unless it was accompanied by a readiness to act on the demand side as well on the basis of a new kind of coordinated policy made possible by the organization of work, industrial policy and a training policy.

Gaiotti di Biase

Mr President, we should like the Commission to know that, in our view, the decisions made and implemented in recent years, ranging from the pilot projects for the training of girls to the recent report on rotation, are sound and logical. We do not dispute their wisdom or the intentions behind them. What we do object to is that they merely scratch the surface, since they attach too little importance to the part which, in this field, Community policy can and ought to play as an instrument of unification and encouragement and since they are insufficiently related to the other policies. In our view, the Community will not have an employment policy at all until a proper training policy has been launched. We are only too well aware that this should be addressed to the Council of Ministers, and we unanimously condemned the effect of this in the Committee on Youth and Culture. Frankly, we are amazed that, in his speech, the Commissioner made no reference to the need to arrange a meeting of Education Ministers or to coordinate the main policies. We are ready to give Parliament every assistance in at last bringing some sense and order into the whole approach to the problem of employment.

President. — I call Mr de Ferranti.

Mr de Ferranti. — Mr President, I am very pleased to follow Mrs Gaiotti de Biase who emphasized training. It seems to me that training and the kind of attention which Mrs Gaiotti de Biase devotes to the details of training will be one of the factors, if not the key factor in resolving this most serious problem.

Training, however, takes many forms, Mr President. I was privileged myself once to be trained for a whole day with the German trade union movement. I attended a conference which was organized by Mr Vetter — whom I was pleased to listen to this morning — held in the Ruhr on the problems of Europe with particular reference to employment. At that German trade union conference in the heart of Europe speaker after speaker stressed the fact that one German job in four was owed to the Community and to the existence of the Community and that, therefore, anything which threatened the Community also threatened one out of every four jobs in Germany.

Now, we all know that Germany was a founding Member State of the Community and that the United Kingdom has had less time to work itself into a similar position, but the fact of having this European home market does give all of us an opportunity of creating and helping to create employment, and thus of providing some solution to the problem that we are discussing. I hope this House will not take it amiss if perhaps I sound a note of criticism that not enough has been said during the course of the debate today about the basic job we are supposed to be doing here, namely, building an economic community — a community with wider dimensions than economics perhaps but an economic community none the less.

We have to get on with the details of the job, in other words, of removing barriers to trade. We have to make sure that goods and labour capital can move freely. We must press for convergence between the policies of the governments of the Member States in order to reduce inflation, limit fluctuations in the exchange rates between our currencies and successfully follow the lead given by the Commission and by the President of the Commission in working towards an effective European Monetary System.

In this way, we shall, as Mr Ortoli has demonstrated, gain confidence and a greater credit base, which in turn will enable many of the detailed suggestions, for instance made by Mr Prag, Mr Nicholson and others, to bear fruit in the shape of new jobs. It seems to me that it is our normal daily work that we need to be getting on with if we are to solve the problem of unemployment.

And let's face it, as we read our newspapers and we see the price of gold soaring and the dollar falling, we are forced to recognize the instability that is inherent in the economic system today. Mr President, I put it to you and to all of you in this House, we may not have much time to put our house in order, to acquire the confidence and create the credit that is going to be necessary not only to make the problem better, but perhaps simply to prevent it from getting any worse.

If we are to succeed in our daily job, more people will inevitably have to change their jobs. The very nature of the Community means more specialization, and more specialization means that some firms will have to concentrate in certain areas while others will have to switch their activities to other fields, a fact which is bound to lead to the sort of difficulties we are facing in the steel, textile and footwear sectors. The responsibility of this House is therefore not to take the old-fashioned social attitude of saying, this is how it must be, so get on with it, but to see where the fears of those people who are affected in their daily lives actually lie, because it is our duty to try and alleviate those fears by enabling people to accept the process of job-changing because they understand that it is fair and reasonable to do so.

The sort of things that we can do, once again, are absolutely in line with the daily work that we do here. The Social Fund has been mentioned by many speakers. With a Social Fund of far greater dimensions, I would suggest, than is currently possible with the difficulties that we face with the budget, we could do much to help retraining, which, as so many speakers have stressed, is quite clearly one of the keys to taking the fear out of job-changing.

However, we also have to recognize that the dilemma of changing jobs also raises other problems: the process of being made redundant, financial worries raised by the prospect of change, problems with schools, problems with one's house, etc. These seem to me to be the kind of difficulties which it is part of

Ferranti

our normal task to consider when planning the activities of the Social Fund and of the Regional Fund too in many instances, and to consider with some urgency, if we are to overcome the problem that we are discussing. Indeed, it seems to me, Mr President, that this process of job-changing, is an area in which the Community can provide the greatest help, with a sort of Community re-insurance policy enabling Member States themselves to reduce the burden on their own taxpayers and the Community itself, which is after all the framework in which the readjustment is taking place, increasingly providing the funds to help the job-changing process run smoothly. If we can do that, if we can take the fear out of job-changing, we can then get the sort of sustained growth that will enable us to solve our other problems.

Now, admittedly this does mean that the richer regions of the Community will have to contribute more towards the job-changing process than those regions that have a bigger job-changing process to go through, but it is clearly in their interest that this should happen, since their contribution will be rewarded in the form of a share in the higher growth rate that may result from this process. This is all a question of detail, all a matter of getting on with our normal job as a parliament. I might add, however, that when it comes to doing our jobs we can only do them through the channel of the Institutions, in which connection, there is one Institution, which I would particularly like to mention, several references having been made during the course of the debate, Mr President, to the Tripartite Conference in connection with the need to involve the social partners in the process of discussing how the kinds of problems I have referred to are to be tackled and how people can be made to understand the difficulties involved.

Now Monnet, himself, when he was discussing the original Treaty of Rome, recognized the importance of this discussion process with the social partners and established an institution in which such discussions could take place it is called the Economic and Social Committee. It has a staff of 350 and a budget of some 6 million units of account and is there to do the daily detailed job of discussing ways of resolving the problem of unemployment. Of course, Mr President, if the Commission and the Council want to hold an annual spectacular for the bosses of industry, the bosses of the unions and the Council of Ministers then all well and good, nobody is against that happening, except that afterwards people say, what has been achieved, what has happened at this meeting? We have listened to 90 set speeches. There has been no real communication. We have made decisions and exchanged a series of commonplaces, as Mr Van der Gun mentioned earlier during the debate. This is all very well but do not expect too much of it. What we should do is recognize that we do have a normal properly established Community institution, whose business it is to enable the social partners to communicate, and it seems to me that we should have given

much more emphasis during the course of our debate today to the role that they could play and the job that they can do.

Now, as some of you know in this House, I was formally the President of this institution and I am very proud to have been its President, but I would be the first to admit that it has its faults, many faults. But if we give it some encouragement, if we recognize that this Parliament, as Mr Vredeling said earlier, is the real power house of initiative in this field, if we through our own confidence can give to this other institution the confidence to play a larger and more fulfilling role, then I think that many of the faults from which that institution suffers could in fact be corrected. I think it is up to us to gain confidence ourselves, to see this other institution in its proper light and to give it a fair chance to succeed, and we can do that by taking it seriously. Our freedoms, all our freedoms, our freedom to reduce unemployment included, depend on institutions. This House is the most precious of our institutions to us. We have a job to do here and we have been doing it today and I am sure the result of this debate will contribute, effectively to solving many aspects of the basic problem. We need, though, to recognize the role of the Council, to congratulate the Commission on its work and, I believe, Mr President, to give some help and assistance to our sister institution which can play an essential role in the problem we are discussing today.

President. — I call Mrs Hoffmann.

Mrs Hoffmann. — (*F*) Ladies and gentlemen, according to the letter of the Treaty of Rome, female employment should be promoted and diversified. Unfortunately it has to be admitted that the proportion of women unemployed in the Community has never been so high. Over half the number of lost jobs is in sectors like the textile, footwear and clothing industries where the workforce is primarily female. In France, not a day passes without one company or other closing its doors.

For the clothing industry in the Rhône-Alpes region alone, the companies that have gone into liquidation include Mavest and Prost of Roanne, Guther Royon of Saint Etienne and Lou and Emesse of Grenoble. In addition a hundred or so women have been made redundant at the Bonneterie Cévenole at Granges les Valences.

Employers are laying off staff, shutting down their factories and investing in plant abroad, in countries with cheap manpower and with no social security system. Rhône-Poulenc have shut their Roussillon spinning mills and are importing acetate yarn made by its subsidiaries in Germany, Brazil and Argentina. The owner of Bonneterie Cévenole has works in Portugal and Thailand and the owner of Guther Royon has factories in Tunisia and Portugal. In fact not one sector of our economy, is spared. On top of this situation there is the increasing pace of schemes for decentralizing jobs in the tertiary sector and the

Hoffmann

plans to step up part-time working. Was it not Mrs Pasquier; referring to the Nora and Minc report we all know, who has just referred without the slightest shame to a 30 % saving in employment whereas the prospects are quite definitely the loss of one job out of three in the tertiary sector where, once again, women are the hardest hit — and will be even harder hit in the future — when jobs are cut.

And what about the situation in la Réunion, the West Indies and Guyana where, with female underemployment, the new cohorts of young people arriving on the labour market, redundancies and the rural exodus, there are as many people of active age out of work as there are working. Unemployment is steadily climbing. One out of every two workless is a woman and the forecasts for 1985 give a possible figure for women unemployed of a million and a half by that time.

These figures reflect the time magnitude of the waste but they also demonstrate the irreversible nature of the movement of women into employment in the present crisis context when this right is being challenged as never before. Whom would you persuade — certainly not women — that, through its institutions, Europe has striven to reduce the discrimination against them? I have just proved the opposite with the figures I produced. Never has the picture been so black and the future so disturbing. Without work how can you look forward to the future, that of your children, perhaps an eagerly awaited new arrival. There is nothing inevitable about this catastrophic situation. It is the result of an economic policy based on austerity and the redeployment of the multinationals operated by the French Government and French employers with the assistance of the European institutions for the greater profit of a handful of industrial and financial groups.

For our part, we refuse to accept the idea of the crisis being inevitable and call on women workers to fight to save their jobs and for the right to work. The path traced by the policy decided here in this House is the opposite of what we want. That is why we are against it. Women in our country will not give up. And let no-one tell us 'that it is simply a matter of awakening the conscience of women who too easily accept the injustices of which they are the victims'. What contempt for the increasing number of women who have chosen to fight to stop the destroyers and to have their right to work finally recognized and who are in the forefront of the struggle against redundancies and the wrecking of industry like the women of the Saint Joseph factory who have been occupying the works for three years to keep the textile industry going in France, the women workers of Sogeico in the Bigouden area, the women of Denain in the north fighting to keep iron and steel production going there and the men and women of Dalami in my own département. I tell them firmly that they can count on the support of the French Communist Party and its elected representatives in their struggle. Tomorrow

they will win, through their struggle as the women workers of Bastide Rouerou, Prisunic in Toulon and BSN in the Vosges area all won before them.

Nothing has more effect than their struggle. It is high time that women's claims were heard and concrete solutions found. In this field we cannot be satisfied with pious hopes or directives of vagueness. We have to reduce working time, progress towards the 35-hour week and put into effect all the measures outlined by my friend Georges Frischmann this morning. This, in my view, is the direction in which the Community should be going to the men and women in this House who, by their attitude and misleading language, have allowed the multinationals to increase their profits by looting the wealth of France.

President. — I call Mr Donnez.

Mr Donnez. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, everyone of us realizes that the problem of employment or more exactly unemployment must be the foremost of our concerns. To be more precise, everyone of us, has in mind the specific problems that come up every day in his or her region.

With your permission I would like to draw your attention more particularly to my own region — Nord-Pas de Calais. The reason I do so is that here the industrial employment situation has worsened over the last few years more than it has anywhere else. The economic reason is the fact that many of the old industrial areas no longer exist or are dying out and have not been replaced by the new industries of the future.

A few simple figures will show what I mean. In 1945 there were 220 000 jobs in the textile industry in this area. Today there are only 90 000 and we are losing another 4 000 to 5 000 every year. In the coal-mines there were also 220 000 jobs; today the figure is 30 000 and these will disappear, too, during the next few years. We used to have 180 000 agricultural jobs and today there are only 70 000.

Some of these jobs have been replaced by the region's own vitality. Of itself the motor industry has been no miracle cure because so far it has generated only 30 000 jobs in ten years.

The situation is aggravated at the present time by what is known as rationalization measures in the steel industry. The Valenciennes area in particular has taken the full force of the loss of thousands of jobs in Usinor. Local economic activity, however buoyant, and the quality of the workers in that area are not enough to offset this fresh bloodletting. The sacrifices demanded by industrial redeployment are thus becoming increasingly hard to bear. This Nord-Pas de Calais region is therefore clearly one of those to which special attention must be paid. The Commission has just made public the regional breakdown of the financial help given to France in 1979. I am pleased to say that Nord-Pas de Calais is high on the list but the support given is largely inadequate. What is involved is virtually complete industrial redevelopment. The

Donnez

basic industries — coal-mines, steel and textile industries — have to be replaced by the industries of the future. Because they live in the heart of Europe, the people of Nord-Pas de Calais, who have never spared their efforts or labour, have high expectations of Europe. They reject social disruption just as they refuse to despair. The assistance I have just solicited for them, in the form of changes to the budget for integrated operations, would not be an act of charity but a demonstration of our desire to give a region back its natural vitality which has invariably been essential to our European Community.

President. — I call Mr Seal.

Mr Seal. — I want to speak very briefly about the effects upon employment of the new microelectronic technology and whether microelectronics will bring about a revolution in the pattern of organization of work, or simply *accelerate* the present trends. This is largely a matter of definition, but what cannot be doubted is that the development of the silicon chip will bring about profound and sweeping changes in everyone's work situation well before the end of this century.

The present increase in unemployment is against a background of rapidly rising rates of increase in the size of the labour force, and also steadily increasing productivity. Yet the growth rate of the Community as a whole remains disturbingly low, around 3 %. Even if productivity continues to grow at only recent rates and this is unlikely to be the case because the new technology will give a much higher rate of productivity than the Community economy as a whole will need to grow something like 4 % per year just to keep unemployment at its present unacceptably high levels.

Now the number of people in work, remains the same now as in the early 1970s, but there have been significant changes in employment patterns. Agriculture has continued to shrink at a fairly constant rate in recent years, but employment in the secondary sector — the manufacturing sector — has also begun to decline. Until now this has been compensated by an increase in the service sector, which now provides more than half the jobs in the Community.

I want to stress this, Mr President, because it is in the service sector that micro-electronic technology will have its most immediate applications. It will allow for very large productivity increases where up to now investment has been very low.

The reason why the silicon chip will have a more substantial impact on employment than any other new technology is that, as the first cheap intelligent electronics, it can be applied in all sectors of the economy, wherever there is control, and it can produce very great increases in productivity; in the

past, other new technologies have also produced reductions in employment, and also produced widespread social dislocation. But the previous improvements relied on an expanding economy to cushion the blows and to absorb the workers in new growth industries. We can no longer rely on a continued large-scale economic growth.

Now I cannot predict the precise impact of micro-electronics on employment in the Community. The precise figures depend on too many complicated parameters, such as rates of innovation, the competitive position of the Community, the state of the world economy, and so on.

But definitive data are available from case-studies where firms have already introduced micro-electronic technology. Increasing the number of integrated circuits in colour television enabled the Japanese industry to raise productivity by a massive 233 % in four years. European manufacturers followed suit.

In my own constituency 2 000 workers last year were made redundant by just one television manufacturing firm. The manufacture of new electronic-based telephone exchange equipment needs only one worker where previously 26 workers were required to produce these exchanges. The use of integrated circuits in self-service petrol pumps has produced a loss of over 100 000 jobs in the United Kingdom alone.

But the most immediate job loss, as I have said, is likely to occur in the service sector. In my own constituency the local council has, by the introduction of word processors, increased output whilst more than halving the number of typist it employs. A United Kingdom insurance company has decreased its staff by 40 % after introducing word processing.

Mr President, the French Nora and Minc report estimates 30 % job loss in banking and insurance in the next decade. The German company Siemens estimates that if productivity grows by 8 % a year over the next decade there would be a displacement of 25 % of office staff at past rates of output. This would amount to a displacement of 5 million, from 18 million clerical staff in Western Europe. If we assume only a 3 % growth in the Community economy over the next 10 years with productivity and labour forces growing at the present rates, we have an estimate of 9 million people unemployed by 1983 and 10 500 000 million people unemployed in 1980.

This does not take into account the effect of micro-electronic technology. In this period, half of the jobs will be an information processing. If there is only a 30 % displacement in this sector and only a 10 % displacement in the non-information sector, we have additional technological unemployment affecting 21 million jobs. This makes a frightening total, Mr President, of 32 million for Community unemployment in 1990.

Seal

We must recognize the scale of the problem. It is not just a question of one or two jobs here and there, but millions of jobs right across the economy. I know some new jobs will be created, but nothing like the number we need, because the newly created industry will be extremely capital-intensive and will not provide the jobs. We must support the reduction of the working week to 35 hours as the first important step.

But much more, Mr President, will have to be done. We will have to change our education systems, we will have to rethink economies. Micro-electronics can change the way of life of the whole world for the better, but only if we recognize and solve the problems early enough. A 35-hour week, Mr President, is the important first step.

President. — I call Mr Croux.

Mr Croux. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to draw Parliament's attention firstly to the long-term problems relating to the employment policy, and secondly to the role of education and research in these problems.

I will begin with the long-term problems. This debate rightly concerns topical problems connected with unemployment, but we must also think of the coming decade: And this for three reasons. To begin with, a human reason: we must be able to give the younger generation new hope, new prospects of meaningful work in an economically productive developing world, which must be and must remain a guarantee of prosperity and well-being. Secondly, a social reason. The best way of achieving a satisfactory social consensus in Europe again is the joint preparation of a new plan for future activities in our European society. Thirdly, run-of-the-mill technical economic reasons. In the long term we have to face the problem of the international distribution of labour and also the problem of international distribution of energy. We lack raw materials: We have technological challenges to face: microelectronics, factory farming, the exploration of the oceans, and, last but not-least, the energy problem.

In addition, cultural and social values are changing, primarily with regard to work. And then there is the relationship between work and leisure. There must continue to be economic growth, but its achievement will be increasingly divorced from employment, the creation of jobs, and also from the consumption of energy.

Taking all these factors together, we can but devote our utmost attention not only to the present period but also to the 1980s, the 1990s, the period between now and the year 2000.

If there is one place in Europe where this can be done, it is here. Because we know that the energies of our governments and also of our national parliaments

are very largely devoted to the daily fight against unemployment, the problems in the social and economic spheres. This European Parliament should see it as its mission to respond to the demand voiced above all by the younger generation that we should in the long term work towards a new future in cooperation with the other institutions.

And now to education and research, and the question of putting a value on intellectual abilities. They represent one of the most important levers for the new future. Reference has been made here to the discrepancy between supply and demand in the labour market. One of the major reasons for this is the deficiency of our education system, the lack of permanent retraining and the continuing absence of large-scale efforts with respect retraining in certain areas. From a European point of view too, large-scale projects are needed. The funds spent on these projects will be better spent than has hitherto been the case at national level and also at European level.

Then there is the problem of working women. One of the major causes of the discrepancy between supply and demand in the labour market is the excessively conservative attitude of our educational institutions and their inability to shake off traditional methods in the training of young women. Everyone realizes this, but too little is done about it. Apart from some forms of unemployment among graduates, at least half of all unemployed young people are untrained, having had no more than a lower education. We must tackle this problem. There is a need for more education and for different education. There is also a need for different jobs, involving a greater mixture of work for the untrained and the trained. Otherwise we shall not be able to solve this problem.

Secondly, research. Many of the research workers in our European institutions and universities are disheartened and even embittered. The public are often disappointed with the results of research carried out at universities and scientific institutions. I believe the Commission faces a very important task here and that it has in fact already taken steps with respect to research. We must take account of three factors. Firstly, in the 60s and even the early 70s the universities were the darlings of our western civilization, whereas they are now often the subject of oppression. Not infrequently they now suffer under bureaucratic encapsulation, administrative obstacles, financial cuts and so on. Secondly, a more interdisciplinary approach must be adopted at universities, this being one of the major requirements in the fight against unemployment and in the search for new forms of meaningful work. They must be found by interdisciplinary means. Thirdly, the universities, and scientific research generally, must be more directly oriented towards society.

Croux

The traditional universities, which are still, and perhaps too much so, centres of pure science despite the developments of recent years, must be increasingly involved in the enormous social problems surrounding the project to create a new future for Europe. They must increasingly devote their activities to this. That, Mr President, is what I think this debate should focus on. I appeal to the Commission and the Council, but to the Commission in the first instance, to give a great deal of thought to these problems. I hope that the Commission will take new steps and will find ways of overcoming existing national resistance and the resistance of other institutions and put forward new proposals, initially to this Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Price.

Mr Price. — Mr President, I should like to talk specifically about the problem of youth unemployment. This is in itself a problem because of the long-term consequences of it. The size of the problem is greater, because there are simply more young people unemployed *pro rata* than there are older people, and that is true throughout all the countries of the Community. Technological changes have had their impact, particularly in the case of the kind of work which tend to be the first jobs young people receive on leaving school, and these people tend to take the first impact of lower growth rates, which is what we have been suffering from in recent years, so that there are many more young people unemployed.

In long-term consequences, the first and second jobs are those which determine the pattern of adult life. It is a time of transition from adolescence to adulthood and it has a singular importance for that reason. If young people leave school and simply have no occupation, then they will fail to establish a good basis for the future, and this kind of system encourages the adoption of a dropout antisocial lifestyle.

The main way to tackle youth unemployment is to obtain greater growth in the economies of Community countries and to reduce unemployment as a whole by a variety of different economic and social measures. So the main way of dealing with youth unemployment is to deal more effectively with the general problem, and on the regional basis the same rule applies.

In my own constituency, the greater part of which is in Merseyside, there is a high rate of unemployment. Mr Paisley spoke earlier on in this debate of a 13 % unemployment rate in Northern Ireland. In Kirkby, in part of my constituency, the overall rate of unemployment is almost 20 %, and for young people the rate is even higher. Now clearly this is a special case for Community regional aid, but it also makes the general point that where the overall level of economic activity is low, you then have a situation where the position of young people becomes utterly intolerable.

What can the European Community do to help, and specifically in relation to youth unemployment? The Social Fund is already aiding various schemes for training and work experience, and I believe that this should continue to be the means of action and that this aid should be expanded. I would not want to see funds diverted from other sections of the Social Fund such as that for retraining adult unemployed workers, that Mr de Ferranti spoke about earlier. So what this implies is an expansion of the Social Fund as a whole, so that a higher proportion of the aid can go to youth unemployment measures.

There are two kinds of aided projects. There are those projects that help in training, and those that help with work experience. Both have a part to play, but the European Democratic Group believes that the priority should be given to the training projects. This would have two beneficial effects. Training more young people to be skilled workers would be a good investment for the Community as a whole and for the young people themselves, while those being trained would also be removed from the pool of unemployed and make it easier for some of the others to find work. However, a shortage of skilled people able to carry out the training may prove to be a limiting factor in expanding this kind of help. So it will also be necessary to expand work experience schemes where young people are given fairly simple, but socially useful tasks. These schemes can be organized by far fewer skilled people and will usually cost less so it is easier to expand them quickly.

By means of these twin approaches the European dimension, through the Social Fund, could play a real and constructive part in laying the employment foundations for the future.

President. — I call Mr Ceravolo.

Mr Ceravolo.— (I) Mr President, in the short time available I can merely emphasize the need for a very thorough investigation into all the options open to the Community in taking action on social questions, particularly that of employment. We should give special attention to the Social Fund, which was provided for in the Treaty and under subsequent amendments as a general purposes fund to cover the social expenditure involved in setting up the common market. The situation is very different today. Unemployment has become a permanent feature of the economy and has changed its character. Completely new cultural and social aspirations and needs have produced a profound change in the conditions for beginning work.

We must look into the working of the Fund. It has produced results which, quantitatively speaking, are pretty meagre compared with the magnitude of the unemployment problem. We should look at their quality, too. For example, we should find out whether the funds for occupational training match the occupational requirements of the labour market, the techno-

Ceravolo

logical and scientific standards required by reorganization operations and the new advanced technology industries, and we should start bringing the application of the Fund up to date.

Another important point is that the Fund is being increasingly called upon to meet intervention requirements in connection with reorganization operations, and it often happens that funds are requested on no uniform basis, as we shall see in a day or two when we discuss the textile industry and shipbuilding. This means that funds are used mainly for technological reorganization and only secondarily for the purposes of employment. If we really believe that employment is our top priority, the principle must be strictly applied in the use of funds for whatever purpose. It is only on the basis of strict planning and the coordination of all measures designed to achieve our aims that we can hope to register tangible results in tackling an essentially novel phenomenon such as present-day unemployment.

Believing as we do that unemployment can be conquered by strict planning, we have tabled a motion for a resolution designed to ensure that today will not be the end of the debate and that its continuation produces concrete results. It would be deplorable if, having started it, we allowed it to lose its impetus and peter out. We are asking Parliament to make the Committee on Social Affairs and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs responsible for carrying on the debate, examining the effectiveness of all action taken to date at Community level, with special reference to the value of the results achieved and to the purposes and amounts involved, and, finally, for verifying the validity of the implementing instruments and the whole range of funds made available. We are asking for a decision on additional amendments relating to the improvement of working conditions, the establishment of genuine equality between men and women, the reorganization and reduction of the time spent at work, education policy and occupational training. We are asking for an appraisal to be made of the extent to which sectoral economic policies fit in with the regional policy and to which investment of public funds by individual Member States accords with the primary objective of full employment. We want to see, without delay, the preparation and submission to the House of a convincing proposal for a long-term plan in pursuance of the fight against unemployment based on close coordination of all the economic and social policies and which lays down the implementing instruments to be employed and the total amount of financial help judged to be necessary for effective execution of the plan.

We believe that, without a firm and energetically applied plan along those lines, we shall continue to pin our hopes on empirical action and *ad hoc* solutions which, as we have recently seen, produce results

which fall far short of expectations. As President Jenkins said at a conference in Florence, what we need is a historic leap forward; otherwise the situation will get worse, notwithstanding the effect of a shrinking population in the next few years, and it will get worse in terms of both quantity and quality, because of the enormous number of young people and women seeking work for the first time.

President. — I call Mr Pininfarina.

Mr Pininfarina — (I) Mr President, when the number of unemployed reaches six million, as stated in the Socialist question, it means that, for extrinsic or intrinsic reasons, the system is not working properly and that firm and energetic action is required. Such action must be based on private enterprise and the market playing their proper role. To impose further restrictions and controls will achieve nothing, especially if they are used for political manoeuvres at the expense of the market, since the market constitutes the real control and efficiency, and competitiveness the real restrictions which operate.

While so many people are looking for jobs, there is at the same time a demand for labour which is not satisfied. The best answer to this mismatch is mobility in the widest sense of the word. Without sufficient mobility, the unemployment situation will continue to get worse. This calls for mobility geared to production requirements, accompanied by training arrangements and encouraged by specific incentives. Community action should cover these aspects as well as measures of a general character and measures for industrial reorganization.

But mobility will not settle everything in the sense that everyone will gain something from it. In countries like ours and, consequently in the Community, it is essential that co-operation should be based on economic growth and recovery if it is to produce results. When growth becomes possible, it also becomes possible to determine its content: it can be greater in volume, it can make less demands on energy sources and fit in with the needs of the Community by benefiting all the social partners.

A decision in favour of growth constitutes a rejection of the attractions of State aid and backing. State aid is becoming discredited everywhere and it would be a colossal blunder if the Community allowed itself to be tempted by it at this new stage of history. State aid and support are soporifics, like indiscriminate protection and self-sufficiency.

The Community must turn its face against a programme of public works, with its artificially created employment as an end in itself, and investments and subsidized developments which have no future. The need to avoid these pitfalls argues powerfully for planning on a Community scale. Even the jobs which our Socialist colleagues would like to create on a massive scale by reducing hours of work on the lines

Pininfarina

envisaged in their question would, of course, be artificial and subsidized. In economic history there has been a gradual reduction of hours and this process will probably continue. In view of that, suddenly to force the pace would not constitute progress but a return to a way of doing things which is conceivable in a pre-industrialized economy or an economy which imposes uniformity from the centre but is quite unsuitable for the industrial economy of the West. A sudden reduction in working hours would lower productivity at the very moment in time when greater productivity is the proper answer to the enormous problem created by the shortage and cost of energy.

Finally, it should be borne in mind that, before we can create new, genuine jobs, we must make sure of the existing ones. We must have the courage to decide which are to remain and which are to go. Nowadays we have ways and means of considerably alleviating the adverse effects of rationalization measures. This argues for, rather than against, the contention that a policy of growth is the only one likely to succeed. A constructive dialogue between the social partners can produce results of general benefit to the public only so long as it is conducted in a spirit of unprejudiced examination of cause and effect.

President.— I call Mr Vernimmen.

Mr Vernimmen.— (NL) Mr President, I wish to refer to only one aspect of the unemployment question, namely the effect of microelectronics on employment in Western Europe in the 1980s. The microelectronic revolution has already resulted in the loss of numerous jobs, particularly in certain key industries throughout Western Europe. The rate at which jobs are lost will further increase in the 1980s and along with it the level of unemployment in most countries, unless there is a change in government attitudes. Governments must find sufficient political will to pursue a really active policy and to use the additional resources resulting from technological development to improve working and living conditions.

Technical progress does not, of course, always lead to social progress. It can in fact result in social retrogression when workers' interests are sacrificed to the introduction of new technologies. From the outset workers must be prepared for the dangers or the difficulties of the third stage of technological development in the 80s by keeping the new developments under control by means of political action and collective negotiations.

I should also like to point out that the negative effect of the new technologies on employment will be felt first in industries manufacturing products in which mechanical or electro-mechanical elements have been replaced by microelectronic elements. The application of microelectronics to products has also influenced the choice of sites for new factories. There is a danger that a growing proportion of production and therefore

of employment will be transferred to manufacturers of parts. For us this means a move away from Europe to the United States and above all Japan.

A second adverse effect on employment stems from the application of microelectronics to methods of industrial production. One example of the effect the introduction of this technology has had on employment is to be found in the printing sector in a number of Western European countries. A third negative effect is to be found in the service sector, for example the banks. While employment rose in this sector in the early 70s, it is now stagnating or even declining, notwithstanding the increasing demand for bank services. The 80s are likely to see the introduction of innovations in various branches of the service sector. There has, for example, been a substantial increase in Western Europe in the last thirty years in what is known as white-collar work. This tendency has even continued despite the present recession. But in the 80s white-collar work is in danger of decreasing as a result of the automation of office work. In addition, and as a consequence of the large numbers of women working in this sector, the jobs of female workers may well be hardest hit in future.

As regards the effect on working conditions, the introduction of microelectronics is resulting in the concentration of the employment of semi-skilled workers on the one hand and specialized staff on the other. From now on there will not, as a rule, be any more vacancies for skilled manual workers. I therefore feel I must ask very plainly how technological innovation will influence the existing pattern of work organization at the level of employment and of working conditions. Two important objectives in this context are the prevention of the erosion of certain occupations and an assurance of retraining opportunities. As technological innovation is central to all activities in companies and industries, I believe that new objectives such as the reduction of working time, wage increases and the improvement of the quality of manual work should be considered as a priority. If the trade unions exercises effective control, the introduction of new technology can result in economic expansion in the 80s. It then largely depends on the political decisions taken by governments whether this expansion will lead to better living standards and better employment rather than frightening unemployment figures. Both for social reasons and to keep employment up there must be an increase in non-commercial services in the 80s. The money required for this must come from the profits made by sectors producing or using technological products. Even if it is combined with a policy aimed at qualitative growth, technological innovation must make it possible to reduce working hours and increase leisure time in the 80s. Finally, I feel that the Western European governments must be involved in the development of the European electronics industry and coordinate their activities at European level in particular. It is high time this was done. I believe.

President. — I call Mr Modiano.

Mr Modiano — (I) Mr President, the sustained rates of growth which characterized the 60s in the industrialized countries went down during the following decade. Europe felt the full impact of this and, in the new era of slow growth, Europe is still the most vulnerable. The difficulty of structural reorganization, a shortage of energy resources, some delay in technological advance and mutual distrust between the social partners are slowing down Europe's economic growth while the developing countries are intensifying their efforts to find new ways of organizing their economies and new methods of production.

The energy crisis is one of the main reasons why growth is slowing down. Unless, during the 80s, we show determination, the diversion of more and more funds to pay the bill for oil will deprive us of the resources required to promote the growth of our economy. We must, therefore, limit the consequences of the cuts imposed on us by the oil-producing countries by doing everything in our power to restrict the consumption of crude oil and turn to alternative sources. If the Community organized a general energy check-up on the basis of automatic instruments and the Ispra computer, a host of small and medium-sized concerns could be shown how they could make more efficient use of energy. Action on these lines, financed by the Community and the Member States, would create a new attitude to energy consumption in the Community.

We must also counter the effects of the increase in oil prices. Only by increasing the productivity of our economic structure, with resultant reduction of unit costs, can we ensure growth and provide more opportunities for true enterprise. Unless we consolidate and strengthen our ability to compete with the other industrialized nations, we shall never find an effective answer to the immense and terrifying problem of unemployment.

At this juncture, I should like to make an aside and pose the question whether the determination with which some of those who initiated today's debate press for legislative measures, such as one making a firm automatically responsible for bearing the so-called growth risk involved in the various industries, is justified in the light of the discussion we are having today.

But, to return to the main theme, the possibilities which I have described can become realities only if monetary disturbances, which make it unsafe to embark on new ventures, can be brought under control. The oil-producing countries, who are amassing their dollars, must be given confidence in their dollar assets and arrangements must, accordingly, be made to underwrite their value and discourage speculative attempts to upset the monetary system.

However, all this will come to nothing if the fruitless dialogue between North and South does not persuade the industrialized world to show a united front to the developing countries. If the economic and social development of those countries can be assured, relations will become more relaxed and the conditions will exist for cooperation in which, as will be confirmed at the Western Summit in Venice next June, Europe must play a leading part. Meanwhile we must consolidate our common front in the West to cope with the developments which threaten the existence of *détente* and cast doubts on our future.

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

Vice-President

President. — I call Sir Peter Vanneck.

Sir Peter Vanneck. — Mr President, colleagues, I know that our colleagues in this House realize that the United Kingdom Members have been elected by 81 constituencies and thus, unlike so many others, have a duty to remark on the individual circumstances existing there, a duty which must not be discharged, of course, to the undue tedium of the House. My constituency, Cleveland, is part of the north-east of England, an area with notoriously high unemployment, as my colleagues from Durham, Tyne and Wear and Northumbria will confirm. Our difficulties are twice as great as those in the rest of the United Kingdom. In Hartlepool the latest unemployment figures are treble the national average. So there is nothing I welcome more than the assistance we get from the Regional and Social Funds and the European Coal and Steel Community. We in the north-east want more, and I might add that I think such an increase could be most useful in offsetting Britain's excessively high contribution to the Community budget.

Turning to the United Kingdom as a whole, there is a relatively simple way in which we can substantially reduce our unemployment at a stroke. I refer of course to the reintroduction of national service. It is far too long since we last had it, and naturally it would no doubt be different from what it was in the past. The possibility of non-military service, for example civil engineering work, sea defences, educational and social services must be made available for conscientious objectors. There should, moreover, be more emphasis on adventure training, for example mountaineering, gliding — what in England we classify as outward-bound training — to enlarge the recruits' horizons. This already forms part of training in many continental countries.

I think action on these lines would fulfil three important wishes which we should all have at heart. In addition to putting red meat into our existing cadet

Vanneck

schemes and reducing unemployment it would have other advantages. Firstly, and most importantly, this would be a Community minded gesture which would bring us into line with three-quarters of our fellow Member States. We stick out like a sore thumb in the defence role of the Community, as virtually the sole important member without a scheme for training our young men and women in the practical defence of the ideals we all hold so very vital. Historically, of course, this is because we are an island nation with the navy to keep us clear of, and to give us time to react to, continental involvements. But the modern scenario of European defence precludes our clinging to such a happy philosophy. We must have more trained men at instant readiness; our Territorial Army deployment plans already make this clear.

Secondly, to take school leavers off the streets and teach them the values of teamwork, discipline and leadership cannot but be good news at a time of teenage vandalism and sociological immorality. The whole of Europe preaches the importance of emphasizing law and order in our affairs, and National Service gives nothing if it does not give the youth of our country an appreciation of that.

Thirdly, when Russian imperialism is rampant, blatant and so far triumphant — witness Afghanistan — we can only countervail by showing as quickly and strongly as possible our firm intention to meet power with power: *si vis pacem para bellum*, as I have intoned before.

Years ago, at the time of the Berlin airlift, which many of our German colleagues will clearly remember, Britain called up from its active reserves 21 squadrons of jet fighter aircraft. I am proud to have been a pilot in one of them. They largely comprised ex-national servicemen. This is the sort of reserve the United Kingdom could be rebuilding today. You may say that this is a national concern, you may ask what decisions this Parliament can take that will further this practical proposal. Of course, we here can only influence opinion, but I strongly suggest that pressure from us and from the Commission must eventually be heeded at the level of the Council of Ministers. We could provide the Community with another quarter million trained men to give Mr Brezhnev further concentrated thought about his non-nuclear adventures. It would make Britain more civilized, Europe safer and give the world more confidence in our determination to safeguard true democracy. It would also reduce unemployment.

President.— I call Mr Linkohr.

Mr Linkohr. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, unlike the previous speaker I do not feel that we should solve the unemployment problem in the European Community by increasing our armed strength.

(Applause)

But I do not really want to go into this matter. I wish to discuss the question of whether people in the Community will find sufficient jobs even when there is a decline in economic growth and particularly when energy becomes scarcer and therefore more expensive. It is a question, therefore, of creating new jobs by means of a recovery of demand and demand for different products. It is to that part of our motion that I am now referring. This is a question which ultimately cannot be answered by one of the many scientific works and model calculations. It requires a political answer, all the more so as there is no general fixed connection between the consumption of energy, economic growth and the availability of jobs. Politics has in fact a wonderful opportunity to shape matters using all the links in this chain. One thing is certain: economic growth will decline, energy will become scarcer and more expensive and there are ecological limits to both these quantities.

But does this mean the end of full employment? Do we really need a growth rate of 4 to 6% to keep everyone in work and so ensure a minimum of dignity and self-respect? And there is another question: do we really have enough time to adjust ourselves to these new challenges? Is there just cause for pessimism or, as some people in the European Community think, do we need an ascetic state of equal shares for all, or is it enough, by increasing energy prices, to call on the forces of the market to strike a new balance? Is it enough, as some speakers have demanded in this House, to leave this problem to industry? Or is it not in fact a social responsibility from which the State must not be released?

I should like very briefly to take up the question of whether technology is really our enemy, whether it is eliminating jobs. Allow me to quote a few down-to-earth figures on, for example, the effects of labour market policy on environmental protection.

In the Federal Republic of Germany about 220 000 jobs were filled every year between 1970 and 1974 as a result of environmental policy. The corresponding figure for the period from 1975 to 1979 was about 390 000. Despite the considerable financial burden on the economy a positive employment effect remains. In the USA environmental protection programmes have meant that as an average for the period 1970 to 1983 — part of the figure is therefore an estimate — while the rate of economic growth will fall by 0.5% and prices will rise by 0.4%, the unemployment rate will have dropped by 0.15% because of the higher labour content of expenditure on environmental protection.

A 1977 publication of the Federal German Ministry of the Interior reaches the conclusion, and I quote: 'All the investigations that have been carried out in this and other countries into the question of environ-

Linkohr

mental protection and employment have indicated a clear tendency for environmental protection not only to safeguard jobs but also to create new jobs.' Let me give you a few more figures on the effects on employment of various energy structures. The number of jobs which — and I am again referring to the Federal Republic — could be created by the year 2000 through the large-scale utilization of solar energy is very roughly estimated at 0.7 to 1.4 million. In European Community terms, several million jobs, safe jobs for skilled workers, could therefore be created.

Several objections can be raised to these estimates, but they at least go to show that solar energy, for example, not only opens up new paths in the energy sector but will also have a considerable effect on employment.

The effect on employment of specific measures for the substitution of energy in terms of capital and labour is — again in the Federal Republic — estimated as follows: in the construction sector, for example, the rational use of energy in buildings could create about 50 000 jobs and the installation of a long-distance heating system the creation of about 30 000 to 50 000 jobs for construction and 10 000 for operation. I will leave it to you to do the conversion for the Community or your own countries. You will arrive at similar figures.

These few examples will, I feel, suffice to substantiate the following proposition. Labour-intensive measures for the rational utilization of energy and the conversion of infrastructure in the 80s can be used both to offset the shortage of oil and the increase in the price of oil and to combat unemployment effectively. Secondly, the transformation of our industrial — and I might even say cultural — basis into a post-industrial society is a task for society as a whole. Europe must not leave its cultural traditions to the forces of the market.

It might therefore be advisable to make use of the time in which both energy and labour are available in sufficient quantities. The solution of the employment problem can be combined with the solution of the energy problem. And generally speaking, the sooner the structural change to a research and development-intensive economy involving a large service component and new energy-conserving and non-polluting technologies, the easier we will find it to achieve the objective of full employment in the Community.

President. — I call Miss Hooper.

Miss Hooper. — Mr President, it may be true to say that unemployment is not a new problem, but it is steadily becoming a worse problem. Nowhere is this more true, for historical reasons, than in the area of urban or inner city unemployment to which I wish to address myself. I represent the Euro-constituency of

Liverpool, a city whose name is well-known throughout the world as a great port. Now Liverpool is in the lead again but this time as the prototype of a declining major industrial conurbation with all the consequent urban problems, unemployment being the major one. The unemployment rate in certain areas of Liverpool is the highest in the United Kingdom. Mr President, we cannot just abandon some of the great old cities of Europe and leave them to become areas of desolation and diminishing population with no future, whatever may be said in favour of job mobility. So what can the European Community do about the particular problems of urban unemployment?

I have four suggestions. First it can, as it already does, provide grants and finance to soften the blow. The Social Fund already provides funds for retraining and education, and these funds must be used for training in skills. One anomaly of the present situation is the fact, that in spite of its high unemployment figures, there is actually a shortage of skilled workers in Liverpool today, so I advocate an emphasis on skills.

Secondly, there should be more financial incentives and aids to encourage industry to diversify particularly in urban blackspot areas where traditional industries are failing. Again, if I may quote an example from my constituency, Tate and Lyle, who are cane sugar refiners hit by a world decline in sugar consumption and the sugar surpluses created by the Community's CAP, have opened a small factory producing detergent from refined sugar. I am happy to say that the EEC Regional Fund assisted in this experiment. More such projects must be encouraged.

Thirdly, the Community can implement new policies to take account of the urban dimension. To date the Regional Fund has encouraged the growth of green field industrial sites and applications for urban projects which do not fall within the Regional Fund criteria are often simply not considered. To halt the rising urban unemployment trends, the Regional Fund criteria must be altered urgently to allow parcels or packages of projects which individually may not add up to very much, but which under an umbrella scheme could provide jobs where they are most needed.

However, by far the most significant way in which the Community can take positive action is by encouraging the growth of small businesses. Small businesses are in general labour-intensive businesses, and, as has already been said, if each existing small business took on just one or two more employees, then the Community's problem would be solved. I do not wish to reiterate what has already been said in some detail, but I do wish to affirm my support for the inter-party group on small and medium-sized businesses which is deve-

Hooper

loping within this parliament. I also support the suggestions made by our colleague Mr Notenboom in his report on the subject, which was issued as long ago as February 1978 and on which no further action appears to have been taken, and I support the specific suggestion for a Community initiative put forward by my colleague, Sir David Nicholson, in his speech this morning.

Mr President, to revitalize our city centres there must by all means be a sense of direction and a pattern promoted by sound and consistent planning, but we must permit and educate people to use their own initiatives and to contribute to the solution of their own problems. I see no better way of doing this than by encouraging small enterprises to grow and develop into large ones.

President.— I call Mr Seeler.

Mr Seeler. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to refer in this debate to another aspect, which it can be assumed will very profoundly affect and change the structure of our economy and our labour market in the years to come. I am referring to the continuing industrialization of the Third World. We still regard development aid primarily as an act of humanitarian solidarity with the poorest countries of this world. But many of these countries, particularly those described as threshold countries, have in recent years developed an altogether efficient industry, which is now understandably pushing its products on to the European Community market in growing quantities. Many branches of industry here are feeling the pressure of this competition, the textile, steel and shipbuilding industries being just a few examples. Rising unemployment figures are the result of this trend. It must now be realized that subsidies granted by the Community and its Member States to maintain the present industrial structure and import restrictions on such products manufactured by the threshold countries provide little, if any, help and then only in the short term and are in fact short-sighted. We cannot on the one hand grant development aid to help the poor countries and their people to a small share in the prosperity of this world and on the other hand close our markets to them and so make it impossible for them to trade with us. Developing countries will stop being sources of cheap raw materials and cheap labour for the wealthy industrialized countries.

Those who really want to help our industry and particularly the workers concerned, ladies and gentlemen, must actively encourage the structural changes that are required in our countries. The aim must be a division of labour with the Third World. A step in this direction, the right one, as I see it, was the conclusion of the GATT agreements which will lead to a further

liberalization of world trade. I referred to this in my speech during the December part-session. The sooner this structural adjustment is made, the safer will be the new jobs created as a result. Europe's future lies in the new branches of technology, which the new industrial countries of the Third World will not be able to master in the foreseeable future. It is therefore necessary that we should have constant innovation and also a new quality of production.

The less productive activities must be increasingly left to the industrialized Third World countries. By carefully observing developments in the Third World, by supporting research and innovation projects, by always having up-to-date information, by assisting specific restructuring projects that become necessary and also by introducing moderate import arrangements during transitional periods. The Community will be able to pursue something like a forward-looking, preventive structural policy and thus help to prevent major upsets in the labour market.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, such constant adjustment to market developments is undoubtedly an important task, and one which should primarily be performed by industry. But I should not like to leave it entirely to them, as Mr von Bismarck suggested this morning in his speech. There must be public involvement in this development, it seems to me, because it is not only industry but also and probably to a much greater extent, the workers who suffer the consequences of wrong decisions. And industry and its decision-making structures are not without their faults. In the Federal Republic there have recently been examples of corporate mismanagement, which has had very serious consequences, leading in some cases to the bankruptcy of the companies concerned. It is then the unemployed workers who suffer, who walk the streets...

(Applause) (Protest from Mr von Bismarck)

... But public involvement can have an effect on this, Mr von Bismarck.

To conclude, I should like to say once again that in the long term the development aid I have referred to, combined with an international division of labour and extensive liberalization of trade will lead to a substantial increase in trade between the Community and the Third World. After all, only developed countries, countries which have become wealthier, are able to buy goods and services from us in the Community and also to pay for them. So if by increasing development aid we help the Third World to greater prosperity, we shall also be helping ourselves in the long term and safeguarding the jobs here that will exist as a result of increasing exports to the Third World. Despite the concern present developments will cause us in the next few years there is every reason, I feel, for justified optimism in the longer term.

President.— I call Miss Roberts.

Miss Roberts. — Mr President, I think that the House as a whole is united in its view of the seriousness of the unemployment situation in the Community and the social ills which follow from it. Speakers have already referred to the fact that unemployment, expressed in human terms, is a personal tragedy for an individual and for his family, and if one looks at it solely in the dispassionate light of economic terms it is a gross waste of human resources, talents and skills within the Community. Where we differ — and there is a fundamental difference — is, I would submit, in our approach to finding solutions.

I agree with the view expressed by Mr von Bismarck this morning that the Socialist Group seems to have staged this debate more as a propaganda exercise than as a serious attempt to analyse the causes of unemployment within the Community and to find lasting solutions. I say that, because there is no reference anywhere in the Socialist Group's question to the effect of inflation within the Community upon employment levels, and there is no reference anywhere in their question to the contribution which the free enterprise sector of the Community can make towards solving unemployment problems. I submit therefore, Mr President, that this is really not a serious contribution to finding ways and means of solving unemployment.

The key to the Socialist view would seem to lie in the second paragraph of the question which looks to an improvement in the employment situation from a recovery of demand, particularly in the field of infrastructure and public services. I would suggest that to expand the public services before the wealth to pay for them has been created may provide a few extra jobs in the short term, but in the longer term it is a recipe for bankruptcy and more rather than less unemployment. Of course, the public sector has a role to play in the provision of infrastructures but I hope the motion did not intend that one should simply provide infrastructures for the sake of providing work. That smacks very much of the syndrome of employing men and women to dig holes in the ground and fill them in again. It really has no future. The role which the public sector has to play in relation to unemployment and the provision of infrastructures is to provide the infrastructure which is required to enable new industries to grow and to develop, and to help existing industries to expand. I hope that the Regional Fund's policies will bear this very much in mind and will allocate resources in a way which will identify wealth-creating sectors and employment potential areas in the Community and help the Member States to provide the necessary infrastructure.

But if firms are to be encouraged to locate themselves and to expand within the Community, there must be a welcoming and helpful approach by the Member

States. I view with great concern the statement in the Socialist question to the Commission, that investment should be made subject to the right of information and control by each Member State and its workers. I am not altogether sure what that means but it strikes me as having a pretty sinister tone to it, and I do not believe myself that it is the way to encourage small and medium-sized business to locate themselves within the Community. Of course employers have an obligation to act reasonably and responsibly. For that matter, so have workers, and perhaps when we are hearing about the right to work, reference also to the obligations which go hand in hand with that right would not come amiss. It might indeed encourage greater investment within the Community, which is what we need if we are going to find lasting solutions to the unemployment problem. I would plead therefore, Mr President, that there must be a change of approach on the part of our colleagues opposite if we are indeed to tackle this dreadful problem of unemployment.

President. — I call Mrs Roudy.

Mrs Roudy. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, much has now been said and what I add now will only serve to endorse a number of ideas that have already been put forward.

At a time of economic crisis, as we know, unemployment spares no one, but it is obvious that it primarily hits a specific category of people, above all women, but also young people, immigrants and the handicapped. These social categories are always grouped together when there is talk of injustice and discrimination. It can therefore be said that, unlike others, these workers constitute a secondary employment market or a second market which it is too often forgotten is assuming increasing dimensions and in numbers will soon exceed the first. Under the present economic policy rationalization measures are unlikely to reduce the disparities between the first and second of these markets: on the contrary, they accentuate them and further reduce the status of these second-category workers, who find themselves in precarious employment situations, in interim posts, temporary work, as auxiliary or contract staff.

I shall not go into the specific features of the female workforce. That has been very well explained. I would add, however, that this second market and these particular categories of persons constitute a privileged reserve army which wild liberalism uses when it needs them and sends home when they are no longer required. The present trend in part-time work and temporary work is attracting huge numbers of these second-category workers and thus widening the gap even further between them and the first category. Between 1972 and 1977, for example, the proportion of men in part-time work in France rose from 1 to

Roudy

1.16 % and that of women from 9.7 to 13.1 %. Let no one tell me that this part-time and temporary work is open to everyone. We all know very well that it is reserved for the second labour market, those who get the rougher deal.

It is also clear that certain strategies used in the fight against unemployment are explicitly based on the idea of withdrawing women from the labour market and also on sending immigrants back to their countries of origin. Has it been forgotten that the free market economy could not have expanded as it did in the 60s if it had not been for these under-privileged immigrants, who were encouraged to come and work in our developed countries and who are now being encouraged to go back home because we no longer need them?

I should just like to add a few words about young people: they have been referred to before. The delinquency or violence to which some young people resort is quite simply the expression of a kind of despair and of latent anxiety about the future that awaits them.

If we intend to respect workers, we must also recommend that there be an obligation to employ handicapped persons, that their integration into the employment structures be facilitated, that the necessary resources be allocated for the conversion of workplaces, that the principle be adopted that work must be adapted to the workers and, to a certain extent, to the difficulties these workers face.

Technical progress can be the greatest thing in the world if it provides an opportunity to acquire goods, to improve job security and to create free time for leisure and cultural activities. But it can be the worst thing in the world if it results in dismissals and the rejection of certain categories of worker.

A situation of this kind is not impartial. It is not the outcome of chance or fate, it is the product of a given economic order, which is structured in such a way that it always gives priority to the maximum growth of profits to the benefit of the few. With arrogant cowardice the present system, when in crisis, attacks the most vulnerable, the least skilled, the lowest paid, the weakest members of society. Socialists for their part feel that everyone must have an equal right to work. It forms part of human dignity and of a certain way of life. And that right must apply without distinction as to physical condition, race, colour or sex. If, and this is being done, the labour market is fragmented by offering part-time, temporary work and the opening of private temporary employment agencies as a panacea, workers will inevitably be isolated and weakened and inequality will increase. The development of socio-economic ghettos has never been a sign of balance and democracy: on the contrary, it has been a sign of profound imbalance. We should be aware of that.

President. — I call Mr Caborn.

Mr Caborn. — Mr President, it is with great regret that I listened to Sir Peter Vanneck who looks to the war machine as a means of resolving the problems of unemployment. I would suggest that to use the invasion of Afghanistan as an argument for recruiting young people into the armed forces is a reflection of a sick mind.

But turning to the motion before the House, one of the main points in the resolution tabled by the Socialist Group concerns the 35-hour week. It is intended to bring the struggles taking place in the Community to achieve this objective, and indeed the goal of a shorter working life, forcibly to the attention of this Assembly. Certain industries and sectors are more in need of urgent action for the reduction of man-hours than others. The steel industry, Mr President is, I believe, one of them. It is an industry which is undergoing technological change, which has suffered and is still suffering recession, but which is still a major factor in the development of the manufacturing base of Europe, both practically and strategically.

The British Government's approach to this delicate and complex problem is unfortunately to follow the monetarist line. This has led to a reduction of the workforce by one-third — i.e. by 52 000 workers, in an industry that has already lost 100 000 workers over the last ten years — a 20 % reduction in capacity, the closing of flexible and indeed profitable plants and the destruction of whole communities in the United Kingdom. This has come about because the government has reduced state aid and imposed very strict cash limits.

The corporation's losses of last year were given as £300 millions. But it should be noted that £207 millions of that was in fact due to interest charges. That sum should have been used for investment in modernizing plant that had been allowed to decline under private ownership.

This most inhuman and brutal attack upon the British steel industry has been carried out with little or no consultation with the trades unions. It is little wonder that Commissioner Vredeling said yesterday that his knowledge of the British steel industry was in fact derived from the newspapers. Well, I have a message for Commissioner Vredeling: the trades unionists who in fact have invested their lives in the British Steel industry, have received little or no consultation from the Tory Government of the United Kingdom. The chief axeman, Sir Keith Joseph, is trying to achieve in three to six months what the Commission, in their restructuring plans, is hoping to achieve over three to five years. Some of us in fact do not wholly agree with the Commission proposals. The Minister has created the problems, thrown the industry into

Caborn

total conflict and walked away pronouncing that the problems have got to be resolved between the British Steel Corporation and the unions. This is the state of the British steel industry that has been brought about by the intervention of the British Tory Government. In 1980 this is not the way to tackle major problems. We believe that our resolution indicates the way to resolve the many conflicts in industry.

President. — I call Mr Van Minnen.

Mr Van Minnen. — (NL) Mr President, I must say that it is somewhat difficult for me to find the courage as about the fiftieth speaker in this debate to say something about the reduction of working hours and employment. But I find my inspiration in other people's courage and above all by other people's misplaced courage as has become increasingly apparent today on the right wing, the courage to suggest for the umpteenth time that the reduction of working hours can primarily be used as a means of improving efficiency and the exploitation of machines and investments so that even more people can be dismissed straightaway, rather than using the reduction in working hours to achieve the only real objective for which it can be used, that is the creation of new jobs. Of course, those who speak about the reduction of working hours as a supplementary instrument for the creation of employment for more people cannot ignore technical innovation, I realize that. But, and this is the point at issue, they are referred to the need for the collective agreement, the APO in Dutch, but that is a slogan for which the trade unions still find little sympathy in others.

And when we hear today a large undertaking like Telefunken in Germany announcing its intention of restoring itself to health — a revealing expression, Mr President — by dismissing 13 000 people and when we then find in a motion for a resolution on shipbuilding and textiles, like the one we shall be discussing this week, the recommendation that Community aid should be used for the systematic elimination of jobs by means of the humiliating golden handshake, we can, depending on our nature, but fall prey to two states of mind: desperation and cynicism, at least if, and this is not, of course, the case with all of us here, if we have the fate of the workers at heart.

And when we look up the statements that have been made in the European Parliament in the past five years, we see that there has truly been no lack of firmly worded resolutions. The former Members of the European Parliament were critical of the outcome of the tripartite conferences, and they also stated quite clearly that the available work should be distributed by a system of reducing working hours, so that over a five-year period up to 1985 the volume of work performed by each worker might be reduced in a flex-

ible manner by a total of 10 %. That was what my Socialist colleague Wim Albers proposed, but today we must ask ourselves if the Community can really achieve this by 1985. For the European Parliament, there has never been any doubt that only Community action will bring about a change in the trend, and that, it should be noted, is a conclusion which has largely been supported by the Ministers of the Member States, those hypocrites, but in the past five years it has nevertheless remained impossible for practical steps to be taken to combat unemployment. We find that the workers in the Community have gone empty-handed even though their organizations have cut back wage demands to an almost intolerable minimum in the interests of employment. Those who do not realize this today are making a travesty of this whole debate.

This statement raises the importance of today's debate on employment well above the normal level at which this Parliament is accustomed to philosophize. In fact, today's debate can be regarded as a test case for the importance and value of the EEC as a common social market. And the answer to the question as to whether there will eventually be a common *labour market* will be of decisive importance when the workers decide how seriously they should take us.

Finally, Mr President, this new, directly elected Parliament now has the opportunity as the elected representative body of the people to state its views on a clearly worded resolution that has been tabled by my group, the Socialist Group, and the Commission in its present composition, which means that it must act this year, must do its utmost to make 1980 the year in which the luck will turn and in which there will be an opportunity of changing the trend towards the creation of new jobs and the better distribution of what work is available.

And the Council of Ministers has another chance to use the final budget, if we ever have one this year, to show that they really do want to protect tens of thousands of jobs in industries like the steel industry and that they are prepared to use funds to support the training and retraining of those concerned.

At this particular moment the reduction of working hours is not only more necessary than it has ever been; it will also be more difficult to achieve. And this, in one sense, is where the Council has a second chance to eliminate the impression that it is opposed to any real policy to the benefit of workers' living and working conditions, and this expression does not come from me, but from the President of the European Trade Union Confederation, who in a state of fury at the situation said as much in a letter to the President of the Council of Ministers.

But at the same time the Commission clearly has a duty to stop reflecting the views of others and to draw up its own programmes. It is not enough, Mr Vred-

Van Minnen

eling, to say you feel stronger with Parliament's support. In its proposals the Commission must simply go further than what industrial circles say is possible. We can talk this over a hundred times, but that is what has to be done, and that, Mr Vredeling, is the Commission's bounden duty.

President. — I call Mr Fich.

Mr Fich. — (DK) Mr President, recycling is a term very much in vogue today. There is much talk of recycling resources of various kinds so that they are not wasted. What I am going to do today is to recycle a speech. Of course this is not a particularly brilliant idea, but the speech is one which I have delivered time and time again in recent years, and it concerns unemployment among young people. The fact that I can make the same speech time after time is of course because, despite declarations of intent, in recent years amazingly little has actually been done to remedy the situation.

Young people are in a desperate position, not just in our own countries, but throughout the world. There are millions of young unemployed with very little prospect of finding jobs at all. Of course youth employment is an aspect of general unemployment. But it has individual characteristics, and I should like to mention three of them.

For a start, one of our watchwords today is conservation. The only abundant resource in our countries is, as we know, a trained and experienced work force. What we are doing at present can be summed up as throwing away our only resource. We don't train young people and we don't give them job experience. One day we will pay for it. One day we shall need them and they will not be there. We cannot afford not to give them job experience or training if we expect them to come on to the labour market in five or ten years to give us the high production we are, after all, hoping to achieve.

The second aspect is the social cost. I am of course thinking here partly of the purely human misfortune involved. We know that it is disastrous to go straight from school into the dole queue and to stay there for year after year. We also know that it is the socially disadvantaged who are hardest hit by youth unemployment, which further widens social disparities. We also know that the cost in financial terms is high. We are creating social problems for which we will have to pay over the next fifty years. It would be cheaper to pay now to solve the problem of youth unemployment.

Thirdly, there are the political consequences of youth unemployment. Many of us in this Parliament are old enough to remember Fascism in Europe. The others will have read about it. Similar tendencies can be observed today. I do not wish to be overdramatic, but there are Fascist tendencies in some countries. Unem-

ployed young people are easy prey in such a situation. Society has not given them anything, so what do they owe to society? The logic of the matter is clear. Those politicians who are neglecting to invest in solutions to this problem will be to blame if Fascism again sweeps Europe.

I should like to conclude with a question. What are we going to do about youth unemployment? There is no shortage of reports and proposals. It is obvious that what is needed is a completely different strategy, a completely new determination at all levels, local, national and international, if these problems are to be solved. I myself do not believe that we will find the final answer to youth unemployment until we realize that young people must have a right to training and a right to work, just as there is a right to school education and an old age pension. The consequences of failure to accept this could be exceedingly dangerous. In the long term I do not think that young people will put up with the present situation.

President. — I call Mrs Desmond.

Mrs Desmond. — As Socialists we view the attainment of full employment as central to our ideal of a society based on justice and equality. The existence of a reserve army of unemployed not only demoralizes those unfortunate enough to be enlisted in that army but must of necessity have an enslaving effect on all workers and considerably reduce their options and potential for self-fulfilment.

This debate is therefore of fundamental importance to all of us in this group, but perhaps to none more so than those of us who represent areas such as Ireland in this Parliament.

Long before the crisis of the '70s, unemployment posed a very serious problem for us. We have never possessed the economic infrastructures required to create jobs on the scale needed. The lifting of protective barriers, coupled with the onset of the recession, brought our problems to crisis proportions in the '70s.

Our most basic need at the moment is to meet the challenge of the future. We must facilitate improvements to the infrastructure of which I have spoken. Our road network is very seriously deficient; 3 1/2 million acres of Irish land lie waste and could with sufficient capital be made productive; harbour development is required. The development of Cork harbour in the constituency which I represent, with its vast planned potential for increased employment, has been commenced with aid from the Regional Fund, and it is very important that further progress should continue on this project this year and in subsequent years. There is obvious potential for development of the food industry in my country, notably in the processing of the produce of the land and seas around our shores.

Desmond

I must confine my remarks, however, to the question of the creation of employment and the preservation of one important unit of food processing in the constituency which I represent. The Irish Sugar Company is one of our most important industries, directly employing some 4 000 people and indirectly providing employment for some 16 000 people. That industry could be threatened by Community action in relation to sugar beet quotas. Should your proposal to reduce the quotas and abolish the higher intervention prices applicable to Ireland, the UK and Italy go through, it could have a drastic effect on employment and on the prosperity of the regions in which the factory towns are situated. Two of those towns, as I said, are in the constituency I represent. I therefore avail myself of this opportunity to plead that the interests of the workers of those towns be upheld.

Youth employment is of very particular concern to all of us. In Ireland 50 % of our population is under 25 years of age and our youth unemployment is above the Community average. The problem for us is also a long-term problem: we have therefore a vital interest in a comprehensive Community policy on youth employment.

We must commence, however, with the educational system, which many of our young people see as irrelevant to them and which does not meet their actual needs. Some guarantee of a particular job for a particular time must be linked with the educational and retraining programmes we will operate in the future for our young people. Chronic unemployment has a particularly devastating effect on young people and also has very grave social, economic and political dangers. I think our attitudes to policy formation must be based more on the recognition of the essential right of every young person to independence and prospects for personal development which the job for which he or she is suited brings to him or her.

The position of women workers has been dealt with adequately in Parliament today. That position requires very special attention. The proportion of women workers unemployed in the Community has gone up from 43 % in 1978 to 45 % in 1979. Drastic action is needed to compensate women for the discrimination perpetrated against them in the past in so far as access to and conditions of employment are concerned. Special working hours and parental leave must apply in the future to both sectors if justice is to be done to our women workers.

In promoting the idea of the reduction of working hours, I would just say that, while there has been opposition to this in the past it has in fact proved itself by increased production. Any further reduction, however, must be accompanied by provision for an adequate living wage. I believe that too often in the past, indeed even in the present, overtime has constituted an indispensable element of the living wage in far too many instances.

I will conclude by saying that I feel confident that with the holding of this debate in Parliament a start can be made on the formulation of a policy to bring the basic justice too long denied to very many citizens of the Community.

President. — I call Mr Kavanagh.

Mr Kavanagh. — Mr President, I can deal only very inadequately with one area of this very wide topic. As vice-chairman of the Youth Committee, obviously I want to talk about youth employment, but only very briefly.

The figures have all been given. At the present time there are two million young people under the age of 25 unemployed in the Community; they form 44 % of the total unemployed. Ten years ago the corresponding figure was 400 000. The total number of young unemployed has increased fivefold in ten years, and its proportion of total unemployment has increased too. The prospects for the future are not very encouraging either, since the number of young people reaching working age between 1980 and 1985 is expected to increase by one million. In Ireland, however, the young labour force will continue to grow until the end of the century as a consequence of its population structure. At present 50 % of the population is under 25.

For Socialists the extent of the problem of youth unemployment is the most serious aspect of the present crisis in employment. Young people are brought up to believe that they have a right to a job, and they see that their significance in the eyes of society is measured in terms of their job. Yet our society, our economic system, does not provide them with a job, and this alienates so many of them. Some turn to violence, the vast majority become totally apathetic.

We in the Socialist Group have been concerned for some considerable time with trying to find solutions to this problem. Our group was the first in the old Parliament to raise the issue of youth unemployment and called for the Social Fund to finance measures for the retraining of young people. We have continually called for further Community measures to combat the problem. We have supported the Commission's proposal for extending the possibilities available under the European Social Fund. We have also endeavoured every year to increase the amount available for measures to combat youth unemployment in the Community budget.

However, though measures and aid for retraining are positive and beneficial, they do not provide many new jobs. The new measures under the Social Fund do indeed provide aid for projects to employ young people, but this is very new and at any rate only a small proportion are likely to benefit from it. I believe

Kavanagh

that the solution to the problem of youth employment lies in the measures proposed in the resolution tabled by the Socialist Group, namely, the creation of new jobs through public investment, coupled with improved education and training and coordinated with policies on career guidance and placement.

President. — I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — It grieves me a little to hear the hypocrites across the floor talking about unemployment, when their government in Westminster is cynically and deliberately creating it. In fact, on every occasion, whether it was when the Wales TUC invited the Prime Minister to see the consequences of their action in South Wales, or when the Socialist members of the Social Affairs Committee, asked that the committee come to Britain to see the problem for themselves, the Tories rejected the proposals.

But this does not surprise me. What we have over there is a set of Tory pre-programmed robots without hearts. The mere fact that they look human is only the result of technological progress. No human beings could cynically make 50 000 people unemployed in the steel industry and give the workers — if they were given any opportunity to discuss it at all — three or four months to try and solve a major problem. I said in a previous debate that Sir Keith Joseph was acting indiscriminately, like a blind butcher slashing around in an abattoir. This time I have to say that he is deliberately removing the heart from all the communities with the efficiency of a skilled surgeon. In the case of Consett, he has not even got a patient. Consett, a mining area in the northeast of England, is profitable. Consett has been modernized and had a massive amount of capital investment. There is a need, as the Sunday Times editorial said this week, for small, flexible plants. We have had a very responsible workforce. We cannot say the same about British Steel Corporation management. Today's Guardian calls for an enquiry into the Corporation's stewardship. I support the Wales TUC in their call for the immediate dismissal of Sir Charles Villiers and his cohorts, and for their replacement by an interim management whilst an enquiry is carried out into their operations.

In conclusion Mr Chairman, I support the resolution tabled by the Socialist Group, because the social and economic consequences of unemployment cannot be stressed too strongly. It must be part of our ammunition and propaganda in our quest to create a new social order, that functions for the benefit of the workers.

President. — I call Mr O'Connell.

Mr O'Connell. — Mr President, I am grateful for the opportunity of speaking on this issue. Firstly, I do not want to adopt a nationalistic approach to the problem, because as a European socialist, the unemployment

problem in Italy, in Britain or in Northern Ireland, is as much my concern as that in Ireland, the country I represent. However, I do think that it is important for us to look very seriously at the question of unemployment. We as a Parliament will be judged by what we have done to solve it. We must say to the Council of Ministers, that we demand political action and that the political will must be there to solve the unemployment problem.

I was shocked to hear the Member from the Conservative benches say that military conscription was the answer. Hitler provided the same answer. He solved the unemployment problem by embroiling the world in war. As civilized human beings we cannot even consider this option.

I would like to mention an aspect of the unemployment problem which has been overlooked, namely the imbalance between supply and demand on the labour market. In my country alone massive unemployment goes hand in hand with a chronic shortage of skilled workers. I believe that the educational system is totally out of step with the needs of the labour market. We need to undertake a thorough overhaul of the educational system to equip our young people for jobs. This is one area which we in Ireland must tackle urgently, otherwise we run the risk of becoming the hewers of wood and the drawers of water of the European Community.

Finally, Mr President, I hope that today's debate will not produce mere pious platitudes and that this resolution will produce action.

President. — I call Mr Vredeling.

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I am glad that I am to speak while you are in the Chair. The first time I spoke under your chairmanship was years ago at a meeting of the Federation of Youth Groups of the Dutch Labour Party. We were rather younger in those days.

I should like to begin by making a somewhat critical remark. I have followed the whole debate since 9 o'clock this morning until now, and what I am really asking myself now is whether this has in fact been the ideal, optimal way for Parliament to hold a debate. I do not intend to answer the question, but I will put it. It is, of course, for you to answer this question. I feel that a number of matters that have been raised here could have been dealt with differently if the debate had been conducted on a somewhat more clear-cut basis. We have published various documents on the redistribution of labour, on part-time work and the problem of working women, about which much has been said. But today the reactions have been spontaneous, without reference to our documents and without criticizing them where necessary, which a Parliament has every right to do.

Vredeling

I do not know, Mr Von Minnen, whether I can say that I feel any stronger for this debate. You beat me to it, and I will not repeat it. For example, four resolutions have been announced, only two of which have been distributed. No one has asked me to comment on these resolutions on the Commission's behalf. It is, moreover, apolitical not to ask the executive to react to resolutions that are about to be adopted. But only two of them have been distributed. So I could only comment on two. The others are not available. The Socialist resolution, which has been discussed, is not available, and the resolution of the Group of the EPP is not available, and I find that rather strange. I therefore felt compelled to voice this criticism.

And now to the debate itself. I believe I can say that everyone recognizes the seriousness of the problem of unemployment. Various ways of solving the problem have been indicated. Mr von Bismarck suggested that there should be no ideological speculation. I wondered how he could say that, because his speech was based entirely on ideology, which I do not, of course, begrudge him in any way. I believe that this is a pre-eminently political subject, and political lines should be drawn.

The debate has been too extensive for a brief summary. There have been fifty-six speakers, of whom 25 % are now present. It is impossible to wind up a debate of this kind. But I should like to say one or two things with the aid of the questions that have been put to the Commission. Mr Vetter began with a remark on the tripartite conference, and Mr van der Gun backed him up and asked various questions on this subject. Mr Vetter suggested that a forthcoming tripartite conference should be devoted to the question of the redistribution of labour. But the last tripartite conference broke up in an atmosphere of complete disagreement between employers and employees on this point. Would it be wise to announce now that another tripartite conference was being held on the same subject? I feel that the time is not yet completely ripe for this. The Commission will continue its efforts, as it was invited to do by the European Council, to get the employers and employees to agree on this point at European level.

Mr van der Gun asked how the reduction in working hours should be paid for. Dutch studies and other sources show, as I believe someone has already said, that there is an absolute correlation between the reduction of working hours and the manner in which the consequences of such a reduction are offset in wages.

Work for 40 hours, pay for 40 hours; work for 35 hours, pay for 40 hours. If that is to be the position that is adopted, the consequences for employment, as econometric analyses show, will be disastrous. So something else must be done as on the effect on wages policy. I must refer expressly to the link between reduction of working hours, employment and compensation to the worker. And then we come to the autonomy of the two sides of industry. Mr van der

Gun asked about this. In our documents we have proposed that there should be framework agreements, very weak precursors of something which looks remotely like collective labour agreements. In every Member State we have laws and official measures to do with collective labour agreements. So is there any question of the autonomy of the two sides of industry? In addition, this is a very one-sided remark, since one of the two sides, the trade unions, is asking us for it. There is rather more variation in the employers' point of view. Some say that this would affect autonomy in the negotiation of wage rates. I do not believe that this is correct. It will be an autonomous decision by employers and employees organized at European level to adopt a course of this kind, and by definition this will not affect the autonomy to negotiate wage rates. I must therefore utterly reject this criticism.

Mr de Ferranti asked me about the Economic and Social Committee. I can reply very briefly. It is, of course, remarkable that so little reference has been made to the Economic and Social Committee in this debate. The connection between the Economic and Social Committee, the tripartite conference and the Standing Committee on Employment is complicated. We are working on an improvement in this. As you know, a proposal for the restructuring of the tripartite conference is now before the Council, which will be discussing it with the two sides of industry. I very much hope that we will solve the problem. The relationship between the bodies at Community level to which you referred is indeed complicated but nevertheless necessary so that the two sides of industry can be involved in the work. I also hope that it will be possible for us to put forward a proposal for the simplification of the structure.

Mr Price spoke about unemployment among young people. As from this year we have been able to grant direct aid from the Social Fund to projects aimed at the creation of jobs for young people in companies and in the public sector. 72m EUA was set aside for this purpose in 1979. We had proposed more for this year, and it now depends on what happens with the budget. I told Parliament last year that we had broken the sound barrier, as I called it then. The Social Fund can now intervene directly in the creation of jobs, particularly for young people. I do not want to go into everything that has been said about the problems connected with working women, which is very closely connected to this subject. I look forward, Mrs Roudy, to an early opportunity of exchanging views with the special committee that has been set up for this purpose. But I should like to leave the discussion of the whole problem of employment of women until that exchange of views takes place. It would also be better to discuss Mrs Dekker's remarks on that occasion. The fact, Mr President, that I am having to reply so hastily is an indication that the somewhat critical remarks with which I began were not unfounded.

President. — Your somewhat critical remarks have been noted.

I call Mr Galland on a point of order.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, I refer to the Rules of Procedure in connection with two points.

The first concerns Rule 47. I should like to draw the President's attention to yesterday's debate on the oral question with debate by the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members on the constant increase in housing costs. This oral question with debate was tabled by Mr Blaney on behalf of his group. Yesterday the President stated that the procedure had been complied with. But it was not, Mr President, and I insist that you draw the Bureau's attention to this.

In his statement Mr Bonde stated very clearly that the four Danish members of this group were not involved, since they did not agree to this question. At the risk of finding that the number is lower than five, it is essential that the signatures of those tabling an oral question with debate appear on the question, which is not true of the photocopied version I have now in my hands.

Far more important for me is the second point, which concerns Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure. I noted from what Mrs Veil said on Monday that speaking time for the debate on Afghanistan would not be allocated pursuant to Rule 28. For three months, ladies and gentlemen, we have had a peaceful situation thanks to the technical reforms initiated by the Nord report. I would remind the House that this report also provided for various changes with respect to speaking time.

For the first time, on the subject of Afghanistan, we shall not be respecting the Rules of Procedure, and speaking time is to be allocated in a different and arbitrary manner. I wish to say that I personally find that this is a serious mistake, and I am certain that it will have repercussions in the weeks to come when Mr Pannella takes advantage of it. I wish to insist that what I have said will be noted in the minutes of this debate, and that you, Mr President, will inform the Bureau of my view that we are making a fundamental mistake in not respecting Rule 28 as to the allocation of speaking time and that any other solution is wrong.

I shall continue to oppose Mr Pannella's arguments on this subject.

President. — With regard to your second point, I would point out that Parliament, on a proposal from the President, adopted the allocation of speaking time as proposed.

With regard to your first point, technically you are right, but the matter belongs to the past so that all we can do is draw lessons for the future.

9. *Speaking time*

President. — With regard to the debate on the Council statement on the Italian Presidency I propose, on the basis of what was agreed when fixing the agenda and after consultation with the political groups, to allocate speaking time as follows :

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| — Council | 45 minutes |
| — Members : | 135 minutes |
| broken down as follows : | |
| — Socialist Group, Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) and the European Democratic Group : | 20 minutes each |
| — Other groups and non-attached Members : | 15 minutes each |
| TOTAL | 180 minutes |

10. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, 16 January 1980 with the following agenda :

9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m. :

- Vote on urgency of a proposal for a resolution
- Vote on request for an early vote on six motions for resolutions
- Debate on Afghanistan (on the basis of seven motions for resolutions)
- Council statement on the Italian Presidency (followed by a debate)

3 p.m. :

- Voting time

5.30 p.m. to 7 p.m. :

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

The sitting is closed.

(*The sitting was closed at 7.20 p.m.*)

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 16 JANUARY 1980

Contents

| | | | |
|--|-----|---|-----|
| 1. Approval of minutes | 112 | | |
| 2. Documents received | 112 | | |
| 3. Membership of committee | 113 | | |
| 4. Decision on urgency | 113 | | |
| 5. Decisions on requests for an early vote | | | |
| <i>Mr Rogers; Mr Bangemann; Mr Klepsch;</i> | | | |
| <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Rogers; Mr Fantì; Mr</i> | | | |
| <i>Pannella; Mr Herman</i> | 113 | | |
| <i>Points of order: Mr de la Malène; Mr</i> | | | |
| <i>Pannella; Mr Glinne; Mr Pannella . . .</i> | 114 | | |
| 6. Situation in Afghanistan — Motions for | | | |
| resolutions by <i>Mr Berkhouver and others</i> | | | |
| <i>(Doc. 1-650/79/rev.); Mr Fantì and others</i> | | | |
| <i>(Doc. 1-656/79); Mr Glinne and others</i> | | | |
| <i>(Doc. 1-660/79); Mr Tyrrell and others</i> | | | |
| <i>(Doc. 1/662/79); Mr Klepsch and others</i> | | | |
| <i>(Doc. 1/665/79/rev.); Mr Druon and others</i> | | | |
| <i>(Doc. 1-666/79); Mr Scott-Hopkins and</i> | | | |
| <i>others (Doc. 1-667/79)</i> | 115 | | |
| <i>Mr Ruffini, President-in-Office of the</i> | | | |
| <i>Council; Mrs van den Heuvel (S); Mr</i> | | | |
| <i>Blumenfeld (EPP)</i> | 115 | | |
| <i>Point of order: Mr Pannella; Mr</i> | | | |
| <i>Fergusson (ED); Mr Berlinguer; Mr Rey</i> | | | |
| <i>(L); Mr Druon (EPD); Mrs Castellina;</i> | | | |
| <i>Mr Romualdi; Mr Colombo; Lady Elles;</i> | | | |
| <i>Mr Ansart; Mr Berkhouver; Mr</i> | | | |
| <i>Capanna; Mr Møller; Mrs Macciocchi;</i> | | | |
| <i>Mr Paisley; Mr Coppieters; Mrs Weiss;</i> | | | |
| <i>Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the</i> | | | |
| <i>Commission</i> | 120 | | |
| 7. Council statement on the Italian presid- | | | |
| ency | | | |
| <i>Mr Ruffini, President-in-Office of the</i> | | | |
| <i>Council; Mr Glinne (S); Mr Klepsch</i> | | | |
| <i>(EPP); Mr Scott-Hopkins (ED)</i> | 133 | | |
| 8. Urgent procedure | 146 | | |
| 9. Votes | 146 | | |
| | | <i>Employment situation in the Community</i> | |
| | | <i>Glinne motion for a resolution (Doc.</i> | |
| | | <i>1-659/79):</i> | |
| | | <i>Points of order: Mr Van Miert; Mrs</i> | |
| | | <i>Seibel-Emmerling; Mr Sarre; Mr Arndt</i> | 146 |
| | | <i>Macario and others motion for a resolu-</i> | |
| | | <i>tion (Doc. 1-661/79):</i> | |
| | | <i>Mr Glinne; Mr Enright</i> | 147 |
| | | <i>Points of order: Mr Pannella; Mrs Catel-</i> | |
| | | <i>lina</i> | 147 |
| | | <i>Spencer, Nielsen and others motion for a</i> | |
| | | <i>resolution (Doc. 1-669/79):</i> | |
| | | <i>Points of order: Sir Fred Warner; Mr</i> | |
| | | <i>Irmer; Mr von Hassel; Mr Sarre; Mr</i> | |
| | | <i>Damseaux</i> | 148 |
| | | <i>Rejection of the motion for a resolution . .</i> | 149 |
| | | <i>De la Malène and others motion for a reso-</i> | |
| | | <i>lution (Doc. 1-670/79):</i> | |
| | | <i>Point of order: Mr Van Miert</i> | 149 |
| | | <i>Rejection of the motion for a resolution . .</i> | 149 |
| | | <i>Bonaccini and others motion for a resolu-</i> | |
| | | <i>tion (Doc. 1-671/79):</i> | |
| | | <i>Mrs Salisch</i> | 149 |
| 10. Invalidation of votes taken on the employ- | | | |
| ment situation in the Community | 149 | | |
| 11. Votes | 149 | | |
| | | <i>Employment situation in the Community</i> | |
| | | <i>Glinne motion for a resolution (Doc.</i> | |
| | | <i>1-659/79):</i> | |
| | | <i>Points of order: Mr Cottrell; Mr Collins</i> | 149 |
| | | <i>Rejection of the motion for a resolution . .</i> | 150 |
| | | <i>Macario and others motion for a resolu-</i> | |
| | | <i>tion (Doc. 1-661/79):</i> | |
| | | <i>Points of order: Mrs Weber; Mr Griffiths;</i> | |
| | | <i>Mr Glinne; Mr de la Malène</i> | 151 |
| | | <i>Adoption of the resolution</i> | 151 |
| | | <i>Spencer, Nielsen and others motion for a</i> | |
| | | <i>resolution (Doc. 1-669/79):</i> | |

| | | | |
|--|-----|---|-----|
| <i>Adoption of the resolution</i> | 151 | <i>Boserup; Mr de Goede Mr Fanti</i> | 158 |
| <i>De la Malène and others motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-670/79):</i> | | <i>Rejection of the motion for a resolution</i> . . | 158 |
| <i>Rejection of the motion for a resolution</i> . . | 151 | <i>Points of order: Mr Paisley; Mrs Kellett-Bouman; Mrs Ewing</i> | 159 |
| <i>Bonaccini and others motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-671/79):</i> | | <i>Glinne and others motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-660/79):</i> | |
| <i>Mr Klepsch; Mr Delors; Mr Fanit; Mr Spencer</i> | 151 | <i>Amendments seeking to replace the entire motion for a resolution</i> | 159 |
| <i>Rejection of the motion for a resolution</i> . . | 151 | <i>Rejection of the amendments</i> | 159 |
| <i>Frischmann and others motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-672/79):</i> | | <i>Points of order: Mr Arndt; Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne</i> | 159 |
| <i>Rejection of the motion for a resolution</i> . . | 152 | <i>Explanations of vote: Mr Friedrich; Mrs Castellina; Mr Glinne</i> | 161 |
| <i>Point of order: Mr Scott-Hopkins</i> | 152 | | |
| <i>Afghanistan</i> | 153 | 12. <i>Urgent procedure</i> | 163 |
| <i>Points of order: Mr Bangemann; Mr Tyrell; Mr Paisley; Mr Romualdi; Mr Pannella; Mr Ansart; Mr Fanti; Mr Druon; Mr Klepsch; Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Berlinguer; Mr de la Malène</i> | 153 | 13. <i>Membership of Parliament</i> | 163 |
| <i>Fanti and others motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-656/79):</i> | | <i>Points of order: Mr Glinne; Mr Bangemann; Mr Colombo</i> | 163 |
| <i>Amendment to the first indent of the preamble: Mr Fanti</i> | 156 | 14. <i>Agenda</i> | 164 |
| <i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i> | 156 | <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Fanti</i> | 164 |
| <i>Amendment to the second indent of the preamble</i> | 156 | 15. <i>Votes</i> | 165 |
| <i>Point of order: Mr Patterson</i> | 156 | <i>Afghanistan (continued)</i> | 165 |
| <i>Amendment to paragraph 1</i> | 156 | <i>Druon and others motion for a resolution (Doc. 1666/79):</i> | |
| <i>Amendment to paragraph 2</i> | 157 | <i>Mr Druon</i> | 165 |
| <i>Explanations of vote: Mr Galland; Mr Pannella</i> | 157 | <i>Scott-Hopkins and others motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-667/79):</i> | |
| <i>Point of order: Mr Capanna</i> | 157 | <i>Amendment seeking to replace the entire motion for a resolution</i> | 165 |
| <i>Explanations of vote: Mr Fich; Mrs</i> | | <i>Adoption of the resolution</i> | 165 |
| | | 16. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i> | 166 |

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received

(a) the following motions for resolutions, tabled pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure:

— by Mr Enright, Mr Caborn, Miss Quin, Mr Cohen, Mr Seal, Mr Griffiths, Mr Boyes, Ms Clwyd, Mr van Minnen and Mr Rogers, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the British Rugby Union tour of South Africa (Doc. 1-652/79),

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee;

— by Mr Seefeld, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the seat of the European Parliament (Doc. 1-654/79),

President

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee ;

- by Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the right of self-determination of the people of Western Sahara (Doc. 1-655/79),

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee ;

- by Mr Romualdi, Mr Almirante, Mr Petronio and Mr Buttafuoco, on the invasion of Afghanistan (Doc. 1-663/79),

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee ;

- by Mr Almirante, Mr Petronio, Mr Buttafuoco and Mr Romualdi, on the problems of migrant workers in the Community Member States (Doc. 1-664/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment ;

- by Mrs Majj-Weggen, Mr Vergeer, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Bersani, Mr Beumer, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mr Estgen, Mr Wawrzik, Mr Michel, Mr von Bismark and Mrs Rabbethge, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), on the export of baby food to and the sale of baby food in the developing countries (Doc. 1-668/79),

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

(b) the following oral question with debate :

- by Mr Beumer and Mr Penders, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), to the Commission on the boycott imposed by the Arab States (Doc. 1-657/79).

3. Membership of committees

President. — I have received from the Socialist Group a request to appoint Mr Ove Fich as member of the Committee on Budgets to replace Mrs Gredal. Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

4. Decision on urgency

President. — I consult Parliament on the urgency of the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation on trade agreements between Southern Rhodesia and the EEC (Doc. 1-658/79).

Urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this item be placed on the agenda for the sitting on Friday, 18 January 1980, and I hope that the Committee on Development and Cooperation will table a report on this subject as soon as possible.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

5. Decisions on requests for an early vote

President. — The next item is the decision on the requests for an early vote on six motions for resolu-

tions seeking to wind up the debate on the oral question (Doc. 1-616/79) on the employment situation in the Community.

We shall begin with the Glinne and others motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-659/79).

I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Madam President, is there any logical reason for taking these votes separately? The motions that are in front of us are all to do with the same topic and I think it would be more logical and easier for Members to take stances on particular aspects of the reports if early votes were taken on them together, rather than separately. It is the same issue, after all. I wonder if there is any particular reason why this should not be so. It at least saves us six votes now.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, this proposal would simplify matters but I do not feel it is in keeping with yesterday's debate, since although we all share the concern over the employment situation at the moment, it nevertheless became apparent yesterday that the various groups have different views.

(*Interruption*)

Well, if it is a matter of an early vote, we can vote together on that. I thought we were going to vote on the Social Fund.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, if I understood Mr Rogers rightly, he is suggesting simply that we decide on an early vote this afternoon for all these motions. In my opinion we can deal with them in a single vote. There is no need to take seven separate votes because we shall be voting on the content this afternoon.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (I) I am sorry, Madam President, but I think your procedure is the only correct one. I therefore trust that your procedure — a separate vote on each request — will be followed.

President. — I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Madam President, I am not suggesting to the House that we vote on the substance of the motions. That will happen when the vote takes place. All we are now being asked to do is to decide whether we want an early vote on all of them. In fairness to all the political groups, even the smaller ones, I think it would be wise if we took an early vote on all of them at the same time. I am not concerned with the substance of any particular motion as such.

President. — I call Mr Fanti.

Mr Fanti. — (*I*) Madam President, I think there is a precedent for this, and one that occurred not so long ago. As recently as yesterday morning we took a single vote on the urgency of all the motions on Afghanistan, which we are about to discuss. I suggest that we apply the same procedure here, too, by which I mean a single vote on the request for an early vote, but of course when we get round to voting we should still be able to discuss the motions separately.

President. — If the House is agreed, I propose that we take a single vote on all of these requests for an early vote.

As Mr Fanti has just pointed out, this was the procedure adopted yesterday with regard to the motions on Afghanistan.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Madam President, it is precisely because there is a precedent that I do not want this to become the accepted procedure and then one of those practices which are not in line with the Rules of Procedure. Simply because there has been this precedent, I hope we can quickly decide to carry on with separate votes. If we had done this at the outset, voting would probably have been over by now.

President. — I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — (*F*) I am sorry, Madam President, but I cannot agree with Mr Pannella. Parliament cannot decide to take an early vote and then decide to take another early vote, when the subjects of the vote are one and the same. The House has to show a bit of common sense.

President. — I propose that we take a single vote. Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I put to the vote the six requests for an early vote. The requests are adopted.

The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at 3 p.m. today.

I call Mr de la Malène on a point of order.

Mr de la Malène. — (*F*) Madam President, I should like to raise a procedural point in connection with the request for early votes on these six motions for resolutions.

I note that some of the motions have been amended, although there has been no change in the order of the motions as a result of these amendments. I am not objecting to this in principle but I do feel it is a serious matter from the procedural point of view. You know how important the order of the vote is, since it can radically alter the stances of the groups. After a motion has been tabled and assigned a certain place in the order, I just wonder where the Rules of Procedure allow the motion to be amended without a

change in the order. I should like you to consider his procedural point.

President. — The point you raise, Mr de la Malène, is certainly one which concerns procedure. It is difficult to give an immediate ruling and the matter will have to be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, so that it can be sorted out for future debates.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, I have learned from Mr de la Malène something which I did not know before. Have these motions been amended?

President. — Some of the motions have been amended by their authors. This is what Mr de la Malène is referring to, that the final text is not exactly the same as the initial version. Mr de la Malène feels that in some way this makes it a new motion, which ought to follow the other original motions.

The problem is whether an amendment which a group decides to make to a motion has to be considered a new motion, which does not replace the first and which must follow the other motions.

A ruling on this can be given only by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. Perhaps each case should be considered on merit, to decide whether there is genuine substitution of the text or whether there has simply been change of wording which does not alter the meaning.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) I want to point out, Madam President, that the significant fact there is that the authors are the same. This is still the original motion, even if the text has been changed by an amendment.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) I am very sorry, Madam President, but I think the first point concerns the majority of us poor Members. The updated versions of the texts do not seem to have been distributed, and we do not have them at the moment. For my part, Madam President, I should like to know exactly what Mr de la Malène is talking about. He is obviously talking about amendments which the authors have made to their own texts. Yesterday we voted on the urgency of the original texts and there is no provision in the Rules of Procedure for stylistic alterations. Anyway, perhaps the alterations are more than just to the style. What is more, Madam President, may I point out that we are entitled to amend the proposed texts within a given time. If I am not given an opportunity to look at a text when it is changed, I cannot exercise my right to table amendments. I hope you will bear in mind the difficult circumstances in which we are working.

President. — Mr Pannella, the new texts are going to be distributed right away, if this has not already been done. I do not have the two versions in front of me and I cannot say whether significant changes have been made. I feel that Mr de la Malène's query was prompted by a desire for a general ruling for the future, rather for an answer to a specific point. We cannot spend any more time on this matter, which I have already said will be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedures and Petitions. I hope that the final versions of the motions will be distributed as quickly as possible, so that each Member may propose amendments or at least know what he is voting on this afternoon.

6. Situation in Afghanistan

President. — The next item is the joint debate on seven motions for resolutions on Afghanistan.

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-650/79/rev.), tabled by Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Vanderpoorten, Mr Bangemann, Mr Calvez, Mr Damseaux, Mr Geurtsen, Mr Irmer, Mr Jürgens, Mr Louwes, Mrs Martin, Mrs Nielsen, Mr Nord, Mrs Scrivener, Mrs von Alemann, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Maher, Mr Delatte, Mr Haagerup, Mr Baudis, Mr Rey, Mr Galland and Mr Pininfarina on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-656/79), tabled by Mr Fanti, Mr Segre, Mr Spinelli, Mr Amendola, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Berlinguer, Mrs Bonaccini, Mr Cardia, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Carossino, Mr Ceravolo, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr De Pasquale, Mr Ferrero, Mr Galluzzi, Mr Gouthier, Mr Ippolito, Mr Leonardi, Mr Pajetta, Mr Papapietro, Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Veronesi, on relaunching the policy of détente after the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-660/79), tabled by Mr Glinne, Mrs Van den Heuvel, Mr Arndt, Mr Colla, Mrs Cresson, Mr Dankert, Mr Delmotte, Mr Estier, Mr Bruno Friedrich, Mr Gabert, Mr Hänsch, Mr Jaquet, Mr Lange, Mr Linde, Mr Linkohr, Mr Van Minnen, Mr Muntingh, Mr Oehler, Mr Pelikan, Mr Percheron and Mr Schmid on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-662/79), tabled by Mr Tyrrell, Mr Harris, Mr Hord, Mr Forth, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mr Moreland, Mr Marshall, Mr Spencer, Mr Turner, Mr J. D. Taylor, Lord Bethell, Mr Prag, Mr de Courcy Ling, Sir Peter Vanneck, Mr Provan, Mr Curry, Mr Battersby, Miss Hooper, Mr Normanton, Mr Patterson, Miss Brookes, Mr Pearce, Mr Dalziel, Sir John Stewart-Clark and Miss Roberts, on the situation arising out of the Russian invasion of Afghanistan ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-665/79/rev.), tabled by Mr Klepsch, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Schall, Mr Notenboom, Mr Vergeer, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Alber, Mr von Bismark, Mrs Moreau, Mr Barbagli, Mr Nothomb, Mr Schnitker, Mr Luster, Mr Müller-

Hermann, Mr Michel, Mr Pürsten, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Sälzer, Mr McCartin, Mr Adonnino and Mr Dalsass on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), on the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union ;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-666/79), tabled by Mr Druon, Mr Ansquer, Mr Buchou, Mr Chirac, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Debré, Mr Deleau, Mrs Dienesch, Mrs Ewing, Mr Flanagan, Mr Gillot, Mr Labbe, Mr Lalor, Mr de la Malène, Mr Messmer, Mr Nyborg, Mr Poncelet, Mr Remilly, Miss De Valera and Mrs Weiss on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the situation in Afghanistan ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-667/79), tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mr Patterson, Mr Moreland, Miss Hooper, Mr de Courcy Ling, Mr Purvis, Mr Hutton, Sir Fred Catherwood, Mr Beazley, Lady Elles, Mr Battersby, Mr Provan, Miss Brookes, Mr Fergusson, Mr Møller, Sir Fred Warner, Mr Howell, Mr Harris, Mr Turner, Mr Dalziel and Lord Douro on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan.

At its meeting on Monday, 14 January 1980 Parliament decided to allocate speaking time as follows :

- Council and Commission : 30 minutes
- Socialist Group : 15 minutes
- Group of the European People's Party (CD) : 15 minutes
- European Democratic Group : 15 minutes
- other groups and non-attached Members : 10 minutes

I call Mr Ruffini.

Mr Ruffini, President-in-Office of the Council, — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, what I have to say can obviously not be a reply to each individual resolution, nor can I undertake to make any specific or personal remarks with regard to the views that have been expressed concerning the political, diplomatic, economic and commercial aspects of the Afghan crisis.

Any reply on my part which reflected only my own private reactions to what I had heard during the debate would not be in keeping with what is expected of someone whose task is to represent the considered collective opinion of the Nine Community Foreign Ministers.

My responsibility and my task is to put over and illustrate the Community's views and to say what the Council of Ministers, for their part, had to say and what decisions they took with regard to the dramatic events in Afghanistan, to which the greater part of yesterday's Council meeting was devoted.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, European public opinion has been deeply disturbed by the USSR's armed intervention in Afghanistan. The resultant feeling of anxiety stems both from the violation of that country's national sovereignty and from an

Ruffini

awareness of the risk that the balance of power in an entire geographical area may be altered, with serious consequences for world peace.

Unmistakable proof of the existence of this anxiety has been furnished by the reactions the Soviet intervention has triggered off all over the world and throughout the international community, one of the consequences of which was the immediate convening of the UN Security Council, the supreme UN body responsible for the safeguarding of peace and security. We should like to express our profound regret that the draft Resolution tabled by the non-aligned member countries of the Security Council should have foundered on the Soviet veto, in spite of the fact that this Resolution was highly constructive and 13 out of the 15 Security Council members voted in favour of it. The extraordinary session of the UN General Assembly which was convened immediately afterwards approved by a large majority, after a debate marked by the highest degree of objectivity, the condemnation of the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan and called for the immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces.

In view of the extreme delicacy of the situation, our aim must be to determine how much our countries will be able to do subsequently to help to restore respect for the sovereignty of Afghanistan and, more generally, for the fundamental international rules governing a country's right to peaceful co-existence with its neighbours.

Any objective examination of the matter and of the actual circumstances surrounding the Soviet military intervention in Kabul shows that the objective was the overthrow of the government in power in that country. There had been no events in connection with the Afghan situation which could be seen as acts of aggression from outside the country itself, i.e. as having occurred at the instigation of other countries. What had been going on in Afghanistan was, in fact, a civil war between part of the population and the régime in power: the intervention of the Soviet Union was therefore direct interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

The primary issue at stake at the international political level is the already precarious balance of power in the area. The repercussions on this balance of power of an increased Soviet presence in Afghanistan are likely to be serious, since Soviet forces could take up positions on the western border of Pakistan and on the eastern border of Iran, which would put the countries of the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean under increasing pressure and pose a threat of destabilization in that region.

Relations between the United States and the Soviet Union are likely to deteriorate. The United States' position was stated on 4 January by President Carter, who considered that the Russian intervention endangered the international balance of power in one of the

most sensitive areas of the world; he added that it could not fail to have consequences for relations between Washington and Moscow.

We are gravely concerned for the future of détente. We know — and the Nine have always had this firm conviction — that there is no alternative to détente. We are also aware that détente must, by its very nature, be global and therefore indivisible. The process of détente must be based on appropriate demonstrations of goodwill by all parties. If this condition is not complied with, there is a serious risk that the results — limited as they are but none the less important and significant — which the dialogue of détente has produced since the end of the cold war may be wasted. Meanwhile, we of the Nine are busy making a united effort to build on and consolidate some of the important gains achieved by détente

We considered the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on nuclear arms limitation to be a factor capable of paving the way to subsequent agreements on arms reduction and disarmament. We have consistently followed the line of not giving up the gains of détente in our international dealings, and whenever possible we have tried to promote talks on the control and limitation of troops and arms. In so doing we have acted in strict compliance with the principles and provisions of the Final Act of Helsinki and, as a group, we have undertaken to ensure that the follow-up is such as will lead to a genuinely constructive meeting in Madrid.

However, it is incumbent upon the Soviet Union, as upon everyone else, to make every effort to defend détente and not to violate these principles. Nor is this only true in Europe; in the present international situation, if détente is to develop naturally, the obstacle represented by the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan must be removed. The reason for this is that, in situations of international tension, it is the particular duty of a power like the USSR, which is one of those on which the task of protecting world peace and security devolves, to act with prudence and responsibility.

The people of Afghanistan must be left free to decide their own future, with a government of their own choice and the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of their country must be respected. It follows that the Soviet Union must withdraw its troops from Afghanistan.

We discussed the Afghan crisis yesterday in Brussels, at a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the Community, in the light of the latest dramatic developments and the debates that took place at the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The foreign ministers of the Nine issued a statement reiterating their deep concern at the situation in Afghanistan resulting from the USSR's military interven-

Ruffini

tion, which constitutes a serious violation of the principles of international relations enshrined in the United Nations Charter. They emphasized that the explanation given by the Soviet Union to justify its intervention in Afghanistan was unacceptable. The Soviet intervention constitutes blatant interference in the internal affairs of a non-aligned Islamic country and a threat to peace, security and stability in that region, including the Indian sub-continent, the Middle East and the Arab world.

In view of the wide-ranging and complex implications of the crisis, measures to deal with it were immediately undertaken by the United Nations, as it appeared clear to all that any attempts to mediate by individual countries or regional group would be inadequate.

It is the responsibility of the governments of the Nine, as of all other governments, to participate in the international community's efforts to ensure that, on the one hand, the rights of the Afghan people are safeguarded and, on the other hand, the most recent de-stabilizing factors to have emerged in the international power balance are countered. By a process of close cooperation between their own governments and other friendly governments in Europe, America and the Third World, the Nine States of the European Community have already acted, and intend to continue to act, to that end.

In this context, far from issuing empty uncoordinated statements or indulging in the dangerous task of retaliation the Nine have after due consultation amongst themselves, informed the Extraordinary Session of the UN General Assembly, through the representative of the Presidency, of their firm condemnation of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan.

Only if these various moves within the appropriate world bodies are carried out in complete solidarity with the United States of America and the other Western countries will Europe be in a position to help the world to return to a situation in which it is possible to carry on with the efforts which the Nine have consistently made to safeguard the achievements of détente.

I should like to remind you that the Nine have never spared any efforts to strengthen the process of détente, convinced as they are that this is in the interest of all the members of the international community. Basing ourselves on this clear approach we should like to reaffirm our unwavering desire that the fundamental principles of peaceful co-existence should be restored and that the need for peace in the world should be respected.

As a result of the step taken by the United States to stop supplies of agricultural produce to the USSR, the Community has decided that Community produce shall not be used, either directly or indirectly, to replace these supplies.

Because, as I said a short while ago, détente is one and indivisible and global the Community calls upon the Soviet Union to respect the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations and, consequently, to comply with the Resolution passed by the UN General Assembly and end its military intervention in Afghanistan.

In adopting this position, the Community has also taken due account of the present and past sufferings of the Afghan people, including that part of the population which the present crisis has obliged to leave the country.

The Council has therefore resolved to take a decision as soon as possible on the proposals that the Commission is about to submit to it with a view to providing urgent aid to the Afghan refugees through the intermediary of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. This aid will be in addition to any aid that the individual Member States may decide to provide for the same purpose.

Faced with the Afghanistan crisis and the other international crises which are increasing instability in numerous parts of the world, the Italian Presidency will do everything in its power — showing both tenacity and enterprise — to see that the Community succeeds in fulfilling what is one of the fundamental ambitions of the countries of the European Community, which is to make their own contribution, as effectively as possible, to the cause of world peace.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel on behalf of the Socialist Group and the two members of D'66.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — *(NL)* Madam President, I have pleasure in informing you that I shall be speaking today on this matter not only on behalf of the Socialist Group, but also on behalf of the two members of D'66. The invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet troops has unleashed a storm of protest in the world. This may sound like a cliché, but in this case it is not. One only has to look at the results of the discussions in the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations to realize that there has rarely before been such agreement on a particular subject in our world, which is governed by political confrontation. The veto of the Soviet Union in the Security Council in no way detracts from the fact. My group shares the indignation of the vast majority of the Community of nations, as is apparent from our motion for a resolution. We have no hesitation in saying here that this Soviet intervention must be regarded as an act of expansionist aggression. In our view, this military action on the part of the Soviet Union has put peace and security in jeopardy, not only in the region concerned but in the world as a whole. With this act, the Soviet Union has taken on an enormous responsibility.

However, this does not mean that we have not had our doubts in joining the ranks of those who have

Van den Heuvel

voiced their indignation since, as we all know too well, there are certain persons present who, on numerous occasions when indignation and condemnation would have been equally appropriate, showed less political courage and were not prepared to make statements as explicit as these. In our view, violations of fundamental freedoms should always be denounced regardless of the time or the place. The Socialist Group and D'66 have always condemned such violations and will continue to do so just as forcefully in the future. We do not belong to those who are selectively indignant, although, strangely enough, we have occasionally been accused of this. We shall speak out whenever it should prove necessary, regardless of the economic or electoral consequences. We feel this is a duty to ourselves, and we feel we have a right to draw attention to this fact every time we get the impression that others are taking a more non-committal attitude.

However, the question in hand today is that of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and we shall restrict our remarks to this event. Naturally a Parliament which voices its indignation at political events must at the same time answer the question of what measures should be taken to achieve positive results, i.e., in the case of Afghanistan, a withdrawal of the Soviet troops and to give a special emphasis to the moral and political indignation. We have a wide range of possible methods at our disposal. In the view of my group, economic measures and boycotts are worthy of consideration in certain cases. I might remind you that, when speaking at the October part-session about political cooperation among the Foreign Ministers, I raised the question of whether or not it was high time we considered the idea of an oil boycott in the context of action against the abhorrent apartheid policy in South Africa. We have no intention of ruling out something of this kind once and for all in the case of Afghanistan. We are consistent in our attitude. In each case, we have firstly considered alternative measures and, occasionally, have ultimately come up with farther-reaching proposals. In each case it was our chief concern that the efficiency of the measures should be carefully examined from the two viewpoints I have mentioned.

As far as we are concerned, there is no question of food aid being used as a political weapon.

The question of whether or not food aid should be granted must always be answered on the basis of the unshakable principle that only humanitarian considerations may be allowed to affect our decision. It is, of course, obvious that we must then consider in practical terms whether or not the food aid in fact reaches the people for whom it is intended. Our attitude is consistent, but unfortunately this cannot be said of all the political groups in this Parliament. Those who are for ever pointing out the impossibility, the ineffectiveness of harsh measures, those who push their pleas for dialogue, for consultation, to the limit — and

frequently beyond — have apparently now been very quick to realize what must be done — indeed they have no hesitation in falling back on the terminology of the cold war which means that the beginnings of a policy of world détente, which had been so laboriously brought about, in the balance. Furthermore, one gets the impression that they speak more on the basis of party-political and electoral considerations than out of an awareness of the need to bring peace and security within reach of the people of Europe. I think they are making a mistake anyway, and that the people of our countries have no wish to return to the hopeless intransigence of the cold war. Do not underestimate common sense, by which I mean the demand of the majority of the people of our Community for peace.

To return to the subject in hand, we feel that the countries of the Community must continue to do their utmost to carry on the policy of détente to which another member of our group, Mr Willy Brandt, has made such a major contribution. This policy is not based on optimistic expectations regarding the good intentions of our partners in the negotiations. We are not advocating a policy based on illusions. We merely hope to continue tenaciously on the road we have started out on, a road which we took because we felt it was in the interests of the world as a whole, the interests of all those millions of men, women and children who have only one wish — to live together in peace and security. These interests must not be put at risk by the kamikaze antics of politicians out-bidding each other with spectacular proposals, mainly in order to show how clever they are.

Détente must continue and, let us be honest, we have never advocated this détente as a sort cut-price offer to the Eastern bloc, but as something which is in our own interests too. For this reason, we should like to state quite clearly here that the ratification of Salt II, one of the milestones on the road towards détente, must still be regarded as just as vital as it was before the invasion of Afghanistan, and the same is, of course, true of all other efforts and talks aimed at promoting mutual disarmament. We must not give in to the temptation of trying to be too smart. Indeed, we must use all our resourcefulness to make progress in this matter, and this is an area where the European Community also has an important part to play.

The days when the European Community was exclusively an economic Community are, whether we like it or not, long past. The European Community and, in particular, the ministers meeting in European Political Cooperation, have a part to play in the laborious struggle for peace and security. We remember how the Member States of the Community acted as a united body in Helsinki and how our countries have taken a united stand in various major political contexts. However, there have been other occasions when our countries have reverted to individual standpoints.

Van den Heuvel

It is particularly disappointing that at such a decisive moment in world history as this, now that the Soviet Union — to repeat what my fellow socialist Bruno Kreisky has said — is embarking on one of the riskiest adventures in its history, European political cooperation has been found wanting. True, we have heard the statement issued by the Foreign Ministers yesterday, on which President-in-Office of the Council spoke today. In our view, this statement could be described as cautious, but at the same time sensible and unambiguous. However, this statement did not appear until a few weeks after the events we are discussing, and only after various Member States had stated their positions individually.

In our view, the Foreign Ministers have missed a chance to demonstrate that European Political Cooperation has a real political significance and that so much progress has been made that the adoption of a common position has become part of the political routine of the Community. As we see it, this shows clearly the artificiality of drawing a distinction between European Political Cooperation on the one hand and Community responsibilities on the other. The Community must discuss effective measures in a situation such as this, but the Foreign Ministers are neglecting to provide the necessary common political framework. It is high time that the representatives of the governments of the Member States discussed this point.

We are not calling for the total integration of the entire foreign policy of the Member States. We are merely pointing out that the political significance of the position adopted within European Political Cooperation is undermined by the failure of this cooperation at decisive moments such as this. The Community should, in our view, make its own creative contributions to the process of détente, and this undoubtedly includes taking initiatives in the part of the world to which we are currently devoting our attention, where peoples are confronting one another and are split by ideological differences. We are not against ideological differences. People are not all the same, so there is no need for political structures and States all to be the same either.

However, division based on hate and lack of mutual understanding is extremely dangerous. In a region such as this, which is one of great interest to the world as a whole because of its oil supplies alone, a serious conflict could all too easily flare up, and the victims would first and foremost be those who are not able, as we are, to play a part in directing political affairs. Judging from the statement made yesterday, the Foreign Ministers also realize this. The Community must do all it can to prevent disastrous developments of this kind. We therefore urge the Foreign Ministers to make proposals on this matter and will be glad to exchange views on them in this Parliament.

Madam President, to sum up I can only repeat that we most emphatically condemn the Soviet intervention, but that nevertheless the policy of détente must continue in the interests of us all, and that the Soviet Union should demonstrate by immediately withdrawing its troops, that it too is equally serious about returning to a policy of détente, which was boldly initiated by some of our most prominent statesmen and which appeared, albeit imperfectly, to have been established in the Helsinki agreement. We make an urgent appeal to all those in the world who wish to serve the interests of peace and détente. A time may well come when history judges our politicians by the extent to which we were prepared to play a part in this matter.

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

Mr Blumenfeld. — *(D)* Madam President, the European Parliament is the first Parliament in Europe to have the chance to discuss the events in Afghanistan at this truly historic moment. We, as Members of this House, represent the desire for peace and liberty of the peoples of Europe. The European People's Party, on whose behalf I have the honour to speak today, very much welcomes what the President-in-Office of the Council had to say as a fundamental and important step which the Community has to take in the present situation. We are grateful to Mr Ruffini for this.

(Applause)

Let me say quite clearly that the European People's Party needs no lessons from anyone on détente and the basic principles of humanity and a peace-oriented policy.

(Applause)

I think the same goes for other political groups in this House, and it seems to me to be entirely inappropriate for people to indulge in cheap polemics at this time.

(Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, what we are talking about today is not any old incident somewhere in the world; the point at issue is not interference in another country's internal affairs; what we have here is a political, a military invasion by a world power of an independent, sovereign State at a time when the world is in an extremely dramatic situation. In 1968, following its invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union could unfortunately rely on the fact that world opinion would get used to the invasion within a few months. Let me tell the Council that, with very few exceptions,

Blumenfeld

this House is united in expressing its anger and protest at the Soviet Union's action. With very few exceptions, we are united in condemning the invasion of Afghanistan! The only point on which we have unfortunately not been able to reach a consensus — not for want of trying — is what the European Community should do about the situation. Our protest at the action of the Soviet Union must go beyond mere words. We must make it quite clear that we not only condemn this brutal, calculated and premeditated demonstration of power politics, but shall respond with all the political and economic means which the European Community, as a bulwark of peace and détente, has at its disposal.

(Applause)

Let us please learn our lessons from the past; let us learn from our mistakes and benefit from our experience. Let me tell the Members of the Socialist Group that the Soviet Union is in an extremely difficult economic situation and is more dependent on cooperation with Europe and on our technology, our financial resources, our loan facilities and our deliveries of grain and other foodstuffs than our free Europe is dependent on supplies and orders from the Soviet Union. Let us make no bones about that.

(Applause)

The conclusion we have to draw from the Soviet invasion of the small, non-aligned, neutral country of Afghanistan is surely that power politics takes priority over any other global policy considerations the Soviet Union and its rulers may have.

The Soviet rulers will only realize there is a point of no return when we show them that we are prepared to learn the lessons of the past — including those of the 1930s — and that we know what is at stake, and when they realize that the Soviet Union's economic well-being and internal security are in jeopardy. If we fail to state this clearly now and don't back up our words with action, we shall, one fine day, be woken up rudely from our sweet dreams of peace and suddenly find ourselves in a situation which nobody had anticipated — not even in the 1930s, when — sad to say — it became historical reality.

The Group of the European People's Party agrees with the President-in-Office of the Council that détente is geographically and temporally indivisible...

(Applause)

If we fail to recognize that the precept must also be applied to the Soviet Union's strategic aims and its policy, and if we fail to act now we shall be seriously weakening our determination to uphold peace and liberty, we shall be seriously restricting our room for manoeuvre and we shall finish up along the road to

political neutralization; and that is bound to have dire consequences.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Soviet Union's aims are clear. They regard the Middle East as their source of oil and other raw materials. The invasion of Afghanistan was another strategic, political and economic step towards threatening Europe's lines of supply and placing us in a position of vulnerable dependence. That is their strategic aim and it behoves the European Parliament to say so loud and clear...

(Applause)

... We must retain our credibility, ladies and gentlemen...

(Applause)

... Whoever holds political sway in the Middle East has a decisive influence on developments in our free, democratic and peace-loving Europe, and might be in a position in the future to force us to dance to the powerful Communist Soviet Union's political tune. Let me conclude by saying that we must not allow this historic moment to pass without reminding ourselves that it is now up to us to devote all our energy not only to cultivating solidarity within the European Community and with all the other countries of Europe, but also to making it work in practice. We must build up and maintain a position of solidarity with the USA and Canada, who are our partners in NATO. The policies we pursue actively today and the sacrifices we are prepared to make now and in the future must strengthen and preserve peace and liberty the world.

(Loud applause)

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

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Madam President, I just want to point out once again that the Members here have still not been given the documents to which there has been official reference. This is a serious matter in my view. If there are new versions about — and this has been indicated — we still have not seen them. Perhaps they exist in other languages but we do not have them in Italian or, as far as I am aware, in some other languages. We really need to have these documents in order to make up our minds.

President. — Mr Pannella, I sympathize with your request but we must also be realistic. The fact is that we cannot suspend the proceedings this morning because the texts are not available. The translators are not robots, and they require a certain amount of time to translate the motions into the various languages. The same goes for the printers when it comes to printing them.

President

They are all doing their best so that everyone in the House has all the documents they need as quickly as possible. But this does take time, and in these circumstances we shall have to manage for a while without documents, since otherwise we should never get any work done. This is how this Parliament works and we have to accept the fact.

(Applause)

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

Mr Fergusson. — Madam President, less than two months ago, in an explosion of publicity and while the North Atlantic Alliance was reviewing its defence position, the Soviet Union withdrew 20 000 troops and 1 000 tanks from Eastern Europe leaving behind, I might add, more than three times as many troops as the West, and challenged the West to emulate this evidence of its love of peace. It is hard to suggest any way in which political cynicism could have gone further. The Soviet Union has delivered, by its invasion of Afghanistan, a clearer and more brutal message to the world than any other to date. I say more brutal, but perhaps it is invidious to compare the suppression of Hungary or Czechoslovakia or the Baltic States with the attacks now being made by Russian troops, with their highly sophisticated weapons, on the people of Afghanistan who are fighting for their own liberty.

The specious efforts of the Soviet Government to justify its own act of naked aggression against a once independent State outside the Soviet bloc, and one which at no time has threatened the security of the Soviet Union are simply beneath our contempt. There is no need any longer to spell out warnings to those who accept Russian aid, advice on technical assistance or who sign treaties of friendship with Moscow, because the mask has fallen. We see not just the vaunting ambition of the Soviet State, but the pitiless determination with which the Soviet Government pursues its ends regardless of human cost or principle. To us the Russians are crushing one more disturbed yet sovereign people. To them they are simply occupying one more square on the chessboard.

Madam President, I think another message is now getting through to the world, one which President Carter's firm decision to stop grain exports to the Soviets has underlined, namely, the wretched imbalance of the Soviet economy, the economy of a State that now spends one-eighth of its GNP on armaments and possesses forces immeasurably larger than are required for defence but which cannot afford even to feed its own people. It hardly needs this Parliament to tell the populations of Eastern Europe of the extent to which the Soviet Union has become a parasite among nations, sucking in the agricultural produce not just of its satellites but of the free world too — European butter, fish from Britain, wheat from the United States, so that its own efforts, often helped, to our

chagrin, by Western technology — as Alexander Ginsberg has reminded us — can be directed towards the domination of its neighbours and the subversion of others. Where now are the troops and tanks so ostentatiously pulled out of East Germany last year to promote détente? You could ask the Afghans or the refugees in Pakistan, or judging by this morning's newspapers, the Iranians on Afghanistan's border.

Ninety-five per cent of the members of this Parliament are agreed; just as the United Nations is agreed, on the precariousness of world peace at this moment. We are united in unreservedly condemning this act of aggression, and in calling for the immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, and we are united in hoping that genuine détente — if it ever existed in Moscow — will return again. The extent of agreement between all parties who can be taken seriously in this Parliament is the damnation of the Soviet Government and the real measure of the odium in which that government is now held throughout the world. It is expressively to bring this condemnation home to the subjects of that government that this group, exceptionally, takes the line it does in respect of the next Olympic Games.

Of course it has been harder to agree in this Parliament on a common policy to restore such security as we hoped we had had. It is useful, though essentially negative, to resolve to do nothing to weaken the measures that the United States are attempting, but what more can we do? Madam President, the Community and the Parliament have two weapons at their disposal. One is the far from negligible ability to give expression to the anger of Europe at what has happened, because here alone free Europe's united voice can be heard above the tumult of the nations. We must ensure that it remains united in effective protest just as long as this aggression continues.

Our other weapon is our power as a trading bloc, the largest in the world, and this is a weapon which materializes in our hand only when we choose to act in concert. Hitherto the nations of the Community and the West, pressing for détente, have sought all kinds of economic links with the States beyond the Iron Curtain. When we say that our trust has been abused and betrayed by the Government of the Soviet Union, that our food, our credits, our high technology, have been used not to improve the welfare of the Russian people, but to increase Soviet military superiority in the world, let the governments and the workers of the Comecon countries too reflect very soberly on the severe damage now being done to their creditworthiness by Soviet militarism and the crushing blow it has dealt to the spirit of détente. With them we look, this week particularly, with strong misgivings in the direction of the Balkans and we ask them, as Moscow drags

Fergusson

them down, to understand our apprehension even if Moscow apparently cannot.

Madam President, in condemning the Soviet action this Parliament speaks with one voice. In this part of the Chamber we believe that unless withdrawal is immediate, action has to follow over and above aiding the refugees and the defenders of a sovereign Afghanistan. The resolution our group has tabled calls on the Commission to identify all measures, which, acting in concert, the Community can take to exert further effective economic pressure on the Soviet Union and, failing withdrawal calls on the Council of Ministers to put such measures into effect. It is the very least of our demands, an expression of our outrage, that the Soviet economy should no longer benefit from our soft credits and subsidized food. We see nothing clever about this. The hawks in Moscow believe we cannot act in union. Certainly we cannot afford to be united now only in our ability to do nothing together.

Finally, Madam President, historical parallels to this act of opportunist aggression are present in all our minds. They may not be useful but I put it to this House, and by extension, to the free world, the Middle Eastern nations included, if we do not stop the Soviet Union in Afghanistan and oblige its forces to go home, where indeed shall we stop them? In the Gulf, when Iran has gone? At the Adriatic, when Yugoslavia has gone? Or on the Rhine? If the measures taken so far do not suffice, if what we propose is not enough, then we shall have to consider others the next time we meet.

President. — I call Mr Berlinguer.

Mr Berlinguer. — (1) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this debate is taking place at a time of international gloom and crisis, which confronts us, as representatives of the peoples of our countries, with the problem of how to develop European policy and a positive European initiative.

Our position on the events in Afghanistan is well known and unambiguous. We immediately condemned the Soviet military intervention and demanded that it be halted. Our stand was inspired above all by the principle which has always led us to condemn any violation of the right of peoples to national independence and to the free choice of their own form of development.

Many times since the last war, and indeed in the last few years, the capitalist countries, and especially the USA, have ridden roughshod over this right, and our voice has always been raised in condemnation. The same can certainly not be said by all the political parties present here. The fact that the intervention in Afghanistan was carried out by a socialist country led

by a Communist Party has not caused us to diverge from the principle we have consistently followed.

Our position was all the more resolute because the Soviet intervention took place in an already tension-laden international context — I am thinking of the Persian Gulf, the Middle East, South-East Asia, various parts of Africa, and East-West relations, — causing it to deteriorate still further.

The outlook today is sombre and threatening.

The first disturbing aspect is that not only are all disarmament negotiations now paralysed, but the very ratification of the agreements already reached, such as SALT II, is thrown into doubt, while a new quantitative and qualitative leap in the arms race is taking place. Here lies the serious error in the decision taken in Brussels by the NATO Council. The situation would be different if the policy proposed by us, by other political parties and by some European governments had prevailed, namely that of postponing, at least for a while, any decision on the production and development of new American missiles while simultaneously asking the Soviet Union to suspend production and deployment of the SS 20 missiles, while at once beginning negotiations between the two blocs to establish the real military balance and try to stabilize it at a lower level.

But what is most alarming at present is the deterioration in the world political climate, the absence of even a modicum of mutual confidence, and above all the daily sharpening of the confrontation and bitter dispute between the two superpowers, combined with a growing temptation to use, or to threaten to use, military force, and with various other forms of economic and political pressure. There is, as it were, a marked militarization of politics and even of political thinking.

Let us therefore ask ourselves where all this is leading. The answer is that the worsening confrontation between the USSR and the USA can only lead to the end of détente. But the end of détente, in a world already made so unstable by an increasingly serious economic crisis, by so many imbalances and so many causes of crisis and conflict, would today not only mean a return to the cold war — which would bring with it serious economic and political consequences for Europe — but would create an imminent danger of general war. — Indeed, in today's world, there is no alternative to détente.

The choice we must make is therefore clear. We must reverse the present trend and stop the escalation in the use of force by both sides, the escalation of actions and reprisals. We must reopen the door to dialogue and negotiation.

Berlinguer

There are powerful forces which are already expressing these views, and which have the capacity for corresponding action. When I say this I have in mind above all the actions of vast masses of simple people who want to live in peace, but also what can be done by the non-aligned countries and great spiritual authorities such as the Catholic Church.

And let us remember first and foremost the unique function which Europe can and must perform.

It is times such as this which test that European commitment which cannot be confined to empty phrases, but must be expressed in a forceful and real capacity for independent action.

In stating this need, we are not proposing that our countries should detach themselves from the Alliance of which they are members. The problem, however, is that of how to act within this Alliance.

Do the members of the Alliance intend to accept passively all the proposals and decisions of the USA? This is essentially the position of some of the governments and political parties of Western Europe, some of which now aim openly to increase tension. Or do we intend to affirm our right and duty to develop and maintain a joint European policy capable of resisting any pressure which might further worsen international relations, and to encourage action designed to achieve détente and cooperation? The latter is our policy and also, we think, the policy of other parties — and not only those with socialist leanings — which feel that Europe has an essential part to play in preventing a further widening of the rift which is so dangerously opening between the two superpowers.

It is clear to us that world peace still depends essentially on the policies of the USA and the USSR and on relations between them. But it is also clear — and it is being proved by events — that what is going on between Washington and Moscow, quite apart from what their respective intentions may be, is not leading the world towards security, détente or a basis for coexistence and cooperation. In order to reverse this trend and help to induce the two superpowers to fulfil their roles in a positive way, a clearly defined European policy is not only useful but essential — a policy of moderation, wisdom and constructive initiative.

A specific European initiative is also essential to help to overcome the serious economic and social imbalances between North and South in the world, which would become even more dangerous if the move towards increased tension between the USA and the USSR, between East and West, were to continue. The inequalities, injustice, suffering, hunger and malnutrition which affect thousands of millions of people are the tragic heritage of centuries of colonial domination and imperialist exploitation. But today these peoples and countries no longer accept the subjugation of the past or the inferiority of the present. In the final

analysis, as the chairman of our Group, Giorgio Amendola, stated recently, 'the human race can save itself from the catastrophes which threaten it only if it succeeds in finding a new system of economic cooperation which would permit the rational use of all the resources of the earth, starting with the most precious resource, the intelligence of its inhabitants. The creation of such a universal economic order can only be achieved if there is disarmament and peace.'

It is to this end that European policy must work, encouraging new and existing initiatives for disarmament, rejecting every form and temptation of neocolonialism, and creating with the peoples and countries of the Third World a network of relationships based not merely on aid, but on equality and mutually beneficial cooperation. But we must also show that we understand that, for the sake of peace and justice in the world, we can no longer tolerate privileges and waste, or the lifestyles and consumption models characteristic of the industrialized societies, which offend, wound and rouse the legitimate anger of vast masses of people, indeed of whole continents. Of course one cannot expect much in this respect from the most narrow-minded section of the dominant bourgeois parties. But it must be added that even in the Western European workers' movement there is not yet sufficient awareness of the scope of the changes required in the form of development and the lifestyles of the industrialized countries in order to create social structures based on both the judicious use of resources and justice.

It is to these tasks of social change and to the creation of a world free from every kind of oppression and corruption, of a more just, freer and safer world, that we devote our action and all our policies, especially that of the unity of the working classes and of all democratic and peace-loving forces.

(Applause)

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

Mr Rey. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I have three points to make on behalf of my colleagues.

Firstly, we wish to add our voices to those now raised in outraged protest throughout Europe — and indeed in this House — at the armed aggression to which a small country has been subjected by a great power. After the Helsinki Conference, we had hoped that such revolting sights were a thing of the past, not just in Europe but elsewhere in the world. None of the scant explanations we have heard, can justify this brutal act, which has greatly shocked public opinion both here in Europe and elsewhere, and which the United Nations General Assembly has just condemned.

Rey

The second remark I wish to make, like others before me, is that the invasion of Afghanistan by the armed forces of the Soviet Union has seriously jeopardized the policy of détente, so dear to the hearts of Europeans. We would like to think that it will be possible to re-establish and continue this policy, as we can see no other capable of reducing the increasingly serious threats to world peace and saving the world from disaster. But it would be a great mistake to think that Europeans lack courage, or that, for the sake of détente, they are willing soon to forget what has just happened. The peoples of Europe are neither cowardly nor blind. The policy of détente, in which we believed, cannot be one-sided nor based on acceptance of bully-boy tactics. If the USSR wants us to continue believing in détente, the situation on which it was based must be restored. The USSR must clearly realise the concern that its aggression has caused throughout the world and the reactions this has led to. The Soviet Union must help to re-establish an acceptable political climate, not just by making verbal promises, but by taking steps, the first of which, but not the only one, should be for Soviet troops to evacuate Afghan territory immediately and unconditionally.

My third point is that events in Kabul have reminded us, if indeed we needed reminding, just how dangerous is the world in which we live. Let this be a lesson to Europe. We tend at times to overemphasize our differences in this Parliament. Now is the time to remember, when faced with these threats to peace, that the most important thing is what unites us. So, let our Parliament, which represents almost 300 million Europeans, be heard voicing in virtual unanimity the desire to reinforce our Community, to make it more powerful and to make it a force for world peace.

(Applause)

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

Mr Druon. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, what I find most astonishing about this Afghan crisis, which in the last few days has so greatly shaken world opinion, governments and parliaments, including our own, is that anyone at all should be astonished. What I am most surprised about is that anyone should be surprised.

From April 1978 onwards, when the Taraki government was set up in Kabul, it was obvious that the Soviet Union had decided to bring Afghanistan into its direct sphere of influence. It had fired the rocket which would stage after stage put a new satellite into a Soviet orbit. It was obvious that, as soon as there were any signs of local opposition, Moscow would provide the Afghan Government with the materials and advisers necessary to muzzle that opposition. It was obvious, too, that in the event of this opposition becoming open rebellion with the pro-Soviet authori-

ties in Kabul unable to contain it, the Soviet Union would intervene directly by force, and this point has now been reached.

The great concern now being shown somewhat belatedly only goes to show how tragically impotent our democracies are, even when it comes to foreseeing what is obviously and certainly going to happen. We might well ask ourselves whether governments on both sides of the Atlantic have any ambassadors or intelligence services at all, or whether they even have their eyes open. We should have made it clear to the Soviet Union as early as 1978 that any attempt to turn Afghanistan into a satellite would have serious, if not fatal consequences for détente, with all that that might imply — but we did not, and the Soviet Union was able to draw up its plans at its leisure without fear of punishment.

As for me, my conscience is clear. I tried on several occasions from June 1978 onwards to point out the seriousness of the situation in Afghanistan.

I tried to make people aware of the plain facts: that southern Afghanistan is a mere 500 kilometres from the Straits of Hormuz, the biggest petrol pump on earth; that the Soviet Union's hold over Afghanistan is a central factor in the Soviet strategy for gaining access to the warm seas and encircling the Middle East; that it was to be expected that the explosive mixture of the oil war and certain fanatical and militant religious movements would lead to incidents with world-wide repercussions.

At that time, I was generally called a prophet of doom — I was accused of exaggerating dangers which did not exist. There were a few, very few, experienced and responsible men — some of them are sitting near me now — who agreed with my analysis. Today we can see where this has got us. I am modest enough to think that what I had foreseen could have been foreseen by those in power.

And what can we do now? Not that all we can do is raise outraged protest at what is over and done, I hear people talk of 'we, the European Parliament' — but what exactly are we in a position to do?

We are perfectly entitled to condemn this action, as it violates both the principles on which the democracies of which we are the representatives are founded, and the principles of the Communities institutions themselves.

Those principles are a people's right to decide its own fate and no interference, especially military interference, by one State in another's affairs.

The Soviet Union has openly defied those principles. The arguments put forward as justification are worthless! Firstly, they quote clause 5 of their Friendship and Cooperation Treaty with Afghanistan, or again Clause 51 of the United Nations Charter, which enables a country to appeal for help when defending

Druon

itself against outside aggression. This is not a case of outside aggression, but of a large proportion of the Afghan people who refused the government which had been foisted upon it. As for the appeal for help made under the Friendship Treaty, it was made two days after the Soviet divisions entered the country by a government set up as a result of this same military intervention.

We have, thus, a perfect right as a parliament to express our condemnation and disapproval of this action. But we should harbour no great illusions about any effect this protest might have, other than an albeit useful moral one.

Can we go any further than this purely moral stance? I don't think so, because we have neither the powers nor the competence to do so. It is not up to us, but to the individual countries, to decide what measures should or must be taken — such as the retaliatory measures which some people might well call for in the fields of food supplies, technology or even sport.

If the Member States wish to take steps, then it is for the Council of Ministers, meeting within the framework of political cooperation, not for Parliament nor the Commission, to take them. The meeting held in Brussels yesterday does not encourage us to foster any illusions on that score. But it would be overstepping our role and even laying ourselves open to ridicule to do any more than, on the other hand, condemn the Soviet intervention and, on the other, recommend that the Member States take any joint decisions they may feel appropriate.

This is no reflection on the courage or determination we all may possess. It is a matter of getting the facts into perspective, and that is why our Group has tabled a motion which is faithful to the principles and to the real facts, as I have just recalled them.

The 36 laborious and fruitless hours of wrangling in which we have just been involved in order to try to reach the unanimous decision which, at the outset, we all declared to be our aim — and which our Group for one is still ready to help achieve — prove how risky it is for a parliament to overstep its own area of competence and try to give itself powers which it does not possess. It would be sad if one of the side effects of the invasion of Afghanistan should be ultimately to bring this House into disrepute.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Castellina.

Mrs Castellina. — *(I)* Madam President, the invasion of Afghanistan is an event of the utmost gravity, which we not only condemn in the most forthright terms but which, as Communists, we think makes it impossible ever again to regard the party leading the country which perpetrated it as a Communist Party.

But if we really wish to assess seriously the nature and consequences of this action we must bear in mind that it does not represent — as Mr Ruffini appeared to suggest in his speech — a kind of trivial mishap, a sudden interruption of a process of détente which would otherwise have gone from strength to strength. On the contrary, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan took place in an international political context which has for some time been marked — and both the Soviet Union and the United States are responsible for this — by a reversal of the trend towards détente of the preceding years, by a return to a cold war which is much more dangerous than that of the fifties, because both superpowers have now lost political and ideological control of their respective camps, and because we are at the height of a serious economic crisis, and the resulting tension tends to increase the number of trouble spots where real warfare may break out.

It seems to me that all the motions for resolutions which have been tabled here miss the essence of this problem, that is to say they avoid taking account of the state of the world in general, and therefore even those which show the greatest desire and concern to resume détente end up by proposing initiatives which are totally ineffective. I think that today, if we really wish to try to safeguard peace, Europe will have to use the political and economic strength which it undoubtedly has, not to carry out useless and dangerous economic reprisals — the experience of the sanctions applied by the League of Nations in the thirties shows the futility of this course — but to apply pressure to both superpowers and counteract the military thinking which inspires them. In practical terms, this means proposing that Europe be detached from the military blocs, that it should contribute to disarmament by refusing to have any more nuclear missiles stationed on its territory, and that it should establish a new and positive relationship with the developing countries, thereby assisting them to free themselves from the blackmail imposed on them by the USSR and the USA which makes them pawns in the race towards war. The problem of the North-South relationship is closely linked to that of the East-West relationship. If no positive solution is found, appeals for détente and the hope that the Madrid conference or similar conferences may ensure peace are certainly useful, but frankly inadequate to the situation.

It is time for Europe — and I am addressing my remarks particularly to the Left — to have the courage to make itself a third force in the world, a force which is essential in order to halt the escalation of confrontation between the two superpowers.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I would not wish the treacherous invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet troops to be regarded as an over-hasty reaction or taken out of the context of the

Romualdi

deadly plans which Soviet Russia and Communism have been preparing against the Western World for a long time. If we had the means and the time it would be very easy to prove that, on the contrary, this move was studied and prepared at length.

I would also like it to be realized — since some European leaders seem to disagree — that this event was above all an attack upon the independence and economic and political freedom of Europe. The serious and destabilizing crisis which has developed in the area of the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean, which began with Khomeini's chauvinist revolution and now continues with the occupation of Afghanistan, obviously strikes at the economic and political interests of the American people, which has been rightly obliged to react. But in my view it would be unwise, naïve and dangerous to believe that Europe is or can be untouched by these events, when it is in fact the most seriously and directly affected area. In other words, I would not wish that, out of goodwill and concern for détente — a détente which was perhaps never any more than a one-way street and which in a way was destabilizing for us, as shown by the political and economic crises and the lost ground which have characterized it in every field, and of which Communism and Russia have taken advantage in order to spread unopposed over the continents and in people's minds — I would not wish that out of concern to safeguard peace, which is threatened only by the aggressive expansion of Russia and of Communism, we Europeans should entertain dangerous illusions. Of course the distant objective is America, which is the only power capable in practice of opposing the expansion of Russian and Communist imperialism. The more immediate and direct objective of this action is Europe, the road which leads to oil and to the warm waters which are so closely linked to Europe's vital interests. The outpost of the Western World against which the Russian and Communist manoeuvre is directed is none other than Europe.

The United States of America must play their part — and we hope that they will do so with our support, in the spirit of the Alliance — by taking all the measures required in the circumstances to make Russia realize that security, détente and disarmament are incompatible with invasions, massacres of free peoples, or attacks on economically vital strategic positions. But the Europeans, for their part, must do what lies within their province. Brezhnev, after occupying and subjugating Afghanistan, is now trying to play down the affair by reducing everything to an unfortunate episode of the power politics that he is obliged to conduct, of little import in comparison to the great problems of disarmament, peace and détente which Western condemnation would threaten to freeze. In other words, after playing the military card, Brezhnev is now playing the diplomatic card. He is systematically accusing the United States of an attempt at encirclement in order to justify his actions. To the Euro-

peans, on the other hand, he is extending an invitation to dialogue, détente and an independent attitude which may be one of disapproval but which would exclude reprisals, hostile acts or attempts to intimidate, and he is doing this directly or through the differentiated tactics of his Communist parties, of which Mr Berlinguer's speech a short time ago was an example.

'Why die it for Kabul? It would not be in the European's interest do so' — says Brezhnev — 'but to strengthen security and develop the policy of cooperation in Europe'. This is how Brezhnev is reported in Pravda, and these very words can be found in the Communist motion for a resolution and were repeated a short time ago by Mr Berlinguer who has come here to play his own special card, to explain the reasons for his attitude of disapproval differentiated from the attitude of Mr Marchais, who clearly has a different role to play.

What does Berlinguer want? He wants two things. First and foremost, he wishes to seize the opportunity to urge Europe to adopt a policy of détente *à la façon* of the Russians and the Communists, namely their policy of détente which has in practice emasculated and spiritually and physically demobilized Europe, and through which they aim to neutralize and Finlandize Europe completely. Secondly, Berlinguer is trying to obtain some support on the 'soft' themes of détente and disarmament, which are useful in order to overcome prejudices and remove internal and international obstacles which still prevent him from entering the Italian Government. Prime Minister Cossiga is standing surety for him, for with his certificate of good 'Western' conduct on the part of the Italian Communist Party he is preparing to meet Carter to advocate, both to him and to Western public opinion, the entry of the Communist Party into the government. This is the final move in a subtle manoeuvre whose aim, ladies and gentlemen, is to destabilize not merely Italy but European politics as a whole.

That is why, as representatives of the Italian and European Right, we expect Parliament to make a clear condemnation of the dangerous, brutal and bloody Soviet aggression, and the responsible and freely elected members of this Parliament to urge their governments to do what they can to achieve maximum solidarity and a single responsible answer to the threat of Russia and Communism. But, precisely because it needs to be responsible, such a reply should be extremely firm.

President. — I call Mr Colombo.

Mr Colombo. — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I thank the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers for the statement he has made and wish him every success in his term of office.

Colombo

Today's debate will be useful above all if it enables us to realize, as a Parliament, the seriousness of the crisis brought about by the Soviet violation of the independence, sovereignty and independent right of decision of Afghanistan, and by the violation of its frontiers by Soviet forces sent there to shore up a pro-Soviet regime.

This is one of the most serious and dangerous crises of the post-war period. The invasion by Soviet troops is only the latest and most serious, of a series of events which have shaken the Asian continent in recent years and which, taken individually as local conflicts, have not given rise to the suspicion that behind all of them there could be a single plan. At all events, it shows that there is a serious crisis within the Communist world, as well as a crisis brought about by the deterioration of East-West relations and of relations between the two superpowers. Recently the invasion of Cambodia by Vietnam, the Chinese incursion into Vietnam, the violent changes of regime in Afghanistan, and events in Africa have shaken to its foundation an already unstable balance in those regions.

These events are not and cannot be regarded as merely local, for they strike at the roots of the policy of détente. Have not some in fact spoken of the end of détente? Such phrases must be totally avoided, and we must instead reaffirm that détente is the basic aim of our policy.

At the moment the responsibility for détente lies primarily with the Soviet Union. We must regard it as indivisible and reaffirm this principle. Nobody is infallible at the present time, any more than in the past, but in my view it is erroneous to think, as some do, that détente and a return to normality can be encouraged by a critical or detached attitude to the United States and to the attempts it is making to reestablish a balance which has been so seriously disturbed. The reestablishment of the balance must include security.

How can one realistically think that one of the two protagonists in this uncertain world balance can accept the decline in its influence and swallow the frustration resulting from the violation in Iran of the principle of diplomatic immunity, without stating, in forceful terms, the need to return to negotiations by restoring certain basic conditions which would make them possible? That is why it is necessary above all firmly to reiterate the condemnation of Soviet aggression and the demand for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

It is certain that at such difficult times discretion is the better part of valour. It would none the less be absolutely misguided to regard the temporary blockage of the process of ratification of SALT II in the American Senate — how could one expect it to be

approved in these circumstances? — and the European decisions to achieve a new balance of tactical forces in Europe — accompanied, moreover, by an offer of negotiations which was rejected — as being almost the cause of what is now occurring in Asia, rather than the consequence of a deterioration in international détente and in the balance of forces, to which the armaments of the Soviet Union and the events culminating in the invasion of Afghanistan have contributed, first disturbing the atmosphere and then the actual balance.

Although we wish to make constructive criticisms in the alliances to which we belong, we also wish to remain firmly attached to them.

What is happening in Asia certainly affects international détente, and therefore Europe, but it affects Europe much more directly than appears at first sight. Russia's old ambition to gain access to the Indian Ocean, control of the oil routes, encirclement of Saudi Arabia because of its function as an oil supplier, greater pressure on Turkey — a member of the Atlantic Alliance associated with our Community — the aggravating effect which the invasion of Afghanistan may have on the unrest in Iran — the effects of these factors on the Arab world and the Middle East directly concern Europe.

Allow me to say here that the fact that we Europeans continue to pursue economic union — albeit not always very forcefully or consistently — without yet being able to make our united presence felt on the international political scene — and this weakness of ours affects the West as a whole and makes the effective pursuit of a world balance more difficult — is one of the causes of the instability of the present situation. Will we be able to take up a joint position with conviction in these very serious circumstances? Will we be able to strengthen the cohesion of the West, or shall we fall into the fatal trap of asking the United States to look for solidarity and support elsewhere?

Such unity could lead us effectively to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Madrid, which we wish to and indeed must attend, but over which hangs — though it should not and must not be allowed to hang — the cloud of Soviet aggression in Afghanistan.

The invasion of Afghanistan moreover affects the vast grouping of the non-aligned countries, which in recent years has been a force for equilibrium and peace. The Yugoslav reactions of the last few days indicate their concern. Europe must establish an even closer relationship with these countries at a time of disorientation and crisis, and try to share their concern, while also helping them to create a fairer and more equitable basis for cooperation.

Madam President, all these considerations oblige us to be the advocates of peace, but also of security, within the context of the choice of political camp which

Colombo

each of our countries has made, in the belief that peace can best be served in that way.

(Applause)

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Madam President, we congratulate the new President-in-Office, Mr Ruffini, we thank him and welcome his statement. But what a shabby day for Europe, Madam President, and what a delusion for the freedom-loving and proud people of Afghanistan, if the elected representatives of the peoples of Europe, elected in the name of liberty and democracy and representing the largest trading group in the world, cannot cooperate to condemn and resist violent military aggression, wherever it may occur, in breach of international law, and particularly in breach of Section 24 of the United Nations Charter to which all our Member States adhere.

(Applause)

There is an urgent need for Western powers to show their solidarity, not only among themselves, but also with the non-aligned countries of the Third World particularly those Islamic States immediately and geographically threatened, both in the Middle East and the Far East, and to present a united front against the ruthless duplicity of the USSR, unparalleled either in time or in place in the history of the world. We must not only condemn the Soviet Union; we have a task as elected democratic representatives, a task for which we fought last year, to ensure that the institutions of the Community take all the necessary measures to show our strength in this regard. A great nineteenth century politician said that evil conquers and for evil to conquer it suffices for good men to do nothing. Let us not be in that situation.

We must use our strength, so dearly won, to strengthen the hand of the Commission in several areas of action. First of all in the administrative area, to see that the European taxpayer's money is not used to pay for the substitution of grain and other agricultural products to feed the Soviet Union. We must also investigate immediately the possibility of suspending the export of high technology products and know-how to the Soviet Union, which is so eager to acquire them. We must review the policies and attitudes to be taken by our Member States at the Madrid Conference on the implementation — and I repeat the implementation — of the Final Act of Helsinki.

Détente, Madam President, applies not only to the economic wellbeing of the peoples of Western Europe, cocooned by a successful capitalist system, but to the universal respect for sovereign integrity of States throughout the world. We cannot speak of détente in this part of the world without thinking of the USSR's actions in other parts of the world from

the Horn of Africa to Angola, Vietnam, Cambodia and now Afghanistan. We want to show the peoples of the world that we recognize the new twentieth century Trojan horse of the Soviet Union, the oft-repeated technique of getting a puppet Communist government to 'invite' the troops of the Soviet Union to keep peace and order on its territory.

We must see that aid is not given to the Soviet troops, but to the half million refugees who have crossed the border in great hardship and suffering into Pakistan. This is where our aid should go. We should appeal to the International Committee of the Olympic Games, not because we want to stop games wherever they may take place, but to show the people of the Soviet Union that we understand the oppression and tyranny under which they are living and that the West can respond to an act of violent aggression which has shocked the whole of the civilized world.

We must use our freedom to ensure and protect the freedom of others. It is in this spirit, Madam President, that I have the honour to table an amendment on behalf of the European People's Party and the European Democratic Group to the two motions for a resolution contained in Working Documents 667/79 and 665/79. This amendment is being circulated and we shall have it in all languages before the voting this afternoon.

President. — I call Mr Ansart.

Mr Ansart. — *(F)* Ladies and gentlemen, we live in a world which has seen great changes in the last few decades, a world exemplified by the rise of new ideas, of socialism — a world of inequality in which hundreds of millions of people live in hope of eating their fill and being happy and free at last. It is hardly two years since Afghanistan rebelled against feudal rule and set up its new government.

As in Afghanistan, many other peoples have freed, or are trying to free, themselves from reactionary colonialism. The United States and its allies do not accept these legitimate ambitions which we can see in Africa, Latin America, the Middle East and Asia. In order to regain positions they have lost they interfere in the internal affairs of other countries in many different ways, not even hesitating to use force, as we saw in the case of Vietnam. This is what we must do away with — this constant interference which endangers détente.

For their part, the French Communists have always fought for the sovereignty and freedom of choice of a people, for its right to decide freely its own fate and to resist any interference in its internal affairs. However, the basic principles of international relations have no substance unless they are backed up by sufficient power to dissuade the imperialists from any rash move.

Ansart

We at any rate have made up our minds: if we must choose between feudal reaction, propped up by the forces of capital, and a people, which in the face of great difficulties and deep poverty, is seeking its own path towards economic development and independence, then we are on the side of the Afghan people, so that it may continue its march towards progress in complete sovereignty. It was its legal right, when faced with overt interference from outside and the very real threat this posed to the country, to appeal to its ally the Soviet Union, in complete accordance with the treaty they had signed. These events have given rise to an unusually violent anti-communist campaign. We protest vigorously against this demonstration of hatred and against the way in which the facts are distorted in our country. Any forward looking democrat should be concerned at this misuse of the media. How can we not protest at the United States using what they have the gall to call the food weapon. This amounts to threatening poor countries with seeing their food supplies cut off, should they oppose American policy.

In conclusion, Madam President, the French Communist Party following in the great tradition of the working class movement has always striven for peace, however difficult that might have been. It is in the same spirit that it is now strongly opposed to the installation of 600 new American nuclear missiles in Europe. We welcome the large demonstrations organized against these missiles in Brussels, Rome, as well as in Denmark, Holland and Great Britain. We want to expand this struggle for peace — all the more so, because events in Afghanistan are now an excuse for the United States and its allies to jeopardize international détente. We feel that the Salt II agreement should be ratified as soon as possible, and we refuse to submit to the authority of the European Community in this matter. Above all, we have faith in the people's struggle. At the same time, we wish to reiterate that we deny this Assembly any right to set itself up as a judge of world events and to pass sentence on them in a unilateral and biased manner. This is not its role, nor is it within its powers. It is for all these reasons that we, the French Communists, categorically oppose the motion tabled.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Berkhouwer.

Mr Berkhouwer. — *(NL)* Madam President, it is an unfortunate fact that every ten years since 1945 the Soviet Union has committed, as Mrs Van den Heuvel put it on behalf of the Socialist Group, an act of aggression. In 1948 it was Prague, in 1956 Budapest, in 1968 Prague again, and now in 1979, Afghanistan. The brutal reasoning behind all this shows that the Soviet Union is underestimating our intelligence. It commits an act of aggression, and when the free world

refuses to accept this act, it maintains that we are reopening the cold war. In my view, our job here is to demonstrate that nothing could be further from the truth. The name of Mr Brandt has been mentioned as protagonist of our European détente policy, and we European liberals admire the good will and good faith of Mr Brandt. I say this as a liberal and can assure you that there are no negative political overtones. We can only regret the fact that Mr Brandt is not here today. The fact that Mr Marchais is also absent is understandable, since he is too busy in Moscow.

We must realize that the Soviet Union's interpretation of détente is very different from ours. What we want is cooperation, but it appears that what the Soviet Union understands by détente is a relaxation of tension between the two superpowers, but a continuation of the conflict between them in all respects without actually resorting to the use of arms.

I naturally go along with what my friend Mr Rey said. We must not panic but should, I think, be on our guard.

What we liberals in this Parliament have always been concerned about, is the following. We were the first group to take the initiative immediately after this event to draw up a motion for a resolution, which we tried to do in a balanced a manner as possible. If the world political forum of the United Nations has rejected the act of aggression on the part of the Soviet Union with an exceptionally high majority 104 to 18 with a few abstentions — in other words practically unanimously — can we as representatives of the people of Europe, lag behind? This was our inspiration, it was in this spirit that we tried to get Parliament to express its opinion. When we come to vote on the motions for resolutions tabled this afternoon, it would be a tragedy of the highest order if we were to vote in all sorts of different ways let alone if there were to be no decision at all. This is the spirit in which we did all we could yesterday to achieve a consensus. Indeed, at one moment we seemed to have almost succeeded, and I make no reproaches to anyone present here in this assembly that this did not in fact ultimately prove possible. However, I must make an urgent appeal to you all to vote in unison, so that we can do all we can in the time left to us so that today, we as representatives of the people of Europe can condemn this act of aggression on the part of the Soviet Union as unanimously as possible.

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — *(I)* Madam President, I do not think for a moment that the Red Army in crossing the borders of Afghanistan, was exporting revolution. Even on the assumption that such was the case, I wish to remind you all, and particularly Mr Ansart, that

Capanna

even Stalin, undoubtedly the least subtly dialectical of the Soviet Communist leaders, understood that revolution cannot be exported at gunpoint. At all events, the invasion forces must be withdrawn, but we must also condemn the sanctions imposed by the United States on grain exports, which certainly do not strike at the Soviet leaders but, Mr Colombo, at the people of the Soviet Union.

I find it strange that neither Mr Ruffini nor Mr Berlinguer uttered a word on this point, and I think it deplorable that both have been outflanked on the left by Indira Gandhi who stated that even after the events in Afghanistan the United States remain the major destabilizing factor in the world. This debate will have served a purpose if, apart from condemnations, it gives Europe the decisive function of a point of reference and a source of action against the imperialist appetites of all the superpowers.

President. — I call Mr Møller.

Mr Møller. — (DK) Madam President, I can wholeheartedly endorse the condemnation of Russian expansionism and imperialism which has been voiced here today from practically all quarters with the exception of the Danish Communists, but we knew where we stood with them and never expected them to disobey their masters.

As I interpret reactions so far — apart from purely verbal ones — the most important thing which has happened is that this event has contributed to the establishment of firm cooperation between the USA and another major power, i.e. the People's Republic of China. The Soviet Union's *Drang nach Osten* will, I think, be halted by an alliance similar to the Western alliance which resulted in the Soviet Union limiting its westward expansionist activities to what are now the Warsaw Pact or Comecon countries. The latest events in the East are ominous, but I think it is encouraging if China can side with the free world in future developments in world politics.

However, it is not true to say that it is primarily out of a direct interest in East Asia that the Council and Parliament are concerning themselves with that part of the world, and many will ask what the events in Afghanistan have to do with the European Parliament. However, wherever human hearts beat, wherever people live and breathe, what is happening to them and how they are treated is the concern of their fellow men. This is the principle of human rights, i.e. that everyone is everyone else's concern. Regardless of colour or religion etc., we all have a responsibility to one another.

A direct conclusion of what I have said is that what has taken place in Afghanistan is the same as what took place in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and our

reaction should be to act rather like a hedgehog and roll into a ball, put out our spines and try in this way to play our part in protecting the free world of which we form part, i.e. the western democratic world and its culture, which is our culture and which might also soon be threatened. I am speaking here on behalf of a country which is so close to the Soviet Union that it practically borders on it, at least via the sea.

I should like to say that it would be of supreme significance if one of the consequences of these recent events — apart from reactions so far, such as the proposal to withdraw from the Olympic Games — were to be a strengthening of our solidarity in the western world. Regardless of whether it is economic solidarity around the European Community or military solidarity for the defence of our western world via NATO, the lesson we should learn from Afghanistan is that one cannot destroy the unity and solidarity of the western world with imperialistic acts of this kind.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (F) I should like to remind some speakers that Stalin once said, at the time of the Moscow trials in the thirties, that Europe would soon 'get over that'. When I hear the counsels of moderation and caution delivered by some speakers, I have the impression that we are in the same situation today. Speaking from within the workers' movement — for I refuse to allow that title to be claimed exclusively by certain speakers who are now acting against the interests of the workers' movement throughout the world — I would remind you that we must be absolutely firm in condemning the invasion, and not merely express our disapproval, as Mr Berlinguer has done here. We must totally and absolutely condemn the present aggression against Afghanistan, an event which puts the whole world in a new situation and marks the end of détente.

I was not shocked by the talk of blocking wheat supplies, because back in September last year, during the debate on world hunger, I said in this very Parliament — which has a very important part to play — that the Soviet Union had already bought 25 million tonnes of wheat from the United States and that its silos had therefore already been filled. I believe that this invasion of Afghanistan was prepared very carefully and at great length. In my view, a kind of socialism which cannot produce enough wheat but which devotes such a large share of its gross national product to armaments is not socialism at all. There is no question of socialism or revolution, for we are faced with a new kind of imperialism which takes action throughout the world to suppress the freedom of peoples who are trying to achieve it, sometimes against that very imperialism.

Macciocchi

In conclusion, I wish to express my belief that the conference on cooperation and disarmament in Madrid cannot take place — this is my personal opinion, but I hope it will be shared by others — if the Soviet occupation forces have not first been withdrawn from Afghanistan. We should not practise *détente* towards those who are destroying it, nor make use of polite phrases. I condemn the attitude of those who follow two policies, one official and the other more secret, so that perhaps in their heart of hearts they regard this invasion in the same way as Mr Ansart did in his speech. I regard what we are witnessing today as a terrible tragedy, which recalls 1939. The French Communist Party has expressed very disturbing views which remind one of what occurred in 1939. In today's issue of *L'Humanité* there are phrases which make one's blood run cold. It is a summary of 50 years of faithful service to the Soviet Union which has worked against the interests of both the French and the European proletariat. Then there is the appeal by the great writer Aragon for the Soviet army to be supported in Afghanistan and to become a symbol of popular liberation. What a travesty!

In these circumstances, anything that can arouse the conscience and heighten the understanding and awareness of the proletariat, of the workers, of the peoples of Europe — any means, including the Olympic Games — must be employed. We are also capable of extending the hand of friendship to the Soviet people, about which so many lies are now being told, such as the statement by one of the speakers here claiming that the army which has invaded Afghanistan is liberating a people, rather than assassinating its leaders and thereby endangering the peace of the world. To speak of *détente* and say that it is an option which must be kept open is to use terms which are too weak, too naïve or too ambiguous for one to give credence to what has once more been presented as a basic element of the strategy which the Left should follow.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Madam President, make no mistake about it, the invasion and annexation of Afghanistan by Russia reveals that Russia's real objective is world domination and conquest. While the West was immersed in Christmas and New Year revelling, and while the snow and frost held the Afghan fighters back, Russia was engaged in yet another murderous venture. A powerful political earthquake has taken place, the map of the Middle East has now been drastically changed and the world has come closer to a third world war.

The whole world now waits to see if the Ayatollah will choose the Koran or the Kremlin. His decision will be of vital importance. The hypocritical claim that the Russian forces were invited into Afghanistan by the government stands exposed by the fact that their first action was to murder the head of that government. When President Tito of Yugoslavia dies, and tens of thousands of Russians invade that country, I suppose we shall be told that they are really an invited guard of honour for Tito's funeral!

Action must be taken decisively and in unity. I welcome the statement made by the President of the Council today, but I would remind him that actions speak louder than words. Russia must learn that the free world really means business. The folly of doing too little too late would be our undoing.

(Applause)

President. I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Madam President, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has brought the world to the brink of conflict. There are risks of confrontations between the major powers so that it strikes me as a little feeble, not to say irrelevant, to be talking about *détente* here today. I also find the reaction of the nine Ministers extremely feeble. However, I should like to bring up a point which has so far not been raised in this debate, namely the fact that the composition of the various peoples inhabiting the state of Afghanistan is one of the dangerous but essential factors in this conflict. These peoples are striving for autonomy and they live on both sides of the national frontiers — a situation which the major powers and warmongers can of course callously use and abuse to their own ends. Among other peoples in Afghanistan there is a Kurdish minority, but together with the 13 million or so Pathans, these people form one of the major ethnic groups in the world. 40 % of the Pathans live in Afghanistan, but 7 million live in Pakistan, concentrated mainly in the north-western tribal area and Beluchistan. I am sure you are aware, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, that this Pathan area is where the Khyber Pass is situated. This is the gateway to Pakistan and India as followed by Darius and the generals of Alexander the Great.

Therefore, if we wish to demonstrate clearly that what we want is peace, we must also request the international forum to devote some attention to these problems of the peoples of Afghanistan, since peace in this region depends on them too. Let us please not go on being hypocritical. We are being hypocritical when we speak of the so-called Muslim fanatics, since we decide whether or not they are fanatics on the basis of which side they choose. And there is a second

Coppieters

kind of hypocrisy too. I quote Robert Escarpit in *Le Monde* of 11 January 1980 :

It is easier to comment on events in Afghanistan or Iran than on those in Corsica. Distance makes matters easier, but it is not certain that proximity makes the consequences any less significant.

Mr Debré. — (F) I don't see how one can talk like that. Where has our common sense gone ?

President. — (F) I call Mrs Weiss.

Mrs Weiss. — (F) Speaking in a personal capacity, and as the oldest Member of our Parliament, I endorse all the motions calling for a withdrawal from the Olympic Games, due to start in Moscow in a few months' time.

Some people will claim that it is ridiculous, when so many human lives are at stake, to try to tip the scales in our favour by using contests between swimmers or runners. This is not true. Firstly, justice is one and indivisible. Secondly, we should remember the boost the Olympic Games held in Hitler's Germany gave to the Nazis. There is no point in condemning an action without doing something about it. We have learnt this much from our painful experience of the past. The withdrawal I advocate will be understood by world youth and will lead them to a better understanding of the threat to their spiritual development. Europe, and our Parliament, will take on a moral stature. Besides, it may well be that the Russian authorities, quite obviously angered by this revolt of the free world, will be most relieved — at least judging by the measures already being taken, in direct contravention of the Helsinki agreement, to prevent any contact between their own people and their guests.

President. — I call Mr Haferkamp.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (D) Madam President, this debate has shown that — with the exception we are all aware of — this House is united in condemning the Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan, in demanding that the Soviet troops should be withdrawn and in stressing the dangers facing the whole world. The European Parliament has thus made its position clear, in line with the statement made yesterday by the Council, and which was explained to you this morning by the President-in-Office of the Council. Parliament's position also accords with the vote taken by the United Nations. The European Parliament's attitude is quite clearly that we cannot simply go on as if nothing had happened. You have underlined the need to pursue the policy of *détente*, and we have heard speakers say that such a policy is indivisible. The events in Afghanistan have shown us once again that the world is shrinking, and the peaceful coexistence of peoples throughout this shrinking world must therefore also

be based on indivisible principles. The European Community has always worked towards improving peaceful coexistence and cooperation between the peoples of the world. As far as the Community is concerned, cooperation is a key-word. Indeed, the Community itself is living proof of the importance of cooperation in a part of the world in which confrontations have taken place — two of them within the lifetime of some people still alive today. Cooperation is therefore the keyword for our relations with the rest of the world. Let me remind you of what we did to bring about a successful conclusion to the Helsinki Conference and to see that the results of that conference are put into practice. Let me remind you also of the Community's continuing efforts in the field of development policy, and of what we are doing to strengthen international organizations and institutions which are of decisive importance to our work to promote international cooperation in a wide variety of fields. We intend to pursue this policy, but we shall only be able to do so if others share this will to cooperate.

We have already heard in the course of this debate that it is easy to reach agreement on the formulation of general statements but difficult to find a common answer to a question of what, specifically, is to be done. We have heard references to Community economic measures, and I think it is important for us to realize what courses of action are open to the Community. The Community can only act as a Community where it has policies of its own and where Community instruments exist to implement those policies. As you are all aware, this is very much the case in the agricultural sector.

As you know, the United States has decided to take steps to reduce or stop exports of particular agricultural products to the Soviet Union. The Council decided yesterday on the principle that deliveries from the Community should neither directly nor indirectly make up for supplies of agricultural produce to the Soviet Union which will not now be forthcoming from the USA.

(Applause)

The Council has therefore called on the Commission to take the necessary steps as regards grain and derivative products and to propose other measures for other types of agricultural produce, bearing in mind traditional trade currents.

The Commission has done whatever is necessary to implement this policy and to respect this principle, and will continue to act along these lines. We have also heard reference to the question of export credits. This is an area in which the Community has some chance of pursuing a policy of its own, but in which the Member States also have their responsibilities and powers. As far as the Community is concerned, you know of course that guidelines have been adopted

Haferkamp

within the OECD which cover the question of credits. The Community participated in its own right in this process, and it is up to the Community to see that these guidelines are respected. There are still bilateral credit agreements between some Member States and the Soviet Union, and the Commission already intends to bear in mind the events in Afghanistan when drawing up a harmonized Community credit policy and when meeting its obligation to see that these guidelines are complied with by calling on the Member States concerned to take these directives into account when making the necessary changes.

As to getting the Member States to exert special pressure in this field along the lines I have just mentioned, I think it would be advisable for the national parliaments to do their bit here.

The question of industrial products was also raised. In this respect, there is little the Community as such can do directly. However, now that the Member States have taken a common political line in the statement issued by the Council of Ministers, we may expect a coherent and harmonized policy to be pursued by the Member States. The Commission will do all it can to encourage this, and will in particular supply the Member States with facts and figures as and when required.

Another area where the Community has its own policy is development and food aid. There will be a separate debate on this subject in the House on Friday, and so for the time being I shall just mention what is directly relevant to the subject of today's debate. By the end of last week the Commission had already suspended Community food aid destined for Afghanistan for 1979 — at least that part which had not yet been sent on its way.

The Council decided yesterday to cancel this food aid altogether.

Secondly, we have received an urgent appeal from the UN High Commissioner for Refugees for aid for the 500 000 refugees from Afghanistan. The Council decided yesterday that the Community aid should be lumped together and granted in the same way as provided for by the Member States at national level. The Commission has now called an urgent meeting with the Member States to be held in the next few days to discuss ways of implementing this decision.

You may rest assured that the Commission will take the initiative and put forward whatever proposals are necessary within its field of competence and wherever Community policies and the means of implementing them exist, to prepare the ground for the measures necessitated by the political statements we have heard.

We are greatly encouraged in this task by the vast measure of agreement which is evident in this House, which is also a clear expression of unity and solidarity. I believe we would all agree that everything possible must be done in the near future to maintain and

strengthen this solidarity within the Community and between the Community and all those who are committed to the principle of cooperation between the peoples of the world.

(Applause)

President. — I have received a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-675/79), tabled by Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Vanderpoorten, Mr Bangemann, Mr Calvez, Mr Damseaux, Mr Geurtsen, Mr Irmer, Mr Jürgens, Mr Louwes, Mrs Martin, Mrs Nielsen, Mr Nord, Mrs Scrivener, Mrs von Alemann, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Maher, Mr Delatte, Mr Haagerup, Mr Baudis, Mr Rey, Mr Galland and Mr Pininfarina on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic group, on the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union.

This motion for a resolution replaces the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-650/79/rev.) by the same authors.

The abovementioned motions for resolutions, together with the amendments which have been tabled, will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

The debate is closed.

7. Council statement on the Italian presidency

President. — The next item is the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the programme of the Italian presidency. A debate will follow. Parliament decided yesterday that speaking time would be allocated as follows:

- Council: 45 minutes
- Socialist Group: 20 minutes
- Group of the European People's Party (CD): 20 minutes
- European Democratic Group: 20 minutes
- Communist and Allies Group: 15 minutes
- Liberal and Democratic Group: 15 minutes
- Group of European Progressive Democrats: 15 minutes
- Group for the Technical Coordination of Independent Groups and Members: 15 minutes
- Non-attached Members: 15 minutes

I call Mr Ruffini.

Mr Ruffini, President-in-office of the Council. — *(I)* Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen, it has become standard practice for the country taking on the Presidency of the Council to set out before this Parliament the main lines and action priorities of the six-monthly work programme.

I do not approach this task as someone wishing to get a ritual duty out of the way, however weighty and

Ruffini

exalted. On the contrary, I am well aware of the need to regard it as an important stage in dialogue between the Council and the European Parliament, which in the interests of the Community must be both continuous and fruitful.

As I address this House, I am fully aware of the political implications of its election by universal suffrage, which has made this Assembly the direct expression of the will of our nine nations and has conferred on its Members specific responsibilities towards the European electorate.

I am well aware that it would be short-sighted to refuse to take at their true value the reactions which have emerged from this Parliament and which evince a determination to discharge with the utmost fidelity the tasks of guidance and control conferred on Parliament by the Treaty of Rome.

I therefore wish to say at once that the Italian Government, aware of the urgent need for the Council to act responsibly in the face of this Parliament's expectations, intends to make the greatest possible effort to dispel the distrust and coolness often psychological in origin, which are at present clouding relations between the institutions of the Community. It must frankly be admitted that this distrust and coolness at present constitute an irksome impediment to creating the climate of active trust which is needed if our internal problems and, more generally, the many complex challenges of modern society, are to be overcome.

The six-monthly period of the Italian Presidency coincides with the start of a new decade — the 1980s — which will be of decisive importance not only for the welfare of our peoples but also for the role which Europe is called upon to play in the world as a force for peace, stability and social progress. Only if we are able to assert our unanimous intention of defending and strengthening the moral values fundamental to the European ideal will Europe come safely through the very difficult times that lie ahead.

We shall, therefore, need to foster harmonious collaboration between the Community institutions, each of which will, within the limits of its particular area of responsibility, be called upon to make its own distinct contribution to the primary objective of a unified Europe. We are fully aware that, as we enter the Eighties, the world economic situations is fraught with doubts and uncertainties that cast deep shadows over medium term development prospects.

The probable continuing disorder in the oil market, at least in the near future, will inevitably tend to force world prices upwards, and serve to destabilize the monetary system, with a likely depressive effect on international trade. However, it would be a serious mistake if the caution which the gravity of these problems undoubtedly demands were to lead to a

purely defensive and passive attitude. Indeed, were this to happen, the situation would get worse rather than better.

I feel it necessary for me to state, therefore, that the major decisions before us require an immediate and committed awareness on our part of what the Community stands for today, of what it could and should be and of what it must become.

If we are to restore to the Community the dynamism necessary for its survival and progress, to keep alive the European spirit of the founding fathers of the Community and to preserve the credibility of the European institutions, both in the eyes of European public opinion and of third countries, we must have the moral and political courage and the farsightedness to set the Community on the road to new goals. This involves, first of all — and it is worth restating this — full implementation of the rules laid down in the founding treaties and of the policies adopted to that end.

The problem confronting us today is essentially of a political nature; it can be narrowed down to our capacity to find an adequate Community response to the challenges now confronting our individual countries and the Community as a whole. We must safeguard Community achievements to date and encourage such developments and innovative ideas as may enable us — by means of increased cooperation and solidarity — swiftly to adapt Community machinery and rules to meet changing realities.

I refer here not only to the need to adapt our development models to the altered conditions of the world economy — such as the higher cost of raw materials and, above all, of oil — but also to the now pressing urgency of rethinking all aspects of relations between the industrialized democracies and the developing countries. In this connection, the initiative of the Group of 77 to begin global negotiations in 1980 within the United Nations' Committee of the Whole will provide a good opportunity for reflection on these matters. So too will the special session of the United Nations, to be held in August this year in order to formulate a strategy for the third development decade.

So much, then, for the general picture. I should now like to dwell on some of the priorities which, under the guidance of the Italian Government, should figure amongst the activities of the institutions and, first and foremost, the Council, in the first half of 1980.

It should not come as a surprise to anybody that one of my Government's primary objectives is the strengthening of cooperation between the Council and the European Parliament, a prerequisite for the opening of a frank and wide-ranging dialogue based on full respect for the statutory powers of each institution and on an understanding of each body's aspirations and expectations.

Ruffini

I have just referred to the obligation for the Council to give a suitable response to the legitimate claims of this Parliament to exercise fully and authoritatively the prerogatives devolving on it under the Treaty. The Council is already considering this question, which will be looked at in greater detail when in due course, there is a more specific examination of the report on adjustments to the machinery and procedures of the Community institutions recently drawn up by the 'Three Wise Men', as was required of them by the brief they received from the European Council in Brussels in December 1978. The purpose of this examination is to prepare the ground for an effective discussion at the next European Council, with a view to establishing the most suitable institutional framework for further democratic progress towards the ideal of European Union.

No-one can ignore the importance and urgency of this objective, nor is it possible to deny the difficulties lying in the way of its full attainment. There is no doubt that the attainment of these goals could be greatly facilitated by a responsible common attitude which would not neglect the concern for renewal and the ever more clearly discerned need to set new targets, but which could simultaneously temper that concern and need with the cautious gradualism called for by the rather difficult economic situation through which the Community is passing today. The Council and the Parliament will soon be called upon to show such proof of their wisdom by adopting the 1980 budget, following the rejection of the previous draft by this House.

The Italian Presidency proposes to devote particular attention to the speedy preparation of the new budget and to take positive steps to ensure that the political guidelines worked out by this Parliament receive due consideration, respecting both the Treaty and the need to see that the requirements to be met by the budget are kept within reasonable bounds. In this connection, I wish particularly to stress that — in accordance with the decisions of the European Council in Dublin — steps will have to be taken in the near future, if the objective of greater convergence of the economies of the Member States is to be attained, to help solve the problem of the financial imbalances of which the United Kingdom has been complaining. This is a problem in respect of which Mr Galland, Mrs Pruvot and Mr Calvez have already approached the Council in order to request a debate in this House.

In this respect, and until the Commission has put its proposals before us, I should like to confine myself to pointing out that any further contribution by the European Parliament — in addition to the contribution made during the November part-session on the problem of economic convergence — can only facilitate the search for a solution to this problem, the seri-

ousness and the delicacy of which everyone, especially the President-in-Office, is aware.

As regards the objective of convergence of Member States' economies, it will be necessary in the first place to strive to abolish those distortions in the common policies which are now causing divergence; secondly, we must strive to achieve conditions which will ensure a more consistent development of the backward regions and, as a natural consequence of this more consistent development, guarantee continuous and balanced expansion, greater stability, an increasingly rapid improvement in the quality of life and closer links between the Member States, all of which are objectives expressly laid down in the Treaty of Rome.

In carrying out those tasks that come within its own particular province, the Italian Presidency intends to avail itself of the achievements of the previous six months. In this connection, I should like to pay tribute to the incisive and intelligent way in which affairs have been handled by the Irish Presidency.

Let me just make one more observation before briefly reviewing the problems that face us in the various sectors of Community activity.

This Parliament has rightly called for urgent action to change the balance of Community policies in favour of structural and general-investment policies to achieve wider and more effective solidarity. Solidarity does not mean, however, hand-outs by the richer countries to the poorer; it is a collective requirement. It is as true of the Community as of any social grouping that if one part is weak or in difficulties, everyone suffers. The Community cannot be strong, efficient and active if there exist within it economic and social imbalances which perpetuate differences between the Member States which are inimical to the pursuit of common policies and to the achievement of Community objectives.

There is no doubt that this is not an easy problem which involves not just the restructuring of the present Community expenditure, but also the more general question of the overall volume of Community own resources. Again, we are awaiting a proposal from the Commission on this matter.

The problems of the common agricultural policy must certainly be included in this context, not in order to question the principles on which that policy is based, but in order to ensure that when these principles are implemented, the distortions which have occurred in the past are avoided and that greater emphasis is placed on structural measures to enable farms in the most underdeveloped areas to be modernized and a new balance to be established between various types of production on the basis of actual market requirements. It is with this in mind, and taking information supplied by Parliament into account, that we shall try to make the fastest possible progress in examining the

Ruffini

Commission proposals for the improved control of agricultural expenditure in sectors where there is a surplus and take action aimed at a fairer protection of the various crops.

With regard to the development of structural and general-investment policies, I think can say that the strengthening of the Community's energy policy is an obvious priority.

The European Council in Dublin outlined a common strategy providing for the attainment of a number of important objectives, including the more moderate and rational use of oil as a non-renewable natural resource and the achievement of economic growth no longer based on increased oil consumption but on the development of other energy sources.

As regards limiting consumption, the Community has already agreed on maximum levels for oil imports in the short and medium term. These are fairly important measures but they are not enough to reduce the inflexibility of the relationship established in the past between the growth of gross domestic product and oil consumption.

Energy is therefore clearly one of the subjects on which we must make a greater effort to achieve a true Community policy and to start to take those steps, including financial ones, needed to reduce the Community's dependence on imported oil.

In the industrial sector, we consider it to be in the common interest to encourage the launching of a more systematic policy of re-establishing a unitary approach as regards aid to those sectors that are in difficulties, and as regards the measures to be adopted to strengthen those sectors that are expanding. A more systematic policy should take greater account of international specialization and a more rational division of industrial labour, by endeavouring, *inter alia*, to find the most suitable means of tackling structural weaknesses and making supply more elastic to enable it to adjust both to changes in demand and to new production techniques. The need to increase the competitiveness of European industry and restore productivity to former levels therefore means that we must devote special attention to the problems of modernization of the entire production apparatus, which we feel, cannot be divorced from those of retraining and the mobility of labour.

This last objective leads me to emphasize the attention which should be given to the social sector, in view of the extent and the structural nature of unemployment in all the countries of the Community. The gravity of unemployment in the Community, and the likelihood that it will deteriorate still further call, more than ever before for courageous common solutions to be found.

There can be no doubt that progress along these lines has been made as a result of the approval last

November of the Resolution setting out a number of guidelines for action and certain general principles to be followed in connection with the re-organization of working hours. This step should be seen as one element in that active employment policy which the Community needs, especially in the present economic climate, and which should include the better utilization for social ends of these Community financial resources which are of a structural nature.

We are convinced that, to achieve this aim, there will have to be more efficient and comprehensive consultation of both sides of industry making better use *inter alia* of the Economic and Social Committee.

The other structural policies are of course equally important, especially the Regional Policy, which continues to be the prime instrument for reducing imbalances within the Community and must be pursued by coordinating all the means at our disposal. The Regional Policy, or rather the implementation of the Regional Policy, cannot consist solely of utilizing the financial resources provided for by the relevant Fund. A true Community policy in this sector must necessarily include the territorial dimension of all common policies, since it is only in this way, through taking an overall view, that we shall be able to prevent regional policy from being seen merely as the granting of subsidies — however large — to less favoured regions.

On the monetary and financial front, one of our main objectives concerns the preparatory work for moving on to the second stage of the EMS and especially for the creation of the European Monetary Fund.

On the whole I think it must be recognized that the system has worked satisfactorily. Nevertheless, it is a matter of urgency that we should devise a Community policy *vis-à-vis* the dollar, which will provide not only for closer coordination of intervention on exchange markets but also for more effective monitoring of the compatibility of national monetary policies, especially those relating to interest rates.

I said a moment ago that the EMS had, so far, worked satisfactorily; however, apart from the repercussions which serious and lasting external monetary disturbances might have on the system, it must also be consolidated by making real progress towards a reduction in the continuing major imbalances between the national economies and the regions of the Community. This was in fact the gist of the decisions taken by the European Council on the convergence of the economic policies of the Member States.

Similarly, fresh impetus will also have to be given to transport policy, where we feel convinced that real progress can be made by adopting the Regulation providing for aid to projects of Community interest in the field of transport infrastructure. The Commission's recent communication to the Council will — we are

Ruffini

convinced — provide a useful opportunity for further examination of the most suitable measures to be taken in this field.

As part of the aim of strengthening the cohesion of the Community, serious efforts will have to be made to speed up work on the definition of a common fisheries policy in order that the Regulations on structural measures and measure to rationalize the market in fishery products may be adopted.

In addition to promoting suitable concerted action on those priority topics of energy, raw materials, public health, agriculture, etc., on which the social and economic development of the Community depends, the need to stimulate technical progress will mean that greater attention will have to be devoted to research.

On this last point, one need only consider the fact that, comparatively speaking, the Community countries spend distinctly less on research than other countries which are technologically more advanced. This state of affairs should lead us to reflect upon, and perhaps convince ourselves of the need to give greater encouragement and more substance to research activities.

As regards environmental policy, there must be better organization of those activities that are already in progress, with a stepping-up of the more important of these, for example the protection of water resources, anti-pollution measures, protection of the soil and an assessment of the importance of environmental matters.

I should like now to mention the importance which the Italian Presidency will attach to the question of 'special rights'.

As well as speeding up the examination of the Commission's proposals on the residential rights of all citizens, we believe it necessary to reach an early conclusion to discussions on the question of voting rights at local government level, which, following on the direct elections of this Assembly, would be a significant further step towards reinforcing the Community. If these rights were recognized, it would give individual citizens a deeper awareness of being part of the new, larger political entity that is the European Community.

I should now like to consider for a while the European Community's external relations. As I have already had occasion to remark, it is essential that the Community's internal cohesion should be strengthened if the Community itself is to fulfil its role in world politics. We must shortly take some important decisions concerning the Community's relations with the rest of the world. First of all, of course, there is the enlargement of the Community, the political significance of which is clear to everyone and has often

been stated in this Assembly. Negotiations are taking place for the accession of Spain and Portugal, and as far as the Italian Presidency is concerned, I can assure you that we are conscious of the part to be played by these countries in bringing about democratic unity in Europe, and we shall do everything in our power to ensure unhindered progress — right across the board — and a constructive atmosphere in the conduct of the renegotiations.

There is another point to be made in this connection. The question of further enlargement of the Community cannot and must not be tackled solely from the traditional, albeit essential, standpoint, according to which the applicant countries must accept our Community's rules in their entirety. In the 1960s we created a Community to meet the requirements of the six founder members and, in particular, the economic circumstances of that decade. That Community was a success, but it proved to be less so in the 1970s, in a situation of changed economic circumstances and a Community of nine members.

We must realize — at least, this is how it appears to me — that we cannot face up to this second enlargement without strengthening existing structures, reinforcing current policies and creating new ones. What is more, we must at the same time go further into the problem of the reactions of third countries, especially Mediterranean ones, to the enlargement of the Community.

In the same constructive spirit, the Italian Presidency intends to use its best endeavours to obtain an early conclusion of the new agreement with Yugoslavia and the adoption of measures to give new impetus to the association agreement with Turkey. Apropos of this, I should like to assure the members of the Socialist Group, who have formally requested information on this matter, that the Presidency has made every possible effort to speed up negotiations so that they may be concluded in time for the Council meeting of 5 February.

Important developments are foreseeable in our relations with Third World countries. I have already mentioned the need to give greater prominence and political weight to the North-South dialogue. As to specific objectives, I believe the Community should be able to finalize the basic regulations on financial and technical aid to non-associated countries. The new Food Aid Convention, which provides for an increased commitment by the industrialized countries, and in particular the Community, should also be concluded.

As well as signing the cooperation agreement with the ASEAN countries, the negotiations for which were successfully concluded under the Irish Presidency, the Italian Presidency proposes to stimulate cooperation between the Community and the countries of Latin

Ruffini

America, with which we have many ties that are not only economic in nature but also historical and cultural. We shall seek to re-organize our dialogue with these countries and introduce new forms of cooperation. We also intend to pursue the negotiation of cooperation agreements with Brazil and the countries of the Andean Pact.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, this Parliament is familiar with the distinctive features of political cooperation between the Nine which, as you know, is carried out outside the confines of the Community Treaties. I should like to mention just one of these, namely the fact that such cooperation has developed without the creation of a bureaucratic structure and has shown an appropriate degree of imagination in following original procedures, the effectiveness and objective limits of which we are all familiar with.

The Nine have not established a common external policy, although this still remains one of our ideals. But there has been proof of the effectiveness of our Governments' commitment to consulting each other and coordinating their attitudes to developments in the current international scene with the aim of reaching common positions and pursuing common actions, wherever possible and desirable.

When evaluated in these realistic terms, the experience of ten years of European political co-operation will be seen to be broadly positive, its benefits extending beyond the purely tangible results obtained. While, as was observed by the Irish Presidency before this House the Nine have acquired a new habit, that of automatically consulting one another, they have also acquired a corresponding reflex action in their dealings with the outside world, which has consequently come to recognize them as a distinct entity, a development which reflects the albeit gradual growth of awareness of a European identity.

As this point I think it would be useful if I were to give you a brief summary of the main topics of international policy.

As regards Indochina, I know that I am expressing the conviction and feelings of Parliament when I emphasize both the political aspects of the situation, with its effects of destabilization over a vast area, and the urgency of a solution to the dramatic and desperate humanitarian problems. Both the European Community and the nine Member States have already made a substantial contribution to the humanitarian initiatives rightly launched by the international community. We intend to carry on with this work, while at the same time doing everything in our power to secure a return to peace in South East Asia consistent with the principles of the independence and territorial integrity of all the States in that area.

The taking of hostages in the United States Embassy in Teheran and their continuing detention, in flagrant violation of the fundamental principles governing relations between States and in spite of the recommendations of the world community, is an example of an alarming deterioration in international relations and a source of serious additional tension in an area already subject to destabilizing factors.

Neither the duty of non-interference in the internal affairs of another State nor the effort of understanding which is owing to a nation engaged in the struggle to create a new order after a revolution, can justify any attitude other than condemnation for actions which infringe the fundamental rules of international law.

This disquieting situation should be extended to include the whole area usually described as the Islamic world. In the Middle East the vital issue of finding a global solution for the serious outstanding problems, and in particular the Palestinian problem, is running into difficulties, despite the peace initiatives which the United States have succeeded in promoting in order to reconcile Egypt and Israel.

The past year has seen encouraging signs of stabilization in Africa. Not only have new moves towards reconciliation between neighbouring countries previously separated by bitter rivalry, but, thanks to the courageous, tenacious and authoritative action of the United Kingdom Government, concrete form has been given to the hope that a negotiated settlement will be achieved in Zimbabwe which will enable the people of that country to choose a system of government responding to the desire for independence expressed by all shades of Rhodesian political opinion. It is to be hoped that this positive development will serve to promote favourable development in all the other problems of southern Africa, and in particular that of Namibia.

As regards the problem of disarmament, which is of such critical importance for the future of humanity, the Italian Presidency intends to promote the further strengthening of the Nine's activity, in particular with a view to the adoption of those joint initiatives which may contribute to the achievement of the objective of practical progress on the fundamental issue of disarmament. It is comforting to note that, on the entire range of problems relating to disarmament, the Nine have achieved a high level of coordination of their attitudes and their actions.

The Italian Presidency looks on the next session of the Commission on Human Rights — to be held in Geneva from 4 February to 14 March — as a crucial occasion for demonstrating European solidarity in a field of such great importance for the Nine. We intend to pursue this same objective in respect of the other events figuring on the United Nations timetable, starting with the Copenhagen World Conference for Women.

Ruffini

Over and above the divisions that have emerged within the Arab world — in respect of which the Nine do not intend to intervene or be drawn into any sort of interference — the Euro-Arab dialogue continues to represent an exemplary initiative in the field of political cooperation, one that should be nurtured and taken further. During the Irish Presidency concrete steps were taken to give practical effect to this general approach. We plan to continue this process and to endeavour to exploit any opportunity for a balanced revival of the dialogue.

For the meeting in Madrid of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), the preparatory phase of which is scheduled to take place in September whilst the main session will begin in November, the next six months will see the Community's agenda reflecting an intensification of the work that we have been pursuing for more than a year. It is in the field of the CSCE, in fact, that political cooperation has recorded some of its most marked successes, right from the moment the process began.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am aware that there exist, in addition to the problems that I have just mentioned, others of a more procedural nature, i. e. relating to the best methods for ensuring this indispensable link with the European Parliament. Views and requests in this connection have already been voiced here on a number of occasions. The Italian Presidency views the matter of improving these procedures as something which must be constantly borne in mind as part of the process of political cooperation. This latter is a pragmatic and a non-institutionalized mechanism which, by its very nature, has to devote constant attention to the various aspects of its continuous functional adjustments.

The Italian Presidency will be honoured to brief Parliament on all the developments in European political cooperation as and when the various scheduled meetings take place. It considers these engagements which occur during the exercise of its functions, not as a duty but as privileged occasions by means of which — and here it is appropriate to use the language of the Luxembourg Report — public opinion and its representatives must be effectively associated in the process of political cooperation in order to confer a democratic character on the building of European Union.

Ladies and gentlemen, the quality and level of the debates in the European Parliament on the most important themes of current international politics have been much appreciated in all our countries and welcomed by all those who believe that the European Parliament, particularly in the present delicate international situation, must represent one of the basic dynamic factors in the construction of European Union. The Italian Presidency is convinced that it is precisely the link with the democratically elected Parliament that gives international political cooperation in

the field of foreign policy the chance to catch the imagination of the peoples of Europe and take account of their views on the major international options open to them.

In view of everything that I have just said, it seems to me that this is the most appropriate forum in which to make a fervent appeal to the governments and peoples of Europe and ask them, in the face of the storm-clouds overshadowing the international scene on this threshold of the Eighties, to think first and foremost of the things that they have in common.

I have already mentioned the priority aims of this Presidency, and the special background against which it must act. The solution to those problems that threaten to paralyse the Community must be found in an orderly relationship between the European Institutions and in a common effort to realize the objectives of the Treaty of Rome.

I am confident that the Commission will carry out its obligations to propose initiatives in a thorough and expeditious manner and I am equally confident that the various national governments will also be prepared to agree to reconcile their own understandable personal interests with the general interest of the Community.

The Community is facing a great test: it is up to us to show both to ourselves and to the world that we can overcome it.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET*Vice-President*

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

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President-in-Office of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, no one in this House can say that the Irish presidency of the Council was a very happy one; it ended with the failure of the Dublin summit, at which it proved impossible to solve the problem of Britain's contribution, and with the rejection by Parliament of the budget proposed by the Council; it was also marked by the absence of decisions, particularly concerning employment and energy.

The problem of energy and of our dependence on external supplies is, however, of great concern to the Community.

Glinne

I raised this problem last July in our inaugural debate, when I emphasized the importance to the Community of devising an energy policy which was less dependent on big concerns and foreign powers. In particular, during the first part-session in July, the Socialist Group proposed the setting up of a European Energy Agency, one of the aims of which would be to keep a check on the multinational oil companies. Such an agency should be empowered, first and foremost, to negotiate our supplies directly with the producer countries, thus bypassing the rapacity of the multinationals. Sadly, I now have to repeat the proposals we made six months ago, but I am afraid this is unavoidable in view of the Council's inaction.

Since then, the situation has deteriorated: oil prices have risen and the Commission has once again shown the degree to which it is at the mercy of the oil-producing countries. My colleague, Edgard Pisani, has moreover rightly commented that we can no longer even speak of a 'real oil market'. Indeed, now that we need oil from the OPEC countries far more than they need our money and technological hardware, the situation has lost all balance.

A voluntarist Community policy is therefore required in this field. We should, as a matter of urgency, resume our discussions with the OPEC countries: these were broken off last July following the statements by Commissioner Brunner and have still not been restarted: and we should also devise a system for organizing the market so as to guarantee transactions and prices. A European Energy Agency should play a prominent role here. This is what should be done in the short term.

In the longer term, balance between supply and demand should be achieved by reducing our imported oil requirements. This can be done in two ways: by energy conservation and by research into alternative forms of energy.

We should begin by asking ourselves to what extent we can rely on alternative energy sources and what such sources are. The question of nuclear energy arises inevitably.

Here again, I am forced to repeat the comments I made to the Council last July.

The Socialist Group remains opposed to giving any 'strong fresh impetus' to nuclear energy as advocated by the European Council at its meeting on 21 and 22 June 1979.

Following the Harrisburg accident, and at the request of the Socialist members of the Committee on Energy and Research, a resolution was adopted by Parliament at its April 1979 part-session calling upon the Commission to report to Parliament on the accident at Three Mile Island and its consequences for the Community's nuclear programmes. We are still

waiting for this report. It is unacceptable for us to build certain types of reactors before we can even read the Commission's report, as they may have to be scrapped if they are found to be dangerous! Safety is of prime importance to us Socialists. For this reason, several members of my Group have tabled a number of written questions and an oral question with debate concerning safety in nuclear power stations. We can in no event approve of an expansion of the nuclear sector until we receive satisfactory guarantees concerning reactor safety and the long-term storage of highly radioactive waste.

In view of the Community's need to seek alternative forms of energy to make us less dependent on the oil-producing countries, the Socialist Group proposes the following measures for the immediate future: firstly, Community coal mining should be developed more intensively; in this connection Parliament has already passed two resolutions requesting the Council to adopt a regulation on subsidies for the use of coal in electric power plants; secondly, practical measures should be taken in the field of energy conservation, and these should be the result not merely of recommendations made to the national governments but, above all, of Community directives.

I do not feel it necessary, Mr President, to raise the distressing subject of unemployment today. My group had ample opportunity to voice its opinions on this matter during yesterday's debate. I shall not repeat the concrete proposals we made on that occasion, but would merely stress that we hope the Council will take account of them.

Mr Ruffini, you stressed the need for a permanent dialogue between the Council and Parliament. We are deeply gratified at the new presidency's positive attitude towards Parliament because, without wishing to open up old wounds, we must tell you quite plainly that we were shocked by the aggressive tone of your predecessor, Mr Lenihan, during the budgetary debate, in which he went so far as to label the members of this House as irresponsible. This kind of language from the Council is unlikely to encourage the necessary dialogue with Parliament.

You also said, Mr Ruffini, that you would give priority consideration to the 1980 budget and to the problem of the Member States' contributions within the framework of a more intensive convergence policy.

In this connection, the Dublin summit ended disappointingly, since no solution was found to the problem of Britain's contribution. My Group has always acknowledged the unfairness of the present situation: the United Kingdom undeniably pays too much in relation to its GNP. We believe that this problem must be solved on a European scale and agree with you, Mr Ruffini, that a policy of conver-

Glinne

gence could help to overcome the disparities between the wealthy and poor regions and that the Regional Development Fund, for example, should be used more actively for the benefit of the poor regions. But in any event we are firmly opposed to the policy of *juste retour*. In the case of the United Kingdom, we deplore the attempts by Mrs Thatcher to recover £ 7 million for purely budgetary reasons in order to reduce her foreign debts and not to help the poor regions of the country where unemployment is continuing to increase at an alarming rate.

My Group rejected the budget proposed by the Council because it feels that it should be radically restructured to make it capable of contributing towards economic development within the Community and in the developing countries.

It is incredible that while the Council is calling for the introduction of regional, social, energy and industrial policies it is trying to deprive the Commission of funds which are essential if these policies are to be successful.

The Commission and Parliament, through its rapporteur, Mr Piet Dankert, made realistic proposals to the Council to enable the Community to pursue an active employment policy and combat unemployment. The Council saw fit to reject these and proposed an unbalanced budget to Parliament. No-one can disagree with us when we say that a budget in which 70 % of the funds are earmarked for the agricultural policy — in 1979 80 % of the budget was apparently devoted to agriculture — is unbalanced.

The Socialist Group expects the new budgetary proposals submitted by the Council to Parliament to be more in line with the proposals made by the Commission and Parliament. If we wish to eliminate the disparities between the wealthy and poor regions of the Community — and Mr Ruffini rightly emphasized that this is urgently needed — we shall have to give the Regional and Social Funds the necessary means to assist the poor regions.

I shall conclude, Mr President, Mr Ruffini, ladies and gentlemen, by discussing the common agricultural policy.

A debate on the farm price policy has been scheduled for March. Without wishing to cast doubt on the usefulness of and need for such a debate, the Socialist Group feels that we should hold a debate on the reorganization of the agricultural policy independently and in advance of a debate on a matter of detail.

The President-in-Office of the Council rightly emphasized the need to modernize farm production, especially in the underdeveloped regions. He also spoke of

the imbalance between the various products and market requirements and of the need for greater protection for various crops, etc. I hope that these justified anxieties do not remain merely pious hopes and that the financial resources required to pursue a different agricultural policy will be made available.

While I do not wish to anticipate the debate on the reform of the agricultural policy requested by my Group, I would repeat the three main principles set out by the Socialist Group of the old Parliament at a meeting in Copenhagen in 1974: firstly, we are opposed to price increases on surplus products; secondly, the EAGGF Guidance Section should be increased to modernize farm production; and thirdly, expenditure on regions in genuine need, many of which are in the south of the Community, should be stepped up.

The Socialist Group's underlying philosophy is based on two fundamental principles: to protect the earnings of farmers and farm workers and to provide the consumers, most of whom are workers, with products which are satisfactory as regards quality, quantity and price.

The President-in-Office of the Council also spoke at length about political cooperation. I personally cannot agree with his view that present political cooperation is satisfactory. While it is true that a cooperation 'reflex' has emerged, no joint decisions have been taken in many highly important fields, in particular with regard to the Community's position *vis-à-vis* southern Africa; now that elections have been held in Rhodesia the situation may one day begin to stabilize but the Community must be more forceful in condemning, in accordance with international decisions, the odious policy of apartheid.

The President-in-Office of the Council referred to the need for Community policies on industry, social and regional affairs, employment and on the fight against unemployment, as well as to the need to reform the agricultural policy.

These declarations of intent are indeed highly interesting and laudable, but they will remain empty words if the Community does not have the financial resources to implement them successfully.

The Members of this House, I repeat emphatically, did not behave irresponsibly when they used their legitimate authority to reject the 1980 budget proposed by the Council. This budget did not provide the financial backing necessary to achieve the goals pursued in any of the important areas I have mentioned.

Glinne

I earnestly hope that the new budget which Council will be proposing to Parliament — as soon as possible, I hope — will take account of the anxieties of the European people which were reflected in the votes of four-fifths of the Members of this directly elected Parliament.

If the Council fails to do this, Parliament, at any rate the Socialist Group, will once again face up to its responsibilities and make a clear stand.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

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

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my Group, I should like to thank the President-in-Office of the Council for his detailed statement and especially for the determined and balanced plan he put forward. The six months of the Italian Presidency and, indeed, the 1980s are beginning with political and economic crises on a global scale. The free part of the world, including Europe, is faced with an enormous challenge. The ever-growing number of political powder-kegs throughout the world is not only an alarm signal; it must be seen as an urgent and inescapable appeal for common political action on the part of us Europeans.

Following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and in view of the brutality with which this country has been brought under Soviet control, the European Community is called upon to take up an unequivocal stance and give a clear reply to a policy which relies on the use of military force and therefore jeopardizes peaceful coexistence. Other members of my Group have already made this point in the previous debate, and I should like to thank the Council for the clarity of the position it has adopted and to assure it that we all support this position. If we want to live in security, peace and freedom, our economic power and our political and moral values make it incumbent upon us to declare our determination to accept our responsibilities. One of our major tasks is to uphold and strengthen the independence of the Third World. In the forthcoming negotiations on improving and expanding our external relations with a number of countries, we must demonstrate a constructive attitude which will improve the chances of peace and stability.

For instance, I feel that it is time to put our relations with Yugoslavia on a more formal footing. The negotiations on an economic and cooperation agreement with Yugoslavia, which have been dragging on for years now, must be brought to a rapid conclusion. Our

special relations with the countries of the Third World — most of them non-aligned countries — must be more vigorously cultivated; after all, by helping to build up the economies of these regions, we can contribute towards their social, economic and political stability. This is particularly true of the hard-pressed country of Pakistan and other Islamic States. The economic and financial cooperation agreement with Egypt — which has indicated its willingness to accept its share of the responsibility — should be extended. By strengthening the Community's commitment, we could help these countries to steer a course of economic cooperation between the super powers without becoming politically dependent on either of them.

I also think that — after a long interruption — our institutionalized relations with Turkey, a direct neighbour of the Middle East trouble spot, should be resumed as soon as possible now that the new Turkish Prime Minister, Mr Demirel, has expressed his government's wish that the temporarily frozen association negotiations be revived. There must be more intensive work to prepare the ground for the accession of the new members to the Community. As far as parliamentary contacts are concerned, we feel that the Joint EEC-Greece Parliamentary Committee should, if possible, meet every month until Greece becomes a full member of the European Community. By reason of its experience and its position *vis-à-vis* Asia Minor and the Middle East, the Italian Presidency can do a lot to help the Community improve its foreign relations image.

In the North-South Dialogue, which the Italian Presidency rightly intends to concentrate on in the next six months, it is time a new phase was opened. In view of the major importance of this question for the future of the industrialized nations of Europe, we should be glad to see it made one of the main subjects of the two Venice summits, i.e. the European Council meeting and the summit of the major Western industrialized countries. Development policy based on economic cooperation with the Third World is the best way to ensure peace.

These events on the world political stage will have immense and unforeseeable repercussions on the state and internal development of the European Community. Economic prospects have seriously deteriorated following the second oil price shock in six years, and forecasts at the beginning of a new decade are subdued. The pundits foresee modest economic growth, the possibility of a further rise in unemployment and the rate of inflation and more disequilibrium in the balance of payments. These dangers — resulting from the increase in oil prices — must be reduced.

Klepsch

In view of the dramatic deterioration in our supply situation — I am thinking here particularly of the developments in Iran and the price policy pursued by the oil-producing countries — the Community's energy policy record to date is totally inadequate. Unless the Member States are ready and willing to overcome their internal conflicts of interest, there is a danger of the Community losing all credibility both internally and externally. The appropriations in the budget for energy policy are absolutely ridiculous when viewed against the magnitude of the problem. It is beyond my understanding why the Energy Ministers in the Council have done virtually nothing at all in response to the appeals and decisions from the Heads of State and Government. It is really high time some significant progress was made on discussing new energy policy objectives for 1990. It is a fact that the Community can only react — rather than act — to events in the oil sector; for this reason, we must concentrate our actions on other energy sectors. For instance, we must make progress in the coal sector, with the emphasis on using coal to generate electricity. It is worrying to hear that, for power stations currently under construction, less than one-third of total capacity is coal-fired, almost two-thirds being exclusively oil-fired. We must break out of the present total deadlock in the nuclear energy debate at European level. The Council has so far apparently made no attempt at all to get things moving on the revision of the Euratom Treaty. The introduction of a system of mutual consultation on the location of power stations in border regions could take a lot of the heat out of public discussion.

To sum up: the European Community's energy policy has so far failed to meet the challenge of the oil crisis, and the upshot of this is that the Community's position *vis-à-vis* third countries is being irresponsibly jeopardized. This situation must change, and we hope that the Italian Presidency will help to overcome the conflict of interests within the Council. The only way we shall get to grips with this problem which is so vital to our future prospects is by all pulling together. The oil-producing countries' enormous surpluses will place the international financial institutions and the European Monetary System, still in its infancy, under a great strain. International events are therefore one more reason why we should not falter in developing the EMS. The character and the role of the European Currency Unit — the ECU — must be strengthened and the European Monetary Fund must be more than just a regional credit institution: it must increasingly take on the role of an independent European Central Bank. In the monetary policy sphere, too, we must have more harmonization.

The Presidency of the Council will also be under great internal pressure in the next few years. As far as budgetary policy is concerned, the Community is still faced with a dual problem. The President-in-Office mentioned the possibility of arbitration in the conflict

over the United Kingdom's contribution to the budget. We hope that a compromise which satisfies all sides will be found in this question.

As to the Community budget for the current year, we expect the Council to move quickly in complying with the demands put forward by this House so that the 1980 budget can be finalized as soon as possible.

We hope to see effective conciliation, both formally and informally and we are optimistic in thinking that one round of discussions may be enough. While I am on this point, I must tell you that my Group will support no proposal which does not take account of the basic opinions expressed by this Parliament elected by the citizens of Europe.

(Applause)

It is well known — and you made the point again today, Mr Ruffini — that the Italian Presidency is not ill-disposed towards Parliament's attitude to the budget, and we hope that, here again, you will be able to arbitrate between the two opposing camps. You will then have the chance to prove that you meant what you said about improving relations between the Council and the European Parliament. Joint responsibility of the institutions for Community interests must be a matter of paramount importance to all of us.

I should like at this point to make a few comments on the common agricultural policy, which was undoubtedly the central issue in the debates on the 1980 budget and which is bound to remain a central issue. We were, and still are, worried that the lack of balance in certain markets — notably in the milk sector — will jeopardize the common agricultural policy — which is the only fully integrated European policy we have so far — and with it the very foundation of European economic integration.

My group and a majority of this House have in the past again and again proposed specific measures or supported Commission proposals aimed at bringing about a fairer balance. The Council, however, has in the past either failed to put these proposals into practice or only done so after a long delay. We now expect to see the introduction of an agricultural policy which will get a grip on production and keep the cost to the Community budget down by making the agricultural sector itself partially responsible for meeting the costs. Let me make it quite clear, though, that we do not intend to take any money out of the agricultural sector; we simply want the management of the agricultural markets to be based more on cost/benefit considerations. Let me repeat — we are not calling into question the principles of the common agricultural policy. We want to see past mistakes rectified and the policy modified where necessary. As far as we are concerned, the questions of economic convergence and employment policy have not been tackled

Klepsch

anything like effectively enough. We agree with the Italian Presidency that these matters are vital to the further development of the Community and we shall do our best to make sure that the necessary decisions are taken.

Last year, the political parties involved in the first direct elections to the European Parliament received the support of the Community institutions in conducting a massive information campaign to bring the Community nearer to the people of Europe.

We attach great importance to symbolic acts which will give the 260 million people living in the European Community the feeling of belonging to one huge family. We have been waiting for two of these symbolic acts for years now. In 1972, the Commission submitted its first draft for the harmonization of European driving licences. In 1974, the Heads of State and Government meeting at the Paris Summit proposed the introduction of a standard passport for the whole of the European Community. The subsequent bickering about these documents has been unworthy of the Community. We refuse to sit idly by and watch these two proposals gather dust on the shelves of bureaucracy, and we call on the Presidency to oppose any further delay to these two projects and to see them through to acceptance in the Council.

It is also absolutely essential to make the cultural aspect of Europe more a part of the overall development of the Community. The Council has before it a number of reports on the institutional development of the Community. The forthcoming second phase of enlargement — beginning in early 1981 and continuing, if all goes well, in the first half of the 1980s — makes it a matter of the utmost importance to think — and, I would say, decide — about how the Community institutions should work. If a Community with 12 Member States is to work effectively, the institutions must develop and there must be an improvement in their mutual relations their decision-making mechanisms. We therefore welcome the fact that the Italian Presidency intends to get an immediate discussion going in the Council on the report of the Three Wise men. What we need are structures and decision-making mechanisms which will encourage joint action and will help us to overcome self-seeking nationalism.

The pragmatic proposals for overcoming our current problems must be studied and decided upon without any further ado. At any rate, the way the Council went about examining the Tindemans Report can hardly be taken as a good example. The Community must move forward, and its citizens must not be disappointed. 1980 must see the start of a period of increased convergence; it must be a transitional year from which the Community emerges with renewed political and institutional strength. We hope and trust that the Italian Presidency will do a lot to make this possible in the first six months of this year. They can be sure of our support and we wish them well.

(Applause)

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

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, I too would join my predecessors in thanking the Italian President-in-Office of the Council for what he has said to us and I wish him good fortune in the coming six months of his presidency.

There is a headline in the British newspapers today, Mr President, which expresses disappointment that the West can only go on using words, words, words and taking no action. That headline referred, of course, to the situation in Afghanistan. I, too, am just as disappointed. We have had an awful lot of words from the Italian President-in-Office today in his short speech, words aimed at stepping up our activity in all kinds of fields. I only hope that those words will really be translated into action during these six months. We have heard these same good intentions from previous Presidents-in-Office. We applauded and said, 'Well done, splendid!' However, when it came to the end of the six months we looked back and said, 'Oh what a pity it could not be done'. And very little actually happened. So I hope that during these six months he will be able to take really positive action on all the pressing problems facing us and him and that we shall not just have words and words all the time.

The first problem, of course, is that of the budget and the British contribution. This is not the moment for me to go, into detail. We shall be doing that, when we debate Mr Guerlin's oral question next month. I think that would be the right moment and I am grateful for what the President said in this connection. Parliament will be coming forward with possible solutions, and I think it would be helpful if we continued along the same lines as we did in November.

I must admit I was absolutely amazed at the effrontery of the Socialist Group, when its chairman said that he had rejected Mrs Thatcher's view of what she was doing. It showed a complete lack of understanding of the economic fact that what she is trying to do is to reduce public expenditure in my country. Part of that is the thousand million which has to go to pay for what he himself admitted to be the unfair balance of EEC payments at this moment.

As I said, this is not the time to go into the details of what can be done or even to put forward possible solutions. That will come at a later stage, but I must reiterate that there is no question of us wishing to leave the Community. We want to continue to work in it and will do everything we can to do so. However, the search for a solution to the imbalance in the budget need not be held up by Parliament's decisive rejection of the 1980 draft budget. Indeed there is no reason why these solutions should not be dovetailed into the procedures for settling the 1980 budget, on which we are about to embark. If in November the European

Scott-Hopkins

Council had arrived at a successful conclusion for the United Kingdom, we would probably at this very moment be dealing with a supplementary budget necessitated by those conclusions. My group wishes to see the agreement between all the budgetary authorities accelerated and established, if possible, before Easter of this year, but in a way, of course, that fully respects Parliament's budgetary powers. To this end of course, conciliation between Council and Parliament will undoubtedly be needed.

This year, also for the first time, the establishment of the 1980 budget will have to coincide with the 1980/81 farm price review, which we are going to be debating later on this year in March. Indeed, for the first time, we shall be able to deal with the budgetary implications of the price review at the same time as the actual price review itself, instead of doing what we normally did in the past, which was quite ridiculous, namely to pass a completely imaginary figure in the budget and then come back with a supplementary budget later on in the year, which we generally had to accept as it stood without being able to make any comment or changes to it. I am glad that this particular year we are going to be able to do this. Nevertheless I must give a warning to the Commission, and indeed to the Ministers of Agriculture that if they think they are going to be able to increase the percentage figure of the agricultural sector without paying due attention to what Parliament has said in the past, then it will be very difficult to reach agreement on the totality of the 1980 budget. This farm price review is extremely important, and we appreciate that this particular year, when farmers throughout the Community have had dramatic increases in their costs there are going to have to be some price increases, but we hope very much that the institutional price increases this year will be kept to an absolute minimum, bearing the rising costs in mind.

We cannot go on financing ever-increasing surpluses and we really cannot go on paying export refunds on products going to countries such as Russia. I sincerely hope this House will decide in the vote this afternoon to stop those kinds of exports to Russia and that the Ministers themselves will curb that type of export and that type of production within the Community in the future. It is essential that we start reconstructing the financing of the Community's agricultural industry, and this is an ideal opportunity for the Ministers to take the initiative. We showed the way when debating the budget. We showed that we are serious in wanting the Ministers to really start working on changing the structure of the budget and to deal not with the fundamental principles of the CAP, which we accept, but with the serious imbalances within the CAP.

I should warn the President-in-Office of the Council that this newly-elected Parliament is going to take as great an interest in the forthcoming price review as it has done in the 1980 budget. With all the authority of 150 million votes behind us we really do expect full

and complete involvement in all the stages and processes of this agricultural price review. Much of the budget debate was taken up with agricultural matters, and similarly the price review will have significant budgetary implications. Therefore my group seeks greater Parliamentary influence over the Community's agricultural policy. And we ask the Italian President to look favourably on our call for the establishment of a conciliation procedure over the agricultural price review, analogous to that which exists for the budget. If we can do this in working partnership, then I am hopeful for the future. I welcome what the President-in-Office of the Council has said concerning the need to deal with and make improvements to the structural sector of agriculture.

I must make one short comment concerning alcohol proposals, which I am sure the President is perfectly well aware of. No progress has been made on this for a very long time and I would really urge him to look at ways of paying for the export restitutions for grain-based spirituous beverages under a cereals regulation rather than under an alcohol regulation. This has been delayed for years and is excessively unfair to those who produce those particular beverages. Obviously, one such beverage is Scotch whisky. I am also glad to hear the Italian President say that he hopes to make progress in the fisheries sector as well. Obviously, as all my colleagues have said, one of the important issues for the Italian presidency is the energy situation. With the events in Iran jeopardizing 10 % of the world's oil, the situation is really bad.

It is surely disgraceful that the Council has been unable to come to any real firm conclusions in the field of energy. Where is the urgent action to stimulate the Community to increase its energy production? What is being done? What are the financial institutions giving to Member States to induce them to take decisions on new coal and nuclear installations? What is being done — this is really most important — to help the Greek nation, which is coming into the Community very soon, in its energy situation?

Therefore I ask the President: is it not possible for the Council of Ministers to ask each Member State to prepare an investment plan for coal and nuclear energy, something which will match the examples of France, Belgium and my own country, and to make the best possible use of the Community's coal reserves and techniques of coal liquefaction and gasification.

There must be more money spent on this research, Mr President; there must be more development and exploitation of our enormous coal reserves. It is scandalous that ministers have not come to a conclusion on a common policy to help the exploitation of coal which exists in this Community.

Finally, Mr President, we really must act on the report of the Three Wise Men. I hope that the President-in-Office of the Council will let us know what action he

Scott-Hopkins

intends to take on this report. That must be done before Greek accession. I really do believe that the relations between the Council and Parliament should be improved. We pass resolution after resolution on the draft directives coming from the Commission, on plans and projects in the regional, social and various other fields, but what happens? Nothing. The President-in-Office then promises more action in all these fields. But at the end of the day, unless the projects are passed by the Council, those promises are futile. We can vote the funds, the Commission can propose them, but it is up to the Council to implement them. I do beg it to do so.

And finally, during his presidency the new president of the Commission will of course be appointed — in June presumably in order to give him time to get around. I hope that this House will be consulted, albeit only informally at this stage, over the appointment of the new president of the Commission, and that in future, we shall be able to show our confidence by actually voting on the appointment of the new president of the Commission.

This would greatly increase its authority, the next step being for us to show our confidence in the various commissioners appointed by Member States at a later stage.

But that is the next development. We look to the President to complete the first step during his six months. As I said when I started, I wish him well and I hope that he can help to solve some of the very pressing problems facing us in this House and in the Community in general.

(Applause)

President.— The debate is closed.

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

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.10 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR ROGERS

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

8. Urgent procedure

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

— motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Papapietro, Mr Adonnino, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Barbagli, Mrs Barba-

rella, Mr Barbi, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Cariglia, Mr Carossino, Mr Ceravolo, Mr Costanzo, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr Diana, Mr Filippi, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mr Giummarra, Mr Lezzi, Mr Lima, Mr Orlandi, Mr Sassano, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Travagliini on the natural disasters in the Mezzogiorno (Doc. 1-674/79)

— motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Vergès, Mr Glinne, Mr Bersani, Mr Ansart, Mr Estier, Mr Michel, Mr Ferrero, Mr Jaquet, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Kühn, Mrs de March, Mr Enright, Mr Chambeiron, Mr Woltjer, Mr Maffre-Baugé, Mr Cohen, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Piquet and Mr Bonaccini on urgent aid from the EEC for the Island of Mauritius which has suffered severe damage by hurricane Claudette (Doc. 1-676/79).

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

I shall consult Parliament tomorrow morning on the urgency of these motions for a resolution.

9. Votes

President. — The next item is votes on motions for a resolution on which the debate is closed. We begin with the vote on the various motions for a resolution on the *employment situation in the Community*.

This vote, which will be taken by means of the electronic voting system, requires a simple majority of the Members voting.

I first put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne of behalf of the Socialist Group* (Doc. 1-659/79).

The vote may commence.

I call Mr Van Miert.

Mr Van Miert. — *(NL)* Mr President, it is obvious that there is something wrong with the system. I definitely wanted to vote in favour of this motion for a resolution and here in front of me it says that I have voted against, even though I followed the voting instructions which we were given.

President. — Mr Van Miert, would you like to take a seat which is unoccupied, put your card into that seat and see if it works? If it does not, then we shall have to consider whether to use the electronic system or not.

I call Mrs Seibel-Emmerling.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling. — *(D)* Mr President, I cannot vote from my seat and I refuse to vote from the seat of any other group.

President. — Might I simply suggest that you move to seat 125 which is unoccupied and is within the political group to which you belong.

I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (*F*) Mr President, since this sophisticated equipment we have is unsatisfactory, might I be permitted to vote from seat No 387, instead of from my own seat No 386? This will enable me to vote in accordance with what I said in the House, as I intend to vote in favour of the Socialist Group's motion.

President. — I understand from the technicians that this is possible.

I call Mr Arndt on a point of order.

Mr Arndt. — (*D*) Mr President, could you explain to me why things always go wrong in the Socialist Group?

(*Laughter*)

President. — Mr Arndt, might I suggest that as vice-chairman of the Socialist Group, you attempt to throw some light on the matter.

The ballot is closed.

The result of the vote is as follows :

Votes cast : 278
In favour : 106
Against : 165
Abstentions : 7

The motion for a resolution is rejected.

I now put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mr Macario and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD-Group)* (Doc. 1-661/79).

The result of the vote is as follows :

Number of votes cast : 270
Votes in favour : 130
Votes against : 113
Abstentions : 27

The motion is adopted.

(*Applause from certain quarters*)

I call Mr Glinne on a point of order.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) Mr President, with regard to the first vote, I must confess that I am somewhat puzzled by the results we have been given.

(*Protests from certain quarters on the right — Applause from the left*)

I must assume that there is some technical hitch despite all the efforts to perfect the system. Two groups in this Parliament have normally voted in favour of motions by the Socialist Group. In view of the numbers present, I fail to understand this figure of 106. I should like a vote by show of hands, or else an electronic vote with indication of the votes.

President. — Mr Glinne, I cannot accept your point of order since I have already declared the motion rejected. The proper time to object was before I made that statement. I must rule you out of order. If I did not rule you out of order, no electronic vote would be final.

I call Mr Enright on a point of order.

Mr Enright. — It is quite impossible for us to question a technical matter until we have actually heard the announcement of the result. Therefore I would suggest that on the last technical vote there could quite clearly have been discrepancies. It takes some considerable time to carry out a non-mechanical check and it is only then that objections to mechanical faults can be voiced. The fact that discrepancies had occurred both before the vote was taken and subsequent to the vote was confirmed once one was able to determine where the faults were located. However, since you have ruled, and I accept your ruling, that any question on the first vote is out of order, I now question the second vote, Mr President.

President. — I am sorry, Mr Enright, I have already declared that vote as well. The procedure which I am following does, I think, provide enough time. However, what I will do in future is to pause very briefly again before making a final declaration.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Mr President, following on from what you have just said, I think there is a likelihood of a technical error. For example, your staff may have made a mistake in counting the votes. If there has been a technical error, Mr Glinne's request is vindicated by the Rules of Procedure.

However, since there are some doubts as to whether the electronic voting system is working properly, I think there should be a vote by roll call with indication of the votes. In this way everyone will be happy, Mr President, although I might add that if the Socialist Group wants to be content with the outcome of the vote, its best course would be to be here when a motion is put to the vote. This is not usually the case.

President. — If 21 members or a political group ask for a vote by roll-call, then this vote is also taken electronically, and the names are recorded.

I call Mrs Castellina on the same point of order.

Mrs Castellina. — (*I*) President, there can be no going back on the vote we have just taken. However, I feel that before we go on to the next vote we ought to have, say, a vote on the method of voting, not to approve or reject any particular motion but simply to see whether the system is working or not. And there is no need to take a roll call vote to do this. It is quite

Castellina

sufficient to have a show of hands because this on its own would give an idea of whether the last vote was correct or not. I know that this would not alter the official result announced by the President, but I think it is important for all of us to know — to keep the record straight, as it were — whether the Socialist motion would have been adopted if the usual system of voting had been used. For the sake of getting things straight, Mr President, can we check the method before we go on to the next motion motion? Let me say again that this check will not affect earlier votes, but it will give us an idea of how Parliament actually thinks.

President. — Parliament has taken a decision to install an electronic system. Tests were carried out and are carried out periodically. Tests were carried out immediately before this sitting opened and the President was assured by the person in charge of the electronic system and by the secretariat that it was working properly. There were two problems before we voted, but these problems were cleared up. Under Rule 35(6) the decision was made that voting should be done electronically. We will now proceed with it electronically.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

I now put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mr Spencer and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group and Mrs Nielsen and others (Doc. 1-669/79)*.

The result of the vote is as follows :

Votes cast : 288 ;
For : 95 ;
Against : 148 ;
Abstentions : 45.

I call Sir Fred Warner on a point of order.

Sir Fred Warner. — Mr President, during the voting there was a person sitting in a seat very close to me who is not a Member of this Parliament.

President. — Any person who is not a Member of Parliament is requested not to sit in the seats where a vote can be cast.

I call Mr Irmer.

Mr Irmer. — (D) Mr President, I am sorry but I really must protest that the request I made ten minutes ago to be allowed to speak on a point of order has been ignored until now. If I must sit on the extreme right of the Chamber where I do not belong, could you at least ensure that requests to speak from here get as much attention as requests from the centre of the Chamber?

What I was going to say was this : I have absolutely no faith in this electronic equipment and in the reliability of the results, if it turns out that even before we

start voting it is impossible to cast votes from two of the seats. If it happens that these two seats are not connected to the system, heaven knows where my vote is going to end up. I press the 'yes' button and get a 'no' or an abstention. Listen, if an electronic system is going to be an any good, every part of it must work properly, whether it is where you press the button or where the signal comes out. If it does not work at this end when I press the button, I cannot help wondering if it is working at the other end. If you ask me, Mr President, when voting is straightforward like today, without hundreds of votes in the budget procedure, and if the majority can be determined by a simple show of hands, we ought to rely less on fancy equipment and more on our own eyes and our own common sense. I therefore think we ought to vote here today by show of hands or by sitting and standing. I am not convinced that this equipment is working.

President. — The House has already decided that it will use an electronic voting system, and therefore we will proceed with it.

I call Mr von Hassel.

Mr von Hassel. — (D) Mr President, you get my full support for carrying on with the electronic voting system. It is regrettable that one of the groups is discrediting the whole system, because they have realized that they have not got the result they were counting on. If we are not ready to use this modern equipment, we can disconnect the whole lot...

President. — That again is a subjective statement and not a point of order.

I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (F) Mr President, I do not want to raise a point of order or make a subjective statement, but Mr Schieler has just arrived and so I can no longer vote from seat No 387. Since the equipment in seat No 386 is out of order, with your permission, Mr President, I shall move to seat No 384, although I hope that I shall not have been up and down every row in the Chamber by the time the sitting is over.

(Laughter)

President. — The cards in your seats are personal numerical cards that belong to you. It does not matter in what slot that card is put. It would be perfectly proper for you to cast your vote in another seat, and it would be recorded under your name. Parliament has made a decision to use the electronic system. I do not believe that at the moment there are sufficient problems to warrant abandoning the electronic system, and I want to proceed with it.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

I call Mr Damseaux.

Mr Damseaux. — (F) Mr President, to avoid any confusion I suggest that you record the votes from now on. In this way Members will be able to check afterwards whether their vote has been correctly recorded, and furthermore the people who elected us will at least know who voted for and against and who abstained and who the other 122 are, who were elected on 10 June but who are off parading around Moscow or elsewhere!

President. — Mr Damseaux, a request for a roll-call vote must be made by either 21 Members or a political group.

If not, will 21 people please stand to signify they want roll-call votes?

(More than twenty Members rise to request a roll-call vote).

I put Mr Spencer's motion to the vote.

The motion is rejected.

I call Mr Van Miert.

Mr Van Miert. — Mr President, since Mr Sutra has arrived in the meantime, I have no place to vote.

(Laughter)

President. — Mr Van Miert, as Madame Veil is not here and she has allowed me the pleasure of occupying her hot seat today, I offer you the courtesy of my seat, which is number 79.

(Applause)

Mr Van Miert. — (F) Thank you, Mr President, but I want to point out that I am not taking out a mortgage on this.

President. — I now put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-670/79).*

The result of the vote is as follows:

Votes cast: 277
For: 61
Against: 141
Abstentions: 75.

The motion is rejected.

We now proceed to the *motion for a resolution by Mr Bonaccini and others (Doc. 1-671/79).*

I call Mrs Salisch.

Mr Salisch. — (D) I should like to make a statement on the procedure for voting on Mr Bonaccini's motion for a resolution. I would like to ask you, Mr President,

to have paragraph 1 (d) on page 3 voted on separately. We have already virtually adopted a resolution here, and I believe this House should regard it as a matter of importance to have this resolution re-examined in detail. I think the two main committees concerned — the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment — should discuss this question again and report back to the House. This seems to me to be a very important point. I would ask Members from the other groups to support this view and I would ask you, Mr President, to allow the vote to be taken like this.

President. — If there are no objections, I think it would be reasonable to vote on this separately, because it is only a question of referral to committee.

10. *Invalidation of votes taken on the employment situation in the Community*

President. — I have an important announcement to make, I understand from the technicians that the roll-call votes are not being recorded. This fault in the system means that as President I cannot rely on any of the votes taken so far. With your permission therefore I shall now go back to voting by traditional methods.

11. *Votes*

President. — We must recommence the entire voting procedure.

We shall begin with the motions for resolutions on the *employment situation.*

The first *motion for a resolution is by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-659/79).*

I call Mr Cottrell on a point of order.

Mr Cottrell. — Mr President, what is the position with regard to the right of those who are not elected Members of this House to sit in seats reserved for Members of this House? I have just observed again a person who is not a Member of this House sitting in the front row. Now, I am not suggesting in any way that he intends to do anything wrong, but it does cause confusion and surely we have had enough of that this afternoon.

President. — I do not know what can be done, because there are Commission and Council officials, as well as officials from the political groups, in the hemicycle. All I say is that if any Members sees someone voting who is not a Member of the House, then we can take the necessary action. However, I certainly take your point in general and I would ask

President

the chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to look into this as a matter of urgency and report back on it.

I call Mr Collins on the same point of order.

Mr Collins. — I wonder, Mr President, if you would make it clear to the Members that they should really sit still while they are voting. Is it in order for some Members, including one member of the political group of the same complexion as the previous speaker, to move around the Chamber while voting, thus making it possible for his vote to be counted in several places?

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The motion for a resolution is rejected.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution by Mr Macario and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD-Group) (Doc. 1-661/79).

As the result of the show of hands is not clear, we shall have to vote by sitting and standing ...

I call Mrs Weber on a point of order.

Mrs Weber. — (D) Mr President, I am very sorry to have to make a comment about this very human way of voting by show of hands. I happened to count seven abstentions while the first vote was being taken, but when you were giving the result there were only five abstentions. This last row is perhaps at a disadvantage because the names of the Members here begin with letters at the end of the alphabet, and I wonder if the Members whose names begin with 'W' are perhaps at a disadvantage because they cannot be seen very well from the front. It might be better if you arranged for your staff to move from the front and to take a more accurate count up here.

President. — I am going to rule on that point of order. I agree that it is very difficult to see what is happening from where I am sitting. I would ask the ushers to ensure that there is no-one standing in the entrances and that only Members of Parliament in the House are permitted to stand behind the back row.

I call Mr Griffiths on a point of order.

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, before we proceed any further with this vote, I would like to ask you to rule whether in one part of the House where there seemed to be considerable disarray about voting intentions, votes were in fact counted twice. It was not quite clear what the intention was in the serried ranks opposite me.

President. — Mr Griffiths, I cannot accept your point of order.

I call Mr Glinne on a point of order.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, pursuant to Rule 35 (4) of the Rules of Procedure, I ask on behalf of my group that a vote roll call be taken.

President. — I call Mr de la Malène.

Mr de la Malène. — (F) Mr President, I realize that the Socialist Group's request must be satisfied. If they insist on a roll call vote, this is covered by the Rules of Procedure and we have to give way. However, what we can do — and perhaps the Socialist Group will agree to this, too — is quite simply defer these votes to another date. I should like to point out to the Socialist Group that we have done nothing else since ten past one but consider these votes, and we must start Question Time with the Council at half past five, and we have also down on today's agenda a debate — which in my opinion is more important than a procedural wrangle — on the Council programme for the next six months. In the light of all this, I would ask the Chair to agree to a vote by roll call — it cannot do anything else anyway — but to defer it until tomorrow. Otherwise the debate on the Council programme is going to be interrupted and it will not be finished. I do not think this would reflect too well on Parliament. I ask you to accede to the request — you have no other choice — but to defer the vote until tomorrow.

President. — Decisions as well as debates are important in a parliament. I am therefore going to proceed to the vote.

Mr Pannella, I cannot take any further points of order.

The roll-call will begin with Mr Pearce, whose name has been drawn by lot.

I ask the Secretary-General to call the roll.

(The roll-call was taken)

President. — Does anyone else wish to vote?

The ballot is closed.

The sitting is suspended for five minutes to enable the tellers to count the votes.

Here is the result of the vote:

Voters : 296 ;
 Abstentions : 20 ;
 Votes cast : 276 ;
 For : 159 ;
 Against : 117.

The resolution is adopted.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President

The following voted in favour:

Adonnino, van Aerssen, Agnelli, Aigner, Alber, von Alemann, Antoniozzi, Balfour, Bangemann, Barbagli, Barbi, Battersby, Baudis, Beazley, Berkhouwer, Bersani, Bethell, Bettiza, Beumer, von Bismarck, Blaney, Blumienfeld, Bocklet, Brookes, Calvez, Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Catherwood, Cecovini, Colleselli, Collomb, Colombo, Costanzo, Cottrell, de Courcy Ling, Croux, Curry, Dalsass, Dalziel, Damseaux, De Keersmaecker, Dekker, Delorozoy, Diana, Diligent, Douro, Elles, Estgen, Fergusson, de Ferranti, Filippi, Fischbach, Forster, Forth, Friedrich I., Früh, Fuchs, Galland, Geurtsen, Ghergo, Giummarra, De Goede, Gonella, Goppel, Van der Gun, Haagerup, Habsburg, Harmar-Nicholls, Harris, van Hassel, Helms, Henckens, Herman, Hooper, Hopper, Hord, Howell, Jackson C., Jakobsen, Janssen, Van Raay, Johnson, Katzer, Kellett-Bowman E., Kellett-Bowman M. E., Kirk Klepsch, Lega, Lenz, Ligios, Lima, Louwes, Luster, Macario, Maher, Majonica, Marshall, Martin S., Mertens, Michel, Modiano, Møller, Moorhouse, Moreau L., Moreland, Newton Dunn, Nicholson, Nielsen J., Nielsen T., Nordlohne, Notenboom, O'Donnell, O'Hagan, d'Ormesson, Pearce, Pedini, Penders, Pflimlin, Pintat, Plumb, Pöttering, Poniatowski, Prag, Price, Prout, Provan, Pruvot, Pürsten, Purvis, Rabbethge, Rey, Roberts, Rossi, Rumor, Schall, Schinzel, Schleicher, Schnitker, Schön Konrad, Scott-Hopkins, Scrivener, Seligman, Sherlock, Simmonds, Simpson, Spautz, Spencer, Stewart-Clark, Taylor J.M., Tolman, Travaglini, Turner, Tyrrell, Vanneck, Vergeer, Verhaegen, Walz, Warner, Wawrzik, Welsch, von Wogau.

The following voted against:

Adam, Ansart, Arndt, Baduel Glorioso, Baillet, Balfe, Barbarella, Bonaccini, Boserup, Buchan, Caborn, Capanna, Cardia, Caretoni Romagnoli, Cariglia, Carosino, Castle, Ceravolo, Chambeiron, Charzat, Cinciari Rodano, Clwyd, Cohen, Colla, Collins, D'Angelosante, Dankert, Delors, De March, De Pasquale, Desmond, Enright, Estier, Fanti, Faure M., Fernandez, Ferrero, Fich, Focke, Frischmann, Fuillet, Gabert, Galluzzi, Glinne, Gouthier, Gredal, Griffiths, Groes, Hänsch, Herklotz, Van den Heuvel, Hoff, Hoffmann J., Hume, Ippolito, Jaquet, Kavanagh, Key, Klinkenborg, Krouwel-Vlam, Lange, Leonardi, Le Roux, Linde, Linkohr, Lizin, Lomas, Loo, Lyngge, Macciocchi, Martin M., Martinet, Megahy, Van Minnen, Moreau J., Muntingh, O'Connell, Oehler, Pannella, Papapietro, Pelikan, Percheron, Peters, Piquet, Pisani, Poirier, Pranchère, Quin, Radoux, Rogers, Roudy, Salisch, Sarre, Schieler, Schmid, Schmitt, Schön Karl, Schwartzberg, Seal, Seefeld, Seeler, Segre, Seibel-Emmerling, Sieglerschmidt, Spinelli, Squarcialupi, Sutra, Van Miert, Vayssade, Vergès, Vernimmen, Veronesi, Visentini, von der Vring, Walter, Weber, Wettig.

The following abstained:

Ansquer, Bøgh, Bonde, Buttafuoco, Chouraqui, Debré, Donnez, Druon, Ewing, Hammerich, Hutton, Irmer, de la Malène, Messmer, Paisley, Petronio, Poncelet, Remilly, Romualdi, Skovmand.

I now put to the vote the *motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Spencer and others on behalf of the*

European Democratic Group and Mrs Nielsen and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-669/79).

The motion is adopted.

(Applause from the right)

I now put to the vote the *motion for a resolution tabled by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-670/79).*

The motion for a resolution is rejected.

We shall now proceed to the *motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Bonaccini and others (Doc. 1-671/79).*

I remind the House that Mrs Salisch asked that we first of all vote on the last subparagraph (d) of the motion.

We will therefore take a vote on whether this subparagraph goes back to the committee. Even if, as a result of the vote, this subparagraph (d) does go back to the committee it will still remain part of the motion.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Perhaps I have misunderstood you, Mr President, but this seems to me an extraordinary procedure. We cannot really send anything back to committee because what we are discussing here are requests for early votes. Those responsible for the motions are seeking an early vote. There is nothing to stop them from tabling a new motion pursuant to Rule 25. It will go to the relevant committee as a matter of course. But I fail to comprehend why we are dealing with these requests for early votes in such an odd fashion. If Mrs Salisch wants to propose her text as a new motion for a resolution pursuant to Rule 25, she is at liberty to do so at any time. The text will be referred to the relevant committee and the matter is settled. I do not see why we have to introduce a new way of dealing with things.

President. — As I understand it, it is merely a question of whether this particular aspect should be referred back to the committee or not. It does not affect the resolution before us.

I call Mr Delors.

Mr Delors, chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. — (F) Mr President, I think we have to be sensible here. Our work on Tuesday was very unsatisfactory, as we spent more than eight hours discussing the employment situation when there were only 20-30 Members present. To cap it all, the Bureau decided in its wisdom to give the Commission only 30 minutes, which meant that the Commission did not even have the time to provide us with the information and data on which to base a discussion.

Delors

If we really want to consider the employment situation in a serious manner, I beg everyone here to let the two committees involved work hard for three months and present a more finished product to the House, so that we do not have a repeat of Tuesday's tedious debate. We can learn nothing from those who were absent on Tuesday but who are here today with their neat solutions all ready to be voted on.

President. — I do not intend to open this up to a general debate. I have had one speaker for the request. I will now take one speaker against the request and then I will put it to the vote.

I call Mr Fanti.

Mr Fanti. — (I) Mr President, it seems to me that what was asked for was not reference to committee but a vote item by item. I support this request.

President. — Mr Fanti, I am sorry but you misunderstand. The motion before the House is as put down by Mr Bonacinni and we will be voting on that motion in its entirety. Because of the subject matter of subparagraph (d), the chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs asked that this matter, regardless of whether the motion is carried or falls, be referred to this committee and to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. I have one speaker in favour of this proposal. I am not taking it out of the motion; it will stay in the motion for voting afterwards. But, this is quite separate. Does anyone wish to speak against this proposal?

I call Mr Fanti, who, I presume, wishes to speak against it.

Mr Fanti. — (I) The President has perhaps misunderstood the proposal by Mrs Salisch to have a vote item by item on the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Bonaccini and others. The request in paragraph 1 (d), instructing the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs urgently to formulate and submit to Parliament as soon as possible proposals for an effective strategy, requires a formal vote by the House.

I support Mrs Salisch's proposal that we first vote on this request item by item and then go on to vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole.

President. — I call Mr Spencer.

Mr Spencer. — Mr President, I want to speak against this proposal which I consider to be unnecessary. A lot of the items contained in the general omnibus debate which we had yesterday on unemployment are already before both the committees concerned, that is the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Economic and Monetary

Affairs. It seems unnecessary to lumber their agenda with yet another requirement to discuss in general terms. Secondly, the motions which the House has passed on the last two occasions, the motion for a resolution tabled by the Group of the European People's Party and my own motion, which this House has just approved, call for committee consideration and for action to be taken so I consider it completely inappropriate to refer a particular paragraph which has been drafted by one particular party back to committees and for that paragraph to form a brief for those committees to work on. This is not the way for this Parliament to take decisions.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I now put to the vote the proposal to refer subparagraph (d) to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

The request is rejected.

I now put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The motion is rejected.

I now put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mr Fischmann and others* (Doc. 1-672/79).

The motion for a resolution is rejected.

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

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, I think you and the House are certainly aware of the situation concerning time. I, myself, am particularly anxious to hear the President-in-Office wind up the debate, and with no disrespect to him am even more anxious to have Question Time. We lost Question Time, if you remember, last month and it would be a disaster for this House if we lost Question Time again. Now, if we have the Afghan votes to take — and, for the sake of final clarification, I would ask this House for an adjournment of 10 minutes before those votes are taken — and we are to finish at 7 p.m., then there is no earthly way we can complete all our work. Is it possible, Mr President, for us to switch from a night session tomorrow to a night session tonight? In that way we could continue the debate after we have taken the vote, perhaps by delaying Question Time for a quarter of an hour or so, and have the pleasure of hearing the President-in-Office wind up the debate. Whether this could be arranged with the administration I do not know, Mr President. I gather that you were given previous warning. I think this is the only possible solution. It is certainly going to be very difficult tomorrow. We have a very full agenda containing so many motions that it is going to be difficult to get through, but the more I talk the less time there will be so I will sit down and hope that you, Mr President, and the administration can make arrangements to this end.

President. — I adjourn the sitting for ten minutes.

(The sitting was suspended at 5.10 p.m. and resumed at 5.35 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

We shall now vote on the motions for a resolution on the situation in Afghanistan.

I call Mr Bangemann on a point of order.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Mr President, I should like to give an explanation of vote on behalf of my Group, and at the same time say that we should now like to withdraw our revised amendment in favour of Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr Klepsch and others (Doc. 1-667/1).

(Applause from the centre and right)

Now for our explanation of vote: my Group has tried to the last to find as broad a base as possible for a motion for a resolution which would receive the support of a wide spectrum of political groupings. For this reason, our original motion for a resolution bore many of the hallmarks of an attempt to find a suitable compromise. We then took this idea one step further by formulating a joint motion for a resolution together with two other groups, and this draft resolution was then passed on to the Socialist Group in the hopes of getting their support too. This was apparently not possible for the Socialist Group which means that we can now only resign ourselves to the fact that either no single motion for a resolution will receive the support of a majority of this House, or we shall have to overcome some of our reservations and accept a resolution which does look like getting the support of a majority of the House. I should like to make it quite clear, Mr President, that the view taken by my Group was that we should not allow this very good discussion to peter out without passing a resolution on the subject; that would have failed to reflect the importance of the subject and would have been unworthy of this House. That is why we shall be voting for this amendment, although I must say on behalf of certain members of my Group that we have reservations as to paragraphs 5 and 9. In the end, however, we decided to accept them because paragraph 5 does not call for economic sanctions, but merely calls on the Commission to examine whether there might be some point in applying such sanctions, and because paragraph 9 does not call for a boycott of the Olympic Games, but simply calls on the national Olympic Committees to decide, of their free will, whether it would be in line with the Olympic ideal to let these games to ahead in Moscow in view of the current situation. Otherwise, this motion for a resolution follows the political line taken by my Group in this matter, and it will therefore receive our support. We would ask all the other Members who share certain of our reservations to do the same, so that this House can be as united as

possible in condemning this violation of peace, which is something we should all be prepared to do without any qualms.

(Applause)

President. — The motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Berkhouwer and others (Doc. 1-675) is accordingly withdrawn in favour of Amendment No. 1, tabled by Mr Klepsch and others, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mr Colombo, Mr Blumenfeld, Lady Elles, Mr Penders, Mr Ferguson and Mr Møller, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party and the European Democratic Group, (Doc. 167/1).

Some Members have asked for the floor. The Rules state that explanations of vote can be given before the resolutions. I would appeal to the House to proceed first to the votes, and at the end I shall allow time for explanation of votes. This will very much expedite business of the House without necessarily taking away people's freedom to give their explanations of vote.

I call Mr Tyrrell.

Mr Tyrrell. — Mr President, I wish to withdraw the motion Doc. 1-662/79 which bears my name and those of 26 of my colleagues in favour of that tabled by Mr Klepsch, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mr Bangemann and others. The reason for the withdrawal is this: it is of paramount importance that this Parliament express itself by a majority and with as much clarity as it can achieve on this, the latest instance of Russian aggression and expansion.

Great efforts have been made through the groups to find a form of words which would command a majority in this House and it appears that that may well have been achieved. The resulting motion does not go quite as far as the motion standing in my name and those of my colleagues. Our motion calls for an immediate response by the Community in a way which the Community is capable of implementing and implementing without delay. Nevertheless, in the interests of Parliament, and of achieving a common declaration of condemnation of the Russian action and a call for immediate effective action by the other Community institutions, our motion is withdrawn.

(Applause)

President. — The motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Tyrrell and others (Doc. 1-662/79), is therefore withdrawn in favour of Doc. 1-667/1.

I have proposed that the explanation of votes should be given after the vote. Although this procedure is not strictly in keeping with the rules, I feel it would save considerable time.

I put the proposal to the House.

The proposal is accepted.

I call Mr Paisley on a point of order.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, I would like your guidance regarding what is going to happen to the business after these votes are taken. We did adjourn, Sir, on a motion by the leader of the European Democratic Group about the order of business after the vote has been completed. Could you tell us whether the House is going to adjourn at seven o'clock or whether it is going to carry on with Question Time? The President gave me a firm promise on Monday that Question Time would take place.

President. — The House did not adjourn on a motion by anyone, it adjourned after a request by the leader of a political group and on the decision of the President.

I am sorry that, at the present time I cannot give you any further information on the matter you refer to.

I call Mr Romualdi, on a point of order.

Mr Romualdi. — *(I)* Mr President, there is something I wish to make clear. It was my privilege to table a motion for a resolution on behalf of the non-attached Italian Members, but I wish to withdraw my amendment in favour of the amendment tabled by Mr Klepsch. I have to do this before voting starts. Consequently, I do not want to give an explanation of vote but simply withdraw the text I had tabled on behalf of my colleagues and support the Klepsch amendment, which is substantially the same as ours.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — May I suggest, Mr Romualdi, that you wait until we come to your motion for a resolution at which time you can formally withdraw it and explain your reasons for doing so.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* I have the utmost faith in you, Mr President, and in the interpreters as well. You said: 'If there is unanimity, we shall adopt this procedure.' Everyone here heard you. I checked, and in the other languages apart from Italian and French you said: 'If there is unanimity, we shall adopt this procedure.'

I just want to say that I find your way of proceeding somewhat odd. In the first place you acknowledge that there would be a different procedure if we went by the Rules. In the second place you asked for unanimity which we regret we were unable to give you. You also asked for Parliament's opinion and forgot to ask who was abstaining. And lastly you were very witty when I tried to get you to ask who was abstaining and you put me down as an abstention, when in fact I voted against the proposal. I assume that this was supposed to be a joke. I hope it is not a sick joke.

(Protests)

President. — What I did say, Mr Pannella, was that if the House rejected my proposal, I would proceed strictly according to the Rules. However, my proposal was almost overwhelmingly adopted. I did not ask for unanimity. All I asked for was a clear general consensus, and I received it.

I call Mr Ansart.

Mr Ansart. — *(F)* Mr President, we have no motion for a resolution. As I said during my speech this morning, we are against the powers which this Parliament is assuming. We believe that it should not have discussed this matter. It is because we are strongly and utterly opposed to all the motions which have been tabled that my colleagues and I are going to take no part in the voting. Of course, I could not announce this afterwards. I just want everyone to know that, as a sign of our protest, the French Communists and allies will not be taking part in the vote.

(Cries from certain quarters)

President. — Your statement has been noted by the Chair.

I call Mr Fanti.

Mr Fanti. — *(I)* I should like something cleared up because I do not want a repeat of what happened before, when an error in the interpretation caused a misunderstanding between us and the President.

If I have got it right, the President has proposed that explanations of vote be given after the vote. This is unthinkable in my view. It is quite ridiculous. In my opinion explanations of vote have to come before the vote, because if they do not they have no meaning. It is for this reason that the President's proposal did not get the overwhelming majority which he said was necessary. We say that Parliament cannot accept this procedure. Explanations of vote must come before the vote. In our view there can be absolutely no doubt about this.

President. — Mr Fanti, you are quite correct, and that is what I put before the House just now. The reason why I suggested it was to expedite the business of the House. The debate having taken place, it seems to me irrelevant whether explanations of vote are given before or afterwards because the arguments on the subject matter are made within the debate.

I call Mr Druon.

Mr Druon. — *(F)* I asked to speak simply in order to give an explanation of vote. It is all the same to me whether I give it before or after the vote, as I do not think it will make much difference to the ridiculous nature of this debate.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Mr President, I have begged leave to speak simply to inform you that I am withdrawing the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-665/79/rev.) in favour of Amendment No 1.

President. — The motion for a resolution by Mr Klepsch (Doc. 1-665/79/rev.) is accordingly withdrawn in favour of Document 1-667/1.

I call Mr D'Angelosante.

Mr D'Angelosante. — (*I*) Mr President, just let me say that things have really got beyond a joke as regards the conduct of business in the House.

I want to refer specifically to the Rules of Procedure. It is not only illogical and senseless — as Mr Fanti indicated — but it is also not permitted by the Rules of Procedure to give explanations of vote after the voting which winds up the business of the House as regards items on the agenda. Rule 26(3) states:

Once the general debate and consideration of the texts have been concluded, only explanations of vote shall be permitted before the matter as a whole is put to the vote.

This means that explanations of vote must come in their logical, sensible and obvious place before the voting.

On several occasions this evening you have interpreted the Rules of Procedure in a very free manner. I am not going to pass any comment on this but it would be a good idea if Parliament were to come back to it, because this has not been a very happy or useful day for the European Parliament. I hope that there is not going to be any more of this. I do not want us to become the laughing stock of every country in Europe, and of every parliament, by letting everyone know that we are the only Parliament which, after it has voted, explains how it has voted. You have to put a stop to things somewhere. I ask for the Rules of Procedure to be strictly applied, in particular Rule 26(3).

President. — I take your point, Mr D'Angelosante, but I am trying to expedite the business of the House so that we can move on to deal with the other matters on the agenda.

I call Mr Berlinguer.

Mr Berlinguer. — (*I*) Mr President, it is not a question of expediting or hindering our business. It is a question of establishing whether we want to have a vote which is valid or one which is suspect because it has taken place in circumstances which run counter to established practice as laid down in the Rules of Procedure. I am glad that you have read Rule 26(3). Could I ask you to take another look at it because the wording there is quite specific? I quote:

Once the general debate and consideration of the texts have been concluded, only explanations of vote shall be permitted before the matter as a whole is put to the vote.

Note, Mr President: before it is put to the vote. Let me point out that this means that explanations of vote can clearly not be given after the matter has been put to the vote.

President. — In view of the fact that people have strongly objected, and the fact that I do not believe that the rulebook should be broken except when Members generally agree it should I am not continuing any further. As Mr Fanti has tabled a resolution which is before the House, I will revert very strictly to the rulebook and explanations of vote will be given before the matter as a whole is put to the vote.

I just want to say this: I do not think there has been any victory for anyone, merely a lack of common sense. We shall now proceed to the vote on the motion for a resolution by Mr Fanti. Mr de la Malène, if you wish to speak on this issue, I have already changed my mind once. I will not change it again.

Mr de la Malène. — (*F*) No, Mr President, I am not asking you to change your mind and I have no intention of coming back to this issue which you have just closed. I want to refer to the Rules of Procedure on another point which in my view is important. I am referring to what Mr Klepsch said, and I am getting back to what I said this morning.

Mr Klepsch has just told us that he is withdrawing Doc. 1-665/79 in favour of his amendment. He is perfectly entitled to do this. All I want to say is that Mr Klepsch's document cannot replace a document which no longer exists. I said so this morning.

I am simply asking that we do not create an unhappy precedent in this Parliament and that once a text has been presented, urgency requested and the agenda approved, there should be no more changes.

This is important not only for this debate but for subsequent debates here in the House. I am very sorry to have to say this. I do not want to interrupt the debate, but things have to be done properly.

President. — Mr de la Malène, Mr Klepsch withdrew his motion for a resolution in favour of another motion. However, amendment No 1 is to Doc. 1-667/79 which will be taken at the end of the voting. The amendment stands because the motion for a resolution to which it refers still stands.

On the first indent of the preamble to Mr Fanti's motion for a resolution, I have Amendment No 1 by Mr Pannella:

The first part of this paragraph to read as follows:

1. Unconditionally condemns with the utmost vigour the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, which constitutes...

(rest unchanged)

What is the position of the author of the resolution?

Mr Fanti. — *(I)* Mr President, we reject all the amendments which have been tabled in connection with our motion for a resolution.

President. — Mr Pannella, Mr Fanti has already said, as the author of the resolution, that he is rejecting the amendment. Consequently, it is not in order for you to speak on it now. The debate is finished and we are now voting.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, I want to raise a point of order which I should like you to listen to very carefully, because otherwise in half an hour you are going to change your mind for a second time and make us lose more time.

The Rules of Procedure, Mr President, state that an amendment cannot be put to the vote unless it has been moved. You cannot put the amendments to the vote unless you have asked me to move them first. It is not a matter of whether it is in order for me to speak. You have to ask me to speak. If I do not, the amendments are automatically withdrawn and you cannot put them to the vote. I appeal to you for goodness sake to let us get on with the business of the House in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, and to let us get on with it now, before our Communist colleagues wake up half an hour after everyone else and make you change your mind.

President. — Mr Pannella, Rule 29 states quite clearly that any Member may table amendments. Now you properly tabled amendments to the resolution and I presume that in the debate you spoke on your amendment, or at least you had the right to speak on your amendment. I cannot see under Rule 29, how a Member can be authorized to speak in the middle of a voting procedure.

If you believe, Mr Pannella, that I am depriving you of a right, would you please give the number of the rule and the paragraph.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, my interpretation is different from yours and — would you believe it? — it happens that I was right earlier.

President. — Could you say what paragraph?

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Rule 29(1) of the Rules of Procedure states that Parliament shall not deliberate on any amendment unless it is moved during the debate. I want to point out, Mr President, that the amendments by Mr Klepsch and others were presented after the debate was closed.

President. — The paragraph in question states that Parliament shall not deliberate on any amendment unless it is moved during the debate. Your amendment is perfectly in order. It was moved, and was received, during the debate. I am ruling you out of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* I did not speak, Mr President, and so I could not move the amendment. I said nothing during the general debate...

President. — You are out of order Mr Pannella. Mr Fanti does not accept your amendment.

(Throughout the remainder of the voting, Mr Pannella continued vociferously to ask to speak on a point of order or give an explanation of vote.)

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

I put the first indent of the preamble to the vote.

The first indent of the preamble is rejected.

On the second indent I have Amendment No 2 by Mr Pannella:

The beginning of the second indent to read as follows:

— aware of the serious risk of a revival in Europe and the world in general of the nuclear arms race and of a further period of confrontation, especially in relations between the industrialized countries and the countries of the Third and Fourth World and between the Soviet Union...

(rest unchanged)

I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, I think this might help you. Mr Pannella has referred to Rule 29 (3), and he is perfectly correct. He did not move any of his amendments during the debate, as he himself is claiming, and therefore we should not be voting on any of Mr Pannella's amendments.

On the other hand, Lady Elles specifically moved the Klepsch amendment during the debate, and therefore that amendment stands. Therefore, I appeal to you, Mr President, to apply Rule 29 as Mr Pannella has indicated, declare Mr Pannella's amendments out of order and let us proceed with the amendments which are in order.

(Applause)

President. — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote. Amendment No 2 is rejected.

I put the second indent of the preamble to the vote. The second indent is rejected.

I put the third and fourth indents to the vote.

The third and fourth indents are rejected.

On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 3 by Mr Pannella:

The first part of this paragraph to read as follows:

1. Unconditionally condemns with the utmost vigour the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, which constitutes...

(rest unchanged)

I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

President

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I put paragraph No 1 to the vote.

Paragraph No 1 is rejected.

On paragraph 2 I have Amendment No 4 by Mr Pannella :

The middle of this paragraph to read as follows :

2. ... carried firmly forward : for all this it is necessary to insist on the prior withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan before reaching agreements and understandings ... (rest unchanged)

I put Amendment No 4 to the vote.

Amendment No 4 is rejected.

I put paragraph 2 to the vote.

Paragraph 2 is rejected.

I put paragraphs 3 and 4 to the vote.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 are rejected.

I call Mr Galland for an explanation of vote.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, with regard to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, it is clear that what brings this Parliament close to unanimity is much more important than what divides us. We have voted on seven or eight motions for resolutions and there are three or four to come. None is going to get the 90 % of votes which would be meaningful and therefore politically effective. This is the result of divisions along political lines which have unhappy consequences and which, considering the situation in Afghanistan, leads to unwarranted differences in the House. The feelings of criticism, disappointment and doubletalk which they will arouse in the people of Europe are enough to make me abstain from voting on all these texts. I should like to have voiced an emphatic condemnation of the Soviet intrusion in Afghanistan, but voting is divided and once again the opinion of this House will count for little. My abstention serves to illustrate my opposition to Parliament's dismal and perpetual inability to reach agreement on even the most basic issues, when dramatic political events are calling out for compromise and unity.

President. — I call Mr Pannella for an explanation of vote.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Mr President, the Rules of Procedure — which you are unacquainted with or which you have deliberately been tossing aside all afternoon — make no distinction between explanations of votes on amendments and those on other items of our business.

Secondly, Mr President, you stated quite clearly that you were calling speakers for explanations of vote, pursuant to the Rules of Procedure, but now you are asking for explanations of vote on the Fanti motion after voting has finished.

There are two risks here, Mr President. One is that we may get a wrong decision on Afghanistan and the other...

(Interruption by the President)

Do not interrupt me, Mr President !

President. — I have the right as President to interrupt you, because you are out of order !

(Applause)

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Mr President, you cannot do away with explanations of vote during the voting when there is provision for them in the Rules of Procedure. This is the first point I want to stress.

Anyway, Mr President, I am going to vote against the motion because the House has not adopted these amendments, which you did not let anyone explain to the House, which means that the Members have not been able to assess them.

This motion, Mr President, smacks of the Munich Agreement — that cloud-cuckoo-land of agreement with men of violence and with invaders. The non-violent know that there can never be agreement with the violent. Afghanistan is being invaded — like the Sudetenland and Poland in the past — and if we think we can urge the invader to return home or to make other concessions, we are reverting to the approach which led to the 1939-45 war, the approach of constant concessions to the invaders and to the men of violence.

Unfortunately, Mr President, it is not only the Communists who adopt such an approach. Unfortunately, Mr President, there are many people here who are ready to condemn or to offer sympathy, but there is no one on the left or in the traditional parties of the left who is ready to adopt measures of non-collaboration with the invaders and with the men of violence. This is the basic principle of every initiative in support of peace, freedom and independence.

In my opinion, Mr President, those who kid themselves that they can get the Soviet troops to pull out by continuing to offer the hand of friendship are, in every way, the accomplices of these invaders and these men of violence.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — Rule 26 (3) states that explanations of vote shall be given before the matter as a whole is put to the vote. So far we have dealt only with the amendments. I have not yet put the matter as a whole to the vote ; that is why explanations of vote come now.

I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (*I*) Mr President, there will be no need to interrupt me, because I shall be very brief.

The whole Parliament has been a witness to what has happened. After justified protests from Mr D'Angelo-sante and Mr Berlinguer, you changed your mind. You agreed to apply the Rules of Procedure — which is

Capanna

quite right — and call for explanations of vote before the voting. You thus recognized a general principle which is valid for both motions and amendments. However, you refused to allow Mr Pannella and me to give an explanation of vote on the amendments, and therefore if the Rules of Procedure constitute the law which governs the business of the House, you have behaved — and I say this without fear of contradiction — like an 'outlaw', Mr President.

Consequently, as a small but — I hope — eloquent gesture of protest, I shall not give my explanation of vote.

(Laughter)

President. — I call Mr Fich.

Mr Fich. — *(DK)* Mr President, I should like to state why I cannot take part either in this vote or in the forthcoming votes on the motions dealing with Afghanistan. In the proper place and at the proper time, I would gladly express my solidarity with the Afghan people, but I have a strong impression that this is not what is at stake here. What we are discussing here is security and arms policy in Europe, and I must emphasize that this subject has absolutely no place in the Treaties laying down the terms of reference of this Parliament. Moreover, it is in direct conflict with the programme of the party for which I was elected. I have the impression that this House is trying to assume a role which it does not have — and I would add that it is a good thing it does not have this role, because I do not think Parliament would contribute much to détente and disarmament in Europe if these were in fact subjects which could be discussed here. However, they cannot be debated here. There are other places for discussing these matters, and that is why I cannot take part in these votes.

President. — I call Mrs Boserup.

Mrs Boserup. — *(DK)* Mr President, my party, the Socialist Peoples Party, disassociated itself more than a week ago from the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. For us, a people's right to self-determination is an immutable right, and it does not matter that the invasion came from a country which calls itself Socialist. We can foresee an escalation of the cold war, and this is all the more serious, since we are currently in a period of crisis and the arsenals are bursting at the seams. I cannot but point out that NATO has contributed to this cold war with its injudicious decision to increase the number of missiles deployed in Europe. Despite our party's clear condemnation of the Soviet invasion, I cannot take part in these votes. It is our firm conviction that the Community should not get involved in disputes between the major powers, and that this House should refrain from discussing such matters.

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — *(NL)* Mr President, your task is difficult enough as it is, so I shall not complicate it further for you. I should like to make the general point that we are among those who unequivocally condemn the invasion of Afghanistan. We do feel, however, that the policy of détente must not be called into question, although the invasion naturally poses a threat to it.

The third aspect of today's debate was the question of how appropriate sanctions are. Sanctions are doubtless justified, but we must proceed with extreme caution, since overdoing sanctions at the wrong moment can only result in escalation, which would be going against the need for détente which we have all stressed. We shall be voting in this spirit.

Mr President, in concluding my explanation of vote, I would urge you to turn your attention to a point of order. You have just informed the House that the paragraphs of the motion tabled by Mr Fanti and others have been rejected. I wonder whether it is admissible under our Rules of Procedure for you to hold a vote on a motion for a resolution at which we have chipped away until nothing is left. I hardly think so. I should also like to state that I did not object to the tenor of the motion tabled by Mr Fanti and others in its original form, but I think you would be making a procedural error if you put this motion to the vote now that it has been reduced to nothing. If you do so, I shall be obliged to abstain.

President. — I can see the technical problem. Mr Fanti, do you accept that there is no point in putting it to the vote now?

Mr Fanti. — *(I)* I am sorry, Mr President, but I believe that an incorrect procedure has been followed, because when amendments to a motion are tabled, they have to be voted on — as we have just done — but the motion does not have to be voted on bit by bit, item by item. The voting that has just taken place rejected the amendments. What I think should be done now, in keeping with the Rules of Procedure, is to put the motion as a whole to the vote.

President. — I can see the position where people can reject individual paragraphs and yet want to speak or vote for the whole

Therefore I am now putting the matter as a whole to the vote.

The motion is rejected.

I have been informed by the President that as a result of unsuccessful negotiations with the Staff Committee we shall be finishing at 7 o'clock this evening, which leaves us very little time.

I call Mr Paisley on a point of order.

Mr Paisley. — Does the announcement that we rise at 7 p.m. mean that Question Time for this plenary session has now been dropped?

President. — If we can complete the voting by 6.55 there might be enough time for one question.

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman on the same point of order.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, may we ask you to ask the President to consider going back to the proper time for Question Time since this is the second time that we have missed this most valuable parliamentary institution?

(Applause)

President. — Yes, I am quite sure in fact that this will be done.

I call Mrs Ewing on the same point of order.

Mrs Ewing. — As the person who raised the matter of Question Time at the last part-session, I received an assurance from the Chair that the loss of Question Time would never happen again. I am not interested in having a Question Time of twenty minutes or one question. I am interested in having one and a half hours. And if we are not going to have it tonight then I demand that we have it tomorrow.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. — I shall take the matter up with the President.

We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-660/79)*.

I have received seven amendments seeking to replace the entire motion for a resolution by new texts:

- No 1 by Mr Glinne on behalf of the socialist group,
- No 2 by Mrs Castellina,
- Nos 3, 4 and 5 by Mr Pannella and Mrs Macciocchi,
- Nos 6 and 7 by Mrs Macciocchi.

The Rules of Procedure stipulate that the President shall decide which amendment departs furthest from the text. I feel that in doing this I should be expressing political judgments and I do not think it is my function as President to do so.

I call Mr Arndt on a point of order.

Mr Arndt. — *(D)* Mr President, may I point out that if Amendment No 1 is adopted, all the other amendments will fall and we can then take a final vote on Doc. 660. I should be grateful if you went along with this view — which will simplify proceedings considerably — and stated that if Amendment No 1 is adopted, the others fall and we can then have the general vote on the amended Doc. 660.

President. — Mr Arndt, as I have been advised, and according to the Rules, this procedure is perfectly correct. If Amendment No 1 is adopted, Amendments Nos 2 to 7 fall. On the other hand, if No 1 is rejected, we shall move on to No 2, and so on until we eliminate them all.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, the action that is about to be taken is one of serious political import. It is not at all true — indeed, quite the contrary — that all the other amendments will fall if the Glinne amendment is adopted, for these amendments are in fact seeking to amend the Glinne amendment, too. What I mean is that they seek separate amendments to the Socialist Group's motion, whether the Glinne amendment is adopted or not. I begin to wonder, Mr President, whether your advisers are Socialist advisers or advisers to the Chair. We have proposed to incorporate three important points from the Klepsch motion and from the Conservative motions in the Socialist one. How can you maintain that if the Glinne amendment is adopted, the others fall? They all seek alterations but they are not the same. Let us be careful. This is what happens, Mr President, when you do not allow people to explain the amendments. Let me tell you that the Glinne amendment must fall if it has not been moved. Since it was introduced this morning, it is clear that it was not moved yesterday at the beginning of the debate. According to the Rules of Procedure, either Mr Glinne and the rest of us can move these amendments or else you cannot put them to the vote. In any case, our three amendments — and I am saying this for the benefit of those who are about to vote — seek to incorporate three points from the Klepsch and Conservative motions, regarding specific measures, in the Socialist motion.

To sum up, Mr President, I repeat that the Glinne amendment and the others are not the same.

President. — I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group:

After the words 'The European Parliament' replace the motion for a resolution by the following text:

— aware of the responsibility of the Member States, which, at the inception of the European Community, declared that they were 'resolved to preserve and strengthen peace and liberty', as stated in the preamble of the founding Treaties,

— condemning Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, which is a flagrant violation of the principles of national independence and sovereignty,

— concerned at the serious deterioration in the international situation and at the threats to world peace caused by the current tension in many areas,

President

- considering that all countries should return to the policy of détente as guarantee of a policy of peace,
- 1. Calls on the Member States of the Community :
 - (a) to make every effort to secure the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan,
 - (b) to spare no effort in pursuing the policy of détente in accordance with the Helsinki Agreement, having regard to the forthcoming Madrid Conference and the need for balanced and controlled reduction of armaments ;
- 2. Calls also on the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, acting in keeping with the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement, to take the necessary steps and the appropriate measures to achieve the above-mentioned objectives ;
- 3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the governments of the Member States and to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation."

I put it to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

I have Amendment No 2 by Mrs Castellina :

After the words 'The European Parliament', replace the motion for a resolution by the following new text :

- aware of the responsibility of the Member States, which, at the inception of the European Community, declared that they were 'resolved to preserve and strengthen peace and liberty', as stated in the preamble of the founding Treaties,
- condemning Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, which is a flagrant violation of the principles of national independence and sovereignty,
- concerned at the serious deterioration in the international situation and at the threats to world peace caused by the current tension in many areas,
- considering that all countries should return to the policy of détente as guarantee of a policy of peace,
- 1. Calls on the Member States of the Community :
 - (a) to make every effort to secure the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan,
 - (b) to spare no effort in pursuing the policy of détente in accordance with the Helsinki Agreement, having regard to the forthcoming Madrid Conference and the need for balanced and controlled reduction of armaments ;
 - (c) to take the appropriate initiative to thwart the military designs of the two super powers, starting by refusing any further installation of military potential on their own territory, using their own political and economic power to create a third, autonomous point of reference in the world, based on a positive relationship with the developing countries thus helping the latter to free themselves from the blackmail to which they are being subjected by the USSR and the USA and which multiplies the dangers of war ;
- 2. Calls also on the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, acting in keeping with the spirit of Helsinki Agreement, to take the necessary steps and the appropriate measures to achieve the above-mentioned objectives ;

3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the governments of the Member States and to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation."

I call Mr Glinne on a point of order.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) Since Amendment No 1 has not been adopted, the amendments to Amendment No 1 become meaningless. As for their content, we are against.

President. — I put the amendment to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is rejected.

I have amendment No 3 by Mr Pannella and Mrs Macciocchi :

Replace the resolution by the following text :

- aware of the responsibility of the Member States, which, at the inception of the European Community, declared that they were 'resolved to preserve and strengthen peace and liberty', as stated in the preamble of the founding Treaties,
- condemning Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, which is a flagrant violation of the principles of national independence and sovereignty,
- concerned at the serious deterioration in the international situation and at the threats to world peace caused by the current tension in many areas,
- considering that all countries should return to the policy of détente as guarantee of a policy of peace,
- 1. Calls on the Member States of the Community :
 - (a) to make every effort to secure the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan,
 - (b) to spare no effort in pursuing the policy of détente in accordance with the Helsinki Agreement, having regard to the forthcoming Madrid Conference and the need for balanced and controlled reduction of armaments ;
- 2. Welcomes the Commission's decision to temporarily suspend food aid to Afghanistan and to make it available to the refugees from that country, since otherwise the supplies might not in the present circumstances reach the Afghan people for whom they are intended ;
- 3. Calls on the Council and the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, acting in keeping with the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement, to take the necessary steps and the appropriate measures to achieve the above-mentioned objectives ;
- 4. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the governments of the Member States and the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation."

I put to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I have Amendment No 5 by Mr Pannella and Mrs Macciocchi :

Replace the resolution by the following text :

- aware of the responsibility of the Member States, which, at the inception of the European Commu-

President

nity, declared that they were 'resolved to preserve and strengthen peace and liberty', as stated in the preamble of the founding Treaties,

- condemning Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, which is a flagrant violation of the principles of national independence and sovereignty,
- concerned at the serious deterioration in the international situation and at the threats to world peace caused by the current tension in many areas,
- considering that all countries should return to the policy of détente as guarantee of a policy of peace,

1. Calls on the Member States of the Community :

- (a) to make every effort to secure the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan,
- (b) to spare no effort in pursuing the policy of détente in accordance with the Helsinki Agreement, having regard to the forthcoming Madrid Conference and the need for balanced and controlled reduction of armaments ;

2. Welcomes the Commission's decision to temporarily suspend food aid to Afghanistan and to make it available to the refugees from that country, since otherwise the supplies might not in the present circumstances reach the Afghan people for whom they are intended ;

3. Calls on the Council and the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation acting in keeping with the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement, to take the necessary steps and the appropriate measures to achieve the abovementioned objectives ;

4. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the governments of the Member States and the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation."

I put it to the vote.

Amendment No 5 is rejected.

I have Amendment No 6 by Mr Pannella and Mrs Macciocchi :

Replace the resolution by the following text :

"— aware of the responsibility of the Member States, which, at the inception of the European Community, declared that they were 'resolved to preserve and strengthen peace and liberty', as stated in the preamble of the founding Treaties,

- condemning Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, which is a flagrant violation of the principles of national independence and sovereignty,
- concerned at the serious deterioration in the international situation and at the threats to world peace caused by the current tension in many areas,
- considering that all countries should return to the policy of détente as guarantee of a policy of peace,

1. Calls on the Member States of the Community :

- (a) to make every effort to secure the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan,
- (b) to spare no effort in pursuing the policy of détente in accordance with the Helsinki Agreement, having regard to the forthcoming Madrid Conference and the need for balanced and controlled reduction of armaments ;

2. Calls also in the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, acting in keeping with the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement, to take the necessary steps and the appropriate measures to achieve the abovementioned objectives ;

3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the governments of the Member States and to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation."

I put it to the vote.

Amendment No 6 is rejected.

I have Amendment No 7 by Mrs Macciocchi :

Replace the resolution by the following text :

"— aware of the responsibility of the Member States, which, at the inception of the European Community, declared that they were 'resolved to preserve and strengthen peace and liberty', as stated in the preamble of the founding Treaties,

- condemning Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, which is a flagrant violation of the principles of national independence and sovereignty,
- concerned at the serious deterioration in the international situation and at the threats to world peace caused by the current tension in many areas,
- considering that all countries should return to the policy of détente as guarantee of a policy of peace,

1. Calls on the Member States of the Community :

- (a) to make every effort to secure the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan,
- (b) to spare no effort in pursuing the policy of détente in accordance with the Helsinki Agreement, having regard to the forthcoming Madrid Conference and the need for balanced and controlled reduction of armaments ;

2. Calls also on the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, acting in keeping with the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement, to take the necessary steps and the appropriate measures to achieve the abovementioned objectives ;

3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the governments of the Member States and to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation."

I put it to the vote.

Amendment No 7 is rejected.

The floor is now open for explanations of vote.

I call Mr Friedrich.

Mr Bruno Friedrich. — (D) Mr President, the reason I am voting for this motion for a resolution is because I see it as the only means I have of registering my protest. I shall abstain from voting on all the other motions because I do not consider that they all merit rejection. I should like — by my action — to highlight the deplorable situation whereby 104 countries with political systems covering the whole spectrum spent three days discussing this brutal act of expansionism and aggression and then joining together in condemning the Soviet Union's actions, whereas this

Friedrich

House — with a common democratic foundation — only managed to devote an hour's discussion to the same subject, but then proceeded to waste two hours discussing niceties of voting procedure. This can only appal all of us who want to see a Europe which is prepared to fly the democratic flag.

(Applause)

I can only hope that this House will learn today's lesson and in future, when we have to discuss so important and so world-shattering an event as this one, will lock the chairmen of the political groups into a room together until they have reached a consensus.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mrs Castellina.

Mrs Castellina. — *(I)* Mr President, I intend to refrain from voting on the Glinne motion, but not because I do not go along with the condemnation of the Soviet Union which it contains and the call for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, nor because I do not share the desire to relaunch the policy of détente. Another thing I like in this motion — although it was also urged in other motions tabled in the House — was the rejection of risky and pointless economic reprisals. But there are two things in the motion which fail to convince me. If you are going to analyze the situation correctly and if you want to draw positive, sensible and effective conclusions from events, there are two basic points which must not be ignored.

First of all, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is a very serious matter, but it is not the only reason for a breakdown in détente, which has been faltering for some time because of the prevailing military strategy of the Soviet Union and the United States. If there is no reference to this complex pattern of international tension and the relative burden of responsibility, not only will you get a wrong picture and a one-sided view of the situation but the end result will be significant repercussions stemming from a mistaken approach. It is not by sheltering under the wing of the United States, i.e. by staying in NATO, that we are going to safeguard peace. On the contrary, we shall be fostering a military strategy, and this is why I abstained on the Fanti motion as well.

Secondly, I do not think it will be possible to relaunch the policy of détente if we have to rely on the spontaneous efforts of the two superpowers. We need to develop a strength which can exert enough pressure to counter the military strategies of the two great powers. Does this mean adopting a neutral stance? Of course it does, but Swiss-style neutrality rather than the kind of neutrality that washes its hand of events in the world. What we are proposing is some-

thing positive, the creation of a third force in the world, here in Europe.

I know that my opinion is very much a minority one in this Parliament, but I state it again because I believe that this will be the great theme of the 80s and, what is more, there are already people in your own parties who are beginning to put forward similar ideas.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* I want to raise a point of order first of all, Mr President. I really wonder if the vote on our motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-660/79) still has any relevance. The text was replaced by Amendment No 1, which has already been voted on. I do not see why we should insist on voting on a document which we at least are withdrawing.

On the essence of this matter, I want to give an explanation of vote. It was the desire of the Socialist Group, Mr Bangemann, to cooperate with every group in the House, in the hope of achieving a balanced interpretation — and I mean balanced — of the situation which has arisen on the one hand from events in Afghanistan and on the other from other alarming aspects of international affairs. We believed and we still believe that the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan must be condemned and that there must be suitable measures and moves to achieve a dual aim, outlined in our motion:

to make every effort to secure the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan, and to spare no effort in pursuing the policy of détente in accordance with the Helsinki Agreement, having regard to the forthcoming Madrid Conference and the need for balanced and controlled reduction of armaments.

As things stand at the moment, in connection with Afghanistan, we do not feel there is any need to add anything to the opinions which were expressed and the stances which were adopted by the Foreign Ministers of the Community, meeting yesterday in political cooperation, and by the Commission last week.

President. — Mr Glinne, it would be proper not only for yourself but also for those who are signatories to withdraw the motion. I must know whether or not you are withdrawing the resolution.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* I repeat, Mr President, that our political view was perfectly and totally expressed in the text of Amendment No 1. There was a vote on this amendment. But we are not asking the House to vote on the original motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-660/79), notwithstanding its interest as a political document.

President. — The motion is accordingly withdrawn.

President

12. Urgent procedure

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

- by Mr Capanna, Mr Pelikan, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr Lyngé, Mrs Buchan, Mrs Ewing, Mr Orlandi, Mr Puletti, Mr Van Minnen, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Coppieters, Mr Filippi, Mr Macario, Mrs Agnelli, Mr Cecovini, Mrs Castellina, Mr Pannella, Mrs Macciocchi, Mrs Dekker, Mr De Goede, Mr Blaney, Mr Johnson and Mr Gendebien on the violation by the USA of the human rights and right of self-government of the Mohawk people and of the Six Nation Iroquois Confederacy (Doc. 1-680/79)
- by Mr Coppieters, Mr Pannella, Mr De Goede, Mr Lyngé, Mr Van Minnen, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Blaney, Mr Schinzel, Mrs Castellina, Mrs Macciocchi, Mr Capanna, Mr Vernimmen, Mrs Dekker, Mr Van Miert, Mr Linde, Mr Wettig, Mrs Weber, Mr Colla, Mr Schwencke, Mr Hume and Mr Flanagan on the situation in Corsica (Doc. 1-682/79).

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

I shall consult Parliament on the urgency of these motions for resolutions at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

I have received advice that the President of Parliament is negotiating with the Staff Committee to work beyond 7.00 p.m. The reason for this is something outside the voting situation. The Staff Committee have said that if the only business before the House is voting, then they are not prepared to work beyond 7.00 p.m., but if there is some other matter in relation to the presidency of the Council, then they might be prepared to work on. If I proceed with the votes, then the staff walk out. Therefore, all I can do is make announcements.

(Loud protests)

13. Membership of Parliament

President. — The German Bundestag has informed me that on 16 January 1980, Mr Karl Heinz Meer was designated as Member of the European Parliament to replace Mr Loderer. I welcome this new Member who, in accordance with Rule 3 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, will take his seat in Parliament and on its committees with the same rights as other members until such time as his credentials have been verified.

I call Mr Glinne on a point of order.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, I can well understand that the staff want us to finish our work at a reasonable hour. You tell me, however, that the staff is ready to continue if we move on to other business, whereas they will stop working if we carry on voting.

As a Member of this Parliament, I must say that this is intolerable.

(Applause)

Nothing could harm the image of this Parliament more than the fact that we interrupt the proceedings in the middle of an unfinished vote. Let us at least carry on until we have finished with the votes on the situation in Afghanistan !

(Loud applause)

President. — I agree with you, Mr Glinne. On two occasions I have left the Chamber to meet with members of the Staff Committee because I understood the President was negotiating. When I got to the President's room I found there were no staff people there to negotiate with. I then had to come back in. The negotiations were by that time going on. I then received the following communication : 'Le Président communique que le personnel refuse de travailler au-delà de 19 heures.'

I then received other information saying that Mr Ruffini, the President-in-Office of the Council, had been waiting patiently all day in order to speak to the House. He would be prepared to give his statement, if it was possible, out of courtesy to the House if the House were prepared to listen to him.

I understand that the staff said they were prepared to extend to Mr Ruffini the courtesy that he wanted to extend to the House.

I call Mr Bangemann on the same point of order.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Mr President, after what Mr Glinne has just said and in view of the importance of this vote, and considering that there are still two votes to be taken which we can deal with in two minutes, I feel certain that the staff of this Parliament identifies so strongly with us and with the political aims of this House that we can get the voting finished in three minutes.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Colombo on the same point of order.

Mr Colombo. — *(I)* Mr President, among all the things a parliament must not do, in my opinion, one of them is not to interrupt the proceedings in the middle of a vote. It has to finish voting, whatever happens !

(Applause)

A parliament must be in a position to express its opinion freely, and no outside pressure may stop it from expressing this opinion. We have to carry on voting.

(Cries of 'Let's vote!')

President. — I would just like to know whether the interpreters are prepared to carry on...

(Protests)

Thank you very much for your help and cooperation in a very difficult period in the presidency. I leave the presidency and Mrs Veil will take the Chair.

(Applause)

14. Agenda

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, this is a crucial moment for the House and I appeal to everyone here, no matter to which political group he may belong, to really make an effort.

I am sure that if we make an effort, the staff will do the same. I have not yet had their answer but I have consulted them and I am sure that they, too, have at heart the proper conduct of our business and the good reputation of this institution, its Members and everyone who works here.

What I want to ask everyone is that we finish voting, but without a roll call and without explanations of vote. In this way we can finish very quickly.

(Applause)

I know, Mr Pannella, that this contravenes the Rules of Procedure but there are circumstances when the seriousness of the situation perhaps allows the Rules to be forgotten for a moment.

(Applause from the centre and the right; protests from certain quarters)

This morning — and I thank you for it — we had an excellent debate and everyone tried to keep within his speaking time, and some of you managed in three or four minutes to say a great deal about this tense moment. Let us not waste time now. I am asking all of you to make an effort, and I am also asking the staff, because I know that if we continue as I suggested we can quickly finish voting and suspend the proceedings until tomorrow morning. I ask you not to raise any more points of order or to interrupt for any reason at all.

Mr Pannella, I am asking if the House agrees to the proposal I have just made. Either there is agreement and we vote, or else there is no agreement and we do not vote but suspend the sitting.

(Mr Pannella asks leave to speak; protests from most quarters)

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* I wish to support you, Madam President.

President. — Mr Pannella, I ask you not to speak, even to support me!

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Madam President, you have been placed in a very difficult position by the irresponsible attitude of a lot of people who want to force you into the travesty of a vote. Out of respect for your person, Madam President, I shall leave the Chamber.

(Applause from the centre and the right; mixed reactions)

If you want my opinion on these Members, Madam President, you have been far too patient in the Chair of this Parliament. Here there is just a gaggle of yes-men, not European Members of Parliament, and so my place is elsewhere.

President. — I call Mr Fanti.

Mr Fanti. — *(I)* Ladies and gentlemen, we all realize that this is a tricky moment. I ask everyone, calmly, to draw the right conclusions. On behalf of the Italian and the French Communists, and after listening to the earnest and considered words of the President, I must express our regret that the sitting was chaired this afternoon — for reasons outside the control of Mrs Veil — by a Vice-President who, in our opinion, did not adhere to the Rules of Procedure. For this reason we cannot accept Mrs Veil's proposal and we shall vote against it.

As responsible Members of this House, we have to say that it is up to Parliament to decide, even though it must be made quite clear that each and every flouting of the Rules of Procedure must be considered a serious matter.

President. — Let me say first of all that I cannot accept the terms which were used with reference to this afternoon's presidency. The president had to cope with very difficult circumstances — a situation I know well. As a result of ambiguities in our Rules of Procedure, there are occasions — I can assure you — when it is not clear what action should be taken and when any position of the Chair is criticized. I was not present at this afternoon's sitting but my predecessor in the Chair has my unconditional support.

(Applause)

The fact is that we should not be apportioning blame. If we want the business of Parliament to be conducted in satisfactory circumstances in the future, we must all make a determined effort and show more willingness to work together. It is difficult, we know, because we come from different parliamentary backgrounds and we have different political ideas. We have to work together and show willingness, at least as far as this goes, and above all we must not blame the presidency for anything that happens. Mr Rogers has all my sympathy.

(Applause)

President

I now consult Parliament on the procedure which I am obliged to propose. We are caught, as it were, between two stools. As Mr Colombo said just now, we cannot interrupt the vote. On the other hand there are the commitments to the staff which mean that we cannot conclude our business tonight. Faced with this situation, I have proposed that we resume voting, adopting a simplified procedure.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

IN THE CHAIR : MR ROGERS*Vice-President*15. *Votes*

President. — We shall resume the vote on the motions for a resolution on the situation in Afghanistan.

We first take the motion for a resolution by Mr Druon and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats :

I call Mr Druon.

Mr Druon. — (*F*) Mr President, my group is ready to support the simplified procedure and the speedy conclusion of our business. We have just decided to take no further part in the voting and we are withdrawing the motion for a resolution which we tabled. We were hoping for a short, unanimous and swift condemnation which by virtue of being short, unanimous and swift would have been the only kind of condemnation to have any moral impact, which is all we can expect. Whatever longwinded text the House is going to come up with this evening, after an even more longwinded debate, we have just been making fools of ourselves all day.

The Russian troops stood on less ceremony when they marched into Kabul ; the idea of order is not the same there as it is here. We are withdrawing, because it is the easy thing to do and it will simplify the proceedings. It is a matter of personal dignity, since the House presents a sorry picture of being generally unmanageable, and at times it is a degrading spectacle !

President. — Doc. 1-666/79 is accordingly withdrawn.

The staff have now informed me that they will carry on working.

We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Scott-Hopkins and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group (Doc. 1-667/79)*.

I have received from Mr Klepsch, Mr Colombo, Mr Blumenfeld and Mr Penders, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD-Group), and from Mr Scott-Hopkins, Lady Elles and Mr Fergusson on

behalf of the European Democratic Group, amendment No 1 seeking to replace the whole of the motion for a resolution by the following new text :

- outraged by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and profoundly concerned about the threat to international peace,
- 1. Condemns the armed intervention in Afghanistan which is contrary to the provisions of the UN Charter ;
- 2. Calls for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan in order to enable its people to determine their own form of government ;
- 3. Emphasises the responsibility of the USSR for the grave consequences of its action on the policy of détente and affirms that the principles of détente are neither divisible nor limited to certain geographical regions and confirms the urgent need to ensure that they are applied everywhere ;
- 4. Reaffirms its desire for détente and deplores the brutal intervention of the USSR which diminishes its future development ;
- 5. Requests the Commission to review immediately all economic, commercial, credit and financial relations between the USSR and the European Community, specifically in the field of high technology, agricultural products, and antidumping practices and to report to the Council of Ministers ;
- 6. Calls upon the Council and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Nine acting in political cooperation to take effective measures in the light of the Commission's report in support of efforts to end the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan ;
- 7. Welcomes the decision provisionally to suspend food aid for Afghanistan, and calls on the Commission to give full support to the programme of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees to supply food and medical aid to the Afghan refugees who have fled into neighbouring states ;
- 8. Urges member governments to act in cooperation with all governments who condemn this flagrant act of aggression against an independent sovereign state ;
- 9. Calls upon the International Olympic Committee as well as national committees of member states and the federations of the national athletic associations taking part in the Olympic Games with the representatives of participating athletes to reconsider whether the summer games should take place in Moscow if the occupation of Afghanistan continues ;
- 10. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the UN Secretary-General, to the parliaments and governments of the Member States of the Community and to the Commission and Council with a request for the latter to report to the European Parliament.

I put the amendment to the vote.

Amendment No 1 — that is, a new motion for resolution — is adopted.

(*Applause*)

President*16. Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Thursday, 17 January 1980, with the following agenda :

10 a.m. to 1 p.m., 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. and 9 p.m. to 12 midnight

- Decision on urgency of four motions for a resolution
- Oral Question with debate, to the Commission, on consumer protection
- Legal report on the Staff Regulations
- Weber report on radioactive waste
- Ghergo report on radiation protection

- Combe report on cocoa and chocolate products
- Combe report on fresh poultrymeat
- Joint debate on the Nicholson and Forster report and the Oral Question with debate to the Commission on the shipbuilding and textile industries
- Joint debate on the two Cresson-reports, and the Ligios motion for a resolution on swine fever and the Nielsen report on tuberculosis and brucellosis

3 p.m.:

- Voting time

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.15 p.m.)

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 17 JANUARY 1980

Contents

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| 1. <i>Approval of minutes</i> <i>Points of order: Mr D'Angelosante; Mr De Goede; Mrs Ewing; Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Mr Pannella; Mr Paisley; Mr Romualdi; Mrs Kellett-Bowman</i> | 168 | 10. <i>Regulations amending the Staff Regulations of Officials of the Communities — Report by Mr Lega on behalf of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 1-584/79):</i> <i>Mr Lega, rapporteur</i> | 188 |
| 2. <i>Documents received</i> | 170 | <i>Mr Nord (L); Mr Sieglerschmidt (S), draftsman of an opinion; Mr Fischbach (EPP)</i> | 189 |
| 3. <i>Agenda</i> <i>Mr Maher; Mr Pannella; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Paisley</i> | 171 | <i>Point of order: Sir Peter Vanneck</i> | 193 |
| 4. <i>Decision on urgency</i> <i>Mr Vergès; Mr Irmer; Mr Capanna; Mr Lyngé; Mr Arndt (S); Lord Harmar-Nicholls (ED); Mr Pannella</i> | 171 | <i>Mr Forth; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Mr Lega</i> | 193 |
| <i>Point of order: Mr Galland</i> | 174 | 11. <i>Second five-year programme on radioactive waste — Report by Mrs Weber on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. 1-576/79):</i> <i>Mrs Weber, rapporteur</i> | 196 |
| <i>Mr Berkhouwer (L); Mr Paisley</i> | 174 | <i>Mrs Walz, draftsman of an opinion; Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission; Mr Estgen (EPP); Mr Sherlock (ED)</i> | 197 |
| <i>Points of order: Mr Bøgh; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Pannella; Mr Ippolito; Mr Coppieters; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Arndt (S)</i> | 174 | <i>Points of order: Mr Pannella; Mr Calvez</i> | 201 |
| 5. <i>Agenda</i> <i>Sir David Nicolson</i> | 176 | <i>Mr Ippolito; Mrs von Alemann (L); Mrs Ewing (EPD); Mrs Dekker; Mrs Charzat; Mr Hutton; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Linkohr; Mr Seligman; Mrs Weber</i> | 202 |
| <i>Point of order: Mr Patterson</i> | 176 | <i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i> | 213 |
| 6. <i>Consumer and environment protection — Oral question with debate by Miss Hooper and others (Doc. 1-615/79):</i> <i>Miss Hooper, author of the question</i> | 176 | <i>Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission</i> | 213 |
| <i>Mr Burke, Member of the Commission; Mr Collins (S)</i> | 177 | 12. <i>Decision adopting a five-year radiation protection programme — Report by Mr Ghergo on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. 1-552/79):</i> <i>Mr Ghergo, rapporteur</i> | 214 |
| 7. <i>List of speakers</i> | 180 | <i>Mr Seligman (ED); Mrs von Alemann (L); Mr Coppieters; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Capanna; Mr Ghergo; Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission</i> | 216 |
| 8. <i>Consumer and environment protection (continuation)</i> <i>Mrs Maij-Weggen (EPP); Mrs Squarcialupi (COM); Mrs Scrivener (L); Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr Alber; Mr Johnson; Mr Modiano; Mr Muntingh; Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Mr Moorhouse (ED); Mr Burke, Member of the Commission</i> | 180 | <i>Point of order: Mr Capanna</i> | 221 |
| 9. <i>Agenda</i> | 188 | | |

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>13. <i>Directive on cocoa and chocolate products</i> — Report by Mr Combe on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. 1-618/79): Mrs Pruvot, deputy rapporteur 222 Mr Newton Dunn (ED); Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission 222</p> <p>14. <i>Directive on intra-Community trade in fresh poultrymeat</i> — Report by Mr Combe on behalf of the Committee on the Environ- ment, Public Health and Consumer Protec- tion (Doc. 1-619/79); Mrs Pruvot, deputy rapporteur 223 Mrs Schleicher (EPP); Mr Turner (ED); Mr Denis; Mr Nyborg (EPD); Mr</p> | <p>Spencer; Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission</p> <p>15. <i>Swine fever, tuberculosis and brucellosis</i> — Joint debate on three reports and a motion for a resolution by Mrs Cresson, Mr Ligios and Mr B. Nielsen on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Docs. 1-571/79, 1-620/79, 1-626/79 and 1-621/79): Mrs Cresson, rapporteur 228 Mr Ligios 229 Mr B. Nielsen, rapporteur 229 Mr Davern (EPD); Mr Skovmand; Mr Bocklet; Mr Clinton; Mr Gundelach, Vice- President of the Commission; Mr Skov- mand; Mr Gundelach 230</p> <p>16. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i> 233</p> |
|--|--|

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

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

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

I call Mr D'Angelosante.

Mr D'Angelosante. — (I) Mr President, with regard to the minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting — or rather of the end of the sitting — our group would like to have it put on record that at the close of the sitting there were certain happenings of which we disapprove most strongly. I am referring to the fact that there was an attempt — although we admit that the situation was somewhat difficult — to solve the problem by stating bluntly that the Rules of Procedure had to be ignored. This was enough to create a situation which in our view is unacceptable and fraught with danger. When the President put to the vote the proposal whereby the Rules were to be ignored, the Socialist and Communist Groups voted against the idea, which made it absolutely impossible and clearly illegal and inadmissible to carry on with that procedure — which is instead what happened.

We disapprove of the procedure and we want to make sure that everyone realizes that yesterday a mistake was made and that no precedent was set which can ever be repeated. We want this to be put on record in the minutes, Mr President.

President. — Mr D'Angelosante, I can assure you that your remarks will be recorded in the minutes of today's proceedings. I can also inform you that the Bureau is currently holding talks on the course of events yesterday, naturally with a view to preventing such things recurring in future. These talks, however, are not yet finished.

I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to take this opportunity of stating that I agree with what Mr d'Angelosante has said. I also agree with you that yesterday's events should be the subject of detailed discussion by the Bureau. My own view is that these talks should be held in the Enlarged Bureau, of which both you and I are members. The main point I want to make is that I find it scandalous that, after the President-in-Office had made his statement yesterday, he had to make do with listening to only three of the twenty people down to speak in the debate. It should be possible to hold such an important debate, but this was rendered impossible because the votes were allowed to go ahead yesterday afternoon — and we all know what happened after that. I want to say that quite openly, and I think that many of you will agree with me that nothing like that should be allowed to happen again. We are making a farce of Parliament if we allow such an important debate as this to fizzle out in this way.

President. — I call Mrs Ewing.

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, I wish to refer again to the matter of Question Time, which I hold very dear. If we backbenchers are going to have Question Time taken off the agenda at two successive part-sessions. I think we should go back to the old system where we knew where we were. As this is a complex Parliament with two front benches, it is very important to hold the front benches accountable, and Question Time is our only opportunity to do so. I therefore urge all sides of the House to go back to our old system with Question Time at every part-session.

(Applause)

President. — Mrs Ewing, I think it was already agreed yesterday that the problem you raise is a serious one. That problem has to be solved. The Bureau is considering whether Question Time can have the place it merits.

I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — Mr President, I do not think that the interpretation of what happened yesterday, as given by the first speaker, ought to be allowed to stand. We must give the President discretion regarding control of the Assembly, particularly when circumstances are as they were yesterday. If there was any fault for the disgraceful happenings of yesterday, it was not from the President's chair, it was from the floor of Parliament itself. It may well be that we shall have to give the President the power of deciding certain things which now are kept in the hands of the whole Assembly. The latter approach, as yesterday showed, clearly does not work.

Furthermore, if there is to be criticism on the record, it must not be of the President, but of the behaviour of the Members of Parliament itself. It is up to us to behave ourselves when we are discussing important matters, such as those before us yesterday.

President. — Thank you, Lord Harmar-Nicholls, for the support you have given to the presidency. Your remarks will be as much a part of today's report of proceedings as those of Mr D'Angelosante.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, like the last speaker I want to make it clear that we are discussing the minutes of proceedings. In connection with this may I say how disappointed I am that this is being used as a pretext for a debate on yesterday's sitting. For this reason I am also disappointed by the remarks made.

Mr President, in the first place I want the minutes to record the fact that the President of the sitting — after reaching the item on the agenda which was the

debate on the statement by the President of the Council and finding that he had made himself scarce — simply closed the sitting. It is essential in my opinion that this be recorded in the minutes, because it is something unprecedented and unheard of.

Secondly, Mr President, I think that Item 15 in the minutes should make it clear that Mrs Veil not only proposed voting by show of hands — this is what it says in the minutes — but also proposed that no Member should ask further leave to speak, adding that she was fully aware that this contravened the Rules of Procedure.

This addition is designed to give proper regard to the statements by the President and to stop the minutes from being doctored too much, whoever is responsible.

Thirdly, Mr President, I want the minutes to record that during yesterday's sitting the President — in spite of what the last speaker was fawning on about — on several occasions contradicted himself and consistently failed to apply the Rules of Procedure which he was at great pains to quote on the subject of explanations of vote.

I also want the minutes of proceedings to state that the President first put the Communist motion to the vote item by item and that he then put the motion as a whole to the vote, even though each and every item had been rejected.

Finally, Mr President, I want the minutes to record that I, too, shared the same opinion as Mrs Ewing and Mr D'Angelosante yesterday, with regard to protests over Question Time and the conduct of our business.

President. — I have a problem here. Mr Pannella proposed concrete amendments to the minutes. He wants to have the minutes changed. Pursuant to the Rules of Procedure, I have to ask Parliament whether there is a majority in favour of changing the minutes in line with the proposals made by Mr Pannella.

We shall have a show of hands to decide whether the minutes are to be changed along the lines indicated by Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella's proposal is not approved.

I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, I wonder why the back seats of this Chamber should not have some light? When 10 o'clock comes we have to sit in darkness for about 15 minutes. Could you have the lights put on in these back seats? I know that some people would like to put us right outside the Chamber, but while we are in here surely we should have some light.

That is not, of course, the matter I rose on, Mr President. I should like to draw your attention to page 19 of the minutes. At the top of the page it says 'Mr

Paisley

Paisley, Mrs Kellett-Bowman and Mrs Ewing spoke on the conduct of proceedings'. In fact, we did no such thing. We spoke on the agenda, which had been altered so that Question Time was completely cut out. I would like to join very strongly in protesting on this matter. Page 9 of the Report of Proceedings for Monday records that I asked Madam President whether Question Time on Wednesday would be retained and if there would be an hour and a half for questions. I got an assurance from the Chair that nothing would hinder Question Time yesterday, but when yesterday came Question Time was wiped out. It is wiped out today as well. I should like to register my strongest possible protest against this order of proceedings. We need to retain Question Time, as it is the only lever and check this Parliament has on the Council.

President. — Mr Paisley, you are not speaking on the minutes at the moment. I have given instructions that the lights should be put on, as we do indeed need more light. Your other point was already put by Mrs Ewing, and I have made my remarks on it.

I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (I) Mr President, I cannot seem to find in the minutes mention of the fact that during yesterday's sitting I withdrew on behalf of the non-attached Italian Members our amendment in favour of Amendment No 1, by Mr Klepsch. This has not been put on the record. It is very important because by doing this a political group made its political position clear.

I also want to point out that there is no mention in the minutes of why and how the debate on the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council failed to take place. I know, we defeated the amendments to the minutes proposed by Mr Pannella, but it really is unheard of and an act of arrant discourtesy — quite apart from the political impact and the political significance it can be given — for the debate on the statement by the President of the Council not to be finished, but just to peter out. And there is no indication of when it is going to be resumed, or of what is going to happen with all these statements left hanging in the air. I should like all this to be included in the minutes, and some explanation for this incredible episode.

President. — Mr Romualdi, your last comment is another reference to what happened last night. I have commented at some length on this. In the minutes of yesterday's proceedings you will find full information about what was going on. These minutes are only a summary of what happened and do not contain everything. Apart from that, if you look again, you will find on page 17 of the minutes mention of the fact that you withdrew your amendment in favour of Amendment No 1 to Doc. 1-667/79.

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, it would solve the problem on page 19 of the minutes if the wording were slightly altered to read 'spoke on the conduct of proceedings and requested that in future Question Time should always be held'. That was the substance of what all three speakers had to say on that matter, and it is not reflected in the minutes.

President. — Mrs Kellett-Bowman, this point will certainly be brought out in the verbatim report of proceedings which will be handed to you tomorrow.

Are there any other objections?

The minutes are approved.

2. Documents received

President. — I have received:

a) the following report:

— by Mr Poniatoński, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-658/79) for a regulation on trade arrangements between Southern Rhodesia and the European Economic Community (Doc. 1-673/79);

b) the following motions for resolutions tabled pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure:

— by Mr Cottrell, Mr de Courcy Ling, Mr Beazley, Mr von Bismarck, Mr J.M. Taylor, Lord O'Hagan, Mr Bocklet, Mr Forth, Lady Elles, Mr Marshall, Mr Hord, Mr Kirk, Mr Pflimlin and Mr Jakobsen, on the situation in the Middle East (Doc. 1-677/79),

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

— by Mr Balfe, Mr Collins, Mr Klepsch, Mr Adonnino, Mr Coppeters, Mr Notenboom, Mr Gendebien, Mr J.D. Taylor, Mr Lyng, Mr Albers, Mrs Ewing, Mr Diana, Mr Bersani, Mr Antoniozzi, Miss Quin, Mr Adam, Mr Linkohr, Mr Peters, Mr Bettiza, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Schall, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Colombo, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Balfour, Mr Griffiths, Mr Christopher Jackson, Mr Cecovini, Mr Key, Mr Hume, Mr Marshall, Mr Battersby, Mr Capanna, Sir David Nicolson, Mr Seligman, Sir Fred Warner, Mr Papapietro, Mr Barbi, Mr Aigner, Mr Ghergo, Mr Filippi, Mr Sassano, Mr Zecchino, Sir Peter Vanneck, Mr J.M. Taylor, Mr Ippolito, Mr Prag, Mr Spencer, Mrs Macciocchi, Mr Robert Jackson, Mr Moorhouse, Mr Seal, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Clinton, Mr Seeler, Mr Dalsass, Mr Colleselli, Mr Barbagli, Mr Giavazzi, Mr Modiano, Mr Pedini and Mr Simpson, on the possibility of designating 1985 'European Music Year' (Doc. 1-678/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

3. Agenda

President. — At its sitting yesterday Parliament voted in favour of urgent procedure in respect of a proposal for a regulation on trade agreements between Southern Rhodesia and the EEC. I can inform the House that the Committee on Development and Cooperation has in the meantime submitted a report, which has been placed on the agenda of the sitting tomorrow, 18 January 1980.

I call Mr Maher.

Mr Maher. — Mr President, I want to ask a question about the agenda. What is to happen to the remainder of the debate on the programme of the Italian Presidency of the Council for the next six months? Only a few members had spoken yesterday when we reached 1 o'clock, and we understood that the debate was to continue afterwards. Could you please explain what is to happen?

President. — As the Italian President-in-Office is not available today, we have to discuss in the Bureau how we should handle the continuation of that debate, but I cannot pronounce on that without further consultation with the President of Parliament.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, following on from what Mr Maher said, I want to inform you that by this time our group has already tabled a question in the Italian Parliament deploring the conduct of the Italian President-in-Office of the Council. With your permission, I also want as an Italian to apologize for my part to all Members of the European Parliament for the unprecedented behaviour which marks the beginning of the Italian presidency. You can perhaps start Mafia meetings in this way, but not a meeting of the European Parliament.

President. — Mr Pannella, I have already announced that the minutes are approved. I want no more discussion about this. I do believe that there is every reason to discuss the matter further, but this is not the time nor the place. I think this is a matter for the Bureau and for the groups.

I call Mrs Pruvot.

Mrs Pruvot. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not want to go over yesterday's happenings again. But I do have one question. I wonder if it would not be a good idea for Parliament to agree to offer its apologies to the President-in-Office of the Council for what occurred yesterday. It is perhaps not a very important point, I admit, but it will not take any time or effort.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, could I draw your attention that the back seats are still in darkness half an hour after this Parliament has met? Surely it is an absolute scandal that one part of this Parliament sits in darkness while the other enjoys the light.

President. — Mr Paisley, I already said that you were perfectly right and instructions are on their way.

4. Decision on urgency

President. — The next item is the decision on the urgency of four motions for resolutions (Docs. 1-674/79, 1-676/79, 1-680/79 and 1-682/79).

I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution by Mr Papapietro and others (Doc. 1-674/79): Natural disasters in the Mezzogiorno.*

Urgent procedure is adopted.

I propose that the motion for a resolution be placed on the agenda of the sitting on Friday, 18 January 1980.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

*

* * *

Mr President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Vergès and others (Doc. 1-676/79): Urgent EEC aid for Mauritius.*

I call Mr Vergès.

Mr Vergès. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, last September the House voted unanimously for urgent procedure and subsequently adopted a resolution on emergency aid for the people of the West Indian islands hit by hurricanes David and Frederick. When we spoke on the subject then, we voiced fears about similar hurricanes hitting the islands in the southwest Indian Ocean at the end of the year or at the beginning of this year, when the hurricane season shifts there from the Caribbean. Unhappily this is what happened on Christmas Eve, when hurricane Claudette raged over Mauritius, causing loss of human life and devastating homes, communications and the productive resources of the island. Mauritius is an associated State, one of the ACP countries, and we feel that Parliament ought to express its sympathy with the stricken inhabitants by asking for emergency aid, as we did last September. A gesture like this would have a tremendous impact on the island.

President. — I call Mr Irmer to speak in favour of urgent procedure.

Mr Irmer. — (D) Mr President, I should like to speak for the motion and for the adoption of urgent procedure. Indeed, I may say on behalf of our group that we support urgent procedure. The reason I asked leave to speak is this: we are saddened by the fact that we were not consulted by the other groups which drew up this motion. What I mean is that for resolutions of this kind it would be better to have the widest possible consensus in the House. We are somewhat surprised that the motion, which was signed by Members from other groups, was not also passed round to us. We should have been happy to put our names to this motion. We hope that this will be borne in mind in the future.

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

Urgent procedure is adopted.

I propose that the motion for a resolution be placed on the agenda of the sitting on Friday, 18 January 1980.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

*
* * *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Capanna and others (Doc. 1-680/79): Violation by the USA of the human rights and right to self-government of the Mohawk people and of the Six Nation Iriquois Confederacy.*

I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (I) Mr President, I assure you that I shall not exceed the three minutes laid down in the Rules of Procedure, but first let me thank the 22 Members from almost every group in Parliament — apart from one — who put their names to this request for urgent procedure.

Unless any of you are guilty of hypocrisy, I am sure that we all agree that human rights and the basic tenets of international treaties must be respected and observed in all parts of the world — in Teheran, Kabul and Moscow, but in Washington as well.

The winter Olympics start at Lake Placid on 11 February. The Olympic village there is built like a prison. Some time ago the state of New York approved a plan to use the Olympic village as a prison for young offenders as soon as the games were over. For thousands of years the Olympic Games have symbolized peace and goodwill among people and nations, and it is beyond belief that they should now take place with the athletes having to live in a prison.

Lake Placid, the 1980 'Olympic Prison', lies in New York State on the autonomous territory — by virtue of treaties signed long ago by the United States — of the

Akwesasne reservation. The territory is inhabited by Mohawk Indians, who belong to the Six Nation Iriquois Confederacy. For the last four and a half months, since the end of last August, 400 Mohawk Indians have been held prisoner — because they are literally surrounded by New York State police — in the town of Racquette Point, capital of the Akwesasne reservation. The Government of the United States is openly violating not only the treaties of 1784 and 1794 — which take legal precedence over federal laws — but also the UN resolution adopted in Geneva in 1977 and Articles 8 and 10 of the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement.

These are the reasons for urgency, Mr President. We must respond to the appeal which the Mohawk people, addressing us as 'brothers', made to the 410 Members of the European Parliament. There must be an end to their uncertain way of life and we must make sure that the winter Olympics starting on 11 February are in no danger of being disrupted. If we reject urgency, it will mean that the 49 American citizens who are illegally held in Teheran are immeasurably more important than 400 American-Indian citizens who are being illegally held within America's own borders.

President. — I call Mr Lyngé.

Mr Lyngé. — (DK) Mr President, the American Indians form part of what is known as the fourth world — a term which has become more and more widely used in recent years but many people do not know exactly what it means.

The 'fourth world' is a term used to refer to various groups in different parts of the world which belong to the original population of a particular country and are living on their own original land but which do not have any political control of the society in which they are living. For example, there are the Laps in Northern Norway and Northern Sweden, the Indians and Eskimos in Canada and America and the Aborigines in Australia etc. The problem we are discussing is one of the fourth world.

As we all know the history of the American Indians is among the most tragic. The American Indians are a people in an entire continent of which not a single group has full control of any part of its own country. There are only a few who have managed to play the game on the white man's terms. In the USA there are the Navajo Indians in New Mexico and there are the six nations in the United States, some of whom also live on the Canadian side of the border, i.e. the Iroquois Mohawk Nations. The history of the American Indians consists of one breach of Treaty after another on the part of the white men, and this is yet another example, with some racialism, which is unfortunately typical of certain sections of American society, thrown in for good measure.

Lynge

Thus this is nothing new in itself. What is new in this situation, however, is that it is taking place under the Carter administration. President Carter has, like no American President before him, made human rights throughout the world and in his own country a major issue.

Ladies and gentlemen, I myself am from the fourth world. I come from Greenland where the colonial power has never used military or police methods to assert itself. We have been colonized by Denmark but we have never been shot at. Our case is possibly unique in the history of the European colonization. However, this makes it all the worse to see our friends on the other side of the Davis Strait, being treated in the way they are, and I cannot hold my peace on this matter. We cannot understand why this sort of thing should be necessary. In the entrance hall of this building there is an exhibition of photographs, some featuring children from the fourth world. I am sure some of you have noticed this. What is this exhibition there for? Is it just supposed to look pretty or is it supposed to have some significance? The Indians who have been detained and fired at by the New York police include a number of children.

If we can devote attention in this Parliament to human rights in Czechoslovakia and Chile, we can do the same in the case of our friends and allies and not keep quiet simply because a world power or trade partner is involved. I should like to know what view this Parliament takes of the rights of minorities. It is my duty to those who elected me to find out. I represent a minority. What we are discussing here is a cry of distress from a group of human beings, and we cannot just ignore it.

(Applause)

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

Mr Arndt. — *(D)* Mr President, the Socialist Group is aware that this is an important and serious problem which it is perfectly proper for Parliament to discuss. But as far as urgent procedure is concerned, we must not forget that, just because a subject is dealt with by urgent procedure, it does not necessarily mean that it receives Parliament's full attention if it happens to be dealt with on a Friday. We consider this an extremely important subject which must be thoroughly examined in the Political Affairs Committee and therefore feel that it ought not to be dealt with summarily on Friday. My Group would be very grateful if, at its next meeting, the Political Affairs Committee were to discuss this matter even though it is not yet on the agenda. It could possibly even take the necessary steps before the next plenary part-session of the European Parliament. In our view this subject is too important to be dealt with summarily on Friday and should be examined by the Political Affairs Committee. I should

like, if I may, to take this opportunity to state that in any case we in this House should show rather more restraint when it comes to urgent procedure. There are urgent matters which must be dealt with immediately. For example, if Mr Paisley were to table an urgent motion to the effect that the lights should be switched on where he is sitting, I would vote for it without hesitation even though it is not all that important, because it is a problem which cannot wait. Otherwise I feel that we would do more justice to the importance of subjects by referring them to committee. The Socialist Group will therefore vote to refer the matter to committee instead of dealing with it on Friday.

President. — I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — I want to join with the last speaker in resisting urgency on this matter because I oppose it on grounds rather wider than Mr Arndt. He seemed to be suggesting that there may be grounds for discussion and he accepted the implications of this. I do not believe we ought so lightly to interfere in the internal affairs of another country. The whole matter should first be examined carefully by a committee so that when it comes in front of Parliament we shall know it is not just the off-the-cuff view of only one or two Members but the considered view of a committee that has looked into the matter.

If we accept this request and debate the matter in Parliament as a whole, *prima facie* we are accepting the basis of the complaints contained in it. We do not have sufficient evidence to justify that sort of stature being given to what is suggested and therefore, on behalf of the group, I propose that the matter be referred to the committee so that the real basis of any complaint that may be contained in it may be seen.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, since it is unlikely if by some quirk urgency were adopted that the pro-American and pro-Russian majority in this Parliament — at any rate, not pro-European — would vote in favour of the motion, I just want to say this to Mr Capanna. If urgency were adopted, we should be in danger of doing something in time and in danger of clashing with the racialist policy of the USA. I say in time because these games open on 11 February. Do Mr Capanna and the others who signed this motion really believe that the majority groups in this Parliament, with the way it behaves, are really likely to jump to defend the civil rights of 400 poor Indians?

The right in this Parliament worries about civil rights when they are trampled on by the Russians. There is a group on the left that gets worked up only when the Americans do it. And then all these people in the North get together when it is time to trample on the rights of people in the South. Since these 400 Ameri-

Pannella

cans — like the people of Greenland, for that matter — belong to the South and the fourth world, in spite of geographic indications to the contrary, I suggest it would be better if we avoided the cynicism of asking Parliament to vote for urgency.

Why do we not let ourselves be taken in by the words of the Socialist Group? In Italy Giolitti said: 'If you want to thwart any initiative, refer the matter to committee.' This is what the Socialists want to do. Of course, I do not know what kind of Socialists they are. But this is the Socialist Group's proposal: refer the matter to committee and forget about it.

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

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, there are two points I wish to raise. The first concerns the statement by Mr Pannella, who was one of the co-signatories of this motion for which he was seeking urgency. It seems to be very easy to spread confusion in a parliament: just ask for urgency for a motion and then speak against it.

Secondly, Mr President, I am very surprised that Mr Pannella was the spokesman for his group. This ought to be checked because it was Mr Capanna, a Member of the same group, who was the instigator of this request for urgency. If he was speaking in a personal capacity, he should not have been allowed to speak.

President. — Mr Galland, there is no way of checking that someone is speaking on behalf of his group. We have to accept what the speaker says.

In any case, Mr Pannella gave no indication that he was withdrawing his name from the request for urgency and as long as this is the case, there is nothing else I can do.

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

Mr Berkhouwer. — (*NL*) Mr President, what Mr Arndt said on behalf of his group gets my full support. I think it is worthwhile taking a proper look at the main issue in this matter, and this must be done by the Political Affairs Committee.

As for what Mr Arndt said on the subject of Mr Paisley, I can add that Mr Paisley may be acquainted with the words in the fifth verse of the Gospel according to St John: And the light shineth in darkness.

Mr Paisley. — On a point that has just been raised, I would like to give a better scriptural quotation: If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness?

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

Mr Bøgh. — (*DK*) Mr President, I should like to state that Mr Pannella is not speaking on behalf of our group. This must be made quite clear. Now that I

have the floor, however, I should like to raise the question of the lighting. Yesterday, we tried on several occasions to catch the eye of the Chair from the back row here, but nobody saw us. We would suggest that the President pay some attention to us in the back row when we want to speak. We cannot accept what happened yesterday. We refuse to sit here and continue to have our tongues tied. However, to repeat my original point, I should like to make it quite clear that Mr Pannella is not speaking on behalf of the Technical Coordination Group.

President. — I cannot give an answer to this problem. It is one which you in the group have to sort out. I called on the spokesman of the group to speak, and at that time it was Mr Pannella.

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman on a point of order.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, in view of the statement that has been made that Mr Pannella was not in fact speaking on behalf of the group, I would ask you to exercise your discretion in omitting what he said from the record of these proceedings.

President. — Mrs Kellett-Bowman, the speaker told me that he was the spokesman for the group. For this reason I gave him leave to speak. The problem is now rather one for the group, and not the Chair...

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — You can exercise your discretion, under the Rules, to excise what he said from the record of these proceedings. That is all I am asking you to do.

President. — Mrs Kellett-Bowman, I cannot do that because I have no way of checking if Mr Bøgh is the spokesman of his group. The problem is insoluble. It will have to be settled by the group.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, I was given the floor because I raised my hand and shouted 'Against!'. Since there had been one speaker in favour, someone else was entitled to speak against the motion. As co-chairman of my group, I say that no one was able to speak on the group's behalf and no one did.

In my view, Mr President, Mr Galland, who was attacking me as well as you, ought to know that in the short time available for a parliamentary debate one speaks to be heard and so that the others can listen. I am entitled, after listening to some of the debate, to change my mind. That clearly comes as something of a shock to those of you over there, Mr Galland, because as often as not you are just yes-men. As for me, after I had heard what the Socialists had to say, I changed my mind because there is absolutely no point in requesting urgency when, as far as you lot are concerned, the only thing that is urgent is more often than not how to kowtow to interests which are not European.

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

Mr Ippolito. — (I) Mr President, I do not think we are going to get anywhere with the business of the House until the Vice-Presidents get to know the Rules of Procedure better. We had an example of this yesterday.

Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure is quite explicit as regards requests for urgency. You were supposed to call one speaker for and one against. If there is a debate about the request — which is what you have allowed to happen — Parliament is going to waste time in procedural wrangles instead of getting on with its work. I do insist that the President apply the Rules of Procedure — and if he does not know them, he should study them first.

President. — Mr Ippolito, I feel I must contradict you. We heard Mr Capanna, who tabled the motion for a resolution, and then we heard Mr Lyngé. Thereafter there were a number of Members who spoke on behalf of the groups and then Mr Pannella spoke against the request for urgency. This was entirely in accordance with the procedure outlined in Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure.

I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

The request is rejected.

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

* * *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Coppieters (Doc. 1-682/79/rev.): Situation in Corsica.*

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, I hope the problem will not arouse as much passion as appeared to be aroused yesterday. For us, and for myself in particular, the spirit of the French Revolution and the Commune marks the beginning of freedom in Europe. The problem of Corsica is a European problem, and if the motion is read impassionately, it will be noted that we are acting completely within the powers of the Community. It would be a blessing if regional development could prevent incidents such as those in Corsica, and if each people and each community could genuinely pursue the European ideals.

I was much impressed by what Mr Druon said yesterday about the motion for a resolution on Afghanistan. How can we adopt a European standpoint

unless people all over Europe — regardless of where they live and what personal problems they have — can feel that they are involved?

Mr President, in a French radio programme this morning, I heard the results of an opinion poll. I do not know how big or how valid the poll was — I am simply repeating what I heard. The results indicated that 43 % of people in France think that it is time now for Corsica to be given some form of self-government or autonomy. They think this is the only way to counter alienation and separatist movements and to strengthen Europe. It is in this spirit, and in this spirit alone, that I feel that this motion is justified in view of the tragic events of a few days ago.

President. — I call Mrs Scrivener to speak against the request for urgent procedure.

Mrs Scrivener. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be very brief and to the point, because this motion is quite simply unacceptable. The fact is that if we accept this motion, we shall be setting a very dangerous precedent, because this is a matter which concerns domestic policy which has nothing — absolutely nothing — to do with the European Parliament.

We have been elected to construct Europe by bringing States together — and of course there are lots of subjects which do not come up here — and not to meddle in affairs which are the strict preserve of the Member States. Let me remind the authors of this motion that when it comes to human rights and basic civil liberties, France has nothing to learn from anyone, in my view. And everyone knows that here.

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

Mr Arndt. — (D) Mr President, I am speaking pursuant to the second paragraph of Rule 14 (2) on behalf of the Socialist Group, which has something to say on this point. And I want to make it quite clear that Mr Ippolito's criticism of the Chair was totally unjustified. He did not read the next paragraph in the Rules of Procedure, which you should never forget to do.

But let me get to the point. The Socialist Group believes that this is in fact a matter for discussion by the House. But we also believe that this subject, which concerns a Member State and a political movement, should not be dealt with by urgent procedure on Friday. These are problems of such import that they have to be thoroughly discussed by the Political Affairs Committee. We want this matter to be discussed by the Political Affairs Committee, and we shall therefore vote for reference to committee and not for urgent procedure on Friday.

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

The request is rejected.

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

5. Agenda

President. — Members will recall that on Monday Parliament allocated overall speaking time for all the items on today's agenda. The allocation is given in the draft agenda for this part-session and in the minutes of proceedings of the sitting of Monday, 14 January 1980.

I call Sir David Nicolson.

Sir David Nicolson. — Mr President, as one of the two rapporteurs, I should like to raise a question regarding Item 154 on the agenda, relating to Community aid to the shipbuilding and textile industries. Unfortunately, the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has not yet been able to deliver its opinion on this report and has requested postponement of the debate to the next part-session. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has accepted the request to postpone Item 156, and also the Oral Question relating to shipbuilding tabled by Mr Carossino and others. As the two subjects go together, the Committee feels that they should both be postponed until the February part-session. I should like to know if the Bureau can agree to this request.

Now, since I feel that this is a very important subject which raises not only issues of industrial policy with respect to the shipbuilding and textile sectors but also the very principles which we should adopt in the future, I should like to request that if it is postponed until February, it be given some measure of priority in the agenda at that time.

President. — The point you raised is under discussion in the Bureau at the moment. I would propose waiting for the result of that discussion. The only other possibility would be for the rapporteurs or the chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to withdraw the reports. As they have not so far done so, I would advise the House to wait until the Bureau gives its opinion.

I call Mr Patterson on a point of order.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, I think this is the correct time for me to raise this point of order under Rule 29. It concerns the matter of amendments.

We have on our tables quite a sheaf of amendments, and you will recall that yesterday Mr Pannella complained, towards the end of the proceedings, that

he had not had the opportunity during the debate to move his amendments, and therefore sought to do so when we came to the vote. In my opinion this was out of order. Could we ask the Chair therefore, for all today's debates and tomorrow's debates, to pay particular attention to the third paragraph of Rule 29 (1). Could we ask that only amendments which have been specifically moved during the debates be considered when we come to the vote. Otherwise we shall repeat the proceedings of yesterday when amendments were moved incorrectly during the vote. I think if we stick to this procedure, which is provided for in the Rules specifically to prevent what happened yesterday, then we shall get through our business very much more quickly and prevent the sort of scenes which we had yesterday. Could I ask the Chair to do this today and tomorrow?

6. Consumer and environment protection

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-615/79), tabled by Mr Sherlock, Miss Hooper and Mr Newton Dunn on behalf of the European Democratic Group, to the Commission:

Subject: Economic consequences of EEC consumer protection and environment protection legislation

Government regulations cause increases in the prices paid by consumers, while at the same time Community industry finds it difficult to compete internationally with the cost of excessive regulation.

Therefore,

1. Does the Commission assess the costs — to consumers, to industry and to other interests — of the implementation of consumer protective, public health, and environmental directives when they are drafted in the Commission?
2. Will the Commission undertake in such directives to devote a section of the Explanatory Statement to a statement of the likely costs as well as the benefits of such Community legislation?

I call Miss Hooper.

Miss Hooper. — Mr President, there can be no doubt that consumer and environmental protection and legislation carry a cost. Consumer associations as well as industry affirm this. It is equally clear that very often the cost is worthwhile. In raising this question for debate my colleagues and I, who are all members of this Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, had no intention of suggesting that there is no case to be made for protecting the consumer or the environment in which he lives. Indeed, our legislation in the United Kingdom is as advanced as any in this field, so we have no particular axe to grind in that respect.

However, I believe that the ultimate consumer is interested more than anything else in the price he has to

Hooper

pay for goods and services. What we seek to do, therefore, is to ensure that we obtain a cost analysis giving the fullest possible information on which to base our decisions and decide our priorities. Since there can be no doubt that there is a price-tag, we need to know what that price-tag is likely to be. We shall then be in a position to ask ourselves the following questions in respect of any particular measure before us. The first question: is this measure really necessary? The second question: what is the likely benefit? The third question: if it is necessary and we can see a clear benefit, then is the result likely to be commensurate with the efforts and costs involved?

The costs involved, about which we wish to be informed, include not only the obvious burden and cost to industry and the producer of taking special measures — and incidentally this burden probably falls most heavily on smaller firms which, as was repeatedly said in the employment debate the other day, we want to encourage in order to create more jobs — but also the costs involved in the preparation of legislation, in the research entailed and eventually the costs of enforcement. I believe that this information is in fact already available and has been considered by the Commission, and I ask merely that it should be shown clearly in any proposals made by the Commission. It may be argued, and indeed it has been argued, that this information should be available in relation to all Community legislation. But our question is confined to the matters arising in the particular committee on which we serve.

I should like to complete my statement, Mr President, by quoting from the Consumers' Association — a British association for the protection of consumers — which comments on this question as follows: 'It seems a reasonable demand that before government legislates or regulates, it should seek to identify the costs and benefits of that legislation to the various sections of the community. We, in common with BEUC, the European consumers union, have in fact consistently pressed for consumer impact statements to accompany EEC draft legislation. But in any such schemes it is imperative that the benefits of consumer legislation to both business and consumers and the costs of trade protection to both consumers and business are taken into account'.

Mr President, I trust this House will agree that the question raised involves a reasonable demand intended for the benefit of us all and that we shall have the support of this House.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Burke.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I welcome the opportunity given by the tabling of this question to congratulate the honourable

Member for her contribution and to outline some of the considerations which underlie Commission policy.

The topics raised have been very keenly debated in recent times. In the United States the economic impact of legislation intended to safeguard health, the environment or consumer interests has provoked controversy and, sometimes, violent polemic. More recently the claims made by American business interests — claims which I regard as unduly alarmist — have been echoed on this side of the Atlantic. A number of European industrial interests have taken up the theme.

I should like to examine in turn the three parts of the question as it is framed: the first paragraph, which states the problem in terms which I find debatable, and the two questions which follow from that paragraph. The first paragraph states, and I quote, that 'government regulations cause increases in the prices paid by consumers, while at the same time Community industry finds it is difficult to compete internationally with the cost of excessive regulation.' In the first place I reject the implication that national and Community regulations in this field invariably or necessarily cause price rises for consumers. That is simply not true. On the contrary, certain kinds of legislation such as national and Community law on competition and price transparency lead to price reductions. Similarly some legislation in the area of pollution prevention and of ergonomics helps firms to economize resources, eliminate accidents or increase productivity, and thereby reduces the prime cost of production.

Secondly, where regulations lead to an increase in production cost and prices the causes of that increase must be examined carefully. It is frequently the case that price rises result from the internalization of external costs which had previously been borne by third parties other than the producer or the consumer or by the general public. For example, the injury to health caused by the pollution of the atmosphere by a factory is not reckoned in the price of the final product. Resources are used as if they were free goods for as long as the injury or other costs arising from their use are borne by the public at large. But economic efficiency should require that prices reflect true costs. If they do not then an inefficient allocation of resources will result and more pollution occur than under conditions where prices reflect the true costs.

Similar considerations apply in respect of consumer protection legislation. Regulation is therefore required to internalize these external factors so that market forces can develop structures of production and consumption, more compatible with environmental, health and consumer requirements. This is the essential objective of the principle adopted by the Council of Ministers in 1975 as a basic guideline for environmental policy, namely the principle that the polluter must pay. Equally it is one of the main concerns underlying the 1975 programme for a consumer

Burke

protection and information policy. I would add, Mr President, that legislation concerning the environment, consumer protection and public health gives effect to ethical trade standards and considerations of safety which are democratically established by due process of legislative procedure.

I would suggest, therefore, that when we examine the consequences of laws for the protection of health, the environment or the consumer, we should not forget to ask also what the consequences of the absence of such legislation might be. Damage to public health and the environment arising from industrial operations can often be on a disastrous scale. This damage can linger for years and reverberate for generations. Such would seem to be the case for example with the Seveso contamination by dioxine kepone and the contamination of the James river in the United States. The tragic results of thalidomide and the synthetic hormone known as DES diethylstilbestrol are prime examples here.

Now alongside these great and manifest public disasters there are countless instances of other damage which is less dramatic and often slow to take effect, but nonetheless of a very serious order. I refer to the negative effects which health and environmental damage can have on the production process in terms for example of the number of working hours lost as a result of occupational injuries. It cannot be contested that legislation concerning such areas as terms of sale, standards of purity for foodstuffs, weights and measures and advertising has been of considerable benefit to consumers both in economic terms and in terms of health. Capital goods are also subject to deterioration. Sulphur oxides accelerate corrosion and provoke architectural damage. Air pollution affects textiles. Mobile source emission of air pollutants leads to vegetation losses. The growing costs of health care which are among the major problems of all industrial countries are in part the result of a deteriorating environment. A large number of cancer cases are believed to be complicated by an environmental factor.

To sum up, I contend that legislation for health, environment and consumer protection does not always add to the cost of production. When it does, it is often by internalizing costs which would otherwise be borne externally, and thus it contributes to the proper allocation of society's resources. It has other beneficial consequences both social and economic.

Now the honourable Members who tabled this question also claim that Community industry finds it difficult to compete internationally with the cost of excessive regulation. Such Community legislation as exists — and may I remind the House that there is far less of it than there is national law — has as its object the elimination of distortions affecting the operations of the Common Market, as well as the protection of health and environment. I therefore reject the suggestion that it simply adds to the burden on industry. On

the contrary, I would contend that Community legislation and proposals are manifestly essential to the establishment and maintenance of the Common Market. I am not persuaded that industry itself necessarily has a strong objection to the setting of standards for industrial products or processes. Such standards in fact provide a planning framework and a stable production environment within which enterprises can prosper, since they facilitate the free movement of goods. Standards make for good business. Industry itself clearly recognizes this. It is testified by the pressures it frequently brings to bear on the Commission to put forward harmonization proposals at Community level.

As far as international competitiveness is concerned, we can distinguish different situations. Firstly, we have the case in which a particular industry in a Member State has difficulty in competing in another Member State because of differences in national legislation. Secondly, we have the case in which a Community industry has difficulty in competing with other producers, either in the Community market or in third country markets, because the competing products are designed to meet more exacting legislation than exists in many of our Member States. The toy industry is a case in point. There is another case to which I think I should refer, that is the case in which Community industry has to provide for more exacting legislation covering major export markets than that on Community markets, and does so successfully. We frequently find in cases like this, that the Community products sold on Community markets are identical to the exported product, so that Community consumers pay whatever extra price is involved, and derive the corresponding advantages without this being prescribed by or derived from Community legislation.

I would now like to respond more specifically to the questions posed by the honourable Members. The answer to the first is 'yes'. The Commission does seek to evaluate not only the costs but also the benefits for industry and for the other interested parties — citizens, consumers and workers — of the implementation of proposals for directives in these fields. Examples are the directives dealing with the pollution of water by mercury, pesticides, waste products and from the manufacture of titanium dioxide. I must however emphasize the fact that such evaluations can be extremely difficult to carry out, and their results are hazardous and uncertain. It is often difficult to get an objective prediction of the costs of anti-pollution measures. In many cases such costs have been overestimated, sometimes simply as a result of objections to the proposed regulations, sometimes because of genuine difficulties encountered by industry in costing important modifications of its production processes, and in incorporating new technologies, and sometimes because of the methods of calculation employed. It can also happen that by virtue of other innovations made, or following the evolution of costs of other elements of production, the absolute or rela-

Burke

tive price of environmental improvements in an industrial process tends to diminish considerably over time.

It was with a view to facilitating the collection of information that the Commission proposed to the Council a recommendation concerning certain principles, definitions and methods to be used in the analysis of costs to industry resulting from measures envisaged or already taken in the field of environmental protection. The Council adopted this proposal in December 1978. As regards the benefits of legislation, similar if not greater difficulties arise. A complete measurement of the benefits would have to take account both of the value of life and property, and also of intangible goods. It is clearly impossible to do this with complete precision. What is the value of being able to see clearly across a city street? How much is a life 'worth'? How much are fair trading practices worth to the consumer?

There is the additional difficulty that most health hazards are multi-faceted. The reduction of one factor, for example the reduction of the percentage content of one chemical such as saccharin erucic acid in a particular product, cannot be analysed precisely in cost/benefit terms. What we can say with certainty is that the generalized improvement of consumer products and of the environment, as a result of a range of measures implemented over the long term, is enormously significant, even though that significance cannot be quantitatively assessed with precision.

On the second question for us today, the Commission, for the reasons I have just given, must decline any commitment to furnish in all cases a detailed quantitative estimation of possible costs and benefits arising from the enactment of its legislative proposals. The Commission will, at most, be able to give, as it has in the past, certain broad indications of the likely consequences of its proposals. Even this will depend largely on access to relevant and reliable information from industry. I thank the House for this opportunity, which is my first, to make a major statement on consumer and environment policy.

(Applause)

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

Mr Collins. — Mr President, it is a rare occasion indeed when I find myself in such agreement with a statement from the Commission, but I must admit I think the statement we have had is an exemplary one. I am glad that the Commission saw fit to resist so clearly some of the implications of the questions being asked.

This is one of those questions, Mr President, that at first sight looks very reasonable. It looks as if it is based on some kind of sound commonsense. It is only when you begin to get under the surface that you realize that this question is not only badly worded and

could hardly therefore form any kind of framework for Community policy either now or in the future, but is, in fact, based on a whole series of false and perhaps even dangerous assumptions. I want to illustrate what I mean. In the first place I consider that the question is badly worded and loosely framed, because it is quite clear, I think, that the costs and benefits mentioned are certainly in no way cumulative. The goals and aims of public health legislation, of consumer protection legislation and of environmental protection legislation are quite different, and they cannot therefore be assessed or quantified or even made accountable in the same kind of way, for the same kind of purpose or even by the same kind of people.

Here I must say that I am rather disappointed that Miss Hooper did not see fit to read the whole of the Consumers Association statement. Her treatment of it was, to say the least, a little selective. She missed out the sentence, for example, which said 'it may be that in the event precise quantified estimates are impossible.' That is, of course, a very significant sentence, because quite clearly again that casts doubt on the whole intention of the question before us.

In actual fact, in order to bring this about, even if it were possible, we would have to take on a great many more staff. Presumably we would then have a question asking us about the cost of providing the staff needed to estimate the cost of this legislation. Now the assumptions are, of course, that the cost of such legislation makes Community industry uncompetitive. In any event we would probably hear later on that this kind of public expenditure is self-evidently bad anyway, that it somehow or other saps the moral fibre, an argument which we have heard in various guises from the other side of the Chamber and from their colleagues in Westminster. I do not think that there is any, or very much, evidence to support this. I can cite at least three German studies and one American study which show that the reverse is true, that Community legislation or, at any rate, consumer protection legislation and environmental protection legislation are quite likely to improve job prospects and to improve the efficiency of companies, simply because they are forced to take the kind of action they might not otherwise take. I must say that I think we ought to look very carefully at the other side.

The Commission has already dealt with this, but I want to point it up just a little bit more. I think the result of such legislation is usually beneficial, because whilst we certainly do not want to cost industries out of the market, we do want to be free, as consumers and as people, from the kind of exploitation than can be our lot when business interests are allowed free range. I do not think there is anything either in history or in contemporary practice which would lead us to suppose that business interests are so altruistic that their practices are always for the benefit of the consumers.

Collins

Mr Burke, is right, of course, in saying that good commercial practices can frequently lead to consumer satisfaction, but nonetheless in a fair number of areas within Community commerce and industry the fact of the matter is that the consumer is taken for a ride. I am not against the costing of legislation, although I cannot accept Miss Hooper's idea that we are only interested in costing this because that happens to be the committee she serves on, but if we are going to cost Community legislation, why not start with the common agricultural policy? That costs the consumer several hundred times more than consumer protection legislation ever could, or environmental protection legislation. I think I know the answer. Vested interests are piled so high against consumer legislation and in favour of the common agricultural policy that our friends and colleagues across there do not want to tackle it.

I support the kind of statement the Commission has made, and I hope that in future the Commission will make it absolutely clear that it regards as perfectly reasonable requests that we should attempt to measure the costs to the Community of legislation, because in that way, for example, we might even get the staff we need to carry out the legislative practices being recommended by them. However, I reject entirely the kind of implications contained within this question.

7. List of speakers

President. — The list of speakers for all of today's debates will be closed at 12 noon.

8. Consumer and environment protection
(continuation)

President. — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (NL) Mr President, the questions put by our Conservative colleagues are of great importance. This is because there is often a lack of sound objective information on the economic consequences of this sort of legislation, leading to a great deal of positive and negative conjecture and speculation in this field, simply according to the personal views of the people concerned.

We have also noticed — and for this reason the Conservative Group's question is particularly timely — that the Commission does not provide very much information on this point. In the directives and proposals we have discussed in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection

information of this kind has often been totally lacking, as it is too in the multi-annual reports on environmental and consumer policy, although in that case it is stated — and Mr Collins is right in this — that making this sort of assessment is particularly difficult. It is only fair to say, however, that in the parliamentary committee concerned there have not been too many questions asked on this point, so that the executive has not been under much pressure to go into this in detail.

The question is particularly apposite but in our view incomplete, for the fact is that these data are only of use if they are balanced against the economic harm arising from the failure to adopt measures — harming people and harming to the environment. It is unfortunate that the conservative group's questions were not rather more balanced on this point. In weighing the harmful effects of the failure to take measures against the harmful effects of implementing measures, the motives behind the decision-making process naturally play an important part. If the Commission has nothing to say on this, it is in fact somewhat understandable. It is indeed particularly difficult to provide exact information on this question. It may well be possible to calculate the economic consequences of suspending or modifying the production of a particular article, but things become much more difficult if we are to calculate the harmful effects of a product or production process. With regard to the harmful effects of chemicals in our food, for example, we are dealing with health risks over a very long period. Making economic calculations on that is a precarious and perhaps even immoral business.

The same goes for the environment. How are we to express the value of clean air, a healthy flora and fauna, silence and tranquillity? It is almost impossible to do that in terms of money.

Mr Collins will also be interested to know that there have in fact been macro-economic studies on this, for example within the framework of the OECD. These studies emphasized the fact that the harm caused by environmental pollution amounts to about 5 % of the gross national product of the average industrialized country. The costs, on the other hand, amount to 1 or 2 %. These, of course, are macro-economic figures which say nothing about specific measures but do give an idea of the scale of the problem. Perhaps Miss Hooper will be somewhat reassured by these figures.

Measures for the protection of the environment and consumers can indeed also have a positive effect. I am thinking, for example, of the stimulus provided by new, clean technologies. Some countries are showing rather more inventiveness here than others. OECD figures show that above all West Germany and the United States are in the lead. Thus, in the period 1970-1974 West Germany gained something like 220 000 new jobs in this sector. In the United States the figures are, proportionately, much higher.

Maij-Weggen

I must repeat what I said before: the question put by the Conservative Group is very apposite but it is rather one-sided. I am glad that in his initial reply the Honourable Member of the Commission went into the other aspects of this question. I also hope that when these matters actually come up for discussion in the Parliamentary committee this many-sidedness will also be considered.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about the more political side of this question. Indeed, this problem brings us up against a political choice. Do we find it acceptable for economic activity and economic growth to be restricted for the sake of protecting man and the environment? We Christian Democrats take a perfectly clear stand on this: for us, economic activity and economic growth are no end in themselves. What we need is balanced and healthy economic growth — economic growth which does not make people ill, which does not damage the environment and which maintains or increases employment opportunities. Otherwise, economic growth and profit can in the long run only mean a loss. Scientists, economists, employers, employees and above all our political leaders must take up the challenge of bringing about this kind of sound, balanced economic growth — a challenge which is to be welcomed.

IN THE CHAIR: MR POUL MØLLER*Vice-President*

President. — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — *(I)* Mr President, I think that the oral question tabled by Members of the European Conservative Group was very timely, albeit not properly phrased. If a clear reply was required to this question, then that reply has been given today in Parliament. And in that sense I would say that we must agree with what was said by Mr Burke and the other previous speakers.

When a consumer acquires a product, he acquires health or well-being at the same time. We therefore totally reject Miss Hooper's statement that the consumer is only interested in the price of a product. On the contrary, he wants certain guarantees which go beyond the price.

Let us be realistic about the costs which industry would face as a result of the Community directives on environmental protection. What is the time scale of the directives? It is a very long time scale, starting with a period of study of these directives, then a period — unfortunately very long — in which they make their way from the Commission through the Parliament to the Council of Ministers, and finally there is a long period of incubation by the Council of Ministers. I find it impossible to believe that over this

period of years industry will not succeed in taking the measures necessary to ensure that the changes called for by the Community directives will weigh as little as possible — if at all — on its costs. Then again, how can one deal in isolation with the problem of the cost of a product, of the effects of a measure on consumers and on the environment, if one does not consider in overall terms all the costs borne by the Community as a result of products or production which are damaging to health? I think Seveso, which was mentioned by Mr Burke, is one of the clearest examples and one which we must keep always in mind.

At the same time, I would say that the interests of consumers and of society in general cannot and must not be subordinated to those of industry. Industry must show increasingly that it is serving of the consumer, who in recent years has become increasingly concerned with the quality of life. And the facts given by the previous speakers show how this quality of life can open up prospects for employment and for new types of employment. We know that young people feel a certain disinclination towards some types of work. On the other hand, work aimed at improving health, safeguarding the environment and improving the quality of life is a type of work which young people are more willing to do than other types.

With the consumer policy and the environment policy, the Commission has begun to move, albeit too timidly and too slowly — I hope Mr Burke will forgive me for saying so — towards a new concept of society. Oral questions such as that tabled by members of the European Conservative Group can have a beneficial effect given that at least up to now they have received a good response from Parliament and the Commission.

President. — I call Mrs Scrivener to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Scrivener. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the authors of the question express their concern for the protection of consumers, public health and the environment, while at the same time suggesting that some regulations are excessive. It seemed to me that the way the question was put was somewhat ambiguous. Indeed, the problem here — and Miss Hooper, who presented the question, made no secret of this — is in fact simply that of the increasing prime costs for goods and services, an increase which is put down to the obligation imposed by legislation. However, if measures have been necessary, if the Commission has on occasion had to intervene, this has always been because of the seriousness of the problems involved. I should like here to ask a few questions. Is it regarded as excessive to adopt directives aimed at protecting public health in the fields of foodstuffs and medicines? Directives aimed

Scrivener

at protecting workers against accidents at work or occupational illness? Is it regarded as excessive to adopt measures intended to prevent pollution of the atmosphere or of water? For example — as has already been mentioned — do the victims of Seveso regard the Community directive on the risks of major accidents in certain industrial activities as excessive? I think these examples are sufficiently clear to show the absolute necessity of Community regulations and thus reassure the authors of this question, who are anxious to have the advantages of such legislation set out.

As regards the cost of implementing these directives, I must say that here I share the view of the Conservatives, since I think it is true that in certain cases the increase in costs is not insignificant. But that is an inescapable consequence of the improvement in the quality of life, and producers cannot simply abandon their responsibilities with regard to the risks incurred by the public. It is thus quite right for the 'polluter pays' principle to have been recognized in the Community and for industrialists to exercise stricter control over the dangerous activities in their factories.

I am quite sure that the Commission is not seeking deliberately, out of malice as it were, to take measures which would involve maximum costs for industry. Quite the contrary, and as Mr Burke, — the Council in fact on 19 December 1978 sent the Member States a recommendation on methods of costing measures against pollution in industry. It considers that this cost analysis should provide information on the means of reducing pollution at the lowest possible cost. Consequently, the Council recommends the Member States to apply certain principles, definitions and methods so as to use costing systems which are as similar as possible. I should therefore be very surprised if the Commission failed to apply these recommendations in putting forward proposals in this field.

In conclusion, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to ask a question and make an assertion. The question — which I appreciate is very difficult to answer — is whether the cost can ever be too high when it is a matter of protecting our health — which is ultimately what it comes down to — and our environment. And I maintain that in the current state of affairs our protective legislation is in no way excessive. In many cases it is not sufficient.

President. — I call Mrs Seibel-Emmerling.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling. — (D) Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking Mr Burke for his remarks, and in particular for dealing with the preamble to this oral question, which says that government regulations, which are intended to protect the consumer, are responsible for the constant increase in consumer prices. I think an investigation of this ques-

tion would prove that in most cases government regulations are just used as a pretext for price increases. If — as many of the previous speakers said — prices were to increase by only the amount directly due to compliance with regulations designed to protect the consumer, I am quite sure that consumers would be only too willing to pay the price. Such increases would also be economically justifiable in safeguarding valuable resources, including energy. The fact is, however, that industrial interests in the Member States and in the Community are constantly appealing to us to grant exemptions, and regulations designed to protect the consumer are increasingly being rendered ineffective by excessive delay. If we really want to give some point to this oral question, we ought instead to ask what ways the Commission sees of making sure that regulations which should come into force immediately to give effective protection to the consumer are not subjected to unreasonable delays. I think the Members who tabled this question would have been better advised to address themselves to this point.

Mr President, there are a number of things this House should reach agreement on very quickly in the interests of consumer protection, including the question of product liability, which is something the House is currently concerned with. Investigations carried out by insurance companies have shown that it would cost only very little for a firm to take out insurance and thus give better protection to the consumer. If the Members who tabled this question were to go into the question carefully, they would realize that the real costs of consumer protection regulations are accepted by the consumer, but that industry throughout the Community all too often behaves irresponsibly in passing price increases immediately on to the consumer.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Alber.

Mr Alber. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by thanking the Members who tabled this question for taking the initiative in this matter. I think they were right to do so, because all too often people seem to think that they can get something for nothing, and that is simply not true. I should also like to thank the Commission for its clear reply, although there are a number of comments I should like to make. It is generally acknowledged, both in this House and elsewhere, that consumer protection and environmental protection — especially the health aspects — are very important matters. It is also generally recognized that many things which make a product more expensive may have a highly beneficial effect in general terms — non-pollution of the environment was one point mentioned earlier. It is therefore difficult to decide what is the real value or cost of a product. On the other hand, we should be on

Alber

our guard against abusing this very important subject of consumer protection for ideological purposes, by claiming simply that industry is out to maximize profits and is therefore unwilling to accept the necessary degree of consumer protection. We all know that not everyone in this field is a paragon of virtue; but nor is every Member of this House. We must realize, though, that we cannot simply go on calling on industry to pay high taxes, bear in mind the social aspects of its actions, respect regulations — one of the Members referred just now to the question of producer liability — comply with environmental protection regulations, and pay for all this out of the firm's profits. Things are just not that simple. Mrs Seibel-Emmerling referred just now to the insurance industry's calculations regarding product liability. I must express some doubt as to the accuracy of her statement; after all, it is precisely the insurance companies which would benefit from this legislation. Needless to say, they are unlikely to overstate the cost of the legislation. We know only too well from other measures that the cost does go up tremendously after a certain time.

What, then, is the point at issue? The main point is not the cost factor, nor is it the question of who pays. Everyone knows anyway that the consumer always has to foot the bill in the end. The real point at issue is competition — and not competitiveness — between Member States and between their industries, and here I must say that Mr Burke's statement was, to my mind, inadequate. Of course it is true that the relevant provisions in our countries are similar. Nevertheless, they can be evaded, especially in the case of products which do not contain in themselves anything which is more beneficial to the environment. It is simply a fact that something produced by a European firm which is required to keep its waste water clean is more expensive than similar products from other countries — for instance, the Third World — where no such regulations exist and where the factory responsible for the product is therefore not required to have a waste water purification plant. As the consumer's powers of discernment are always so highly praised, let me just point out that if someone comes across two similar products in a shop, one of which is cheaper because it comes from a country where these environmental regulations do not exist, he or she will simply buy that cheaper product. That is what really matters — not the shopper's realization of the need to protect the environment. This being so, I should like to ask whether anything is being done to prevent such discrepancies by way of negotiations with these countries? Perhaps we should take a leaf from the agricultural sector's book — prices of imported agricultural produce are increased by way of import levies — and use different customs levies to bring the price for these products up to that of our own products which are subject to so many environmental protection regulations. The same should apply to substitute products which might be a means of getting round these regulations. As to the export situation, some thought is being given — and this applies to the domestic

market as well — to whether or not to introduce a split rate of tax, which would mean reducing the VAT payable on products which are required to comply with a mass of environmental protection regulations. You may be wondering what the point of all this is. Let me remind you, though, that there are countries which have three separate rates of VAT and which levy a very high rate of VAT on certain luxury products. This is no doubt a sensible arrangement. But would it not be just as reasonable to introduce a lower rate of tax for products which have to comply with all these regulations?

Finally, let me stress that I welcome this oral question and believe it essential for a table of costs to be drawn up, although I realize that it will be no easy matter to carry out a full review of the situation. Let me just ask in conclusion whether the Commission carries out periodic checks to establish whether or not regulations and guidelines are still relevant in a particular area or whether they should be modified from time to time?

President. — I call Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, I very much appreciated Commissioner Burke's remarks and his assurance that the Commission will endeavour to take into account the costs of measures for environmental and consumer protection. I think at the same time we must be aware of the cost of not taking action.

I want to take very briefly one concrete example in the field of consumer protection, and that is smoking. Smoking poses a severe threat to health, and the cost of repairing the damage caused by smoking is a major burden on the public finances in many of the Member States. The Community has a consumer action programme. We know about it and I, for one, approve of it. Important progress has been made, but over the last several years I have seen no signs of action in the Commission or the Community on this question of smoking. Quite apart from the health reason, we cannot pretend that it is not a matter of direct concern to the Economic Community. For instance, if you ban cigarette advertising on television in one Member State and similar bans are not enforced in other Member States, you have distortions of competition.

I conclude, Mr President, with a direct question to the Commissioner: bearing in mind the need to consider the cost of not taking action, will he undertake that in the second consumer programme, which this Parliament is about to discuss and which the Council will in due course consider, the question of smoking will be given the most serious consideration by the Commission, that the Commission will see whether some Community measures are possible or desirable and if so, that measures will be proposed for the consideration of this House?

President. — I call Mr Modiano.

Mr Modiano. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, environment policy has developed in recent years, both at national and at Community level, in response to a new awareness on the part of increasingly large sectors of the public that all human activities have an effect on the natural environment, and that this applies particularly to our industrial civilization. Indeed, a large number of the industrial processes by which natural resources are transformed into products for human use cause some kind of pollution.

The implementation of environmental policy, while meeting a basic need of our society, nevertheless causes problems for the economy in that it requires considerable investment.

The OECD estimates, for example, that industrial investment in purification plants represents about 1.5 % of all investment. This figure, which may not seem excessive, should however be interpreted in the light of the following considerations :

- in certain industrial sectors or certain undertakings, because of the type of activity or production processes used, or because of the geographical situation, anti-pollution investment can be as much as 20 to 25 % of total investment ;
- small and medium-sized undertakings have to bear anti-pollution costs higher than the average, since they are not in a position to reduce them through economies of scale ;
- the capital investment in purification plants is often less than their operating costs (which are not taken into account by the OECD).

Then there is another aspect which must be borne in mind, namely that environmental policy was conceived and launched at a time of economic growth and high employment levels. The current economic crisis, the increase in energy costs and the current restructuring of production make necessary a reassessment of the options chosen at that time. The immediate problem for the whole Community is now the maintenance and improvement of productivity and competitiveness — essential preconditions for solving the serious problem of unemployment.

Investment must therefore be directed above all to reviving economic growth, and environmental policy will have to take account of these needs and concentrate on essentials, without for that reason disappointing the legitimate expectations of the public, which is worried by the deterioration in the environment.

All this applies also to consumer protection policy, which will have to be directed to safeguarding the real interests — and not the artificial needs — of the consumer himself, in terms of health, safety and adequate information.

In both cases, any new legislation will have to be based on a serious cost-benefit assessment of the real advantages for the environment, for public health, for the consumer and therefore for society in general, as against the additional burdens which the economy will have to bear.

It is worth mentioning at this point that an excess of legislation imposed by the authorities leads to significant waste, because of :

- bureaucratization of the whole system needed to achieve any results in the few sectors which are unsatisfactory ;
- exponentially growing costs in order to achieve margins of protection close to the absolute ;
- atrophy of entrepreneurial and creative skills.

Moreover, there is a valid alternative in the form of self discipline, codes of behaviour and agreements between undertakings and consumers. Examples of this are the Codes of the International Chamber of Commerce, the ethical codes of trade associations and professions, and the agreements between undertakings and consumers proposed by the Commission in the Second Community Programme on Consumer Protection.

Where self-discipline does not apply, one must instead apply the principle that policies should be accompanied by a cost-benefit analysis in measurable terms, so that definite costs are not incurred in exchange for uncertain or improbable benefits.

It should be pointed out that the costs resulting from an erroneous assessment would cause waste, more easily tolerated by large undertakings and multinationals, but at the risk of sacrificing the small and medium-sized undertakings which cannot spread the risks and costs.

In conclusion, two practical suggestions seem in order :

- the Community should extend the present system covering national aids in the anti-pollution field — a policy of aids seems, indeed, to be essential in order to ensure an acceptable chronological distribution of the financial burdens involved in combating pollution, and it would also make it possible to increase the construction of purification plants, thus improving employment prospects in a sector which is destined to expand ;
- the so-called sectoral contracts should be developed at European level — the *conventions de la qualité de la vie* already adopted in French practice — since this would make it possible to avoid the bureaucratization of environmental policy, and above all to define methods and time-scales as well as the financial aspects, of the fight against

Modiano

pollution, with close cooperation between the public authorities and the industrial sectors concerned.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Muntingh.

Mr Muntingh. — *(NL)* Mr President, I was able to agree entirely with the Commissioner, Mr Burke, and with most of the other speakers. I would just like to comment on the text of the oral question, in particular the passage concerning the cost of excessive regulations. I find this both incomprehensible and unacceptable. It is a pity that Miss Hooper is not present, as I would have liked her to listen to what I have to say. If I may give an example, there are at present 60 or 70 000 chemical substances in current use, and if we include combinations the figure rises to 1 or 2 million.

The questions raised suggest that the Conservative Group believes that our unfortunate industries should be helped and supported rather more. I cannot altogether agree with this, as I feel that the existing regulations are insufficient. If Miss Hooper means by 'excessive regulations' that there are excessively few regulations, then I can go along with her.

We should obviously try to assess costs and yields; indeed, this must be done wherever possible. But I would like to say a word of warning against calculating the price of things in this way. Surely, if we put a price-tag on everything in this world and try to express everything in terms of money, this is a dreadful debasement of the things with which we are dealing. Previous speakers have already said that the price of certain things simply cannot be calculated. What price can be put on a plant in a woodland pond, a seal with a salmon in its mouth, or the majestic flight of an imperial eagle, perhaps the last of its kind? This can never be expressed in terms of costs and yields. These things have quite a different value — an aesthetic and cultural value — which is just as important as economic values expressed in monetary terms. I therefore feel that the questions, as they have been put, are rather tendentious. We must constantly be aware, when considering the measures we are requesting, that the value of certain things is incalculable, and we should take account of this fact.

This may be rather an emotional appeal, but I believe that when drafting regulations we must always look further than the end of our noses. I would be in complete agreement with any suggestions for a cost benefit study, but I am personally more in favour of the term 'multiple criterion' analysis; for such an analysis at least makes it possible to show, in precise terms, that there are values which cannot be quantified in monetary terms but which have to be considered in the decisions taken by the government and

administrative bodies. I hope, Mr President, that my views will meet with some small measure of sympathy in the Conservative Group, among those who persistently believe that industry must be protected whereas what we really need to protect is our defenceless environment. For let there be no mistake: the present state of the environment is not such that we can say that it is now time to help industry a little. That is not the case, and the situation is deteriorating day by day. Every day plant and animal species are becoming extinct, and every day we do not have to look far to see that the environment is in a sorry state. Let us, therefore, be wary of arguing that everything must be given a price-tag and that more help must be given to this kind of economic activity, without considering the aesthetic, or 'gentler' values.

President. — I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — Mr President, as an admirer of Commissioner Burke, with very good reason, this is one occasion when I am afraid I was disappointed with his reply. Like many of the speeches we have had, it was the reply of a theorist. It gave the impression, or tried to give the impression, that we had reached a state of new perfection in arriving at what regulations ought to be passed, and how they were to be applied.

Of course, those of us who have to deal with this situation every day know that we are nowhere near that utopian position at all.

I think one ought to disabuse those who have suggested that my colleague was concentrating only on cost. That of course was not the burden of her speech at all. The question itself defined cost as the main point. She feels, and I certainly do too, that the cost element is not taken properly into account. We know that the other aspects of it, health etc, are taken into account, and rightly so. We applaud that, and we want that to continue. But the cost element is one which is too significant in these days of inflation to be passed over without real, careful thought.

I felt that Commissioner Burke, in replying to the specific questions my friend put to him, really did downgrade the importance of cost. He emphasized all of the supposed benefits but did not for one minute give the suggestion that some of those benefits were overrated in terms of how they are applied, whether the discretion was always there, and whether the good sense of application was always there.

He rather suggested that the cost element was so insignificant that it ought not to be taken into account. I do not believe we ought to let that pass. I would have thought even now that he could have said that he would make certain that in any regulations that pass through his hands, he will take costs into account.

I agree with the last speaker. It may well be that he would not be able to present costs in detail right

Lord Harmar-Nicholls

down to the last penny. But I believe that the estimates that I hope they have in their mind when they are arriving at certain decisions ought to be included in any explanatory statement.

If it could be appreciated by those who have to apply or suffer from the regulations that those estimates were wide of the mark, then they have a measuring rod to put their point of view against.

I believe that to say that no cost element at all can be included in an explanatory note that is attached to it makes the whole of the reply rather suspect. Every one of us who recognizes the benefits of medical advance and scientific research knows that the consumer can be protected if that new knowledge is taken into account. We want that to be taken into account, but we do believe that it is wrong in these days of high costs to completely ignore the cost element which the consumer certainly always takes into account.

I am speaking in this debate merely because I have had some experience at all levels on this. For a number of years in our home government I was a minister and had to put through many of these measures. They were measures that at the time I agreed with. They were measures which in theory were almost above any sort of suspicion. But then when I saw later how a good many of these measures were being applied, when I saw the effect of their actual application in practical terms, I found that this bore no relation to the theoretical view I had in mind when I was presenting them.

I have also sat as a magistrate when the infringement of these regulations was brought for objective and impartial investigation. I was often appalled to see how what was a good regulation with the best intentions in the world, by the legal twists of the words — because it is very difficult to find words which express precisely what you want — rendered people guilty of an infringement when in practical terms they had done hardly anything wrong at all.

When we are putting these things through our governments — and it would be the same with the Council and Commission here — we always take it almost for granted that they will be applied with sense and discretion. But we know that they are not always applied with sense and discretion by the officials concerned. We know that by adhering strictly to the definitions of the words used great injustices can be done. It is that element which often adds to the costs of the people who are bringing products and services to the Community as a whole. So I would ask the Commissioner, who, I know, is capable of getting nearer to truth and objectivity than most people, to revise the answer he has given to my honourable friend. I would ask him to try and take into account the cost element from now on, even if it is only an estimate, and to see if he can find some way of including the estimates of

such cost in the explanatory regulations that go with it because I believe that service to the Community generally deserves that sort of safeguard.

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

Mr Moorehouse. — I am very glad to wind-up for the European Democratic Group on this subject, and I would like to compliment the authors of the Oral Question and say how much I do support Mr Sherlock and Miss Hooper and now, also, Lord Harmar-Nicholls.

No one, of course, on this side of the House disputes for one second that there is a need for well thought out, well conceived, scientifically based, environmental and health standards and for similar standards in the consumer field and I trust that all Members of the House appreciate this fact.

What we are concerned about, however, is that the economic aspects should be given proper consideration since we feel very strongly that this has not been altogether the case up to now. I do rather wonder whether the Commission itself and the officials concerned are fully aware of the great amount of data relating to costs in industry and elsewhere and to benefits that is now available. Is the Commissioner, for instance, aware that Sweden has undertaken a study of the costs and benefits of pollution control in the pulp and paper industry? Are the Commissioner and his staff fully aware that the Federal Republic of Germany has been engaged in collecting data on cost benefit analyses of problems of environmental control? Is he furthermore aware that Finland is convening a meeting of Baltic countries, jointly to study the problem of cost and benefit assessment of environmental quality control? In addition, I would point out that a lot more information and data has become available in the last two years through concerned efforts by Member States, not least the United Kingdom but also, I have no doubt, Denmark. In the United Kingdom for instance, there has been a special study on the aluminium industry and the aluminium industry has been very forthcoming with data. In the United Kingdom also regular cost figures are maintained, for instance, for air pollution control over the past ten years. To refer to the figures for one ten-year period which I have before me, the capital cost to works ranging from electricity, through ceramics, to chemicals, amounted to 150 million pounds, which I am sure you will agree, is no mean sum. Moreover, I would draw the attention of the Commissioner once again to the OECD study on several industries including the iron and steel industry — there is a relevant document called 'Emission Control Costs' — and remind him and his colleagues of the call made by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, Dr Tolber, to all Member States throughout the world, to undertake a cost benefit analysis of industrial activity.

Moorehouse

Now, this call was made 18 months ago and has received a very positive response from member governments, including my own government. Indeed, I know of no exceptions to this. Furthermore, there has been a particularly good response from the EEC countries. What the Executive Director, Dr Tolber, has said to the governments, and therefore to industry and to all those concerned, is that cost benefit analysis has been rather primitive in its approach up to now, but it is already much more refined than it was, and is being improved and, we think, we can now put some figures, not only on the cost side, but also on the benefits side, the benefits to the community at large.

So, Mr President, I would ask the Commissioner if he would be good enough to take a fresh look at his attitude in his answers to questions 1 and 2 and more particularly in his answer to question 2, where he said that he could not undertake in all cases to give an explanatory statement of the likely cost and benefits of Community legislation. I do believe from my own experience, and I am sure that the UK government would support us in this, that there is no case where we could not make a proper statement of this kind. I would in a mild way issue a challenge to the Commission to do just that. Let us not forget that even if we talk about the 'polluter pays' principle, at the end of the day these costs are mostly passed on by the makers of products to the consumer and so it is also the consumer that pays.

Having said that, we must strike the right balance. This is the key point. We need certain environmental and health standards. There is inevitably a cost element attached to that. It affects both amenity and the quality of life. Let us strike the right balance. So I appeal to you, Mr Burke, through the Chair, to do all you can to ensure that we have the full facts available in committee and for Parliament as a whole.

Mr President. — I call Mr Burke.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, since I went into some detail in my opening statement, I believe I can be rather briefer in this conclusion.

I wish to thank the chairman of the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, and the Members generally who have given a broadly positive welcome to my statement. I think it is an indication of the positive atmosphere in which environment, consumer and health legislation proposals are being considered by the House.

Taking some of the points made briefly: the administrative costs of preparing proposals for legislation, discussing them and bringing them through the normal legislative procedure are impossible to forecast. They are difficult to estimate post facto because 13 administrations are involved. There are those of the

9 Member States, the Commission, Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Council.

I would echo what was said by one of the speakers that we should try at all times to avoid what was termed 'approaching consumer affairs in an aberrant, ideological way'. This I think has been the broad thrust of my own approach.

I recognize the force of the remarks about consumer's choice between a Community product made in a pollution-controlled factory and a product of a third country manufactured without regard for the environment. This is a difficulty, but I think the first answer is that the protection of the Community's environment is so important that we cannot relax our vigilance within the Community and I do not know how we can even out in favour of the Community industry the extra costs. And I accept that there are costs to Community industry arising in this case. However, I do know that the answer is not to dismantle our programmes and, speaking also with my taxation hat on, I think I would find it a little difficult at first sight to follow the suggestion that VAT rates on exports might be used, and this for a variety of reasons.

Regarding the specific question concerning tobacco, I would ask the questioner to be a little patient and to wait until the Commission's 1980 programme is given to the House next month. The Commission relies on Member States to ensure that directives are implemented with the greatest possible degree of efficiency. In many cases the Commission is obliged to update the directives in order to take account of developments in scientific and technical knowledge. If at any time it appears that legislation is not producing the desired results, the Commission is prepared to examine what action is required.

Towards the end of the debate a slightly more contentious note crept in, but expressed as usual in the polite terms which I have come to learn from the people I meet in other committees such as the Committee on Transport. I would like to say that I, too, do not believe that there is any Utopia to be reached in a short period. I can assure you, honourable Members, that for me it is not a question of theory. I did not say that costs could be ignored. I have said that costs are difficult to calculate, but benefits are even more difficult to assess. For these reasons it is unrealistic to expect a detailed cost/benefit examination to accompany each proposal. I can agree that administrations can misapply regulations or directives and that there is an extra argument for care in drafting, and I have taken particular note of the point made by the speakers. I know also that the amount of information available on costs and benefits of environmental and consumer measures is expanding all the time and I have taken note of the points made at the end of the debate and shall certainly have my services get in touch with all the sources suggested, at least to read the material available.

Burke

I am equally aware that the techniques for carrying out cost benefit analyses in specific sectors of industry are still developing. To those who ask me to take a fresh look I would say that my original statement is a statement of our policy, but that we have open minds and we shall continue to take an interest in all the modern and up-to-date knowledge available to us. As to the mild challenge offered to the Commission, I certainly shall examine that and see what I can do about it.

I thank all the Members for their kind remarks and would remind the House that this department serving the consumer and the environment is very small. Parliament will be able to look at the staff requirements which have been suggested and I hope, when it comes to deliberate on the budget, will have regard to the thrust of this debate in showing that some staff may be provided.

(Applause)

President. This debate is closed.

9. Agenda

President. — The enlarged Bureau has proposed that the report by Sir David Nicolson and Miss Forster (Doc. 1-623/79) and the oral question (Doc. 1-612/79) on the shipbuilding and textile industries, which were included on the agenda for today's sitting, be postponed until the February part-session.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

10. Regulations amending the Staff Regulations of Officials of the Communities

President. — The next item is the debate on the report (Doc. 1-584/79), drawn up by Mr Lega on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on :

the proposals from the Commission to the Council for three regulations amending the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the Communities :

Salary scales (Doc. 202/79)

Family and social security matters (Doc. 201/79)

Pensions and social security (Doc. 212/79)

I call Mr Lega.

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after lengthy discussions in the Committee on Budgets and the Legal Affairs Committee, we now come to examine the report which I have the honour of submitting to you on behalf of the Committee on Budgets relating to three proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations.

These proposed amendments have three objectives :

- to readjust the salary scales approved by the Council in 1976, because it is believed that in that year certain mistakes were made in working out the scales ;
- to improve certain provisions of the Staff Regulations regarding social security and family matters ;
- to revise the officials' pension scheme.

Over the last few months the Committee on Budgets has examined the Commission's proposals to the Council in great detail. This has been a particularly difficult and delicate task, particularly as regards the first of the three proposals under examination, that is to say, the proposal correcting the salary scales.

In this respect I have been able to act as a mediator between the Community institutions and the staff representatives, and I think that this mediation has produced positive results which are incorporated in the motions for resolutions which you are about to discuss.

The Committee on Budgets would like the following principles to be brought out during this debate :

- a) in a matter as important as setting out the Staff Regulations of the European civil service, Parliament must play a primary role, and consequently the decisions taken by the Council must, if these principles are not to be distorted or ignored, result essentially from intensive efforts to close the gap between the positions of the two institutions that make up the Budgetary Authority, namely the Council and Parliament ;
- b) the three proposals under examination must be regarded as being closely linked, since it is not good staff policy to modify this or that article in the Regulations without having an overall view and without taking account of complex social problems. If we were to continue in this manner, we would probably end up with a text too piecemeal to constitute a proper settlement of such an important and tricky question. In order to take account of this very requirement, the Committee on Budgets insists in the first of the three motions we are to examine today — the one relating to the salary scales — that any decision on the part of the Council must be taken only after consultation of the Parliament.

This consultation — I emphasize this because it is an essential point — is absolutely necessary because I am of the opinion that the procedure adopted by the Council last December — unfortunately with the full support of the Commission — which was designed to settle the matter of revising the salary scales without asking the opinion of the Parliament, must give us very serious cause to doubt whether the Council of Ministers really wishes to take account of the elected Parliament's role in the matter.

Lega

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I now come to the contents of these three proposals.

We join with the Legal Affairs Committee in rejecting the proposed manner of correcting the salary scales, because it flies in the face of the principle of serving acquired pecuniary rights and is likely to give rise to serious conflict between the staff and the European Institutions; more importantly, it is likely to lead to a rupture of the principle of justifiable confidence in contracts between the staff and the institutions.

For these reasons we have joined with the Legal Affairs Committee in insisting that Parliament reject these proposals and the Commission withdraw them.

If there was a mistake in the calculations carried out at the time the decisions on the incorporation of the weightings in to the salary scales were taken in 1976, these mistakes — the existence of which, moreover, has not been adequately proved — cannot in any circumstances be corrected by the means proposed by the Commission. The Council would be wrong to reduce the salary scales in force since 1976: if it were to do so, the institutions would run the risk of probably finding themselves condemned by the Court of Justice which would uphold the acquired rights of the staff.

The second proposal under examination which is intended, let me repeat, to improve certain provisions of the Staff Regulations concerning social security and family matters, has been partially accepted and partially improved by the Committee on Budgets, as can be seen from the amendments given in the margin to the second motion set out in my report (pages 9 to 26).

We were unable to accept some provisions, which in our opinion were likely to weaken interest in the European civil service, such as the excessive extension of leave on personal grounds and the introduction of three-quarters time work (there is already a provision for half-time working).

On the other hand, we have improved the provisions on sickness insurance and on setting aside a certain number of posts in the establishment plan for the invalided and the handicapped, and, finally, on ensuring respect for national legislations in the case of those social provisions which impinge upon family laws.

As for the third proposal, we have accepted the principle of early retirement from the age of 55 onwards. Nevertheless, it seemed to us that this principle, put forward by the Commission of the Communities solely as a means of making the necessary establishment posts available during the first five years following the accession of a new Member State, should be implemented with greater fairness and should be a permanent alteration in favour of all offi-

cial who have served the Communities for a minimum of 26 years and who have reached the age of 55.

The provision concerning pensions calls for our full attention because, though it is rightly intended to recompense the years of service given by our officials, it should nevertheless not result in an objective lowering of the standard of Community officials. We had to take account of all these requirements, and the Committee on Budgets has attempted to improve the Commission's proposals along these lines.

Before concluding, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to emphasize one more point.

The Committee on Budgets has not the slightest intention of weakening or calling into question the method by which staff salaries are annually reviewed, a method which has already been accepted for some time by the Community institutions and by the staff representatives.

It is for this reason that, when we come to vote, I shall ask that the second part of paragraph 3 of the motion be eliminated — the part dealing with salary scales, the drafting of which, even though clear enough in the eyes of the Committee on Budgets, seems likely to give rise to some misunderstanding, if only of a linguistic nature.

Finally, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to insist that the Council take due and proper account of the need to deal simultaneously with the three proposals under examination, and I should also like to insist on the Council's giving serious consideration to the request for consultation from this Parliament, which, in a matter with such important social and financial consequences, cannot be ignored, except at the risk of violating the inter-institutional agreement on consultation regarding those Community provisions which have financial consequences.

As regards the amendments which we have suggested, I should be grateful to you, Mr President, if you would give me leave to speak at the moment they are presented to the House or, at the very least, when the amendments themselves are voted on.

(Applause)

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

Mr Nord. — *(NL)* — Mr President, I should like to express my thanks to those who were by rights before me on the list and who have been so good as to give me the opportunity of presenting the views of our Group before the break. Fortunately, I can make this very brief, since our Group is in favour of Mr Lega's report. It has our support and I would like in parti-

Nord

cular to add my voice to the request to the Commission to withdraw its proposal for adjusting the salary scales.

For us this involves a matter of principle. Let me quote from the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee, which says that it would be contrary to natural justice to allow an administrative authority to reverse established situations, even if they are illegal, which have applied for many months or even years, since the legality of the Regulation of 21 December 1976, which it is intended to modify so as to remove certain imperfections, cannot be called into question because the period in which proceedings may be instituted has expired. For us, this is the main argument in support of the conclusions reached by Mr Lega in his report.

Since Mr Pannella is in the habit of reminding us regularly that a vote cannot be taken on amendments here in Parliament if they have not been explained during the debate, I should like to take this opportunity of briefly explaining our two amendments.

In our Amendment No 5, we want to criticize the Council, as Mr Lega too so rightly said just now, for violating, or at least intending to violate, the Treaty and the Staff Regulations. Back in December, an attempt was made in the Council to adopt this Regulation without an opinion from Parliament, and that is a violation of the Treaty. This did not succeed, in the first instance, because there was no majority in favour of it. If the information I was given this morning is correct, agreement was reached yesterday at Permanent Representative level with the necessary majority, so that a decision on this will be taken in the Council of Ministers next Monday. Decisions are thus going to be taken in conflict with the Treaties without waiting for the opinion of Parliament. Our Amendment No 5 aims to draw attention to this, in order not to let an intended violation of the relevant legal provisions pass unnoticed. Our other amendment concerns the deletion of paragraph 3. On this, however, Mr Lega said just now that he was prepared to have everything deleted except the first part. If the rapporteur confirms this, our amendment can be withdrawn. We do not wish to go beyond deleting the second part of paragraph 3.

If I have been able to be so brief, this is not because our Group underestimates the importance of this problem but because we have 41 minutes at our disposal for all today's reports together and I do not wish to take up my colleagues' precious minutes. I should like once again to thank Mr Lega for his report and commend our amendments to Parliament's indulgence.

President. — I call Mr Sieglerschmidt to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group and to present the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin with four brief preliminary comments. Firstly, I am speaking here on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee — as far as the first two amendments are concerned — and also on behalf of the Socialist Group. There is no conflict of interests here, because the Socialist Group agrees in this case with the Legal Affairs Committee and also with the Committee on Budgets. Secondly, I deplore the fact that, looking back over my time as a Member of this House before direct elections, it is years since the European Parliament held a really full-scale debate on the status of the officials of the European Community and the staff regulations. If this House is to take its work seriously — and I mean these remarks to be taken in a political, rather than a legalistic sense — we must proceed on the assumption that we are the people employing the officials of the Community; in other words, each of us is one four-hundred and tenth of an employer. It therefore behoves us to have a lengthy debate on the status of our officials on occasion. Thirdly, the staff regulations of the officials of the European Communities cannot be a prototype for civil servants in the Member States. The staff regulations can only try to reflect the normal legal state of affairs in the Member States. This means — and I should like to address my remarks here directly to our officials — that they should not be placed at any disadvantage *vis-à-vis* civil servants in the Member States, but neither should they be way ahead of them. That is something we shall have to keep an eye on as far as possible. My fourth remark follows on from what Mr Lega said earlier.

For eight years I was a member of the Bundestag's committee on staff regulations for German civil servants, and during that time I learnt to read the legislation on civil servants' remuneration. I must say, though, that the regulations I have had to plough through here as draftsman for the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee are far more difficult to make head or tail of than the German regulations, and that is really saying something. Let me therefore address an urgent appeal to the Commission and the Council to have another, closer look at the staff regulations. I am aware of the problems. This is a highly complicated subject, but that is all the more reason for drafting the regulations in a form in which they can be really understood by a normal person, and at least by a normal official of average intelligence, who should not need legal assistance to help him to understand them.

Moving on to the Commission's three proposals, I shall be brief because I agree very largely with Mr Lega. Both the Legal Affairs Committee and the Socialist Group agreed that the proposal in Document No 202, which is designed to effect these salary scale readjustments, should not be allowed to pass in its present form. I am aware of the difficulties facing the

Sieglerschmidt

Commission and the Council, but I must say that these problems are partly of their own making. They must find another way of overcoming these problems, not least — and I would stress this point on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, — for the legal reasons advanced so admirably by the rapporteur and by Mr Nord.

We therefore welcome the extra weight in the Liberal Group's Amendment No 5, which points out to the Council in no uncertain terms what legal points are at issue. I had originally intended to oppose the amendment seeking to delete paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution, but — speaking personally — I could go along with the compromise which seems to be emerging here — that is, to let the first sentence stand and to delete the rest.

As to the proposal in Document No 201, which contains the social provisions, I must draw your attention under the Rules of Procedure to Amendment No 2, which I have tabled on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee. It seems to me that there is a slight difference of opinion here between the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on Budgets. The Committee on Budgets would like to introduce an enabling clause to apply to the person legally entitled to receive payment.

The Legal Affairs Committee would like to substitute 'is to' for 'can' in this case. Let me point out to those Members who are not from the Federal Republic of Germany that, in normal German usage 'is to' is taken to mean not 'must', but 'must normally'. The Legal Affairs Committee felt that it should not simply be left up to the employer institutions to decide to whom payment should be made, but that the procedure should normally be that described in this Commission proposal, with the employer institution only deciding otherwise in exceptional cases.

I should just like to comment briefly on Mr Ryan's Amendment No 3. I think his idea is, generally speaking, a good one, but I should like, on behalf of my Group, to ask for the two sections a) and b) to be voted on separately. We agree with section a), which seeks to introduce a different criterion for maintenance payments. Section b), however, introduces an imprecise legal concept. I should like to say on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee that, although we all know that our legal work involves a lot of imprecise concepts, this is really going a bit too far. According to Mr Ryan's amendment, the criterion should be whether the person entitled to payment is being treated in accordance with natural justice. The concept of natural justice is something we can scratch our heads about for a long time. We would ask for that part to be deleted and for a separate vote to be taken.

Moving on the proposal in Document No 212, dealing with pensions and social security matters, I

should like to comment on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee on Amendment No 1. Paragraph 1a) has become superfluous and will be withdrawn. I believe that whatever was necessary has now been said on the text of the regulation proper. Point 1a) does not therefore need to be mentioned. However, the other two points have thereby become all the more important. What exactly is paragraph 1b) of Amendment No 1 driving at? The Commission's proposal is that payments to divorcees should in certain cases take into account who the guilty party was. Anyone who has gone into this subject will know that in the Federal Republic of Germany — and possibly also in other Member States — the question of guilt in the break-up of a marriage has now been abandoned. This is therefore not a sensible principle to work on, and the Legal Affairs Committee proposes that the survivor's pension should be based on the decision of the court competent to fix maintenance. This is a neutral formulation and, in my opinion, meets the Commission's and the Council's requirements perfectly adequately. I attach even more importance to point 1c), which says that all differences in the treatment of a surviving widow or widower should be eliminated from the arrangements for the survivor's pension.

The Legal Affairs Committee apologizes for not being able to draw up the necessary amendments for reasons of time. It is, however, extremely important that the principle of the equal treatment of men and women, as enshrined in the Treaties, be reflected in the pensions and social security provisions of the staff regulations. We would therefore ask the Commission and the Council to do whatever is necessary, and to do it conscientiously.

Let me add that there are of course other problems concerning equality of treatment, although I do not intend to table any more amendments on this point. Let us not forget the extremely tricky legal problem of the pensions and social security status of those who live together permanently, but who are not married. I think I am right in saying that only one Member State has so far tried to deal with this situation in law. Therefore there is nothing I can say on the subject at the moment except that this question is very likely to crop up again in a few years' time.

There is one last thing I should like to say on the amendment which I have tabled in my own name — Amendment No 4. The point of the amendment is to clarify the fact — and I should just like to make this point because I get the impression that some of the problems here may be only of a linguistic nature — that the time taken into account should be not only the period of national military service, but all periods of national service. The situation is different in the various Member States, but what I am thinking of here in particular is non-military service performed by conscientious objectors. This period of service must of course count just as a period of military service would do. That is the point of Amendment No 4.

Sieglerschmidt

The third matter is something which is particularly important to me personally. The original draft provided for periods of imprisonment as a result of the Second World War to be taken into account as well. That, of course, is perfectly natural, and there should be no question that it is perfectly right to do so. However, it seems to be just as right and normal to take account also — as I have suggested — of political persecution, provided the facts have been recognized by the legislation of a Member State. I think periods of political persecution should at least rank equally with time spent as a prisoner-of-war, and those of our officials who have had the misfortune to suffer political persecution should be granted the same status as prisoners-of-war and the like.

(Applause)

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

The House will rise.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Lega report (Doc. 1-584/79).

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

Mr Fischbach. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like first of all, if I may, to thank Mr Lega for the splendid work he has done as rapporteur for the Committee on Budgets. His report, the structure and reasoning of which are extremely clear, will undoubtedly make it considerably easier for Parliament to take its decision. As regards the motions for resolutions on Documents Nos 201 and 212 concerning in the first case improvements to the provisions of the Staff Regulations regarding family and social security matters and, in the second case, improvements to pensions and social security, my Group is in favour of the motions presented by the Committee on Budgets, including the amendments it proposes. We subscribe to the favourable opinion expressed by the rapporteur on Amendments Nos 1 and 4 presented by Mr Sieglerschmidt, one on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee and the other on his own behalf, taking account, naturally, of the fact that in his Amendment No 1 Mr Sieglerschmidt has withdrawn paragraph 1 a of Document No 212.

My Group cannot, however, see its way to adopting the amendment Mr Sieglerschmidt has just presented,

i.e. Amendment No 2 on replacing the possibility of paying the allowance to the dependent person by an obligation to do so.

As regards the amendment tabled by Mr Ryan, my Group is in favour of the first paragraph of this amendment but cannot subscribe to point b, which introduces the notion of 'natural justice' into the text.

Above all, however, my Group is unable to endorse the draft regulation based on Document No 202/79 which aims, by readjusting the basic salary scales, to correct the supposedly unintentional effects of a regulation adopted by the Council in 1976. The fact is that my Group finds it unacceptable for the administration to go back on established positions and thereby shake the staff's confidence in the pay policy pursued hitherto. This is all the more unacceptable in that before the incorporation of the weighting into the salary scales the staff representatives pointed out to the Council at the time — i.e. in 1976 — that the new method of calculation would lead to distortions in favour of married officials with dependent children. By failing to take account of these observations at the time, the Council implicitly agreed to these distortions, so that the resulting increases for officials with families might be assumed in fact to have been intended by the Council. Since then, the weighting has been incorporated twice without any reaction from the Council. That is why it is unacceptable for the Council to call into question now a situation it has allowed to persist for three years without making the slightest change although it was aware that this involved obvious advantages for a certain category of officials.

For these reasons — and above all because it is far from certain that adjusting the scale would not produce new distortions — my Group agrees with the conclusions of the Lega report, in that the proposal for adjusting the salary scales should be rejected and, consequently, the Commission asked to withdraw it. In the event of the Council's taking a different view, it is invited to consult with Parliament. In addition, my Group entirely supports the amendment tabled by the Liberal Group protesting at the cavalier way the Council has acted in this matter by proceeding to make amendments to the proposal for adjusting salary scales in December 1979 despite the fact that Parliament had not given its opinion, and failing to take a decision on the level of salaries before 31 December 1979.

While the Council has in this way sinned against the Treaties and the Staff Regulations, there is even more reason to condemn the attitude of the Commission, which has on two occasions — i.e. in 1977 and 1978, submitted to the decision-making process in the Council proposals for adjustments to the salary scales without insisting on a prior opinion from Parliament. Such an attitude is unworthy of a European Commis-

Fischbach

sion which is, above all, the guardian of the Treaties and which so often appeals to Parliament for support in its dealings with the Council. This is in any case a fine example of the Commission's failure to show solidarity with Parliament, which does nothing whatever to serve the cause of Europe and is most unfortunate for the image of the executive in a Community which wants to be forward-looking.

This said, my Group expressed its support of the motion for a resolution on Document 202/79 tabled by the Committee on Budgets and also accepts the modifications to the text endorsed by the rapporteur in the light of the amendments tabled by the Liberal Group.

President. — I call Sir Peter Vanneck on a point of order.

Sir Peter Vanneck. — Mr President, our agenda states that 3 p.m. is voting time. Now, even if there is nothing to vote on, I feel that before continuing the debate the Chair should make it clear that although 3 p.m. is voting time on the agenda, there is no vote and therefore we are going on with the debate. This would clear up any uncertainty in the minds of the Members here today.

President. — Sir Peter, the votes scheduled for three o'clock were to be on the motions for resolutions on which the debate had closed. This has not happened yet. The first debate today which should lead to a vote is still being held.

I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, I should like to make it clear that on this occasion I am not speaking on behalf of my Group, although I hope that I will be able to persuade a number of my Group to support me in what I am about to say. I would also appeal to those in the Chamber from other groups to listen to my brief comments and support me also.

I wish to comment on Amendment No 4 tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt, because I believe it goes completely contrary to the discussion we had on this matter in the Committee on Budgets. In committee we wanted to acknowledge, in relation to the matter referred to in the amendment, that account would be taken under these provisions of periods of imprisonment as a result of acts of war in the Second World War. This was discussed quite explicitly and agreed upon in the Committee on Budgets. I now find, on looking at this amendment, that Mr Sieglerschmidt wishes to go back to what I had previously opposed in committee. He also referred in his speech, made just before the lunch break, to conscientious objectors. This introduces an entirely new principle with which I certainly would not agree. I do not think many of my colleagues would either. He also refers in his amendment to acts of political persecution.

My submission, Mr President, is that if you use such terms in the context of this kind of arrangement, it is open to very many interpretations, which will give rise to a great deal of difficulty in the Community. In my view we should stick to the original text which is completely acceptable and was accepted by the Committee on Budgets. I see this amendment as being highly dangerous and highly political, and with the gravest implications. I would strongly urge my colleagues in this Chamber from all groups to reconsider Amendment No 4 very carefully. I myself will vote against it and I would urge all my colleagues to do the same for the reasons I have given.

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — (*F*) Mr President, after reading the report presented on behalf of the Committee on Budgets and, of course, more particularly the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee, I have a few observations which I should like to present briefly.

Last October, I joined with a number of other Members in calling for the withdrawal from the agenda of the draft interim report presented on behalf of the Committee on Budgets concerning the proposal for adjusting the basic salary scale, so that the report should not be dealt with until the Legal Affairs Committee had delivered its opinion, since you will recall that the Committee on Budgets had dissociated consideration of the proposal on the salary scales from that of the proposals concerning the pension scheme and the social security system.

It can thus be regarded as a positive development if the two committees, the Committee on Budgets and the Legal Affairs Committee, are now fully agreed in recommending that the Commission must withdraw its proposal and, in accordance with Article 65 of the Staff Regulations, submit a proposal to the Council for a decision to be taken in line with the letter and spirit of Article 65 and of the Council's own decision of 1976 laying down the method of calculation for the review of salary levels.

I shall not dwell on the legal arguments set out by the spokesman for our Legal Affairs Committee, which seem to me to be perfectly clear. I should, however, like to express my regret at the fact that the relevant Community bodies sometimes attach such little importance to consultations with the staff representatives. Everyone is aware that the method chosen by the Commission and the Council is liable to create a state of conflict with the staff, as Mr Natali was in fact willing to admit at last October's part-session. We cannot allow legal subterfuges to be used to call into question acquired rights. This is a question of principle on which I and my colleagues do not intend to give way. I know it is very often said that the Community Staff Regulations are very favourable. But it is

Chambeiron

perhaps worth taking this opportunity of recalling the quality demanded of Community officials and the particularly arduous working conditions to which many of them are subjected. We have very clear proof of this at each part-session of this House. Need I remind you that since 10 June last year the European Parliament has been operating with the same number of staff as before direct elections, although the number of Members has more than doubled, there has been a massive increase in the number of meetings and the volume of documents translated, printed and distributed has more than tripled? I should also like to take advantage of this debate to say how much we appreciate the helpfulness shown to us every day by the staff of this Parliament. And I think we must, as a matter of urgency, turn our attention to their situation and make a serious study, perhaps by setting up an *ad hoc* committee, of their demands and their conditions of work.

With regard to the way the weighting is applied, Mr President, I have been wondering whether certain modifications proposed by the Commission and the Council were not the beginnings of a new salaries policy. The problem of the remunerations and rights of public service employees and the tendency to question acquired rights are not peculiar to the Community institutions. The same problems arise, in acute form, in the various Member countries, where the officials and other categories of employees are not exempt from the effects of austerity. Whatever differences there may be between the regulations governing officials and other public service employees in the various countries of the Community, there is necessarily a close link between the policy pursued at government level and that prevailing at Community level. It is in fact difficult to see how the cumulation of restrictive national policies towards the civil service could have a positive effect on the position of Community staff.

We shall keep a close watch on the policy the Commission and the Council intend to pursue and shall be vigilant in defending the rights and working conditions of Community staff.

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I would like to say, first of all, how pleased the Commission is that this question is now being debated; pleased for a number of reasons, I may say. It is pleased because it is a subject which is clearly of interest to all the institutions, because all of us are in one way or another employing people who work for the Community, but pleased too because these proposals have been before Parliament since it first assembled in July, and we have of course been pressing Parliament for some time to consider this matter, which we regard as urgent.

Since the question first came before Parliament, the situation has evolved, and on this occasion, I am happy to say, it has been a rather fortunate and satisfactory evolution. As Mr Nord mentioned in his speech, a settlement has now been agreed by the Council in the sense that the Council has accepted a package of proposals covering pay and the *nettoyage*. This matter has been settled at one level in the Council and will, I hope, be the subject of an affirmative resolution in the Council early next week. So as of today, unlike previous occasions in the past, no conflict exists with the staff over the salary scale correction, because they have accepted the *nettoyage* as part of the overall settlement. I am glad that the Council was able to reach an agreement which I know was difficult for some delegations, but I also think that the staff deserve a very considerable word of thanks for their willingness to look at the issue in such a broad fashion and to take such a view of the matter.

Now, as Mr Lega himself said in his introductory speech, there are in fact a number of proposals before Parliament. I should like first, if I may, to deal briefly with the question of family matters and pensions.

The Commission notes with satisfaction that the Committee on Budgets has given a general approval to the proposals in Documents 201/79 and 212/79. I clearly cannot comment in detail today on the small number of changes which have been proposed, but I can promise that they will be examined carefully and with an open mind by the Commission. By all means let us try to keep in contact on this matter. The *nettoyage* has always been a more difficult question — we always say *nettoyage* in English, I am not even sure if we have a satisfactory translation for it. At any rate the *nettoyage* or the correction of salary scales, following the unintended distortions created by the Council at the end of 1976, does I think require some more detailed comment.

The Commission took the view that these distortions should be corrected, and its proposal of 30 May 1979 was designed to do so in a manner which did not involve a diminution of existing net salary for those concerned. This is a point which a number of speakers have made; the last speaker in fact talked about the necessity of avoiding a net reduction, and our proposal has been designed to ensure that there should be no diminution in the existing net salary. It was a proposal produced after long discussion with the staff representatives and went as far as possible in taking their views into account. I would stress that no member of staff — and I think this is important — will see a drop in his or her net salary from one month to the next as a result of the proposal that we made.

Unfortunately, Parliament did not give its opinion on this proposal — we would have wished that it had

Tugendhat

done so and we did press Parliament to do so — before the Commission and the Council came to discuss the 1979 annual pay review for Community staff, which it is normal and necessary to complete by the end of the year. On this occasion, the purchasing power increase resulting from the method used by the Council to fix salaries was such that it allowed the *nettoyage*, as proposed in Doc. 2021/79, to be it had and completed in 95 % of the cases concerned. In this situation the Commission, when asked by the Council in December to propose a salary settlement for 1979 with *nettoyage* applied, felt it right to do so in the interests of achieving a fair settlement and avoiding disruptive action by the staff. In so doing I made it very clear to the Council, Mr President, that in the Commission's view it would have been preferable to wait for Parliament's opinion. I am bound to say, however — and I think this is a reasonable thing for me to say — that in view of the fact that the matter first came before Parliament when it was first elected, Parliament has, perhaps, been a little slow in getting round to dealing with the matter, and therefore one had to take that point into account together with the need and the desirability of securing parliamentary opinion. As a result of all the complications that have in fact occurred, Parliament's opinion will be on the record before a decision is taken.

The staff themselves, who, I think, have behaved very well and very responsibly in this matter, are prepared to accept the general package, so that we now find ourselves in a position where the Council is poised to take a final decision which I believe will bring a peaceful settlement to the difficulties which have existed. I hope, Mr President, that Parliament will, in the light of all that I have said, be able to give a favourable opinion on the proposal; but above all I would ask Parliament to give a proposal on this occasion so that further delays do not occur.

There is one other point of a slightly different nature which I must make in answer to the question raised by Mr Sieglerschmidt concerning equality of treatment for male and female officials. I would like to make it quite clear to the House that the Commission, as far back as 1974, made a proposal for equal treatment in respect of pension matters for male and female officials, and this proposal is still on the Council table. I hope, therefore, that as a result of the pressure which the Parliament is able to bring to bear, this desirable innovation will now make rather more rapid progress than has been the case hitherto.

President. — I call Mr Sieglerschmidt.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — (D) Mr President, I should like to comment very briefly on what Mr Forth had to say about my Amendment No 4. My aim is not to score debating points off him, but simply to clarify the matter somewhat. Opinions may differ as to

giving other forms of national service the same status as military service and, that being so, I shall not comment any further on the matter. I do, however, think — and this is something I should really like to stress — that a system of compulsory non-military service for conscientious objectors which is officially recognized in the country concerned should rank equally with military service from the point of view of staff regulations. I do not want to get into any argument with Mr Forth on this point, but I do want to comment on my second point — which Mr Forth called 'highly dangerous and highly political' — seeking to have periods of political persecution counted for pension purposes along with periods of imprisonment as a result of the Second World War. Mr President, I fail to see what is so dangerous and political about something which is qualified — in line with the provisions on periods spent as a prisoner-of-war-by the proviso: 'provided these facts have been recognized by the legislation of a Member State'. The condition is therefore that the staff regulations for national civil servants must recognize these facts — and to that extent we are not breaking any new ground. I should like to ask Mr Forth whether he really thinks that people who were interned in concentration camps or subjected to some other form of political persecution — always assuming, of course, that all these things have been properly investigated and nationally recognized — should not be given equal status to prisoners-of-war. I cannot believe that he would seriously dispute this point, and I trust that the same goes for a majority of this House.

President. — I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — I wish to speak in defence of my colleague who is not in the room. I think it ought to be on record that the main point my colleague made was that this had been discussed by the Committee on Budgets and that certain agreements have been come to. Mr Sieglerschmidt seemed to be deviating from a previous agreement in a way which can only cause confusion.

President. — I call Mr Lega.

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — (I) President, I just want to make a very brief observation of a technical nature. Unfortunately, having another look this morning at the final text of my report, I noticed that, contrary to what appears in the minutes of the Committee on Budgets, a coordinating measure referring to Article 18 of the draft regulation has been omitted on page 49 of the printed report. This is probably — I repeat — a printing error. I would ask the secretariat to bring the text put before the House into line with the one provided by the Committee on Budgets in order to correct this mistake. In other words, it is a mere technical alteration.

Lega

I have nothing else to say, other than to thank my colleagues. It seems to me that there is broad agreement on the binding principles of these three motions. With the President's leave, I should be happy, during the voting to give my opinion on each individual amendment in line with the general scheme provided by the Committee on Budgets.

President. — Steps will be taken to remedy what seems in fact to be a printing error.

The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

11. *Second five-year programme on radioactive waste*

President. — The next item on the agenda is the debate on the report (Doc. 1-576/79), drawn up by Mrs Weber on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on :

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 11/79) for a decision on a second five-year programme (1980-1984) on radioactive waste management and storage.

I call Mrs Weber.

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as a result of long and very intensive discussion, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection — as the Committee responsible — has decided to propose a number of changes to the Commission's research programme on radioactive waste management and storage. We now seek your approval for these changes, a detailed explanation of which is contained in the report. I should like to take this opportunity, however, to discuss briefly the details of some of our proposals.

I am sure we all realize the need to find a solution at European level to the problem of storing and processing radioactive waste; after all, given the amount of waste produced and current storage methods, we unfortunately cannot rule out the possibility of an environmental and public health hazard. The need to find a solution is just as pressing whether one is for the greater use of nuclear energy or whether one sees no political future for nuclear power stations. Whatever one's views, it is essential to create safe storage facilities for the nuclear waste which already exists and which is constantly being produced.

Whether or not nuclear energy is to become one of our major energy policy options is ultimately a political decision. However, no one can close his eyes to the fact that nuclear energy has in recent years created a number of new problems which are not exclusively technical, and which we must take into account and create research capacity for if we seriously intend to

give top priority to protecting people and the natural environment.

Almost all national legislation on nuclear energy stresses the safety aspects. The logical conclusion of this is that the research needed to bring out this concern for safety should be adequately funded.

Ladies and gentlemen, let no one run away with the idea that the people of the European Community will react to recent developments in the Middle East and to the expected further rise in the price of oil by giving those responsible in Europe *carte blanche* to go full steam ahead with developing nuclear energy. Let us not jump out of the frying pan straight into the fire. The uncertain political situation regarding the distribution of the world's available reserves of oil should not lead us to give uncritical support to a technology which will still leave us feeling insecure and which may even bring us real danger. One of our basic demands must be for long-term storage facilities for nuclear waste which will not prove to be a hazard for future generations. It is precisely for this reason that we need a change in established research priorities. The Committee therefore proposes that the part of the programme dealing with storage problems should have priority over radioactive waste processing and management, and this of course means that research funds will have to be reallocated. The amount of nuclear waste which is actually produced will depend on other decisions, and we therefore feel that this programme should incorporate a number of different options regarding the rate at which nuclear energy is developed, including the possibility of zero growth. It is only by drawing up alternative scenarios that we shall really be able to assess the consequences of our decisions. We also believe it is urgently necessary to produce analyses of the possible risks, taking into account the possible faults and ways of dealing with them. We saw last year the difficulties that can arise if the possibility of a major accident happening in a nuclear power station is not taken seriously. Such risk analyses are nowadays regarded as a matter of course in assessing the possible consequences of using other technologies.

Before such risk analyses can be carried out, there must be uniform safety standards throughout Europe for radioactive waste management and storage, along with the means of checking that the standards are complied with. This is surely a reasonable demand in the eyes of anyone who is in favour of a consistent and decisive Community energy policy. We would be dealing here with an area about which we so far know very little and which we would like to see given more prominence in the future, to wit, the effect of long-term, low-level radiation on human beings and the natural environment. I should like at this point to lend my support to a proposal put forward by the Committee on Budgets that the question of decommiss-

Weber

sioning nuclear power stations be included in these studies as a matter of urgency, on the grounds that it has proved to be an extremely tricky and cost-intensive problem.

Our supplementary proposal on Section D of the Commission's proposal concerns a matter which is being discussed more and more urgently in all the Member States, and which we must not shirk, namely the possible repercussions for the political culture of Europe of certain major technologies. What effects will the essential and far-reaching protective measures — especially with respect to radioactive waste management and storage — have on the traditional civil liberties in our countries? To be more specific: can the principle, common to the liberal democracies, that measures taken by the State should be commensurate with the goal they seek to achieve, be maintained, given the high degree of protection required by the population when an installation is working normally and in the light of possible emergencies? It surely goes without saying that the European Community must be seen to accept its worldwide responsibility for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons when establishing a programme on radioactive waste management and storage, and must ensure that recycling the waste does not enhance the risk of the proliferation of nuclear arms potential. This aspect should be studied, bearing in mind the results of INFCE.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, however great our technical potential may be, it is to no avail if our people refuse to accept technological developments. It is precisely for this reason that we, as representatives of the people, are duty bound to incorporate the terms of public acceptance of nuclear installations in the programme and draw our conclusions from the results of this research. In the question of storage too, we must ensure that the people are adequately involved. By fostering ignorance — particularly in this field — we shall be fostering fear, perhaps not least in this House, which must therefore insist on receiving regular reports and information on the progress made in the programme when it comes to extending the programme's life.

Perhaps it would be just as well to mention at this juncture that the Commission has called a major conference for May this year to discuss the results of the first five-year programme. I am puzzled that this conference should be planned for a time when the second five-year programme is already a *fait accompli*; I should have preferred it to have been held exactly a year earlier, so that we could really have included the results of the first programme in our discussions. It is about time we put an end to the situation whereby elected Parliaments are treated as rubber stamps or merely allowed to worship at the altar of so-called disinterested science when it comes to decisions of a technological nature. Anyone who thinks

that technical problems or technical research have nothing to do with politics is in for a rude awakening when he reads this programme. Every technical development has political and social repercussions, but it also has causes, and these we cannot simply ignore. We believe that this point has been ignored for far too long in discussions and decisions on nuclear energy. Energy policy is not only a matter of overcoming technical problems. That is why we call clearly and unequivocally for our demands and our ideas to be incorporated in the programme; bland declarations of intent, as proposed in some of amendments which have been taken, will not get us anywhere.

Over the last few months, this Parliament has had sufficient courage to be independent and make its own decisions. Our amendments to the programme are indispensable demands in the interests of the safety of the people of Europe, and I would ask you therefore to approve our draft programme.

President. — I call Mrs Walz to present the opinion of the Committee on Energy and Research.

Mrs Walz, deputy draftsman of an opinion. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by pointing that what we are discussing here today is a programme which the Council has already adopted in its original form. However, the fact that we have tabled 17 amendments to Mrs Weber's report shows how much importance we attach to the report, which is a quite remarkable piece of work which heads quite clearly in one particular political direction. The Committee on Energy and Research's report on the Community's energy policy objectives to 1990 will take a fundamentally different line from Mrs Weber's report.

I firmly believe that energy policy — and in particular the question of radioactive waste — is a matter for the Committee on Energy and Research, and that moreover the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection is not the right committee to handle questions of fundamental rights — known in other countries as human rights — or external trade policy issues. This should rightly be the Legal Affairs Committee's territory. I do not want to go through all the 17 amendments we have tabled; let me just pick out the most important among them. We ask you to delete paragraph 3. Of course, alternative scenarios are already largely in existence, but what we need are decisions. In view of the fact that the energy situation is becoming more and more precarious, we cannot go on for ever keeping our options open, as the modern jargon has it. Sometime or other we have got to reach a definite decision, otherwise, one fine day, we shall be left empty-handed. We would suggest a rather different wording here. Paragraph 8 of Mrs Weber's motion for a resolution should be deleted, and the question should be studied again by the Legal

Walz

Affairs Committee. Paragraph 10 dealing with the terms of public acceptance should likewise be deleted. We would go along here with Mr Ippolito's Amendment No 3, which seeks to combine paragraphs 8 and 10 and present them in an improved form. The question of public acceptance, which is a matter of great importance in the Federal Republic of Germany, boils down to a question of public information on safety matters, and this is something which is discussed openly with the people in most of the Member States of the Community at all levels — from local politics up to national parliament and government level. In those countries where this is not yet the case, it should be introduced as a matter of urgency. We feel that paragraph 12 should also be deleted on the grounds that nothing at all is known about storage projects in the developing countries. The question of proliferation is a matter for the Political Affairs Committee and the Legal Affairs Committee, and it should not figure in this programme. Paragraph 14 should be completely rewritten. We can afford no further delay in the question of storing radioactive waste. The waste material already exists and something has got to be done with it. Paragraph 15 must be deleted. The Commission's text should be reinserted in the proposal for a Council decision — for which purpose we are withdrawing our Amendments Nos 25 to 28 in favour of Mr Ippolito's Amendment No 9. As to Article 3 of the Council decision, Amendment No 24 must stand.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, environmental and radiation protection are extremely important matters which should be treated with the utmost urgency. We need to strike a sensible balance between ecological and economic problems, but energy policy cannot be judged simply by reference to environmental questions. If the environmental aspects were really to be given top priority, we should soon have no power station of any kind, and we should finish up having chemical works and other factories which process things like natural stone, clay and earth submitting their waste for public approval, which would — by Mrs Weber's own admission — mean waiting a long, long time for acceptance — and might mean waiting in vain.

President. — I call Mr Brunner.

Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission. — (D) Mr President, the aim of this programme is to study ways of making it easier for people to live with today's technology. It shares this aim with the programme on radiation protection which we shall be discussing later when Mr Ghergo comes to present his report. Given that the aims are identical, I propose to deal with the whole subject as one. We got this programme going five years ago thanks to the admirable support of the old European Parliament. What we are concerned with now is continuing and improving that

programme. I hope that — in the interests of the people of Europe — we shall manage to maintain a basic consensus on these programmes dealing with radioactive waste and radiation protection. Indeed, we must maintain a consensus, otherwise we shall be acting against the interests of the people of Europe and preventing progress on research in a field where everyone would really like to see progress made.

I think we should therefore be clear in our own minds as to what significance these programmes have for the Community's overall research programme. We had an extensive public debate on this subject three years ago, when I first took over responsibility for energy questions in the Commission. At that time, I organized hearings on nuclear energy in Brussels, where we gave every conceivable nuance of opinion an airing. To some extent these programmes follow on from that public debate, which went on for several weeks and which resulted in a document a few hundred pages thick. The time has now come to reassess the situation. As Mrs Weber said, this is something we intend to do very soon, and we have very good reason for doing it at the end of the programme. On the one hand, it would have been practically impossible to carry out a reassessment any earlier and, on the other hand, the four-year and five-year programmes run into each other without a break. So we cannot leave any gap in between programmes for the purposes of reassessment; instead, we must make our methods more sophisticated and carry out any reassessment while the programme is still running and at the moment of transition from one to another. On 30 January, we shall be appearing before the Committee on Energy and Research — under the chairmanship of Mrs Walz — to carry out a comprehensive stock-taking of all the Community's current research projects. This is an extra stock-taking session, and I think Mrs Weber was right to say that we must always ensure that detailed information is forthcoming.

It will become evident in the course of this stock-taking session that there are a number of projects which already cover the points raised by Mrs Weber and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, and which also take into account the thinking behind the amendments tabled to Mrs Weber's motion for a resolution. For instance, we have a highly interesting research project on decommissioning power stations, which has been very favourably received in scientific circles throughout the European Community and throughout the whole world. We intend then to continue together along this path and to ensure that a basic consensus is maintained.

I must say quite frankly that I cannot go along with some of Mrs Weber's amendments: not because I violently disagree with her — I too am in favour of keeping the public informed and taking a close look

Brunner

at all possible options — but because we must not forget that time is of the essence. We simply do not have very much time left, and this applies to the whole spectrum of energy policy and energy research policy in Europe. The time just is not available. We are already into the crisis we were anticipating for 1985. In a few years' time, we shall regret any moment we have lost now, whatever the options may be. I think we should be doing the research programmes and ourselves a favour by bearing in mind the need to speed up our activities.

With these two programmes — dealing with radioactive waste and radiation protection — we have done something which is not only important in terms of Community and European research. We have helped to avoid the duplication of a lot of work, and we have enabled the Community to play a coordinating role in evaluating these projects — and that includes the Member States. We have opened the door for a lot of countries which had so far carried out no research of any significance in this field. We have gradually concentrated our efforts in the field of energy research on these matters in which we owe something to the people of Europe.

As far as waste management and radiation protection are concerned, the main thing is to protect the health of the individual and to see that he is not subject to any nuisance. The point at issue is improved use of modern technologies. We have already achieved some remarkable successes, and we have made a lot of progress in the cladding of nuclear waste. We have also made a lot of progress in the Community in the deep storage of this waste. As far as radiation protection is concerned, we have made progress in developing common standards for the protection of our citizens. Seen overall, this research — however modest it may appear in terms of volume — has helped not only to get things moving rather faster, but has also achieved a new, higher level of protection for the individual in Europe. I believe that our region — most of which is densely populated — has no reason to look with awe on any other region of the world as far as safety standards for its citizens are concerned. We are one of the world leaders in this field, and this is partly thanks to these research projects. We appreciate the support we have received from you in this matter. We shall retain the major points of our proposals, which have already been well received in the Council. Provided that you do amend the main objectives and proposals in our document, we shall soon be in a position to continue this work which so far everyone has judged to be worth while.

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

Mr Estgen. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I must say at the outset that the Group of the European People's Party, whose spokesman I have the honour to be, attaches very great importance to

this programme we have before us, and I must stress that what interests us in this problem is the whole range of implications, as regards both its technological and economic aspects and its psycho-sociological, health and environmental aspects.

This is no new problem: I recall that as long ago as 1973 the European Parliament examined the problems involved in the storage of radioactive waste. My Group has made a thorough study of the new text concerning the establishment of a second five-year programme for the period from 1980 to 1985. We have also given a great deal of attention to making a detailed and constructive study of Mrs Weber's report on this subject, which has our support as far as the protection of the public and the environment is concerned.

It is precisely in the interests of efficiency and clarity — and also, I must say, in a spirit of respect for the democratic rules and procedures which must apply in this field as well — that we have felt unable to subscribe to certain views adopted by the rapporteur which are, in our opinion, liable to dilute or to mask the true objective of the five-year programme, confuse public opinion and lead to conflicting responsibilities. What is perhaps more decisive is the fact that certain points divert from the main objective funds which are already far too uncertain and restricted, thus tending to hamper the opportunities we have for ensuring safety and protection.

Undeniably, the first five-year programme for the management and storage of radioactive waste made some progress — even, it must be admitted, considerable progress. However, as both the rapporteur, and the Committee on Budgets of the European Parliament, have stressed, the Commission has shown itself to be far too self-satisfied in speaking of the excellent work accomplished in the course of the first programme.

In a field as complex — and, let us be frank, as dangerous — as this, one should never be content with the results so far, it is always possible to go one better. None the less, in our view the outgoing programme has been useful and must at all costs be extended by this second five-year programme (1980/1984) covering a period in which, as our Group sees it, we shall have to increase and accelerate our research work, intensify our protective measures and seek much more effective cooperation still at Community level.

Quite apart from the highly important, indeed essential considerations concerning health and the environment in this field, cooperation is also necessary for economic and financial reasons. Indeed, as the Committee on Energy and Research and the Committee on Budgets have rightly pointed out, it avoids each Member State in isolation engaging in costly projects which would be bound to lead to duplication and wastage of time and resources.

Estgen

The new programme is also important — and I think this is an essential point — if we are to achieve a still greater degree of harmonization between the member countries in the safety standards and security measures regarding radioactive waste and in monitoring the implementation of these measures. It is absolutely essential for us, at Community level, to arrange global consultations on the whole problem of the management and storage of radioactive waste. In this context, however, it is impossible not to be worried, at a certain disproportion between the scale of these imperative objectives and the means to be used for achieving them. The scope of the problem would justify a somewhat older commitment in the budget and it is with this in mind that our Group regarded it as indispensable that the totality of the funds available should be allocated to the essential aims of the programme, leaving aside all the other objectives, however attractive and useful they may be, which have no place in the present proposal.

I am thinking here in particular of the rapporteur's comments about informing and consulting the sections of the public concerned, and I was very glad to hear from the Commissioner that there have been some very concrete achievements in this direction. The Commission clearly has a responsibility to inform the public on an even broader basis, in a clear and objective manner, about the treatment of radioactive waste in order to counter to a certain extent the psychosis which prevails in this field. Similarly, consulting the public on this question which concerns it in the highest degree is in our view indispensable in all the Member States.

However tempting it might be, in connection with this programme, to enter into a fundamental discussion on the peaceful use of nuclear energy — and such a discussion will clearly be necessary and indispensable in this Chamber one day — I think we must at all costs avoid it at the present time, since it would draw us away from our subject and would easily lead us into the realm of Utopia, for it is of little importance here whether or not nuclear energy will be one of the principal sources or the principal source of energy in the future. The situation is that nuclear reactors are in operation and the quantity of radioactive waste produced by these reactors is likely one day — and this may not be very far away — to reach a truly critical level. We must beware of this and we have a moral obligation to admit the fact and take all necessary measures to ensure greater safety and greater protection. Indeed, no one will deny that the peculiar nature of nuclear energy calls for increased prudence and strict safety measures. This source of energy can and must be used only if strict security standards are observed to protect the public and the environment. This is a moral obligation we have towards ourselves, our children and future generations.

The potential, i.e. purely hypothetical, effects — even if they are highly unlikely — are such that we must intensify our efforts on research to ensure the protection of our fellow citizens, future generations and the environment. It is in the light of this that we must assess this second five-year programme for the management and storage of radioactive waste. It is also with this in mind that the Christian-Democratic Group, as Mrs Walz indicated, has tabled several amendments.

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

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President and colleagues, this morning certain of my colleagues from this party presented a question to which I was one of the signatories. This question was primarily directed at the fact that if we are to reach suitable political conclusions we must, as parliamentarians, be fed all the information necessary. I venture to suggest that price might be one of those components.

There was also perhaps in that question — and it seemed to be picked up — and implied criticism that sometimes the Commission's work was not exactly directed along the best lines.

We have here this afternoon the following two topics : the report which will shortly be presented by the excellent Mr Ghergo on the health of those exposed to radiation, and the report on the disposal of radioactive waste, both of which, I will state categorically wearing my most scientific hat, are already fields in which this Community can hold its head high with pride in the quality of the work that has emerged from the Commission and the research behind it.

It is first-class work. The original document which came to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection was a balanced, scientific, forward-looking five-year programme. Unlike sometimes when I feel, with Oliver Cromwell, that the picture that has been painted is not like the one that he demanded of himself 'warts and all', we now have something from that committee which is all warts ! It has come out, having been descended upon by a posse of enthusiastic amateurs who have done their best to overlay it with a sticky, sentimental surfeit of saccharine and made of it something of a laughing stock.

It would be laughable were it not for the fact that the inaccuracies do not reflect in any way the current state of knowledge.

Sherlock

Paragraph 2 I find particularly offensive in that the research in this field and the progress that has been made already should be subject to such implied criticism as lies therein. That particular paragraph should be removed.

Paragraph 3, as Mrs Walz has already said, is also not acceptable to most of us.

You have, Mr President, a long list of speakers, and it is not my intention to say other than that those paragraphs which have already been listed by Mrs Walz as being those on which amendments are tabled all win my complete support.

We must look at various other factors of the environment, and future energy sources are one of those areas where in my opinion the Community can continue to work to the best effect. But a part of the human environment, important to the creatures that we have become over centuries of civilization, is keeping warm, keeping comfortable and being well lit — even our friend from Northern Ireland noticed the lack of light over in that corner today.

These are things that are part of the synthetic environment, if you like, but they are nevertheless a part of the environment in which 20th century man and women have come to live.

We cannot go back to our caves. We cannot go back to the one-cow environment from which our ancestors came.

If we are to continue to advance, energy is essential. This energy is already being provided by nuclear sources and has already produced discharges, leftovers, which need dealing with. They do exist. They are a fact of life. They will end up, as I have said somewhat unpopularly, on someone's doorstep, because the whole of the world is someone's doorstep.

Our scientists, I am sure, are capable of making them reasonably acceptable, so that I might even say 'Yes, put them in a neat package. Leave them even on my own doorstep', and I would not object too much.

This is the responsibility of science. It is a responsibility to which it can rise. It is a responsibility which, in its unadulterated form, this proposal would allow us to progress towards. We can have a clean, post-nuclear environment in which mankind can progress to further thought and further activity which continues to make this world and this Community truly worthy of its efforts.

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

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, several Members made reference this morning to the attitude of the President-in-Office of the Council. He said that the House would be informed of the Council's decisions. Well, Mr President, I have just been informed that, in spite of the shameless attitude by the Italian President of the Council, the enlarged Bureau intends to offer

him its apologies, whereas — and this was pointed out by Mrs Ewing and several others — we have courteously given up Question Time, which every Member is loath to forego.

Mr President, by virtue of Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure on the proper conduct of the business of the House, I think it would be a good idea to ask the President of the Council to come and tell us what he thinks of this shameless attitude, which stopped us from concluding the debate as laid down in the Treaties.

President. — Mr Pannella, I do not think there was any example of a shameless attitude.

Yesterday's debate was supposed to be devoted primarily to the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council. He spent the whole afternoon here waiting to hear speakers who were unable to speak because we were having another debate on votes. It was seven o'clock when he had to leave, after hearing only three speakers, although there were more than twenty down on the list. It was because of this that the enlarged Bureau met this morning and decided to explain the situation to the President-in-Office of the Council so that he would not go away with a bad impression of yesterday afternoon's sitting.

Mr Pannella. — Thank you for the explanation, Mr President, but I can just say that when France held the presidency an effort was made to check the times of the debates on Council statements.

The fact is that the President of the Council knew yesterday that our agenda, which had been approved the night before, included Question Time at a specific hour during the debate. He was also aware — and I know this for a fact — that there was going to be a vote on Afghanistan. This House, Mr President, had the courtesy — and I am stressing this point — to forego one of these items on its agenda. At 7.18 p.m. the President for the sitting, Mr Rogers, correctly announced — which makes a change — the resumption of the debate on the statement by the Italian President-in-Office of the Council, but he then noticed that the President was not in the Chamber and he closed the sitting. The minutes of proceedings which were distributed this morning unfortunately omitted to include this last bit by Mr Rogers, although it would have been better if it had left out some of the others. I therefore feel, Mr President, that the Italian presidency has adopted an attitude which is quite incredible. But what is even more incredible is that Parliament, after missing Question Time, wants to apologize instead of protesting. At any rate, let it be known that if the enlarged Bureau has offered any apologies, they are not from the Italian Radicals in this House, because in our opinion this attitude is — to use an adjective employed by Mr Druon last night — degrading.

President. — Mr Pannella, there is no point in continuing this exchange, which is only wasting a lot of time. I shall simply repeat that I fail to see on what grounds we may reproach the Italian President-in-Office of the Council, who spent an entire afternoon here waiting to hear speakers who were unable to speak. He did not leave the Chamber until seven o'clock, by which time he knew that the debate would no longer take place.

(Applause)

I call Mr Calvez on the same point of order.

Mr Calvez. — *(F)* Mr President, can I remind Mr Pannella that it was Mrs Pruvot who put forward the suggestion this morning that we should offer our apologies. You heard the applause with which this proposal was greeted, Mr Pannella. That settles the matter in my view.

President. — The debate will continue. I call Mr Ippolito.

Mr Ippolito. — *(I)* — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution and the report on the second five-year research programme on radioactive waste management and storage represent a notable and laudable effort to improve, as far as possible, this important research sector which, in our opinion, is not only a key sector of nuclear research but is also the sector that is hardest to understand for the initiated. I shall not waste time repeating here what the scientific and technological world considers an established and incontrovertible fact: that, in other words, this is a problem which is capable of being solved in reasonable terms and with a minimum of risk, on condition that the kind of scientific and technological research suited to this purpose is pursued. Nor shall I remind you that recently a group of highly authoritative experts brought together by the IAEA concluded by saying that the problem of the final disposal of so-called radioactive wastes was without any doubt solvable on condition that the means needed to carry out the right kind of research were made available. This is precisely, if only partially with the project which the Commission of the European Communities has proposed puts forward, which we are to debate today. In spite of this, however, Mrs Weber's report, which is unfortunately not backed up by an appropriately scientific view of the problem, goes without any doubt beyond the intentions of its drafter who contemplated the problem not from a global point of view but from a somewhat special and restrictive point of view. In other words, it was not entirely free of what I shall call nuclear psychosis, an emotional attitude which is very wide-spread within our Member States and which, were it to become the

prevailing attitude, would lead to an ever-increasing worsening of the energy crisis.

For the reasons I have just alluded to — and without wishing to quote from the most recent scientific literature on the topic one or two important conclusions, which indicate, for example, that there are significantly greater dangers for men and women and for the environment in the use of coal than those driving from storage of radioactive wastes, particularly for the future generations — we take pleasure in submitting to this House a series of amendments to the Weber resolution designed to preserve the character of the research programme relating to this matter as it was submitted to us by the Commission.

We shall elucidate these amendments tomorrow, but now I wish to draw the attention of the President and of the members of the Parliament to the fact that problems like those we are discussing here cannot be simply entrusted for examination to the Committee on the Environment and Public Health but must first of all be examined and discussed by the committee with whose remit they come, which means, by the Committee on Energy and Research.

We have presented — as I have already said — one or two amendments to Mrs Weber's motion for a resolution, amendments to which Mr Walz has already alluded. We shall illustrate these amendments more fully when we come to vote on them tomorrow. However, I want to repeat that they are mainly designed not to alter the scientific and technical character of the research programme proposed by the Commission and, for this purpose, they eliminate from the text submitted to us by the rapporteur those parts that refer to other activities which the Commission must in any case carry out, but in other capacities and with other means, an example being those concerning information. In addition, it seems to us that Mrs Weber has a tendency to confuse problems relating to temporary storage of irradiated fuel in the reactors with the final and definitive disposal of wastes, which is the main purpose of the research programme at present under examination.

Finally, we shall suggest that the text proposed by the Commission of the European Communities should not be modified as regards the economic data of the programme; in fact the Commission has provided data showing how the appropriations will be divided up amongst the various parts of the research programme so that we can have some idea of the matter, which will allow for the maximum flexibility in the management of the programme itself. This practice is usually the case with all Community research programmes and to part from it would constitute a very dangerous precedent. Moreover, the correct execution of those parts of the programme which the

Ippolito

rapporteur would like to see financially strengthened depends in the main on whether the Member States have the political will to bring their own activities in this area into line. The financial aspect of the matter is therefore very marginal.

In conclusion, to accept the amendment to the Commission's text suggested by the rapporteur would introduce, on the one hand, an element of rigidity which would be inimical to the proper management of the programme and, on the other hand, could put the Commission in the disagreeable situation of being unable to spend all the appropriations voted for these particular activities, given that appropriations might be in excess of what could actually be spent.

Our group hopes that the Commission will be able to get off to a quick and early start with its second five-year programme without being held back by the previous one, looking and asking for the maximum amount of collaboration on the part of the appropriate bodies in the Member States in order to get as close as possible, as quickly as possible, to a solution of one of the fundamental problems of nuclear safety, thereby alleviating the worries felt by members of the public in the Member States and so widely disseminating amongst the members of the public not only the final results of the research but also the partial results which have been obtained to date.

President. — I call Mrs von Alemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs von Alemann. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are now in the utterly crazy situation of discussing a programme which has already been adopted by the Council. I must say that this is not only extremely bad habit to be getting into; it is also contrary to the Treaties, and I would ask the Council most sincerely — on behalf of my group — to kindly get out of the habit.

(Applause)

This is a problem which involves more than just the programme we are discussing at the moment. Exactly the same applies to the next programme, dealing with radiation protection, on which I shall also be speaking on behalf of my group. When we come to that debate, I can only repeat what I said just now. As elected representatives of the people, I really think we have the right to discuss these extremely important matters, which are causing so much anxiety among the people, before the Council decides to adopt the programme. I should also like to comment on something Mr Sherlock said. He referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, which was responsible for drawing up this report, as 'a posse of enthusiastic amateurs'.

I should like to say to Mrs Weber — and here again I am speaking on behalf of my group — that I may not agree with all the points in her motion for a resolution, but I do not think Mr Sherlock can go around calling people who are extremely concerned about the consequences of nuclear energy and about what the public — at least in my country — thinks about it a 'posse of enthusiastic amateurs'.

I think you are greatly oversimplifying the problem and I very much regret the fact that the committees have come to such different conclusions in this case.

Let us take a closer look at what has happened. The Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Energy and Research presented their opinions, and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection — which ought ideally to include a number of members of the Committee on Energy and Research, so that environmental protection and energy policy can be properly coordinated — came to an entirely different conclusion. I suspect that this is something we shall be seeing a lot more of in this House, and I would ask all Members most sincerely to make a real effort to achieve more effective coordination of environmental protection and energy policy, as I think these are subjects we shall be discussing frequently here in the future.

Ladies and gentlemen, this second research programme is necessary, so much so that I would go so far as to say, on behalf of my group, that the 'frills', all the amendments that have been tabled to the motion for a resolution, are really not all that important; the fact is that we need this research programme. The reason that it is so important is that the radioactive waste already exists and we must protect the public and the environment. The problem of radioactive waste is closely connected with the problem of the development of nuclear energy as a whole; hence the doubts harboured by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. It is really immaterial whether we are talking about nuclear energy as a way of meeting marginal requirements or whether — as many Members of this House would prefer — the development of nuclear energy should be given absolute priority in its own right. One way or the other, the fact is that this waste already exists and we have to find some means of dealing with it and storing it.

Even those Members who are opposed to nuclear energy cannot simply reject the programme because, as I said the waste is there and something has to be done with it.

A number of Member States have already started work on promising research projects. The first programme introduced a degree of coordination into the work and the exchange of information. But let me give you one

von Alemann

example of how we think things should not be arranged. There was a bilateral agreement between the USA and the United Kingdom which — as far as I know — the Commission is aware of, but which it has not associated itself with. This programme, which is for research into storing radioactive waste in the reactor itself, covers the same ground as some similar Community research projects, and confirms the worst fears of critics who are saying that work is being duplicated, particularly in the research field. I believe the Commission should have been able to prevent this sort of thing. At any rate, we expect the Commission to acquaint itself with the programme I just mentioned and then to tell us more about it.

With the second programme, it is time to start work on pilot projects. The Nine must pool their research to find the best ways of handling and storing radioactive waste. We are concerned that the Council has cut 10 million EUA from the research budget. As this programme has been universally welcomed — and if you read the various Member States' opinion, you will find that they all thought the programme was a good and necessary thing — I really cannot see why the cuts were made. The aims of this second programme are much more ambitious and wider-ranging than the first. Ladies and gentlemen, these objectives are the right ones, because — as I said before — the public is concerned. The flow of information must be improved and research work must be coordinated. Then, of course, there is the matter of costs. The second programme will cost 60 % more than the first; this is a lot of money, but the Committee on Budgets has agreed that the expenditure is justified.

As regards the research findings, it is important that they should not remain locked up in the scientists' mind or in their archives. They must be made available to the public, and public opinion must be kept informed as the work proceeds. We therefore welcome the fact that a conference will be held in May 1980 to discuss the results of the first programme. Of course, I cannot help wondering why the Commission has not provided the people of Europe with more information over the last four years; after all, our people have a right to this information. This same point was raised earlier by Mrs Weber.

The Commission has always emphasized that the people of Europe must be supplied with objective information on nuclear energy, because — as I said before — our people are concerned, and we would be well advised not to make light of this concern. We shall be giving our support to the amendments tabled by the European People's Party and by the Communist Group — and which are supported by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection — on the financing require-

ments and the reallocation of resources. This will mean reinstating the Commission's original proposals, because the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection had originally sought to amend those proposals. I think it is now too late to make such radical changes to the financial priorities of a programme which — as I said just now — has already been adopted by the Council. I was pleased to hear Mr. Brunner say that he took the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection's suggestions on the flow of information very seriously, and to hear Mrs Walz say that alternative scenarios had indeed been considered. I think this is a subject which warrants further discussion, but I really think that the next time the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection adopts a position so diametrically opposed to that of the Committee on Energy and Research, we should perhaps have a joint meeting of the two committees and engage in a more lengthy discussion than was possible in this case.

To sum up: we need a common European policy on radioactive waste management and strategy. I think this is very largely accepted by the House. We must — and I would call on the Commission to take action here — avoid duplicating research work as far as possible. We need better information on scientifically sound ways of storing and handling radioactive waste. It would be irresponsible of us to cover even our marginal energy requirements with nuclear energy if we fail to solve the problem of how to handle and store radioactive waste. We also expect the public and the European Parliament to be kept adequately informed.

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that this discussion, which covers only one aspect of the nuclear energy debate, must be continued. The question of secure supplies of energy on the one hand and the growing concern of large sections of the population about nuclear energy on the other must be given a thorough airing in this House, and I would call on all of you to participate in this.

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

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, I would like to be associated with the remarks made by Mrs von Alemann, because I agree with the point she made. There is no doubt whatsoever that our citizens have unquiet minds, and calling us amateurs, those of us who are concerned, will not make the disquiet go away. It does no service to the idea of civil nuclear energy if we try and sweep the concern of people under the carpet, as is being done in Britain by the Atomic Energy Authority.

Ewing

For example, at a public enquiry to be held in February, the latter body is only going to allow proposed test borings to be discussed and will not allow discussion of the implications of storing waste in that part of Scotland which is actually not in my constituency. However, most of the proposed sites for test borings are in the Highland and Islands of Scotland which I represent, and I can say that perhaps it is partly this disquiet that was responsible for my election to the House. It is a very real concern, and I would say that research is at such an early stage that we really have to be fair and open to our citizens. Some of the secrecy with which the Atomic Energy Authority in the United Kingdom tries to shroud the matter is one of the most worrying aspects, even for instance to the point of withholding accident statistics. That kind of thing only makes people more concerned than ever, and I would advocate complete openness by this Community at every stage, as has been suggested already.

I want to talk about temporary storage — how temporary is temporary? In Windscale we have these tanks where some waste has been stored for 25 years and we are no nearer a solution, because our research which is now looking at reducing the waste to solid form after 20 years research on the vitrified glass process, is still not really developed. We simply do not know how to dispose of this waste safely, and anyone who says that we do is misleading the public. That is the first point I would like to make.

There is great concern about the selection of sites not only in Scotland but also in other parts of the Community. Clay is one of the substances used, and there is plenty of clay in the south of England. There is also clay in many other countries, and there is salt in Germany. Much concern has been felt. However, another matter causing public disquiet is the transport of the waste. We spend a lot of time in this House discussing fishing, yet we are transporting waste through the Minch, one of the richest fishing grounds in Europe. It is usually the press which leaks this kind of information to the public, and then there have to be admissions after the event. They are transporting it by rail and they are transporting it by lorry. The thought of an accident is absolutely horrifying, and there is no way that we can go on doing this without having a bad accident some day.

These are things that the public are entitled to be concerned about and on which, frankly, in the UK at any rate, we are not getting answers. For instance, we had an exercise recently off Caithness in the very north of Scotland to simulate what would happen if plutonium containers fell overboard and to see if they could be recovered. That came out from the press, and only after the information is out do we then get some kind of statement from the authorities. This is no way to treat the public. The public are right to be concerned. This is a unique issue affecting generations

as yet unborn. It is a unique human issue, perhaps one of the biggest unsolved problems in the world today. If only we in this Community could be more open, with every State telling the public frankly of the dangers and not trying to hide them, that would be the best way of proceeding.

I mentioned that one of the possible methods of disposal is hard rock, and, of course, we in Scotland have a great deal of this stuff. I know that experts disagree, but as I understand it, hard rock has one or two problems attached to it. One of these, certainly in our country, is water seepage, because, of course, we have rather a lot of water too. Another is fissures in the rock; these two factors seem to make it unsuitable in the event of an earthquake. Now you would think perhaps that we do not have earthquakes in Scotland, but we just had one very recently. This, of course, immediately revived public alarm at the thought of possible waste disposal in hard rocks, when we found that we too can have earthquakes.

There is a real fear in Scotland because of our large incidence of hard rock and because of our low density of population. Perhaps the Community has designs on the Highlands and Islands in particular, and other parts of Scotland too, as some kind of nuclear dustbin. One of the speakers mentioned the creation of fear, but fears are not being created. They are already there and they are growing, particularly because of the high-handed way in which public concern is dismissed.

In connection with deep storage we are at a very elementary stage of our research. I would suggest to you that behind this debate today there is the implicit assumption and I think it came from Commissioner Gundelach, that we are all committed to going ahead with more and more nuclear energy. However, I would question whether we have any right to commit ourselves until we have more information about how to dispose of the monstrous stuff we are creating. In Britain at the present time only 3.7% of the UK demand comes from this source, yet it accounts for 35% of our research spending. I am all for more research, because we have the waste already, as one speaker said, and we have to find a method of disposing of it. There is no way round this, so to that extent I welcome Mrs Weber's work in this Committee and her report. I also like the paragraphs that Mr Sherlock took exception to and I would particularly hope these paragraphs will be left in.

There is a kind of debonair lack of information and planning. On a very recent programme on the BBC there were three experts arguing for further types of reactor, and there were three speakers against. One of these latter speakers was not against the programme on moral grounds; he was against it because he said that up to now we have wasted a lot of money on the wrong kind of reactor and that we were liable to make the same mistake again. Apart from the moral aspect, which I have already dealt with in these brief remarks,

Ewing

perhaps we are going in the wrong direction from the technical point of view. I think the eventual statement from the Atomic Energy Authority's spokesman was that we would build one of the new watercooler reactors and see how we got on from there. It really seems to me that we might do better to insulate every house in the United Kingdom; at least we could calculate the cost of that. I am not one who believes that nuclear energy is a cheap option. There is absolutely no evidence to show that anyone knows the global cost of it.

Very briefly then, I want it to be quite in the open that we do not yet know how to dispose safely of radioactive waste. I want the Community to be open with its citizens and tell them exactly what the risks are, and to carry out constant medical research on accidents, particularly on the instances of leukaemia, as has been done around the Windscale area where it has doubled in the last 10 years. We talked today about the dark and the light. Well, I am in favour of a lot more light being cast on this subject and of not rushing into options before they have been properly researched.

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to start by saying that I assume we are not holding this debate today to fill in time, since there are plenty of other ways in which we could do that, but because this is a subject which we take seriously. We hope that the Council in particular, even if it has already decided its position — and, of course, the Commission, which is in fact represented here will bear this in mind.

I have the greatest respect for Mrs Weber's contribution and I should like to stress this point since I have a strong impression that she has had to produce a synthesis of a great many divergent viewpoints, which she has done in a very positive manner. However, there is one particular point which I should like to raise which concerns both the Commission's proposal to the Council and Mrs Weber's report, i.e. the fact that both documents work on the assumption that we intend to continue with the nuclear energy programme. This is a political assumption. Subsequently, both the proposal and the report deal only with questions of the treatment and storage of radioactive waste. This is a scientific and technical problem.

This Parliament is, or at least should be, a political forum. I do not therefore need to dwell too long on the technical aspects and I will use my speaking time mainly to go into the political assumptions involved. Nuclear waste is one of the greatest, if not *the* greatest problem arising from the use of nuclear energy. Apart from the question of where we are to keep the nuclear waste, there is the problem of safety and proliferation. The report rightly proposes including in this programme a study of these risks in connection with

the possible export of radioactive waste to third countries in this programme. The urgency of the question of nuclear waste and the extent to which it is becoming a cause for concern in the major countries is apparent from the fact that the Netherlands sends the waste from the nuclear plant in Borssele to be treated at La Hague in France. However, as from 1 January 1980, the residual waste is being sent back and this is becoming a general trend. The other countries are fully prepared to treat the waste, but send the residues back to where they came from. This is symptomatic of the situation. The problem has by no means been solved, as is also clear from the programme, which has as its primary objective work towards solving certain technological problems posed by radioactive waste.

The crucial political question is, I think, whether it is justifiable to build new nuclear plants before a solution has been found to the problem of processing and storing waste. In the Netherlands, those who, in the light of this, even advocate shutting down the existing nuclear plants are becoming more and more vociferous. At any rate, there is the question of whether it is acceptable to go ahead with the somewhat ambitious European nuclear energy programmes, if, as we know, the problem of waste is far from having been solved satisfactorily. This is a problem which is completely glossed over in both the proposed programme and the report. Both documents work on the unqualified assumption that the use of nuclear energy will continue with the production of radioactive waste which this will inevitably involve. The Commission's proposal states, and I quote, that 'it is therefore essential to implement effective solutions to safeguard the public and protect the environment against potential hazards associated with the management of such waste', and the motion for a resolution even states that the amount of radioactive waste produced by the nuclear power station in operation has already reached such a critical level that a solution to the existing problems has become a matter of urgency.

In other words, all we have is an acknowledgement of the fact that the risks and the scale of the problem are already a serious cause for alarm with existing nuclear power stations, and that we have still to find solutions to this problem in spite of the research and all the work which has already been done— witness the last five-year programme. Thus, there are at present not even any prospects of finding solutions to these problems, and yet, without even considering the question of whether this problem should be allowed to continue, people are proposing to make it far greater still by stepping up the use of nuclear energy and hence inevitably the production of radioactive waste.

In this connection I should also like to say a few words to Mr Sherlock, since I really wonder where he gets this boundless wisdom which entitles him to dismiss anyone who does not share his views on nuclear energy as amateurs or sentimentalists. I do not

Dekker

know exactly how I am supposed to interpret this, but I should nevertheless like to ask him to put this obvious wisdom of his work in trying to find these solutions which are so vitally needed, since I by no means agree with this conclusion that all you need to do is simply ask the scientists to solve a problem and they come up with an answer just like that. After all, a lot of scientific work has already been done on this problem of nuclear waste. There has been an enormous amount of research, but so far we have simply not found any solutions. The situation is typical. Why is the problem so great? Why is it so difficult, why are the solutions so long in coming? The main reason is the incredibly long time for which the danger will persist — a problem which is also recognized in the report, which speaks of the need to protect not only the present generation but also future generations against the harmful effects of nuclear waste.

Firstly, there is the possibility of storing the waste. This is a temporary solution, since stored waste is still accessible and must therefore be guarded for hundreds or, according to some, thousands of years — and we cannot make such long-term provisions. Society is not that stable. Furthermore, a storage site is a sitting target for terrorists.

Then there is the possibility of final storage, in which case there is no longer any need to guard the waste since it is no longer inaccessible. This means enclosing radioactive waste in concrete and throwing it into the sea in the Bay of Biscay as is done by the Netherlands, among others.

Another alternative is reprocessing, which is put forward as *the* way of reducing the scale of the waste problem and is also mentioned in the report. However, quite apart from the proliferation risks which it involves, this is not the means *par excellence*, since reprocessing itself produces high-level waste so that on balance the amount of high-level waste would rather tend to be greater than if there were no reprocessing.

Finally, there is the possibility of storage underground and disposal in salt formations. This method is still being studied and it is by no means certain that it is a good solution. The experts are by no means agreed as to whether or not it is feasible since it must be certain that the radioactive waste can never find its way into the drinking-water system and that there are no risks of any contact whatsoever with the outside environment.

How stable is a salt formation, particularly in the very long term, i.e. over the period which would be involved? What are the chances of geological formations of this kind undergoing changes or shiftings? Both mining experts and geologists are extremely uncertain on this point. I will not go into the under-

lying scientific debate here today, but is an established fact that the experts are by no means agreed on this. In other words, nothing in this field is certain. The Netherlands Parliament takes the view that the relevant research can only be done after the outcome is known of the broad social debate on the use of nuclear energy, since any experiments would, as it were, be jumping the gun.

The Commission makes particular mention in its proposal of public opposition to experimental drilling as this is holding up work — indeed, to such an extent that this is put forward as a particular reason for shifting appropriations to the treatment and processing of waste at the expense of storage and disposal. I should like to add to the criticism, contained in paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution, of the proposed shift of emphasis towards according the same attention to treatment and processing as to storage and disposal, since this fails to take adequate account of the fundamental question of whether it will be possible to find any solution at all to the problem of disposal — which should be the factor which decides whether the nuclear energy programme is to be continued or not.

This brings me to the more general aspects of the question, partly in the light of certain points made in the explanatory statement, particularly in so far as it takes a less optimistic view of the place of nuclear energy in our energy supplies and quotes Mr Natali, who said that perhaps too much importance had been accorded to this form of energy.

I should like to look at the problem from the point of view of price, since the energy problem is first and foremost a price problem — which makes the problem of nuclear energy even greater. Although for completely different reasons, the price of nuclear energy is rising in a similar way to that of oil, particularly since safety requirements have been made so much more stringent, especially following the Harrisburg incident, the analysis of which showed that accidents can only be avoided if human action is eliminated as far as possible.

This means that the price per kilowatt-hour of nuclear energy will rise even further. The fact that the price of nuclear energy is, for quite independent reasons, keeping pace with the price of oil, puts the use of nuclear energy and hence the development of alternative bulk-energy sources, such as oil from tar sands and shale, the gasification of coal and the use of alcohol as fuel, in a different light. This development would in fact lead to a completely different distribution of the producing areas around the world. Even though I am pleased at the car with which many different types of activity have been proposed in this programme, I was anxious to put this issue in a somewhat broader context.

Dekker

The fact that there are no signs of any solutions being found leads my colleague and myself to take the view that we must be extremely cautious in carrying out these ambitious nuclear energy programmes.

Following on from what I have just said, I should also like to make a few observations regarding Amendments Nos 10 and 29 which I have tabled together with Mr Coppieters and Mr Capanna and which are interrelated. They contain proposed additions to the motion for a resolution in the Weber report and to the programme proposed by the Commission respectively. These amendments propose including an additional research topic in the relevant part of the programme, i.e. a study of the possible consequences, particularly as regards the long-term safety of the use of nuclear energy, if no adequate solution is found to the problem of waste before the programme is completed.

This forms a logical complement to the research topics already included in the programme and, for this reason, I was very pleased to hear from Mr Brunner this morning that projects, which he described as very interesting, already exist for studying the consequences of calling a halt to the use of nuclear energy. I conclude from this that he might well be able to give his support to our amendments. Moreover, it would be inconsistent, not to say irresponsible, if we were to shut our eyes to the very real possibility that no solution may be found since, as I have already said in my observations regarding the report, both the Commission proposal and the report state quite clearly that the solutions have yet to be found. Thus, it is by no means out of the question — and in saying this I do not wish to pass judgment in any way — that no solutions will be found in the coming five years covered by this programme either.

It would thus be a gross omission if we had not even discussed the consequences this would have. There is also the fact that, as the report makes quite clear, the amounts of waste produced so far have already reached critical levels and, according to the proposal, the management of this waste involves incalculable risks to the safety of the public and the environment — in other words, to our existence. It would hardly be possible for more to be at risk. If we at least include in the programme the additional research proposed in this amendment, we will also be averting the otherwise obvious criticism that Community policy is too one-sided on this issue and that, particularly as regards these unsolved risks, the Community is pursuing a head-in-the-sand policy. The amendment thus forms an essential addition which will enable us to stand the test and will render the programme balanced and acceptable.

President. — I call Mrs Charzat.

Mrs Charzat. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the proposals from the European Parlia-

ment's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on the second five-year programme on radioactive waste management and storage call for three main observations on my part.

Firstly, in the absence of a definition for the concept of radioactive waste, this report perpetuates the confusion regarding this term. This applies in particular to paragraph 1 of the motion which in effect, confuses low-activity waste, which is produced in relatively large quantities and does not present any major problems regarding treatment and storage, and high-activity waste from the reprocessing of irradiated fuel, which can be stored and vitrified and is produced in fairly small amounts.

In the nuclear energy field radioactive waste results from the combination of two factors: a material containing radioactivity and the fact that there is no use for this material. In view of this, we should consider the definition of the term 'radioactive waste' given by the Nuclear Energy Agency of the OECD:

Any material, containing radionuclides or contaminated by radionuclides in a concentration which exceeds the values regarded by the competent authorities as admissible for materials suitable for unrestricted use or for discharge and for which no use is intended.

consequently, a distinction should be made between two main groups of products in irradiated fuel: on the one hand there are the usable sub-products, i.e. the fission products which constitute the raw material for reprocessing and are invariably produced and on the other hand the high-activity waste which, together with medium and low-activity waste, must be managed in such a way as to minimize the risks for present and future generations. This distinction gives rise to two possible strategies which differ both in economic and technical terms and in terms of the risk of proliferation. The first regards reprocessing and the storage of waste as inseparable aspects of the nuclear energy programme, while the second comes down to storing irradiated fuel containing fissile material, which presents considerable risks both for future generations and with regard to nuclear proliferation without, however, resolving the problem of the possible energy shortage which constitutes one of the major risks of war in the world today.

My second point concerns paragraphs 4 and 7. In this field, the first programme, like the second simply covers the problem of nuclear waste and not the reprocessing of irradiated fuel. There is thus some confusion on the concept of research into the processing of the various kinds of waste. The five-year programme must give priority to research on the processing, packaging and storage of low, medium and high-activity waste attention must be given to studies on the legal and financial aspects and the various strategies but on a lesser scale.

Charzat

My third point is on paragraph 12. As far as we know, there are no plans for the storage of irradiated material in the developing countries, unless the Committee on Public Health has any further information for us. The risks of proliferation are the result of political intentions much more than of the development of civil nuclear capacity.

In conclusion, to return to the problem of radioactive waste, it is contradictory to maintain that the problem of waste has not yet been mastered, while at the same time opposing the solutions and measures which are necessary for the management and storage of waste. That is why in this particularly sensitive area Community cooperation is essential and represents the most logical solution for choosing the most reliable technological processes, recognized by all the Member States, and the storage sites which offer maximum security to present and future generations.

IN THE CHAIR : MR GONELLA*Vice-President*

President. — I call Mr Hutton.

Mr Hutton. — As a simple Scotsman, I tremble to follow four such able and glamorous speakers as the last four ladies, and I hesitate especially to comment on the report of the equally attractive rapporteur, Mrs Weber. But let me, ladies and gentlemen, try to distract your attention from these ladies for a moment and carry you far away from this Chamber to the proud hills of Galloway in my large and beautiful area of the south of Scotland, where there stands a mountain which was hardly known until a year or two ago. It was, and indeed it still is, a favourite haunt of hill walkers and birdwatchers. It is difficult to get to but it is well worth the effort to climb to the summit and to survey the grandeur of the Galloway hills rolling away on all sides.

Now the name of this mountain is a household word in the south-west of Scotland entirely because of nuclear waste, but it was not the research scientists who seek to drill granite from the heart of Mullwhar-char who have put its name on everyone's lips but the people who oppose them. For the disposal of radioactive waste has become one of those magnetic subjects which has attracted a great many people with a great many motives. It has attracted a great deal of emotion, and the scientists are learning that the serious work of finding a solution does not have the support and understanding of the public. The use of the terms 'dumping' and 'dustbin' to describe the storage of waste is a good example of the kind of emotion I am referring to. I do not suppose that greater care has ever been taken over the storage of anything, but the effect on the public is to suggest a dangerous indiffer-

ence. Especially in the areas where research is proposed, the real public fear has been skilfully mobilized to oppose the research and to build up opposition to nuclear power as a whole.

In our democracies anybody who has an opinion can put it before his fellow citizens and try and persuade them to share it. It is a precious freedom, but it is only of help to the public if they have a fair choice of arguments before them. So far those people who are genuinely afraid and those people who oppose nuclear power have presented their view forcefully and constantly. But those who want to carry out the research have seemed shy of engaging in the rough and tumble of public debate and in telling people what they are doing. This has been a great disservice to the public. I say then to the researcher, you must go out and convince the people, and if you cannot or will not, then you must face the consequences. The researchers must go out and involve the people in their work. They must explain what nuclear waste is, and what they want to do with it. The boffins know, the pressure groups know, but the people are being treated like mushrooms; they are being kept in the dark and fed on scraps.

The problem, as so many speakers have already said, is not theoretical. We have the waste with us now. We need to get on and find the best way of dealing with it. We need a united effort to get this done as safely and as quickly as possible with the full understanding of the people. Sadly, I do not think this report altogether helps us, in this very serious purpose. It is a politically charged document which tries to use this sensitive and important subject to gain political advantage. That to me is deeply disappointing, as it is to all of us who are worried about this subject indeed, and none of us here can support any attempt to use this subject as a political football. Consequently, we are supporting those amendments which bear this group's name.

Ladies and gentlemen, nuclear radiation does not notice any difference between people's politics, so I want to see us take the subject out of the party political argument and unite to find the right answer to this research for all the people of Europe.

President. — I call Mrs Le Roux.

Mrs Le Roux. — (*F*) Mr President, we are in favour of working together to carry out major scientific and industrial projects which are in the interest of our various countries, particularly in the field of energy and, more specifically, with the support of public bodies.

We are in favour of encouraging scientific and technical cooperation with the aim of protecting living conditions and the environment and combating pollution of all kind.

Le Roux

We note that the outgoing five-year programme has led to fruitful exchanges with regard to the appreciation and dissemination of findings obtained both within the Community and in conjunction with other countries. The programme has made it possible for this costly and complex research to be carried out in optimum financial and technical conditions, and we hope this will continue.

At the same time, there is a need to take care to respect the strict independence of the various countries, to respect the rights of each country and to carry out the research which each country regards as necessary for its development and national independence.

Considerable progress has been made in the field of storing radioactive waste. All this confirms the value of pursuing this course and undertaking a second programme. I should like, however, on behalf of the French Communists and Allies, to make a number of comments and express certain reservations on the report presented by Mrs Weber.

The report refers to a critical level reached by the quantity of radioactive waste produced by the power stations in operation. We dispute this assertion, which in fact rests on a confusion, as has already been mentioned.

The rapporteur for the Committee on the Environment proposes not to follow the Commission and to lay the main emphasis on storage, putting off till later research on the treatment of nuclear waste.

For our part, we share the view that joint research should cover both the treatment and the storage of low- medium- and high-activity waste.

Lastly, we feel we must express two reservations on this report. The first concerns paragraph 12 regarding the need to review projects by member countries to store radioactive materials outside the European Community, particularly in developing countries. We wonder what this paragraph means. How can the rapporteur, who belongs to a group which declares concern for the Community's relations with the developing countries, countenance any such possibilities? The countries which choose to use nuclear energy must accept not only its advantages but also its drawbacks.

My second reservation concerns the rapporteur's proposal for financing a study on the terms of public acceptance of storage and treatment, as well as for the dissemination of information and public participation in the decision-making process. In the field of nuclear energy, these questions are the responsibility of the national governments, the elected national parliaments and of the citizens of the countries concerned. Anything which goes against this would be interference and supranationalism.

President. — I call Mr Linkohr.

Mr Linkohr. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think we should avoid the danger of

engaging in a kind of nuclear debate by proxy, which would not be in keeping with the subject of today's debate. Nor do I think this should be a debate between what appear to be the prophets of doom and the zealots of progress. That may be something for another occasion, but my feeling is that this debate is sufficiently important for us to stick to the point. There are, to my mind, three problems: firstly, the storage of nuclear waste; secondly, the question of proliferation; and thirdly, the question of basic rights.

Starting with the problem of the storage of nuclear waste, I think we can say that neither the European Community nor any other country in the world has any viable final storage facilities; nor can we expect such facilities to be available before the turn of the century — or the turn of the millennium, depending on how you look at it — if at all. Radioactive waste has so far been stored in interim facilities. The Community has research programmes on subterranean final storage of radioactive waste in crystalline rock structures — principally granite. The Belgians and Italians are concentrating on clay formations, whereas research in the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany is concentrating on salt domes. The fact is that we simply do not know what to do with the radioactive waste which we shall be producing in large quantities over the coming years. It is somewhat paradoxical to start using a technology without knowing what to do with the resulting waste, and it is therefore important that some thought should be given to this point. On the other hand, we must proceed carefully with the increased use of nuclear energy, so that we produce as little radioactive waste as possible.

The second problem is that of nuclear proliferation. Since 1967, we have had the Non-Proliferation Treaty to give us protection in this field. The aim of the agreement was to institute checks to ensure that fissile materials from civilian facilities were not being secretly misdirected into military channels. Such abuses have frequently and rightly been criticized in the past. We thus need more rigorous checks. We should also give some thought to what proliferation-proof alternatives there are to the present uranium-plutonium fuel cycle, and this is where I come to Mrs Weber's report. Are there any such alternatives, for instance the use of thorium, or the direct final storage of nuclear waste? This is something that will have to be considered, and when I hear that this question is to be dealt with in the INFCE (International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation) Report, I really wonder why the initiative in these matters always has to come from the USA. What is there to prevent the European Community considering such questions and making a little money available in this field?

The third problem, which Mrs Weber very rightly dealt with in her report, is that of basic rights. Ladies and gentlemen, if you have ever visited a factory or

Linkohr

facility which handles nuclear fuel, and if you have ever made your way through the barbed wire fences, past the guard dogs straining at the leash or resting quietly, and if you have even been given the once-over and had a little badge stuck on you, as people who work there have to do, you are bound to wonder whether what is going on there is a normal business like any other. I rather think it is anything but that. What we are confronted with here is a highly dangerous activity which affects people's basic rights. This House would, I think, be well advised to give some thought to the question and to spend a little money on it. To this extent, I think this report has raised important points. We should now not just content ourselves with voting on amendments tabled by one political group or another. We must go into these questions further.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, I am speaking as a member of the Committee on Energy and Research and not the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. But as I am the last Member to speak in this debate, I think that perhaps the few people here would like just to hear my opinion on some of the points that have been raised, because they have not been answered so far.

Mr Linkohr has just said that we should devote more attention to proliferation and basic rights. Mr President, this is a technical research programme, and not a political research programme, and if we divert money from the technical research to these political problems, there will be insufficient money for finding the proper solution to the technical problems of waste treatment and disposal. That seems to me to be obvious.

Mrs von Alemann said it was a pity the opinions of the Committee on Energy and Research and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection differed so much and she called for a grand debate between the two committees. Now as far as the Christian-Democrats and the European Democratic Group are concerned, the Walz amendment are the result of close consultation between our energy and environment Members, and there is no significant difference between any of us on the amendments which Mrs Walz put forward.

Mrs Ewing, who unfortunately has had to leave to catch an aeroplane, says that leukaemia has doubled round Windscale. What is her basis for that wild remark? What does 'round Windscale' mean? Does it mean five miles, ten miles, one mile? Has it occurred to her that the population round Windscale has probably doubled since that huge factory was put there? This is the sort of remark that is hindering the progress of the whole nuclear power project.

Mrs Dekker who is kindly still here, says you cannot plan to store nuclear waste for thousands of years. Why not? Certainly you can and you must. It would be ridiculous to have a moratorium on nuclear power until the problem of waste has been solved. What does solved mean? This is a horizon which we shall never actually reach. We must aim at what is an acceptable level of risk.

Now, while the report of Mrs Weber is excellent in many ways, it is unfortunately misleading in other ways. It gives the general impression that nuclear waste storage and disposal technology is quite inadequate at present. This is absolutely wrong. Certainly within the Community, that is in Europe rather than in other places, the situation is quite well under control as far as waste processing and management are concerned. That does not mean that in the next twenty years improved techniques will not be needed. They will. But by exaggerating problems Mrs Weber's report gives ammunition to certain types of eco-fanatics who are out to stop nuclear power everywhere and for ever. I sympathize with Mrs Weber because it is very difficult to point to the research work which should be done without opening the door to the anti-nuclear movement.

The elimination of nuclear power would be a much bigger disaster than the limited amount of radiation which is now released in the atmosphere or under ground. Ecologists have the most excellent motives, but they do not put the proper choice before the public. The real choice is between nuclear power which may injure a small number of people periodically, and a major shortage of power with mass unemployment and possibly a nuclear war over energy supplies.

The percentage of deaths and injury from nuclear power is far lower than from road, rail or air transport, and far lower than from coalmines or hydro-electric dams. If the ecologists treated these industries in the same way as they treat nuclear power we would have to stop the pattern of life as we know it. Let us face it, it is a fact that despite the advances of medical science some people do unfortunately die in childbirth, but is this a reason to stop human procreation? Surely we must keep a sense of proportion and enjoyment. So while we admire the Weber report in many ways, we have proposed 17 amendments with the Christian-Democrats in a way, I think, that rectifies the wrong impression it gives that its operation is defective.

The present methods of storage and the new methods of immobilizing waste by vitrification mentioned in the Commission's proposals promise to be very effective. Excellent work is being done, in the JRCs, in the United States and at Dounreay in Scotland in the reduction of actinides, the transplutonium isotopes, which have a very long half-life. Actinides can in fact be separated and then reduced and even eliminated by

Seligman

being burnt up in a fast-breeder reactor. As a result of this the radiation power of these actinides, even if they go into underground water, would have less radiation power than the uranium from which they originally came. Actinides can therefore be eliminated as a long-term problem for future Commission proposals. Let us express confidence in the conscientious work of our nuclear scientists. They hold the key to our future. Above all, let us give them every help to establish the facts about such things as geological storage of vitrified waste. Let us not use emotional words like 'nuclear dustbins'. Mrs Ewing said that we do not know how to dispose of nuclear waste. She must support the investigations in Scotland which will provide the answer. Let us on no account accept paragraph 14 of the Weber resolution which takes 6 million units of account away from the treatment and conditioning of nuclear waste, and spreads it thinly over additional non-technical research into such matters as legal, administrative and financial aspects. The Commission needs every penny it can get to strengthen scientific research into reducing the volume and toxicity of waste. Public opinion will soon catch up, once we have found the scientific know-how. Finally, a glancing reference by Mrs Weber to the Harrisburg accident, on page 14, is very misleading. There is no technical similarity between a nuclear power station accident and the problem of nuclear waste disposal. In English we would call this a 'red herring'. Apart from all that, I congratulate Mrs Weber on producing a very interesting report, which would be quite acceptable if she were to accept the 17 amendments that we propose. I also think that she should accept the 11 amendments from Mr Ippolito, which are extremely sensible and balanced. Mrs Weber is quite right when she says that all technical decisions have a political importance. However, there is no room for political extremes. A balanced realistic approach to nuclear waste disposal is vital to the welfare and the way of life of future generations.

President. — I call Mrs Weber.

Mrs Weber, *rapporteur*. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted that my report has given rise to such a thorough debate. I was not at all upset to hear certain views which have been put forward today, because they bring out a number of points extremely clearly. Let me begin by commenting on what Mr Sherlock had to say. I must say, Mr Sherlock, that I do not altogether share your opinion of scientists. This may be due to the fact you yourself are a scientist and I am what is known as an amateur. Let me tell you, though, that when I first began to go into the problem of nuclear power and nuclear energy, I tried to work my way through something like two metres' worth of books. The first half-metre was for nuclear energy, the second half-metre

against nuclear energy and the rest was on the fence. All the books were written by *bona fide* scientists, so it would appear that not all scientists share the same view after all.

Secondly, I do not quite see how — now that we have had nuclear power stations for something like 20 years and are now gradually starting to think seriously about storing the waste — you can still have such a high regard for science. Would it not have been sensible to show some concern for this problem rather earlier and to give some thought to what to do with all the stuff that is being produced all over the place?

(Applause)

I also believe that Mr Seligman's cynical comment — and cynical really is the only word for it — that we can all put up with a limited amount of radiation is, scientifically speaking, highly dubious. I am sure that Mr Sherlock — who is sitting next to you — will be able to confirm that. Just a little of radiation over a long period could turn out to be extremely harmful. Unfortunately, it is not possible to be just slightly dead. I believe we have a responsibility not only to bear in mind our children's supplies of energy and electricity and to think about ways of safeguarding those supplies, but also to give some thought to the quality of our children's lives. I do not think this is an amateurish view to take; nor do I believe that it is something politicians should steer clear of discussing. I sometimes wonder — and we had an extremely long discussion on this point in committee — what we are trying to do here in this Parliament. I believe this problem deserves our urgent attention, and all these complaints that I am deliberately trying to delay the programme are completely without foundation. We cannot simply put a problem like this to one side and pretend it doesn't exist. We must realize that what we are doing is spending gigantic amounts of money — more than has ever been spent on any technology before and probably more than will ever be spent on any technology again — on something, the consequences of which are at the very least regarded as dubious by reputable scientists. I believe we must look into whether these doubts are justified, and we politicians must give some thought to where we should at least try to get a foot in the door. That is all I want. If you have read this report carefully, you will have seen that I am in favour of the programme in principle. I think it important for some means of safe storage to be found. But, after such a long period of uncritical acceptance, I should like to make the point for once, that there are other things we should be thinking about and that it is not enough to build up our technical research capacity: we also need research into the broader implications. If money cannot be spent in this field, that is the first sign we have of an obvious failure to take action where it was desperately needed.

Weber

Before going any further, I should like to clear up a few doubts on procedural matters. It may have sounded as though I was speaking here on my own behalf or on behalf of my group. I was the rapporteur for my committee, and of the 18 members of the committee present — including representatives of almost all the political groups — 13 voted for the report and 5 abstained. In other words, the honourable spokesmen for the other groups who have spoken here today either voted for the report or abstained — they certainly did not vote against. That being so, I fail to see why everyone is making such a to-do all at once, as if things hadn't followed their proper course. I must say — and I am sorry if this sounds a bit harsh — that if a report was discussed in October, voted on in committee for the first time in November and finally at the beginning of December, and was available in time for our last plenary session at the beginning of December, the Committee on Energy and Research and its chairman must surely have had time to get in touch with the Committee on the Environment — particularly if you think this subject is so important that you feel obliged to stand up and accuse us of acting irresponsibly. To my mind, this is the wrong way of going about things. I have tried to do my job as rapporteur and to report our discussion and the subsequent voting as objectively as possible and — unlike other speakers in the past — I have not deviated from the discussion we had in committee in any shape or form. In the course of tomorrow's vote, we shall be taking a look at the amendments one by one, and I shall be saying what I think of them then.

I should like once again to draw the attention of all Members of this House in all seriousness to the fact that — as I see our work — it is not right for us to take a purely technical view of problems like this. As I said in my introductory statement, it is our job to add the political dimension. It sounded almost like an insult when someone claimed earlier that we only wanted to make political mileage out of this question.

I think, however, that it is a good thing for us to add a political dimension to a technical programme like this. I would ask you therefore to accept this responsibility of behalf of the people who elected you for that purpose and not just for saying yes or no at the appropriate times.

(Applause)

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

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, I want to ask for an explanation, not raise an objection.

It has been established that amendments must be moved during the general debate. This is your version, the official version. The moving of amendments, which is required if they are to be put to the vote, must be a separate event because the Rules of Proce-

dure make provision, for amendments as well, for the right of other persons to speak, and not only the rapporteur and the signatories of the amendments.

We are on the verge of the downward path towards nullifying the Rules of Procedure by virtue of these *faits accomplis*. A word of explanation from the Chair, Mr President, might in my view put a stop to any serious misunderstandings. When amendments have been tabled, I think that once the debate is over the President should ask if anyone wants to speak in support of his amendments, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. If this offer is rejected, the amendments obviously fall. If they are moved on the other hand, there will be a debate on them. I insist that the Rules of Procedure be followed.

President. — All the Members who had their names down for the debate have been able to speak. As you are aware, the deadline for the list of speakers was midday. However, there is nothing to stop a Member asking leave to speak on the amendments, and he will certainly not be denied this right.

Mr Pannella. — This seems a right a proper decision.

President. — I am delighted that I have been able to satisfy you, Mr Pannella, which as you know is no easy task. In any case, the principle is safeguarded on this point and what Mr Pannella really likes is principle.

(Laughter)

I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — *(F)* Mr President, I shall be very brief, since Mr Branner has already dealt with most of the questions raised, and I shall confine myself to three points.

Firstly, at one point Mrs von Alemann wondered whether the Council had already taken its decision on the programme, thus anticipating the opinion of Parliament. As the guardian of the Treaties, the Commission is careful to see that the proper procedures are followed. The precise situation is as follows: last October, the Council discussed the fundamental questions and arrived at an overall consensus. This consensus has not yet been translated into legal form, which means that the decision has not yet been taken. In strict legal terms, Parliament will be delivering its opinion before the Council has taken its decision.

As regards the underlying question, this involved a problem of organization in the work of Parliament. The Commission proposals concerning this second programme date back to March 1979. The Council, for once, made rapid progress in drawing up the programmes, and what is needed is thus to coordinate the pace of work in the Council and that in Parliament. It is programmes of this type which have implications for the annual budgets.

Davignon

Then there is the fact that it is rather difficult to make a distinction between political background to this programme and its scientific and technical aspects; this was what Mrs Dekker and the rapporteur, Mrs Weber, were talking about. For its part, the Commission is anxious for these programmes, which have a precise technical purpose not to be seen in isolation from the general political framework within which they are to produce their effects. This is quite clear. There is no need to make an artificial distinction between the characteristics of a programme and the effects it is to produce. It is thus not only inevitable but desirable that this debate should take on a wider aspect.

That said, if a five-year programme is being proposed it goes without saying that it is of a scientific nature, even though it fits into the context that I mentioned. That is why, for example, we have not dealt in our programme and had no reason to deal with the question raised by Mrs Dekker, i.e. the export of waste. That is not among our priorities in this context. It is possible, given the actual situation, to pursue other activities? That is another question. But I think that sooner or later an opinion must be delivered on this programme and on this programme alone, naturally having regard to both political and technical considerations.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

12. *Decision adopting a five-year radiation protection programme*

President. — The next item is the debate on the report (Doc. 1-552/79), drawn up by Mr Ghergo on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on:

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 88/79) for a decision adopting a five-year research and training programme (1980-1984) of the EAEC in the field of biology and health protection (radiation protection programme).

President. — I call Mr Ghergo.

Mr Ghergo, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, the programme submitted for an opinion to the European Parliament is the fifth in a series of research programmes in the field of radiation protection carried out under Community auspices. The first began in 1959 and the fourth, which is still under way, began on 1 January 1976 and is expected to come to an end during the course of this year.

The proposed new programme should have begun on 1 January 1980, would have partly overlapped with the previous programme and would have come to an end on 31 December 1984.

As regards the budget appropriations for the period 1981-1984, the Commission has assessed the overall requirements for the programme to be 58.2 million u. a., plus approximately 10 million u. a. for the year 1980, which will be entirely covered by the appropriation of 39 million u. a. for the period 1976-1980.

The main aims of the proposed programme are:

- to improve technical and scientific knowledge in order to update basic data on protection of public health in general and protecting workers against the risks of ionizing radiation;
- to assess the biological and ecological consequences of nuclear activity, the use of nuclear energy and ionizing radiation, in order to provide for adequate protection for both man and the environment in cases in which they are exposed to unacceptable damage.

On the basis of what has been set out in greater detail in the written report, we believe we can give a favourable opinion on the research programme proposed by the Commission of the European Communities: in fact, there is no doubt, that the risk of exposure to ionizing radiation has increased significantly over recent years and will probably tend to increase in the near future in all the Member States of the Community.

As a consequence of technological and scientific progress and economic and social developments, the applications of ionizing radiation have been significantly extended and as a result the risks of exposure to such radiation for individuals and for the community at large have also significantly increased.

At present, the main uses of radiant energy are:

- a) industrial uses
- b) medical applications
- c) military uses.

In addition to these sources of exposure, which may be called artificial inasmuch as they are the deliberate creation of man, there also exist numerous natural sources such as cosmic rays and the natural radiation to be found in the environment and in the radioactive substances contained in the human body. The total level of exposure resulting from natural sources is very modest and is not generally dangerous unless such natural sources are combined with artificial sources.

The term 'ionizing radiation' means radiation which gives rise to an ionizing of the substance exposed to it, that is to say, to the creation of an atom bearing a positive charge and an electron bearing a negative charge. Whereas in normal conditions the atom is electrically 'neutral', inasmuch as it is made up of protons (which are positive) and electrons (which are negative), the effect of ionizing radiation is to make one of these electrons move towards the outer edge of its orbit

Ghergo

within the atom or even escape from the atomic system altogether: in the first case a more or less large quantity of energy is released, whilst in the second ions are produced, that is to say, the atom acquires a positive electrical charge (positive ion) and the free electron takes on a negative charge (negative ion).

If the change brought about in a substance by ionizing radiation is reflected in the molecules and atoms making up the cells, so-called 'biological effects' are produced, consisting in the main of serious damage to the metabolism of the cell and to one or two fundamental constituents of the cell.

Amongst the various biological effects we can distinguish:

- short-term somatic effects;
- long-term somatic effects;
- genetic effects.

Short-term somatic effects consist in damage to the various organs and tissues which appears during the period immediately following acute exposure to large doses of ionizing radiation; examples are cutaneous lesions, haematological damage (serious anaemia, to the point of what is known as medullary aplasia, that is to say, the destruction of the bone marrow), haemorrhages and gastro-intestinal disturbances.

Long-term somatic effects are due to the delayed effect of acute exposure to strong doses, or are due to chronic exposure to average or low dose of radiation, and consist mainly in damage to the visual organs (cataracts), in the appearance of leukaemia and malignant tumours, and in a reduction of the life-span. Some of these somatic effects are in direct relationship as regards seriousness and frequency to the doses of radiation which have been absorbed (non-stochastic effects) whereas others, on the other hand, such as leukaemia and malignant tumours, show no direct relationship between dose and seriousness of symptoms (stochastic effects).

Genetic effects consist in an alteration of the DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid), which constitutes the basic substance of chromosomes, that is to say of the cellular structures concerned with the transmission of hereditary characteristics: the result in mutations, that is to say, the appearance of abnormal characteristics in the offspring of irradiated individuals, malformations, hereditary defects and the inability of procreate (sterility).

In order to prevent damage by ionizing radiation it is necessary:

- 1) to measure the degree of exposure and the dose of radiation absorbed by individuals and by the community as a whole;
- 2) to check the effects of the radiation on the environment and on living substances;
- 3) to study the transfer mechanisms of radioactive substances (radionuclides) both within the human organism, and in the earth water and atmosphere.

The first problem therefore consists in developing effective systems of dosimetry, such as will make it possible on the one hand to measure the dose of radiation deriving from the various sources (whether natural or artificial), and on the other hand to define the 'maximum acceptable dose', that is to say, the level of exposure beyond which harmful effects begin to appear.

There exist methods for calculating doses absorbed by the environment and human beings; in the latter case it may be external (measuring the intensity of the radiation on the various parts of the body) and internal (measuring the dose which, in the event that radioactive substances have been introduced into the organism itself, affects the various organs).

Then there is microdosimetry, designed to calculate the level of radiation over very small areas, and biological dosimetry, which is used above all in the case of accidents in order to measure the doses which have in fact been absorbed by the various organisms.

The problem of defining the maximum acceptable dose (or threshold dose) is very complex, because, as I noted earlier, there is in the case of some biological effects no direct relationship between the dose and the seriousness of the damage. In order to solve this problem it is in any case necessary to take account of a series of parameters, such as spatial and temporal distribution of the radiation vis-à-vis its quality (we can distinguish magnetic radiation, which consists of X-rays and gamma rays, from so-called corpuscular radiation, which consists of alpha and beta rays) and the mechanism by which this radiation is transferred throughout the biological tissues.

These, though important, are only some of the problems which directly involve Community bodies, and in the first instance the European Parliament, which, inasmuch as it is the direct expression of the will of the peoples of the Member States, cannot remain indifferent in the face of the need to protect individuals and the community as a whole against the risks that may result as side-efforts from technological and social progress and from economic and social trends.

For this reason, whilst examining the proposal for a research programme presented by the Commission of the European Communities, the Parliament could at the same time formulate some suggestions, some requests and stipulate some conditions in order to make this programme more efficient.

One aspect of the matter, to which the Parliament should draw the attention of the Council of the European Communities, is the need for the research programmes to be given a final shape in line with public health policy, the protection of the environment and the energy policy of the Community.

Ghergo

We should also emphasize the need to involve the major research centres within the Community in this programme, as well as public bodies, such as, for example, health services and social security institutions which may be able to provide important epidemiological and economic and social data.

We should also point out the desirability, when the time comes to draw up the individual research contracts, of maintaining a fair balance in the allocation of the contracts among the various Member States and allowing for a fair alternation between those centres that have already taken part in the previous programmes and those that are to take part in the programme we are discussing now, bearing in mind, however, the need for continuity in the case of some research programmes which cannot be completed in the time normally allowed for a single research programme.

Another aspect of the matter to which we should draw the attention of the Council concerns the need for continuous and effective checks on the implementation of the programme, so that a periodic check may be kept on the progress of each individual contract, the results achieved to date assessed and the need for any revision, reorientation or modification of the contract ascertained.

If the programme is to be implemented efficiently, there is, in addition, a need to provide for coordination between the various community bodies involved in the matter.

We must also see that this five-year plan ties in with the proposed Council directive on the protection of workers against risks deriving from exposure to noxious chemical, physical and biological agents during the course of their work, as well as with any other possible proposal directly or indirectly concerned with radiation.

In order to improve the productivity of the research included in the programme, we should recommend that the Commission should take whatever steps are necessary to make the widest use possible, in the interests of the Community, of the results achieved at the end of the programme.

The present motion for a resolution consists of seven paragraphs, summarizing these recommendations and two articles introducing new material — Articles 3 and 4. The first of these provides for the presentation by the Commission of a report at the end of the third year of the programme, in addition to the report after the first two years suggested by the Energy Committee, given that, as I said earlier, the first year of this new programme overlaps with the previous programme, which will not be completed till the end of 1980.

Article 4 provides for the use and the dissemination of the scientific information obtained.

I am naturally prepared to provide any further elucidation in relation to this matter and in respect of the amendments, which will have to be discussed subsequently.

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

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, I would like to say to Mr Ghergo that he has produced a fantastically good report, and naturally we support a five-year Euratom research and training programme in the field of biological and health protection. I merely want to add a few words concerning the amendments tabled by Mr Coppieters, Mr Capanna and Mrs Dekker, which are completely unacceptable to us. Amendment No 1 expresses regret that on the eve of this new research programme the Committee has accepted the ICRP 26 recommendations, which will have the effect of increasing the permissible doses by factors of 3 and 8, and sets out the view that priority must be given to inserting in the five-year programme an independent study on the effects on health of low-level radiation doses in view of recent scientific findings.

Mr President, we do not need an independent study on the effects on health of low-level radiation doses. In this field the whole world is working closely together, and the Community effort is just part of the whole world effort.

ICRP is in any case by far the best organization to do this work. We do not want to duplicate its efforts. Let me quote briefly from the description of ICRP given by Walter Patterson — an anti-nuclear leader, I would add — where he says :

the body whose standing is highest in the field of radiobiology, as it affects decisionmaking, is the International Commission on Radiological Protection. Founded in 1928 and made up of leading radiobiologists from many different countries, it is entirely non-political, and its committees meet regularly to assess the current understanding of radio-biological phenomena.

Since it is that organization which has made these new regulations, I am sure we do not need any other body to duplicate its work. The second amendment tabled by Mr Coppieters, Mr Capanna and Mrs Dekker says: 'pending the results of its own studies, the Community should refrain from applying the ICRP 26 recommendations, which will lead to increases in permissible doses for each body organ'. Does Mr Coppieters realize that the ICRP report was published in 1977, three years ago, and ICRP research is going on the whole time, extending both the range of products and the range of human organs which it is examining for the effects of radiation? The world does not stand still and wait for the Community to set up an independent organization to check up for itself. Things are moving much too fast for that.

Seligman

Let us keep a sense of proportion about radiation. Do Members realize that in medicine they use levels of radiation 10 times higher than are generally allowed in the world, and that therefore if we cut medical X-rays by one-tenth, we would do more to reduce radiation than if we eliminated the entire world nuclear programme? So let us, as I say, keep a sense of proportion. Now while I recognize the public-spirited motives of our colleagues, especially Mr Coppieters, Mr Capanna and Mrs Dekker, I fear that they refuse to recognize that alternative sources of soft energy, such as solar, bio-mass and geothermal, are not going to provide an adequate substitute for nuclear power. By the year 2000 they may be supplying up to 7% of our total requirements, and in Israel, where there is much more sunshine than here in Strasbourg, solar energy is not likely to provide more than 2% of the country's total energy requirements in the year 1990. So let us not in any way deceive ourselves that we can do without nuclear energy. Let us support the Ghergo report and not hold back any necessary research into nuclear power and its implications.

President. — I call Mrs von Alemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs von Alemann. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Davignon said earlier that I was not quite right in claiming that the Council had not yet formally adopted the research programme on radioactive waste. Perhaps I should therefore correct myself and point out that the Council has of course accepted the programme informally, but — as Mr Davignon himself said — formal approval had not yet been forthcoming. I would, however, repeat my warning that — notwithstanding the remarks made by the Member of the Commission — we should try to ensure that our parliamentary work is more effectively coordinated and that the Council does not first of all cut the budget, leave us afterwards to get on with our discussions and then simply rubber-stamp the whole thing. Getting back to specifics, very much the same applies to the radiation protection programme, although in this case the proposed 68 million EUA have 'only' been cut by the Council to 59 million EUA.

From where I am standing, it looks very much as though this programme is being delayed by the Member States and their own nuclear research programmes. Given the complexity of the problems — measuring the radiation dose, assessing the radiation risks or monitoring the radionuclides being emitted into the atmosphere — I can quite understand their reservations. We therefore very much welcome attempts to coordinate national research efforts at Community level to prevent unnecessary duplication and to lend support to the Member States.

The Harrisburg incident underlines the need for this kind of programme, and the scientists will have to rethink their evaluation of the criteria and give some thought to the radiation doses resulting from nuclear incidents.

Generally speaking, the aim of a radiation protection programme must be to try to keep radiation doses as low as is reasonably possible. We also need to know how much it is likely to cost to reach this optimum standard. It seems from discussions at a seminar in Vienna in March 1979, which the Commission took part in, that the Member States operate different systems of limiting radiation doses. This makes it all the more important to harmonize research work at European level, and the proposal put forward by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for the creation of a European irradiation register is a highly welcome move.

As far as I am concerned, there is one more matter of urgency, namely the lack of agreement on the new radiation standards which are currently being assessed by the Member States on the basis of recommendations from the International Commission on Radiological Protection. The United States seems to be hesitating to adopt these new standards. Investigations published by the US Academy of Sciences in 1978 showed that the effects of low-level radiation doses had so far clearly been underestimated. Is the Commission acquainted with this report? If its findings were to become conventional wisdom, the maximum permissible doses of radiation would have to be corrected downwards. There has been other research in the field of dosimetry: for instance, the controversial tests on the leakage of radioactive material in the shafts of the storage installation for radioactive waste in Hanford. It is reported that the radiation to which workers in Hanford were exposed has led to a substantial increase in the incidence of cancer. Ladies and gentlemen, these uncertainties are bound to give cause for concern. Experts say that we should have to monitor 10 000 people exposed to an annual radiation dose of 0.55 rem — the threshold value laid down in the standards — for 55 years to find out whether there is in fact greater incidence of cancer. This, of course, is not feasible just like that. It is also difficult to ensure that the characteristics are comparable from group to group, because every person exposed to radiation is of course inevitably affected by any number of other factors. It therefore goes without saying that a lot of thought has to be given to keeping the long-term effects of ionizing radiation down to a minimum. It should be the Commission's job to keep the public informed about the results of this research, as it did at the seminar for representatives of Member States' trade unions. The people have a right to know what risks they are running and what progress has

von Alemann

been made in the field of radiation protection. We support Mr Ghergo's report and we shall be voting against the amendments tabled by Mr Capanna, Mr Coppieters and Mrs Dekker.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, Mr Seligman, was so kind as to comment on my amendment. In his eyes I am one of the emotional and naïve fanatics against whom he is speaking out in the name of science, or rather a kind of 19th century scientific self-satisfaction. I shall repeat what I said, quoting Rabelais, in the Commission: 'Science sans conscience n'est que ruine de l'âme', (Science without conscience is the ruin of the soul), although there is surely no point in repeating this before my colleagues.

It is somewhat disconcerting that in its proposal to the Council regarding a research programme spread over five years which will require a considerable amount of taxpayers' money, the Commission has done no more than submit a single printed page containing, moreover, only the titles of the various fields of research. I hope that the rapporteurs will in future press for more detailed information for reports of this kind.

Although the maximum permissible levels of radiation have continually been lowered year after year, everyone used to be agreed that there must be a certain minimum level below which there was no longer any health risk.

Nowdays, however, as is clear from the results of scientific research, our basic ideas regarding radiation doses are undergoing radical changes. I need only refer you all — and Mr Seligman in particular — to the Morgan, Stewart and Battele reports.

Thus, we have arrived at a decisive moment when the Community must take action by submitting a new research programme.

The International Commission for Radiation Protection has chosen this very time to make recommendations. Recommendation No 26 proposes an approximately 3- to 8-fold increase in the admissible radiation limits. On the eve of the new research programme, the Community has decided to adopt these new standards and to recommend them to the Member States. Thus, the workers in the Member States are faced with the Community standards which they cannot change at national level. What we want, therefore, is for the Community itself to revise these standards.

Might I point out that the United States have rejected the standards proposed in Recommendation No 26 and are thinking in terms of lower levels. Systematic monitoring of workers, their families and the population of areas surrounding nuclear facilities has

provided further evidence of the danger of low-level ionizing radiation. In spite of this, both the Commission proposals and the Ghergo report are still based on medical analyses and experiments with animals. However, extrapolation of possible effects on man from the results of experiments on animals is clearly highly unreliable. For this reason, it seems vital that a serious programme for the monitoring of workers, their families and, in particular, the population around nuclear facilities should form part of the Community research programme. More and more people living in the vicinity of nuclear power stations are becoming worried. News of the dangers of low-level ionizing radiation spreads quickly. If the conclusions of courageous scientists in this field are correct — and they have not as yet been refuted — continued use of nuclear energy under present conditions would mean condemning or running the risk of condemning many workers and citizens to sickness and, in some cases, death from cancer and other conditions. The central issue in this debate is whether or not we should go on with the current use of nuclear energy.

If we want to take democratic decisions based on a full knowledge of the facts, serious research will be necessary. For this reason, I appeal to all of you and to the rapporteur to support, regardless of your views on the question of nuclear energy, the amendments tabled by myself, Mrs Dekker and Mr Capanna regarding the setting up of a monitoring programme.

President. — I call Mr Buttafuoco.

Mr Buttafuoco, — (I) Mr President, on my own behalf and that of my fellow-members of the Italian right, I welcome the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a further research and training programme in the field of biology and health protection — or, to put it in a way which will be more easily understood by the general public, in the field of radiation protection.

This proposal explains the effects of, and damage caused by, nuclear energy and ionizing radiation, and sets out suitable measures to protect the human environment and, in particular, that of workers in this sector. Moreover, the proposals have been welcomed by the Scientific and Technical Committee.

Mr President, we agree fully with the move to set up this programme for the years 1980 to 1984. Up to a certain point, we consider it to be extremely opportune and worthwhile in all respects, and we also agree with the proposed appropriation and timetable. Although we should have liked to have been informed more fully and in greater detail of the results achieved by the last programme, we feel that the appropriation should be accepted and that any move to reduce it would have a negative effect on the results.

Buttafuoco

Allow us to make the following suggestions. The programme should take into account the need for the public to realize the extent of the problem and the serious dangers involved — and to which all the speakers have referred. I am speaking of the long and short-term somatic effects of ionizing radiation and to the terrible genetic effects they may have. There will have to be studies, research and large-scale information campaigns. There will have to be protective measures. There should be information campaigns in this sector in the Member States. There should be maximum coordination of the various programmes of the individual Member States, so as to avoid any divergence — whether real or only apparent — in the regulations. Finally, there should be the tightest possible check on the implementation of this programme, and from time to time — even before the deadlines — the results achieved should be established and communicated to us.

We accept some of the amendments tabled by Mr Coppieters, Mr Capana and Mrs Dekker. In particular, we can subscribe to amendment No 3, which does meet human needs which this Parliament, quite apart from giving science the respect it deserves, cannot but take into consideration.

With these few remarks and suggestions, and with regard to the proposal of the Committee on Energy and Research and the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Budgets, we announce that we shall be voting in favour.

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (I) Mr President, it is an incontrovertible fact that there exists in this Parliament an overwhelming majority of not, please note, just partisans of nuclear energy but extremist partisans of nuclear energy, consisting moreover, of a highly significant line-up that goes from Mr Seligman to Mr Ippolito. This majority of extremist partisans of nuclear energy, in my opinion, ought to live up to their duty be honest with the citizens of Europe, that is to say, to tell them the truth!

It is, Mr Seligman, untruthful and mendacious to say that, in the final analysis radiation has no deleterious effects. You must be well aware of a piece of information which was recently published in medical journals all over the world, according to which it has been shown that, in the naval repair yards in the United States, where American nuclear submarines are repaired, cases of tumors and cancer are between 3 and 5 % more frequent than the national average for the United States. For this reason, the amendment which bears the signature of Mr Coppieters at the top is of great importance. You may reject it, you have already said that you will reject it. Nevertheless, Mr President, it must be clear from now on that rejecting this amendment, which taxes the Commission of the

European Communities with having arbitrarily increased the acceptable radioactive doses for individual parts of the human body, is equivalent to taking a decision which will have the most serious consequences for the health of millions of European citizens. I am speaking of European citizens and here, too, Mr Seligman will be aware of the fact that the density of population in the nine Member States of the Community is even higher than that of the United States of America.

I shall now conclude, Mr President. Mr Coppieters has already said most of what needs to be said, that is to say, that the Commission has arbitrarily accepted the increase in these acceptable doses by a factor of between 3 and 8. I want to make this quite plain by giving the quantities in rems, that is to say, in the unit of measurement currently in use in assessing exposure to radiation. In the case of exposure of the gonads, the limit has been increased from 5 rems to a full 20 rems per year. In the case of the breasts, from 15 to 32 rems and in the case of bone marrow from 5 to 42 rems per year. Finally, in the case of the thyroid gland and bones taken together, the increase is from 30 rems per year to a full 167 rems per year. This is a decision which scientists are the first to recognize as gravely injurious to the health of citizens of Europe.

The extremist partisans of nuclear energy, on the basis of their favourite reasoning with regard to risk benefit relationships, may say what they like of nuclear energy, but let them also say what the consequences are in health terms for the peoples of our countries from this insane proliferation in the use of nuclear energy.

President. — I call Mr Ghergo.

Mr Ghergo, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, I should like first to thank all those who have spoken, and especially those who were kind enough to express appreciation for my work and my report.

I should like to reply to some comments which have been made. Mr Coppieters stressed that very serious risks exist, and on this I unreservedly agree, so much so that I am in favour of the renewal of this research programme, precisely to ensure that the possible damage resulting from the increasing use of this form of energy may be kept to a minimum. I therefore share his concern, indeed we all share it, and I would say that it is precisely for this reason that we are debating this programme.

Mr Buttafuoco commented that it would have been preferable to have had the full results of the previous programme before us. I hinted at this also in the report, but unfortunately it is not possible to have all the results available, since the programme as I said earlier, is still in progress — it will not be completed for another year — and therefore it is not yet possible to have the results of all the studies or research

Ghergo

projects. I think at this point I could move on, if the President will allow me, to deal with the four amendments tabled by Mr Capanna, Mr Coppierters and Mrs Dekker. The first part of Amendment No 1 refers to the famous Recommendation No 26 by the International Commission on Radiological Protection. Here, as Mr Capanna is well aware, it is a question of a 1979 document, No 619, concerning an amendment to the directives which lay down the basic regulations on health protection of workers and the population at large against the hazards of ionizing radiation. This was followed by a report by Lord Bethell on the subject, Document No 78/79 of April 1979, and Parliament has already expressed its view. Moreover, the problem outlined in Amendment No 1 does not have a direct bearing on the matter under discussion, which is the five-year research programme on radiation protection submitted by the Commission. It is, however, possible that this research may provide the basis for revising the EEC regulations in this field.

(Interruption by Mr Capanna)

Mr Capanna, the Community has consulted, among others, the International Commission on Radiological Protection, and obviously this means that it has confidence in the technical and scientific capability of this organisation. I do not think I have any right, in assessing these international organizations, to put myself in the position ...

(Interruption by Mr Capanna)

I do not represent the United States, and I cannot claim the right to say why the United States do not accept ...

(Interruption by Mr Capanna)

President. — Please continue, Mr Ghergo.

Mr Ghergo. — *(I)* The second part of the amendment states that it is necessary as a matter of priority to include in the five-year programme an independent study of the effects on health of low doses of radiation, taking account of recent scientific data. I agree with this, but obviously even Mr Capanna agrees, since he spoke in support of a study which is already envisaged in the programme. It is necessary to investigate these effects of low doses of radiation, which are acquiring considerable importance. Objectively, therefore, Mr Capanna, I do not think it necessary to emphasize that piece of research any more than has already been done.

Turning to Amendment No 2, I have already implicitly replied to the second part of it. As for the first part, I could quote to Mr Capanna page 13 of my report, which mentions the need to research more deeply into the matter:

The programme proposed by the Commission is based on foreseeable requirements of radiation protection in the countries of the Community, in the light of the expected development of nuclear facilities and other

sources of ionizing radiation and of their possible effects on man and the environment ... To this end the proposed programme provides ... for the studies and research to be oriented towards certain principal activities or sectors.

And these principal sectors include dosimetry, to which our attention has been drawn.

Moving on to examine Amendment No 3, with reference to the programme which we have studied I especially brought out in my report the fact that, in the studies provided for by the current programme the idea of drawing up a European Community register or catalogue of radiation levels was analysed with particular care. This would supplement the national regulations of individual Member States, which have already laid down radiation protection standards for workers whose work brings them into contact with radiation. However, the subject is still very uncertain and much debated, especially with regard to dosimetry and methods of measuring the doses absorbed. A very complex survey is involved, and this is shown also in the report submitted by the Commission, which mentions studies to check the feasibility of such a register. As for extending checks to populations living close to nuclear installations, it is clear that such checks are desirable. I therefore agree fully on the usefulness of checks, but at the same time I have no illusions about the technical, organizational and legal difficulties in the way of carrying out extensive continuous checks on people living near industrial plant. It is to be hoped that by also taking into account the results of this research, the difficulties can be overcome so as to achieve, as early as possible, the highest possible degree of radiation protection at Community level.

Let us move on to Amendment No 4, which envisages seven main areas of activity. The first six are exactly the same as those to be found in the programme and in my report. As regards the seventh, there is a request to initiate, in addition, a long-term programme of systematic checks on the health of workers in the nuclear industry, of their families and of the populations of areas surrounding nuclear installations. But I would remind you of what I have already said with regard to workers — that something has already been done, and that a study is now being carried out to introduce a 'register' of radiation levels. This corresponds to Amendment No 3. In this connection, too, I think one can envisage extending the essential checks to the populations of the surrounding areas, for there is a serious health hazard involved.

In conclusion, I feel I must express a hope which undoubtedly reflects that of the whole European Parliament — that this extremely powerful instrument which science has put into our hands may be increasingly — indeed, I would stress, exclusively — used for the progress of mankind.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, after the two excellent speeches and the rapporteur's presentation of his report, I can be quite brief. For obvious reasons, the Commission attaches great importance to this programme. Mr Coppieters expressed surprise that certain specific projects were presented very briefly, and I would like to explain the reason for this. We discussed the explanatory statement at great length, but Mr Coppieters commented that only one page was devoted to the projects themselves.

The reason for this is that if we had had to submit decisions to the Council which were extremely detailed on each of the projects, any amendments found necessary during the discussions would have meant returning to the Council for the sake of secondary and minor changes. That is why we acted in this way.

Does this mean that the Commission, its members or the interested members of Parliament have no detailed information at their disposal? The answer is clear: all such information is available to those who wish to obtain it. We should therefore not confuse a necessarily brief account of a decision with the withholding of information: for the reasons I have given, these are two different things.

I would also like to draw the attention of Mrs von Alemann and other interested members to the question of low-level radiation and its effects. As the rapporteur has pointed out, this question, which is still not sufficiently understood, has been given special emphasis throughout the programme and is one of its *raison d'être* and main priorities. We are therefore in possession of the report to which Mrs von Alemann referred; it was not incorporated into the text because there are many documents dealing with the same subject.

I would also like to comment briefly on the controversy which has emerged concerning the standards laid down by the ICRP and on the assertion that Europe shows little interest in protecting its citizens, whereas the American authorities are far more concerned about protecting theirs. I feel we should view this question in its proper context, as we did when setting the maximum rate or standard which we regarded as acceptable in the light of present scientific knowledge. Certain national legislations already prescribe standards which are lower than this; they will continue to do so, and we have therefore acted rationally.

With regard to your report and the proposals it contains, I am happy to say that the Commission agrees with it, in particular with Article 3. It feels that the proposal whereby it should be possible to revise the programme to take account of developments in science is a welcome improvement.

A problem arises with regard to Article 4, however. This is not a fundamental problem since obviously the whole point of the programme is to pass on the findings, once it is completed, to those concerned. What purpose would it serve if this information was reserved for specialists who are already familiar with it? It is not they, but all the people of Europe, who need such information.

The Euratom Treaty, however, imposes certain limitations which make it impossible for us to accept the vague wording of Article 4. I therefore have to tell you on behalf of the Commission that the present wording of Article 4 creates certain difficulties. However, I can assure you, that as far as the basic issue is concerned — i.e. the priority given to the dissemination of information — we shall do what is required on our own initiative; this is, quite obviously, one of the Commission's objectives.

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

Mr Capanna. — (I) Mr President, I am sure you will agree with me that the proceedings in this Parliament must be as thorough, precise and unperturbed as possible. In the debate which has just ended we not only considered problems vaguely connected with health and the environment but we also dealt with a number of features which are determining factors in the energy problem.

I want to express my very strong criticism of the behaviour by Mr Brunner, the Commissioner with responsibility for energy questions, who made a short speech and then disappeared, without staying to hear any of the debate. Mr Davignon on the other hand listened with great courtesy and attention. I thank him for what he said. I realize that he is also a representative of the Commission, but when there is a question which specifically relates to the problem of energy, you will agree that the speedy departure of Mr Brunner is in fact, more than an oversight, a slight to Parliament.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

13. Directive on cocoa and chocolate products

President. — The next item on the agenda is the report (Doc. 1-618/79), drawn up by Mr Combe on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on:

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 175/79) on the amendment for the seventh time of Directive 73/241/EEC relating to cocoa and chocolate products intended for human consumption.

President

I call Mrs Pruvot, who is deputizing for the rapporteur.

Mrs Pruvot, deputy rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Council Directive of 10 October 1978 authorized the Member States to maintain until 20 June 1979 the national provisions in force on 1 August 1973 which permitted the use in cocoa and chocolate products of certain emulsifying agents, including, in particular, polyglycerol polyricinoleate, sorbitan tristearate, and the ammonium salts of phosphatidic acids.

Acting on a proposal by the Commission and after consulting Parliament, the Council could include these substances in Annex I of basic Directive 73/241/EEC, whereby they would be authorized throughout the Community.

The present Directive was examined by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on 19 December 1979 in Brussels. The Committee examined the use of these substances from the point of view of consumer protection and of their technological usefulness in cocoa and chocolate products intended for human consumption.

As far as the use of phosphatic products is concerned, in particular the ammonium phosphatides, the Scientific Committee for Food considers that they may be authorized up to an overall limit of 30 mg per kg of body weight, and the quantities now used are far below this level.

This was in response to the concern expressed in the fifth draft amendment to the basic Directive, which is here modified for the seventh time.

The following may therefore be added, on their own or in combination: lecithins E 322, ammonium phosphatides E442, polyglycerol polyricinoleate and sorbitan tristearate. In general, there seems to be no reason for not mentioning these emulsifying agents on the wrapping, as well as any others which are or may be authorized, if only for the information of consumers.

From a technical viewpoint, some emulsifying agents already mentioned, when added within the prescribed limits, have been found to be quite useful in cocoa and chocolate processing. Since they are non-toxic, there is no reason to oppose their use.

We hope that Parliament will back our proposals, at the same time bearing in mind that all food additives must be useful while not being harmful to consumers' health.

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

Mr Newton Dunn. — May I say that I find it very pleasant to be able to talk about chocolate after the last two debates which have been about radioactivity. I find this much tastier. I should also like to extend my

own and my group's best wishes to Mr Combe, who is not here today because of illhealth. We send him our best wishes for a full and speedy recovery.

Furthermore, I should like to congratulate Mrs Pruvot for producing at very short notice a really excellent and thorough report. On behalf of my group, the European Democrats, I ask Parliament to support Mrs Pruvot's report in full, as she has presented it.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health, and Consumer Protection has added two extra materials to the EEC approved list of additives as originally proposed by the Commission. The proposal to include these two extra materials is supported by Caobisco, who are the European association of chocolate manufacturers. In other words, the proposal from the committee has the approval of all European chocolate manufacturers and is thus not contentious. Indeed, I spoke this afternoon on the telephone to a chocolate manufacturer in France and he confirmed that he supports these proposals.

As Mrs Pruvot has said, these materials have been tested in the quantities which are normally added, and indeed in larger quantities, and there is no evidence at these levels of addition of any danger to health. Nor indeed has the Commission suggested that there is any health risk at these levels. The two materials in particular that I am discussing are polyglycerol polyricinoleate and sorbitan tristearate, both referred to by Mrs Pruvot. I should like to say just a few words on each of these subjects.

First of all, polyglycerol polyricinoleate. The effect of adding this to chocolate in very small amounts is to alter the fluidity of the chocolate. It helps chocolate flow into corners. In other words chocolate bars that contain nuts or fruit or any other additives contain more chocolate because there are fewer trapped air bubbles. I am sure everybody in Parliament will be glad to buy chocolate in future that does not have those unsightly holes at the bottom of the bars.

Secondly, sorbitan tristearate is an anti-bloom agent, which in ordinary language means that it prevents crystallization of fat on the surface of chocolate which is stored at higher temperatures. In other words, it prevents the appearance of those little white dots which many of us find very objectionable on the chocolate that we buy. Indeed, one manufacturer has reported that complaints from consumers have been reduced by some 75 % since he started adding very small amounts of this material.

So to summarize, Mr President, these materials are safe in the quantities that are added. Their addition to the approved list is supported by chocolate manufacturers throughout the EEC. Also, consumer complaints are reduced, so it seems to me that it satisfies all parties. On behalf of my group, I urge Parliament, and especially everybody who enjoys eating chocolate, to support Mrs Pruvot's fine report when we vote on it tomorrow.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I would like to begin by thanking Mrs Pruvot for presenting this report, thereby enabling us to call upon the Council to take the final decision on the matter. This is necessary, since the period allowed to us for studying this problem has now elapsed.

In this connection — for this is relevant to the matter in hand and also to the last comment by Mrs von Alemann on the two other matters — I would like to discuss the relationship between the work of Parliament and that of the Council. I feel it is very important that the Enlarged Bureau should examine this question and that the chairmen of the various committees should be aware of it.

I feel it would be unfortunate if Parliament had no influence on the decisions concerning the various programmes. But you must appreciate that while the Commission has to push the Council into taking its decisions, while the Council does not reach its decisions easily, willingly or quickly, its work could be delayed without real reason owing to the poor organization of Parliament's tasks. This is a point which we ought to examine more closely, since that is what happened in the case of the two previous reports, and that is what is happening with the present report. When there are legal obligations and schedules to be met, the committees and the Enlarged Bureau should at least be aware of them in order to plan their work, in the interests both of Parliament and of the Commission. I hope Parliament will excuse this digression.

To return to the subject of chocolate, I was much taken by the comments of Mr Newton Dunn, who said that chocolate wappings would in future mention the additives used. Mr President, I would welcome this since, like all my countrymen, I am very fond of chocolate, but I have liked chocolate for a long time and so would be wary of any excessively detailed information on this point. I am reassured, though not necessarily convinced, by the fact that this measure is supported by the manufacturers.

This report presents a slight difficulty — that of deciding how to deal with the two additives not mentioned in the Commission's original proposal.

The Commission's position is as follows: we believe it is an accurate reflection of Parliament's views to say that the technical work on these two additives is not sufficiently advanced to enable us to adopt a definitive position. This must be seen within the legal framework of the directive. What we needed to do was to determine which additives would be maintained beyond a certain date.

We feel it would be reasonable to allow these two additives to be used until our studies are complete. We

shall then take a final decision on whether to include them or not.

Mr President, I think we can go along with Mr Combe's report. As for the legal procedure, since the Council will be taking a retroactive decision on the continued use of these additives, we propose that the period prescribed for their use should be extended to enable us to reach a final decision with the necessary information at our disposal.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

14. Directive on intra-Community trade in fresh poultrymeat

President. — The next item is the debate on the report (Doc. 1-619/79), drawn up by Mr Combe on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on:

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-231/79) on the amendment of Directive 71/118/EEC on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultrymeat.

I call Mrs Pruvot, who is deputizing for the rapporteur.

Mrs Pruvot, deputy rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission has submitted a proposal for an amending directive with the purpose of placing on a permanent basis certain temporary derogations from the basic Directive 71/118/EEC on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultrymeat which the Council had approved in July 1975.

Under the 1975 derogations, which are due to expire on 15 August 1981, small-scale producers of poultrymeat are permitted to market their own production, subject to certain health requirements. The abolition of these derogations would present the traditional *foie gras* producers of certain Community regions and all the other small-scale poultry producers in the Community with such difficulties that they would no longer be able to maintain their business.

For this reason, and to safeguard the continued existence of a sector whose role in our economy is by no means negligible, the following measures have been proposed: to authorize the slaughter of geese and ducks without delay, if this is carried out on the farm, evisceration to be carried out within 24 hours on approved and supervised cutting premises; to allow small-scale producers to sell fresh poultrymeat direct to consumers after 15 August 1981, the date specified in the July 1975 Directive; and finally, to remove the time-limits in respect of these derogations from the basic Directive subject, of course, to the fulfilment of additional health requirements.

Pruvot

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection favours the adoption of this proposal because it allows the traditional producers of *foie gras* from geese and ducks, and all the other small-scale producers of poultrymeat in the Community, to retain their production methods, subject to the health requirements.

A misunderstanding must be cleared up. Small-scale poultry breeders and merchants fear that normal sales of '*volaille effilée*', or slaughtered poultry which is plucked, bled and eviscerated, expressed in percentages as defined under heading 0202 of the Common Customs Tariff, will no longer be allowed and that their livelihoods are being threatened. This is not our aim. These traditional sales practices will remain unchanged thanks to the abolition of the time-limit of 15 August 1981 (Article 3 (5) of the basic Directive).

We believe that Parliament will support our proposed amendment, which aims on a permanent basis to place measures which are designed to assist small-scale poultry farmers in general and the producers of *foie gras* from geese and ducks in particular.

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

Mrs Schleicher. — (D) On behalf of the European People's Party, I should like to say that we fully support Mr Combe's report and also the committee's motion for a resolution. I should like to comment briefly on four points which persuaded us to support the proposed measures.

Firstly, the real point of all this is to improve the market supply to the consumer. There is a great demand for good poultrymeat; which is easily digestible and is therefore particularly good for invalids, and we shall be performing a service to the consumer by ensuring that the housewife will continue to be able to buy her farm-fresh chicken or other poultrymeat from the market stall. There was some doubt about this, as the directive originally only ran up to 1981. We now have the chance to place this provisional directive on a permanent footing, which should remove any doubts from the housewife's mind.

Secondly, small-scale producers, who cater for more specialised market requirements, will continue to exist, which will be a good thing for consumers who are not too keen on factory farms, where the poultrymeat is massproduced.

Thirdly, we in the European People's Party are particularly keen on seeing traditions preserved in Europe, and what we are talking about here is specifically *pâté de foie gras*, which is especially important here in Strasbourg. More recently, Strasbourg has made its name through Europe, but before that it achieved

prominence in the cultural sphere: Strasbourg Cathedral, for instance. In the 18th century, though, it was *pâté de foie gras* which made Strasbourg's name, and I think it might be interesting for people like us, who regularly meet in Strasbourg, to get some idea of the history of this delicacy. The name of Strasbourg has become associated with *pâté de foie gras* because a 21-years-old chef working for the Marquis de Contade invented the dish for a banquet, where it was a resounding success. Later on, truffles found their delicious way into the recipe, and they have since become a characteristic — albeit expensive — ingredient. The association with Strasbourg came about because this young chef married a widow from Strasbourg, part of whose dowry was a pastry shop which provided a sales outlet for the *pâté de foie gras* and helped it to achieve world renown. There are now as many as 42 different recipes for *pâté de foie gras* throughout the world, and I believe that we Europeans have a duty to see that things like this are preserved. The important thing is that the animals providing the liver should, wherever possible, no longer be transported, to prevent the liver being damaged. Because of the rather rigorous restrictions, farmers can nowadays unfortunately no longer meet this condition, with the result that a great deal of liver is imported from Eastern Europe. I hope that, when we finally add the new European directive, goose liver will once again become a viable product for small-scale producers and will no longer have to be imported.

Fourthly, let me just say something to those who are worried that force-feeding the geese may amount to maltreatment. Let us not forget that the Ancient Romans were a lot more demanding of their geese. Before the animals were slaughtered, they were first of all herded all the way from Gaul to Rome, whereas the geese should nowadays normally be transported to the slaughterhouse. Indeed, we want to go one step further with this directive and ensure that the geese and ducks — the animals to which the directive mainly applies — are not moved at all, and are thus not subjected to the rigours of a journey. I think this should satisfy everyone, including those people who were afraid there was going to be some drawback somewhere. I think the directive bears many of the hallmarks of the European ideal, and in this case I think we can truly say that the way to the European's heart is through his stomach.

(Laughter)

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

Mr Turner. — Mr President, I am not going to speak on behalf of the geese, or their long walk, or the absence of it. I would like to speak on behalf of the group supporting this report as far as it goes.

Turner

I mentioned, before Commissioner Davignon left, that he was right in saying we were late with our reports. I am glad that on this occasion the Council of Ministers did not act before we made our report, as they did in the isoglucose case. But we have now got an avalanche of not very worldshattering reports before us today which are the first results of our work in the autumn.

Mr President, it is quite right that the side effect of the protection of goose livers that has been proposed by this directive is that the small farmer will retain the right to sell unviscerated poultry in local markets. That, I think, is a very reasonable freedom. It is well beneath the proper sights of the EEC. To interfere in that sort of small localized trade would be carrying interference too far. It should be left to national governments, and I am glad it is going to be on a permanent basis.

However, in paragraph 9 the report says that further definitions should be given of the terms 'producers on a small scale', 'small quantities', 'weekly markets' and 'the retail trade'. I would suggest that it is unnecessary to have further definitions of those terms, which seem to me quite clear as they are. It would be a waste of the EEC's time to deal with such small matters.

But there is another trade which is also a small one, namely, unviscerated poultry that has gone through EEC licensed processing plants. It is a harmless, national trade. There are no exports. The processing plants have been licensed by the EEC, and they are inspected.

I would suggest that as this derogation has been made permanent for the small farmer, it should also be made permanent for the processing plants which at present can sell unviscerated poultry but would not be able to do so next year unless a derogation is arranged. This is purely a consumer matter.

The consumer wants to buy this kind of poultry and I think he should be allowed to do so. It is not a regulation being imposed to prevent undesirable practices by producers. It is purely something affecting the consumer himself.

This committee should be firm in saying, when it gets the chance, that consumers' rights with regard to unviscerated poultry, which has gone through slaughterhouses licensed by the EEC, should be put on the same footing as small farmer rights as laid down by this directive.

I would just like to say one other thing: the Directive deals a good deal with hygiene, of course. It varies very much from country to country how the hygiene regulations for meat products are implemented. I myself think that Whitehall, in Britain, has made far too much of the poultrymeat hygiene regulations of the EEC. It looks to me as if Whitehall is trying to build empires under the guise of being good European. They are attacking, in fact, the prerequisites of

local authorities. I do not like this imperialistic attitude from London against the local authorities. When I have my material fully at my fingertips, I intend to get the Commission to attack Whitehall in defence of the local authorities and, incidentally, in defence of the consumers. For too much bureaucratic control of meat inspection simply puts up the cost. So, finally, I would ask the Commission what is the present state of the inquiry they are now carrying out into the inspection that takes place in each country of the EEC. I know they are going into this and that they are trying to find out indeed whether there are great differences. I should like to know when we shall have their report on that matter.

President. — I call Mr Denis.

Mr Denis. — (*F*) Mr President, the proposals before us are, in a sense, a reflection of the emotion and demands of small-scale poultry producers. I am thinking mainly of the producers of *foie gras*, 300 of whom demonstrated on 11 January in the Landes region of France, voicing their anxiety at the plans which threaten their livelihoods and their very existence.

However, the derogations do not solve the underlying problems or meet the real needs of producers; instead, they are tailored to the interests of the multinational food suppliers.

As the Commission itself points out, *foie gras* producers would be particularly hard hit by the 1971 directive. At the same time, other small-scale farmers and producers of high-quality foods face similar difficulties. Again in connection with this directive, I would like to voice the grave concern felt by the Bresse poultry farmers, and remind the House that Bresse chicken is internationally renowned for its high quality.

The full implementation of the Community directive would have catastrophic consequences for the production and marketing of this poultry and would ultimately jeopardize the very livelihoods of thousands of small and medium-scale farmers and their families. Nearly a million Bresse chickens are produced each year and 10% of these are exported to various Community countries. The producers, who have invested large sums in their farms, are already encountering numerous difficulties.

What is going on behind this facade of Community health standards to protect the consumer? To remove the claws, head and neck feathers, as prescribed, would be to destroy the special characteristics of Bresse poultry. Their famous blue claws, their white necks and their crests are their distinguishing features and have for decades guided French and other consumers in their choice. Such a measure would make Bresse poultry indistinguishable from lower quality industrially reared poultry which is not subject

Denis

to the highly stringent standards which make Bresse produce so famous.

As the journal of the Bresse farmers has very appositely remarked, can we imagine a situation in which all French wine is marketed in the same bottles! While we are about it, why not make it a plastic one! Is this the kind of life we can expect from our 'standardized' Europe? We believe that our efforts should be directed at making high-quality produce, whether *foie gras*, chicken or other foods, available to all consumers.

The emotion and anger aroused by the announcement that the directive would be implemented on 15 August 1981 were therefore justified, adding as they do to the anxieties already felt by the French people, in particular the small and medium-scale farmers, at the prospect of Community enlargement. Last month, however, Mr Mehaignerie, the Minister for Agriculture, was forced to make his first concession. At an annual Bresse poultry competition, and following a question which I put to this House, he promised that he would request a derogation for Bresse poultry and suspend a French government measure which would worsen the effects of the Community directives.

The French people, together with their communist representatives, will keep a close watch on the situation, for although many promises have been made, not all have been kept. The people of Bresse and the poultry breeders will fight to maintain their production. We support the demands of all French producers and breeders, in particular the demand that the time-limit set for the derogations should be abolished. We want the Community regulations on Bresse poultry to be amended without delay so that a derogation can be granted to the slaughter and marketing of Bresse poultry as practised at present, and applied throughout the EEC. As far as the *foie gras* producers are concerned, we want farm slaughter to be maintained, and any measures which would hinder production, as the health protection measures do in this case, should be abolished. The time-limit for evisceration should be increased to 48 hours, as requested by the producers, and steps should be taken to ensure that local markets are fully safeguarded. This would make it possible to preserve the quality of the products and enable the small and medium-scale producers, whom we defend, to earn a reasonable living and pursue their traditional activities.

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

Mr Nyborg. — (DK) Mr Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for reasons of hygiene, it is obvious that slaughtering of poultry should be carried out principally in approved and supervised slaughterhouses. However, it is nice to see that the Commission is also able to take more human standpoints since the

proposed amendment before us concerns a very specific group of holdings which have a tradition of slaughtering on the farm and for which, for simple reasons of marketing, problems can arise which make the sale of poultry from these holdings difficult or impossible. It is also pleasant to see due regard being paid to such a delicious product as *pâté foie gras* which I for one prize very highly. I do not think there are any health risks in the way in which this is produced and I therefore think it is reasonable that some changes should be made, such as those contained in the Commission's proposal and discussed in the report. In addition, surely no one can be in favour of introducing or maintaining restrictions for their own sake.

The report before us deals, as I have already said, with a number of specific problems within the poultry sector. However, if we consider the sector in general we will see it is of no small significance within the agricultural sector as a whole. During the 70's the production of poultrymeat within the Community rose by approximately 2% per year, and the rise in consumption has been greater than the increase in population. At the same time, there has been an increase in export surplus. The market in eggs and poultrymeat has been subject to common organization since 1962, and it might be a good idea — in the light of problems of the kind we are discussing here today — to set up a European Poultry Council at European level with a view to establishing closer cooperation within the poultry industry.

The idea is not new. It was taken up by the former Commissioner for Agriculture, Mr Lardinois in 1975, and I know that Mr Gundelach also takes a positive view of the idea of setting up a Council of this kind which would make it possible to rationalize the decision-making process. I also feel that a body of this kind could become an effective instrument in combating any new illegal state aids which might be introduced, and for this reason I should like to take this opportunity of asking the Commission how far it has got in considering this question of the establishment of an European Poultry Council of this kind and when we can expect it to submit a proposal on this matters.

President. — I call Mr Spencer.

Mr Spencer. — Mr President, I rise in a purely personal capacity. Conscious of all the things which have been said in favour of *pâté de foie gras*, I want to draw the attention of this House to the cruelty involved in the production of this ridiculous delicacy. If we approve this report, we shall be giving our support to a proposal that a cruel practice will continue beyond 15 August 1981.

I make no apology for raising the matter here in Strasbourg, because to me it is a shame that the fair city of Strasbourg should be associated with this barbaric practice, and make no mistake, it is barbaric. The degree

Spencer

of cruelty involved in force-feeding a goose with four to five hundred grammes of salted, cooked maize three times a day for three or four weeks until its liver is so distended that it can hardly move or breathe is an intolerable affront to the dignity of both man and animal. To those who have spoken in this debate I would just say that it is equivalent to force-feeding them with 28 pounds of spaghetti every day. I eat a considerable amount of food myself, but I would not like to be force-fed with 28 pounds of spaghetti every day. If this had been done to a man, it would be an outrage that Amnesty International would have us all crying about.

In an increasingly hungry world and one this Parliament has shown itself only too willing to be concerned about, such force-feeding is an example of a scandalous waste of resources. If you examine the amount of maize that goes to produce that tiny piece of *pâté* to amuse a few gourmets and think how that could be fed to Cambodians, you begin to think about the waste of resources involved. I am aware that I am perhaps exaggerating to make a point. I am ramming it down the throat of this House in the same way that maize is rammed down the throats of geese.

Let me say at this stage that I speak as someone with long contacts with the poultry industry. My own family business is involved in poultry. I have written academically on the industry and I am prepared to accept factory farming for the production of chicken because it produces meat for a hungry world, but *pâté de foie gras* is a luxury which we could all agree to forego. The animal welfare laws of the United Kingdom would not permit the practice of this barbarity, and I call upon this Parliament to express its distaste for this behaviour by rejecting this report.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) Mr President, I should firstly like to thank the rapporteur for the report which supports the proposals put forward by the Commission. As has been stressed, the aim of these proposals is to establish on a permanent basis a traditional local type of production which accounts for a considerable proportion of the incomes of the producers in question. Since the proposals involve an exception from the general regulations, there must clearly be criteria for the definition of the term 'small producers and local trade' and these criteria should take account of considerations of hygiene and be more or less the same for all the Member States. The studies we are conducting in this respect will be completed by the end of February and I shall inform Parliament of the results. I should like to stress in this connection that production processes and conditions, including those for *foie gras*, will, by virtue of this directive, be subject to considerable health and veterinary control measures. I

therefore fully agree with the last speaker that he was probably exaggerating somewhat in his description of what goes on. He also expressed an interest in poultry production as a whole, so I am certain that he must be familiar with the rather artificial conditions under which this production takes place throughout Europe. These conditions incidentally demand our attention and we shall return to them and submit a number of proposals in the coming months.

As regards the introduction of other exceptional arrangements than these for larger undertakings, I do not see how this could serve any useful purpose since it would affect the free market, which can only operate if there are standard rules. As Mr Nygborg stressed, it is of vital economic importance that there should be a free market in poultry. Internal trade in poultry and export to various destinations are currently undergoing major developments. This is one of the reasons why we must take some definite steps regarding hygiene in this field, but it also means that a number of other problems concerning auxiliary measures, i. e. marketing regulations, must be solved in cooperation between the Commission and the producers' organizations. For this reason, we have discussed the idea of setting up a poultry council with the producers' organizations. Our discussions with these organizations are approaching their conclusion and it will probably be possible in the very near future to set up a body of this kind which will undoubtedly be extremely useful in our attempts to solve various problems concerning the development of this sector of production and trade.

President. — The debate is closed.

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

15. *Swine fever, tuberculosis and brucellosis*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on :

— the report (Doc. 1-571/79), drawn up by Mrs Cresson on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on :

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-253/79) for a regulation laying down conditions designed to render and keep the territory of the Community free from classical swine fever ;

— the report (Doc. 1-620/79), drawn up by Mrs Cresson on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on :

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-543/79) for a directive prolonging, in respect of swine fever, certain derogations granted to Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom ;

— the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-626/79), tabled by Mr Ligios on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on :

President

the campaign against African swine fever ;

— the report (Doc. 1-621/79), drawn up by Mr B. Nielsen on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on :

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-406/79) for a directive amending Directive 64/432/EEC as regards tuberculosis and brucellosis.

I call Mrs Cresson.

Mrs Cresson, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, in March 1968 the Council adopted a resolution laying down the fundamental objectives and basic principles of a Community policy for veterinary science and plant health. Since then, in spite of the efforts of the Commission and the oft repeated views of the Committee on Agriculture, which has supported the Commission on this matter, one is forced to conclude that the Council has not shown the political determination necessary to achieve a common set of regulations in these fields.

As a result, the Community's farmers have suffered heavy financial losses on account of various diseases, especially swine fever ; in addition, there has been a danger of herds being infected, not to mention the risk to public health. Let us not forget, either, the obstacles to trade within the Community, since very often the real or supposed disease is used as an excuse to prevent the movement of animals or carcasses. Trade with non-member countries has been equally affected.

What is the present situation as regards pig breeding in the Community? Even before 1973, in the veterinary and plant health fields, the situation varied greatly between Member States. Some countries were affected to different degrees by these diseases, herds were infected to varying degrees, and methods of prevention and inspection again varied from country to country. Some countries, for instance, practised vaccination, and still do, while others did not.

After 1973, the three new Member States, for the most part free of swine fever, kept their own regulations and national legislation on veterinary matters, and in a moment we shall see the need to extend to the end of 1980 the derogations granted to these three Member States in order that they can bring their detection and inspection methods into line with those of the other Community countries.

To comply with the Treaty of Rome and especially all the provisions concerning the liberalization of trade and the removal of obstacles arising from health provisions, a common policy in the veterinary and plant health fields is required. The same applies to public health, trade with and exports to non-member countries as well as farmers' incomes.

A large-scale Community campaign is therefore required, especially as regards swine fever, brucellosis

and tuberculosis. Swine fever is a highly contagious disease, passed on very quickly and very easily ; it has a high death rate and causes heavy financial losses. These losses become all the greater, since without an adequately defined policy for the eradication of this disease, large sums of money have to be spent on inspection, prevention and vaccination.

Which areas are seriously affected by the disease? Most of the Member States, apart from the three new members, where a slaughter policy had already been in operation for a long time, although a few isolated incidents did occur in the United Kingdom. Vaccination is practised in Belgium, France and Italy, but not in the other countries.

What large-scale action can be taken, then, to combat the plague? I do not mind telling you that the procedure proposed by the Commission is cumbersome and complicated. It is cumbersome and promises to be quite expensive. It is not a case of using vaccination as the sole means of combat, as has been the case up to now, but of establishing areas free of swine fever when all the infected animals have been slaughtered. A certain number of criteria will have to be decided and then applied to holdings and areas, giving them the description 'free of swine fever'. The different inspection procedures and diagnostic methods of the Member States will also have to be harmonized, and vaccination continued, although this cannot be expected to prove the final answer. Vaccination will merely be used in addition to slaughtering. One can hope then that, after five years, all the Member States will be entirely free of this disease. If there is movement of animals from one area to another, duly appointed veterinary surgeons will carry out rigorous inspections. These provisions are therefore severe, but also expensive.

The Committee on Agriculture, having studied the Commission's proposals, considered it necessary to pay this high price if positive results were to be achieved. The Community will pay 50 % of the total expenses of the operation, i. e. some 37 800 000 u. a. This is exceptional, since these programmes are often subsidized to the tune of only 25 % ; in any case the Community never takes total financial responsibility for such an operation. We must maintain pig stocks, because pig consumption is increasing, because farmers engaged in uneconomic farming or in areas of surplus production can often change over to pig farming, and, furthermore, because the herds have a tendency to increase in the Community, and the number of large herds is constantly increasing. The consequent dangers of infection are therefore correspondingly large. The Committee on Agriculture was therefore almost unanimous — there were only two votes against — in its decision to adopt the Commission's proposals, and requests Parliament to receive them favourably.

Cresson

The second report I have the honour of presenting concerns the Commission's proposal to extend the derogations, valid until December 1979, granted to the three countries who joined the Community in 1973. The Committee on Agriculture unanimously approves the Commission's proposal to maintain through 1980 the national legislations in Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom.

President. — I call Mr Ligios.

Mr Ligios. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mrs Cresson has outlined what has been done so far by the Community to combat livestock diseases. Of course the Community has not yet done everything that it should and probably could have done to try to overcome the difficulties well known to us all. However, we must acknowledge that some livestock diseases — for example foot and mouth disease — have almost disappeared. What the Community has done has been done very well, with action taken in some cases not only within the Community but by creating a health protection cordon outside it, for example in Turkey as far as foot and mouth disease is concerned.

However, I note one inconsistency, namely that the Commission, in the swine-fever sector, concerns itself above all and almost exclusively with classical swine fever. It neglects the other strain of namely African swine fever, about which it has done very little, and which today threatens to cause more damage than classical swine fever to Community pig stocks. What is the nature of this African swine fever? First and foremost, like the other strain, it is a virus disease which can be transmitted not only by the live animal but also by carcasses or even waste if they come into contact with live pigs.

The present situation is that whereas for classical swine fever a vaccine has been found — the so-called Chinese strain — with which the pig stocks can be vaccinated and the disease can be prevented from spreading — and it should be possible to treat the disease even when it has spread, no vaccine has yet been found which would help to control African swine fever, despite the financial aids granted by the Commission to some research institutes in France, Britain, Denmark and Portugal.

The Community allocated funds to combat the disease, which had spread in Spain and from there to Malta and twice to France, but these are absolutely inadequate, so much so that there is a region of the Community which has suffered for two years from this terrible livestock disease — Sardinia, my home region — without the Community having so far launched a programme which tackles the situation with adequate means and in good time.

We say that it is no longer enough to carry out scientific research in laboratories in Spain, Portugal or

France, or to help to some extent to prevent the spread of the disease in Malta or Spain as has been done in the past. Action must be taken also and above all in Sardinia, where the livestock disease has spread, not from Malta or Spain, but directly from the countries of North Africa where we know that wild boar, for example, are healthy carriers. Today there is a certain amount of direct trade between North Africa and Sardinia, so that livestock diseases can spread directly without passing through Malta or Spain.

As far as Sardinia is concerned, we know that this livestock disease has so far caused the loss of about 40 000 pigs which have had to be slaughtered.

But the gravest reason for concern is that the import of pigmeat, even packed, to the mainland, i.e. to the Italian peninsula or to another country of the Community, would be enough to cause a general spread of this livestock disease, without the means being available to combat it. We therefore call upon the Commission to draw up a programme making the means available, bearing in mind the requests made by Sardinia and thus by Italy, for action which would not be purely a local matter but which would serve to safeguard the resources of the whole Community. Such action would consist not so much of slaughtering pigs stocks as of changing the structure of pig rearing in an area in which animals are still free-ranging, and which therefore causes particular concern.

That, Mr President, was the basic aim of this proposal of ours. We wanted to urge the Commission to take special and timely action designed to deal not only with classical swine fever but also with African swine fever, which has already affected some regions of the Community.

President. — I call Mr Nielsen.

Mr Brøndlund Nielsen, rapporteur. — (DK) Mr President, since these questions and reports are being discussed jointly, I assume that I may also be permitted to make some more general remarks regarding the problem as a whole. I can urge the House to adopt my report regarding the amendment of the directive on tuberculosis and brucellosis. However, the four reports deal with the same general problem, i.e. the attitude of the Community as regards the veterinary sectors within the agricultural policy. I should like to stress what I think must be the fundamental principle, namely that we are trying to guarantee as high a standard as possible as regards health and veterinary matters within the Community, and that we are extremely concerned to maintain the progress which has been achieved so far. It is vital for the consumers of the Community that they should be able to feel confident in this respect. It is vital from the point of view of the agricultural production sector and also from the point of view of exports of Community products, that other countries should not be able to use dubious veterinary points as a means of

Brøndlund Nielsen

more or less blocking our exports to these countries or at least making them difficult. This is a very important point since, for example, my own country is currently having problems with the export of pigmeat and tinned pigmeat products to the United States. This is causing major problems and I should be grateful if the Commissioner would comment on these matters. Clearly, if the United States could also have doubts regarding health risks resulting from exports of this kind, these problems could become even greater, if that were possible.

While we are on the subject, I must also mention what I see as the most serious of the problems before us here today, namely the question of combating swine fever. I assume we will continue with the regulations which unconditionally guarantee that no meat or pigs may be imported into areas which are entirely free of swine fever since this might result in the disease spreading to new regions. The previous speakers have explained very clearly how difficult it is to combat this disease and for this reason it is obviously vital that it should not be reintroduced into areas where it has been effectively stamped out. As Mrs Cresson also said in her report, the final eradication of classical swine fever must be achieved before there can be free trade in this sector.

I should like to say in this connection that I have certain doubts about the Commission's idea of removing restrictions between certain regions when this disease has been successfully combated, since even if the aim of the Community is that we should not bother too much about national borders if there are practical reasons for working on a regional basis, it is nevertheless true that controls at national borders are the most effective and absolute and that, for this reason it could be a little risky if the conditions under which animals which could spread infection could be moved from one area to another were to be made less precise. I therefore have misgivings, but I hope that the Commission will insist absolutely that there must not be the slightest risk of the disease spreading if all restrictions on trade are to be lifted. This certainty must be based on the absence over a long period of the disease, even without vaccination. It is also pointed out in the documents that this is a disease which can break out sporadically, which means that it can break out again in an area where one might well have believed it had disappeared, for example, if the environmental conditions under which the animals are living become conducive to its development.

I think therefore that we must attach great importance to maintaining and developing as much as possible quality and hygiene within the Community. Consequently, I can support the Commission's efforts in these various sectors with a view to combating the various diseases, but we should also maintain the standard we have achieved already. I also think that

these points should be taken into consideration since one of the things we must devote more attention to in connection with the agricultural policy of this Community is how we might do more to promote quality requirements for foodstuffs. We often talk about surpluses in various foodstuffs, but I think this is rather too general a way in which to take up this matter. We must devote more attention to questions of quality including, in particular, hygiene, health and veterinary requirements. In this context too, it is vital that we seriously set about combating these various diseases.

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

Mr Davern. — Mr President, I would like on behalf of my Group to thank Mrs Cresson, Mr Ligios and Mr Nielsen for their comprehensive report which we have had before the Committee of Agriculture and also for the manner in which they have reported here to the House.

My group attaches great importance to the efforts being made by the Member States and the Community, first and foremost to eliminate animal diseases and secondly to control any outbreak of such diseases. Of paramount importance with regard to animal diseases is the protection of the health of human beings. My group is committed to the total elimination of animal diseases which may in any way endanger human life. The Community, for its part, also concerns itself with questions of liberalization of trade between the Member States. I would not suggest, of course, that the Commission gives greater priority to free trade than to the health aspect, but it is conscious of the importance of avoiding health measures and controls which would unnecessarily prevent free trade in animal and meat products. All of these attitudes are borne out by the current proposals before the House, which have come from the Commission. I am sure the House will agree with me that the health of human beings must come first at all times.

A significant difference between the Member States has arisen, due to the different types of policies adopted with regard to control and elimination of animal diseases such as swine fever, tuberculosis and brucellosis. Some countries, such as my own, Ireland, have a strict policy of slaughter when swine fever breaks out. In order to preserve such a disease-free status, it is necessary for us to maintain a very strict control, particularly as regards access of pigs and pigmeat from other Member States where the disease frequently occurs. Other Member States prefer to control swine fever through a system of vaccination which, of course, is not as thorough as the slaughtering policy pursued in the three new countries. Because of the regular outbreaks of swine fever on the Continent, we are forced effectively to prohibit all

Davern

imports of live animals, fresh meat and meat products from the Member States concerned. To do otherwise would be to run great risks of introducing disease into Ireland, resulting in the total destruction of the pigherd. This, of course, we cannot accept and we welcome the derogations granted to us to maintain our very effective national provisions against swine fever.

Indeed, I would urge other Member States, where swine fever occurs frequently, to adopt a stricter system for eliminating swine fever, such as our own. In this way the dangers to public health would be substantially reduced. In fact, I would go so far as to propose that this disease must be eradicated through Community-wide measures, which should be financed through the EEC budget.

As regards the proposal to amend the directive relating to brucellosis and tuberculosis, I welcome the proposals from the Commission. In general they take a more realistic view of the efforts being made, particularly in our own case, to eliminate brucellosis and tuberculosis. We are pursuing at the moment a very active policy to eliminate these diseases once and for all from our cattle herds. Indeed we are grateful that the Community has been able to provide us with the finance to enable us to accelerate our disease eradication scheme. When these schemes are complete and brucellosis and tuberculosis have been totally eliminated, Ireland will enjoy the privileged distinction of being free not only from these diseases but also from the most destructive of all cattle diseases, i.e. foot-and-mouth disease.

Eliminating such diseases is a costly business, particularly for the farmers whose cattle are affected. Those of us who live in rural areas know the hardship that this inflicts on a farmer, not only immediately but also for the following two or three years. Nevertheless, I believe that farmers are prepared to make these short-term sacrifices in order that in the long term the health of our people can be improved.

In conclusion, Mr President, I reiterate my thanks to the three rapporteurs, and my group wishes to support these amendments without reserve.

President. — I call Mr Skovmand.

Mr Skovmand. — (DK) Mr President, of the four proposals before us, the most crucial are naturally the Commission's proposals for a regulation on swine fever and the proposals on the amendment of the directive on tuberculosis and brucellosis. These two proposals have one thing in common. They aim at weakening a number of veterinary provisions since, in the Commission's view, they are prejudicial to free trade as provided for in the Treaty of Rome.

This principle of free trade is regarded as so important that the Commission is proposing weakening these

provisions before the disease has been stamped out. In my view, this is a totally irresponsible attitude. If, for example, swine fever were to be reintroduced into Denmark, it would cost Danish agriculture hundreds of millions of kroner each year. The Members of this Parliament should not let themselves be fooled by the fact that, according to its title, this proposal is supposed to be aimed at combating swine fever. It would be more accurate to call it a proposal for the propagation of swine fever as it proposes replacing an effective means of combating the disease by one which is ineffective.

Denmark, the United Kingdom and Ireland are nowadays free of swine fever and for this reason, all imported pigs must spend a month in quarantine, during which time it is possible to ascertain with 100 % certainty whether or not they have the disease. The Commission thinks that a certificate from a veterinary inspector should be adequate, although it should be patently obvious that this would by no means be the case. I should therefore like to conclude by putting two questions to Mr Finn Gundelach, the Commissioner for Agriculture. Firstly, has the Commission taken due note of the observations by the Committee on Agriculture to the effect that the diseases must be stamped out before trade restrictions are relaxed and will this be taken into account in future work on this matter? Secondly, can Denmark, the United Kingdom and Ireland count on the derogations granted to them in respect of swine fever being prolonged until it becomes firmly established that the disease has been stamped out in the countries exporting the animals?

President. — I call Mr Bocklet.

Mr Bocklet. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the political dimension of the four motions for resolutions before us mainly lies in our efforts to ensure adequate protection for animals and human beings within the Community, while at the same time applying precise and uniform Community regulations in the veterinary field. I should like to emphasize that the harmonization of Community legislation is essential not just in terms of the free movement of goods; the health of human beings and animals within the Community is at least as important. There can be no doubt that the large number of different regional regulations is one of the reasons why these diseases have still not been eradicated. The proposed regulations and directives are undoubtedly a positive step towards removing the differences and existing exemptions. However, we must appreciate that these proposals alone will not bring about any short-term removal of the trade barriers between the Six and the three new Member States resulting from the differences in the situation regarding these diseases. It looks as though Denmark, the United Kingdom and Ireland in particular are expected to be

Bocklet

officially declared swine-fever-free regions, which means that under Article 12, they will be able to lay claim to the special health guarantees provided for in this directive. In the long term, however, the proposed legislation seems to be an appropriate way of speeding up the eradication of swine fever on the Continent, with the creation of swine-fever-free regions providing a basis for removing the present obstacles in EEC trade in live pigs.

Let me conclude with two suggestions. To make it easier to implement this legislation, we should make sure that the regulations regarding the trade in live pigs between regions are worded more simply and comprehensibly. As to the introduction of a new tuberculin standard, we must find some means of enabling the Member States to go on using tuberculin, which was successfully used in the past to eradicate bovine tuberculosis.

President. — I call Mr Clinton.

Mr Clinton. — Mr President, I would like to make just a few very brief comments on the reports under discussion. First, I consider the eradication of disease an extremely important matter. And a very urgent matter, too, not just from the point of view of facilitating intra-Community trade, but also because of the danger of spreading some of these diseases to humans, and also because disease can have, and indeed often does have, a serious effect on the economics of meat production. However, when making arrangements for the eradication of disease in the shortest possible time we must also be conscious of the enormous cost involved, both for certain Member States and for the individual livestock producers involved.

In Ireland an accelerated programme of disease eradication has been undertaken. And this is causing immense loss and hardship to some farmers where disease levels are found to be exceptionally high and where compensation is completely inadequate. To take care of such hardship cases there should in my view be a special fund to ensure that these farmers are saved from bankruptcy. Otherwise there will be a lack of cooperation and serious resistance because, as we know, self-preservation is the first law. I would like to express on behalf of my country our appreciation both of certain derogations and of the contributions and consideration we are being given in connection with these problems.

I would also say that the goal and the policy must be complete eradication. Not just immunisation by means of vaccination. Vaccination may be an acceptable temporary measure, but vaccination on a permanent basis is totally unacceptable because of its costs in the first instance, and that is cost on a continuous basis. It also makes diseases endemic. I say this in relation to such diseases as swine fever and foot and mouth disease. I feel that the slaughter policy is the only sensible approach.

I know that disease eradication is a fairly technical matter requiring a good deal of professional knowledge. Indeed, I have no such professional knowledge. I have simply spoken as someone who has been fairly close to the scene in one capacity or another for a number of years.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) Mr President, I should first of all like to thank the rapporteur and Mr Ligios for presenting this motion for a resolution and report which support the Commission's proposals. I should like to stress, on a general level, that the Commission fully agrees with the view put forward regarding the combating of animal diseases, be it classical swine fever or African swine fever, which is something completely different — it not only came from Africa, but it is an entirely different disease — or brucellosis or bovine tuberculosis. Naturally, different methods must be used in different cases, but under certain circumstances they will inevitably be dramatic, such as slaughtering of livestock. Since this has considerable economic implications, the Community has, as you know, provided considerable funds for the combating of brucellosis, which are currently being used to the full. The programme is therefore being stepped up. Similarly, we thought of making funds available for the combating of classical swine fever which continues to exist in various parts of Europe, but it must be stressed that the situation is far less serious than it was for many years.

The programme we propose aims at freeing Europe of swine fever, firstly by means of a campaign to eradicate the existing cases — this would be partly financed out of Community funds — and a subsequent phase involving the introduction of the control measures necessary to prevent a new outbreak, thereby providing the basis for free trade which, after all, is one of the principal objectives laid down in the Treaty of Rome.

I cannot accept Mr Skovmand's criticisms of the proposal. I must urge Mr Skovmand to study the proposal a little more carefully before he puts forward ideas which are bordering on demagoguery. What we are proposing for the second phase is a regulation whereby the following guarantees can be required for trade between different regions: firstly, that the animals come from herds free of swine fever, in a region free of swine fever, secondly, that the animals have been tested for swine fever, and finally that quarantine may be required in the country of export. In addition, regions can be approved only if they can carry out checks on the imports and exports of pigs. Whilst the rules must apply for the entire Member States, under these conditions, it would, I think, be possible to make control effective in a situation where

Gundelach

swine fever has been combated, and that there is, consequently, no question of weakening the regulations, but rather of strengthening them and guaranteeing that they are implemented on a European level, since a further reason why this is necessary is that as long as swine fever continues to exist in neighbouring countries, a country such as Denmark is constantly faced with the threat of losing the somewhat privileged position which its pig producers currently enjoy on both the internal and the world market. It is therefore in the interests of Danish pig producers too to solve this problem at Community level.

As regards the motion for a resolution on African swine fever, I fully agree with the main principles. However, I should like to stress that we have already provided considerable funds for combating this dangerous disease which is on our doorstep, i.e. in Malta, Spain and Portugal and now, I should like to stress, a great deal of money has been spent over the last two years with a view to eradicating the disease in Sardinia. We have called for a full-scale eradication programme in these regions, and when a programme of this kind has been drawn up, we will make proposals for its implementation. We also intend to play a considerable part in an overall programme for solving this problem in the entire Mediterranean region, either in direct cooperation with the countries in question, if they ask us to do so, or via appropriate international organizations. I wholeheartedly agree with Mr Ligios that we must remove the strain from our borders and avoid one problem, i.e. classical swine fever, being replaced by another problem, i.e. African swine fever.

Finally, I should like to say that I fully agree with those who have said that the health of human beings must come first. However, when this has been said, when the problems of public health and health requirements have been solved, one of the aims of the Treaty of Rome remains the establishment of the free movement of goods. And the pigmeat sector is no exception. We must, therefore, hope that we will be able to solve these problems in the foreseeable future, and that the derogations for the acceding countries, which must be prolonged for some time to come, will not become permanent. The phrase 'for one last time' which occurs in the report, Mr Skovmand, is the rapporteur's phrase and not the Commission's.

President. — I call Mr Skovmand.

Mr Skovmand. — (DK) Mr President, I should just like to go into the question to Mr Gundelach a little deeper. The Commissioner said that it was not the Commission that said it was for one last time. Are we

to understand from this that the Commission regards it as reasonable that the derogation should continue as long as swine fever has not been eradicated in the countries from which the pigs are imported?

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) Mr President, it follows from what I have said that until we have put the programme we have outlined into action and until it has produced some results, it will be necessary to prolong the derogations. I hope that the programme will be put into practice and that it will be possible to do without the derogations. However, the derogations must continue until a valid Community regulation has come into force.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

16. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Friday, 18 January 1980 from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. (and possibly 2 p.m.) with the following agenda :

9 a.m.

— procedure without report

10.30 a.m.

— voting time

— Warner report on humanitarian aid for Afghanistan

— Poniatowski report on trade arrangements between Southern Rhodesia and the EEC

— motion for a resolution on Community aid for Wales

— motion for a resolution on natural disasters in the Mezzogiorno

— motion for a resolution on urgent EEC aid for Mauritius

— Almirante report on Cyprus wines

— Caretoni Romagnoli report on certain agricultural products originating in Turkey

— Giummarra report on frozen beef and veal

— Lemmer report on export procedures for goods

— Seeler report on duties on certain types of fish

— Agnelli report on certain adult bovine animals from Yugoslavia

— Luster report on certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products (without debate)

End of sitting

— voting time

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 8.05 p.m.)

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 18 JANUARY 1980

Contents

| | | | |
|--|-----|--|-----|
| 1. <i>Approval of minutes:</i> | | <i>Mr Vergès and others (Doc. 1-676/79)</i> | |
| <i>Mr Patterson</i> | 237 | <i>Mr Vergès, author</i> | 246 |
| 2. <i>Documents received</i> | 237 | <i>Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission;</i> | |
| 3. <i>Petitions</i> | 237 | <i>Mr Bersani</i> | 247 |
| 4. <i>Membership of committees</i> | 237 | 12. <i>Regulations on wines of fresh grapes and</i> | |
| 5. <i>Procedure without report</i> | 238 | <i>liqueur wines originating in Cyprus —</i> | |
| 6. <i>Statement by the President</i> | 238 | <i>report by Mr Almirante, drawn up on</i> | |
| 7. <i>Situation in Afghanistan — Report by Sir</i> | | <i>behalf of the Committee on External</i> | |
| <i>Fred Warner, drawn up on behalf of the</i> | | <i>Economic Relations (Doc. 1-568/79)</i> | |
| <i>Committee on Development and Coopera-</i> | | <i>Mr J.D. Taylor, deputy rapporteur</i> | 248 |
| <i>tion (Doc. 1-638/79)</i> | | <i>Mr Martin; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr</i> | |
| <i>Sir Fred Warner, rapporteur</i> | 238 | <i>Ortoli Vice-President of the Commission</i> | 248 |
| <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Cheysson, Member of the</i> | | 13. <i>Votes</i> | |
| <i>Commission</i> | 239 | — <i>Lega report (Doc. 1-584/79): Regula-</i> | |
| 8. <i>Regulation on trade relations between</i> | | <i>tions amending the Staff Regulations</i> | |
| <i>Southern Rhodesia and the European</i> | | <i>of Officials of the Communities:</i> | |
| <i>Economic Community — report by Mr</i> | | <i>Points of order: Mr Pannella; Mr</i> | |
| <i>Poniatowski, drawn up on behalf of the</i> | | <i>Patterson; Mr Pannella</i> | 249 |
| <i>Committee on Development and Coopera-</i> | | <i>Motion for a resolution on salary</i> | |
| <i>tion (Doc. 1-673/79)</i> | | <i>scales (Doc. 202/79):</i> | |
| <i>Mr Bersani, deputy rapporteur</i> | 240 | <i>Amendment before paragraph 1:</i> | |
| <i>Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission;</i> | | <i>Mr Lega, rapporteur</i> | 250 |
| <i>Sir Fred Warner; Mr Bersani</i> | 241 | <i>Amendment to paragraph 3:</i> | |
| 9. <i>Community aid to Wales — Motion for a</i> | | <i>Mr Lega; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Lega</i> | 250 |
| <i>resolution by Mr Rogers and others (Doc.</i> | | <i>Adoption of the motion for a resolu-</i> | |
| <i>1-651/79)</i> | | <i>tion</i> | 250 |
| <i>Mr Griffiths, author</i> | 242 | <i>Motion for a resolution on family and</i> | |
| <i>Miss Brookes; Mr Harris; Lord O'Hagan;</i> | | <i>social security matters (Doc. 201/79):</i> | |
| <i>Mr Maher; Mr Pannella; Mr Griffiths;</i> | | <i>Amendment to Article 13:</i> | |
| <i>Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commis-</i> | | <i>Mr Lega</i> | 250 |
| <i>sion</i> | 242 | <i>Amendment to Article 14:</i> | |
| 10. <i>Natural disasters in the Mezzogiorno —</i> | | <i>Mr Lega</i> | 250 |
| <i>Motion for a resolution by Mr Papapietro</i> | | <i>Adoption of the motion for a resolu-</i> | |
| <i>and others (Doc. 1-674/79)</i> | | <i>tion</i> | 251 |
| <i>Mr Papapietro, author</i> | 244 | <i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 212/79)</i> | |
| <i>Mr Bersani (EPP); Mr Pannella; Mr</i> | | <i>on pensions and social security for</i> | |
| <i>Capanna; Mr Ortoli, Member of the</i> | | <i>temporary staff:</i> | |
| <i>Commission</i> | 245 | <i>Amendments to the proposal for a regu-</i> | |
| <i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i> | 246 | <i>lation:</i> | |
| 11. <i>Urgent aid from the EEC for the Island of</i> | | <i>Mr Lega</i> | 251 |
| <i>Mauritius — Motion for a resolution by</i> | | <i>Consideration of the motion for a reso-</i> | |
| | | <i>lution:</i> | |
| | | <i>Amendment after paragraph 1:</i> | |

| | | | |
|--|-----|--|-----|
| <i>Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Lega</i> | 251 | <i>Mr Ghergo</i> | 259 |
| <i>Adoption of the motion for a resolution</i> | 251 | <i>Motion for a resolution</i> | |
| — <i>Weber report (Doc. 1-576/79): Second five-year programme on radioactive waste:</i> | | <i>Amendment after paragraph 1:</i> | |
| <i>Amendments to the proposal for a decision:</i> | | <i>Mr Ghergo</i> | 260 |
| <i>Mrs Weber, rapporteur; Mr Johnson; Mrs Weber</i> | 252 | <i>Amendment after paragraph 3:</i> | |
| <i>Motion for a resolution:</i> | | <i>Mr Ghergo; Mr Coppieters</i> | 260 |
| <i>Amendment to paragraph 1</i> | | <i>Explanations of vote: Mr Coppieters; Mr Pannella</i> | 260 |
| <i>Mrs Weber</i> | 252 | <i>Adoption of the motion for a resolution</i> | 260 |
| <i>Amendment to paragraph 2:</i> | | <i>Points of order: Mr Sherlock; Mr Veronesi</i> | 260 |
| <i>Mrs Weber</i> | 252 | — <i>Combe report (Do. 1-618/79): Directive on cocoa and chocolate products:</i> | |
| <i>Amendments to paragraph 3:</i> | | <i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i> | 261 |
| <i>Mrs Weber</i> | 253 | <i>Explanation of vote: Mr Pannella</i> | 261 |
| <i>Amendment after paragraph 3:</i> | | <i>Adoption of the motion for a resolution</i> | 261 |
| <i>Mrs Weber</i> | 253 | — <i>Combe report (Doc. 1-619/79): Directive on trade in fresh poultrymeat:</i> | |
| <i>Amendments to paragraph 4:</i> | | <i>Adoption of the motion for a resolution</i> | 261 |
| <i>Mrs Weber; Mrs Walz</i> | 253 | — <i>Cresson report (Doc. 1-571/79): classical swine fever:</i> | |
| <i>Amendment after paragraph 4:</i> | | <i>Adoption of the motion for a resolution</i> | 261 |
| <i>Mrs Weber</i> | 253 | — <i>Cresson report (Doc. 1-620/79): Derogations in respect of swine fever:</i> | |
| <i>Amendment to paragraph 6:</i> | | <i>Adoption of the motion for a resolution</i> | 261 |
| <i>Mrs Weber</i> | 254 | — <i>Warner report (Doc. 1-638/79): Situation in Afghanistan:</i> | |
| <i>Amendment to paragraph 7:</i> | | <i>Sir Fred Warner</i> | 262 |
| <i>Mrs Weber</i> | 254 | <i>Adoption of the motion for a resolution</i> | 262 |
| <i>Amendments to paragraphs 8 to 10:</i> | | — <i>Poniatowski report (Doc. 1-673/79): Regulation on trade arrangements between Southern Rhodesia and the European Economic Community:</i> | |
| <i>Mrs Walz; Mrs Weber</i> | 254 | <i>Adoption of the motion for a resolution</i> | 262 |
| <i>Amendments to paragraph 11:</i> | | — <i>Motion for a resolution by Mr Rogers and others (Doc. 1-651/79): Community aid to Wales:</i> | |
| <i>Mrs Weber; Mr Arndt; Mrs Walz</i> | 255 | | |
| <i>Amendments to paragraph 12:</i> | | | |
| <i>Mrs Weber</i> | 255 | | |
| <i>Amendments to paragraph 13:</i> | | | |
| <i>Mrs Weber</i> | 256 | | |
| <i>Amendments to paragraph 14:</i> | | | |
| <i>Mrs Weber</i> | 256 | | |
| <i>Amendment to paragraph 15:</i> | | | |
| <i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Muntingh; Mr Arndt (S)</i> | 257 | | |
| <i>Points of order: Mrs Weber; Mr Arndt</i> | 258 | | |
| <i>Mr Klepsch; Mr Luster</i> | 258 | | |
| — <i>Ghergo report (Doc. 1-552/79): Decision adopting a five-year radiation programme:</i> | | | |
| <i>Amendment to the proposal for a decision:</i> | | | |
| <i>Mr Ghergo, rapporteur</i> | 259 | | |
| <i>Amendment to the annex:</i> | | | |

- Amendment to the first indent of the preamble* 262
- Sir Fred Warner* 262
- Explanations of vote: Mr Boyes; Mr Cluyd; Mr Newton Dunn* 262
- Adoption of the motion for a resolution* 263
- *Motion for a resolution by Mr Papapietro and others (Doc. 1-674/79): Natural disasters in the Mezzogiorno: Explanation of vote: Mr Klepsch* 263
- Adoption of the motion for a resolution* 263
- Motion for a resolution by Mr Vergès and others (Doc. 1-676/79): Urgent aid from the EEC to the Island of Mauritius:*
- Adoption of the motion for a resolution* 263
- *Almirante report (Doc. 1-568/79): Regulations on wines of fresh grapes and liqueur wines originating in Cyprus: Adoption of the motion for a resolution* 263
14. *Regulation on duties of certain agricultural products originating in Turkey — report by Mrs Carettoni-Romagnoli, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1/562/79):*
- Sir Fred Catherwood, deputy rapporteur* 263
- Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission* 263
15. *Regulation on a tariff quota for frozen beef and veal — Report by Mr Giummarra, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1-569/79):*
- Mr Giummarra, rapporteur* 263
16. *Directive on procedures for the exportation of goods Report by Mr Lemmer, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1-547/79):*
- Sir Fred Catherwood, deputy rapporteur* 264
17. *Regulation on duties on certain types of fish — report by Mr Seeler, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1-643/79):*
- Mr Seeler, rapporteur*
18. *Regulation on imports of certain adult* 264
- bovine animals from Yugoslavia — report by Mrs Agnelli, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1-622/79):*
- Mr Irmer, deputy rapporteur* 264
- Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission; Mr Seeler (S)* 265
19. *Regulation on certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products — report without debate by Mr Luster, drawn up on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-590/79)* 265
20. *Votes*
- *Carettoni-Romagnoli report (Doc. 1-562/79): Regulation on duties on certain agricultural products originating in Tunisia:*
- Adoption of the motion for a resolution* 265
- *Giummarra report (Doc. 1-569/79) Regulation on a tariff quota for frozen beef and veal:*
- Adoption of the motion for a resolution* 265
- *Lemmer report (Doc. 1-547/79): Directive on procedures for the exportation of goods:*
- Adoption of the motion for a resolution* 265
- *Seeler report (Doc. 1-643/79): Regulation on duties on certain types of fish:*
- Adoption of the motion for a resolution* 265
- *Agnelli report (Doc. 1-622/79): Regulation on imports of certain adult bovine animals from Yugoslavia:*
- Adoption of the motion for a resolution* 265
- *Luster report (Doc. 1-590/79): Regulation on certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products:*
- Adoption of the motion for a resolution* 265
- Points of order: Mr Patterson, Mr Moreland; Miss Brookes* 266
21. *Dates of the next part-session* 266
22. *Approval of the minutes* 266
23. *Adjournment of the session* 266

IN THE CHAIR : MR ROGERS

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9.00 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments ?

I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — The point raised by Mr Romualdi and Mrs Kellett-Bowman on Question Time resulted in a specific alteration to the minutes of proceedings of Wednesday's sitting. This is not recorded in yesterday's minutes.

President. — Mr Patterson, you are referring to paragraph 4 on page 1 ?

Mr Patterson. — Yes, I am. Paragraph 4 states : 'The following also spoke on Wednesday's minutes ...'. As a result of Mrs Kellett-Bowman's point on those minutes, a change was made. I think it is worth recording in these minutes that a change was made to Wednesday's minutes.

President. — That will be taken care of. The minutes are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received the following motions for a resolution, tabled pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure :

- a motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Megahy, Mrs Weber, Mr Pelikan, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling and Mrs Vayssade on behalf of the Socialist Group, on compensation for victims of acts of violence (Doc. 1-679/79)

referred to the Legal Affairs Committee ;

- a motion for a resolution by Mr Seal on the establishment of a European facility for the production of micro-processors (Doc. 1-681/79)

referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs ;

- a motion for a resolution by Mrs Desmond, Mr Kavanagh, Mr O'Connell and Mr O'Leary on the Commission's proposals to reduce the Irish sugar quota (Doc. 1-583/79)

referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

- a motion for a resolution by Mr Collins, Mrs Weber and Mr Muntingh on the relationship between economic efficiency and consumer satisfaction (Doc. 1-684/79)

referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for its opinion :

- a motion for a resolution by Mr Moreland, Mr Jakobsen, Mr Moorhouse, Mr Cottrell, Lord Harmar-Nicholls, Sir Peter Vanneck, Mr Kirk, Mr Prout, Mr C. Jackson, Sir David Nicolson, Mr de Courcy Ling, Mr Hord, Miss Roberts, Mr Hutton, Mr Curry, Mr Seligman, Mr Turner, Mr Harris, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr J.D. Taylor, Mr Sherlock, Mr Tyrrell, Miss Hooper, Mr Battersby, Mr Price, Mr Howell and Mr Simmonds, on the use of transport from the Comecon countries (Doc. 1-685/79)

referred to the Committee on Transport ;

- a motion for a resolution by Mr Coppieters, on the impression of colonization prevailing among the people of Corsica (Doc. 1-686/79)

referred to the Political Affairs Committee ;

- a motion for a resolution by Mr Cottrell, Mr Hutton and Mr J.D. Taylor, on a fixed link between Northern Ireland and Scotland (Doc. 1-687/79)

referred to the Committee on Transport.

Petitions

President. — I have received the following petitions :

- a petition by Amnesty International, Work and Adoption Group, Mechelen Branch, Belgium, on the respect for basic human rights in Ethiopia
- a petition by Mrs Thomsen on amnesty for prisoners in Chile
- a petition by the ecological movement 'Anders denken'. Anders Doen ! (Think differently ! Act differently !) on the call for an EEC directive to protect the ecological consumer
- a petition by representatives of nine artificial insemination companies on the incompatibility of French Artificial Insemination Monopoly with the Treaty of Rome
- a petition by Mr Schenk on CB radio
- a petition by Mr Jan Feidt and others, on behalf of the General Union of European Organizations — European Parliament, on government interference in the recruitment of Greek officials.

These petitions have been entered respectively under Nos 38 to 43/79 in the register provided for in Rule 48 (2) of the Rules of Procedure and, pursuant to paragraph 3 of that same Rule, referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

4. *Membership of committees*

President. — I have received from the Socialist Group the request that Mr Mihr be appointed a member of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and that Mrs Viehoff be appointed

President

member of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

5. Procedure without report

President. — On Monday I announced the title of that Commission proposal to which it was proposed to apply the *procedure without report* laid down in Rule 27A of the Rules of Procedure. Since no Member has asked leave to speak and no amendments have been tabled to it, I declare that proposal approved by the European Parliament.

6. Statement by the President

President. — I have been asked to read a text drawn up following a request by the Staff Committee to the President. As requested by the Staff Committee, I would like to make a correction and amplification to the communication which I transmitted to you on Wednesday evening regarding the position of the Staff Committee *vis-à-vis* our work.

While emphasizing that it insisted on observance of the agreement concerning the duration of sittings, the Staff Committee wishes to state that it in no way intended to interfere with the order of business.

(Applause)

7. Situation in Afghanistan

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-638/79) drawn up by Sir Fred Warner on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the situation in Afghanistan.

I call Sir Fred Warner.

Sir Fred Warner, rapporteur. — Mr President, the purpose of the motion for a resolution is to provide food and support for refugees from Afghanistan. I very much regret that it has not been possible to present to Parliament a written report on this subject. The reason for this is that the Committee on Development and Cooperation had to move very fast indeed in order to be sure of securing without delay those unexpended funds which are available for relief of this kind.

The matter was originally brought to the attention of Parliament in a motion standing in the name of Dr von Habsburg, No 1-461/79, which was referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation on 5 November. However, it was not until mid-December after the last part-session of this House that the committee was authorized to go ahead. Therefore, although your committee has taken the decision commended in the document in front of you today, it has had no opportunity to approve a written report.

Instead, it agreed without any dissenting vote that I should make an oral report to you.

On Wednesday afternoon of this week, this Parliament passed a resolution on Afghanistan which dealt with all the political and international aspects of the invasion of that country by a foreign power. The resolution before you today does not seek to deal with such matters. It is intended only to deal with the humanitarian aspects, with the plight of the hundreds of thousands of peace-loving people who have been driven from their homes by the fighting, who have had to flee their own country to safeguard their lives and who now find themselves in pitiable conditions in Pakistan. Fellow Members, the people on whose behalf we are appealing to you might be called the unknown refugees of the world. When tragic events were taking place in Nicaragua the world press kept us fully informed of the plight of the victims. Hardly a day goes by without our learning of the terrible conditions of the refugees from repression in Cambodia, but we hear very little indeed about the plight of the hundreds of thousands who have been rendered homeless by foreign interference in their country. I understand that on 8 January the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Geneva sent a cable to Commissioner Cheysson pointing to the dramatic increase in the number of refugees which has taken place. The need was expressed for additional supplies of medicines, tents, blankets and the like. Implementing and monitoring of additional aid is to be strengthened by the dispatch of further personnel to Islamabad, Quetta and Peshawar. It looks as if the number of people concerned will be about half a million. The UN High Commission has pointed out that there are additional food requirements also. Since the food aid which was provided under the World Food Programme has not been adapted to the new situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan it is now estimated that a further 12 000 tonnes of wheat will be required during the next three months and at least 1 000 tonnes of sugar as well.

The latest reports on movements of the refugees estimate that the total number at present in Pakistan is well over 400 000 and rising rapidly. The refugee camps are centred around Quetta and Peshawar. In the north-west frontier province there are about 13 settlement sites and in Baluchistan there are a further 30 camps although these are smaller. A report sent to the Commission by the World Council of Churches describes the refugees as civilians and says that they have fled in the face of military and religious persecution. The Pakistan Government is making an allowance of 4 rupees — approximately 42 US cents — per day. We should not get very far on that here in Strasbourg, and they are not getting very far in Pakistan either. Pakistan itself is facing severe economic difficulties as is well known in this House, but according

Warner

to reports received from the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the Red Cross and the World Council of Churches, the Pakistan Government is making every effort possible to alleviate the situation in which the refugees find themselves. But in spite of these efforts the children are receiving an allowance of only half what the adults receive, that is to say 21 cents a day, and it is to relieve this situation that today we appeal to the House. As far as aid from the Community is concerned the Commission has already decided on a dispatch of 260 tonnes of butter oil and 600 tonnes of skimmed-milk powder. Shipment is taking place now.

Finally, as regards the financial situation, I should just make it clear that the Community's disaster fund for 1980 is open to use under the 'one-twelfth' principle while the budget question remains unresolved. This means that a total of 250 000 units of account is available in January but it would not be wise for the Parliament to propose a specific amount to be made available which depends upon the applications received and the opinion of experts in the field. Nevertheless, today we should make clear the principle that monies *can* be made available from the Disaster Fund and that it should be earmarked for this disastrous situation. Further additional food aid, based on the applications received, particularly for wheat and sugar, should also be made available urgently and the specific requests which the Commission has received from the High Commissioner, for a further 12 000 tonnes of wheat and 1 000 tonnes of sugar should be met. The Committee on Development and Cooperation urged Parliament to pass this resolution and to enable the Commission to go ahead with the essential work.

President. — I call Mr Pannella

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, I congratulate Sir Fred Warner on his speech, as I feel that it is part of our work to study this matter. I wish simply to point out that the Community's budget situation is becoming increasingly unsatisfactory, both as regards special aid to deal with the problem of world hunger — as this aspect too is involved — and to create effective development structures. Consequently, the proposal which has just been made, and which I naturally support, to release 150 000 units of account — on which the Committee on Budgets gave a favourable opinion just recently — seems to me more a demonstration of our good will than an aid measure in keeping with the seriousness of this act of aggression and tragedy.

In my opinion, we must ask ourselves once and for all whether we should be making goodwill gestures and doing a good deed each day or if we should really try to tackle the dramatic problems which are arising in the world using the status and the financial, commercial and civil importance of the European Parliament.

Quite simply, therefore it seems to me that the documents we have received from the Commission at least

provide a guarantee that the little that can be done for the moment will be done thoroughly. However, I feel that the battle we are having with the Council on the budget will have a slightly different outcome from the clashes of the past. I do not believe that the Italian Presidency has started its work under very auspicious circumstances, but I do feel that in the coming days and weeks we will see a completely different situation developing on the budget for 1980, both as regards the Development Aid Fund and the Regional Aid Fund.

Mr President, I would like simply on behalf of my colleagues in the Italian Radical Party to support this report and the proposals, and also to express the hope that in the coming weeks we as the European Community will be in a position to take more adequate steps to alleviate the serious political and economic crisis facing the world.

President. — I call Mr Cheysson

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — *(F)* Mr President, two days ago Parliament condemned in unequivocal terms the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan. We are now to discuss one of the dramatic consequences of this foreign invasion, that is the refugees flooding into the neighbouring countries and, in the circumstances, principally Pakistan.

Sir Fred Warner has given an accurate and excellent description of the situation. We are aware of this situation as a result of a cable from the High Commissioner for Refugees, to which the rapporteur has referred and which was sent late on 14 January. Mr Hartling the High Commissioner for Refugees, informed us in that cable that the number of refugees for which the High Commission would be responsible would be 500 000 the figure already quoted by Sir Fred Warner. The High Commission immediately sent staff to take charge of the situation and has set up a programme involving \$55m, 25m for food supplies and 30m for other urgent requirements consisting in temporary shelter — tents: let us not forget that this is a very cold region — sanitary equipment, education, medical care and means of transport.

Mr President, we received this cable in the morning of 15 January and we were able to discuss the situation immediately with the Nine meeting in political cooperation. The nine decided to make a quite exceptional effort, the magnitude of which has nothing to do with the figures that have been mentioned here. Some of the Community countries have already informed the High Commission for Refugees of the amount of aid they are providing. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for example, has announced that it is making DM 5m available.

On 16 January, less than 48 hours after the High Commission's appeal, we had a meeting to coordinate the action of the nine Member States of the Commu-

Cheysson

nity in accordance with the emergency procedures I explained to Parliament three or four months ago during the first debate on hunger in the world.

As a result of these consultations I intend to propose to the Commission within forty eight hours that about \$10m, or 8m EUA, in other words a completely different figure from that so far mentioned, should be made available.

This aid would be split into two parts: firstly, a generous amount of food aid, which would exceed the initial request made by the High Commission, This, as Sir Fred Warner has said, was for 12 000 tonnes of cereals and 1 000 tonnes of sugar, in addition to the milk powder now being shipped and 740 tonnes of butteroil This is three times the volume referred to by Sir Fred Warner because we have been able to release various quantities from elsewhere.

This will be supplemented by recourse to the chapter on aid in the event of disasters, taking the form of a very large sum in cash. It is essential that we act in this way. In view of the misery of these refugees, in view of the moving appeal received from High Commission for Refugees, it would be intolerable if we showed that we were incapable of action, that we were powerless.

But there is a budgetary difficulty, and on behalf of the Commission I call on the Assembly to help us deal with it. What is this difficulty? As we do not have a budget, we are authorized to commit a provisional 1/4: a provisional 3/12 may be committed pursuant to the Financial Regulation. Where payment appropriations are concerned, we can only pay a provisional 1/12, that is 250 000 EUA, the figure mentioned by the rapporteur just now, but unfortunately, of that 250 000 EUA, 106 000 has already been allocated to relieving some of the distress in the Azores and in Timor. All we are therefore entitled to spend in January is 144 000 EUA, which is obviously not enough for what we have to do.

Mr President, the Commission therefore intends to call on the budgetary authority to agree to the provisional 1/12 being exceeded in accordance with the conditions laid down in the Financial Regulation. As we are dealing here with non-compulsory expenditure, the two sides of the budgetary authority will have to tackle this problem

We call on the Council and the Assembly to treat this proposal from the Commission with the utmost urgency. It will be on their tables on Monday at the latest. This can be done under the Financial Regulation, and I hope that the Committee on Budgets will — and the letter it has sent augurs very well for this — treat this matter with extreme urgency. It would be unacceptable for us to turn down so serious a request on procedural grounds.

In short, Mr President, the Community must face up to its responsibilities: its aid will initially amount, taking account of the appeal received from the High Commission for Refugees, to some \$10m, half in food aid, which we can provide under the existing budget, and half in cash, involving the application of an emergency procedure for which provision is made in the Financial Regulation.

On behalf of the Commission I should like to thank the Assembly in advance for agreeing to this emergency procedure.

President. — The debate is closed.

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

8. Regulation on trade arrangements between Southern Rhodesia and the European Economic Community

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-673/79) by Mr Poniatowski drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-658/79) for a Regulation on trade arrangements between Southern Rhodesia and the European Economic Community.

I call Mr Bersani.

Mr Bersani, deputy rapporteur. — (1) Mr President, colleagues, what we are dealing with is a proposal for a regulation presented by the Commission to grant Zimbabwe-Rhodesia access to the Community market on terms similar, to those granted to the overseas countries and territories. This is a consequence — and we feel a necessary one — of Southern Rhodesia's return to legality and the definitive steps Zimbabwe-Rhodesia has now taken on a new path, a development which we have all hoped for so much in this Assembly. It is a development which, after so many ups and downs often accompanied by tragic events, will bring this country to a state of independence and peace with a society governed by a multiracial and democratic majority.

It would therefore seem fair — not only to bring Zimbabwe-Rhodesia's situation into line with those of other countries in accordance with the Community's treaties and obligations, but also to take account of wider political interests and motives — to adopt this regulation as a clear encouragement on our part for those future developments in the overall situation which we know to be of such importance not only for this county and its population but also for this whole area of Africa, which is of central importance not only from the geographical point of view.

Bersani

For these reasons the Committee on Development and Cooperation gave a favourable opinion, almost unanimously (there was only one abstention, but not I believe for any major reasons), and the Committee on Agriculture adopted a similar opinion unanimously.

Mr President, colleagues, in short these are the reasons which led the Committee on Development and Cooperation to recommend that the Assembly approve this regulation.

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I should first like to thank the Assembly and more specifically the Committee on Agriculture and above all the Committee on Development and Cooperation for dealing with this matter by an exceptional procedure in view of the urgency involved.

It is in fact only recently that we have been assured that the situation is developing satisfactorily in Southern Rhodesia — that is the official name of this part of Africa — and that there is now a good chance that one of the greatest dangers to security and peace in this part of Africa, and therefore for the whole of Africa, has been eliminated, in particular to make way for the elections that will be taking place very soon.

The British Government, which is responsible for this part of Africa, has called on the Community to grant the products originating there the same treatment, the same ease of access as products from overseas territories. This is the subject of the motion which Mr Bersani, speaking on behalf of the Committee on Development Cooperation, has just proposed the Assembly should adopt. The Commission would be very grateful to the Assembly if it would adopt it immediately.

As the Assembly has delivered its opinion, the Council, which discussed the matter the day before yesterday, has decided, in application of Articles 43 and 113 of the Treaty, to adopt the regulation straightaway in compliance with the Assembly's recommendations. We therefore believe that the regulation could be adopted without further ado today or on Monday at the latest. The regulation concerns the period until 31 December 1980 and will therefore cover this country after its independence, if independence is proclaimed before 31 December. Only one reservation has been made, and that is that we expect this country to adopt, after its independence, the principle of non-discrimination between the Member States and the most-favoured-nation clause with respect to our exports. Subject to this reservation, therefore, the system would apply until 31 December 1980, on condition that the future Zimbabwe informs us, as a sovereign State, that it wishes to join its fellow African countries as a signatory to the Convention of Lomé or that it wishes to adopt a different system, in which case we would have to re-examine the situation after 31 December 1980 with this Assembly.

Mr President, as we are discussing Southern Rhodesia, allow me to broach a subject directly associated with that country. On 14 January, the day on which we received from the High Commission for Refugees an urgent request on behalf of the Afghan Refugees, we also had another cable requesting our financial participation in an equally urgent operation involving the repatriation of Rhodesian refugees now in neighbouring countries, and particularly Zambia and Botswana. This is a very urgent matter, because these refugees should be allowed to take part in the elections which, we all hope, will be taking place at the end of February. The High Commission for Refugees therefore hopes to receive our reply by 25 January.

Mr President, on the same day we were able to consult our member governments and, in compliance with the procedures laid down by the Convention of Lomé, it was decided yesterday evening, less than 48 hours after receiving the High Commission's request, to grant an amount of 3m EUA or slightly more than \$ 4 m, to cover half the cost of repatriating several tens of thousands of Rhodesian refugees at present in Zambia and Botswana. I felt I should inform the Assembly of this. As this is being done under the Lomé Convention, we do not have the same budgetary problems, and the operation can begin immediately, as the High Commission has been officially informed today.

Allow me to say, Mr President, that this way of doing things shows that we are able to act quickly. This Community, which can be cumbersome at times, can on other occasions demonstrate remarkable flexibility in the action it takes.

President. — I call Sir Fred Warner.

Sir Fred Warner. — Mr President, I do not wish to interrupt the proceedings. I simply wish to take this opportunity of thanking the Commission for their extremely generous decision, and congratulate them on the speed and efficiency with which they tackled this very urgent request. I am sure all of those who are now going back to their homes will be very grateful to the Community for what is being done.

President. — I call Mr Bersani.

Mr Bersani, deputy rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, Sir Fred Warner has just expressed a view which I share to some extent. I too should like to thank the Commission. Some years ago I visited Botswana and Zambia as chairman of a select parliamentary delegation. On that occasion we visited refugee camps and had discussions with those responsible for the efforts with regard to aid and political assistance in a very difficult situation. We were able to appreciate — and at the same time to enter into a certain moral commitment — the basic needs referred to in the proposal

Bersani

and the decision taken so quickly by the Commission. The initiative taken by the Commission with such decisiveness and speed is a positive measure which reflects a wish which has been long held by this Parliament. In the light of our previous experiences, therefore, I too should like to acknowledge the work of the Commission.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

9. Community aid to Wales

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Rogers, Mr Griffiths, Mrs Clwyd, Mr Hänsch, Mr Seal, Mr Caborn, Mr Megahy, Mr Enright, Mr Boyes, Mr F'ch, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mr Wettig, Mr Dankert, Mrs Van den Heuvel, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Abens, Mrs Weber, Mr Schmid, Mr Van Minnen and Mrs Vayssade, on Community aid to Wales for flood damage (Doc. 1-651/79).

I call Mr Griffiths.

Mr Griffiths, deputy-rapporteur. — To a certain extent, Mr President, this motion has been overtaken once again by some speedy action and decision-making by the Commission. It has already been announced that 400 000 units of account will be made available to help South Wales and the West of England. I should like to thank the Commission for the speedy way in which they reacted to our request for help, although of course they will be aware that this amount of money can only be a symbol or a gesture in relation to the amount of damage which has taken place in South Wales in particular. I therefore urge the Commission to try and find a way of providing more aid for the region. In my own area of some 6 000 people homes were badly damaged by flooding. In Mr Rogers' constituency a similar number of people have been affected and even beyond that, in the West and mid-Wales, about 15 000 people have had their homes badly damaged. The amount of money allocated is therefore very small indeed.

We realize that there are budgetary problems, but we have seen that where the House and the Commission have a will, a way exists of providing more money. So I hope that money will be provided at a later date.

I would also say, Mr President, that we accept the amendment tabled by Mr Harris and others and of course the Commission has already recognized the situation in that area as well.

President. I call Miss Brookes.

Miss Brookes. — Mr President, I realize that you are not able to take part in the debate and I listened with great interest to Mr Griffiths. I regret that Mrs Clwyd is not able to listen to this debate. If she is here, I apologize to her, but I cannot see her sitting in her seat.

I would like to have seen her in her seat, which is her proper place, if her name is down to speak on a motion. But so be it Mr President, we shall leave it at that.

First of all, I am deeply grateful that on this particular occasion — and I feel certain that I speak for all people in North Wales — we suffered no damage due to flooding in that part of the Principality. But I can fully appreciate the desolation and harm that has been caused to people, homes, shops, business premises, towns, villages, animals and farms. In fact it is estimated, Mr President, that 6 500 houses were damaged in South Wales alone. It has been announced that the European Community is giving approximately £247 000 to South Wales and the West country. That means that South Wales will receive approximately £159 000. It is gratifying to know that the Commission recognizes the Principality and its needs. But there are never sufficient funds to meet the needs that exist. This money is very special inasmuch as it is to go to those people and householders that have been directly affected by the floods. Therefore this money is to go to meet specific needs rather than to local authorities for overall spending.

One of the towns is Usk in Monmouth. Now that the waters have receded and left desolation behind, there is the awful problem of the silt, sewage, mud and dirt that are clinging to walls, staircases, ceilings, houses and covering roads. That is the aftermath of the force of the furious current of water that came rushing through the town, literally thrashing and destroying all that stood in its path. And 75 % of the town suffered. People with an updated insurance policy are being compensated because insurance companies will cover flood damage when a particular clause is put in that policy. Ten years ago the Usk local authority built a flood wall, and when it was completed insurance companies agreed to include a flood clause in the policies issued to people living in the town of Usk. But it is important that this money allocated should go to people with specific needs because a number of people, particularly the elderly living in Usk and other areas, have never had this flood cover clause put into their insurance policies and therefore are unable to claim compensation. So it is hoped that the money given by the European Community will be spent on the needs of the people and as little as possible on the administration of these funds.

Brookes

But let us take a positive line, Sir, rather than a critical line. The Welsh Water Authority has planned for flood defence costing £5 million. The work is to be carried out in Wales, particularly in Cardiff and the South Wales area, and I ask that Wales may have that £5 million back through the European Regional Fund. The Commission may be interested to know too that the EEC offices in Cathedral Road Cardiff, were very badly flooded being in the centre of the flooded area. They may note this when they are thinking about giving us the £5 million from the Regional Fund. But, Mr President, let us, as I said, take a positive and constructive stand on this serious subject and try to obtain this £5 million for Wales and do all we can to ensure that such serious flooding and disasters do not occur again.

President. — Miss Brookes, I am extremely grateful that you were able to speak on behalf of my constituency when I am unable to do so. I appreciate it.

I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, I am happy to be able to enter into the bipartisan spirit of this debate and to support your motion, and I thank Mr Griffiths for accepting my amendment which I now formally move, on behalf of my fellow members from the West of England. The motion, which you will, I think, accept, was rather incomplete in that for reasons I perfectly understand it dealt just with Wales, as it was tabled on a constituency basis. But as is now well known, the South-West of England, together with Wales, did bear the brunt of the storm after Christmas and indeed the West Country suffered a double blow in that before Christmas there was another storm which did not cause flooding but which did particular damage to my part of the world, Cornwall. In fact preparatory estimates by the County Council show that damage came to about half a million pounds, and that was mainly public property. These estimates took no account of the widespread damage to individual houses during that first storm.

We are very grateful indeed to the Commission for acting so quickly in this matter, thanks to the initiative of my colleague from Devon, Lord O'Hagan, who, I am sure, will be catching your eye in a few minutes. Officials administering the Fund arrived in Exeter right after the second storm, and as a result we have the announcement about aid, which we thoroughly welcome. I share Mr Griffiths' fears that it is going to prove too small an amount, but we realize the strain on the finances of the Commission. We are indeed grateful for this speedy gesture and this speedy help. I, too, welcome the fact that it is going mainly to individual people, particularly, I hope, to the elderly who might not have full insurance cover.

President. — I call Lord O'Hagan.

Lord O'Hagan. — Mr President, I too would like to join in the round of thanks to the Commission for the

efficiency and speed with which they have acted on the appeal I sent on 31 December by telegram to the Commissioners. The money is too little, of course, as the Commission has its resources for emergencies stretched too far, but I am glad that individual householders in Devon will benefit from this allocation from the emergency fund.

Local authorities will have a great burden to bear as a result of this flood. In Devon they calculate it will be a burden of £1 200 000, and that excludes the Water Authority. So I look forward to a speedy and satisfactory answer from the Commission to new applications under the Regional Fund and other funds for aid in dealing with infrastructure damaged by floods, where that infrastructure cannot be replaced from the disaster fund.

Finally, Mr President, could I assure all Members of the House that floods do not happen in Devon very often. Please spend your holidays there next summer.

(Laughter and applause)

President. — I must confess that I usually spend my own holidays in either yours, Miss Brookes, or in Mr Harris's constituency!

(Loud laughter)

I call Mr Maher.

Mr Maher. — Mr President, I too sympathize with the people who have had to suffer hardship as a result of this disaster and I agree completely that it is an excellent idea that the European Community should help in these situations. I think it helps to give people in local areas a feeling that there are others in the Community, either in their own country or in other Member States, who care about them and are concerned about their welfare, whether the victims are in Afghanistan or Rhodesia or our own Member States.

However, Mr President, I hope that when we come to consider the budget we shall be consistent and recognise that more money is needed for this and other areas, when we come to consider the question of whether we should hold down the amounts going into the budget or even reduce them. There is no way in which we can make resources available for deserving areas like this if at the same time we are going to reduce the amount of resources going into the budget. In future, let us be consistent. There is no way we can perform this kind of act if at the same time we reduce the resources going into the budget.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, the statements made by my honourable colleagues from the affected regions and surrounding areas appear to me unanimous: once again the Commission has acted impeccably. Mr President, I confess that I have one worry in

Pannella

this respect. I do not want the Commission's Directorate-General, which deserves this praise as it has proved so efficient, to then be able to justify the absolutely illogical measures which contradict its own demands when it comes to approving the budget. In other words, the fact that the Commission operates so efficiently could be used as a reason to refuse to increase its staff and the commitment appropriations. This is a little paradoxical, but like Mr Maher I too would like to urge the larger groups in this Parliament to be more consistent when voting on the budget. The Directorate-General which has final responsibility for this aid is always complaining that it is unable to continue working as it should and as it would like. If we want, therefore, to see the Commission operating in future in this sector as in others we should not then deny it the means to operate.

President. — I call Mr Griffiths.

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, I should like briefly to point out to the House that flooding of this nature in the city of Cardiff last took place some 20 years ago. It is only in the steep-sided coalmining valleys, which have peculiar drainage problems because of the devastation of the mining industry over some 70 to 80 years, that these events have occurred a little more frequently. In fact, such was the severity of the flooding and the force of the water in some areas that people were swept away to their death in Mr Roger's constituency.

As far as the cost to local authorities is concerned, the three major local authorities which cover the two Euro-constituencies of South-East and South-West Wales have estimated that about £ 15 million worth of damage has been done in the areas under their jurisdiction. As regards getting help for infrastructure purposes from the Community, i.e. from the Regional Development Fund, then of course up to 30 % is available. However, I would plead with my colleagues on the other side of the House to ask the British Government to make these schemes a priority, because the initiative must come from our own Water Authorities and the British Government acting together.

President. — I call Mr Ortoli.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I have listened very closely to what has been said and can only confirm that at its meeting the day before yesterday the Commission decided to allocate 400 000 EUA to the victims both in Wales, which will receive the larger share, and in the South-West of England, as Mr Harris requested.

This aid must go principally to the people affected. As it has been pointed out, the limited emergency funds

we have are not intended for infrastructures or for the regions: they must go to the victims of such disasters. The aid will be distributed by the local authorities through the medium of the Minister for the Environment. I should like to stress in connection with the supplementary requests that have been made, that this is by definition an exceptional operation, which demonstrates European solidarity, but one which, again by definition, is limited, if only by the appropriations, available, which at present amount to 5m EUA.

I have noted with much interest all that has been said on the problem in more general terms. The speakers will, of course, understand that I can only report to the Commission what they have had to say more generally on the problems that may affect Wales and the South-West of England. Be that as it may, Mr President, we have tried to act as quickly as possible and as effectively as possible. I can assure the House that bureaucratic preoccupations will not be uppermost in the distribution of such aid.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be held at the next voting time.

10. *Natural disasters in the Mezzogiorno*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Papapietro, Mr Adonnino, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Barbagli, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Barbi, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Cariglia, Mr Carossino, Mr Ceravolo, Mr Costanzo, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr Diana, Mr Filippi, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mr Giummara, Mr Lezzi, Mr Lima, Mr Orlandi, Mr Sassano, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Travaglini, on natural disasters in the Mezzogiorno (Doc. 1-674/79).

I call Mr Papapietro.

Mr Papapietro. — (I) Mr President, the motion for a resolution speaks for itself: At the beginning of the year there were violent sea storms accompanied and followed by falls of snow and unusual atmospheric disturbances for this area, resulting in damage which has not yet been assessed but which is certainly serious, in the heart of Italy's Mezzogiorno where entire crops, which were already poor and stunted, were damaged, and along the coast factories and public buildings, which were already in a poor state of repair, were devastated.

This is one of the least-favoured areas in Europe and I feel therefore, that the European Community has an obligation to show solidarity in line with its aims, are of the most important and appropriate being to bring about a better economic balance between the regions, by pursuing its usual policy, but also by playing a key role in times of serious economic and social emergencies in its poorer and less developed areas, such as those we referred to in the motion for a resolution.

Papapietro

The motion was tabled by Members from the Mezzogiorno (Communists, Christian Democrats, Socialists, Social Democrats) and also by Italian Members who are not from the South of Italy to stress the fact that, as the Mezzogiorno is the most serious problem facing Italian society and has shaped its history and will determine its development possibilities, any damage done to its economy and public order, such as that experienced recently, is also a blow to the economy and public life of the country, the seriousness of which is apparent to the Italian public.

We hope that the Commission of the European Communities too will take action to observe its obligation to provide active assistance for the population.

President. — I call Mr Bersani to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Bersani. — (*I*) Mr President, colleagues, we the Christian Democratic Group fully support this resolution, which was signed by many of our colleagues together with Italian colleagues from other political groups. As our colleague Mr Papapietro has clearly shown to the House, this is a tragedy of immense proportions.

A veritable cyclone has disrupted agriculture, particularly in the southern areas of Sicily and Calabria, washed away and destroyed the greenhouses and a large number of new buildings constructed as part of a major national and regional programme supported by our government with the aim of helping areas which we know to be the poorest in the Community from the economic and social points of view.

This terrible sea storm devastated large areas of the coast and completely demolished hotels and various buildings of importance to tourism and the local economy, causing incalculable damage.

Over the past few years we have had opportunities to examine problems of this kind, which unfortunately have affected various regions in all the countries of the Community time and time again. I remember the measures taken last year to help areas in the south of France, Ireland, etc.

This request must be seen against the tradition of practical solidarity which has developed in the Community over the years. It is very important and we are counting on the Assembly's support, which would be a clear demonstration of solidarity, commitment and sympathy with the people of these areas, which, I repeat, are amongst the poorest in the Community and the hardest hit by these natural phenomena which have rarely been equalled in intensity.

This is the reason for our support, our full support, for the motion put forward by our colleagues.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Mr President, wherever natural disasters occur we feel that the Community has a duty to act and provide assistance. The fact that the recent natural disasters referred to by Mr Papapietro, Mr Adonnino and others occurred in the Mezzogiorno where I too was born naturally leads me to hope that the action and assistance will be adequate.

Mr President, in order to ensure that this assistance is adequate we must bear in mind that the greatest disaster in the Italian Mezzogiorno is its ruling class and the main tragedy in the Italian Mezzogiorno is the political mafias of all types which are destroying our country, culture and citizens.

These mafias are slowly corrupting the whole body politic and we must therefore make sure that the Community aid really reaches all our people. This is an obligation on the Parliament and the Commission.

I should also like to recommend, Mr President, that the Commission be very careful: I remember that in Belice about twenty years ago the ruling class appropriated thousands of millions of lire, while the victims of the earthquake continued to live in huts, and I remember that only recently Community aid for tomatoes in Campania benefited groups of the Mafia and their smaller units, who interfered in the process of increasing employment and strengthened the criminal element in the area against the interests of the workers and the population as a whole. The aid we and you have given very often serves such ends. We must pay more heed to all these factors since by giving aid to the people affected by the disaster in the Mezzogiorno, we run the risk of subsequently financing the criminal activities of the ruling class, which is probably the main disaster of the Italian Mezzogiorno.

IN THE CHAIR: Mr DANKERT

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (*I*) Mr President, I cannot but support what Mr Pannella has just said. I know that twelve years after the earthquake in Belice those affected are still living in huts. This demonstrates that the damage from the storms in the south of Italy was caused not so much by the weather as by the lack of political measures and by the continually unsuccessful implementation of, for example the necessary irrigation work in the south of our country.

The members of Parliament would also do well to reflect on the fact that often hundreds and even thousands of millions Italian lire leave Rome and never reach Naples as they are intercepted on the way and

Capanna

end up goodness knows where — often one knows only too well — but in any case they never reach their destinations.

I have tabled motions on other occasions namely on the purposes for which Community funds had been provided for those affected by the earthquakes in Friuli — as you see we are talking now about the north of Italy — as here again the manoeuvres of the majority party in Italy, the Christian Democrats, had led to funds intended to fulfil the objectives set by the Commission of the European Communities being used for other purposes.

I therefore support the motion inasmuch as it seeks urgent appropriations to help the population of the south of Italy affected by the storms, but I would also recommend that when the funds are allocated — if the motion is approved — the Community institutions should strictly monitor the destination of these funds, and, above all, the use to which they are put.

President. — I call Mr Ortoli.

Mr Ortoli, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, unlike what I was able to say during the previous debate, I cannot now say that we have already decided to allocate a given amount to the emergency operations that will be necessary in the south of Italy. We have been in contact with the Italian Government on many occasions since the beginning of January. We have initial overall estimates, which show very clearly that the damage suffered by the Province of Messina accounts for more than one-third of all the damage, for example.

I therefore feel that we shall very soon be able to put before the Commission a proposal concerning that province specifically, and that we will be doing so next week, with account also taken of the debate that has been held here. I must, of course, point out that this will be done with a budgetary appropriation which is intended for disaster relief and not for the repair of damage other than that which relates to infrastructures, which affects the people and which does not, therefore, concern the general problem of development which has been referred to here, and I must also say that this budgetary appropriation is itself limited, in that it amounts to 5m EUA and that in distributing appropriations, we must take account of the specific budgetary situation that has existed since the beginning of 1980.

Having said this, Mr President, I have listened with great interest to the various speeches that have been made. I shall be reporting to my colleagues at the Commission, and I feel that we shall be able to take decisions in this area very soon, as we always try to do, with the greatest possible administrative and political effectiveness in matters of this kind, especially when requests are justified, which I believe is now the case.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, I have just heard some news which profoundly disturbs me, and I am therefore addressing you pursuant to Rule 8 and presenting a procedural motion relating to the satisfactory conduct of our proceedings.

I have just been informed by officials of our Parliament that yesterday it appears — but I do not believe it — the Bureau refused to allow the first hearing organized by the Committee on Development and Cooperation on hunger in the world to take place in the only place where it can be held. Mr President, I must remind you, whose duty it is to ensure that our proceedings are properly conducted, that we are still bound by a resolution of our Assembly which called upon us to make preparations for the debate on hunger in the world in February. The main political groups did not make their nominations for a rapporteur until 17 December. Now the enlarged Bureau has adopted an absurd and intolerable position, by putting forward I do not know what bureaucratic arguments, in refusing to organize for 18 and 19 February a hearing which Mr Brandt and others had already said they could attend in Paris, the only place where it could be held. I feel it is impossible that such an attitude could have been adopted, and I hope that Mrs Veil will deny that this decision has been taken.

President. — Mr Pannella, I shall forward your request to the President.

11. *Urgent aid from the EEC for the Island of Mauritius*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Vergès, Mr Glinne, Mr Bersani, Mr Ansart, Mr Estier, Mr Michel, Mr Ferrero, Mr Jaquet, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mr Kühn, Mrs De March, Mr Enright, Mr Chambeiron, Mr Woltjer, Mr Maffre-Bauge, Mr Cohen, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Barabarella, Mr Piquet and Mr Bonaccini, on urgent aid from the EEC for the Island of Mauritius which has suffered severe damage by hurricane Claudette (Doc. 1-676/79).

President. — I call Mr Vergès.

Mr Vergès. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on Christmas Eve hurricane Claudette struck the Island of Mauritius with all its force and passed close to the Island of Réunion, just as some months before hurricanes David and Frederick struck Martinique, Dominica and other Caribbean countries, sparing Guadeloupe and its neighbours. This hurricane caused loss of life — 5 dead, to my knowledge

Vergès

— and many injured on the Island of Mauritius as well as damage which will have very serious consequences for the social and economic life of the island. The Mauritius Interministerial Council, which met in Port-Louis on 9 January 1980, listed the material damage done by the hurricane: 6 000 houses were destroyed, which alone will necessitate the early construction of temporary housing, 4 000 houses must be reconstructed and the whole of the sanitation system of the town of Port-Louis will likewise have to be reconstructed. The capital was also flooded during and after the hurricane. Roads, bridges and the drainage system will similarly have to be repaired, as will the public buildings and the radio and television station, which were badly damaged by the hurricane.

The Mauritius Interministerial Council estimates all this damage at more than 35 m EUA. In addition, the lack of income from agriculture as a result of the devastation of crops caused by the wind and rain is valued at almost 42m EUA. For an island of only 1 800 sq. km, but with nearly 1 million inhabitants, this is a serious situation. I would also remind you that the hurricane period in this part of the Indian Ocean will not be over for another three months. For our part, we alerted the President of our Assembly and the President of the Commission of the European Communities the very day after the hurricane. We forwarded to them, on 11 January, the estimates of the Mauritius Interministerial Council as soon as we had received them. The President of the Commission informed me that Commission staff had been on the Island from 14 to 16 January to gather information on the extent of the damage and on the urgency of the country's requirements. As a result, the President of the Commission added, it would be possible to decide on the aid to be allocated within the next few days.

In this context, I would point out that our motion for a resolution refers to the extremely inadequate measures adopted by the Commission. This is the result of a misunderstanding. A first instalment of immediate, but obviously inadequate, aid was granted to the Island of Mauritius by the French Government and, I believe, the German Government. Now that this immediate aid has been given, planned measures must be envisaged, which is what we are asking the Assembly and the Commission for. Our Assembly's decision to adopt the urgent procedure in respect of the motion for the resolution we are now discussing, which calls for emergency aid to be granted by the Community to the Island of Mauritius demonstrates, in my opinion, a measure of agreement in this House that goes far beyond that indicated by the numerous signatures attached to this motion. We must act quickly. The speed with which a significant amount of planned aid is sent to this country will be of importance not only for the Island of Mauritius itself but for

all the ACP Countries. We feel that a unanimous vote today in favour of this motion for a resolution would enable our Committee on Development and Cooperation to discuss practical aid measures at its meeting next week in Brussels on the basis of the decisions and proposals that the Commissioner responsible for development might make in the light of the findings of the fact-finding mission, which has just returned.

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Vergès and the honourable Members from other political groups who have drawn the Assembly's attention to the serious damage caused by hurricane Claudette.

Although hurricane Claudette just missed Réunion, we are struck by the fact that it is an elected representative of Réunion who immediately looks into the possibility of securing aid for a neighbouring country in the region.

Mr President, this is unfortunately not the first time that the Community has been called upon to take action to alleviate some of the consequences of natural occurrences such as hurricanes. Fortunately, the damage suffered by Mauritius is not comparable with the disaster that struck Dominica when hurricane David devastated that country. I would remind the House that the damage suffered by Dominica was equivalent to fifteen times the annual budget, and we are not talking in these terms in the case of Mauritius. Nevertheless, the damage is very serious and there has even been some loss of life, as Mr Vergès has very rightly just pointed out.

Mr President, we would hope to act as quickly as we did in the case of Dominica, where, I would stress, our first consignments arrived exactly ten days after hurricane David struck. The Mauritians prefer our action to form part of an overall plan, the same plan to which Mr Vergès has just referred. The damage — and I am not talking about loss of earnings — is estimated at 36m EUA, and I am thus confirming the figure quoted by the honourable Member. Some countries have already begun to send aid. Mr Vergès has mentioned the aid granted by France — a team of technicians and equipment — and the aid sent by Germany. The United Kingdom is at present looking into what it should provide, and the United States has sent 300 tents.

As regards the 36m EUA, a request from the Mauritian Government was presented to us the day before yesterday during the mission to which Mr Vergès has referred. This request is for 990 000 EUA, or let us call it 1m EUA, comprising temporary shelter, in other words 100 tents and 50 temporary houses, equipment for the Port-Louis sanitation system — which is at present in a quite serious state, and this may

Cheysson

endanger the health of the people — equipment for the repair of the water-supply, telephone and power systems and various other supplies.

The staff we sent to the Island of Mauritius has not yet returned. The information about which I have spoken was given over the telephone yesterday from Africa. On their return we shall make the necessary arrangements under the Lomé Convention, which means that the absence of a community budget for 1980 will not present any problems. The Assembly may rest assured that, as what I hope will soon be a resolution recommends, the Commission will do its utmost in this matter along the very lines recommended by the honourable Members.

President. — I call Mr Bersani.

Mr Bersani. — (I) Mr President, as co-signatory of the motion for a resolution I should like to thank Commissioner Cheysson for the extremely positive reply he has given. An incredible amount of damage has been done and, while it is not on the same scale as in Martinique, it is certainly extremely serious given the nature of the economy and the size of the island of Mauritius, which is an associated country and for a long time now has had close relations with the Community.

For these reasons I feel we should make a special show of solidarity with the island of Mauritius during these difficult times. I appreciate therefore, Commissioner Cheysson's very positive statement and the Community's commitment and intention to take appropriate action, thus following a long tradition of our Assembly.

IN THE CHAIR : MR ROGERS*Vice-President*

President. — The debate is closed, The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

12. *Regulations on wines of fresh grapes and liqueur wines originating in Cyprus*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-568/79) by Mr Almirante, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-363/79) for

- I. a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of a Community tariff quota for wines of fresh grapes falling within subheading ex 22.05 C of the Common Customs Tariff and originating in Cyprus (1980)
- II. a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of a Community tariff quota for liqueur wines falling within subheading ex 22.05 C of the Common Customs Tariff and originating in Cyprus (1980).

As Mr Almirante is not present, I call Mr John David Taylor.

Mr J.D. Taylor. — Mr President, in the few brief moments that I have there are one or two questions I would like to ask the rapporteur and the Commissioner on this matter of Cyprus. First of all, I would like to know if the transitional protocol, which was to have come into force on 1 January this year, has in fact now been agreed and is in existence.

Second, the protocol is on the EEC-Cyprus agreement of 1973. At that time there was one government and one island of Cyprus. But of course there was the Greek Cypriot coup in 1974 followed by Turkish Army intervention. There is no longer one government and one administration in Cyprus. In international law this is still the case, but in practice there have been two separate administrations in Cyprus since 1974.

What I want to know from the Commissioner is whether the measures we are being asked to pass today affect both administrations in the island of Cyprus — the northern administration under the Turkish Cypriots and the southern administration under the Greek Cypriots. I would assume that there has been proper consultation between the Commission and the Cypriot Government, which administers the southern part of the island. But has there been any consultation with the Turkish Cypriot administration in the northern part of the island? I would also like to raise the matter of wines and liqueurs from the northern part of Cyprus. For the past six years Cyprus has been partitioned completely. There is no movement of persons or products across the border between the northern part of the island. Whilst the agreement we are considering relates to wines originating in the southern part of the island and gives them access to the Community, will the same facilities exist for wines and liqueurs originating in the northern part of the island? Since wines and liqueurs originating in the northern part of the island are forbidden entry into the southern part because of the partition, and for export reasons must now go via Turkey will they benefit from the quotas we are being asked to approve?

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — (F) Mr President, at one of its recent part-sessions our Assembly was called on to state its views on a report drawn up by Mr Martinet, which aimed at authorizing the import into the Community of 430 000 hl of Greek wine. On that occasion I took the opportunity to explain why the French members of the Communist and Allies Group were resolutely opposed to these imports.

Martin

The same question arises today with Mr Almirante's report on the import of fresh grapes and liqueur wines originating in Cyprus. I will not repeat what we said two months ago. For the reasons that resulted in their voting on that occasion against the Martinet report, the French members of the Communist and Allies Group, anxious to protect and defend the legitimate interests of French growers, who are seriously affected by the unjustified policy of importing wine and who call for an immediate halt to all imports from wherever they come, will be voting against the Almirante report.

President. — I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood, rapporteur. — I simply wanted to say that I wish to introduce this report on behalf of Mr Almirante, who could not be here. It is a continuation of an existing situation. It arises directly from the supplementary protocol annex to the 1973 Association Agreement concluded between the European Community and Cyprus. It is thus the implementation of an agreement that has been concluded and ratified with Cyprus.

In previous years Parliament has always approved the opening of the tariff quotas without amendment, and I would have hoped that we could have proceeded in the same way on this occasion. I would remind the House that the Committee on Agriculture, which was asked its opinion, had no specific comments to make.

President. — I call Mr Ortoli.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I should like to thank the committee for the report it has drawn up, and I hope that Parliament will agree with its conclusions. As regards the various questions that have been put, I should simply like to say that exactly the same conclusions will apply as those for which provision is made in the agreement that expired at the end of 1979. There is nothing else that I can say.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on the motions for a resolution on which the debate has been closed. The vote will be taken non-electronically.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (F) I raise this point of order pursuant to Rule 8, Mr President, which concerns the proper conduct of proceedings.

A quarter of an hour ago the President assured me that he would inform Mrs Veil of the considerable anxiety we felt on hearing the news that once again

the Committee on Development and Cooperation would not be able to comply with a resolution adopted by our Assembly. I should like to know what has been done.

President. — Mr Pannella, you have succeeded yet again in wasting the time of the House. That is not a point of order. We shall proceed to the votes.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, in your position I would refrain from such remarks.

President. — I call Mr Patterson, reminding him that only points of order concerning the vote are now admissible.

Mr Patterson. — I do have a point of order on the voting. You will recall, Mr President, that the day before yesterday, with reference to the third subparagraph of Rule 20(1) I raised a point of order, concerning amendments. I hope it will help you if I raise it again.

I asked the Chair at the beginning of debates yesterday to pay particular attention to this rule and to make sure that all amendments which are now placed before us had been duly moved during the debates. I hope I am not being pedantic, and I hope it will help to avoid the kind of situation we reached yesterday, if I ask you to be absolutely certain when putting amendments to the vote that they have been duly moved. Perhaps it would help, if, when you put an amendment to the vote, you stated who actually moved it during the course of the debate. This, I think, would avoid the kind of problems we had the day before yesterday.

President. — When amendments are tabled to motions they become the property of the House. The rapporteur shall tell us whether in fact the subject of the amendment has been brought up during the debate.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (F) I wish to refer to the rule of the Rules of Procedure of which Mr Patterson has — vainly — tried to remind you :

Parliament shall not deliberate on any amendment unless it is moved during the debate.

I wish, Mr President, that you would listen to what is said to you when a point of order is raised. If you do not do so, you will ensure, as happened the other day, that disorder rather than order reigns in this Assembly.

President. — Mr Pannella, if there is any disorder, the Chair is certainly not responsible.

Secondly, some of our rules are not explicit and the House has agreed that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions should try to expedite matters. Mr Patterson has been involved in this work.

President

Meanwhile we must proceed on the basis of common sense. Once I have the rapporteur's assurance that the matter of the amendment has been discussed during the debate I intend to proceed with the vote.

We shall first consider the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Lega (Doc. 1-584/79): Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities.

We shall begin with the motion for a resolution on salary scales (Doc. 202/79).

I put the preamble and recitals to the vote.

The preamble and recitals are adopted.

I have Amendment No 5 by the Liberal and Democratic Group seeking to insert a new paragraph before paragraph 1 to read as follows:

Protests strongly at the attitude of the Council which, by formally submitting for adoption the proposal to amend the salary scales despite the absence of the opinion of the European Parliament and by not taking any decision on the level of salaries by 31 December 1979, has failed to comply with the Treaties, the Staff Regulations of Officials and its own undertakings.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — (I) I support this amendment as it was tabled after my motion for a resolution and hence after the Council had acted in breach of the Treaties.

President. — I put Amendment No 5 to the vote. Amendment No 5 is adopted.

I put paragraphs 1 and 2 to the vote.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 are adopted.

On paragraph 3 I have Amendment No 6 by the Liberal and Democratic Group seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — (I) I wish to put to the vote paragraph 3 as amended, i.e. from the section beginning 'therefore'. Paragraph 3 will now read as follows: 'is considering the three proposals together for obvious reasons of equity'.

I ask again for the withdrawal of this amendment which I shall otherwise oppose.

President. — I call Mrs Pruvot.

Mrs Pruvot. — (F) In these circumstances, Mr President, I withdraw this amendment on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

President. — Amendment No 6 is accordingly withdrawn.

I call Mr Lega.

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — (I) Yesterday I asked the Liberal Group, who had tabled the amendment, to

withdraw it as I had agreed to delete the second part of paragraph 3 and hence the section which could have given rise to misunderstandings and which had been the cause of the amendment.

President. — I put paragraph 3 so amended to the vote.

Paragraph 3 is adopted.

I put paragraphs 4 and 5 to the vote.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 are adopted.

I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote. The motion for a resolution as a whole is adopted.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution on family and social security matters (Doc. 201/79). Before voting on the motion for a resolution itself we shall vote on the amendments to the proposal from the Commission.

On Article 13 (5), I have Amendment No 2 by Mr Sieglerschmidt on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee seeking to amend the first sentence of Article 13 (5) to read as follows: '... the house hold allowance is to be paid to that other person'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — (I) My views reflect those of the committee, where we had a long discussion on this matter. I wish to maintain my position, which is that the text should read 'may' not 'is to be'. I am therefore opposed to this amendment.

President. — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote. Amendment No 2 is rejected.

On Article 14, paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 3 by Mr Ryan seeking to add the following text:

Where an official makes a claim for a dependant in respect of whom the State does not impose a legal obligation for maintenance, the appointing authority may treat that person as if he were a dependent child where it is satisfied.

(a) that the sole barrier to treatment as a dependent child is the fact that the State does not impose a legal obligation for maintenance and the dependant falls within a degree of kindred for which another Member State imposes such a legal obligation,

(b) that the person concerned is a dependant and that the refusal of treatment as a dependant would not be consonant with natural justice.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — (I) Once again I am speaking on behalf of the committee.

I feel that, while the first part of this amendment — namely paragraph (a) — could be accepted in the light of the committee's general views, the second part appears to me totally unacceptable, as it makes it

Lega

possible for anyone to be a dependant, which is somewhat excessive given the present straitened circumstances in which we find ourselves. I would therefore ask you, Mr President, to put the two parts of this Article to the vote separately to reflect this.

President. — Mr Lega, before I put the amendment to the vote, can I have an assurance from you that this subject matter was brought up during the debate?

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — (I) Yes, this subject was dealt with in the House.

President. — I put to the vote the first part of Amendment No 3 up to the end of subparagraph (a).

The first part of the amendment is adopted.

I put the second part of Amendment No 3 to the vote.

The second part of Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole incorporating the amendments which have been adopted.

The resolution is adopted.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution (Doc. 212/79) on pensions and social security for temporary staff.

We must first consider the amendments to the Commission's proposal.

I have Amendment No 4 by Mr Sieglerschmidt seeking to add a new article 14a to the proposal for a regulation :

Add the following paragraphs 2 and 3 to Article 3 of Annex VIII :

2. Account shall be taken of periods of compulsory national service actually performed except where such periods are already taken into account for the purpose of another pension scheme.
3. Periods of imprisonment as a result of acts of war during the Second World War or of political persecution shall also be taken into account, provided these facts have been recognized by the legislation of a Member State.

Amendment No 7 by Mr Sieglerschmidt has been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — (I) Amendment No. 4 raises two points which are set out in paragraphs 2 and 3. I feel that, all things considered, I can give a favourable opinion on paragraph 2 — subject, of course, to the agreement of Mr Lange as chairman — as it enlarges on what we have already said at the committee meeting. However, as regards the other point, I would prefer the Assembly to decide, as I have my own views which do not reflect the committee's position. I am therefore in favour of the first paragraph, but cannot give an opinion on the second.

President. — I put the first part of Amendment No 4 to the vote.

The first part of Amendment No 4 is adopted.

I put the second part of Amendment No 4 to the vote.

The second part of Amendment No 4 is adopted.

We now come to the motion for a resolution proper.

I put the preamble and paragraph 1 to the vote.

The preamble and paragraph 1 are adopted.

After paragraph 1 I have Amendment No 1/rev. by Mr Sieglerschmidt, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, seeking to insert the following three new paragraphs :

- 1 a. Feels it desirable for periods of compulsory national service to be included when calculating years of pensionable service, provided that allowance has not already been made for such periods in a different pension scheme ;
- 1 b. Considers that for the payment of the survivor's pension no account should be taken of which spouse was to blame, but only of the decision of the court competent to fix maintenance ;
- 1 c. Requests that all differences in treatment between the survivor of a female spouse and the survivor of a male spouse be eliminated from the arrangements for the survivor's pension.

President. — I call Mr Sieglerschmidt.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — (D) Mr President, I have come to the conclusion that paragraph 1a is superfluous. I should therefore like to withdraw it. But I have every intention of maintaining paragraphs 1b and 1c, on which the rapporteur will, of course, be commenting.

President. — I call Mr Lega.

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — (I) I note Mr Sieglerschmidt's statement which I would support as it expresses more precisely what the Committee on Budgets had already stated in more general terms.

President. — Paragraph 1a of Amendment No 1 is accordingly withdrawn.

I put Amendment No 1 rev. so amended to the vote.

Amendment No 1 so amended is adopted.

I put paragraphs 2 and 3 to the vote.

Paragraphs 2 and 3 are adopted.

I now put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole, incorporating the amendments which have been adopted.

The resolution is adopted.

*

* * *

President. — The next item is the vote on the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mrs Weber (doc. 1-576/79): *Radioactive waste management and storage*.

Before considering this motion for a resolution we shall vote on the amendments to the proposed decision.

I have Amendment No 9/Corr. by Mr Ippolito, Mr Veronesi, Mr Fantì, Mr Spinelli and Mr Bonaccini seeking to reinstate the whole of the text of the proposal from the Commission.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I feel that the whole of the debate yesterday made it clear that there are differences of opinion when it comes to forecasting the consequences we are discussing here. I believe that this amendment must be rejected because it sets out to achieve exactly the opposite of what I have said here as the rapporteur of my committee, and we shall find this again with the other amendments. I am opposed to the adoption of this amendment.

President. I put Amendment No 9 to the vote. Amendment No 9 is adopted.

Amendments Nos 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29 are therefore void.

I call Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, it is a somewhat complicated matter. The matter we have just been voting on is a decision and, as you rightly say, we have just voted to reinstate the text of that decision. Now, the document which Parliament and the Council have considered is accompanied by another document called a technical annex which is not actually part of the decision before the Council but where we and the Christian-Democrats have in fact felt it sensible as groups to make some proposals for change. Now, these proposals are in fact the amendments which are referred to as Nos 25, 26 and 27 which means that they are part and parcel of the dossier and do not automatically fall as a result of reinstatement of the Commission's text. It is a complicated matter but I feel it is important.

President. — The decision to reinstate the Commission's text has been taken it is not possible to go back.

President. — I call Mrs Weber.

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, please bear with my inexperience, but I must say that the rejection of my motion and the reinstatement of the Commission's original text naturally means the virtual rejection of many of the ideas

adopted by a large majority of the committee with no opposing votes. All I can say is that when we vote on the individual motions for resolutions, I must therefore, of course, vote against all of your amendments. I must also say that I very much regret that the decision has been taken in this form, and I can only refer to what we said about this problem yesterday.

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I put the preamble to the vote.

The preamble is adopted.

On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 12 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Herman, Mr Estgen, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Sassauw, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) and Mr Sherlock, Mr Seligman and Mr Welsh on behalf of the European Democratic Group seeking to amend this paragraph to read as follows :

1. Welcomes the Commission's proposal for the adoption of a second five-year programme, as the amount of radioactive waste produced by the nuclear power stations in operation *may soon* reach such a critical level that a solution to the existing problems will become a matter of urgency.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) I am opposed to this amendment because I feel that we already have enough nuclear waste to necessitate a solution and not that this critical limit will be reached at some time in the future.

President. — I put Amendment No 12 to the vote. Amendment No 12 is adopted.

On paragraph 2, I have amendment No 13 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Herman, Mr Estgen, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Sassano, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party and Mr Sherlock, Mr Seligman and Mr Welch on behalf of the European Democratic Group seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text :

2. Draws attention to the need for research in the field of radioactive waste management which, in conjunction with national projects and through close Community cooperation, can help in solving the remaining technical problems.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) I feel that this amendment does not say a great deal and might perhaps be acceptable as paragraph 2a. If it is meant as a replacement for the existing paragraph 2, I am against it. The original paragraph 2 should be retained and the amendment added.

President. — I put Amendment No 13 to the vote. Amendment No 13 is adopted.

On paragraph 3 I have three amendments :

— No 1 by Mr Ippolito, Mr Veronesi, Mr Fanti, Mr Spinelli and Mr Bonaccini

— No 14 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Estgen, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Sassano, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) and Mr Sherlock, Mr Seligman and Mr Welsh on behalf of the European Democratic Group,

both seeking to delete this paragraph,

— Amendment No 30 by Mr Muntingh, seeking to complete this paragraph as follows :

... and is of the opinion that these alternative scenarios, including the zero-alternative, should be incorporated into the programme.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) I am opposed to the deletion and feel that alternative scenarios and the investigations are urgently required and must be included in the programme. I am in favour of Mr Muntingh's amendment — I shall vote for it — which calls for the zero-alternative to be included among the alternative scenarios.

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

Amendments Nos 14 and 30 are therefore void.

After paragraph 3 I have Amendment No 10 by Mr Coppeters, Mr Capanna and Mrs Dekker seeking to insert a new paragraph :

3(a) Considers that the Commission should make an urgent study of the implications, notably as regards safety, of the future use of nuclear energy if the problem of waste has not been solved satisfactorily by the end of the programme.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) I feel it is acceptable that thought should be given to what is to happen if the storage problem is not solved satisfactorily. I am therefore in favour of this amendment.

President. — I put Amendment No 10 to the vote. Amendment No 10 is rejected.

On paragraph 4 I have two amendments :

— Amendment No 2 by Mr Ippolito, Mr Veronesi, Mr Fanti, Mr Spinelli and Mr Bonaccini seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text to read as follows :

4. Considers that the programme is evenly balanced, but stresses that a major effort should be concentrated on the disposal of waste in appropriate geological formations.

— Amendment No 15 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Estgen, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Sassano, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), and Mr Sherlock, Mr Seligman and Mr Welsh on behalf of the European Democratic Group. Seeking to amend this paragraph, by deleting the following :

— until such time as it is clear whether reprocessing is feasible on a large scale and can be kept under proper control.

These amendments are mutually exclusive.

What is the rapporteur's view ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) In the committee's opinion the emphasis in the programme should be shifted to storage and funds should be reduced where treatment takes place. I am also opposed to amendment No 15 by Mrs Walz, which concerns reprocessing, and would ask the House to vote accordingly.

President. — I call Mrs Walz.

Mrs Walz. — (D) I withdraw amendment No 15 in favour of Mr Ippolito's amendment.

President. — Amendment No 15 is accordingly withdrawn. I put Amendment No 2 to the vote. Amendment No 2 is adopted.

After paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 11 by Mr Coppeters, Mr Capanna, and Mrs Dekker seeking to insert a new paragraph :

4(a) Considers that the Commission should analyse the arguments in support of a moratorium on the use of nuclear power stations until the problem of waste has been solved.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) I oppose this amendment, because it is unrealistic.

(Laughter)

President. — I put Amendment No 11 to the vote. Amendment No 11 is rejected.

I put paragraph 5 to the vote.

Paragraph 5 is adopted.

On paragraph 6 I have Amendment No 16 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Estgen, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Sassano, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) and Mr Sherlock, Mr Seligman and Mr Welsh on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text to read as follows :

6. Considers that analyses are needed of the risks involved in the various processes in all the Member States in relation to breakdowns (including human error).

What is the rapporteur's view ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) All this amendment does is add the words 'in all the Member States'. I do not think this is a fundamental change, and I can agree to it.

President. — I put Amendment No 16 to the vote. Amendment No 16 is adopted.

On paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 17 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Estgen, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Sassano, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD-Group), and Mr Sherlock, Mr Seligman and Mr Welch, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text :

Urges that safety standards be further harmonized and improved and compliance with such standards monitored ; points out that protective measures for employees in nuclear power stations may entail certain restrictions of basic freedoms.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) This amendment concerns not only paragraph 7, but also paragraph 8, because it also mentions the restrictions of basic freedoms. All the first part of this amendment to paragraph 7 does is add the word 'further'. I can accept this first part. I reject the second part, which concerns only the restriction of employees' basic freedoms, because it would make paragraph 8 superfluous.

President. — This is an amendment seeking to amend the paragraph as a whole. Are you saying that the division comes after the words 'standard monitored' ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) Allow me to explain once again : this amendment to paragraph 7 seeks to make two changes, which are not, in my opinion, compatible. The first sentence calls for the further harmonization and improvement of safety standards and for monitoring to ensure compliance with those standards. That is approximately in line with my motion, because the only change is the insertion of the word 'further'.

The second part of this amendment points out that protective measures for employees in nuclear power stations may entail certain restrictions of basic freedoms. I feel that this has nothing to do with the safety standards, and it also has an effect on paragraph 8 of my original text, which concerns guarantees of basic freedoms.

I therefore request that separate votes be taken on the first and second parts.

President. — On paragraph 7 I put the first part of Amendment No 17 to the vote.

The first half of Amendment No 17 is adopted.

I put the second part of Amendment No 17 to the vote.

The second part of the Amendment is adopted.

On paragraphs 8-10 I have three amendments.

— No 3 by Mr Ippolito, Mr Veronesi, Mr Fonti, Mr Spinelli and Mr Bonaccini seeking to replace paragraphs 8 and 10 by a new text :

'8. Stresses the need for the Council to approve without delay the overall ten-year programme on radioactive waste management and disposal submitted by the Commission at the end of 1977 ; the solution of the problems connected with the final stage of the nuclear fuel cycle necessitates an enlargement of the Commission's role in this field : the pursuit of individual research programmes and specific studies is laudable but insufficient ; the Commission must aim for concerted action at Community level so that, by creating a number of sites for the disposal of radioactive waste, the Community assumes a direct responsibility in this area ; in this context, particular attention should be given to keeping the public regularly and correctly informed and to respecting the basic rights of citizens ;'

— Nos 18 and 19 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Estgen, Mr Schleicher, Mr Sassano, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD-Group) and Mr Sherlock, Mr Seligman and Mr Welch, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to delete paragraphs 8 and 10.

The amendments are mutually exclusive.

President. — I call Mrs Walz.

Mrs Walz. — (D) Mr President, amendments Nos 18 and 19 are withdrawn in favour of amendment No 3 by Mr Ippolito.

President. — Amendments Nos 18 and 19 are accordingly withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position on Amendment No 3 ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) I am opposed to amendment No 3 by Mr Ippolito, which seeks to change paragraphs 8 and 10. I feel that there is no point in giving serious thought to whether basic freedoms of people in our Member States have been adversely affected, unless we then draw conclusions from this. I consider wording such as 'that attention should be paid to the maintenance of basic freedoms' to be so obvious that it does not need to be especially included in a programme. I regard the wording of paragraph 8 as far stronger and involving more consequences, and I am therefore opposed to amendment No 3.

Where it concerns paragraph 10, the amendment is again unacceptable, because it seems extremely impor-

Weber

tant for research to be carried out on the acceptance conditions, and this was also rated very highly during the discussions in committee.

President. — I put Amendment No 3 to the vote. Amendment No 3 is adopted.

I put paragraph 9 to the vote.

Paragraph 9 is adopted.

On paragraph 11, I have two amendments :

— No 4 by Mr Ippolito, Mr Veronesi, Mr Fanti, Mr Spinelli and Mr Bonaccini seeking to replace subparagraph (a) of this paragraph by a new text :

(a) Asks to be kept fully informed of progress on the programme through the submission of reports and the organization of meetings to be arranged between the Parliamentary committees concerned, the Commission and the representatives of the Advisory Committee on Programme Management ;

— Amendment No 20 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Estgen, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Sassano, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD-Group) and Mr Sherlock, Mr Seligman and Mr Welsh on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text :

11. (a) Wishes to be given information on the progress of the programme at regular intervals ;

(b) Calls on the Commission to submit to the Council proposals for an extension of the programme not later than one year before its expiry ;

(c) Requests the Council to decide on these proposals within six months ;

(d) Stresses the need for further and more detailed research in the area of radioactive waste given the present situation with regard to the use of nuclear energy in the Community.

These amendments are mutually exclusive.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) I feel that amendment No 4 tabled by Mr Ippolito makes the wording of paragraph 11a clearer, and I therefore agree with this amendment. The paragraph 11a proposed in the amendment by Mrs Walz and others is not so clear. I am therefore opposed to that part of Mrs Walz's amendment.

In the case of paragraphs 11b and 11c the amendment would not result in any change to the programme proposed by the Committee on the Environment. I am therefore able to agree to this amendment.

The part of the amendment that concerns paragraph 11d does not, in my opinion, say any more than that this programme is necessary. I am therefore opposed to this amendment.

President. — The rapporteur agrees with Amendment No 4 but rejects Amendment No 20.

I call Mr Arndt.

Mr Arndt. — Mr President, you have just said that the rapporteur rejects amendment No 20. That is not correct. The rapporteur has said that she is in favour of paragraphs b and c of amendment No 20 and against paragraphs a and d. I therefore request a vote item by item.

President. — Mrs Walz, might I ask you your view on having a vote item by item on your Amendment No 20 ?

Mrs Walz. — (D) I should like one vote to be taken on the whole text. I do not feel there is much to be gained from a vote item by item. The aim is to replace the whole text, and I request that we vote on the whole text.

President. — I am advised that if the rapporteur asks for a vote item by item on an amendment, then it is normal procedure to vote on each subparagraph separately.

We shall therefore vote on Amendment No 20.

I put subparagraph 11 (a) to the vote.

Subparagraph 11 (a) is adopted.

I put subparagraph 11 (b) to the vote.

Subparagraph 11 (b) is adopted.

I put subparagraph 11 (c) to the vote.

Subparagraph 11 (c) is adopted.

I put subparagraph 11 (d) to the vote.

Subparagraph 11 (d) is adopted.

Amendment No 4 stands rejected.

On paragraph 12 I have two amendments seeking to delete this paragraph :

— No 5, by Mr Ippolito, Mr Veronesi, Mr Fanti, Mr Spinelli and Mr Bonaccini

— No 21 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Estgen, Mr Schleicher, Mr Sassano, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD-Group) and Mr Sherlock, Mr Seligman and Mr Welsh on behalf of the European Democratic Group

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) The committee felt that there is an urgent need for an investigation into the problem of proliferation in connection with radioactive waste, and I should like to see paragraph 12 stay as it is.

President. — I put Amendment No 5 to the vote. Amendment No 5 is adopted.

Amendment No 21 stands rejected.

On paragraph 13, I have two amendments, both seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text :

— Amendment No 6 by Mr Ippolito, Mr Veronesi, Mr Fanti, Mr Spinelli and Mr Bonaccini seeking to amend this paragraph to read as follows :

13. Calls for close coordination between the 'radioactive waste' and 'radiation protection' programmes, particularly as regards the study of the effects on human health of constant low doses of radiation (food cycles).

— Amendment No 22 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Estgen, Mr Schleicher, Mr Sassano, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD-Group) and Mr Sherlock, Mr Seligman and Mr Welsh on behalf of the European Democratic Group seeking to amend this paragraph to read as follows :

13. Calls for account to be taken of the findings of the Community's radiation protection programme in implementing these programmes.'

These amendments are mutually exclusive.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) These two amendments simply aim at changing the wording : they call for 'close cooperation' or for 'account to be taken of...' or for inclusion as a priority. In my view Mr Ippolito's amendment is the clearest, and I ask the House to vote for this amendment. But there is no reason to reject the other one either.

President. — I put Amendment No 22 to the vote.

Amendment No 22 is adopted.

Amendment No 6 stands rejected.

On paragraph 14, I have two amendments :

— No 7 by Mr Ippolito, Mr Veronesi, Mr Fanti, Mr Spinelli and Mr Bonaccini seeking to delete this paragraph.

— No 23 by Mrs Walz, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Estgen, Mr Schleicher, Mr Sassano, Mr Herman, Mr Fuchs, Mr Pedini and Mr Salzer on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to replace this paragraph by the following text :

14. Stresses that the search for a solution to the problem of radioactive waste must on no account be delayed irrespective of whether greater use is now made of nuclear energy or not, as it is already a fact which cannot be ignored.

The amendments are mutually exclusive.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I find it rather astonishing that amend-

ment No 7 has not been withdrawn, because during the discussion and vote on point 9 you agreed with the view that greater emphasis must be placed on the items of the programme entitled Evaluation of process strategies and Examination of the legal, administrative and financial aspects of waste management. I ask myself what point there is in arguing in favour of greater emphasis on the one hand and then not approving a shift in resources on the other. I do not understand this amendment in its present form and am opposed to amendment No 7. Amendment No 23 similarly stresses that there must on no account be a delay in solving the problem. I must emphasize that this has never been the view of the Committee on the Environment or of the rapporteur.

President. — I put Amendment No 7 to the vote.

Amendment No 7 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 23 to the vote.

Amendment No 23 is adopted.

On paragraph 15, I have Amendment No 8 by Mr Ippolito, Mr Veronesi, Mr Fanti, Mr Spinelli and Mr Bonaccini seeking to delete this paragraph.

Since Amendment No 9 has been adopted this amendment is now void.

Before putting the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote, I will accept explanations of vote.

President. I call Mr Maij-Weggen.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (NL) Mr President, I must give an explanation of vote, because my group has tabled amendments which for the most part I have unfortunately been unable to support. This report, I would stress once again, is a report on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, and it goes without saying that this committee has given expression in that report to its own specific responsibility. That was why Commission's proposal was referred to it. The report is a satisfactory and balanced reflection of the discussion in the Committee on the Environment, and all the political groups took part in the discussion when they could. The drafting of the report to reflect a given view for or against nuclear energy was in every way avoided. The reason why the report calls for a high degree of caution and restraint with regard to nuclear energy is that the findings of research programmes on the waste problem give every cause for an attitude of this nature. In view of its specific responsibility the Committee on the Environment therefore has not only the right but also the duty to draw the correct conclusions. As a member of the Committee on the Environment I supported these conclusions, which are to be found in the motion for a resolution, and as I am not in the habit of being two-faced I shall also support them now. This means that I cannot vote in favour of the motion for a resolution as it has now been amended.

Maij-Weggen

To conclude, I should like to point out that it might still be possible to adapt the resolution to a certain view of nuclear energy, but that does nothing to alter the fact that the waste problem has not yet been solved. I prefer in this case to side with the many young people in my party, particularly in the Netherlands, who have the courage to look reality in the face.

(Applause from various quarters on the left)

President. I call Mr Muntingh.

Mr Muntingh. — Mr President, on behalf of the Dutch Socialist Members of this Parliament, I would like to give an explanation of vote on the Weber Report. We have had great difficulty in deciding how to vote, since we felt ourselves caught between the Scylla of existing nuclear waste and the Charybdis of our fear of its unwarranted increase. It was also difficult because, on the one hand, the problem of existing waste urgently requires a solution and, on the other hand, the Weber Report only covers one aspect of the problem of nuclear energy: waste management and storage.

As you know, there are many more aspects. I might mention the danger of proliferation which could plunge us into a nuclear war. I might mention the enormous drain on resources arising from the application of nuclear energy, resources which therefore cannot be used for essential research into the development of an alternative solution.

I might mention the problem of increased surface water temperatures, I might mention radioactive effluent, transport problems, the danger of a police state and, last but not least, the possibility of a nuclear disaster and the attendant social problems arising from the fear of such a disaster and the appalling consequences which may result.

None of these problems can be solved at present. Therefore the only acceptable policy would be to halt the perilous development of nuclear energy and to declare a moratorium, which would give the world the opportunity to avoid any further commitment to nuclear energy while considering its uses.

We also encountered great difficulties in deciding how to vote, since the second five-year programme contains the possibility of further aggravation of the problems of nuclear energy. In particular it gives the champions of nuclear energy an excuse to redouble their efforts to make further progress towards an atomic era. Indeed they can reply to any justified opposition to their plans by referring to this second five year programme, pointing out that the problems are covered by this programme and that they will soon be solved. This is an illusion which we cannot and will not accept. The problem is far from being solved, and may never be solved. We consider that the danger of this illusion, and particularly the

consequences of it, namely ever-increasing quantities of nuclear waste, weighs more heavily than the legitimate desire to find a solution for existing waste. Therefore, in our opinion, this solution may only be considered after a moratorium on the use of nuclear energy has been declared.

We consider it irresponsible to bank on an uncertain and radiant future and continue the programme for the industrialization of nuclear energy including this second five year programme. We therefore consider it necessary to vote against the resolution.

President. — I call Mr Arndt.

Mr Arndt. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Socialist Group I should like to state that we had before us a report from the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. It has been completely distorted by the vote which has just taken place. It is now a report against the environment, against public health and against consumer protection ...

(Applause from the left)

Furthermore, it is very strange that a committee should adopt something by an overwhelming majority — more often than not unanimously — and that the interests of industry should then clearly predominate here in the House, for it is a fact that the views of the Committee on Energy and Research have been given priority over the proposals of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. Normally the two committees should have got together in such circumstances to discuss the matter again ...

(Applause)

I found it interesting — and I address these remarks to the Communists in the House — that the Communists should suddenly join forces with those they usually regard as the accursed bourgeoisie to oppose these proposals which would benefit the environment, public health and consumer protection.

(Applause from the left)

We consider it unacceptable that the report should be approved in this form and we oppose it as a group. We were under the impression that the House would have an opportunity to get round this hurdle by referring the report back to a joint meeting of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and the Committee on Energy and Research. However, if this is not possible, we will vote against the report. But in our view the other way would have been much more sensible as otherwise the gulf between these two committees will be total. Let me repeat my explanation of vote. If the other groups agree, I recommend that the report be referred to the two committees for redrafting. If not, the Socialist Group must vote against the report in its new form.

President. — Under Rule 26 (3) once the general debate and consideration of the texts have been concluded, only explanations of vote shall be permitted before the matter as a whole is put to the vote, so that technically I cannot accept another motion in this debate.

I call Mrs Weber on a point of order.

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, pursuant to Rule 26 of the Rules of Procedure the rapporteur may ask for a report to be referred to committee. In its present form the report no longer reflects the opinion of either the committee or even the rapporteur. I am not prepared to vote on this report in its present form under my name. I request that it be referred back to committee and I will then use the possibilities of which the Committee on Energy and Research unfortunately did not avail itself...

(Applause from the left)

The Committee on Energy and Research had three months to make contact with the other committee in order to iron out difficulties. It did not take advantage of this possibility. It approved this report, which in its present form no longer reflects the opinion of my committee. For this reason I ask that it be referred back to committee.

President. — There is a sequential pattern to Rule 26 which stipulates that reference to committee may be requested at any time and shall be granted if made in person by the chairman or rapporteur of the committee responsible, but goes on to say that

once the general debate and consideration of the texts have been concluded, only explanations of vote shall be permitted before the matter as a whole is put to the vote.

If the rapporteur or the chairman of the committee responsible had asked for reference back to committee previously, then it would have been allowable, but as the request was not made during the debate, it cannot be allowed now.

Mrs Weber, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, I am very sorry, but it is really impossible to take such action, and request that this report be referred back to the committee before the last vote has taken place, for only then can one see how extensive the amendments are. It would have been completely illogical of me to have made the request in advance. Paragraph 15 (B) reads 'asks the Commission... to include the following amendments'. It is only at the end of the vote that I can judge how far the report had been changed and draw my conclusions as rapporteur. Of course, I can get annoyed beforehand about votes, but this has nothing to do with the Rules of Procedure.

President. — I have taken a decision on this matter. I do not think this decision prevents the Committee acting again on its own initiative.

At the moment we are dealing with a report from Parliament. The debate and consideration of the text have been concluded. Only explanations of vote shall be permitted.

I call Mr Arndt on a point of order.

Mr Arndt. — (D) Mr President. If I am forced to do so I shall raise a point of order pursuant to Rule 33 of the Rules of Procedure. I note that there is no longer a quorum in the House.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Mr President, I should like to make just one comment with regard to these procedural questions. The Socialist Group, and indeed the whole House, is always complaining about Mr Pannella, but it then acts exactly as he does whenever it is defeated in a vote. We suffered this in silence yesterday on the occasion of the vote on the employment situation.

(Applause from the right)

But it is intolerable that they should have let us vote today on an entire motion for a resolution and then, seeing themselves in the minority at the end, use every trick in the Rules of Procedure to prevent the vote.

(Applause from various quarters on the right)

President. — Mr Arndt is invoking Rule 33 to establish whether a quorum is present now. This request is perfectly in order provided that the final motion has not been put to the vote, which it has not. I am therefore going to act on his request. I shall now ring the voting bell to establish whether a quorum exists.

I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster. — (D) Mr President, colleagues, the subject for discussion here can be read on the monitor outside, which for the past hour has been showing the words 'Weber report'. From the beginning the subject on which we were to vote was a unified whole. One cannot simply dissect a vote, and the final vote is part and parcel of the individual votes. This request would have been in order if it had been made before the voting on the Weber report began. Furthermore, the Rules of Procedure are also subordinate to the general legal principle followed by free people in a democracy, namely loyalty and faith. The principle of loyalty and faith implies that 'venire contra factum proprium' is forbidden, in other words that it is improper and therefore legally unacceptable to act in a manner conflicting with one's own previous conduct.

Mr President, Mr Arndt's request cannot therefore be allowed at this stage.

(Exclamations from certain quarters on the left — applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — The bell has been rung. Let the doors now be shut so that we can count how many Members are present.

I am advised by the tellers that we are substantially below a quorum and I therefore propose to proceed according to Rule 33 (3).

The vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole will therefore be placed on the agenda for the next sitting. Explanation of vote will take place then.

(Mr Pannella demands to be allowed to speak)

President. — Mr Pannella, for the whole of the vote you were out of the room. I am not allowing you to come in when the matter has been dealt with and disrupt the meeting. You can sit down.

(Applause)

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Ghergo (*Document 1-552/79*): *Radiation protection*.

Before considering the motion for a resolution itself, we must take up a position on the amendments to the proposal for a decision.

After the last recital I have Amendment No 2 by Mr Coppieters, Mr Capanna and Mrs Dekker seeking to insert two new recitals:

- whereas account must be taken of recent scientific findings as regards the effect on human health of low-level ionizing radiation,
- whereas, pending the results of its own studies, the Community should refrain from applying the ICRP 26 recommendations which will lead to increases in the permissible doses for each body organ.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Ghergo, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, as I indicated yesterday evening, I feel that this amendment should be rejected as in essence it seeks to achieve something which is already included in the programme, namely that special attention be paid to human health in cases involving to low-level ionizing radiation.

The second part states that recommendation No 26 should be suspended. This is impossible as Parliament has already taken a decision on this recommendation from the International Commission for Protection against Radioactivity.

President. — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote. Amendment No 2 is rejected.

On the second paragraph of the annex to the radiation protection programme I have Amendment No 4 by Mr Coppieters, Mr Capanna and Mrs Dekker, and

others seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text:

The programme will consist of seven major areas. They are:

- radiation dosimetry and its interpretation,
- behaviour and control of radionuclides in the environment,
- short-term somatic effects of ionizing radiation,
- late somatic effects of ionizing radiation,
- genetic effects of ionizing radiation,
- evaluation of radiation hazards.

A long-term programme for systematically monitoring the health of workers in the nuclear industry, their families and the population of areas in the proximity of nuclear installations should also be launched.

The activities shall be carried out mainly under research contracts and partly by the Commission's Biology Group at the Ispra Establishment of the Joint Research Centre.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Ghergo, rapporteur. — (I) This amendment should also be rejected as the programme covers exactly what is requested.

The last paragraph of the amendment recommends that work should be carried out mainly under research contracts and partly by the Commission's Biology Group at the Ispra Establishment of the Joint Research Centre. The programme specifically provides for this, as is shown in the report I had the honour to present yesterday.

President. — I put Amendment No 4 to the vote. Amendment No 4 is rejected.

We now move on to the motion for a resolution. I put the preamble and paragraph to the vote. The preamble and paragraph 1 are adopted.

After paragraph 1 I have Amendment No 1 by Mr Coppieters, Mr Capanna and Mrs Dekker seeking to insert a new paragraph:

- 1 a. Regrets that on the eve of this new research programme the Community has accepted the ICRP 26 recommendations which will have the effect of increasing the 'permissible' doses by factors of between 3 and 8, and considers that priority must be given to inserting in the five-year programme an independent study on the effects on health of low-level radiation doses, in view of recent scientific findings.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Ghergo, rapporteur. — (I) The amendment should be rejected for the reasons I gave with regard to recommendation No 26 from the International Commission for Protection against Radioactivity. The second part of the amendment asks that priority be given to a certain aspect of the programme, thus implicitly acknowledging that this aspect is already

Ghergo

contained in the programme. However, I feel that the various parts of the programme should be a harmonious whole and that there can be no question of giving priority to specific aspects I am therefore against the amendment.

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

I put paragraphs 2 and 3 to the vote.

Paragraphs 2 and 3 are adopted.

After paragraph 3 I have Amendment No 3 by Mr Coppieters, Mr Capanna and Mrs Dekker, seeking to insert a new paragraph :

- 3 a. Considers that in view of the lack of data on the effects of ionizing radiation on human health mentioned in the Commission document, the five-year programme should include a programme for systematically monitoring the health of workers in the nuclear industry, their families and the population of areas in the proximity of nuclear installations so as to provide an adequate basis for verifying the effectiveness of the protection programme.

What is the rapporteur's position ?

Mr Ghergo, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, this amendment seeks to introduce checks on the health of workers in the nuclear industry. The laws of the various Member States already contain such provisions. Furthermore, this matter is covered by the basic Community recommendations on protection against radioactivity.

We must see in perspective the question of extending these controls to the population of areas in the proximity of nuclear installations. Measures of this kind could not be taken with the present level of scientific and technical knowledge.

I repeat, therefore, that I am against this amendment.

President. — Mr Coppieters, you are only allowed to speak on the amendment if it is a technical matter.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Then Mrs Walz should not have been allowed to speak just then, Mr President. You allowed Mrs Walz to speak twice. That was wrong of you.

President. — Mrs Walz was allowed to speak because she was withdrawing.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) It is permissible to comment on the amendments. This was made clear yesterday after Mr Pannella's statement.

President. — Mr Coppieters, you spoke in the debate yesterday on this subject. Mrs Walz only asked for the floor in order to withdraw her amendment. I am not having another debate in the middle of voting.

I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I put these paragraphs to the vote.

Paragraphs 4 to 8 are adopted.

I now will accept explanations of vote.

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, everyone of course shares the concern expressed in Mr Ghergo's

report. However, now that four amendments have been rejected in this way, among them the third on monitoring, and the rapporteur is repeating that all of this was included in his report, which is not true, I am beginning to doubt that the concern is really genuine. However much I deeply believe in the progress embodied in the report, I shall vote against the motion for a resolution primarily because amendment No 3 has been rejected. For, as you do not approve the monitoring I proposed, your concern does not go very deep.

President. — I call Mr Pannella for an explanation of vote.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, like you I must infringe the Rules of Procedure in order to respect them. At the end of the previous debate I asked to make a personal statement pursuant to Rule 31 of the Rules of Procedure.

As a Member of Parliament I have no other opportunity to speak and I note that you uphold disorder in the House, so instead of giving an explanation of vote, I should now like to make a personal statement following the unpleasant criticisms levelled at me by Mr Klepsch.

President. — A Member who wants to make a personal statement shall be heard at the end of the discussion of the item on the agenda being dealt with.

Mr Pannella. — (I) When I asked to speak you refused.

President. — I now put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

I call Mr Sherlock on a point of order.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President, there was a motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Collins, Mrs Weber and Mr Muntingh, i.e. Doc. 1-684/79. It does not seem to have been taken before the Lega motion, though it was discussed before the latter. I wonder if it is your intention to have this put to the vote today at all ?

President. — Rule 25 says that a motion tabled under the rule will be referred to committee.

I call Mr Veronesi on a point of order.

Mr Veronesi. — (I) Mr President, I should like to make a personal statement. We have been accused of adopting a position which conflicts with our principles, and in connection with the discussion which has just taken place ...

President. — Mr Veronesi, this is not a point of order. I am not having any more debates.

* * *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution in the *report by Mr Combe (Doc. 1-618/79): Cocoa and chocolate products.*

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, I insist. You keep saying that the Rules of Procedure do not apply and that some Members are abusing the Rules of Procedure. I maintain that you neither know nor observe the Rules of Procedure.

Mr President, I asked to make a personal statement and you refused, although the Rules of Procedure expressly authorize this ...

President. — I do not accept your interpretation of my behaviour. The matter that you are bringing up now has nothing to do with cocoa or chocolate products and I am ruling you out of order.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, you are not acting as the President of a democratic parliament should. In this respect, therefore, nothing in particular ...

President. — Mr Pannella, I think the record will show that during this Parliament and certainly this morning, you have had many opportunities to state your views. We are trying to conduct the business properly, and one definition of democracy is sometimes to sit down, shup up and let other people talk.

(Applause from the right)

This is what I must ask you to do now. We are dealing with a report by Mr Combe and I am asking if anyone wishes to speak on the report.

I call Mr Pannella for an explanation of vote on cocoa and chocolate products.

(Laughter)

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, I am not in a position to give a considered opinion on this motion for a resolution as your method of conducting business is disruptive as we saw the other day in this House. I repeat, before going on to another item on the agenda you must allow a personal statement. Otherwise, you are being tyrannical rather than chairmanlike.

President. — Of course, Mr Pannella, with 410 Members and even with the few people who have bothered to stay here to vote this morning, you could hold up the House indefinitely. But as some stage a President has to make a ruling. And if I allow personal statements continually, as I say, there will be no business. Nelson turned a blind eye, and from now on I am going to turn a blind eye and I am not allowing you to make a personal statement.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I now put to the vote the motion for a resolution in the *report by Mr Combe (Doc. 1-619/79): Fresh poultrymeat.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution in the *report by Mrs Cresson (Doc 1-571/79): Classical swine fever.*

*
* *

President. — The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I now put to the vote the motion for a resolution in the *report by Mrs Cresson (Doc. 1-620/79): Derogations in respect of swine fever.*

The resolution is adopted.

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Ligios (Doc. 1-626/79): African swine fever.*

I call Mr Pannella for an explanation of vote.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, certain diseases also occur in this Parliament.

I simply wish to say that I wash my hands of this degrading spectacle, as Mr Druon and the members of the Group of European Progressive Democrats did the other evening.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

I now put to the vote the motion for a resolution in the *report by Mr Nielsen (Doc. 1-621/79): Tuberculosis and brucellosis.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution in the *report by Sir Fred Warner (Doc. 1-638/79): Situation in Afghanistan.*

I call Sir Fred Warner.

Sir Fred Warner. — Mr President, although no amendment to this resolution stands, I would ask that, in recording the vote, the Chair draw to the attention of the chairman of the Budget Committee the wish of this House that they tackle immediately the problem of financing in order to enable the Commission to carry out the intentions of the resolution.

President. — I am quite certain that the chairman of the Budget Committee in cooperation with the Commission can expedite the matter as you have suggested.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

*
* * *

President. — I now put to the vote the motion for a resolution in the *report by Mr Poniatowsky (Doc. 1-673/79): Trade arrangements between Southern Rhodesia and the European Community.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* * *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Rogers, Mr Griffiths, Mrs Clwyd, Mr Hänsch, Mr Seal, Mr Coburn, Mr Megahy, Mr Enright, Mr Boyes, Mr Fich, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mr Wetting, Mr Dankert, Mrs Van den Heuvel, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Abens, Mrs Weber, Mr Schmid, Mr Van Minnen and Mrs Vayssade (Doc. 1-651/79): Flood damage in Wales.*

On the first indent of this preamble, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Harris, Mr Griffiths, Mrs Clwyd, Mr Hänsch, Mr Seal, Mr Coburn, Mr Megahy, Mr Enright, Mr Boyes, Mr Fich, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mr Wetting, Mr Dankert, Mrs Van der Heuvel, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Abens, Mrs Weber, Mr Schmid, Mr Van Minnen and Mrs Vayssade seeking to add the following :

and of the damage to other parts of the United Kingdom, particularly the South West of England.

What is Sir Fred Warner's position ?

Sir Fred Warner. — Mr President, I already accepted it. In fact it acknowledges what has already taken place.

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

I put the second indent of the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2 to the vote.

The second indent of paragraphs 1 and 2 are adopted.

I now can accept explanations of vote.

I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — Circumstances have changed, Mr President, since I first asked to give an explanation of vote in that I had intended to speak in this debate in support of the resolution and the amendment because I wanted to show my Welsh colleagues that someone from outside Wales was also in favour. But I don't feel it necessary any longer to apologize to this House for unfortunately being late because if it were not for Mr Scott-Hopkins and his group we would be getting votes in this House now that sounded more like a football score of 4-1. I am certainly not going to apologize to the House for being late during the debate, when I am one of about 2 dozen people apart from that group that have bothered to stay for the vote.

I am going to use my time to say that I think it is absolutely disgusting when we debate resolutions like this one that concern tremendous social problems, when something real can be done, that the House is almost empty. This House is packed for debates on highly esoteric philosophical questions when I don't think anybody is going to take any notice of anything that we have said. So now, Mr Chairman, I will say that I am going to support a vote in favour of the resolution but I am not going to apologize to this House for being late.

President. — I call Mrs Clwyd.

Mrs Clwyd. — Mr President, as my Welsh colleagues know, I fully intended to participate in this debate, and I apologize for the fact that I was not here to do so. I am sorry my absence was used as an opportunity to make cheap political jibes in a debate on a serious and very sad situation. The reason I was late was that my transport did not arrive. I would be glad if people on the other side of the House would check their facts before they attempt to score political points.

Mr President, in Wales besides the towns of the industrial South, the central regions of the country were also badly affected by flood damage. Brecon, in my own constituency in particular, suffered drastically from the floodwater with 500 homes and businesses inundated with muddy brown water. I am glad the Commission responded so rapidly to this situation. I am sorry that the sum of money that the Commission made available for Wales, £ 173 000, was so derisory. It is a sum of money, Mr President, which is not going to be sufficient to deal with the situation. I spoke to people from the constituency on the telephone this morning. I am told that the local authorities in Wales wanted at least £ 750 000. The sum of money that has been made available is not sufficient and I want the House to be aware of the situation in Wales and that we shall be bringing this matter before

Clwyd

the House again because we need more money for this situation. I shall support this resolution as I supported the amendment.

President. — I call Mr Newton Dunn.

Mr Newton Dunn. — Mr President as someone who has fought two elections in Wales, I intend to vote in favour of this motion. I think it is excellent.

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

The resolution is adopted.

*

* *

We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Papapietro and others (Doc. 674/79): Natural disasters in the Mezzogiorno.*

I call Mr Klepsch for an explanation of vote.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Mr President, now that I have heard two explanations of the vote to the effect that these motions for resolutions relate to Parliament's real duties I have no option but to support the resolutions on floods in Southern Italy no less enthusiastically than my colleagues did for Wales and the surrounding areas. I should therefore like to take the opportunity, Mr President, to express my support for this motion for a resolution and all the others which we included on the agenda as matters for urgent debate only because the House as a whole felt it should show its solidarity, although I personally feel that such explanations of vote are superfluous.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

*

* *

President. — I now put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mr Vergès and others (Doc. 1-676/79): Urgent EEC aid for the Island of Mauritius.*

The resolution is adopted.

*

* *

President. — I now put to the vote the *motion for a resolution in the report by Mr Almirante (Doc. 1-568/79): Wines originating in Cyprus.*

The resolution is adopted.

The proceedings will now be suspended for ten minutes, because I have been sitting in the Chair for almost three hours.

(Laughter)

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 00.30 p.m. and resumed at 00.45 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

14. *Regulation on duties on certain agricultural products originating in Turkey*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-562/79) by Mr Caretoni Romagnoli, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-364/79) for a regulation on the total or partial suspension of Common Customs Tariff duties on certain agricultural products originating in Turkey (1980).

I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood, deputy rapporteur. — Mr President, it is a somewhat technical proposal and a very good summary of the explanatory statement. I do not think it is necessary for me to make any further comments. The only thing we would draw the attention of the House to is the importance we attach to the promotion of trade at present between the Community and Turkey. Obviously this is intended to further the promotion of trade.

The committee hope that the European Parliament will be able to approve the proposal without further ado.

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, as the rapporteur has said, the documents before the House outline the problem very well. I would simply like to point out that a decision has now been taken to suspend the customs duties in the context of the generalized tariff preferences for 1980, and that the changes mentioned by the rapporteur are under way. Finally, we have of course taken note of the rapporteur's comments regarding trade promotion.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

15. *Regulation on a tariff quota for frozen beef and veal*

President. — The next item is a report (Doc. 1-569/79) by Mr Giummarra, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-450/79) for a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of a Community tariff quota for frozen beef and veal falling within subheading 02.01 A II (b) of the Common Customs Tariff (1980).

I call Mr Giummarra.

Mr Giummarra, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, in the context of the multilateral GATT negotiations, the European Economic Community has given an under-

Giummarra

taking to open a Community tariff quota for frozen beef and veal to be allocated and administered in accordance with the Commission proposal presented to Parliament pursuant to Article 43 of the Treaty. The Committee for External Economic Relations expressed a favourable opinion after seeking the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Budgets. However, it took careful note of the comments of the Committee on Budgets, which stress the peculiar nature of this concession which will reduce the revenue of the Community budget.

Nevertheless, as the implementation of international commitments entered into on the basis of treaties was involved, both the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Budgets expressed a favourable opinion. The Committee on External Economic Relations agreed with this opinion and asks Parliament to approve the Commission's proposal.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

16. *Directive on procedures for the exportation of goods*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-547/79) by Mr Lemmer, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-266/79) for a directive on the harmonization of procedures for the exportation of goods.

I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood, deputy rapporteur. — I have not been briefed on this subject, but I do recollect it going through committee, so I recommend it to the House.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

17. *Regulation on duties on certain types of fish*

President. — The next item is a report (Doc. 1-643/79) by Mr Seeler, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-502/79) for a regulation temporarily suspending partially the autonomous Common Customs Tariff duties on certain types of fish.

I call Mr Seeler.

Mr Seeler, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be brief. This proposal seeks Parliament's agreement to extend the lower duties on imports of certain types of fish for six months. The real significance of this is that the firms concerned, notably those in Denmark, can continue to operate and that jobs can thus be guaranteed. I would refer you to the uncontroversial document before us.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

18. *Regulation on imports of certain adult bovine animals from Yugoslavia*

President. — The next item is a report (Doc. 1-622/79) by Mrs Agnelli, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-541/79) for a regulation extending Regulation (EEC) No 2862/77 concerning the levies applicable to imports of certain adult bovine animals and beef from Yugoslavia.

I call Mr Irmer.

Mr Irmer, deputy rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, although it is now very late I should like to ask your indulgence for a short statement which I should like to make on behalf of Mrs Agnelli. It concerns a special technical problem, but has a wider significance in that it involves our neighbour, Yugoslavia. An agreement which was due to expire at the end of last year is now to be extended for six months until the end of June 1980 as the negotiations for a new cooperation agreement with Yugoslavia are still dragging on. We consider it necessary to grant the special tariff preferences for Yugoslavia as requested in this report, as Yugoslavia is a very important country for us.

A closer look at the brisk trade between the European Community and Yugoslavia shows that the latter has a very large balance of trade deficit with the Community running to more than \$ 2.5 thousand million in 1979. In other words, the European Community derives considerable economic advantages from its relations with Yugoslavia. The export of the goods covered by the agreement which is to be extended is of special importance to Yugoslavia, particularly as this country can export very few other products to the Community at present.

Secondly, we should take account of the fact that the Yugoslavian economy differs fundamentally from the economic systems of other socialist countries in certain important respects. Yugoslavia has a certain tradition of decentralized economic decision-making processes and, in addition, has always been much more open than other socialist countries to economic ideas from the West. It would therefore be in our own interests to strengthen our trade links with Yugoslavia even further. There is one other point. In view of Marshal Tito's serious illness there is currently great concern and uncertainty about Yugoslavia's future. We feel, therefore, that the European Parliament should demonstrate its political will very clearly with a view to maintaining trade relations with this neighbouring country and promoting its continued economic development.

Irmer

One final point. The expansion of economic links with Yugoslavia, i.e. with an east European country, gives us the opportunity to emphasize that the whole network of trade relations with the third world falls within the Community's own special field of responsibility. This fact cannot be stressed enough to the other east European countries which form part of COMECON. Finally, this agreement gives the Community the opportunity to show its sincerity in trade with third countries. It could also silence some of the unjustified criticisms of protectionism levelled against us.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am sorry that I have spoken at such length. However, I felt that the political context of this purely technical report should also be clarified. I thank you for your attention and would ask you to vote in favour of the motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, the Commission is particularly pleased with the report which has been presented. It involves the straightforward extension of existing arrangements which, as the honourable Member said, has become more important because of Yugoslavia's continuing trade deficit with the Community. This proposal is particularly important given the nature of the products and their significance for the Yugoslavian economy at a time when every effort should be made to help the Yugoslavian economy to stabilize its trade with the Community.

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

Mr Seeler. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group welcomes these negotiations and would be very happy to see them brought to a speedy conclusion.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

19. Regulation on certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products

President. — The next item — without debate — is a report by Mr Luster, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-590/79) on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-275/79) for a Regulation laying down the trade arrangements applicable to certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products.

I note that no one wishes to speak.

The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

20. Votes

President. — The next item is votes on motions for a resolution on which the debate has been closed.

I first put to the vote the motion for a resolution in the report by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli (Doc. 1-562/79): *Duties on certain agricultural products originating in Turkey.*

The resolution is adopted.

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution in the report by Mr Giummarra (Doc. 1-1569/79): *Frozen beef and veal.*

The resolution is adopted.

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution in the report by Mr Lemmer (Doc. 1-547/79): *Procedure for the exportation of goods*

The resolution is adopted.

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution in the report by Mr Seeler (Doc. 1-643/79): *duties on certain types of fish*

The resolution is adopted.

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution proposed in the report by Mr Agnelli (Doc. 1-622/79): *Imports of certain adult bovine animals from Yugoslavia*

The resolution is adopted.

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution in the report by Mr Luster (Doc. 1-590/79): *Goods resulting from the processing of certain agricultural products.*

The resolution is adopted.

Might I before you leave say how much I appreciate that some of you have stayed to attend this morning's sitting. It is an important gesture. Thank you very much.

I call Mr Patterson on a point of order.

Mr Patterson. — Before you do close the sitting, Mr President, I should like — I am sure on behalf of the entire House — to congratulate you on the way you have handled this morning's sitting in very difficult circumstances.

(Applause)

Perhaps I might add a practical suggestion. Although, as you yourself said, the Rules of Procedure leave a lot to be desired, I do feel that during the course of this morning you have made a number of important rulings, particularly with regard to Rules of Procedure 26, 29 and 31. In the interests of consistency and so that Mr Pannella will know how the rules are to be interpreted, perhaps I might suggest that the Bureau make a compilation of your rulings for circulation among others of their number so that we know how the present rules are going to be interpreted from session to session. This will be a great advantage to all of us before the Rules of Procedure themselves are changed. So, once again could I thank you on behalf of the House and make that practical suggestion.

(Applause)

President. — Thank you, Mr Patterson. I should hate to think that any rulings I made in this Parliament were to be taken as precedents in some sense. I acted rather on the basis that the House agreed with the President, who of course has greater authority than I to suspend the rules as she did, with the general agreement of the House, on Wednesday evening.

At yesterday's meeting of the Bureau and enlarged Bureau this was one of the matters discussed, and it will now be taken up as a matter of great urgency. As we have seen over the last six months, people are exploiting the considerable loop-holes that exist in the rules, but we had hoped that people would now have the patience and courtesy to wait until we had hammered out a decent framework in which the institution can operate. However, since it is fairly obvious now that people are not going to have the courtesy and patience to wait until a new set of rules comes into being, the matter is to be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions as a matter of urgency, where I am sure your very expert advice will be highly appreciated.

Thank you very much for your kind remarks. They were greatly appreciated.

I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, my words complement those of Mr Patterson. First of all, it is noticeable to us all that you have taken a very large share of the work in the Chair this week, and particularly at two very difficult times, and I think we would all agree that you have handled it with great skill, and in particular I would say, with your usual Welsh charm.

(Laughter)

I should like to add that I think that you have had to take the Chair so often during difficult times, and that

you have been given the Chair when the agenda includes a motion for which you are the leading name. Secondly I am tempted to ask whether you are not, in fact, taking a greater share of the Chair because others of the Bureau of the Vice-Presidents are not living up to their duties? I hope that this is not the case.

(Hear, Hear)

President. — The programme for the presidency is drawn up during the week, and sometimes Presidents express a preference as to when they would like to sit. They are then generally accommodated. I volunteered my services for this morning — I thought perhaps I would be alternating with others — because I do not have to catch a plane until 6 o'clock, and I thought it would relieve the burden on some of my colleagues who have great distances to travel. The fact that I am here this morning is entirely my responsibility. I do not think that from the point of view of time I have occupied the Chair any longer than any other President. However, I was in the Chair when we had all the technical problems and the personal problems that arose from them.

I call Miss Brookes.

Miss Brookes. — I merely wish to express my support for the two previous speakers and, as one of your Welsh colleagues, albeit not of the same party, I should like to give my sincere and grateful thanks to you for your work during this difficult session.

21. *Dates of the next part-session*

President. — There are no other items on the agenda. I thank the representatives of the Council and the Commission for their contributions to our work.

The enlarged Bureau proposes that our next sittings be held from 11 to 15 February in Strasbourg.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

22. *Approval of the minutes*

President. — Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to lay before Parliament, for its approval, the minutes of proceedings of the sitting which were written during the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 1.10 p.m.)

23. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

ANNEX

*Questions addressed to the Council and the Ministers of Foreign Affairs
for Question Time, and answers given in writing**Question by Mr Spicer (H-94/79)*

Subject: Aeronautical Research

In view of the importance of research and development to the future of the Community's aerospace industries, what steps is the Council taking to give an early go ahead to the Commission aerospace research and development programme?

Reply

The Commission proposal for a first aeronautical research programme concerns an industrial sector marked by the absence of a Community industrial policy and by multilateral cooperation outside the framework of the Community Institutions, which, moreover, includes efforts in the field of research (e.g. the Garteur Working Party). Furthermore, the programme proposed by the Commission does not appear to be likely to ensure full participation by each of the Member States.

In these circumstances, the Council is unable to take a positive decision on the programme in question.

*
* *

Question by Mr Schwartzberg (H-293/79/rev.)

Subject: Harmonization of legislation on the death penalty

Does the Council not feel called upon to recommend the harmonization by the Community Member States of legislation on the death penalty in view of its commitment in the preamble to the Treaties 'to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe'?

Reply

The Council does not consider that the passage of the preamble to the Treaty establishing the EEC referred to by the Honourable Member contains an invitation to harmonize legislation on the death penalty.

*
* *

Question by Mr Provan (H-312/79)

Subject: Export restitutions for cereal-based spirituous beverages

In view of the Council's failure to agree on further progress with the ethyl alcohol proposals, will the Council now urgently consider alternative methods of ensuring that Community cereal-based spirituous beverage producers receive the export restitutions owing to them?

Reply

I would remind the Honourable Member, as my predecessor already had occasion to do in his reply to Mr Corrie at the February 1978 part-session, that the Council, in its Resolution of 28 December 1972, considered that the measures relating to cereal-based spirituous beverages, notably whisky, had to fit in with the Community's general policy on alcohol and that this policy and these measures should be put into effect *simultaneously*.

The date of 1 August 1973 which was envisaged for adoption of the Regulation could not be met, largely because of the complexity of the problems under discussion, and what is more the Opinion requested of the European Parliament had not been delivered. The Commission felt it necessary to submit an amended proposal for a Regulation to the Council on 7 December 1976, on which the European Parliament was once again consulted.

Furthermore, in the light of the Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee and the discussions in your Committee on Agriculture and in the Council itself, the Commission submitted to the Council on 22 May 1979, amendments to the amended proposal of late 1976, which have also been submitted to the European Parliament for an Opinion.

The Council remains willing to expedite its work and accordingly calls upon the European Parliament to deliver its Opinion as soon as possible.

*

* *

Question by Mr Battersby (H-320/79)

Subject: Community's Relations with China

Now that Chairman Hua Guofeng has visited four Member States, will the Council invite China's leaders to visit the Community's Institutions during any subsequent visit to Europe?

Reply

When a statesman from a third country is to visit a Community Institution, such a visit is normally made to the Commission rather than to the Council.

However, I should like to take the opportunity of reiterating the importance the Council attaches to the development of relations with the People's Republic of China.

*

* *

Question by Mr Van Miert (H-276/79)

Subject: Informal ministerial meetings

What is the Council's opinion of the increasing number of informal meetings of Ministers with full or partial Community responsibilities?

Reply

Informal meetings of Ministers responsible for subjects coming under the Treaties establishing the European Communities have been held from time to time. This is the case, for example, with the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and sometimes Agriculture and Finance. Such meetings enable the participants to have freer and more general exchanges of views. The Council, however, remains the sole forum for the taking of decisions.

*

* *

Question by Mr Flanagan (H-341/79)

Subject: Reform of existing structural directives

With reference to the Council undertaking to reform structural directives and in particular the West of Ireland proposals, what steps is the Council taking to reach a decision on the structural package before the end of 1979?

Reply

The Council was presented with a Commission communication in March 1979 containing 12 proposals in connection with agricultural structures policy, *inter alia* amendments to existing Directives and a proposal for a Regulation on speeding up agricultural development in the less favoured regions of the West of Ireland. This joint measure would be implemented over a 10 year period and would be supplementary to the measures already taken in the form of programmes to speed up drainage operations in that region.

However, despite the importance of this package of Commission proposals, in the absence of the European Parliament's Opinion, the Council was unable to take a decision before the end of 1979; as the Honourable Questioner would have wished.

*

* *

Question by Mr Oehler (H-342/79)

Subject : Excessive profits of certain oil companies

With several OPEC countries once again denouncing the enormous profits of the oil companies and energy problems under discussion at the European Council's meeting in Dublin, would the Council not agree that it is necessary to tax the excessive profits made by certain oil companies, which encourage speculation on the oil market, and to use the resulting funds to promote research and development programmes in the energy sector?

Reply

The question raised by the Honourable Member has not been discussed in the Council.

*

* *

Question by Mr Cariglia (H-345/79)

Subject : Energy consumption

Can the Council state which countries have adopted measures, and what those measures are, for reducing energy consumption and to what extent such measures have affected or may in future affect consumption in each of the countries concerned?

Reply

Without exception, all the Member States of the Community have taken measures to reduce energy consumption. I believe that the Commission, whose task it is to follow the situation in the Member States as regards the achievement of Community objectives, has all the relevant information on the extent to which such measures have affected or may in future affect consumption in each country.

For its part, the Council is continuing to make every effort to achieve the objectives which we set ourselves in order to reduce the Community's dependence on imported oil.

*

* *

Question by Mr O'Connell (H-349/79)

Subject : Consumer affairs

Would the Council of Ministers concerned with consumer affairs consider submitting a biannual written report to the European Parliament on action taken on consumer policy, and proposals adopted?

Reply

The Council is prepared to inform the European Parliament in writing or orally of the progress of its work on consumer protection and information.

However, this does not necessarily mean that it will submit a biannual report.

If the Member presses the point with a supplementary question :

'I can confirm that the Council is always prepared to reply to any specific enquiries which Honourable Members may wish to make of it in accordance with the rules of procedure of the European Parliament.'

*

* *

Question by Mr Debré (H-357/79)

Subject : United Kingdom's contribution to the Community budget

What are the Council's intentions concerning the United Kingdom's contributions to the Community budget?

Reply

At its meeting on 29/30 November 1979, the European Council called upon the Commission to submit proposals enabling the Council to continue the quest for appropriate solutions to be adopted at the next European Council meeting.

The Council will examine further the problem referred to by the Honourable Member once it has received the Commission's proposals, as the President, Mr Ruffini, has already indicated in his statements on the matter to Parliament today.

Question by Mrs Ewing (H-359/79)

Subject: Common fisheries policy

Will the Council inform the Parliament of its most recent discussions on the common fisheries policy; when these were held; and what decisions, if any, were reached?

Reply

At its meeting on 3 December 1979 the Council held a further exchange of views on the establishment of definitive Community rules on the management and conservation of fishery resources.

It agreed to continue these talks in January 1980 in order to reach a decision on the most urgent aspects, notably the total allowable catches (TACs) for 1980 and the system of recording and notification of catches, before 31 January 1980.

Pending agreement on these questions, the Council adopted an interim Decision which will be applicable until 31 March 1980 at the latest and the purpose of which is to preserve resources and provide a Community framework for any measures which the Member States might have to take.

The Member States undertook to conduct their fishing activities in such a way as to take into account the TACs submitted to the Council by the Commission in its communication of 21 November 1979 and the share in the TACs made available to third countries under agreements or arrangements made with them by the Community.

As regards technical measures for the conservation and surveillance of fishery resources, the Member States agreed to apply the same measures as those which they applied as at 3 November 1976, together with other measures taken in accordance with the procedures and criteria laid down in Annex VI of the Council Resolution of 3 November 1976.

Lastly, bearing in mind the need for a regular flow of information about catches of stocks or groups of stocks for which a TAC has been fixed, the Council agreed to implement a common system of recording and notification of catches as they relate to the TACs which should be formally adopted by 31 January 1980.

The Council further agrees that by 31 January 1980 it will adopt definitive TACs on the basis of Commission proposals resulting from its communication of 21 November 1979 with Addendum and Corrigendum of 30 November 1979 and from further consideration of relevant scientific, economic and social factors.

Question by Mr Poncelet (H-363/79)

Subject: Strategy to protect the European textile industry

In view of the fact that the European textile industry is suffering from unfair competition from man-made American fibres, the costs of which are lower as a result of the dual price of oil, does the Council intend to draw up a general strategy to give increased protection to European textile products?

Reply

A substantial increase has indeed taken place over the last few months — particularly in Italy and the United Kingdom — in imports of certain man-made textile fibres from the United States which have created serious problems in certain Community regions, already affected by unemployment.

It may be presumed that the competitive position of the American products is the result of the dual price of energy in the United States. The Americans dispute this fact, however, stressing the limited impact of this factor on the formation of their prices, which according to them are explained principally by better conditions of production.

I would remind the Honourable Member that it is the Commission which is dealing with this problem and that the latter has already taken a number of measures, comprising provisional anti-dumping duties, the opening of consultations with the United States under Article XXIII/1 of GATT, contacts with the undertakings concerned and consultations with the Member States with a view to introducing Community surveillance measures, if appropriate.

The Commission, which is continuing its examination of all aspects of this complex problem, has undertaken to submit its conclusions in time for the relevant Council meeting in February. The latter will hold a substantive discussion in full knowledge of the facts of the matter and take any appropriate decisions demanded by the situation.

*

* *

Question by Mr Tuckman (H-368/79)

Subject: Exit controls on individuals

What consideration has been given to the abolition of exit controls on travellers both within the Community and to destinations elsewhere?

Reply

Travellers leaving a Member State of the European Communities to enter another Member State or a third country may be subject to various controls, some of which might in time be abolished as a result of the adoption of Community acts. However, in the present circumstances security problems are the main reason for exit controls being maintained.

*

* *

Question by Mr Simpson (H-371/79)

Subject: Statement by the President-in-office on the Parliament's rejection of the 1980 budget

The Times newspaper of 14 December 1979 reports that the President-in-office of the Council, Mr Lenihan, commenting on the European Parliament's rejection of the Community budget for 1980, told a radio interviewer that the Parliament was rapidly becoming 'a rabble without responsibility'. If this report is correct, does this statement represent the official view of the Council of Ministers, following Parliament's lawful exercise of its responsibilities under the Treaties, and if not, what steps has the Council taken to disavow the statement and to censure Mr Lenihan?

Reply

The press report is incorrect.

*

* *

Question by Mr Muntingh (H-384/79)

Subject: Consultation procedure with regard to nuclear matters

Can the Council inform us of the progress of its work on the adoption of a Community consultation procedure with regard to nuclear power stations which are likely to affect the territory of another Member State?

Reply

Acting on a proposal from the Commission, the Council adopted a *Resolution* on 20 November 1978 in which it noted the Commission's intention, in view of the diversity of local situations, to organize, within a working party of representatives designated by the Member States and meeting under the auspices of the Energy Committee, a mutual exchange of information on the problems raised by the siting of nuclear power stations. The Commission was, after consulting the Energy Committee, to submit to the Council a report on the results obtained from this exchange of information.

Furthermore, the Council is currently examining a proposal for a Council *Regulation* on the introduction of a Community consultation procedure on nuclear power stations which are likely to affect the territory of another Member State. This proposal is aimed in particular at power stations sited in frontier regions and on international water courses and stretches of water.

*

* *

Question by Mr Turner (H-389/79)

Subject: Adherence to an order of the European Court of Justice

What steps are open to the Council, which it considers practical, to take decisions under Article 145 of the EEC Treaty to ensure that the objectives set out in the EEC Treaty are attained insofar as the adherence of the French Government to the order of the European Court of Justice on sheepmeat of 25th September 1979 is concerned.

Reply

The Honourable Member is reminded that under the terms of Article 4 (1) of the Treaty establishing the EEC: 'Each institution shall act within the limits of the powers conferred upon it by the Treaty'. Under the terms of the first indent of Article 155 of the Treaty it is up to the Commission, as guardian of the Treaty, to ensure that the provisions of the Treaty and the measures taken by the institutions pursuant thereto are applied. The second indent of Article 145 of the Treaty does not confer any power on the Council to take decisions with regard to the implementation by a Member State of a judgment delivered by the Court of Justice in the framework of an infringement procedure.

Any further questions dwelling on this point should be referred to the Commission or the guardian of the Treaty.

*
* *
*

Question by Mr Normanton (H-210/79)

Subject: Attack on religious freedoms by the new Iranian regime

Are the ministers aware of the growing anxiety amongst the Bahai Community throughout the world at the threat to their Holy Shrine and place of pilgrimage in Shiraz, where the House of the Bab is being destroyed by the new Iranian Regime, and will the ministers take such action as they can to deal with this latest attack on religious freedoms?

Reply

The Nine are aware of the concern felt among the Bahai Community about recent events in Iran. They have therefore noted with approval the statement made at the United Nations General Assembly of 4 October by his excellency Ibrahim Yazdi, Iranian Minister for Foreign Affairs that 'the Goal of the Islamic Revolution is to create a society in which all people may fulfil their potential, regardless of race, religion or sex'.

*
* *
*

Question by Mr Lomas (H-336/79)

Subject: Human Rights and China

Having noted the concern shown on many occasions by the EEC and its Member States with regard to human rights in many parts of the world and having regard to the trade agreements reached with China, is the Council aware that a prominent leader of China's Human Rights and Democracy Campaign, Wey Ting Sheng, has been sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment for his human rights activities and has the Council made any representations to the Chinese Government on behalf of Wey Ting Sheng? If the answer is No, why not?

Reply

The Nine are aware of the trial and sentencing of Wei Jingsheng, a citizen of the people's Republic of China. It is understood that the trial took place in the manner provided by Chinese law. The specific question of representations on behalf of Wei Jingsheng has not been discussed in political cooperation.

*
* *
*

Question by Mr Berkhouwer (H-339/79)

Subject: Improvement of the situation of the Palestinian people

Would the President-in-Office indicate what steps have been taken to impress upon the Arab Governments and the PLO that peace with Israel is essential if further progress is to be made towards improving the lot of the Palestinian people?

Reply

The Nine have consistently upheld as one of the basic principles of their policy on the Middle East the right of all States in the region (including Israël) to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. They have expressed this view very clearly on numerous occasions most recently in the speech by the President-in-Office to the UN General Assembly on 25 September.

The Nine have also made clear to Israël the need to end the territorial occupation which it has maintained since 1967 and to recognize that in the establishment of a just and lasting peace account must be taken of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians.

*
* *
*

Question by Mrs Ewing (H-360/79)

Subject: Human rights in the USSR

In view of the continuing arrests in the USSR of people who are doing no more than monitoring the Helsinki and Belgrade Agreements on Human Rights, as reported by Amnesty International, will the Foreign Ministers coordinate their policies on foreign relations with the Soviet Union to take account of this disquieting situation?

Reply

Within the framework of the European Political Cooperation, the treatment of groups in various countries monitoring observance of the CSCE undertakings is kept under continuous review. On previous occasions, the Nine have made known their view that they find it incompatible with the aims of the CSCE process that individuals should be harassed and even imprisoned for having demanded the implementation of the Final Act in their own countries. Furthermore, the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act will be of major importance at the next CSCE review meeting which is due to begin in Madrid in November 1980. The issues which are expected to arise at the meeting are also the subject of continuing coordination among the Nine.

*
* *
*

Question by Mr Van Miert (H-372/79)

Subject: Situation in the Middle East

What do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to do in order to step up contacts with all concerned and at all levels in order to end the deadlock in the Middle East?

Reply

The Nine are permanently committed to making every effort capable of promoting progress towards an overall solution in the Middle East. To that end, they maintain regular contacts with the parties concerned on the basis of the principles which were set out in full to the Thirty-Fourth Assembly of the United Nations on 25 September 1979 by the President-in-Office of the Nine, the Irish Foreign Minister, Mr O'Kennedy.

On that occasion, Mr O'Kennedy stressed once again, on behalf of the Nine, that Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the principles set out in the declaration of the European Council of 29 June 1977 must constitute the essential framework for a peace settlement and that these same principles must be applied by all the parties concerned — including the Organization for the Liberation of Palestine — as the basis for the negotiation of an overall solution in the Middle East in which all the parties will play a full role.

*
* *
*

Question by Mr Schwartzberg (H-373/79)

Subject: Draft international convention on the prohibition of torture

Do the Ministers not think that they should make the necessary representations within the competent international organizations to advance the cause of the draft international convention on the prohibition of torture drawn up by Amnesty International?

Reply

The Nine are aware of various initiatives by Amnesty International with a view to bringing about the abolition of torture throughout the world. They are not aware that Amnesty International has itself elaborated a draft convention on the prohibition of torture.

As the honourable Member may be aware, following the submission of a draft text by the Swedish Government, the drafting of a convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment has been undertaken by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. This initiative has been supported by the Nine.

*

* * *

Question by the Marquess of Douro (H-376/79)

Subject: Southern Rhodesia

What steps do the Foreign Ministers propose to take to support the United Kingdom in its efforts to bring peace and stability to Southern Rhodesia?

Reply

The Nine have given their full political and moral support to the British government in its efforts to end the Rhodesian conflict by negotiations. On two occasions during the Lancaster House talks — 11 September and 20 November — this support has taken the form of joint statements by the Nine foreign Ministers on Rhodesia.

British efforts towards a compromise have also been supported by other Member States in their individual contacts with African leaders.

Following the successful conclusion of the London conference and the lifting of sanctions, the Nine are considering, in the framework of political cooperation, how they can continue to assist the United Kingdom in the process of bringing Rhodesia to majority rule. In this context the United Kingdom has invited its partners in the Nine to send observers to the forthcoming elections which will mark an important stage in the transition of Rhodesia to independence. The Nine reiterate that the European Community is ready to play its part in assisting the development of an independent Zimbabwe. The honourable Member may wish to note that discussions are proceeding within the Community framework on economic relations with Rhodesia.

*

* * *

Question by Mr O'Connell (H-380/79)

Subject: Political cooperation relating to peace-keeping in the Lebanon

How is the concern of the Nine, expressed by the Irish President-in-Office about the constant harassment of the UN peace-keeping forces, including citizens of the EEC in the Lebanon, being expressed in tangible terms, within the framework of European Political Cooperation; and have the European Political Cooperation Directors prepared a research report on these peace-keeping forces, and their problems in carrying out their duties, particularly the Irish troops?

Reply

As the Irish Presidency has already stated, the Nine continue to follow most carefully the development of the tragic situation in Lebanon.

With regard to the United Nations peace-keeping forces in Lebanon, they agree in general with the comprehensive report released by the Secretary General on UNIFIL operations from 9 June to 10 December, 1979. In particular, the Nine agree with the Secretary General that a withdrawal or a reduction of the UNIFIL force would, at this juncture, be extremely dangerous, for it could easily result in a resumption of hostilities not only in the UNIFIL area of operation but also elsewhere in the region.

They note with keen appreciation the efforts being made by the Secretary General to facilitate and protect the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations forces in Lebanon, carried out in accordance with Resolutions 425, 426 and 450.

Accordingly, the Nine firmly support the decision taken by the Security Council, in its Resolution 459, to renew the UNIFIL mandate for a further six months, to instruct the Secretary General to consolidate the cease-fire, and to call upon all parties to refrain from any activity incompatible with the objectives pursued by the United Nations peace-keeping forces.

*

* * *

