COUNCIL OF EUROPE

CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION

(First Part)

14-18 May 1973

PACE084



OFFICIAL REPORT

of DEBATES

VOLUME I

SITTINGS 1 to 8

Pages 1 to 275



STRASBOURG

1973

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION
(First Part)
14-18 May 1973

OFFICIAL REPORT

of DEBATES

VOLUME I

SITTINGS 1 to 8

Pages 1 to 275



STRASBOURG

1973

LIST OF REPRESENTATIVES BY COUNTRIES

AUSTRIA

Representatives		Substitutes	
MM. Czernetz Karl	Socialist	Mr. Gratz Leopold	Socialist
Goëss Leopold	People's Party	Mrs. Hubinek Marga	People's Party
Karasek Franz	People's Party	MM. Reichl Josef	Socialist
Leitner Alois	People's Party	Reinhart Karl	Socialist

Socialist

Schieder Peter Socialist Withalm Hermann People's Party

Scrinzi Otto

Liberal

BELGIUM

P.L.P.: Party of Freedom and Progress

Radinger Stefan

F.D.F.-R.W.: French-speaking Democratic Front Walloon Union

Representatives		Substitutes	
MM. Delforge Paul	P.L.P.	MM. Adriaensens Hugo	Socialist
Dequae André	Social	de Bruyne Hector	Volksunie
Christian	De Clercq Paul	P.L.P.	
Leynen Hubert	Social Christian	Defosset Léon	F .D.FR.W.
Schugens Willy	Socialist	Hulpiau Rafaël	Social Christian
de Stexhe Paul	Social Christian	Nothomb Charles	Social Christian
Tanghe Francis	Social Christian	Van Hoeylandt D. Bernard	Socialist
Van Lent Aimé	Socialist		

CYPRUS

Representatives	Substitutes
N	N
N	N
N	N

DENMARK

Representatives		Subs	Substitutes		
MM.	Christiansen Arne	Liberal	MM.	Damgaard Knud	Social
	Hansen Ove	Social			Democrat
		Democrat		Jakobsen Frode	Social
	Holst Carl Erik	Social			Democrat
		Democrat	Mrs.	Madsen Mette	Liberal
	Oestergaard Knud	${\it Conservative}$		Petersen Gert	People's
	Stinus Arne Radical				Social Party
	·	Liberal		Schlüter Poul	Conservative

FRANCE

U.D.R.: Union of Democrats for the Republic U.C.D.P.: Centre Union of Progress Democrats

app.: associated with

Repres	sentatives		Subs	titutes	
MM. I	Beauguitte André	Ind. Rep.	MM.	Abelin Pierre	Ref. Soc. Dem.
ć	de Félice Pierre	Left Democr.		Bizet Emile	app. U.D.R.
]	Flornoy Bertrand	U.D.R.		Bourgeois Georges	U.D.R.
	Jung Louis	U.C.D.P.		Capelle Jean	
]	Labbé Claude	U.D.R.		de Chevigny Pierre	Ind. Rep.
1	Legaret Jean	Ind. Rep.		Dardel Georges	Socialist
(de Montesquiou Pierre	app. Ref. Soc. Dem.		Destremau Bernard	Ind. Rep.
]	Nessler Edmond	U.D.R.		Gautier Lucien	U.D.R.
3	Péridier Jean	Socialist		Grussenmeyer François	U.D.R.
]	Péronnet Gabriel	Ref. Soc. Dem.		Hauret Robert	
]	Petit Camille	U.D.R.		Laurent-Thouverey Charles	Left Democr.
(de Préaumont Jean	U.D.R.		Lemaire Marcel	Rep. Centre
]	Radius René	U.D.R.		Moulin Arthur	
]	Rivière Paul	U.D.R.	Mrs.	Ploux Suzanne	U.D.R.
;	Schleiter François	Ind. Rep.	MM.	Schloesing Edouard	Ref. Soc. Dem.
S	Schmitt Robert	app. U.D.R.		Valleix Jean	U.D.R.
,	Tisserand André			Weber Pierre	app.Ind.Rep.
,	Vitter Pierre	Ind. Rep.		Yvon Joseph	U.C.D.P.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

C.D.U./C.S.U.: Christian Democrat Union/ Christian Social Union Representatives		F.D.P.: Free Democratic Party S.P.D.: Social-Democratic Party Substitutes			
MM.	Ahrens Karl	S.P.D.	Mrs.	von Bothmer Lenelotte	S.P.D.
	Albert Siegbert	C.D.U./C.S.U.	MM.	Büchner Peter	S.P.D.
	Amrehn Franz	C.D.U./C.S.U.		Carstens Karl	C.D.U./C.S.U.
	Blumenfeld Erik	C.D.U./C.S.U.		Gölter Georg	C.D.U./C.S.U.
	Dregger Alfred	C.D.U./C.S.U.		Holtz Uwe	S.P.D.
	Enders Wendelin	S.P.D.		Klepsch Egon	C.D.U./C.S.U.
	Gessner Manfred	S.P.D.		Kliesing Georg	C.D.U./C.S.U.
	Kahn-Ackermann Georg	S.P.D.		Lagerhausen Karl-Hans	C.D.U./C.S.U.
	Kempfler Friedrich	C.D.U./C.S.U.		Lenzer Christian	C.D.U./C.S.U.
	Lemmrich Karl Heinz	C.D.U./C.S.U.		Marquardt Werner	S.P.D.
	Mende Erich	C.D.U./C.S.U.		Müller Günther	C.D.U./C.S.U.
	Richter Klaus	S.P.D.		Pawelczyk Alfons	S.P.D.
	Schlaga Georg	S.P.D.		Schulte Manfred	S.P.D.
	Schmidt Hansheinrich	F.D.P.		Vohrer Manfred	F.D.P.
Mrs.	Schuchardt Helga	F.D.P.		Walther Rudolf	S.P.D.
MM.	Schwenke Olaf	S.P.D.		Wischnewski Hans-Jürgen	S.P.D.
	Sieglerschmidt Hellmut	S.P.D.		Wörner Manfred	C.D.U./C.S.U.
Mrs.	Wolf Erika	C.D.U./C.S.U.		Wurbs Richard	F.D.P.

ICELAND

Representatives		Substitutes		
MM. Arnason Jonas	People's Alliance	MM. Björnsson Björn	Progressist	
Gislason Ingvar	Progressist	Hafstein Johann	Independent	
Kristjansson Thorvaldur Gardar	Independent	N		
	-			

IRELAND

Representatives		Substitutes		
MM. Edward Collins	Fine Gael	MM. Sean Brosnan	Fianna Fail	
Gerard Collins	Fianna Fail	H.P. Dockrell	Fine Gael	
Barry Desmond	Labour	Desmond Governey	Fine Gael	
John O'Leary	Fianna Fail	Tom Hussey	Fianna Fail	

ITALY

Repre	sentatives		Subst	titutes	
MM.	Arnaud Gian Aldo	Christian Democr.	MM.	Arfé Gaetano Bonaldi Umberto	Socialist Liberal
	Averardi Giuseppe	Democr. Social.		Bottari Carlo	Christian Democr.
	Bettiol Giuseppe	Christian Democr.		Brandi Lucio Mariano Castellucci Albertino	Socialist Christian
	Coppola Mattia	Christian Democr.	Mrs.	Cattaneo Petrini Giannina	Democr. Christian Democr.
	La Loggia Giuseppe	Christian Democr.	MM.	Cavezzali Paolo	Socialist
	Leggieri Vicenzo	Christian Democr.		Drago Antonio	Christian Democr.
	Mammi Oscar	Republican		Farabegoli Furio	Christian Democr.
Mrs.	Minnocci Giacinto Miotti Carli Amalia	Socialist Christian		La Rosa Giusseppe	Christian Democr.
MM.	Pecoraro Antonio	Democr. Christian Democr.		Magliano Terenzio	Democr. Social.
	Pica Domenico	Christian Democr.		Moneti Alfredo	Christian Democr.
	Preti Luigi	Democr. Social.		Negrari Andrea	Christian Democr.
	Quilleri Fausto	Liberal		Pacini Arturo	Christian Democr.
	Salvatore Elvio Talamona Augusto	Socialist Socialist		Prearo Roberto	Christian Democr.
	Treu Renato	Christian Democr.		Reale Giusseppe	Christian Democr.
	Vedovato Giuseppe	Christian Democr.		Santalco Carmelo	Christian Democr.
	Zamberletti Giuseppe	Christian Democr.		Spora Ettore	Christian Democr.

LUXEMBOURG

Representatives		Substitutes	
MM. Abens Victor	Socialist Pa rty	MM. Cravatte Henry	

Democrat **Party** Social Margue Georges Democratic ChristianElvinger Paul Party Party

Social

Mart René **Democratic** Spautz Jean Social Party ChristianParty

MALTA

Substitutes

Representatives MM. Borg Olivier de Puget Albert Nationalist

MM. Brincat Joseph Labour Party De Marco Guido Nationalist Carachi Paul Labour Party

Labour Micallef Daniel Muscat Philip Labour

NETHERLANDS

Substitutes Representatives Anti-Revol. Popular MM. Aantjes W. Peijnenburg M.W.J.M CatholicCornelissen P.A.M. Popular Party $\bar{C}atholic$ ChristianParty Piket F.H. HistoricalDankert P. Labour Party UnionLetschert H.B.P.A. Popular van der Werff Y.P.W. LiberalCatholicParty N... Nederhorst G.M. Labour Party N... Portheine F. LiberalN... Voogd J.J. Labour Party N...

NORWAY

Representatives		Substitutes	
MM. Aano Jakob Frydenlund Knut Mrs. Munkebye Margith MM. Petersen Erling Weiberg-Aurdal	Popular Christian Party Labour Party Labour Party Conservative Centre Party	Mrs. Aasen Liv MM. Hegtun Halfdan Johanson Arvid Lillås Asbjörn Stray Svenn	Labour Party Liberal Labour Party Labour Party Conservative
	SWE	EDEN	
Representatives		Substitutes	
Mr. Alemyr Stig Miss Bergegren Astrid MM. Bohman Gösta Hedlund Gunnar Hedström Uno Wiklund Daniel	Social Democrat Social Democrat Conservative Centre Party Social Democrat Liberal	Mr. Ahlmark Per Mrs. Gradin Anita MM. Lidgard Bertil Pettersson Lennart Sjönell Bengt Wååg Nils	Liberal Social Democrat Conservative Social Democrat Centre Party Social Democrat
Representatives	5*****	Substitutes	
MM. Hofer Walther	Centre Democratic Union	MM. Bächtold Kurt	Radical Democrat
Leu Franz-Xaver Renschler Walter	Christian Democrat Socialist	Primborgne Charles Schmitt Henri	Christian Democrat Radical Democrat
Reverdin Olivier Weber Joachim	Liberal Radical Democrat	Schuler Adelrich Vontobel William	Christian Democrat Independent

Socialist

Wyler Didier

Socialist

Wenk Willi

TURKEY

Representatives

Substitutes

MM. Akçali (Cevdet	Justice	MM.	Akça Ertugrul	Justice
Ertug Ç	elal	Justice		Akyürek Sevket	Democratic
F'eyziogl	Feyzioglu Turhan Nat. Reliance	Nat. Reliance			Party
Hocaogl	u Omer Lutfi	Democratic		Barutçuoglu Dogan	Pop. Repub.
_		Party		Bayramoglu Nihat	Justice
Kiratliog	glu Esat	Justice		Günes Kemal	${\it Justice}$
Külahli	Cemal	Just i ce		Karaagaclioglu Kazim	Justice
Oguz Or	han	Justice		Özlen Fakih	Pop. Repub.
Zaloglu	Resat	Justice		Paksüt Emin	Nat. Reliance
Öktem I	brahim	Pop. Repub.		Yardimci Mehmet	Justice
Üstünda	g Mustafa	Pop. Repub.		N	

UNITED KINGDOM

Representatives

Substitutes

MM. Simon Wingfield Digby	Conservative	MM. Stanley Cohen	Labour
Raymond Fletcher	Labour	Julian Critchley	Conservative
Percy Grieve	Conservative	John Farr	Conservative
Barry Jones	Labour	John Hunt	Conservative
Sir Fitzroy Maclean	Conservative	John Mendelson	Labour
MM. Roy Mason	Labour	Charles Morris	Labour
John Osborn	Conservative	John Page	Conservative
Frederick Peart	Labour	J.L. Prescott	Labour
Sir John Peel	Conservative	Michael Roberts	Conservative
Mr. T. Pendy	${m Labour}$	J.F.H. Roper	Labour
Sir John Rodgers	Conservative	Duncan Sandys	Conservative
Mr. Hugh Rossi	Conservative	Lord Selsdon	Conservative
Lord St. Helens	Conservative	MM. William Small	Labour
MM. Peter Shore	Labour	Tom Urwin	Labour
David Steel	Liberal	Patrick Wall	${\it Conservative}$
Michael Stewart	Labour	Lord Walston	Labour
Frank Tomney	Labour	Mr. Kenneth Warren	Conservative
Dame Joan Vickers	${\it Conservative}$	N	

TWENTY-FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION

OFFICIAL REPORT

First Sitting

Monday 14 May 1973, at 3 p.m.

	Summa	ARY
1. Opening of the Session	1	12. Election of the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe (Doc. 3289)
2. Attendance Register	1	13. Progress report of the Bureau, the Stand-
3. Address by the provisional President	1	ing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations (Doc. 3292)
4. Selection of members of the Credentials Committee	4	Speakers: The President, MM. Radius (Rapporteur), Dankert, Mrs. Aasen.
5. Examination of credentials (presentation of the report of the Credentials Committee, Doc. 3291)	4	14. Result of the election of the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe
Speakers: The President, Mr. Prescott (Rapporteur).		15. Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations
6. Election of the President of the Assembly	5	(Doc. 3292) (resumed debate) 12
7. Address by the President	5	Speakers: The President, MM. Kirat- lioglu, Riber Red, Feyzioglu, Ustündag,
8. Election of the Vice-Presidents of the Assembly	6	Oguz, Piket, Radius (Rapporteur). 16. Time-limit to speeches
9. Communication by the President	6	17. Ratification by the Assembly of references to committees
0. Adoption of the order of business for the first part of the 25th Ordinary	7	18. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting
Session	7	Appendix I: Attendance Register 22
1. Appointment of members of committees	7	Appendix II: Membership of committees 23

Mr. Pierre de Félice, the oldest Representative present, took the Chair at 3 p.m.

1. Opening of the Session

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Sitting is open.

In accordance with Article 32 of the Statute and Rules 1 and 5 of the Rules of Procedure, I declare open the 25th Ordinary Session of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

2. Attendance Register

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The names of the Substitutes present at this sitting of which notice has been given to the President

will be published with the list of Representatives appended to the Minutes of Proceedings and to the Official Report of Debates.

3. Address by the provisional President

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Ladies and Gentlemen, the danger inherent in the temporary task that chance has allotted to me today is the temptation to look back on the past rather than forward to the future. But in spite of that, I will not turn back the pages and talk about all that the Council of Europe has done

since 1949, when we met not far from here, at Strasbourg University. But my silence in that respect implies neither forgetfulness nor ingratitude, still less any complex born of disillusion. After all, what is the present but the past remembered?

Like the climber who, having reached the top, forgets the steepness of the climb and sees only the far perspectives opened to his view, I want rather to set my sights on the present and consider the uncertainties which the Council of Europe is facing today — the need to bring itself up to date in relation to the existing state of affairs — in brief, the future of the Council of Europe.

To my way of thinking, as probably to yours, there are two particular features. In the first place, the Council looks to me like the handle of a fan of which the folds are now out of proportion to the scope it was given at the beginning. New European Communities have sprung up; international organisations provide us with highly useful experts to help us in our work. The very success of our undertakings has led to a sort of dislocation, and in that sense it seems to me that the external contacts thus created should be drawn more tightly around the Council of Europe.

In the second place, the Council of Europe and the Assembly in particular seem to me a little troubled by thoughts about their origin and the changes that have taken place in international opinion. In that sphere, we feel there has been some slackening off in our original purpose, and I quite understand that for some of our colleagues this means a rather painful wrench. But I congratulate the Assembly on having chosen that path.

What I want to say briefly to you today concerns these two changes.

First of all, the new European Communities are in a way a normal extension of our Assembly, for it was here that the idea of specialised authorities was born. There is no doubt that these Communities — and we can only be glad about this — young and dynamic as they are,

devoted to specific tasks, more specific than our own, and possessing, if I may put that way, a European executive within hand's reach, are making great strides. There is no point in our being touchy about the overlapping and encroachment caused by these Communities. After all, they are the prosperous branches which like to forget the parent firm that gave them birth.

Unfortunately, the first danger is a dismantling, a parcelling out of Europe, which is quite unnatural. There must be a bridge between the nine countries of the Common Market and the other Members of the Council of Europe — a rallying point for those who belong to the Communities and those who are not yet Members. The best of buildings are nothing but heaps of stone if there is no cement to bind them together.

The second danger is more serious. It is that these Communities, and in particular the Common Market, are too much inclined to set the stress exclusively on material gain. The members of this Assembly should remember to look at the compass. You know that a compass shows the cardinal points, and one of the most important of these is the quality of life.

I am afraid that owing to their desire for material success, people, even the most active among them, fail to see behind their lookingglass the futility of the life they lead.

It is, I believe, up to the Council of Europe, more than to any other organisation, to remind the nations of the famous words of the Gospel: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul."

The cohesion I want to see between the European Communities and ourselves is equally necessary where the intergovernmental organisations are concerned, those bodies of experts who come here to help us with their technical knowhow. We all know that experts are well qualified to point out the difficulties in the solutions proposed, but less skilful at proposing solutions to those difficulties, and their reports, well-balanced as they often are, leave us simply with the agreeable impression that in this world time is no object. Finding solutions is not the experts' job; theirs is to inform and to study,

not to decide. That is the reason why it is in their interest to submit their reports to a political assembly like ours, which will ensure that what they have in mind will be endorsed and carried out.

I would remind you that Robert Schuman in particular went even further in this direction by submitting his plan for ECSC for European endorsement before presenting it to the French Parliament, precisely so that he would get the approval of the national parliament. That is our task from the internal angle.

Side by side with this, in the international sphere there is the likelihood of some slackening off. I want to remind you how our Western Europe came to be born. It was born of the fear of unimpeded Soviet advance. Its plan was to create a framework for Germany to enable that country to discuss reunification in the best possible conditions. It was born with the onesided support of the United States of America. which, after allowing us to benefit from their generosity, wanted a solvent continent capable of paying for services rendered. But it cannot be denied that events have shaken, if not demolished, that state of affairs. Obviously, we are still against what happened in Budapest and Prague, even though these countries are under tutelage, in the sphere of influence agreed at Yalta. But, all the same, there has been a change of attitude on the Soviet side. We cannot deny that, since we are taking part in the Helsinki Conference and in the conference on the balanced reduction of armaments. There would be no sense in our doing so if we did not know that certain changes had taken place where our Soviet sparring-partner is concerned.

Our German friends were the first to diagnose this correctly, for they are in the front line. Their Ostpolitik shows that they have changed direction, which, in my view, is by no means a repudiation of the European ideal. It is a desire to attain that European ideal by a different route. Although the United States are no longer so one-sided as they were, although they are offering us a new Atlantic Charter while claiming that we are merely one area of interest to them, it is up to us to show that Europe is a personality in her own right, and is resuming the historic role that she played in the past.

Those are a few of the ideas I wanted to put before you, and in conclusion I would like to

draw some lessons from them. To my way of thinking, we have a threefold duty. First, we must not cling to the rocks while the torrent rushes by, but adapt ourselves to it, not by retreating before it, but by floating with it, thus preventing our basic purpose, the protection of human rights, from being swamped. I will go even further: there must be proportional representation in our Assembly for all the members of our national parliaments, even for those who do not think as we do, for respect for human rights applies equally to those with whom we disagree. I am against the kind of exclusiveness that has persisted here up to now, and I demand that those members come some day to sit in this Assembly.

Furthermore, we must not isolate ourselves, for isolation means putting oneself first and denying oneself the understanding of others. We must enlarge our audience to the point not of loss, but of gain, so that ideas, whether from West or East, may find a hearing in this Assembly. I believe it is absolutely essential for us to reconstruct our institutions to make them strong enough to receive and discuss ideas, whatever they may be and whencesoever they may come.

In parenthesis let me say this. People say that the Consultative Assembly has never been consulted. I think, put like that, such a blunt statement is a little misleading. We no longer have to be consulted; we have the initiative, we are masters of our own agenda, we have to be listened to.

I personally would like to see the Committee of Ministers reformed. I was present, in the past, at some of its meetings and let me say from this platform that I was rather disappointed. The Committee of Ministers meets rarely and only for a short time. It does not consist of senior Ministers thus capable of producing rapid and consequently useful decisions. I do not think there is any need for change in our opposite number, but I do think, all the same, that it should be reformed so that it takes proper note of our Assembly, which represents the collective strength of our countries, since we are chosen by our parliaments.

That, Ladies and Gentlemen, is what I wanted to say to you. In this Assembly, all of whose vicissitudes I have lived through from the beginning, I often think of Goethe's admonition: You hold the links of the chain in your hands; what you lack is the spirit to join them

together. And since I have the honour of succeeding my eminent friend Carlo Schmid on this platform, from which I want to pay him warm tribute, allow me to end by quoting to you in his own vigorous language, German, this thought of the poet Goethe: "Sie halten die Teile in der Hand, fehlt leider das geistige Band". (Applause)

4. Selection of members of the Credentials Committee

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the choice by lot of ten members of the committee which, in accordance with Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure, has to examine the credentials of Representatives and Substitutes and to report immediately to the Assembly.

I would ask the members of the Assembly who are chosen by lot to be kind enough to stand up as their names are called.

(Lots were drawn and the following were chosen: MM. Leitner, Yvon, Lord St. Helens, MM. Prescott, Grieve, Czernetz, Dankert, Amrehn, Fletcher and Oguz.)

The Credentials Committee thus constituted will meet immediately in Room 401 on the 4th floor.

To enable the committee to carry out its task, the sitting will be suspended. It will be resumed when it has completed its work, in about a quarter of an hour.

(The Sitting was suspended at 3.25 p.m. and resumed at 3.50 p.m.)

5. Examination of credentials

(Presentation of the report of the Credentials Committee. Doc. 3291)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Sitting is resumed.

I call Mr. Prescott, Rapporteur of the Credentials Committee, to present the committee's report.

Mr. PRESCOTT (United Kingdom). — On my first visit to the Assembly, it appears that in

accordance with the traditions of the Council, as the youngest member of the Credentials Committee, I must present its report as the Rapporteur. I have heard of certain privileges of "age before beauty", but it seems that within the first few seconds of the life of this Assembly I am given the tremendous power of being able to blackball any delegate.

The Credentials Committee, in making its report to the Assembly, wishes to bring a number of points to the attention of the Assembly. We met in accordance with the provision of Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure. The committee appointed for the checking of the credentials examined the credentials of the Representatives and Substitutes to the 25th Ordinary Session of the Consultative Assembly. The credentials, certified by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and transmitted to the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe, call for no comment.

No credentials have been received from Cyprus. Four seats for the Representatives remain vacant, three for Cyprus and one for Turkey. The Secretariat has been informed, and so has the committee, that the tenth member of the Turkish delegation may be appointed later. Ten seats for the Substitutes are also vacant—three for Cyprus, one for Iceland, four for the Netherlands, one for Turkey and one for the United Kingdom.

The committee unanimously proposes that the Assembly confirm the validation of the appointment of the Representatives and Substitutes named in the report.

There are two other points to which we should like to draw attention. One concerns a mistake on page 4 of the report concerning the Luxembourg delegation. It is reported that Mr. Spautz is the Representative and Mr. Mart is the Substitute. The reverse is the case; Mr. Mart is the Representative and Mr. Spautz is the Substitute.

Our final observation concerns the United Kingdom delegation. As reported on the back page of the report, Mr. George Darling is a substitute delegate for this Assembly, remaining only until Friday. He will be replaced by the Substitute, Mr. Stanley Cohen.

That is the report of the Credentials Committee.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Prescott.

The committee proposes the ratification of the credentials it has examined.

Are there any objections ?...

The committee's report is adopted.

Thus, the Representatives and Substitutes whose names appear in the list appended to the report just presented are entitled to sit in the Assembly for its 25th Ordinary Session.

6. Election of the President of the Assembly

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the election of the President of the Assembly.

In accordance with Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedure, no Representative may stand as a candidate for the office of President unless he has been nominated in writing by three or more Representatives.

I have received only one nomination, that of Mr. Vedovato.

His nomination has been presented properly in the form prescribed by the Rules of Procedure by MM. Bettiol, Pecoraro and Treu and by the Chairmen of the four political groups, MM. Czernetz, Leynen, Erling Petersen and Portheine.

If there are no objections to Mr. Vedovato's nomination, under Rule 9, paragraph 4, of the Rules of Procedure the election can take place by acclamation.

Are there any objections to Mr. Vedovato's nomination?... (Applause)

I note there are no objections and I therefore declare Mr. Vedovato elected President of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, and I invite him to take his place in the Chair. (Applause)

(Mr. Vedovato, President of the Assembly, took the Chair in place of Mr. de Félice.)

7. Address by the President

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Ladies and Gentlemen, first and foremost a brief word

of thanks to you all for expressing your continued confidence in me. In thanking you, I will seize the opportunity to present you with a very short resumé of the work done during the past year since I became your President.

Two events which took place in Europe during last year stand out: the Summit Conference in Paris and the enlargement of the Community, with Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom becoming Members.

In accordance with tradition, the Assembly has kept up with the political situation and held two debates on the Paris Summit, one before it took place, and one after. On the eve of the conference a delegation from the Assembly was charged with the task of delivering a message to the President of the French Republic, which was also handed to all the participants.

After the Summit we had the pleasure of listening to the Minister, Mr. Bettencourt, in this hall when he reported on the results of the conference and told us the position of his own government on several particularly interesting points connected with the proceedings and conclusions of that meeting.

As regards the enlargement of the Community and the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, with special reference to the powers, functions and role of the Council of Europe, a detailed study has been made by Mr. Reverdin for a special ad hoc working party set up by the Political Affairs Committee. The working party paid visits to the governments of all the member countries - I had the honour and pleasure of taking part in some of these myself — and we shall be turning our full attention to the results of these visits tomorrow - as in fact the Committee of Ministers is doing already — when we shall consider this excellent report and vote on the draft recommendation prepared by the Political Affairs Committee.

We all hope very much that when this draft recommendation has been passed, it may be considered jointly by the Committee of Ministers' Deputies and our Assembly at the meeting to be held in Florence on 4 July.

In view of the fact that next year we shall be celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Council of Europe, and in pursuance of our usual policy

which is to be outward-looking towards the rest of the world, the Assembly held some debates last year which are worth recalling, namely those addressed by Mr. Masmoudi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia, in May, and the one in which Mr. Leopold Senghor, President of the Republic of Senegal, took part in October.

I am now in a position to inform you that Mrs. Golda Meir has accepted the invitation from the Bureau of the Assembly to attend one of our coming sessions. To maintain the balance which is the constant concern of the Assembly of the Council of Europe, I propose to invite a leading representative of the Arab world to take part in the Assembly's debates as well. Representatives of the governments of the member States addressed our Assembly during last year, and I would make special mention of Mr. Werner, Prime Minister of Luxembourg, on 18 May 1972, and of Mr. Jørgensen, Prime Minister of Denmark, on 24 June.

In a couple of day's time, we shall have the pleasure of a visit from Mr. Giulio Andreotti, the Italian Prime Minister, and also during this session we shall be fortunate enough to have with us Mr. John N. Irwin II, the special representative of Mr. Rogers, the American Secretary of State. I have also issued an invitation — and I have good reason for believing it will be accepted — to Dom Mintoff whom I met recently in Malta and who gave me to understand that he was ready to come here soon to attend one of our debates.

As you can see, a great many personalities from the Mediterranean countries will be taking part and have been invited to take part in our debates. And I want once again to confirm and to emphasise what was said last year — and has been reaffirmed by the Assembly — when we took up this task: that is, our very special feeling for this part of the world which, from so many points of view, is the centre of our common preoccupations.

It is in this spirit, which is both constant and outward-looking, or, if you prefer, both outward-looking and constant, that I intend with your help to carry out the task you have been good enough to entrust to me, in which, you may rest assured, I will always remain faithful to the European ideals which unite us all here. Thank you. (Prolonged applause)

8. Election of the Vice-Presidents of the Assembly

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the election of ten Vice-Presidents of the Assembly.

I have to remind you that under Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedure, no Representative may stand as a candidate for the office of Vice-President unless he has been nominated in writing by three or more Representatives.

Ten candidates have been nominated in the proper form.

In alphabetical order, they are: MM. Akçali (Turkey), Hansen (Denmark), Hofer (Switzerland), Kahn-Ackermann (Federal Republic of Germany), Karasek (Austria), Peart (United Kingdom), Erling Petersen (Norway), Portheine (Netherlands), Radius (France), Spautz (Luxembourg).

The number of candidates is therefore the same as the number of seats to be filled.

If there are no objections to these candidatures, under Rule 9, paragraph 7 of the Rules of Procedure, the election can take place by acclamation. I have to point out that if election takes place by acclamation, the order of precedence of the Vice-Presidents is determined by age.

Are there any objections to the nominations before you ?...

I see there are none.

I therefore declare the following elected Vice-President in this order: MM. Erling Petersen, Radius, Hansen, Peart, Kahn-Ackermann, Hofer, Portheine, Karasek, Akçali and Spautz. (Applause)

Your applause underlines the close cooperation which exists between the Vice-Presidents and the President, for which I thank you.

9. Communication by the President

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — On Monday last, 7 May, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel, I sent to Mr. Israel Yeshayanou, Speaker of the Knesset, a telegram which I will read to the Assembly:

"Twenty-five years ago the birth of the State of Israel which came about with the support of the great majority of the member

countries of the Council of Europe realised the hopes of millions of Jews dispersed throughout the world. On this anniversary I send you on my own behalf and on that of my colleagues our wish that peace may at last be established for the well-being of all the peoples of the Middle East."

10. Adoption of the order of business for the first part of the 25th Ordinary Session

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day in the adoption of the order of business for the first part of the 25th Ordinary Session.

The draft order of business distributed to you was brought up to date on 8 May 1973.

There is just one amendment to the draft.

In the Orders of the Day for this afternoon's sitting, the election of the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe has been brought forward.

Regarding tomorrow, Tuesday morning's sitting, after the Communication from the Committee of Ministers, the rest of the sitting will be devoted to the presentation and discussion of the Political Affairs Committee's report on international terrorism, but the replies by the Chairman and Rapporteur of the committee and the vote on the draft recommendation will not take place till the end of the afternoon sitting.

To give all the speakers taking part in the debate a chance of being heard during the morning, the Bureau proposes that the list of speakers be closed at the end of the Rapporteur's statement and, according to the number of names in the list then, if necessary to put a time-limit on speeches of less than the usual ten minutes.

Are there any objections ?...

That is agreed.

I also propose that the Assembly fix the timelimit for the tabling of amendments to the Political Affairs Committee's reports.

In the case of the report on the mission of the Council of Europe, Document 3281, presented by Mr. Reverdin, and the report on international terrorism, Document 3285, presented by Mr.

Czernetz, the votes on which will take place at the end of tomorrow, Tuesday afternoon's sitting, I propose that the amendments to the draft recommendations in these reports be tabled not later than 1 p.m. tomorrow, Tuesday.

Are there any objections ?...

That is agreed.

As regards the report on relations between Western Europe and the United States, Document 3279, presented by Sir John Rodgers, on which the Assembly will vote on Thursday morning, I propose that amendments to the draft resolution in the report be tabled before 5 p.m. on Wednesday.

Are there any objections ?...

That is agreed.

I have to remind you that amendments should be tabled in the Table Office, Room A 93.

If no one wishes to speak, I will ask the Assembly to vote on the whole draft order of business as amended.

Are there any objections to the draft order of business?...

The draft order of business for the first part of the 25th Session was adopted.

11. Appointment of members of committees

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the appointment of members of committees.

The nominations for the 13 committees have been published in a duplicated document which has been distributed to you. It should be amended as follows:

For the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Mr. Alemyr's name should be substituted for that of Mr. Wååg as Representative of Sweden. For the Committee on Culture and Education, Mr. Wååg's name should be substituted for Mr. Alemyr's as Sweden's Representative.

The nominations thus amended are submitted to the Assembly for approval under Rule 43, paragraph 4, of the Rules of Procedure. If there are no objections to these appointments, they are approved.

12. Election of the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe (Doc. 3289)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the election of the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

Document 3289 contains Resolution (73) 15 adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 13 April 1973 after consultation with Representatives of the Assembly at a meeting of the Joint Committee on 23 March 1973, in accordance with the regulations relating to appointment to one of the three senior posts in the Council of Europe Secretariat.

The Committee of Ministers recommends to the Assembly the sole candidature of Mr. Sforza-Galeazzo Sforza to the post of Deputy Secretary General for a new five-year term of office to expire on 30 September 1978.

The Assembly will vote by secret ballot.

An absolute majority of the votes cast is required on the first ballot, but as the Assembly has only one candidate to vote for, there will be only one ballot, unless there is no quorum.

You have to put your ballot paper in an envelope.

You have been given a voting paper with the name of the candidate and an envelope labelled "Appointment of the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe".

When his name is called, each Representative will come and place the envelope containing his voting paper in the ballot box on the speakers' rostrum.

Before that, I will draw by lot the names of two scrutineers to count the votes.

The following have been drawn by lot: Mr. Radinger and Mr. Kempfler.

The roll-call will begin with Mr. Robert Schmitt.

The voting will begin.

(The voting took place by roll-call)

Does anyone else wish to vote?...

The voting is closed.

The count will take place in Room A 94, near the Chamber. I will ask the scrutineers kindly to go there now.

During the counting of the votes, the Assembly will doubtless wish to continue with its work? (Murmurs of assent)

13. Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations (Doc. 3292)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the presentation and discussion of the progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, Document 3292.

I call Mr. Radius, Vice-President of the Assembly.

Mr. RADIUS (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I shall be very brief in presenting the progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations so that the debate, which is becoming increasingly difficult to arrange, can take place according to the timetable. At the same time, there are certain important points in this report in Document 3292 which I must bring to the attention of the Assembly.

The first is the Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union at Helsinki. As most of us will remember, Mr. Michael Stewart was chosen to represent the Consultative Assembly as an observer. He made a speech on the general policy of the Council of Europe and its attitude to the conference. He and our other colleagues from the Assembly who went to Helsinki made it clear that the Council of Europe was not in favour of setting up a permanent body to give effect to the results of the conference.

In parenthesis, I would like to say here that the presence of several eminent personalities at this 25th Session of the Assembly and the discussions which will take place on a number of burning topics are fresh proof that the

Mr. Radius (continued)

Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, in spite of certain doubts recently expressed in some circles, has always been and still remains an excellent political platform which is both open and spontaneous.

My second point concerns the more important part that the political groups should play in the future work of the Assembly committees.

The steps taken recently by the Bureau to encourage the political groups to play a more effective part in the work of the Assembly have resulted in the adoption of certain measures with which, moreover, the groups are in agreement. The most important of these are the increase in appropriations made to the groups to enable them to expand their secretariats, and attendance by the Chairmen of the groups at meetings of the Bureau and of the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations. It is also hoped to find ways in which the Secretariat can provide the political groups with more substantial administrative assistance.

I now want to say a few words about the Assembly's budgetary powers.

Under the new procedure, the terms of which are set out in the report, more attention will be paid to the Assembly's requirements. So far as the budgetary role of the Assembly in regard to its own work is concerned, it can be said that the results of the steps taken over many years by the Bureau and the Standing Committee are very satisfactory.

Finally, I would like to congratulate the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations on the considerable increase in its activities during the last few months. The translation of certain reports into non-official languages represents a forward step towards effective action with the national parliaments, and we hope this committee will do still more work in this field.

For the rest, I would refer you, Ladies and Gentlemen, to Document 3292 with its appendices, and in particular to the speech which our President has just made to us.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Radius, for your excellent report and for all the factual matter it contains.

There are six speakers down for the debate.

The first is Mr. Dankert, and I now call him.

Mr. DANKERT (Netherlands). — I want to make a few remarks concerning the progress report of the Bureau. I will do this in a rather low key in order not to inflame the passions of my Turkish colleagues.

I am grateful to the Standing Committee and the Bureau for having decided on 23 March to pass on the resolution on the situation in Turkey to the Political Affairs Committee for its substance and to the Legal Affairs Committee for an opinion. I sincerely hope that these committees will, in the course of this week, decide how to operate further with this resolution, because I seriously think that some urgency is involved.

It is easier to exercise discreet pressure in a situation which is still in flux than to do it when it is already frozen into a legal and constitutional system which is in conflict with the Human Rights Convention. This is the feeling not only of myself as an outsider — notwithstanding all my involvement — but also of many sincere democrats in Turkey itself, and I think it is a pity that the sub-committee is not already there, now that the Turkish Parliament is discussing the last stages of the constitutional amendment concerning the so-called special security courts.

If such an amendment were finally accepted, I think there is a serious threat to the functioning of real democracy in Turkey by the State security court. One of the fundamental elements of democracy and of the parliamentary system—that is, the independence of justice—would be seriously violated by this special security court.

Elsewhere in the report of the Bureau — and here I am even more astonished — I find the information that the Turkish Government —

Mr. Dankert (continued)

although I have not counted, I think this is for the "nth" time — prolonged martial law in seven districts. I am seriously disturbed at this information. I am also disturbed that the Council of Europe authorities have up to now accepted this in what might be said to be such a matter of fact way.

The greater part of Turkey has been living under exceptional conditions of martial law for over two years now. We would all agree, I think, that martial law is an exceptional circumstance. The number of districts so affected has been reduced from eleven to seven, so from that point of view I would accept that some progress has been made, but I believe that in the important cities of Turkey martial law is imposing very great pressure on people.

According to Article 15 of the European Convention on Human Rights, martial law can be justified only in "a public emergency threatening the life of the nation".

In the Greek case, the Human Rights Commission answered negatively the question whether "such political instability and disorder" existed in that country or threatened it in the near future "that the organised life of the community could not be carried on". One of the two reasons given for this conclusion was that "there was no indication ... that public disorder would be fomented and organised to a point beyond the powers of the police to control: on the contrary, the speed with which a large number of communists and their allies were themselves 'neutralised' on 21 April 1967, suggests that, for all their supposed plans, they would be incapable of any organised action in a crisis."

The situation in Turkey on 27 April 1971 was not so very different from the one prevailing in Greece four years earlier. Even if the number of 200 terrorists — a figure mentioned by Prime Minister Erim in 1971 — were to prove too low an estimate — I would put it as somewhat higher — it is difficult to see how perhaps 500 terrorists would be able to foment and organise disorder to a point beyond the power of the police to control.

If a case might be made in favour of the use of Article 15 in April 1971, such a case can hardly be made after the spring of 1972 when nearly all the Turkish revolutionaries had been caught, or in a few cases, fled abroad.

There is no solid evidence for any "international (communist) plot" often invoked by the Turkish Government. The sole possible proof of concrete material support for the revolutionaries — weapons and training — can probably be found only in the presence of Turkish revolutionaries in camps of Palestinian guerrilla organisations.

As a fourth point, since the Kizildere affair in the spring of 1972, there has been no violent revolutionary activity on any significant scale in Turkey. I was not surprised, therefore, that none of the Turkish politicians I met when I was there two months ago could give me a convincing reason for the prolongation of martial law.

As paragraph 3 of Article 15 of the convention obliges Turkey to "keep the Secretary General of the Council of Europe fully informed of the measures it has taken and the reasons therefor", I think it would be extremely interesting for the Assembly to know whether the Turkish Government actually complied with this obligation and what information concerning the measures taken and the reasons therefor were given. In any case, the martial law situation in Turkey in March 1973 seems to exceed "the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation".

In this context, the very important question arises whether Turkey, under Article 15 of the convention, has the right to use terrorism as an excuse for martial law and martial law as an excuse for a crackdown on a very important part of the non-violent Left.

Not only must that be considered. The main reason I raise the matter here is that time is running out. I am unable to see how an electoral campaign in Turkey and the elections to be held next October can be called democratic if they are held in circumstances of martial law.

My last point arises because rumour spreads in this Assembly. In March in the Political Affairs Committee, Mr. Michael Stewart proposed the showing of a film concerning torture in Turkey on the premises of the Assembly. In order not to embarrass the Turkish Government in an unnecessary way, it was agreed, I believe on the proposition of the Secretariat of the Assembly, that the film should be shown outside the Council of Europe premises, and the

Mr. Dankert (continued)

location chosen, I think with the agreement of the ORTF at that time, was the building of the ORTF in Strasbourg.

As the Rapporteur is more closely involved probably than the rest of us by nature of this being his constituency, can he confirm that it is right that the ORTF under pressure either from its own government or from foreign governments has now decided not to show the film at six o'clock tonight at Place de Bordeaux? If that is the case, I would regret it very much, not only because members would be unable to have a viewing of that film — though I think that could still be organised — but mainly because I think it would seriously affect the ability of members of the Assembly to carry out their work in a responsible way within this beautiful city of Strasbourg.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mrs. Aasen.

Mrs. AASEN (Norway). — Mr. President, I ask your leave and that of my colleagues to refer to that part of the progress report which concerns Turkey. I wish to support Mr. Dankert in what he was just stated in his speech. I feel I must repeat to the Assembly why I, as a parliamentarian from a member country of the Council of Europe, have requested that a representative group be appointed by the Political Affairs Committee and the Legal Affairs Committee to study the present situation on martial law and political trials in Turkey and to keep under review the progress towards the restoration of the constitutional law and parliamentary government.

I have to repeat this in the Assembly because there have been some doubts expressed by certain members as to our sincerity when raising this subject in the Assembly.

I have supported the resolution because Turkey, as a member country of the Council of Europe, has put her signature to the Convention on Human Rights. This signature means the Turkish Government has a duty to uphold and guarantee the rights of her people.

I am aware of the fact that the Council of Europe does not have much power or ability to force a government of a member country to restore democratic institutions, but if we do not take seriously the very foundation on which the Council of Europe stands, then I fear that this Organisation has started on the road towards a meaningless position.

We need the Council of Europe in our fight for human rights, but if the member States of the Council of Europe are not willing to highlight the present situation concerning human rights and democracy in any member State, then we have weakened our own position.

The young people in our countries are concerned about the present practice in Turkey. A four-man joint delegation of the World Assembly of Youth and the Council of European National Youth Committees recently made a fact-finding visit to Turkey. In a statement, the delegation expressed its pain at the measures and practices it found, which have been adopted in the name of preserving democracy. It observed that the prevalence of wholesale detentions and mass trials before martial law courts is a fact of life in Turkey today, and the present practice is causing much concern elsewhere in Europe. I fully agree with the statement that it is a contradiction to believe that democracy can be nurtured through undemocratic means.

I should like to quote just one passage from the statement. It said:

"Freedom of expression is a very perishable commodity, and in Turkey is now only exercised by the very brave. We found that the slight pretexts used for detention, arrest and trial of individuals who dare to criticise political affairs and especially action taken by military commanders have bred widespread fear in the Turkish society. The intimidation of the press, universities, youth organisations and lawyers and other intellectuals we found had reached the point where most such bodies or individuals now practise self-censorship for fear of attracting the attention of the Martial Law Commands. The arbitrary seizure of books from private homes has contributed to this process."

It is right to stress that the use of torture of political prisoners — I can give those who are interested in having more examples of this practice extracts from affidavits from a number of political prisoners in Turkey — has created this widespread fear among the opponents of the regime.

Finally, I want to draw the attention of the Assembly to a resolution on Turkey of the 8th WAY Assembly, in which it urges governments

Mrs. Aasen (continued)

and parliaments to review their relations with the Turkish Government, in which Representatives to the United Nations and the Council of Europe are urged to investigate Turkey's violation of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights respectively. I have been presented with the resolution by the WAY Committee in Norway, and I am sure that other Representatives in the Assembly have also been urged to follow up the matter in the Council of Europe at this session.

It is indeed unpleasant to give a speech like this, but my hope in the Council of Europe as a guard against inhuman practice has made it necessary for me to do it.

14. Result of the election of the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Here is the result of the election of the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe: number of voters, 114; number of blank or invalid papers, 4; votes cast, 110; absolute majority, 56.

Mr. Sforza-Galeazzo Sforza obtained 110 votes.

Having obtained an absolute majority of the votes cast, Mr. Sforza is elected Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe for a new five-year term of office to expire on 30 September 1978.

I congratulate Mr. Sforza on the resounding success of his re-election. (Applause)

15. Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations
(Resumed debate)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Kiriatlioglu.

Mr. KIRATLIOGLU (Turkey) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, you will remember that I spoke at the January Session and drew attention to the political situation in Turkey. Mr. Dankert and Mrs. Aasen have again raised this subject.

Mr. President, Mr. Dankert has, I believe, visited Turkey several times; he has examined the situation there and prepared a report on it. He maintains that special security courts and martial law in Turkey are unjust, inhuman and unacceptable to the democratic countries.

If I am not much mistaken, special security courts existed also in de Gaulle's lifetime in France. The terrorism, which existed everywhere in Europe, in France as well as in Germany and in other European countries, and also in the United States of America, was horrifying.

Mr. President, we have no desire to continue to maintain martial law in Turkey, nor do we wish Turks to have to live under martial law; this is not our wish.

When I spoke at the January Session I gave a historical explanation for the situation. I do not intend to revert to my speech, but I would just say that the situation in Turkey was terrible. Mr. Dankert knows nothing about this because he has not lived in Turkey. We, however, have lived in Turkey. The Demirel Government had to resign and I gave the reasons for this. I do not wish to revert to this; international anarchy and communism wanted to bring down the Turkish Government and put a stop to the legal work of parliament. Turkey was in great danger.

I belong to the Justice Party. Neither I nor my party approve of such happenings. But we need peace in Turkey. Is there anyone in the democratic countries of Europe who does not want peace? If things like that had gone on in Mr.

Mr. Kiratlioglu (continued)

Dankert's country, he would not be talking like this.

The prisoners of whom Mrs. Assen spoke are not political prisoners, but bank robbers, assassins, terrorists, murderers, or ...

Mr. SCHWENCKE (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — There are documents that tell a different tale!

Mr. KIRATLIOGLU (Translation). — Mr. President, my honourable friend should listen to what I have to say, and if he has anything to say, he should say it here. He has the same right as I have.

I repeat, there are no political prisoners in Turkey. To those who speak of documents, let me say that I would have to see them myself and examine them. Like all other Members of the Council of Europe, we in Turkey wish to have a democratic government in the saddle.

Ladies and Gentlemen, as I think I told you three months ago, the election of a President triggered off a situation in which democratic procedures broke down. But the Turkish Parliament and Turkish members of parliament fought against dictatorship. The Turkish Parliament elected a President and that, Ladies and Gentlemen, was a great victory.

As Mr. Dankert has said, there are to be elections in Turkey. By that time, the horrors we are experiencing must be past and done with. We wish democracy to continue in Turkey. No one in Turkey may oppose democracy. If ever democracy goes under in Turkey, then I promise you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we, Turkish members of parliament, will no longer be alive because we shall have spent ourselves in the service of democracy.

For this reason Mr. Dankert and Mrs. Aasen have no right — and forgive me for speaking so bluntly — to speak about Turkey in this way. This situation is none of our choosing, and for this reason we do not intend martial law to be prolonged.

As Mr. Dankert has said, this terrorism is not a matter of two hundred, five hundred or even six hundred, as Mr. Erim said when he was Prime Minister. Mr. Erim had no rights either, which was why he had to resign. He said: In such a situation I can no longer remain at the helm in Turkey.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have one request to make: if things are to go well in Turkey, in future you will have to help us. Let me tell you we are putting up a fight in Turkey.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, there is martial law in Turkey. You cannot imagine what it was like there. We did not even dare to leave our houses and go out in the street. It was terrible. Everyone lived in fear of the sudden bullet in the back, of being murdered in the street.

Mr. President, I ask for your indulgence for another two minutes.

Martial law is not to be prolonged. A fortnight ago the Deputy Premier in Turkey said: We shall do everything possible to see that martial law is rescinded before the elections which are to take place in October. A beginning has already been made. In two provinces martial law has been rescinded and it looks as though martial law will finally be brought to an end throughout Turkey.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we are not in the least interested in the film mentioned here. Do you know why? In Turkey anybody can make a film. We should first have to know whether it is authentic or not.

Another point: I thank Mrs. Aasen for her attention. She need have no fear, democracy will survive in Turkey; no pressure need be brought to bear upon us to ensure this. Have no fear. We shall manage on our own. We shall fight and continue to fight. Everything will be put in order in Turkey. It will only take a few more months. There will be elections and after the elections everything will be all right.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I must remind you of Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure: "A speaker may not be interrupted except on a point of order".

I call Mr. Feyzioglu.

Mr. FEYZIOGLU (Turkey) (Translation). — Ladies and Gentlemen, I am grateful to those of our colleagues who, both here and in committee, have continued to express their confidence in the Turkish nation and have tried to help us in our struggle to preserve and strengthen our young democracy. On the other hand, I must repeat once again how distressed I am to hear the allegations and accusations based on tendentious information and wrong conclusions. It is the powerful propaganda machine that so often inspires these criticisms - and I hope shortly to be able to give Mr. Dankert documentary proof of this in the Political Affairs Committee - I would even say the slander machine, which is directed against my country by those who want to destroy our republic, by those who want to divide up our land to establish a totalitarian regime there, by those who want to cut off our relations with the Council of Europe, with free Europe, with NATO, with the European Economic Community, so as to place our country under the red totalitarian yoke.

In Europe and elsewhere, there are countries where there is no elected parliament, and it makes me sad to think that Mr. Dankert could compare my country with a country under the direction of fascist colonels. There are countries where the governments are not freely elected by the peoples and are not responsible to the people or to those elected by the people. There are European countries where one single party, or rather a Politburo, a Central Committee, a dictator, dominates the political scene. There are countries in Europe where independent justice is an empty word and where the courts are the tools of power politics. In a word, there are countries under the yoke of communist or fascist totalitarianısm.

It is to say the least of it surprising that people who are quite reluctant to say anything at all critical about totalitarian countries do not hesitate to exaggerate when it comes to a democratic country like Turkey. The recent political developments in Turkey have shown that it is not those who ran down our country, but those of our friends here who have always trusted our young republic, who were right. I want to express my gratitude to those colleagues who have supported our democratic action

in our struggle against subversion and totalitarianism.

The election of the President of the Republic and above all the circumstances of that election, the formation of a new coalition government by democratic procedure based on a coalition protocol signed by the two political parties which represent the vast majority of the population and of parliament, have proved once again that our parliament is not only real, but strong and freely elected. These events have also shown that not only our political parties but all our institutions are determined to preserve the democratic system, to respect our Constitution and to ensure that it be respected.

All our democratic institutions are set up and have begun to function quite normally. The Turkish Parliament, let me say again, is the highest authority in the country. The major legal bodies, the Council of State, the Supreme Court of Appeal, the Constitutional Court, which often annul regulations or laws because they consider them contrary to some article in the Constitution, have always functioned freely and been fully independent, just as all the other courts are.

So far as relations between the legislature and the executive are concerned, and the part played by the political parties, we believe that things have now returned to normal.

If I had time — and I hope I will have time in the Political Affairs Committee — I would read you some passages from the protocol signed by the two political parties when the new government was formed, and also some sentences from the governmental programme approved by the parliamentary majority.

But to go back to what I was saying, these two political parties, one of which is my own, have emphasised their firm belief that the only system compatible with human dignity is the democratic system, and that free general elections must be held on the date provided for by the laws in force.

Since its earliest days, Turkey has been a Member of the Council of Europe, whose object is European democratic integration based on freedom and human rights, and has co-operated in the fruitful activities of that Organisation.

Mr. Feyzioglu (continued)

That fact was stressed in the programme of our new government, which also noted that there were some doubts about Turkey's devotion to democracy and that certain criticisms had been levelled in this building. The government stated expressly in its programme that we shall use all our efforts to remove these doubts which are often founded on false information or interpretation.

Judging by what he said about our Constitution, I rather doubt if Mr. Dankert is a lawyer. I am quite sure he is ignorant of our legislation before 1971 and the amendments which have been made to it since. But I want to remind him that, with two exceptions, all the amendments to about forty articles in our Constitution were adopted unanimously by the four major parties in Turkey. Only some communists voted against.

The Communist Party was declared illegal by the Constitutional Court, not by the Executive or the military authorities, but by fifteen independent judges elected by the members of the Supreme Court of Appeal and the Council of State. That party is affiliated to Moscow. It got rid of its leader, who had dared to criticise the invasion of Czechoslovakia, and replaced him with someone who had supported that invasion. This was reported in the Western papers including *Le Monde*. I repeat, except for a few members of that party, four parties voted for most of the amendments.

Mr. Dankert criticises the amended Article 11 of our Constitution. I have in my hands the German text of a lecture given by an eminent professor of law, the former rector of the Free University of Berlin, Professor Hirsch, who spent many years in Turkey because he could not live under Nazi dictatorship. He found asylum in our country; he has a perfect knowledge of our language and our laws. He gave that lecture as a man of law, an expert, and mentioned these amendments saying they were strictly in line with the letter and the spirit of the European Convention on Human Rights. He said that before it was amended Article 11 was rather naif, because it did not foresee that extremist fanatics or organisations could ever dream of destroying the freedom of other people and of annihilating a republic or robbing it of its democratic basis. I will send the text of that lecture to Mr. Dankert for his information.

Regarding the Security Court, he claims that a constitutional amendment is under discussion and will be passed by parliament. I would remind him that all the constitutional amendments were passed a long time ago. Mr. Dankert has only a superficial knowledge of the problems which he has acquired from subversive elements who wander round Europe, terrorists who have managed to get away and find asylum in other countries. As a member of parliament, he has talked to a woman member of the party affiliated to Moscow, and he has had conversations with a number of journalists.

I propose to give him some information about the people he has been talking to, because it is precisely with some of them that we have had to do battle for years to defend the idea that an elected parliament is the highest authority in the country. They claimed that parliament meant nothing, that bureaucrats and the military should govern the country. They applauded what happened on 12 March 1971, under the impression that they were dealing with a team of the Gadafy type, of the type of Iraq or Syria. They thought they were supporting a so-called socialist system, which was really fascist at heart. Their hopes were disappointed, but they commended the intervention by the military. I will give Mr. Dankert proof of what I am saying.

Believe me, Ladies and Gentlemen, there are real democrats in Turkey, parties which have always fought for democracy and will continue to fight for it.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Will you please conclude your speech.

Mr. FEYZIOGLU (Translation). — So far as the free elections are concerned, they will take place in Turkey under the supreme authority of a Council composed solely of judges elected from among the members of the Council of State and the Supreme Court of Appeal. The Executive and its subordinate bodies have nothing to do with propaganda for the election. The State radio and television service, which is an impartial body, allots equal broadcasting time to all the political parties. No prior authorisation is required for public meetings, and they are not under the control either of commissioners of police or of the administrative authorities, but solely of provincial councils presided over by independent judges.

Mr. Feyzioglu (continued)

Contrary to what Mr. Dankert says, martial law is not in force throughout the country. I also want to make it quite clear that it is in no way comparable to Greek martial law. Neither the government nor Colonels decree martial law in any given province; it is parliament which discusses and decides on that by free vote. The opposition parties can have their say about it. It is the Turkish Parliament, the highest elected authority in the country, which decides whether it is necessary to set up an exceptional system in any particular part of the country. Seven electoral constituencies only out of sixty-seven are at present under martial law. We hope in the weeks to come to be able to organise the elections without having to prolong this martial law. The Prime Minister has said so, and the deputy Prime Minister, who is a member of my party, said the same thing officially a few days ago.

If subversive organisations continue to bring arms into our country over our southern border, from China, from the Soviet Union, from Czechoslovakia or elsewhere, if terrorist activities endangering our country, our republic, develop further, we cannot defer the elections simply because martial law is needed in some province or other, in some part of the country or other, where certain organisations pursue their activities.

I will end, Mr. President, by once again expressing my warmest thanks to all our colleagues who have always done their best to help us in our struggle against communism and fascism.

As to our colleagues who, with the best intentions in the world, spread incorrect information, I would ask them to try to be objective and not to compare Turkey with Greece, in short to try not to play the game of those who want to cut us off from the free Western world to force us under the yoke of our neighbours the communists,

Once again, I beg them to try to be objective and to understand that we are fighting for democracy, sometimes even at the risk of our lives. We believe in the ideals of the Council of Europe; we are very much attached to that institution; and we are confident that the Council of Europe will not make the task of the terrorists easier, but will support us, the true democrats.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Üstündag, and I must ask him please to keep to the time allotted to him.

Mr. ÜSTÜNDAG (Turkey). — I know that the Members of the Council of Europe sincerely wish to help their fellow democracies. My approach will be different from that of my colleagues. I am a member of the Republican People's Party, which is on the left of centre in Turkey.

The world today is not as big as it once was; every member of this Assembly is aware to some extent of what is going on in other countries. Nor would I deny the members this right. Nevertheless I would like to mention some facts about what is going on in Turkey. My feelings were a little hurt when Mr. Dankert compared it with Greece. Turkish officers have in the past shown that they respect democracy; this has been proved by long experience. I hope that my colleagues will agree with me on this.

Of course things are happening in Turkey and complaints are made about these happenings, but the young Turkish democracy is making progress towards greater maturity and I feel sure that members of the Assembly wish to help strengthen this movement.

Those who are in charge of the army do not wish to go to elections under martial law since we do not wish any shadow to be cast on them. I hope we will be successful in this aim.

We cannot conceal everything that happens in Turkey. Some of my colleagues have said that there are no political prisoners, that they are all bank robbers, murderers and so on. Most of them are criminals but there are some political prisoners too. I feel it is important to stick to realities, and to ask for co-operation between everybody so as to find the best way to help each other.

As has already been said, we agreed to most of the amendments to the Constitution, but my party is still against special security courts being part of that Constitution. We are not, in fact, against the maintenance of special security courts but we are opposed to the appointment of judges for these courts. We will continue therefore to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Üstündag (continued)

Turkish democracy is growing in strength; we need all possible assistance from neighbouring democratic States to facilitate this.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Oguz.

Mr. OGUZ (Turkey) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, let us be realistic about Mr. Dankert's speech, in which he made a number of allegations. These allegations are made much of in the propaganda of the anarchist leaders. For that reason it is difficult to take them seriously.

It would be useful first of all to get the facts straight. Martial law was decreed in eleven out of the sixty-seven departments in the country. This number has just been reduced to seven. It would therefore be wrong to state that a large part of the country is under martial law.

But, on the other hand, as you know, martial law is a legal instrument under the constitution of almost all democratic countries. That is also true of Turkey. Governments set up by parliament are responsible to parliament for everything that is done under martial law.

In addition, the Turkish Parliament and Government have ensured a free press, a free opposition and an independent judiciary, which provide all the safeguards needed in a democratic system.

The amendments made to the Constitution recently can be summed up in a single phrase: by these amendments, no one is any longer free to destroy the democratic parliamentary system based on human rights. This principle is in line with Articles 10, 11 and 15 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

The constitutions of other democratic countries contain similar provisions. It is quite true that a party which was carrying on illegal activities and wanted to set up a communist regime in the country, a party which wanted a single-class autocracy, has just been banned. That is true; but the decision was not taken by the government, which is a political body, nor by the majority in parliament which wields political

power, nor even by a military tribunal when martial law was established. It was the Constitutional Court that took the decision. The Turkish Constitutional Court is completely independent and provides a top level safeguard. If the need arises, it is the duty of that Court to set aside laws passed by the Turkish Parliament. During the period of martial law, it was also entitled to quash capital sentences imposed by the tribunals and ratified by parliament. I could give you some concrete examples of this.

There are a free press and free trade unions in Turkey. The legal institutions are independent and provide all the necessary safeguards. More important still, free elections reflecting the free choice of the people take place regularly in my country. The nation alone is sovereign under the law. The nation exercises its sovereign rights through its constitutional organs.

Accused persons when under public interrogation in the Courts freely and openly admit the crimes they have committed. They go still further, and even regard the Courts as a medium for their propaganda. What need is there, therefore, to use force to extract admissions from anarchists who are only too pleased to proclaim loudly in the Courts that they are communists, that they have robbed a bank or murdered a man or committed sabotage, all acts of which they are proud?

I will not take up the Assembly's time by going into the latest changes which have been made to the Constitution, because they have already been explained by my good friend Feyzioglu.

To sum up what I have been saying, any attempt to undermine human rights and freedoms, which it is our duty to preserve, will not be tolerated in Turkey. In Turkey, the Constitution prevents anyone from making use of differences in language, religion or race, or even the class struggle, to put an end to the rule of law. That provision is the exact counterpart of the aim and content of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In this day and age, crimes against human rights committed in any country affect not only those whose duty it is to protect these rights, but the whole human race. Cast an eye around the world today and you will realise how much Mr. Oquz (continued)

suffering there is, and that men kill each other for reasons of language, religion, race or the class struggle, thus splitting the world into blocs. Conflicts of this kind have become the main cause of enmity between man and man, and their evil repercussions are felt by the States.

In the light of these facts and its own experience, Turkey has amended its Constitution the better to protect human rights, and I would have hoped the Assembly might praise us for what we have done. The voice that warns off those who commit crimes against innocent people is that of the law. It is that of a freely-elected parliament, not that of fascism.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Piket, the last speaker on the list.

Mr. PIKET (Netherlands) (Translation). — I did not think I was going to be very original today, but it seems that I am, as I am not going to talk about Turkey.

The debate seems to me to have taken a somewhat political turn, and I personally intend to deal with a different section of Mr. Radius's report, section 15, on the age-limit for judges of the European Court of Human Rights.

In using those words, I do not feel I am being very original, because that is a subject which has been mentioned already.

I see that, at their meeting on 25 January, the Bureau requested you, Mr. President, to approach the Committee of Ministers with a view to ensuring that in future the age of candidates is taken into account when nominations are considered. You wrote to the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, and I do not imagine you have yet received a reply. This is an important matter which was brought before the Legal Affairs Committee some months ago. When a representative of a member country was a candidate it was difficult to consider the question in depth, but now there are no nominations outstanding, so I can philosophise at greater length.

In our various countries, the Supreme Courts of Appeal and other courts and tribunals have

that kind of age-limit. In the Netherlands it is 70, but in fact many judges feel that at 65 the time has come to retire. I believe the same kind of age-limit should be fixed for the European Court of Human Rights. As you have not yet received a reply to your letter, Mr. President, I think you might issue a firm request to the States not to nominate judges over 65 to the European Court of Human Rights.

Turning to another section, I am delighted that the Bureau, at its meeting on 23 March 1973, decided to award Council of Europe medals to certain members particularly worthy of them. It is proposed to award four medals. I am very happy about this proposal, which shows that each new President seeks a field for innovation. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on that, Mr. President, as well as on your re-election today. So far as the medals are concerned, I think it would be interesting to know for whom they are intended and for what particular European activities.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Before calling Mr. Radius, I want to reply to Mr. Piket and tell him that the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom has informed me that the letter I sent to the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers about the age-limit for judges has been transmitted to the governments of the seventeen member countries of the Council of Europe. I therefore await their reply to make it public.

So far as the medals are concerned, I am grateful to Mr. Piket for his suggestion. I may even add that, in addition to his two compatriots who have received the Council of Europe medal, this session we are able to award four more, to Mr. Housiaux, Mr. Gonella, Mr. Capelle and Mr. Darling.

I now call Mr. Radius, and would ask him also to reply to the question Mr. Dankert put to him about the film.

Mr. RADIUS (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, when I said at the beginning of my short introductory speech that I was anxious to leave enough time for a full debate, I was naturally thinking of our debates of the next few days. It never occurred

Mr. Radius (continued)

to me that a long discussion would be started even indirectly on one single problem. Several people have spoken since Mr. Dankert, so I do not think I need try to reply to each of them separately.

However, I want to make it clear that I spoke as Rapporteur, to give an account of the work of the Bureau and the Standing Committee, and I intend to maintain that role.

I spoke very briefly because I asked the Assembly to refer to the report. Now I have to remind you that one of the references to committee in that report is that of the motion for a resolution on the situation in Turkey, referred to the Political Affairs Committee for report and to the Legal Affairs Committee for opinion. That being so, it would have been wise to leave these two committees to work in peace and quiet, with cool heads and their feet on the ground, and to await the issue of their deliberations.

Perhaps we shall be able to consider this now, since the problem is on our agenda already. The Political Affairs Committee sent a delegation to Turkey, and all our colleagues who were on that delegation reported on that visit through their Rapporteur who spoke for them. They all came back convinced that their Turkish parliamentary colleagues who belong to the four major parties were imbued with the best democratic spirit and had done what they could.

For my part, I have no intention of entering into a long debate on that subject here.

It was also said that eleven out of sixty-seven departments were under martial law. That number was reduced first to nine and then to seven, and we are assured by persons authorised to do so that this last figure may be reduced again in the near future. Obviously, we all hope that things will go well and that it will be reduced to zero.

If I may make one personal remark, it is this: "Let us be careful". I have heard talk of 400

terrorists. Let us even say there are several thousands. So what, Ladies and Gentlemen? In many European countries there is a minority of troublemakers, of people who seize every possible and imaginable opportunity to sow disturbance and preach rebellion. Let us be both careful and firm, for those people are the real forerunners of totalitarianism. (Applause)

Mr. Dankert asked me a question, Mr. President, not in my capacity as Rapporteur, but as a Frenchman and particularly as a citizen of Strasbourg. He wanted to know about a film I have certainly heard of, but unfortunately I have no idea whether it is likely to be shown in the ORTF building or not. I know nothing of it. What I do know, as a Strasbourger, is that the ORTF has an excellent concert hall, but I personally know of no hall for showing films in that establishment. If you will allow me as a Strasbourger to say one more thing, it would be that if I wanted to have a politically or morally dubious film shown, I could find a much more suitable hall than the one at the ORTF.

Mr. Piket, in his speech, mentioned two points. First there is age-limit problem. I would like to add one more to the clarifications given by the President. When it comes to age-limits, I myself feel a little uncomfortable. It is a subject I prefer not to talk about. There are people who are old in years and still full of sap and at the height of their powers — perhaps, here, I may cite our excellent oldest member, Mr. de Félice — and others who are under forty who are already old. But Mr. Piket can be reassured. When the question of age-limits was discussed in the Bureau, we were a little worried because there were some people who were over eighty. However, hope springs eternal.

Then, Mr. Piket spoke about the Council of Europe medal, saying how pleased he was about it and asking for some publicity. I join him in this. It would be a good thing for people outside this building to know that certain members of the Council of Europe have deserved well of it. Here at least I hope there will be no age-limit! (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you for your report, Mr. Radius.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

The debate is closed.

The Assembly takes note of the progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, including the adoption by the Standing Committee on 23 March 1973 of:

- Recommendation 701 on the European Antarctic Research Project;
- Recommendation 702 on co-operation between the Council of Europe and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT);
- Opinion No. 62 on the budget-programme as it concerns the Assembly's operations in 1974:
- Order No. 335 on European co-operation in specific scientific fields.

Note is also taken of the references to committee, Nos. 962 to 967, decided by the Bureau and ratified by the Standing Committee on 23 March 1973:

- Reference No. 962, to the Political Affairs Committee for report and to the Legal Affairs Committee for opinion, of the motion for a resolution on the situation in Turkey, Document 3251:
- Reference No. 963, to the Committee on Science and Technology of the motion for a recommendation on the creation of an international scientific and technological association of parliamentarians, Document 3263;
- Reference No. 964, to the Committee on Population and Refugees for report and to the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development for opinion, of the motion for a recommendation on aid to the countries of Indo-China following the ceasefire agreement of 27 January 1973, Document 3264:
- Reference No. 965, to all competent committees of the 6th general report on the activities of the Communities, Document 3265:
- Reference No. 966, to the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development of the report on the 5th Intermediate Session of the European

Civil Aviation Conference (ECAC), Document 3268:

— Reference No. 967, to the Committee on Population and Refugees of the 18th report on the activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), Document 3269.

16. Time-limit to speeches

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — On page 2 of the progress report, paragraphs 4 to 6, the Bureau and the Standing Committee propose that, under Rule 34 of the Rules of Procedure, the usual procedure be adopted for limiting speaking time so that the debates during the present session can be properly organised.

Unless there are any objections, and without prejudice to the stricter time-limits already agreed by the Assembly for the debate on international terrorism, the procedure for the limitation of speaking time proposed by the Bureau and the Standing Committee is adopted.

17. Ratification by the Assembly of references to committees

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Under Rule 14, paragraph 3, of the Rules of Procedure, it is for the Assembly itself to ratify the references to committees decided by the Bureau on 7 and 14 May 1973:

- Reference No. 968, to the Legal Affairs Committee of the motion for a resolution on ratification of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, Document 3255;
- Reference No. 969, to the Committee on Agriculture of the 4th report on the activities of the International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies (1972), Document 3273;
- Reference No. 970, to the Committee on Population and Refugees of the motion for a resolution on the position of aliens who for political reasons cannot return to their country of origin, Document 3274;
- Reference No. 971, to the Committee on Agriculture of the motion for a recommendation

on methods of slaughtering meat animals, Document 3284;

- Reference No. 972, to the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations of the motion for a resolution on the encouragement of Council of Europe associations, Document 3287;
- Reference No. 973, to all competent committees of the Communication on the activities of the Committee of Ministers from 1 January to 27 April 1973, Document 3288 and Addendum:
- Reference No. 974, to the Committee on Science and Technology for report and to the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations for opinion of the motion for a recommendation on the setting up of an international scientific and technological association of parliamentarians, Document 3290.

Are there any objections ?...

The references to committee are ratified.

18. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I propose that the Assembly hold its next sitting tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock with the following Orders of the Day:

1. Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, Document 3288 (Presentation by Mr. Rudolf Kirchschläger, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria, Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers);

Parliamentary questions for oral answer, Document 3293;

Debate.

2. International terrorism (Presentation by Mr. Czernetz of the report of the Political Affairs Committee, and debate, Document 3285).

Are there any objections ?...

The Orders of the Day of the next sitting are agreed.

The Sitting is closed.

(The Sitting was closed at 6 p.m.)

APPENDIX I

Names of Representatives or Substitutes who signed the Attendance Register in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure: 1

MM.	Lillås (Aano)	MM.	Prescott (Jones)	MM.	Bizet (de Préaumont)
	Piket (Aantjes)		Jung Louis		Radinger
	Abens		Kahn-Ackermann		Radius
	von Bothmer (Mr. Ahrens)		Karasek		Renschler
MM.	Akçali		Kempfler		Vontobel (Reverdin)
	Alber		Kiratlioglu		Richter
	Alemyr		Külahli	G.	Rivière
	Amrehn		Grussenmeyer (Labbé)		John Rodgers
	Arnason		La Loggia		Rossi
¥ 7.	Beauguitte		Legaret		St. Helens
	Bergegren		Leggieri	IVIIVI.	Reale (Salvatore)
MIM.	Negrari (Bettiol)		Leitner		Schieder
	Blumenfeld		Lemmrich		Yvon (Schleiter)
	Brincat		Letschert		Schmidt Hansheinrich
	Christiansen		Leu	K #	Schmitt Robert
	Collins Edward	c.	Leynen		Schuchardt
	Collins Gerard		Fitzroy Maclean	IVIIVI.	De Clercq (Schugens)
	Czernetz	IVIIVI.	Margue		Schwencke
	Dankert		Mart Mason		Urwin (Shore)
	Delforge				Holtz (Sieglerschmidt) Steel
	Borg Olivier de Puget		Mende		Stewart
	(De Marco)	X 7	Moneti (Minnocci) Miotti Carli		de Stexhe
	Dequae		P. Weber (de Montesquiou)		Stinus
	Hussey (Desmond) Digby		Munkebye		Talamona
			Muscat		Tanghe
	Dregger Enders	101101.	Peijnenburg		Tisserand
	de Félice		Nessler		Tomney
					Treu
	Feyzioglu Fletche r		Oestergaard Oguz		Üstündag
	Capelle (Flornoy)		Öktem		Van Lent
K.X	Aasen (Mr. Frydenlund)		O'Leary	N. / +c	Cattaneo Petrini
	Gessner		Roberts (Osborn)	IVIIS.	(Mr. Vedovato)
IVIIVI.	Gislason		Peart (Osborn)	Dama	Joan Vickers
	Goëss		Pecoraro		Vitter
	Grieve		Warren (Sir John Peel)	IVIIVI.	Voogd
	Hansen		Pendry		Schmitt Henri
	Sjönell (Hedlund)		Péridier		(Weber Joachim)
	Hedström		Dardel (Péronnet)		Weiberg-Aurdal
	Hocaoglu		Petersen Erling		Wyler (Wenk)
	Hofer		Pica	Mrc	Wolf
	Holst		Portheine		Zaloglu
	110131		1 Ordienie	1411.	24 alogiu
List o	of Representatives absent or apol-	ogisina	for absence:		

List of Representatives absent or apologising for absence:

Arnaud Averardi Bohman Coppola	MM.	Kristjansson Mammi Petit Preti	MM.	Quilleri Schlaga Wiklund Zamberletti
Coppola		Preti		Zamberletti

Cornelissen

^{1.} The names of Substitutes who replaced absent Representatives are printed in italics, the names of such Representatives being given in brackets.

APPENDIX II

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

Political Affairs Committee

	Members	Alternates
Austria	Mr. Czernetz Mr. Karasek	Mr. Schieder Mr. Goëss
Belgium	Mr. Leynen Mr. Van Hoeylandt	Mr. Delforge Mr. de Stexhe
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Oestergaard	Mr. Holst
France	Mr. Flornoy Mr. Nessler Mr. Schleiter	Mr. Abelin Mr. Péronnet Mr. de Préaumont
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Ahrens Mr. Kahn-Ackermann Mr. Blumenfeld	Mr. Schulte Mr. Amrehn Mr. Hansheinrich Schmidt
Iceland	Mr. Kristjansson	Mr. Hafstein
Ireland	Mr. Edward Collins	Mr. Gerard Collins
Italy	Mr. Arfé Mr. Arnaud Mr. Bettiol	Mr. Bonaldi Mr. Averardi Mr. Pecoraro
Luxembourg	Mr. Margue	Mr. Cravatte
Malta	Mr. Muscat	Mr. Borg Olivier de Puget
Netherlands	Mr. Aantjes Mr. Dankert	Mr. Portheine N
Norway	Mr. Frydenlund	Mr. Hegtun
Sweden	Mr. Alemyr Mr. Sjönell	Miss Bergegren Mr. Ahlmark
Switzerland	Mr. Hofer Mr. Reverdin	Mr. Renschler Mr. Leu
Turkey	Mr. Akçali Mr. Feyzioglu	Mr. Yardimci Mr. Paksüt
United Kingdom	Mr. Digby Sir John Rodgers Mr. Stewart	Sir Fitzroy Maclean Sir John Peel Mr. Mendelson

Committee on Economic Attairs and Development

	Members	Alternates
Austria	Mr. Czernetz Mr. Goëss	Mr. Radinger Mr. Withalm
Belgium	Mr. De Clercq Mr. Dequae	Mr. de Bruyne Mr. Van Lent
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Christiansen	Mr. Holst
France	Mr. Destremau Mr. Moulin Mr. de Préaumont	Mr. de Chevigny Mr. Rivière Mr. Valleix
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Holtz Mr. Mende Mr. Vohrer	Mr. Ahrens Mrs. von Bothmer Mr. Lemmrich
Iceland	Mr. Arnason	Mr. Björnsson
Ireland	Mr. Desmond	Mr. Governey
Italy	Mr. La Loggia Mr. Mammi Mr. Preti	Mr. Zamberletti Mr. Farabegoli Mr. Minnocci
Luxembourg	Mr. Mart	Mr. Elvinger
Malta	Mr. Brincat	Mr. De Marco
Netherlands	Mr. Nederhorst Mr. Portheine	N Mr. Peijnenburg
Norway	Mr. E. Petersen	Mr. Johanson
Sweden	Mr. Alemyr Mr. Bohman	Mr. Pettersson Mr. Wiklund
Switzerland	Mr. Renschler Mr. Vontobel	Mr. Joachim Weber Mr. Schuler
Turkey	Mr. Kiratlioglu Mr. Oguz	Mr. Akça Mr. Bayramoglu
United Kingdom	Mr. Osborn Mr. Shore Mr. Steel	Lord Selsdon Mr. Roper N

Committee on Social and Health Questions

	Members	Alternates
Austria	Mrs Hubinek Mr. Radinger	Mr. Goëss Mr. Schieder
Belgium	Mr. Adriaensens Mr. Hulpiau	Mr. Schugens Mr. Tanghe
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mrs. Madsen	Mr. Damgaard
France	Mr. Bourgeois Mr. Dardel Mr. Grussenmeyer	Mr. Gautier Mr. Petit Mr. Robert Schmitt
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Büchner Mr. Schmidt Hansheinrich Mrs. Wolf	Mr. Pawelczyck Mr. Alber Mr. Schlaga
Iceland	Mr. Arnason	Mr. Björnsson
Ireland	Mr. Desmond	Mr. Hussey
Italy	Mr. Cavezzali Mrs. Miotti Carli Mr. Santalco	Mr. Leggieri Mr. Pacini Mrs. Cattaneo Petrini
Luxembourg	Mr. Spautz	Mr. Abens
Malta	Mr. Micallef	Mr. Muscat
Netherlands	Mr. Portheine Mr. Voogd	Mr. Letschert N
Norway	Mrs. Aasen	Mr. Hegtun
Sweden	Miss Bergegren Mr. Wiklund	Mrs. Gradin Mr. Sjönell
Switzerland -	Mr. Primborgne Mr. Wenk	Mr. Wyler Mr. Vontobel
Turkey	Mr. Öktem Mr. Zaloglu	Mr. Barutçuoglu Mr. Karaagaçlioglu
United Kingdom	Mr. Page Mr. Pendry Dame Joan Vickers	Mr. Prescott Mr. Cohen Mr. Warren

1st	Sitting
-----	---------

Appendix II

Legal Affairs Committee

	Members	Alternates
Austria	Mr. Schieder Mr. Withalm	Mr. Reinhart Mr. Goëss
Belgium	Mr. Schugens Mr. de Stexhe	Mr. Van Hoeylandt Mr. Defosset
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Schlüter	Mr. Gert Petersen
France	Mr. Legaret Mr. Péridier Mr. Tisserand	Mr. Nessler Mr. Hauret Mr. de Félice
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Alber Mrs. Schuchardt Mr. Sieglerschmidt	Mr. Amrehn Mr. Carstens Mr. Büchner
Iceland	Mr. Gislason	Mr. Björnsson
Ireland	Mr. Dockrell	Mr. Brosnan
Italy	Mr. Castellucci Mr. Coppola Mr. La Loggia	Mr. Negrari Mr. Bettiol Mr. Cavezzali
Luxembourg	Mr. Margue	Mr. Elvinger
Malta	Mr. De Marco	Mr. B r incat
Netherlands	Mr. Dankert Mr. Piket	N Mr. Aantjes
Norway	Mr. Stray	Mr. Frydenlund
Sweden	Miss Bergegren Mr. Hedlund	Mr. Hedström Mr. Lidgard
Switzerland	Mr. Leu Mr. Henri Schmitt	Mr. Hofer Mr. Wyler
Turkey	Mr. Akçali Mr. Külahli	Mr. Yardimci Mr. Günes
United Kingdom	Mr. Grieve Mr. Morris Mr. Warren	Mr. Rossi Mr. Tomney Mr. Small

Committee on Culture and Education

	Members	Alternates
Austria	Mr. Karasek Mr. Schieder	Mr. Scrinzi Mr. Reinhart
Belgium	Mr. Nothomb Mr. Schugens	Mr. Leynen Mr. Delforge
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Damgaard	Mr. Jacobsen
France	Mr. Capelle Mr. Vitter Mr. Pierre Weber	Mr. de Montesquiou Mr. Péronnet Mr. Schloesing
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Gölter Mr. Kahn-Ackermann Mr. Schwencke	Mr. Vohrer Mr. Müller Mrs. Wolf
Iceland	Mr. Gislason	Mr. Björnsson
Ireland	Mr. Gerard Collins	Mr. Dockrell
Italy	Mrs. Miotti Carli Mr. Moneti Mr. Pica	N Mr. Arfé Mr. Reale
Luxembourg	Mr. Cravatte	Mr. Spautz
Malta	Mr. Carachi	Mr. De Marco
Netherlands	Mr. Piket N	Mr. Voogd Mr. Letschert
Norway	Mr. Aano	Mrs. Aasen
Sweden	Mr. Lidgard Mr. Wååg	Mr. Sjönell Mrs. Gradin
Switzerland	Mr. Bächtold Mr. Leu	Mr. Schuler Mr. Wenk
Turkey	Mr. Oguz Mr. Üstündag	Mr. Bayramoglu Mr. Özlen
United Kingdom	Mr. Roberts Sir John Rodgers Mr. Tomney	Mr. Barry Jones Mr. Sandys Mr. Roper

Appendix II

Committee on Science and Technology

(31 seats)

	Members	Alternates
Austria	Mr. Czernetz Mr. Goëss	Mr. Radinger Mr. Karasek
Belgium	Mr. de Stexhe Mr. Van Lent	Mr. de Bruyne Mr. Delforge
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Holst	Mr. Christiansen
France	Mr. Bizet Mr. Rivière Mr. Yvon	Mr. Capelle Mr. Jung Mr. Legaret
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Lemmrich Mr. Lenzer Mr. Richter	Mr. Gölter Mrs. Schuchardt Mr. Gessner
Iceland	Mr. Kristjansson	Mr. Hafstein
Ireland	Mr. O'Leary	Mr. Edward Collins
Italy	Mr. Pecoraro Mr. Quilleri Mr. Treu	Mr. Reale Mr. Bottari Mr. Mammi
Luxembourg	Mr. Abens	Mr. Mart
Malta	Mr. Borg Olivier de Puget	Mr. Carachi
Netherlands	Mr. Cornelissen Mr. Nederhorst	Mr. van der Werff N
Norway	Mr. Erling Petersen	Mr. Weiberg-Aurdal
Sweden	Mr. Ahlmark Mr. Pettersson	Mr. Sjönell Mr. Wååg
Switzerland	Mr. Bächtold Mr. Wenk	Mr. Hofer Mr. Renschler
Turkey	Mr. Hocaoglu Mr. Külahli	Mr. Akyürek Mr. Günes
United Kingdom	Mr. Mason Mr. Osborn Mr. Warren	Mr. Small Mr. Page Lord Selsdon

Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities

(31 seats)

	Members	Alternates
Austria	Mr. Leitner Mr. Reichl	Mrs. Hubinek Mr. Reinhart
Belgium	Mr. De Clercq Mr. Tanghe	Mr. Van Hoeylandt Mr. Nothomb
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Hansen	Mr. Schlüter
France	Mr. Radius Mr. Valleix Mr. Pierre Weber	Mrs. Ploux Mr. Dardel Mr. Schloesing
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Ahrens Mr. Lemmrich Mr. Müller	Mr. Walther Mr. Kempfler Mr. Lagershausen
Iceland	Mr. Kristjansson	Mr. Hafstein
Ireland	Mr. Brosnan	Mr. O'Leary
Italy	Mr. Farabegoli Mr. Pica Mr. Talamona	Mr. Magliano Mr. Pacini Mr. Minnocci
Luxembourg	Mr. Cravatte	Mr. Margue
Malta	N	N
Netherlands	Mr. Letschert Mr. Voogd	Mr. Peijnenburg Mr. Piket
Norway	Mr. Hegtun	Mr. Stray
Sweden	Mr. Hedström Mr. Sjönell	Mr. Wååg Mr. Lidgard
Switzerland	Mr. Primborgne Mr. Vontobel	Mr. Joachim Weber Mr. Wyler
Turkey	Mr. Kiratlioglu Mr. Zaloglu	Mr. Akça Mr. Karaagaçlioglu
United Kingdom	Mr. Roberts Mr. Urwin Dame Joan Vickers	Mr. Farr Mr. Cohen Mr. Prescott

1st Sitting

Appendix II

Committee on Rules of Procedure

(25 seats)

7.7	em	. L		. ~
IVI	em	ω	чı	S

Austria	Mr. Karase	ek Mi	. Radinger
Belgium	Mr. de Ste		. Defosset
Cyprus	N		N
Cyprus	14		14
Denmark	Mr. Schlüt	er Mr	. Gert Petersen
France	Mr. de Fé	lice M1	. Gautier
	N	Mı	. Péridier
	Mr. Petit		. Schleiter
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Ahren	s Mı	. Gessner
,	Mr. Walth	er M1	. Sieglerschmidt
	Mr. Alber		. Kempfler
Iceland	Mr. Arnas	on	N
Ireland	Mr. Brosna	an Mi	. Hussey
Italy	Mr. Brand	i Mı	. Spora
•	Mr. Coppo		. Drago
	Mr. Treu		. Castellucci
Luxembourg	Mr. Mart	Mi	. Cravatte
Malta	N		N
Netherlands	N	M	. Piket
Norway	Mr. Stray	M	. Frydenlund
Sweden	Mr. Lidga	rd Mis	s Bergegren
Switzerland	Mr. Schule	er M:	r. Renschler
Turkey	Mr. Ertug		N
United Kingdom	Mr. Fletch	er M:	r. Pendry
-	Mr. Grieve		d Selsdon
	Lord St. He	elens Si	r John Peel

Committee on Agriculture

(25 seats)

Members

Austria	Mr. Leitner	Mr. Reichl
Belgium	Mr. Dequae	Mr. Van Hoeylandt
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Christiansen	Mr. Holst
France	Mr. Hauret Mr. Lemaire Mr. Yvon	Mr. Bizet Mr. Moulin Mr. de Montesquiou
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Kempfler Mr. Lagershausen Mr. Marquardt	Mr. Holtz Mr. Lenzer Mr. Richter
Iceland	Mr. Gislason	Mr. Björnsson
Ireland	Mr. Governey	Mr. Gerard Collins
Italy	Mr. Averardi Mr. Prearo Mr. Savatore	Mr. Bottari Mr. Pecoraro Mr. Quilleri
Luxembourg	Mr. Elvinger	Mr. Spautz
Malta	N	N
Netherlands	Mr. Letschert	Mr. Piket
Norway	Mr. Weiberg-Aurdal	Mrs. Munkebye
Sweden	Mr. Hedström	Mr. Sjönell
Switzerland	Mr. Joachim Weber	Mr. Vontobel
Turkey	Mr. Hocaoglu	Mr. Akyürek
United Kingdom	Mr. Farr Mr. Barry Jones Lord St. Helens	Mr. Critchley Lord Walston Mr. Wall

1st Sitting

Appendix II

Committee on European Non-Member Countries

(21 seats)

Austria	Mr. Radinger	Mr. Goëss
Belgium	Mr. Nothomb	Mr. Adriaensens
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Oestergaard	Mr. Stinus
France	Mr. Louis Jung Mr. Labbé	Mr. Destremau Mr. Laurent-Thouverey
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Gessner Mr. Mende	Mr. Sieglerschmidt Mr. Kliesing
Iceland	Mr. Arnason	N
Ireland	Mr. Gerard Collins	Mr. Desmond
Italy	Mrs. Cattaneo Petrini Mr. Reale	Mr. Leggieri Mr. Magliano
Luxembourg	Mr. Abens	Mr. Margue
Malta	N	N
Netherlands	Mr. Cornelissen	N
Norway	Mrs. Munkebye	Mr. Aano
Sweden	Mr. Ahlmark	Mr. Hedström
Switzerland	Mr. Hofer	N
Turkey	Mr. Ertug	N
United Kingdom	Mr. Mason Mr. Wall	Mr. Mendelson Mr. Hunt

Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations

(21 seats)

	Members	Alternates
Austria	Mr. Czernetz	Mr. Withalm
Belgium	Mr. Delforge	Mr. Schugens
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Hansen	Mr. Stinus
France	Mr. Abelin Mr. R. Schmitt	Mr. Péronnet Mr. Tisserand
Federal Republic of Germany	Mrs. von Bothmer Mr. Klepsch	Mr. Wischnewski Mr. Müller
Iceland	Mr. Kristjansson	Mr. Hafstein
Ireland	Mr. O'Leary	Mr. Brosnan
Italy	Mr. Bonaldi Mr. Preti	Mr. Talamona Mr. Moneti
Luxembourg	Mr. Spautz	Mr. Abens
Malta	N	N
Netherlands	Mr. Dankert	Mr. Aantjes
Norway	Mr. Johanson	Mr. Frydenlund
Sweden	Mr. Wiklund	Mr. Alemyr
Switzerland	Mr. Schuler	N
Turkey	Mr. Öktem	Mr. Barutçuoglu
United Kingdom	Mr. Fletcher Mr. Hunt	Mr. Pendry Mr. Rossi

1st Sitting Appendix II

Committee on Population and Refugees

(17 seats)

	Members	Alternates
Austria	Mr. Radinger	Mrs. Hubinek
Belgium	Mr. Hulpiau	Mr. De Clercq
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Stinus	Mr. Damgaard
France	Mrs. Ploux	Mr. Vitter
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Enders	Mrs. Wolf
Iceland	Mr. Kristjansson	Mr. Hafstein
Ireland	Mr. Hussey	Mr. Edward Collins
Italy	Mrs. Cattaneo Petrini	Mr. Pacini
Luxembourg	Mr. Margue	Mr. Mart
Malta	N	N
Netherlands	Mr. Dankert	Mr. Cornelissen
Norway	Mrs. Munkebye	Mr. Aano
Sweden	Mrs. Gradin	Mr. Wiklund
Switzerland	Mr. Renschler	Mr. Joachim Weber
Turkey	Mr. Üstündag	Mr. Özlen
United Kingdom	Sir John Rodgers	Mr. Urwin

Committee on the Budget

(17 seats)

М	emb	ers
TAT	e_{III}	CLS

Austria	Mr. Leitner	Mr. Reichl
Belgium	Mr. Dequae	Mr. de Bruyne
Cyprus	N	N
Denmark	Mr. Gert Petersen	Mrs. Madsen
France	Mr. Beauguitte	Mr. Lemaire
Federal Republic of Germany	Mr. Alber	Mr. Lagershausen
Iceland	Mr. Björnsson	Mr. Gislason
Ireland	Mr. Dockrell	Mr. Governey
Italy	Mr. Zamberletti	Mr. Spora
·		,
Luxembourg	Mr. Abens	Mr. Spautz
Malta	N	N
Netherlands	Mr. Voogd	Mr. Peijnenburg
Norway	Mr. Erling Petersen	Mr. Johanson
Sweden	Mr. Pettersson	Mr. Ahlmark
Switzerland	Mr. Henri Schmitt	Mr. Primborgne
Turkey	Mr. Kiratlioglu	N
United Kingdom	Mr. Page	Lord Walston

CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

TWENTY-FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION

OFFICIAL REPORT

Second Sitting

Tuesday 15 May 1973, at 10 a.m.

	Sum	MARY	
1. Adoption of the Minutes	37	Committee of Ministers), Renschler,	
2. Attendance Register	37	Sir John Rodgers, MM. Blumenfeld, Radius, Margue, Cravatte, Digby.	
3. Changes in the membership of committees	37	7. International terrorism (debate on the	
4. Arrangements for the debate on international terrorism	38	report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3285)	46
5. Tabling of amendments to the reports of the Political Affairs Committee (Docs. 3281 and 3285)	38	Speakers: The President, MM. Czernetz (Rapporteur), Mason, Stewart, Henri Schmitt, Grieve, Micallef, Hofer, Stinus, Piket, Eliav (Israel, Observer), Feyzio-	
6. Communication from the Committee of Ministers of the Assembly (debate on the		glu, Amrehn, de Stexhe, Mrs. von Bothmer.	
Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, Doc. 3288 and	38	8. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting	62
Addendum)	<i>3</i> 0	Speakers: The President, Mr. Blumenfeld.	
of Austria. Chairman-in-Office of the		Appendix: Attendance Register	64

Mr. Vedovato, President of the Assembly, took the Chair at 10 a.m.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Sitting is open.

1. Adoption of the Minutes

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — In accordance with Rule 21 of the Rules of Procedure, the Minutes of the last sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments ?...

The Minutes were adopted

2. Attendance Register

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The names of those Substitutes present at this sitting which have been notified to me will be published

in the list of Representatives appended to the Minutes of the Proceedings and to the Official Report of Debates.

3. Changes in the membership of committees

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Irish delegation moves the nomination of Mr. Gerard Collins as Alternate on the Political Affairs Committee in place of Mr. Desmond.

The Italian delegation moves the nomination of Mrs. Miotti Carli as Alternate on the Committee on Culture and Education in place of Mr. Preti; the nomination of Mr. Preti as titular member of the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations in place of Mrs. Miotti Carli.

Are there any objections ?...

The nominations are agreed.

4. Arrangements for the debate on international terrorism

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Before starting the Orders of the Day, let me remind you of the decisions taken by the Assembly during the last sitting regarding arrangements for the debate on the Political Affairs Committee's report on international terrorism which has to be completed by the end of the morning sitting at 1 p.m.

The list of speakers will be closed immediately after the statement by the Rapporteur, and the time remaining until 3 p.m. will be divided by the number of speakers entered on the list. This means that the time-limit for each speaker may be less than the usual 10 minutes.

5. Tabling of amendments to the reports of the Political Affairs Committee (Docs. 3281 and 3285)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I would remind you that amendments to the report of the Political Affairs Committee on international terrorism, Document 3285, can be tabled today, Tuesday, up to 1 p.m.

As regards the report on the mission of the Council of Europe, Document 3281, presented by Mr. Reverdin which has just been distributed, and on which the Assembly will not be asked to vote until tomorrow morning, Wednesday, I propose that the Assembly advance the deadline for the tabling of amendments to 5 p.m. this afternoon.

Are there any objections ?...

It is agreed.

6. Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly

(Debate on the Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, Doc. 3288 and Addendum)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly by Mr. Rudolf Kirchschläger, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria, Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers, Document 3288.

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome Mr. Kirchschläger in this hall. There is no need

for me to introduce him since he has often taken part in our work.

Today I call the Minister to speak to us as Chairman of the Committee of Ministers and I invite him to come up to the rostrum.

I call Mr. Kirchschläger.

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria, Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the statutory report on the activities of the Committee of Ministers for the period 1 January to 27 April 1973 is contained in Document 3288. I do not think I need to expand upon what is said in it. But I do think it is necessary to emphasise that the period covered by the report coincides with the enlargement of the European Communities, by which I mean not only the increase to Nine member States but also the conclusion of agreements of the free trade type with four Council of Europe member States.

The report also covers a period of history during which the relaxation of tensions in Europe made further progress, during which the Vietnam war was ended at least formally, with the major powers withdrawing from that theatre; a period during which the tense situation in the Middle East continued unabated, becoming in part even more tense, while acts of violence diminished in number though not in effect. The period covered by the report is also one in which Europe has been coming increasingly within the purview of the United States of America and the time would appear to be ripe for a rethinking of mutual relations.

It is necessary to fill in this background if the tasks of the Committee of Ministers, and of the Council of Europe as a whole, are to be properly appreciated.

Even a brief glance at the order of business for the Assembly's 25th Session is enough to show how conscious the Assembly is of the political problems of the present day, the problems which Europe faces today and will face in the months ahead.

When the founders of the Council of Europe signed the Statute in 1949 they could not foresee that this all-embracing institution would find itself within the brief period, historically speaking, of scarcely twenty-five years in a completely new economic, technological and above all political, situation which would make it essential to find ways and means of adapting

to change without neglecting underlying principles. In defining our policy for the future we must continue to be guided by the unchangeable ideals and principles which are laid down in the Statute.

As will be seen from Mr. Reverdin's most valuable report, which is to be presented to the Assembly this afternoon, all the governments of the Council of Europe member States share the unanimous view that the enlargement of the European Communities and their progress towards political union in no way cast doubt on the viability of the Council of Europe. Further, all the member States continue to subscribe to every part of the Council of Europe's Statute. In view of the many doubts that have been expressed publicly in the recent past, this seems to me to be a reassuring fact for all those who are persuaded that the Council of Europe continues to have an important part to play in the process of relaxation of tensions throughout Europe. It is essential, precisely in this context, to reassert and consolidate the position of the Council in all those spheres in which its acknowledged achievements and possibilities, in conjunction with the flexible procedures it offers, make it an indispensable and lasting complement to the European Communities, and to the other States of Europe with which we all co-exist.

I should like to make a special reference, by reason of that fundamental significance, to one point which is covered in the statutory report.

Since 1 January of this year the European Youth Foundation has been a reality at the disposal of young people from all European countries. We confidently await the results of its initiatives and look forward with interest to the reactions which the Youth Foundation stimulates in the cultural and political fields.

I should like also to mention the European Conference of Ministers of the Environment which took place from 28 to 30 March, not because it was held in Vienna but because it subsequently proved — with seven nonmember States participating — that the Council of Europe has a potential influence outside its immediate circle. I also believe that the colloquy held on the occasion of that conference between the heads of delegations of the member

States, representatives of the Conference of Local Authorities and representatives of the European Parliament, lent the inherently technical discussions that political flavour which is indispensable if a conference is to have practical effects. Indeed, it is my opinion that such meetings between specialised Ministers and parliamentarians are extremely useful and that they should be encouraged, further developed and applied in a wider variety of fields.

Finally, to conclude this short survey of the statutory report, I should like to mention that the Committee of Ministers, in its efforts to bring about an optimum climate of work within the Secretariat, has decided to review the Staff Regulations and to conduct that review in a spirit of open-mindedness, mutual consultation and co-operation. We are convinced that such a revision of the Staff Regulations is in everybody's interests.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, let me now turn briefly to the 52nd meeting of the Committee of Ministers which took place here in Strasbourg yesterday, and whose results are not yet given in the statutory report.

The Committee of Ministers discussed the following questions: progress in European cooperation; the future role of the Council of Europe; multilateral preparatory talks for the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe; relations between the Council of Europe and non-member States, and the problem of international terrorism.

The Belgian Chairman-in-Office of the Communities' Council of Ministers reported on cooperation in Europe, while the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs spoke on co-operation within EFTA. The debate on European cooperation in the Council of Europe was introduced by Sir Alec Douglas Home, Chairman of the Committee of Ministers. In his report, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe proposed the introduction of a European Identity Card, an idea whose European spirit and international impact will certainly arouse the interest of your Assembly. It was noted with satisfaction that the reports presented on behalf of the three organisations showed their intention to complement each other's work and to co-operate.

On the basis of discussions at the 51st meeting of the Committee of Ministers in Paris last

December, the future role of the Council of Europe was again discussed thoroughly. It was unanimously agreed that the Council of Europe must not be allowed to go on discussing itself indefinitely, but must find its role and task in today's political context as soon as possible. This view appears to be that of the Assembly too. There are different opinions on the path to be followed in pursuing this goal. Nothing would look worse than to waste more time quarrelling over methods. The Committee of Ministers therefore decided unanimously yesterday to set up a working group, consisting of the Permanent Representatives of six member States, namely Denmark, France, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey. This working group is to prepare a report on the future role of the Council of Europe for presentation to the Ministers' Deputies by October 1973. This will enable the Ministers' Deputies to prepare the decisions that the Committee of Ministers intends to take at its 53rd meeting in December. I should also like to mention that the Committee of Ministers has authorised this working group to establish any contacts it thinks necessary for the fulfilment of its task; the Ministers also underlined the importance of communicating this decision to their Permanent Representatives in organisations with which the working group might establish such contacts. This illustrates the Ministers' determination to make no moves in isolation but rather to launch a political process leading to genuine co-operation among the European organisations and particularly between the Council of Europe and the European Communities.

In discussing the agenda item on "international terrorism" the Committee of Ministers was also anxious to find a way towards joint European action. Some time ago, your Assembly set up a sub-committee of the Political Affairs Committee, chaired by Mr. Czernetz, to study the question of international terrorism, and the Committee of Ministers also decided to set up an ad hoc Committee of Senior Officials to consider the legal aspects of this problem, with particular reference to the work done by the United Nations. The work of this committee has shown above all that the governments of all the member States are fully aware of the significance attaching, not only to the signing, but also to the ratification and implementation of the Hague, Montreal and Tokyo Conventions.

Permanent contact between your sub-committee and the ad hoc committee established by the Committee of Ministers will certainly prove valuable. Without wishing to go into details on this highly complex subject, I can assure the Consultative Assembly on behalf of the Committee of Ministers that the latter is determined to keep this question on its agenda, so that it can make definite plans to take the action which you expect. The Joint Committee's meeting in Florence on 4 July will also give you an opportunity of discussing with the Ministers' Deputies this problem which is so difficult because success can only be achieved through agreement of all the member States.

Finally, the Committee of Ministers vesterday held a prolonged exchange of views on the multilateral preparatory discussions for the European Security Conference. This item had been included on the agenda at the suggestion of several member States. I should like to emphasise, however, that the Committee as a whole was determined to demonstrate more clearly than before, by including specifically political items on its agenda, and particularly items of major political topicality, that it was more determined and ready than ever to fulfil its political function. I believe that in doing this it is meeting a wish which you have very frequently expressed in your reports and recommendations. Coming to the heart of the matter, I think I can say that the Committee of Ministers was very well aware that, when the time comes to assess the results of this conference, possibilities which we cannot as yet define may well open up for the Council of Europe.

When we talk of the Council of Europe being open for co-operation between East and West, then we must above all bear in mind the quality of the Organisation's work and the competence of all those who work in or with it on every level.

Lastly, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Committee of Ministers followed its normal practice and discussed relations between the Council of Europe and non-member States. In this connection, we heard an interesting report from the Secretary General, who gave us his impressions of recent events in this field. A number of members also spoke on the bilateral relations which their countries maintain with individual non-member States.

These, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, were the few remarks I wished to make on the statutory report of the Committee of Ministers which I have the honour of submitting to you and on the proceedings of the 52nd meeting of the Committee of Ministers, which has just come to an end.

Following a long-standing custom, I should like now to add a few words as my country's Foreign Minister.

I shall not reiterate my country's determination to support the Council of Europe. That goes without saying, and besides I had an opportunity of giving you my views on this subject on 25 January last year.

Current political developments in the world — which, as we all know, cannot be divorced from economic developments — are unfolding with great rapidity. In times such as this, we must pursue our goals steadily, but we must also subject our methods to constant reassessment and adapt them to circumstances. In doing this, we must not overlook European and indeed world-wide implications. I believe, however, that we must still take as our abiding principle the conviction that care and patience in the service of organic growth can lead to permanent results, even in troubled times.

Eighteen years ago to the very hour, in the Belvedere Castle in Vienna, the Austrian Foreign Minister and the Foreign Ministers of the Four Powers signed the State Treaty by which Austria was once again made a free, independent country. This State Treaty was the outward sign and expression of a turning point in European politics — indeed, in world politics. While Austria was not in a position to bring that turning point about, it was in a position and prepared to take advantage of it.

From that year — 1955 — onwards, the Republic of Austria has endeavoured, through its permanent neutrality and through its foreign policy as a whole, to be of service to other European States; it has done so in the knowledge that a country enjoys greater security in the broadest sense of the word in proportion to the political value which others attach to it. It is from this interpretation of the role of a permanently neutral State that the present function of the Austrian Republic in the community of nations has evolved.

As I have already said, we Europeans live at the present time in a process of détente which we trust will be of longer duration than the corresponding era which began in 1955 with the signing of the Austrian State Treaty. It seems to us that the requisite conditions are fulfilled. This will be all the more so if we realise that it is no part of this process of détente to obliterate the contradiction between the different political systems which exist in Europe, but that the aim must be to bring about a situation in which communism and parliamentary democracy can exist side by side, albeit in an atmosphere of stern ideological competition between the States. At this precise point in time our continent has an opportunity, which may never recur, to be seen as the propagator of genuine human values.

However, if the continent of Europe is again to assume a leading political role, then it is essential for us to escape from the exaggerated introversion of the present time and cease to concern ourselves primarily with our own affairs. In this context we cannot remain indifferent to the tense situation which continues to prevail in the Middle East. It must be possible to offer the parties involved in this dispute ways and means of bringing their quarrel to an end. The discussion of this question in the Security Council this month might offer an opportunity.

I come back to the eighteenth anniversary of the signature of the Austrian State Treaty. By working for that agreement, the Four Powers did Austria a great service, but the service they did themselves was at least as great. For they helped to create the conditions in which Austria, and thereby Central Europe, could become an area of détente — a development which was also undoubtedly in the interests of the Four Powers themselves.

The signature of the Austrian State Treaty eighteen years ago can fairly be said to have harmed nobody so far; on the contrary, it has been of benefit to a great many countries and thus to the people living in them. Could this fact not act as a stimulus to transform the current process of relaxation of tensions in Europe into a lasting state of détente?

Precisely at this moment, we are all of us faced with important tasks, and bear a responsibility which may be greater than we are willing to admit in our everyday political life. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I thank you most warmly, Mr. Kirchschläger, for your

The President (continued)

communication on behalf of the Committee of Ministers.

Questions to the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers are contained in Document 3293.

I would ask Mr. Kirchschläger to reply to the question put by Mr. Renschler regarding the European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers.

I shall read it out:

"Mr. Renschler,

Referring to the Committee of Ministers' reply to Written Question No. 154 (Document 3262);

Considering that the Council of Europe's vocation should not be limited to its geographical boundaries and that it should be open for cooperation with non-member States in appropriate fields:

Stressing that such co-operation is necessary in order to protect the social and economic rights of migrant workers in member States, irrespective of their country of origin,

To ask the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, whether he shares the view that the protection under the European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers should be extended to migrant workers from all European countries and consequently allow for the accession of European non-member States to this convention."

I call the Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers.

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Translation). — Mr. President, my reply to Mr. Renschler's question is as follows. As can be seen from the reply of the Committee of Ministers to Question No. 154 of the Assembly, the elaboration of the European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers remains one of the Committee of Ministers' great concerns. The Committee wishes to conclude this work successfully and has thus itself taken over the study of the technical and political problems which remain open.

Another question which has not yet been solved is the possibility of the accession to the convention of Council of Europe non-member States. The Ministers' Deputies will be guided in their work by the views repeatedly expressed in the Consultative Assembly and will take good account of the immediate problems facing a number of our member States.

I would therefore ask the Assembly for indulgence if I cannot as yet transmit to you the final decision of the Committee of Ministers

regarding the accession of non-member States to the draft convention under discussion.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Are you satisfied, Mr. Renschler?

Mr. RENSCHLER (Switzerland) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question I put to the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers was put to the Committee of Ministers once before by a member of our Assembly, namely by Mr. Pöhler in October of last year. A reply was given on 25 or 27 January of this year. It, too, was evasive in the sense that no decision had yet been reached as to whether the convention would be open to signature and ratification also by Council of Europe nonmember countries.

I regret that we have still had no definite reply. I would request the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers most warmly and emphatically to see that a final decision is taken by the Committee of Ministers regarding this important convention on migrant workers and that it is passed on for signature and ratification to both member and non-member countries.

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Translation). — Mr. President, I shall be glad to comply with Mr. Renschler's request and inform the Committee of Ministers of this emphatic wish.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers to reply to Question No. 2 by Sir John Rodgers which is as follows:

"Sir John Rodgers

to ask the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers how the Committee views the progress of the preparations in Helsinki for the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe."

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER. — At the request of several governments anxious to assert the political function of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, the latter yesterday placed on its agenda an item referring to the multilateral preparatory talks to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. In doing this, the Ministers also bore in mind Recommendation 692 of your Assembly on East-West relations which had been passed on to us. The fact of placing this item on the agenda enabled us to exchange views, to compare experience and also to ensure that our intentions and interests

tended in the same direction by reflecting the spirit of the Council of Europe Statutes.

The Assembly will note from yesterday's press communiqué that the Committee of Ministers passed a collective judgment on a diplomatic encounter in the light of ideas and principles which are largely shared by our member States. The Committee of Ministers particularly emphasised the importance of the principle of free movement of persons and ideas throughout Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Are you satisfied. Sir John?

Sir John RODGERS (United Kingdom). — I thank the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers for that reply, but, in his capacity as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria, could he also inform us as to how his government assesses the progress and timetable for preparing and holding the conference and the result it expects to see achieved in the different areas under discussion?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers.

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Translation). — I shall be happy to state my views as Foreign Minister of the Republic of Austria. I believe that good progress has recently been made in the Helsinki talks, I believe, above all, that on the basis of the Austrian proposal relating to this item of the agenda, item 3, the prerequisites for agreement on this perhaps most difficult question may be achieved within the foreseeable future. It seems to me that the timetable will quite possibly be adhered to and that the first phase of the conference at Foreign Minister level will, in fact, be held at the end of June, beginning of July. I also believe that after an initial period characterised by mutual hesitation, it will now be possible to find a basis for agreement both on the question of reinforcing security and on that of more intensive co-operation.

It is possibly significant that, starting yesterday, preparatory talks for the MBFR have been resumed in Vienna at official level instead of in the very informal manner so far pursued. This too seems to me the occasion for certain optimistic reflections.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers to answer Question No. 3 by Mr. Blumenfeld which reads as follows:

"Mr. Blumenfeld

to ask the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers whether he agrees that European action within the Council of Europe to combat international terrorism is necessary and in no way incompatible with efforts to find a solution at world level; and whether he also agrees that it is not enough to study the legal aspects alone, and that the Committee of Ministers should extend the scope of their work to cover the co-ordination of security measures."

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Translation). — Mr. President, it was emphasised in the reply of the Committee of Ministers to Recommendation 684 that any action taken by the Council of Europe would have to be taken with due regard for the universal character of this problem. I believe that this will help to convince the Consultative Assembly that the Council of Europe does not intend to refrain from acting, but that it is aware of the universality of the problem. This means, politically speaking, that it does not ignore the fact that for Europe, and in particular for the member States of the Council of Europe, the success of joint action to combat international terrorism depends on a solemn undertaking to the international community by all member States of the United Nations.

Naturally, and this was emphasised by the Consultative Assembly in its Recommendation 684, the combating of terrorism has considerable political and technical implications. The mere fact that experts from member States discuss the possibility of joint action outside the Organisation is in itself a gesture of solidarity and a step towards action, even if at first only in respect of the legal aspects of the problem. I would ask you to understand that the solution of the legal questions represents a considerable preparation for co-operation by member States on specific questions of security.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Are you satisfied, Mr. Blumenfeld?

Mr. BLUMENFELD (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, I should like to thank the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers for his well-formulated reply. As we shall immediately be debating this question and as I do not know whether the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers will be present throughout the debate, I should like, in the same way as Sir John Rodgers before me, to ask the Chairman whether, in his capacity as Foreign Minister of the Republic of Austria, he is satisfied with the reply which he has just given as Chairman of the Committee of Ministers.

Secondly, I would like to ask him whether he does not agree with us here in the Assembly that it is not enough to concentrate on the legal aspects of the question, however important, but that, in respect of co-ordinated security measures by all European governments, the time for action has finally come.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers.

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Translation). — Mr. President I have no difficulty in replying to Mr. Blumenfeld's questions.

The answer to the first question, namely, shall I be present during the debate of this matter following our exchange of views is: Yes, to the very end. I consider this subject so important that I believe its significance should be underlined by the presence of the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers.

The second question, namely, am I satisfied with what you called the well-formulated answer which I gave in my capacity as Foreign Minister of the Republic of Austria, can be answered briefly: No. I can say this so openly because Austria, both in the United Nations and the Council of Europe, has left no room for doubt that it does not consider the treatment which the subject of "terrorism" has hitherto received in any of the international organisations as sufficient to combat either the causes and consequences of terrorism or terrorism itself.

As regards the Council of Europe, I readily admit — not as Chairman of the Committee of Ministers but as Foreign Minister of Austria — that I believe it would be easier to reach a joint

understanding of the problem, both in the form of a convention and in the form of steps to be taken, in a European organisation whose Statute speaks of the joint heritage of all States.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers to reply to Question No. 4 by Mr. Radius which is as follows:

" Mr. Radius.

Recalling the Colloquy between Ministers and Representatives of the Consultative Assembly on the occasion of the European Ministerial Conference on the Environment recently held in Vienna and convinced that that initial essay of a dialogue between European parliamentarians and specialised Ministers should be extended,

To ask the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers whether he shares the view of the parliamentarians who took part in the Conference of Vienna that colloquies of the sort should be included in the programme of all conferences of specialised Ministers organised by the seventeen member States of the Council of Europe and that the Committee of Ministers should take account of this principle in the organisation of future conferences."

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Translation). — Mr. President, as I have already said today, meetings between parliamentarians and specialised Ministers on the organisation of the "informal" talks which took place in March would appear to be useful because they allow ideas to be exchanged in a relaxed atmosphere.

I think, however, that the Assembly should bear in mind that the Committee of Ministers remains the decision-making body of the Council of Europe and the natural political partner of parliamentarians in all fields coming within the scope of this Organisation.

Having said this, in principle we can only be delighted at the results of the European Ministerial Conference on the Environment held in Vienna from 28-30 March and the exchange of views which took place on this occasion with the Representatives of this Assembly.

As regards future conferences of specialised Ministers, particularly the Conference of European Ministers of Justice and the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education, this question was dealt with at the last meeting of the Ministers' Deputies with full regard for the wishes of this Assembly.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Are you satisfied, Mr. Radius?

Mr. RADIUS (France) (Translation). — Yes, Mr. President, I am satisfied. What the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers has just said allows us to hope that, following the proposals made during the European Ministerial Conference on the Environment, everything will be done to ensure that the Council of Europe will play its part as fully as possible.

The dialogue begun in Vienna for the first time on the occasion of the Ministerial Conference on the Environment has been most productive. It was welcomed both by parliamentarians and by specialised Ministers. Naturally we are convinced that the Committee of Ministers is our highest authority. We are far too mindful of the established rules to hope for any change, but we rely on you, Mr. Chairman, to convince your sixteen colleagues, if need be, of the value of such conferences with as free a dialogue as possible between Ministers and parliamentarians, since such a dialogue is always profitable to both partners.

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Translation). — I entirely agree.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Mr. Margue wishes to put a question to the Minister.

I call Mr. Margue.

Mr. MARGUE (Luxembourg) (Translation). — Mr. President, as the Chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee of this Assembly I would like to express my satisfaction that the Committee of Ministers, as you have just said, has given favourable consideration to the proposal of our Legal Affairs Committee to hold a meeting with the Ministers of Justice during the Stockholm Conference.

To tell the truth, the Legal Affairs Committee has more or less prepared itself for just such a colloquy with the Ministers of Justice. Years ago, the Committee of Ministers agreed to a yearly colloquy with an enlarged committee of this Assembly. During so general a meeting, however, only questions of general policy are

dealt with in practice. It is therefore chiefly the Political Affairs Committee of this Assembly which comes into its own at such a meeting.

We have, however, many expert committees and we also know that the specific achievement of the Council of Europe is to ensure the conclusion of agreements on the most varied subjects, all of them coming within the scope of specialised Ministers.

We are therefore extremely grateful that we are to be given the opportunity of a direct exchange of opinion not only with the Foreign Ministers, but also with the specialised Ministers.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers.

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Translation). — Mr. President, I believe that it is the special advantage of the Council of Europe that its very Statute ensures co-operation between the Assembly and the Committee of Ministers, and through the latter also close contact with other Ministers of the member governments. I would like to assure Mr. Margue that I shall do everything possible to ensure the broadest interpretation and application of this practice.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Mr. Cravatte also wishes to put a question to Mr. Kirchschläger who, I note with pleasure, is willing to reply.

I call Mr. Cravatte.

Mr. CRAVATTE (Luxembourg) (Translation). — Mr. President, a great deal was said this morning about the recent European Ministerial Conference on the Environment held in Vienna. Mr. Kirchschläger himself also mentioned it several times in his address to the Assembly, quite correctly emphasising its importance.

It is in this context that I wish to put him two questions.

The first is: Do you share the opinion expressed at this conference by various minis-

Mr. Cravatte (continued)

terial delegations and above all by the Minister of the Interior of the Federal Republic of Germany?

We were particularly struck by his speech. In his opinion, the Council of Europe needs to play a much more active part in the protection of the environment, particularly in problems and sectors which go beyond the scope of the nine member States of the Community.

My second questions is: Is Mr. Kirchschläger willing, should occasion arise, to put forward this point of view in the Committee of Ministers and to make proposals which will allow the Council of Europe to play its full part in the protection of the environment in his dual capacity as Chairman of the Committee of Ministers and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Kirchschläger.

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Translation). — It goes without saying that all problems relating to the environment are urgent and topical ones. Far from discouraging goodwill therefore, we must ensure that the best possible use is made of our powers while avoiding duplication.

Without wishing to anticipate the conclusions of the Working Party on the Future Role of the Council of Europe which has just been set up by the Committee of Ministers, I can assure you that the working party will see that the best possible use is made of the experience and capacities available in such great measure within the Council of Europe by comparison with other European organisations on a question of such importance as the environment.

In this connection, the Committee of Ministers will take very full account of the opinions expressed and the results obtained at the Vienna Conference. It will examine its conclusions in order to see what action can be taken within the framework of the Organisation's Work Programme.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Digby, to put the last question.

Mr. DIGBY (United Kingdom). — The Chairman of the Committee of Ministers has made

an important announcement — that a working party is to be set up by the Committee of Ministers consisting of six Permanent Representatives, to report in October. I certainly welcome this idea, but will the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers give an assurance that there will be consultation with the Assembly's own working party, which has had consultations in sixteen different capitals?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers.

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Translation). — Mr. President, I think I can guarantee that the working group of six Ministers' Deputies will also make suitable contact with the working party of the Assembly since the decision instituting this working group was bound up with an authorisation and an invitation to it to contact all organisations and institutions dealing with the same problem. It seems to me natural that a working party of the Assembly will have priority here. I believe, however, that in addition there must also be contact with, for instance, the European Communities and other organisations.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — There are no more questions. Thank you, Mr. Kirchschläger, for taking part in this discussion with the Assembly.

There are no speakers down for the debate.

The debate on the Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly is therefore closed.

7. International terrorism

(Debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3285)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the presentation and discussion of the report of the Political Affairs Committee on international terrorism, Document 3285.

Before calling the Rapporteur, I would remind the Assembly that the list of speakers will close immediately after presentation of the report.

The debate must, moreover, be concluded this morning.

The President (continued)

The sitting may consequently end rather late.

I would also remind you of the need to start this afternoon's sitting at 3 p.m. sharp, since our agenda is a particularly heavy one.

I call Mr. Czernetz, the Rapporteur.

Mr. CZERNETZ (Austria) (Translation). — In presenting Document 3285 on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee of the Assembly, with the request that the recommendation be adopted, I wish to make a number of comments in elucidation.

We live in a time of total insecurity, and I am not speaking of the horrors of war which takes its toll of blood and which it is our most noble mission to combat. In a modern civilisation and particularly under democratic systems, however, it is of the essence that we should rid ourselves of the terrors of violence directed against innocent citizens, of terror in peacetime.

And precisely this terror has descended upon us: bomb attacks, assassinations, kidnappings, the criminal blackmailing of governments in order to achieve the liberation of terrorists, the murder of diplomats and organised air piracy — all this is part of our life in peacetime.

Certain States, certain governments support this terror. They provide training camps, operational bases and the possibility of asylum, and they provide terrorist groups with money and arms. Without this support to the terrorist, without the co-operation of international terrorist groups and arms smuggled by thugs of so-called right-wing and so-called left-wing persuasions, the present terrorist world war could not be waged.

The mass media report in such detail on terrorist attacks that television is becoming a university for psychopaths and criminals. Governments have been blackmailed by threats of violence into liberating criminals with consequent unsettling of domestic law and order in numerous democracies. No one is safe, Mr. President!

We live in an age of escalation of crime, violence and terror. The 27th General Assembly of the United Nations was instructed by the Secretary General to deal with the question of terrorism. And the result? A resolution which we have attached to the report which calls for a study of the causes of terrorism in order that by overcoming them terrorism may be eliminated.

In fact, however, there are individual States which justify terrorism; even the text of the resolution of the United Nations contains justifications of terrorism which is represented as national resistance or a struggle for liberation. There are States which favour terror and these States obstruct the United Nations and hinder common action by the peoples and States against terror and in particular against air piracy.

The argument of these governments and their spokesmen is that violence does not come about of its own accord, that it is not unprovoked, that violence appears to the oppressed, the suffering, to those who have been robbed of their freedom and to those who are suffering under foreign occupation as the only way out; terror, they say, is the revolt of the oppressed.

Certainly, Mr. President, there are still various violent systems in the world, fascist dictatorships, communist dictatorships, military dictatorships and other authoritarian regimes of every kind. Under the present circumstances, escape from the oppressor may often prove necessary. Resistance and liberation struggles certainly have their justification, as is recognised also in the Consultative Assembly, but it is necessary here to elucidate some basic rules.

Mr. President, allow me to make a few personal observations. I am the better able to do this since I fought for four years in the illegal resistance movement against Austrian dictatorship and had to escape abroad as a political refugee from national socialist persecution, with the most serious consequences for my own and my wife's family.

But in all the years of my participation in the illegal resistance movement there was one basic

Mr. Czernetz (continued)

rule for us: no acts of violence under any circumstances against the uninvolved, and above all no bomb attacks.

Violence against innocent people is a mean crime and not a political struggle. The flight from persecution in a dictatorship must not lead to the endangering of innocent lives.

Let me say openly, Mr. President: If anyone has to flee from a dictatorship, whatever its colour, thus committing what is known in German as a Gebrauchsdiebstahl, in other words if he "organises" a military or sports aircraft and pilots it himself, risking his own life, that is to be tolerated. The machine must be recovered and it will then be necessary to verify whether the person really is a political refugee.

But flight by hijacking civilian aircraft and endangering passengers and crew is a despicable crime. The blackmailing of governments by threatening to assassinate innocent persons unless demands are met is a despicable crime.

I know we often urge many of our governments: Resist! Do not give in to blackmail!

Fortunately we have as yet not experienced such a situation in Austria, but it has occurred in neighbouring countries. I believe this advice is too simple; it is difficult to resist such blackmail in democratic countries and to risk the lives of the passengers and crew of civilian aircraft. That is not possible. It is different in countries where there is a state of war or, as in Israel, a near state of war.

But this is not the case in our countries. The fact that these criminals gamble with the lives of innocent or uninvolved people makes this a particularly disgusting and miserable crime.

Mr. President, nobody who justifies terrorism can describe the cold-blooded murders of Lod, Munich and Khartoum — which were planned to the last detail — as acts committed on an impulse or as acts of desperation. No, those were despicable crimes and it is completely irrelevant whether the motives were political or not.

After the second world war, resistance fighters were legally recognised. The Geneva Convention of 1949 which was ratified by practically every State in the world, by all Council of Europe member States, all the great powers and also all Arab States, deals with the treatment of prisoners of war. It is extremely interesting to note the definition of prisoners of war in the military sense.

According to Article 4 of this convention, prisoners of war are persons who have fallen into the power of the enemy and belong to the following categories: members of the armed forces of a party to the conflict, as well as members of militias or volunteer corps forming part of such armed forces; members of other militias and members of other volunteer corps, including those of organised resistance movements, belonging to a party to the conflict and operating in or outside their own territory, even if this territory is occupied, provided that such militias or volunteer corps, including such organised resistance movements, fulfil the following conditions: (a) that of being commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates; (b) that of having a fixed distinctive sign recognisable at a distance; (c)that of carrying arms openly; (d) that of conducting their operations in accordance with the laws and customs of war.

Which laws are these? On this point too the Geneva Convention of 1949 is explicit.

Article 3 states that "In the case of armed conflict... each party to the conflict shall be bound to apply, as a minimum, the following provisions:

Persons taking no active part in the hostilities, including members of armed forces who have laid down their arms and those placed hors de combat by sickness, wounds, detention, or any other cause, shall in all circumstances be treated humanely, without any adverse distinction founded on race, colour, religion or faith, sex, birth or wealth, or any other similar criteria.

To this end the following acts are and shall remain prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever with respect to the above-mentioned persons:

Mr. Czernetz (continued)

- (a) violence to life and person, in particular murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture;
 - (b) taking of hostages;
- (c) outrages upon personal dignity, in particular, humiliating and degrading treatment;
- (d) the passing of sentences and the carrying out of executions without previous judgment pronounced by a regularly constituted court affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognised as indispensable by civilised peoples."
- Mr. President, it seems to me necessary to remind you of this. How do the deeds of the terrorists appear in the light of international law, how should they be judged? They are in stark opposition to the Geneva Convention of 1949 which recognises resistance and freedom fighters, which was not the case before the second world war.

According to international law these acts of terror are crimes and punishable as such. The States are obliged either to hand over such criminals or to punish them most severely according to their own laws.

For centuries there was sea piracy on the high seas and only concerted action by the great powers against the threats to maritime communications and to life internationally ended this situation. Only the creation of international maritime law and its implementation in opposition to those States that provided a refuge for the pirates put an end to piracy on the high seas.

We are today in a similar position. Only common action by the governments, the creation of an international air law and the imposition of such legislation in the teeth of objections by certain States will put an end to the insecurity now existing in international air transport.

At present only government provisions and sanctions against the States which support such terror can put an end to it. But unfortunately we have by no means reached that point. Nevertheless our recommendation calls for the speediest possible ratification of the Tokyo,

Hague and Montreal Conventions against air piracy and it is our task as parliamentarians, Ladies and Gentlemen, to urge our governments to ratify the conventions as soon as possible or to introduce ratification procedure without delay in our parliaments.

We know that unless there is joint government action, joint sanctions, the pilots of the international airlines and the International Transport Workers' Federation will carry out their threat to take trade union against States which support the terrorists. This is a threat which must be taken seriously if the governments fail to react. And such action will, in the absence of governmental measures, have the fullest comprehension not only of parliamentarians but also of public opinion in Europe.

We have been reminded here in the Consultative Assembly by our Committee of Ministers that this is a world problem. Certainly! But the Ministers know as well as we do that at present there is no chance of achieving an early, world-wide solution within the framework of the United Nations.

The United States and Canada have solved their own particular problem regionally with Cuba. It is also up to the Council of Europe member States to attempt to find a regional solution.

The Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, the Austrian Foreign Minister, Dr. Kirchschläger, mentioned in the reply to our Recommendation 684, that the Committee of Ministers had set up an ad hoc committee to study the legal aspects of the question. We recognise the good intentions of the Committee of Ministers. Some time or other this may, in the long run, be a contribution to an international legal solution. But I thank Dr. Kirchschläger for being as dissatisfied as we are with the decision. Even though we honour the good intentions of our colleagues in the Committee of Ministers, this is not enough. This is no contribution to the immediate reduction of the number of terrorist acts.

Hence, Mr. President, our recommendation, our urgent request that the Committee of Ministers should, as soon as possible, call a Mr. Czernetz (continued)

special conference of Ministers of the Interior or of Ministers responsible for police and security which will prepare urgent proposals and co-ordinating measures to prevent terrorism on the regional basis of Council of Europe member States. I need mention no further details. I hope that this will not result in a document marked confidential, since this would ensure it the greatest publicity. I am counting on these being genuine measures and I am happy to hear Mr. Kirchschläger say that it is understood that the specialised Ministers are to act independently; this will be the best case for which we are waiting and on which we are counting.

Mr. President, it is the duty of all our States, governments and parliaments to safeguard the freedom and lives of those living in our countries. I deliberately do not say "citizens" since there are Turks and Yugoslavs living as migrant workers in Austria who have the same right to the protection of their freedom and their life. We have to ensure the security of international lines of communication between nations and States.

Our recommendation, Mr. President, consists not merely of words, it also has teeth. It will use these, if necessary, to prove that the Council of Europe is an effective political reality.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Czernetz.

The first speaker in the debate is Mr. Mason.

Mr. MASON (United Kingdom). — First of all, I congratulate Mr. Czernetz and his committee on this excellent report. The dangers of international terrorism and its likely growth know no boundaries. It has become a frightening modern technique to subject peoples and nations to abject surrender. No airline, aircraft, air traveller or nation can feel safe anywhere in the world until effective measures, including international sanctions against offending States, have been agreed and put into force.

On the question of air piracy, as the document before us states, three conventions have been agreed within the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), to which I shall refer very often in my speech.

First of all, there is the Tokyo Convention of 1963, which deals with crimes committed on board aircraft, and which particularly describes the role and responsibilities of the aircraft commander.

Secondly, the Hague Convention of 1970 spelt out measures for the suppression of the unlawful seizure of aircraft which required all the Contracting States to make hijacking of aircraft an offence punishable by severe penalities, including provision for the arrest and extradition of offenders between Contracting States, or prosecution if extradition did not take place.

Then there is the Montreal Convention of September 1971, which is still in the process of being ratified by a number of signatories to the convention, including my own country, the United Kingdom. This convention briefly requires legislation to protect aerodromes, aircraft and passengers.

All these measures are useful steps towards curbing hijackers, but so far no effective sanctions exist to stamp them out. International terrorism will persist until this is done. I am personally disturbed that nations, particularly the major civil aviation nations, are not yet seized of its urgency.

Last year, 1972, was a particularly bad year, involving 72 aircraft and 4 000 passengers, 14 of whom were injured and 11 of whom were killed. That includes the nine Israeli hostages at Munich.

According to the International Institute of Strategic Studies, 22 of the hijackers were killed in 1972, but what was most disturbing was that the hijacking rate increased during 1972. In 1968, 85 % of hijackers were successful. In 1970 it was down to 60 %, and in 1971 it had dropped to 44 %. However, according to the figures supplied by the International Federation of Airline Pilots Associations, the success rate rose in 1972 to 50 %. We must, therefore, recognise that hijacking and air piracy is still a major threat to airline travel, and to all

Mr. Mason (continued)

civil aviation airlines. It is still a threat, too, to the small and young democracies. Here an aircraft and hundreds of innocent passengers can be used as pawns in inter-State conflicts. In particular, it can be used to prise out of governments response to demands by rebels and fanatical political minorities that otherwise would never be heeded.

Air travel has always been and probably always will be vulnerable in the face of the determined lunatic or paranoiac, but these are rare compared with the series of hijackings that are premeditated and callously planned to hold airlines, passengers and nations to ransom. In spite of the three conventions to date, loopholes still exist. None of the conventions blocks them and soon ICAO, much more important than the United Nations, will have to deal with the ultimate problem, and that is the problem of sanctions.

One major worry to all concerned with safe air travel is that the Arab nations, although Members of ICAO and most of them Members of the International Air Transport Association (IATA), are not co-operating with the same good will as most of the Members of the two international organisations. If co-operation is not forthcoming and any act of air piracy or sabotage emanates from these countries, the ultimate sanction must be used. They must be frozen out of the use and services of international airlines and air traffic control aids. If any nation harbours or provides refuge for one of these air pirates, steps must be taken to freeze out the offending States internationally from all civil airline airports.

Therefore, in the consideration of international sanctions against international terrorism, we must get ICAO to consider the following steps. First, those who harbour or provide a haven for or grant asylum to these potential mass murderers must be aware that ICAO will deny their airlines the use of other nations' air space and air facilities. Secondly, ICAO must be prepared to place an embargo on their airports.

The United Nations cannot effectively deal with this problem. ICAO, backed by the major

civil aviation nations of the world, can. It is due to meet this autumn to consider the ultimate penalties and possibly sanctions against the havens of hijackers. Proposals are already being presented by a number of countries. The United Kingdom and Swiss Governments are proposing sanctions including the stoppage of air services. The French idea is for the expulsion of offending States from ICAO. Russian and Scandinavian countries are also taking an active interest in the furtherance of penalties.

This, then, is the path we should follow: first, to press for the ratification by more nations of the Tokyo, Hague and Montreal Conventions; secondly, to apply pressure upon our Aviation Ministers to agree at the next ICAO Conference that sanctions are now necessary.

In particular, all nations must be prepared to legislate quickly against the political hijackers—those determined, fanatical, intelligent, well-trained groups which use hijacking and aerial sabotage for the purpose of securing political objectives.

Our goal is in sight, I believe, but it is incumbent upon every member of this Assembly not only to endorse this document but to play his part and press his government along the path I have outlined.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The list of speakers is closed.

There are eleven speakers on the list.

To ensure that the debate ends at 1.10 p.m., I would ask those speakers who have been allotted ten minutes to speak for eight minutes only.

I would enjoin those who have asked to speak for less than ten minutes to keep strictly to the time allotted them.

I call Mr. Stewart to speak for five minutes.

Mr. STEWART (United Kingdom). — Mr. President, it is a grim comment on the world we live in that there should apparently be doubt in the international community that terrorism is wrong, a grim commentary that we

Mr. Stewart (continued)

cannot easily achieve international agreement to outlaw it. The reason for that, of course, is the assertion of the doctrine that if you consider you are suffering from oppression, you can do anything you like, use any methods you like, in order to express your feeling.

To kill a tyrant or to rise in arms against oppressive government is one thing, though if we are all to be free to call everybody a tyrant with whom we disagree or any government oppressive that does not do all that we wish, the world will not be a very safe place.

But even in the case of tyranny which any reasonable person would regard as tyranny, we still have to say, "You must not use against it methods which not merely strike at the tyrant or those who are directly responsible for the wrong from which you are suffering but strike also at the general public without discrimination of age or sex". That I take to be the essence of terrorism as distinct from legitimate forms of resistance.

The reason mankind has got to put it down is that if we do not nobody is safe. This is something that can strike in every direction. Why do we have such an organisation as the Red Cross? Why do we have conventions about the treatment of prisoners-of-war? It is because mankind knows that unless some limit is put to cruelty and violence, the whole of human civilisation is in question. This is easier today when there are the fruits of modern science, the huge aircraft so vulnerable to use by such people.

I believe there are a sufficient number of nations in the world who would agree with what I have just said for them to take effective action. There are, it is true, some who would disagree with what I have said, who would still insist that you have the right to use methods of this kind. But they are decidedly in the minority in the whole community of mankind. There are a sufficient number of nations, if they will act together, to take effective action against terrorism.

My colleague, Mr. Mason, has, I think we shall agree, pointed out to us very clearly some of the practicable methods that could be used. There ought not to be any question about the desire to use them. What we now have to do is to urge governments to bring together

the natural desire they have to stop terrorism with the practical methods for doing it.

May I say I was very happy, under the guidance of Mr. Czernetz, to serve on this committee, because I believe we were given an important task to do and that we have offered the Assembly a practical and, I hope, a useful report.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Henri Schmitt.

Mr. Henri SCHMITT (Switzerland) (Translation). — Mr. President, Mr. Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen, let me briefly express my disappointment at the response of the Committee of Ministers to our Recommendation 684.

I shall make a distinction between Mr. Kirchschläger's reply in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee of Ministers and in his capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria.

I wish to express scepticism regarding points 1 to 5 of the recommendation submitted to us by the Political Affairs Committee, while giving my full support to point 6.

Only a few months ago one of our Swedish colleagues asked what general follow-up there had been, as regards a joint European approach for combating terrorism, to the recommendation which the Assembly considered so urgent; he also wished to know what political and economic influence had been brought to bear by member governments to dissuade those States which allow terrorists to prepare their action or to reside or find asylum on their territory from so doing.

We now raise this question again, and I believe that I speak for many if I express the disappointment felt by our Political Affairs Committee at the work of the ad hoc committee appointed by the Committee of Ministers in application of Recommendation 684. If the Political Affairs Committee had been enthusiastic or at least satisfied with the work of the ad hoc committee, it would not today be submitting the text of a new recommendation.

We must look reality in the face both from the legal and the political points of view. No progress has been achieved at European level since this problem was brought before the Council of Europe.

Mr. Henri Schmitt (continued)

To my mind, undertakings entered into by signing international conventions which do not commit us in respect of crimes carried out in third countries constitute no progress at European level. The fact that Europe is divided on this issue and unable to adopt a common stand must once again be denounced.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, how is it possible that when faced with the crime of air piracy which is new in at least certain of its aspects, we, European nations with the same concept of the rule of law, are unable to take united action against the perpetrators of such crimes or their accomplices? How is it possible that our democracies, founded on law and order, persist in attempting to view as a political offence what is in fact a crime under civil law. How many more victims must there be before our conscience is roused and our feeling of solidarity finally finds expression in a common stand by our countries against those who exploit our disagreements and our weaknesses?

When shall we, the representatives of the European peoples, understand that our rights and our security are not echoed in the political resolutions taken by the United Nations. When shall we realise that, faced with terrorism which knows no frontiers, the pursuit of national and separate policies will finally lead to international anarchy and only increase the contempt in which we are held by the perpetrators of acts of terrorism and their accomplices.

I can agree to the new text only on condition that we consider this subject as remaining on the agenda until the European governments give serious consideration to the problem of a common approach, and until valid results are obtained within a reasonable period; indeed, only on condition that we make a fresh and much more direct approach to the Committee of Ministers to make them understand that the peoples we represent in this struggle against international crime, which may strike at us at any moment, expect more from their governments than a selfish policy which, as I have already said, can lead only to anarchy.

Mr. President, as the Rapporteur said just now, our predecessors, with no Council of

Europe, with no Committee of Ministers, were able to put an end to sea piracy. Are we ourselves capable only of talking, but not of seeing that our countries adopt provisions ensuring solidarity and the defence of civilisation, the defence of law and order which the peoples which we represent expect of us and above all of our governments?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Grieve.

Mr. GRIEVE (United Kingdom). — I join all of our colleagues who have spoken this morning in congratulating our Rapporteur on once again having brought before the Assembly, with emphasis and with persuasion, the concern that all civilised nations must feel before international terrorism, which is but a reflection in international fields of the resort to illegal and unjust means of attaining their ends that we have seen within so many national frontiers in recent years. The breakdown of, or the contempt for, law and order. which is manifested by many people within national frontiers when they think they have a cause that justifies the putting in jeopardy of the lives of innocent men, women and children, is reflected by international terrorism.

It seems to me that we are dealing with the same phenomenon on a world scale as we see frequently, and have seen over recent years, within national frontiers. Our Rapporteur was right to compare international terrorism, and particularly the hijacking of aircraft, in the modern world with piracy, which was for so many centuries a scourge of the civilised world and which the civilised world united to put down.

If we allowed international terrorism to go unrestricted in the modern world, without bringing all the power and influence of civilised society against it, the state of the world would be what Hobbes, the English political philosopher, said that it was before mankind was reduced by law and order to civilised ways — nasty, poor, brutish and short.

What are the remedies that civilised society may bring to these problems? They are all canvassed in Mr. Czernetz's excellent report. I should like to emphasise what seem to me to be

Mr. Grieve (continued)

the four heads under which we, the representatives of civilised countries with a common interest in putting down international terrorism, may act against it.

First, nationally, we should see that our laws are severe enough and are enforced enough to make sure that when international terrorists are brought to justice within our respective frontiers they meet their just deserts. My country has done away with the death penalty for murder, but there still remains on the Statute Book the death penalty for piracy with violence. I am not necessarily advocating the death penalty, but each country should see that within its own national frontiers terrorism of this kind and on this scale, which cuts at the lives of the innocent, should be dealt with with the utmost severity that its law allows.

Secondly, internationally, we must co-ordinate our efforts by international convention and agreement. I am glad that my country has been in the van in adhering to and ratifying the Tokyo and Hague Conventions, and that it will shortly ratify the Montreal Convention. We all have a part to play, those whose countries have not yet ratified the conventions, in bringing pressure to bear on our own parliaments and administrations to ratify the conventions, which should play an important part in dealing with international terrorism.

But the matter cannot stop there. We all know that the countries here represented will be the first to ratify an international convention against terrorism, but how are we to deal with those countries still sufficiently misguided to believe that they, or causes that they wish to sustain, may benefit by their abstaining from international agrements and by sheltering international pirates? Here there is a vital role to be played by constant, unremitting diplomatic pressure at the United Nations and in all international forums, and through our respective foreign services.

If that does not suffice, we shall have to resort to what my colleague, Mr. Mason, described as sanctions. Countries that shelter international terrorists must be brought to see, by the refusal of facilities to their own aircraft and the cutting-off of their own airports from international commerce, that they must play their part in the comity of nations and in putting down international terrorism.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Micallef.

Mr. MICALLEF (Malta). — We all share the same concern on this subject; we all agree that the situation must change; and we all sincerely hope that it is only a question of time before one day things are improved.

In the recommendation there is plainly evident a certain amount of impatience, which in view of the price of human life entailed is more than justified. But does this impatience help to create an atmosphere of efficiency, and, above all, action that is impeccably just?

We see that the United Nations General Assembly, by Resolution 3034, has agreed to deal with the situation. We today are challenging again its decision, and also criticising the response to Recommendation 684 (1972) of the Committee of Ministers, saying that we consider:

"that this will not in itself contribute...
towards a reduction of terrorist acts".

Here the Assembly is proposing that something more will be done, because, as is said in paragraph 6 (iii), unless we

"take seriously into account the fact that failing effective and urgent European governmental action, parliamentary and public opinion will openly support retaliatory measures".

There is inherent here a suggestion of what should happen if we do not urgently commit ourselves to effective European governmental action.

This "effective and urgent European governmental action" I interpret, in the light of paragraph 6 (i) (b), as indicative of sanctions. These are extremist material and pschological measures that will tend to aggravate and not improve the situation in certain danger-spot areas of the world. History has taught us that sanctions do not rehabilitate those whom society in general considers to be naughty, but rather tend to fix and multiply what are considered to be their misdeeds.

My concern about this motion is purely and simply a sense of apprehension about the extent to which the Council of Europe as a body — I repeat, as a body — should involve intself. Would committing ourselves to a definite path of action that is discordant with Resolution 3034 of the

Mr. Micallef (continued)

United Nations be creating a situation from which the Council of Europe as a whole would find it difficult to extricate itself later? Would not this increase the chances that the Council of Europe's work may become more impotent and sterile, thereby wrecking the chances of leavening the fruitful work of the Nine in consolidating the true interests of Europe and those of the world?

I sincerely fear that this recommendation is the result of a polygon of forces in which the components are neither homogeneous nor miscible. My appeal is: let us not rush and be forced to jump in where angels fear to tread.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Hofer.

Mr. HOFER (Switzerland) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to thank our Rapporteur, Mr. Czernetz, most warmly for his highly interesting and concise report. At the same time I would like to say that I do not at all support the views of the previous speaker. On the contrary, there was remarkable unanimity on this question, even in the Political Affairs Committee.

The attitude of the Committee of Ministers thus appears to us all the more incomprehensible, and here I agree with the criticism expressed by other speakers. As Mr. Schmitt's speech shows, the Swiss delegation entirely supports the recommendations and the conclusions proposed.

May I perhaps remind you briefly that Swiss members of parliament were among the first to demand measures against international terrorism, in particular against air piracy both at national and international level? It was after the first attack by Palestinian terrorists on civilian airlines four years ago that I called, as the then Chairman of the Political Committee of our National Council, for an international conference to ensure the safety of civilian transport. One year later, after a fresh catastrophe, the Würenlingen catastrophe mentioned in the report, the Federal Council endorsed this idea. In the meantime, our country has ratified the Tokyo and Hague Conventions and

signed the Montreal Convention. Further proposals in our parliament concerned inter alia an international court for crimes against aviation and the adaptation of Swiss legislation in the light — or rather under the shadow — of international terrorism. Corresponding penal provisions will be included during the current second phase of the revision of the Swiss Penal Code.

However, the government thought it necessary to reject the demand for an international court because it would not be legally feasible, in particular because of the difficulties caused by the question of extradition. This appears to me to be typical. Moreover, an ICAO initiative along the same lines also seems to have petered out. It would therefore appear that the question of harmonising legislation as discussed in the Political Affairs Committee will hardly be solved at world level, with the result that we are automatically forced to concentrate on the European level.

As regards Switzerland, the Swiss Penal Code contains no definition of a "terrorist act", but under the Swiss law on extradition, terrorist acts could *ipso facto* entail extradition because they consistently constitute crimes or offences against life, freedom and property in the sense of the extraditable offences listed under Article 3 of the Law on Extradition.

In connection with the amendment tabled by Mr. de Stexhe which has just been distributed, Article 10 of the Swiss Law on Extradition may be of interest. It reads:

"Extradition shall not be granted in respect of political crimes or offences,

Extradition shall, however, be granted even if the perpetrator pleads a political motive or purpose, if the action in respect of which extradition is requested is predominantly of the nature of a common crime or offence. The Federal Court shall decide the nature of

The Federal Court shall decide the nature of the punishable act at discretion in each individual case on the basis of the evidence."

The practice followed by our Federal Court, our highest authority, is that a plea of political motives by the perpetrator is not enough to allow the offence to be deemed a political one. The following is required in addition: under the most recent provisions of the Federal Court,

Mr. Hofer (continued)

the act must, in the view of the perpetrator, appear as the means designed to achieve the desired political aim. And here it is necessary to test — and I quote the French version of a Federal Court decision:

"whether the harm done is proportional to the intended result, whether the interests involved are sufficiently important, if not to justify, at least to provide a legal excuse for the attack by the author of the act on certain legal tenets".

Thus far Swiss federal jurisdiction.

In cases of homicide in particular, the political nature of the offence is admitted only when it is the *ultima ratio* in the perpetrator's view, Related to the Arab-Israeli conflict or to Palestinian terrorism which rightly occupies a focal point in our report, it can hardly be claimed that the murder of innocent and uninvolved people is the *ultima ratio*, particularly in view of the fact that Israel has continued to maintain its offer of direct peace negotiations. This was confirmed also by the leader of the Israeli delegation to the last Conference of the Interparliamentary Union.

The responsibility of certain Arab governments is rightly stressed by the report. In reply to the question already mentioned — such a question was also raised by Mr. Leu in the Swiss Council of States — the Swiss Government unequivocally declared, as long as four years ago, that it was the responsibility of the States concerned if they not only harboured terrorists in the manner described and gave them refuge but even furthered their criminal actions.

Just a few words more, since I appear to have exhausted the time allotted to me — and let me say, Mr. President, that I am extremely sorry that there is a time-limit when such important events are being debated — just a few words on the United Nations resolution, particularly since the previous speaker spoke in its defence.

I would emphasise once again what Mr. Czernetz said and what must be emphasised as the conclusion of his statement: this United Nations resolution is at variance with international law as laid down in the Geneva Conventions. That must be stated very clearly. We are facing a dubious situation. When we consider the results

of the vote and interpret them we see that on this question the Western European-Atlantic world is isolated and that there is a very definite gap, a tremendous contradiction between the interpretation of the law in the civilisation to which we belong and the greater part of the rest of the world. I hope that this does not mean that we are reverting to an era when classical international law was restricted to the Christian part of the world, and when it had no meaning outside that area of civilisation.

It could of course be said that even within this Assembly — and my colleague Mr. Schmitt mentioned this - the necessary unanimity is lacking, and if we consider that an Arab dictator who praised the Munich criminals as heroes and freedom fighters is simultaneously concluding deals worth thousands of millions with a Council of Europe member State — that merely by the way, Ladies and Gentlemen - we shall have a rough idea of how far we still have to go before we have convinced all our governments of the need for a joint approach. This should not be regarded as a call to resign ourselves to the inevitable but as an appeal to all our governments to re-examine their position, to change it if necessary and in any case to give absolute priority to the law in their considerations.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I must remind you that the time-limits for speakers were fixed by the Assembly on the proposal of the Rapporteur and the Bureau.

I call Mr. Stinus.

Mr. STINUS (Denmark). — I am not going to speak in favour of terrorism but I am going to criticise certain aspects of the report and to sound a warning, not against a concerted European action to combat terrorism but against the European attitude towards the problem. Before I continue I want to stress that I can follow the wording of the draft recommendation and I can vote for it. But — and now I come to my criticism of the report, which suffers from certain shortcomings — first, it is a one-sided report, an anti-Arab report.

There is no reason, when we discuss international terrorism, especially to expose Arab acts of terrorism. I am not closing my eyes to such acts and I have no sympathy for them; but terrorism is not new. Arab terrorism is new, and

Mr. Stinus (continued)

therefore it may be natural to use Arab terrorism as an example; but in my opinion it weakens our European position in a case where I feel we have definitely some good viewpoints. It weakens our position towards the rest of the world. Secondly, I see in the report the lack of a proper and clear definition of terrorism on which we could agree and on which the rest of the world could agree with us. There lies our responsibility.

I have said that terrorism is not something new. We Europeans know it, or ought to know it. The rest of the world knows it and thinks that we are hypocrites when today, in a rather hysterical way in their eyes, we suddenly care about combating terrorism. I tend to agree with them. It is hypocrisy to state, as the report states, that there can be no justification for acts of terrorism outside the area of conflict concerned. I understand the third world when it queries the honesty of our intentions. "You never cared before", it says, "but now, when you yourselves -- Europeans and Americans -- are being hit, you react." I understand it when it thinks we are hypocrites because we speak, and perhaps act, against terrorism in our part of the world and close our eyes to other acts of terrorism; or at least we are very quiet about them.

In the United Nations the third world asked, "Is it not terrorism when somebody presses a button 10 000 feet in the air, thus releasing a bomb causing destruction and death to innocent children and women, in Indo-China, for instance?" We say, "This is not terrorism, it is war", and then we are the hypocrites. In the United Nations the representatives of the third world also asked, "Is not the policy of the South African regime another kind of terrorism? Or the policy of many Latin-American governments towards the indigenous people of their countries?" Where are the European voices of protest?

Mr. Czernetz has stated in his report that today there is less solidarity at world level than only a few years ago when the Hague and Montreal Conventions were concluded. By the way, I am happy to state my country has ratified

these two conventions as well as the Tokyo Convention. Less solidarity — that is exactly what the countries of the third world are accusing us of. Are we showing any kind of solidarity towards their causes? Are we trying in a serious manner to find just and peaceful solutions to the underlying causes which, in their eyes, give rise to what we term international terrorism? I have my doubts.

My doubts grow when Czernetz in his report bluntly states:

"The issue is not... the cause of self-determination, revolt against dictatorship or flight from it."

Yes, the issue is also the cause of self-determination, revolt against dictatorships or flight from them; and if we Europeans will not face that, we are going to lose our case. I am in favour of strong, concerted European action against terrorism, but not a one-sided action. Let us show that we are responsible, not only egoists and hypocrites. Let us show the road to combat all kinds of terrorism whatever the cost may be. Let us try to understand the views of the third world. Let us make up for the lack of solidarity at world level by wholeheartedly supporting its causes, the underlying causes. I am sure that then our views, as expressed in the draft recommendation, will be understood by it, too; and thus terrorism will be eliminated by a joint effort.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Piket.

Mr. PIKET (Netherlands) (Translation). — I would first like to congratulate Mr. Czernetz on his excellent report and on having again drawn our attention to this international problem which so greatly affects the question of respect for the individual.

In section II of the explanatory memorandum, Mr. Czernetz gave us the background of the debate which took place in the Assembly on this subject.

We adopted certain recommendations of great importance, in particular Recommendation 684 Mr. Piket (continued)

in which the Assembly invites the governments to take all possible measures to eliminate the difficulties we have experienced in the past.

Three conventions were signed: the Tokyo Convention, the Hague Convention and the Montreal Convention. We must however say that none of these have changed matters,

Let me merely recall what was done by a few terrorists in Munich during the Olympic Games. We forget very rapidly, and that is why it is necessary to recall what a few groups of terrorists have done: in Germany against the Israeli team, at Lod airport where, you will remember, a Japanese commando acting for the Palestine liberation front mowed down civilians who had nothing to do with the Israelis.

It does not require much thought to see that such acts are crimes against humanity. It is the intention of the terrorists to kill innocent people who have nothing to do with politics.

I am glad that the Rapporteur drew our attention to the work of the United Nations. On page 6 of his report I read:

"There is a lack of solidarity at world level even in the face of a universal problem, which it is in the interests of all governments to solve."

What happened when the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Waldheim, proposed that international terrorism should be included on the agenda of the 1972 General Assembly in New York? It was included by 66 votes to 27, with 33 abstentions. Among those opposing its inclusion were China, Cuba and the Arab countries. Abstentions included the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries.

The main disagreement was that some countries insisted on effective measures to combat terrorism, while others felt that the question should first be studied and the underlying causes removed.

The Sixth United Nations Committee — the Legal Committee — pointed out that not only legal but also political elements had played an outstanding part. What was the reply of China, Cuba and the Arab countries? That it was not a legal question, but a question of neo-colonialism and a refusal to respect the right to self-determination. For these governments the end

justified the means, even though these means are completely unjustifiable and despicable. A few days before the end of the 1972 General Assembly the text of Resolution 3034 was adopted, but it produced no definitive solution to the problem.

In conclusion I would like to say that last week I had the honour to speak in the Netherlands States-General on the Montreal Convention and the Hague Convention; these conventions will be ratified in a matter of weeks.

We have also adapted our Penal Code to the Hague Convention.

That is why I am happy to be able to say that the Netherlands are participating in the struggle against terrorism which is a crime against humanity.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — As authorised by the Bureau in accordance with Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure, I call Mr. Eliav, the Observer from Israel.

Mr. ELIAV (Observer, Israel). — I congratulate Mr. Czernetz on his excellent report and spirited presentation. I agree that it is not so very long ago that Europe was the scene and the breeding place of the most dreadful mass terror perpetrated by the Nazis against innocent people, my people. It is encouraging, thirty years later, to hear representatives from many European countries denouncing new kinds of terror. Europe has come to the conclusion that war and terror are no solution to any kind of problem, and Europeans can and should let their views be heard.

Apart from the tragic Irish problem, the most recent terror has been imported into Europe from my part of the world, the Middle East; this is why the names of Munich and Lod cause such feelings of horror. What is the result of the actions of such terrorists? Not only do they kill innocent neutrals and bystanders, both in Europe and in many other parts of the world, but they attack their own cause.

We and the Arabs are cousins; the Arabs want to kill these cousins of theirs, and we have to use force against these terrorists. However, not only are kinsfolk and innocent people killed, but, judging by events in the Lebanon, violent terror devours its own fighters. The terrorists are killing the moderate Arabs, who are now

Mr. Eliav (continued)

afraid to speak their mind; they are thus blocking the way to peace. The terrorists are beginning to kill one another because they are splitting like amoebae into hostile groups. In addition, in the case of Lebanon, they are killing the host country. I would be the last one to justify Lebanese actions but there is no doubt that Lebanese soldiers are being killed by terrorists.

No study of the causes of conflict, particularly that in the Middle East, justifies terrorist methods. Israel has said time and again that she wants to meet moderate Arabs, to come to some compromise with them, to meet them half-way or even three quarters of the way, by means of negotiation. We wish to bring peace to the Middle East although we know the price will be high. Yet the terrorists are blocking this, the only path to peace in the Middle East.

The speeches made here by most of the members, together with the recommendation if adopted, will help in a roundabout way to bring more hope to the Middle East in its tragic conflict, because if this hydra can choke in its own blood, if these and other governments will help to trample it down, moderate Arabs and moderate Israelis will find ways and means to meet each other and to bring an end to this tragic conflict.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Feyzioglu.

Mr. FEYZIOGLU (Turkey) (Translation). — I would like to congratulate our Rapporteur on his report which was unanimously adopted by the Political Affairs Committee and which was presented with remarkable conviction and clarity.

As the representative of a country which has suffered greatly in recent years from international terrorism, I believe that the Council of Europe should take its rightful place in the struggle against this scourge.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone has a right to life and personal safety.

What happens to this personal safety when a small and unscrupulous armed group is able to endanger the lives of innocent people anywhere in the world indiscriminately, without warning, and with complete disregard for the principles of international law?

No religion, no real culture, no ideology worthy of the name, no political system can possibly approve forms of violence which endanger innocent lives. Not even under the pretext of fighting for a noble cause has anyone the right to kill innocent people. To admit that the end justifies the means will result in situations that no one can accept.

Let us put the problem in the simplest possible way.

Will the many millions of air passengers be able to continue to travel in safety?

Can the recipient of a letter still open it without fear of being killed or maimed by an explosion?

Will diplomats be able to continue to fulfil their mission in safety?

It may be a good thing to ask Europe to increase its aid to the third world in order to vanquish misery, as one of our colleagues has just emphasised. It is fair to criticise the bombing of Vietnam provided we also criticise the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Personally, I consider that it is quite wrong to plead these situations to justify acts of piracy, to justify crimes.

There are terrorists whose aim it is to overthrow a freely elected government by acts of violence and to set up a tyrannical and oppressive regime. We have had experience of this type of piracy, of such terrorism in our country.

As the previous speaker emphasised, terror only breeds more terror and more killings. It can lead only to tyranny. It will never lead to a more equitable order, nor to peace in this world.

If the international community does not take the necessary measures in time, technological progress, which will allow of the use of new weapons, small in volume but increasingly powerful, the use of new technical means, will very rapidly increase the dangers and the havoc caused by international terrorism.

International terrorism knows no frontiers. It is international in scope. Measures against

Mr. Feyzioglu (continued)

terrorism cannot therefore be completely effective unless they are taken at world level. As the Rapporteur emphasised, sea piracy was overcome by international co-operation for the purpose of introducing international regulations.

It is sad to note the impotence of the United Nations in this field. The European countries must co-operate effectively in the first place by taking steps to ensure the necessary action at least at European level. It is absolutely essential that all European countries should co-operate effectively within the United Nations and should adopt a common attitude in order to reach an international solution which will put an end to this scourge.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall vote for Mr. de Stexhe's amendment which endeavours to define the notion of "political offence" in order to be able to refute any "political" justification, whenever an act of terrorism endangers the life of innocent persons.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Amrehn.

Mr. AMREHN (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — The committee's report deserves the full support of the Assembly. I certainly wish to express my approval of it in its entirety.

One of the speakers has said that we should not be over-hasty in our action. I have no sympathy with that view. For several years we have been dealing at various levels with this question and nowhere have we experienced a real breakthrough. We must finally act! No question that, far from being precipitate, we are in many ways too late.

There is no justification and no excuse for the actions we have witnessed and to which innocent people all over the world have fallen victim, whether in aircraft or in other places and in different ways; there is no justification and no excuse for killings, the taking of hostages, for starving people into submission, for kidnappings and hijackings. This cannot possibly be justified on political grounds or by political motives.

I can only say that in the Federal Republic of Germany, where we have frequently been the sufferers, a special law has been passed on the basis of many recommendations, which treats as punishable every such act of piracy, every such act of violence. This law has already been applied in cases in which escape has been effected by hijacking aircraft. In such cases, where escape is bound up with violence, the right to asylum is forfeited.

Let me remind you that already more than 70 countries within the Interparliamentary Union have agreed to punish such actions or, if the country in question is unwilling to do so, to cause the perpetrator to be extradited. This resolution was approved by all the participating countries in the Interparliamentary Union.

I do not, in fact, expect much from the mere ratification of conventions. There has been enough of this. We must finally decide to act in the spirit of these treaties, irrespective of their existence or of their ratification. For this it seems to me necessary in the first place to see that preventive measures, preventive police investigations, take place at airports in order to obviate terrorist acts whenever possible.

Secondly, we naturally need appropriate protection through criminal law. To this end it is necessary, and this has been done by the Federal Republic of Germany, to create legislation under which a terrorist act can be punished in the country concerned, even though the act may have been committed outside that country.

I am glad that the committee has decided to recommend that the Assembly should take effective measures, if necessary independently of governments, and that the pilots' associations and Transport Workers' Federation have decided to take independent action if the governments are not capable of taking the requisite measures themselves. These associations will have to act on their own if their demands, which are the demands of society as a whole, are not met by other means.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. de Stexhe to move his amendment to the draft recommendation.

Mr. de STEXHE (*Belgium*) (Translation). — This will be the easier for me since several of my colleagues have already expressed agreement with the idea contained in my amendment.

Let me emphasise how very moderate, modest and effective Mr. Czernetz's report seems to me.

In my opinion, this report has the great merit of being frank, of not dealing in generalities in order to hide reality; we see from this report that we cannot, on the one hand, hope for much within the immediate future from United Nations resolutions because of opposing forces and conflicting positions. On the other hand, although there exist international conventions which have been repeatedly mentioned this morning, I am tempted to say, as a lawyer, that though they make excellent reading from the purely theoretical legal point of view, they do not go far enough and are hardly likely to reduce air piracy noticeably, since numerous States, precisely those from which air piracy systems, either fail to approve them or to apply them, preferring on each occasion to protect the authors of these acts of piracy. Our European means are thus restricted; all the more reason, therefore, to ensure a maximum of unanimity in possible action.

Several possibilities have been mentioned in the recommendations. I would suggest that we add one which, from what the Foreign Minister of Austria told us this morning, would appear to be completely in line with the report and the present work of the Committee of Ministers. Let me define its scope.

At the moment the consequences of committing a political offence are quite different from those following the same offence, if held to be non-political. Legal provisions, the jurisprudence of the courts, and international conventions all treat political offences differently. Thus all bilateral treaties on extradition always exclude extradition for political offences. Similarly, in the European Convention on Extradition which I have here before me, we read under Article 3:

"Extradition shall not be granted if the offence in respect of which it is requested is regarded by the requested party as a political offence or as an offence connected with a political offence."

It is therefore always up to the requested party to extradite a criminal and to have the final say as to whether the offence can be considered a political one.

To sum up, at present the decision rests with the individual States and we notice in fact that there exists no common interpretation even among the 17 Members of the Council of Europe. Opinions continue to diverge very greatly. Yet it seems to me that one of the essential tasks of the Council of Europe is precisely, as its Statute implies, the unification of legal systems.

It is in order to work towards this in a new field that we tabled our amendment aimed at producing a definition of a political offence and conversely of an act of terrorism.

I was both moved and astonished to hear Mr. Stinus argue with great sincerity that the report submitted and the recommendations made gave an impression of one-sidedness, because at present they served Europe, whereas if they were to be applied to other, under-developed countries — possibly Arab countries — we would act differently.

I would like to say most emphatically that for me and, I believe, for the great majority of Council of Europe members, neither frontier nor colour considerations apply when it is a question of defining an act of terrorism, of defining acts which constitute a violation of human rights. If one or other of the Council of Europe member States took the liberty of taking hostages, of sending letter bombs, of causing the death of innocent people travelling by air, I am convinced that the Coucil of Europe would outlaw that member State.

It is therefore up to the members of the Council of Europe, and on a wider scale up to all countries of the world, to find definite criteria, and to define precisely what we mean by "political offences" and similarly by "terrorist acts".

In our view, and this is set out in section I of Mr. Czernetz's excellent report, there can be no justification for acts of terrorism, that is to say for acts which endanger the lives of innocent people. I have just given certain examples, namely, the taking of hostages, the sending of letter bombs and the hijacking of aircraft carrying innocent persons.

Mr. de Stexhe (continued)

I ask, and that is the aim of my amendment, that we should take this opportunity of advancing a step further along the road towards unification of laws and of their interpretation.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mrs. von Bothmer, the last speaker on the list.

Mrs. von BOTHMER (Federal Republic of Germanu) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the report by Mr. Czernetz shows clearly and emphatically the situation we face in regard to acts of terrorism which can be observed everywhere. We are all aware that something similar may happen to us any day; the same may happen to anybody in our countries. If we wish to do anything at all at this level and take direct action against terrorist acts then it seems to me that, as the previous speaker has said, the unification of basic legal principles is absolutely essential; otherwise the situation in which different States take different actions will continue. Some of the measures taken by the Federal Republic of Germany may be more effective than those taken by many other States. But in general this will not help greatly unless we are in agreement as to what can actually be done. It must also be borne in mind that the term "constitutional State" may not mean the same everywhere in the world.

I feel bound to say that the word "terrorism" is voiced the more readily since it actually concerns us in a terrible form. But we must not close our eyes to the fact that this terrorism has its roots in political set-ups and we must not at any price behave as though these laws against terrorism were, as a previous speaker said, directed only against a certain part of the world's population. We surely cannot close our eyes to the fact that at present there are many forms of terrorism in the world. To put it cynically, I do not know which one is preferable. I believe that precisely in this Assembly we must make common efforts to put matters politically in order as far as we are able. It does not behove us to inveigh against terrorism merely where it concerns us personally, and to close our eyes to the terrible things happening in other parts of the world. I shall not say that we are perhaps not entirely blameless — that might be unacceptable to many — but I must say that we are closely involved. For this reason it is, in my opinion, necessary not merely to try and do what we can against this acute danger within the European countries, but also to bring relief where we can and where we dare not close our eyes to events.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — There are no more speakers on the list and the general debate is now closed.

The Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee will reply to speakers at the end of this afternoon's sitting, before the vote on the draft recommendation, and they will give their opinion on the amendment tabled by Mr. de Stexhe.

The meeting of the Political Affairs Committee arranged for 2.30 p.m. is postponed to 8.30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

8. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I propose that the Assembly should meet at 3 p.m. with the following Orders of the Day:

- 1. Communication from the Secretary General of the Council of Europe;
- 2. Mission of the Council of Europe (Presentation by Mr. Reverdin of the report of the Political Affairs Committee and debate, Document 3281);
- 3. International terrorism (Replies by the Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee to the debate and vote on the draft recommendation, Document 3285 and amendment).

Are there any objections ?...

Mr. BLUMENFELD (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, may I have the floor?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Blumenfeld.

Mr. BLUMENFELD (Translation). — Mr. President, I would like to know for certain when the vote on the matter just discussed will take place. If I understood you rightly it is planned for the

Mr. Blumenfeld (continued)

end of the debate on Mr. Reverdin's report. That does not seem to me a good solution. I would like to propose that we hold the vote on terrorism after the presentation by Mr. Reverdin of the report on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee and that we then continue with the debate on Mr. Reverdin's report. This debate will in any case continue into tomorrow.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Mr. Blumenfeld, you know very well that this question was discussed in the Bureau.

The debate and the vote on the recommendation on international terrorism was originally fixed for tomorrow.

In order to facilitate matters, the Bureau considered that they should be put forward to this afternoon. On the basis of this decision, I consider that the reply by the Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee to the debate on terrorism should be given this afternoon after presentation and discussion of Mr. Reverdin's report.

In any case the Assembly has the final say. If it would prefer to change the items on the agenda in accordance with Mr. Blumenfeld's proposal, it is up to it to do so. I am entirely at its disposal.

We think it will be possible to hear the replies of Mr. Czernetz and Mr. Blumenfeld around 5 or 5.30 p.m. and then to proceed to the vote on the draft recommendation and the amendment.

I call Mr. Blumenfeld.

Mr. BLUMENFELD (Translation). — Mr. President, I have no wish to complicate matters. I only wish to make sure that the Assembly will be present in full force for the vote on this important point. If we are to vote on one of the most topical reports ever discussed in recent times at the end of the debate on Mr. Reverdin's report, I fear that we may have to wait until

7 p.m. and that many members of the Assembly will by then have drifted away.

This is my one plea, I am grateful to the Bureau and to you, Mr. President, for having given this debate priority because of its fundamental importance and urgency. But we must be consistent and make sure that we are all present for the vote.

As I have said, that is my only plea. I leave it to the Bureau and to yourself, Mr. President, to draw the necessary conclusions from this afternoon's debate.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Mr. Blumenfeld, it is not merely a question of the vote, but also of the reply by the Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee.

The Bureau considered that in view of its importance Mr. Reverdin's report should be given and debated at the beginning of the sitting.

I hope that the debate on Mr. Reverdin's report will finish at about 6 p.m. We can then hear the reply by Mr. Czernetz and yourself and thereafter proceed to the vote.

I am sure that all the members of this Assembly will want to be present at the sitting and that we shall therefore have a quorum when we proceed to vote this evening.

However, we cannot yet fix the exact time at which the vote will be taken, since we do not yet know how many speakers there will be on Mr. Reverdin's report.

I can only assure you that I shall do my best to make it possible for the vote to take place this evening.

Are there any objections ?...

The Orders of the Day of the next sitting are agreed.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

The Sitting is closed.

(The Sitting was closed at 12.50 p.m.)

2nd Sitting

Appendix

APPENDIX

Names of Representatives or Substitutes who signed the Attendance Register in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure:

MM	Aano	MM.	Kahn-Ackermann	MM.	Radinger	
			Karasek		Radius	
	Abens	ens		Sir	Renschler	
	Ahrens				Reverdin	
	Akçali Alber Alemyr		Kiratlioglu Kristjansson		Richter	
			Külahli		Rivière	
			Gautier (Labbé)		John Rodgers	
			La Loggia		Rossi	
			Legaret	Lord	St. Helens	
Mrs.	Weber P. (Beauguitte)		Reale (Leggieri)		Schieder	
	Bergegren Cattaneo Petrini (Mr. Bettiol) Blumenfeld		Leitner		Marquardt (Schlaga)	
			Lemmrich		Yvon (Schleiter)	
			Letschert		Schmidt Hansheinrich	
			Leu		Schmitt Robert	
	Christiansen		Leynen	Mrs.	Schuchardt	
	Collins Edward	Sir	Fitzroy Maclean	MM.	de Bruyne (Schugens)	
	Cornelissen		Mammi		Büchner (Schwencke)	
	Czernetz		Margue	Mrs.	von Bothmer	
	Delforge		Cravatte (Mart)		(Mr. Sieglerschmidt)	
	Borg Ölivier de Puget		Mason	MM.	Steel	
	(De Marco)		Mende		Stewart	
	Dequae		Moneti (Minnocci)		de Stexhe	
	Digby	Mrs.	Miotti Carli		Stinus	
	Lenzer (Dregger)	Mr.	de Montesquiou		Tanghe	
	Enders		Munkebye		Tomney	
	de Félice	MM.	Micallef (Muscat)		Treu	
	Feyzioglu		van der Werff (Nederhorst)		Üstündag	
	Fletcher		Nessler		Van Lent	
	Capelle (Flornoy)		Oestergaard		Vedovato	
	Aasen (Mr. Frydenlund)		Oguz		: Joan Vickers	
	Gessner		Öktem	MM.	Vitter	
	Gislason Withalm (Goëss) Grieve		Osborn		Voogd	
			Peart		Schmitt Henri	
			Pecoraro		(Weber Joachim)	
	Hansen		Pendry		Weiberg-Aurdal	
	Hedlund		Péridier		Vontobel (Wenk)	
	Hedström		Petersen Erling		Wiklund	
	Hocaoglu		Hauret (Petit)		Wolf	
	Hofer		Portheine	Mr.	Zaloglu	
	Holst		Bizet (de Préaumont)			
	Prescott (Jones)		Castellucci (Preti)			

List of Representatives absent or apologising for absence:

MM.	Arnaud Averardi Bohman Collins Gerard	Sir	Desmond Jung Louis O'Leary John Peel Péronnet	MM.	Quilleri Salvatore Shore Talamona Tisserand
	Coppola Dankert	IVIIVI.	Pica		Zamberletti

^{1.} The names of Substitutes who replaced absent Representatives are printed in italics, the names of such Representatives being given in brackets.

CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

TWENTY-FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION

OFFICIAL REPORT

Third Sitting

Tuesday 15 May 1973, at 3 p.m.

Summary			
1. Minutes	65	(Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria,	
2. Attendance Register	65	Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers).	
3. Communication by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe	65	5. Change in the Orders of the Day	90
Speakers: The President, MM. Toncic-Sorinj (Secretary General of the Council of Europe), Péridier, Kahn-Ackermann.	i	6. Mission of the Council of Europe (resumed debate)	91
4. Mission of the Council of Europe (debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3281)	71	Schuler, Dankert, Portheine, (Chairman of the Liberal Group), Ahrens, Alemyr, Reale, Schieder, de Stexhe, Cravatte, Piket.	
Speakers: The President, MM. Reverdin (Rapporteur), Withalm, Renschler, Capelle, Fletcher, Karasek, Digby, Czernetz, Marque, Kahn-Ackermann, Kirchschläger	i	7. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting	102 104

Mr. Vedovato, President of the Assembly, took the Chair at 3 p.m.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Sitting is open.

1. Minutes

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Minutes of Proceedings of the previous sitting have not yet been distributed. They will be submitted to the Assembly later.

2. Attendance Register

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The names of the Substitutes present at this sitting which have been notified to me will be published in the list of Representatives appended to the Minutes of Proceedings and to the Official Report of Debates.

3. Communication by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is a communication by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

Before giving the floor to Mr. Toncic-Sorinj, may I inform members of the Assembly that he is willing to reply to any questions they may care to put.

I call the Secretary General.

Mr. Lujo TONCIC-SORINJ (Secretary General of the Council of Europe). — The Council of Europe is probably the only international organisation which works and discusses its own problems in the full light of publicity. Several years ago we established a Work Programme which is known to everybody. Its advantages and its

weak points are discussed publicly and other organisations know exactly what we do. It has inter alia had the unexpected result that some of our work has been copied by others and it seems that our imagination has been the basis of the work of other organisations. This lack of concealment has also been seen recently in the fact that the Council is the only organisation which has discussed in complete frankness the problems of its own future. Although the operation as such is a useful and necessary one, it has created in some circles — and often also in the press — the false impression that we are considering not only our future activities but also our very existence.

However, as we have embarked on these endeavours, the moment has now come to draw certain conclusions. Not with absolute accuracy but in general terms we can perceive three periods in the history of the Council of Europe. The first is from its foundation until about 1959. This was the time when the bold concepts of a European Political Community and a European Defence Community were discussed, when the Council was the centre of all hopes of a quick and ambitious form of European integration. However, already during this period, after the failure of these two great designs, Western European Union and the European Communities were founded, and other organisations such as ECE in Geneva and OEEC (later OECD) in Paris developed into important technical organisations.

In the following period — from about 1959-72 — the Council of Europe maintained its great political importance, the reason being its Consultative Assembly and its growing programme of intergovernmental technical activities and the development and multiplication of European conferences of specialised Ministers.

The greater part of its Members did not belong to the Communities and the destiny of the Communities was still uncertain.

In 1972 begins the third and, for us, the decisive period. The greater part of the member countries of the Council of Europe belong also to the Communities since 1 January 1973. The policy of the member governments of the Communities is clearly in favour of a dynamic further development of this institution, including certain fields which have not been provided for in the Treaty of Rome. This development demands categorically even more urgent efforts for

collaboration between the Council of Europe and the Communities, attempts towards which go back already for several years and have been, on the Secretariat side, much increased during the past year. The third element in this new period will evidently be an attempt towards a certain form of co-operation between Eastern and Western Europe, a development which may be decisive for the future of our Organisation. It is premature to say anything definite in this latter field; it is not even possible to give a probability. It is quite uncertain whether such a co-operation between East and West will occur at all and, if so, whether this will be on a purely bilateral basis, whether some kind of a new organisation on a governmental level will be created, or whether already existing European organisations will be included; and if so, which ones.

The Council of Europe is in its administrative structure, especially in its technical activities, well fitted for such co-operation. Its ideological basis, however, which has to be maintained and respected, would demand special efforts on both sides. All this leads us to the conclusion that a time for a possible revision of the Statute of the Council of Europe has not yet come and there is no sign that it may come in the foreseeable future.

The Consultative Assembly and the Secretariat have had numerous contacts over the past year with representatives of governments concerning the future function of the Council of Europe: from the Secretariat side there were also contacts with the Secretariats of other organisations. We have also heard the opinions of many non-member countries of the Council of Europe concerning our future activities. The result can now be defined in a short formula; the Council of Europe is respected everywhere and nowhere is it contested as an organisation of the highest importance for the political unification of Europe. It should remain as it is in the future without altering its political and ideological basis. It should, however, perform its numerous functions in collaboration with other European organisations, taking account the situation in the whole of Europe.

This general summary demands a more detailed specification. It is of decisive importance that the political impetus of our Organisation should come in the future, as in the past, from the Assembly. The Assembly is the direct link, through its members, with the peoples of Europe and it is its task to be ahead of the governments. To accomplish its task, which is under present

circumstances especially difficult in view of the possible increasing importance of the European Parliament, the Assembly needs three things: its needs more financial resources, it needs more and intensified contact with the Committee of Ministers, and it needs positive support from the governments in general. It goes without saying that the prerequisite for all this is that the national parliaments do not cease to send us parliamentarians of the same high quality which, since the beginning of the Council of Europe, has made of the Assembly the parliamentary elite of our continent.

In my view and according to what I have heard by listening to the opinions expressed by many members of governments and parliamentarians and interested outsiders, the Assembly has five functions:

- 1. It is the place of the great political dialogue in Europe.
- 2. It is the place where parliamentarians of the Communities and those of other member countries of the Council of Europe will continue to meet on the basis of complete equality.
- 3. In the Assembly should be debated all subjects concerning our intergovernmental technical activities, which are the proper domain of the Council of Europe, and these in respect of all its member countries.
- 4. The Consultative Assembly is the best place in Europe for a dialogue between the representatives of our continent and parliamentarians or members of governments of other continents.
- 5. As before, the Assembly should remain the parliamentary forum for other organisations first of all OECD. I believe that here are still a lot of unused possibilities.

Whether finally the Assembly will be the place of a dialogue with governmental representatives of European non-member countries will depend not only on the policy of the Assembly but also very decisively on the attitude of these governments to the Council of Europe. Taking all these existing or possible activities of the Assembly together, I have the conviction that our Assembly will lose nothing of its importance in the future.

I turn now to the Committee of Ministers. There is no doubt that from the very beginning the governments have never used the unique possibilities of this largest European Committee of Foreign Ministers to the full. Nobody has ever prevented the governments from taking important decisions about the future of our continent and the development of European integration within our Committee of Ministers rather than anywhere else. Who has ever prevented a government from asking our Committee of Ministers to undertake decisive studies and to work out great political designs for an increased collaboration? The Committee of Ministers is the part of our Organisation which takes the final decisions and which represents the Council of Europe outside,

I am convinced that our Committee of Deputies would very much prefer to deal with farreaching political projects rather than with a multitude of more or less important administrative details, if only the governments were willing to use this instrument. It is of course easier to take a decision within a numerically smaller body of rather coherent partners than within such a large body as that of seventeen countries with sometimes wide differences in economic and social structures. Despite the fact that at the Summit Conference in The Hague in December 1969 and at the Conference in Paris in October 1972 decisions were taken "to intensify the political consultation at all levels", it was also decided that a report should be worked out before 30 June 1973 by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Nine "to propose methods to improve this political co-operation"; namely, consultation at all levels. But the time is indeed coming when exactly this, namely the greater European outlook, wil be necessary.

One of the special tasks of our Committee of Ministers, which is now undertaking an important study about the forthcoming activities of our Organisation, is to avoid our having in the future within the Council of Europe two groups of States: the privileged Nine and the underprivileged Eight. No international body is better suited than ours to tackle this problem. There is indeed no other one which could do it. The representatives of all seventeen countries come together about once a month - on the level of Ministers they could come together more than twice a year. Our Conferences of European Ministers in specialised fields, which meet on the average bi-annually, are on the whole a success, despite the fact that it is much more difficult to draft a common policy or to take a decision with a circle of seventeen, or, in the case of these conferences, often of more than seventeen.

Let us turn finally to the Secretariat. Our Intergovernmental Work Programme is planned for several years. The discussion on what are the priorities in this programme are of course endless. Practice shows that as soon as one filters the programme, opposition comes from all sides. Everyone agrees that we ought to have priorities, but there is little agreement on what are the priorities. It is pragmatic development which will solve the problem. It is more or less accepted that certain activities in Europe are of a very wide, really all-European character; culture is one, environmental problems, health, our famous Pharmacopoeia, a very great part of integration in legal matters, human rights, educational problems, the Social Charter, social security, local authorities are others.

During my meeting with President Ortoli of the Commission of the Communities, the discussion revolved around the possibility of defining a collaboration between our two organisations in the sense that everywhere where the Communities have not the right to act as legislator for their member countries — and in general terms they have this right in matters concerning the creation of an economic union, monetary and agricultural questions and certain social regulations - the field is open for contact and collaboration between the two organisations. Of course the complete partition of responsibilities to avoid duplication of work is not yet possible. The governments too would reject such clear distinctions. But what can be done, and I am sure progressively will be done, is to avoid all encouragement of duplication of work in detail and to press for collaboration wherever it is possible, which would then by itself lead to a certain practical definition of work. I hope I shall be able in the future to increase permanent practical contacts with the Communities, following a report which I presented to the Committee of Ministers last December in Paris.

The Committee of Ministers is now undertaking a detailed study of the report of the Management Survey. Such a survey is nothing new nor sensational. Other organisations such as the United Nations, OECD and NATO have undergone a similar operation which, as with everything, has its advantages and disadvantages. I can say that the greatest part of the practical proposals of a more technical nature which are made in this report have the full agreement of the Administration or reaffirm

suggestions of the Administration itself. Greater and more important problems will be dealt with in the near future in the Committee of Deputies. The part which is of primary concern for the Assembly directly and indirectly has been discussed with the Bureau, and there will be in the near future a discussion between the two organs about this part of the report. I am personally convinced that the outcome will be a positive one which will take full account of the position and interest of the Assembly.

You will be astonished that when you come to the entrance to this building and look to the righthand side you will see nothing of the new building. The reason is that it was extremely difficult and took a long time to make proper foundations. The soil is not solid and therefore it needed 919 piles of about 13 metres in depth to make a firm platform for the new building. This has now been done and everything which is above the surface will soon follow.

As I mentioned before, the Committee of Ministers has created a working group to study the functions of our Organisation in the future. This was preceded by two memoranda by the Secretariat. This is a complementary work to the remarkable report which has been presented to us by the Assembly through its Rapporteur, Mr. Reverdin. I would pay special tribute to this report as a whole, to its detailed proposals, to nearly all of which the Administration can assent, and to the spirit behind it. It is striking to see that all those mainly concerned with the character and the future of our Organisation, be it on the parliamentary or governmental side, taking account of the possibilities of the Statute and the general situation in Europe, are coming more or less to the same conclusions.

One question of course is looming over us but cannot be answered today. It is the question of whether and how far the Council of Europe can open its gates to others. This boils down to several points of detail. What in reality is the reaction of the others? So far the Council of Europe has been for the others merely a source of collecting information. Some are joining certain activities and adhering to certain conventions. But this is not the case with the countries of Eastern Europe. Without a change in their position the whole question is more or less academic. A further question is whether the governments of our member countries are willing to support such a policy of opening out and whether they express an interest of this kind to the governments of Eastern Europe. Both are still

questions without an answer. And the third problem is how far an organisation of our very strong ideological foundation can go in collaboration with such others without changing its basic philosophy. The answer is that these things are possible in the field of intergovernmental technical activities but are not possible on the parliamentary level, but this definition has not brought us very far. Although I am sure the Council will continue to do its best to promote collaboration in all possible fields with all European governments, I wonder whether we ought not to recognise that probably the whole concept of a fruitful co-operation between East and West in Europe may be for the time being a premature hope. During the whole period of all kinds of attempts at détente and collaboration in detail, the situation within the Eastern part of Europe has become more rigid with less personal freedom than before. It is evidently for the East the condition for more contacts with the West that the grouping of their own sphere should be ever firmer. But the Council of Europe is the organisation which defends the values, a respect for which seems to us a precondition for any substantial co-operation between East and West.

At a time of constant and stubborn attempt to debase the values of our civilisation, the Council of Europe is defending them. It is not only the case in East-West relations; it is also the case against the disruptive tendencies in our own society. We are defending human rights sometimes under difficult conditions; we are defending social progress and the respect of mankind by man, as a necessary corollary to economic progress, and we are defending the return of man to his natural position within nature which is threatened in our society. If we speak about the future of our Organisation we must bear in mind these elements, and if the governments would give proper importance to them the question about the Council of Europe would not come up at all. There is no other organisation on our continent which defends this fundamental philosophy in theory and in practice. We must be grateful to those who

created this organisation twenty-four years ago and to those who have worked for it during all these years that the Council of Europe, which Europe needs, is already here, because, as Maurice Schumann has said, if it were not here it would be necessary to create it. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Toncic. If anyone wishes to put a question to the Secretary General, I invite him to do so now.

I call Mr. Péridier.

Mr. PÉRIDIER (France) (Translation). — It is a practical question that I want to put to the Secretary General, and I do not think it out of place because he alone can give me the necessary information.

This question — and he may not like it very much — has to do with the staff of the Council of Europe, and more particularly with the female married staff, who at the moment are quite inadmissibly discriminated against because they are refused the social advantages granted to other members of the staff, and in particular the household allowance and the allowance for dependent children. That is quite inadmissible. The Council of Europe must apply the tests, the laws, the Statute by which it is governed.

At the last session, you told me that this question was beyond the control of the Council of Europe and had to be dealt with in agreement with other international bodies, not only the European Parliament, but UNO, OECD, NATO, and others whose names I do not remember. But is it absolutely necessary for the Council of Europe to wait to take a decision until these other international organisations do so? I repeat, we have the texts by which we are governed.

There is first of all the Convention on Human Righs which lays it down that in matters of work there shall be no discrimination on account of sex. It is surely not much to ask that the Council of Europe apply the European Convention on Human Rights.

Mr. Péridier (continued)

But there is also the Council of Europe Staff Regulations approved by the Committee of Ministers, which make it clear by the wording of Article 13 that there shall be no discrimination and that the rule shall be the same for all members of the Council's staff, whether male or female.

The Secretary General must also know that there is something more than that: a decision by the Appeals Board of 10 April 1973 in the Artzet case, in which the Board found against the Council of Europe.

We really must apply the texts by which we are governed, the legal decisions and the Convention on Human Rights. For if the Council of Europe applies neither the Staff Social Charter nor the legal decisions, I wonder whether there is any point in our going on passing resolutions and recommendations.

The Secretary General will perhaps reply that this does not depend entirely on him, that it depends to a large extent on the Committee of Ministers. That may be so, but the Committee of Ministers must be made to face up to their responsibilities.

I repeat, the Appeals Board did not find against the Committee of Ministers; it found against the Council of Europe. So it is we who have to apply that decision. And we must tell the Committee of Ministers that we have decided to apply it.

I want to know if the Secretary General agrees with this and whether, as I am asking him to do, he will really make the Ministers face up to their responsibilities on this question, which must now be settled at all costs.

I know the Board found against the Council of Europe in a case which concerned only one individual. But now sixty-seven requests have been made to you, and if they do not receive a favourable reply from you, these sixty-seven members of the staff will put in individual appeals. Are we going to wait to decide till the Board has found against us sixty-seven times?

This question must be settled now, and if the Secretary General can give me some definite information on this point, I shall be most grateful.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Secretary General.

Mr. TONCIC-SORINJ. — It is with the greatest pleasure that I answer this question, and I am very grateful to Mr. Péridier for putting it to me. From a certain point of view he is knocking with great energy at an open door, for it was I who put forward for the first time this problem of discrimination in our Organisation, as in the others, to the respective bodies.

But what are the respective bodies? The governments are of the opinion that all these rules — and there are existing rules for the Council — have to go to the Intergovernmental Committee in Paris, which is the body instituted by the governments for the regulation of all these questions in the six organisations. This is the standpoint of the governments who are represented on the Committee of Ministers, and this question of discrimination in matters of allowances, to which you referred just now, was put by me more than six months ago to this committee in Paris.

We have been shown a lot of sympathy, and a sort of positive attitude, to the effect that if we want to increase the financial implications we have to lower the allowances already given to male members of the Organisation. This is not something that I can accept. I cannot accept a solution which gives justice on one side and diminishes the acquired rights of others. So the problem is still unsolved.

Meanwhile, there has been the decision of the Appeals Board. The interesting point about this is that it does not criticise my decision. The decision I had to take was based upon the existing rules, and it was impossible to take another decision. The decision of the Appeals Board criticises the resolution taken by the Committee of Ministers, which is the basis of all the rulings in this field in the Assembly. By attacking my detailed decision they attack the resolution of the Committee of Ministers, with all kinds of arguments into which I do not want to enter at this stage. This is a very interesting development which, however, as such may not remain uncontested.

However, this decision will of course be applied and it is again I who will on the next occasion propose to the Committee of Ministers a new resolution which avoids all this discrimination, as we had not obtained progress in Paris and because we have here a decision of the Appeals Board which takes account of the more basic ideas behind the whole problem.

I will now put to the Committee of Ministers the question "Will you change the rule by a new resolution for the future?" because, as has been said by Mr. Péridier, it may well be that many other similar cases will arise in the Assembly.

As long as the rule exists, I am obliged to decide as I have decided. I will, therefore, press for a new resolution in the Committee of Ministers, which will provide the opportunity to decide in the way which both Mr. Péridier and I and the members of the staff concerned desire.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Are you satisfied with that reply, Mr. Péridier?

Mr. PÉRIDIER (Translation). — I am grateful to the Secretary General for the explanation he has just given me, but I am sorry to have to say I am not satisfied.

The Secretary General tells us that he is awaiting a new decision by the Committee of Ministers, but they have already passed a resolution, and the Appeals Board — whose decision has the force of law — has stated that it cannot be ruled by it because the Committee of Ministers has no right to go against the Staff Regulations which they themselves adopted.

There must be regulations and they must be applied.

(Applause from some benches)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Kahn-Ackermann.

Mr. KAHN-ACKERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, I would like to express strong support for the question put by the previous speaker. I wish to ask the Secretary General whether he considers it tolerable that precisely the Council of Europe, the Assembly of all democratic States in Europe, should as yet have no proper trade union organisation for its staff and that staff representation should not be regulated by proper Staff Rules as is the case in our member States. This is surely the least which those working with and for the Council of Europe can expect.

Since the Committee of Ministers has authorised the Secretary General to represent it, I would like to ask him whether we can expect him to insist during negotiations between the

Council of Europe and the staff representatives — who, I believe, have in the meantime been or are about to be elected — that this question be solved at the latest by 1 September 1973 by adopting a modern method of dealing with staff representation similar to that adopted in a member State.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Secretary General.

Mr. TONCIC-SORINJ (Translation). — Mr. President, I can certainly give Mr. Kahn-Ackermann the assurance he requires because I have already done what he asks.

The problem is this: Staff Regulations exist, but they are not Staff Rules as they exist in certain other organisations. Consequently, I prepared a report some time ago which has in the meantime been transmitted to the Committee of Ministers. This report contains a great number of points; it examines the problem from all sides and concludes with certain ideas and proposals, including that of establishing proper Staff Rules,

In connection with this report the Committee of Ministers held a meeting and asked for a written proposal from the staff setting out precisely how they envisage representation. The three persons who are to prepare this document should represent the vast majority of the staff.

There will then be the Secretariat report and the written opinion of the staff. I assume that these will be ready by June, at latest by September. The Committee of Ministers will then be in a position to discuss these matters and to take decisions. I have already said that the proposal rightly insisted on by Mr. Kahn-Ackermann is contained in my report to the Committee of Ministers.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Assembly takes note of the communication by the Secretary General.

4. Mission of the Council of Europe

(Debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3281)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the presentation and discussion of the report of the Political Affairs Committee on the mission of the Council of Europe, Document 3281.

The President (continued)

I call Mr. Reverdin, Rapporteur of the Political Affairs Committee.

Mr. REVERDIN (Switzerland) (Translation). — Mr. President, Mr. Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to begin by giving you some idea of how the working party went about the task you entrusted to it. It was to take the form of an enquiry, and this could not begin till the decisions about enlarging the Common Market had been taken.

The working party began its series of visits by going to Paris on 27 November. Unfortunately, in our unhappy Europe there is still a certain amount of political disorder. There are elections in one country; a government crisis in another; a state of emergency in a third. This just shows you how difficult it was to arrange these visits. They were spread over five months and the final ones took place only shortly before this session opened, with the Netherlands on 25 April and with Ireland on 30 April.

How was the work organised? If you are to understand the spirit in which the report is drafted, you must know about that.

In every case the working party was received by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, except in Bonn, where the Minister, Mr. Scheel, was ill and had instructed Mr. Mörsch, the Secretary of State, to look after us. So far as Cyprus is concerned, since it is not represented in the Assembly, we thought it preferable to meet Mr. Christofidis in Paris.

The meetings took place in the following conditions. The Minister for Foreign Affairs had prepared himself for them in each case. One of the advantages of the exercise was that in each capital the Council of Europe file was taken out of its pigeonhole and looked at by the Minister and his assistants. The result was that everywhere the question was considered not from the angle of whether the Council of Europe has any raison d'être, but of what its activities should be now that nine of its Members, and among them the four States with the largest population, economic strength and influence, belong to the Community.

This preliminary examination took place in each capital. In so far as it could, the working party sent three, sometimes two, and in one case one of its members to each capital. In each case the Permanent Representative to Strasbourg, and in almost all countries the head of the national delegation, took part in the conversations.

Thus, in the course of often very protracted discussions, we considered the future activities of the Council of Europe. A report was drafted by the working party assisted by MM. Hornecker, Reuter and Venables, who devoted a great deal of time to this task. After each visit, the Minutes were submitted to the Minister concerned and altered if the Minister so requested. This fat file contains the Minutes of the seventeen meetings which took place.

Everywhere our reception was frank and friendly and the problem was always tackled in a very positive way.

Some of you at any rate will probably have been surprised by the restraint displayed in the report. We were faced with two alternatives: we could either produce some purple patches which would project the future image of the Council of Europe as we would like to see it — but unfortunately those purple patches would have remained a mere rhetorical exercise; or we could keep our feet on the ground and present you, as we have preferred to do, with a realistic report representing what we feel to be the general consensus of opinion at the moment.

Let me dot the i's and cross the t's: in no capital was the slightest doubt expressed about the need to maintain a strong Council of Europe capable of tackling its own tasks. The Council is felt to be one of the corner-stones in the building of Europe. But how to define its exact place in the new set-up is not easy, and we met with different although not divergent views about that.

So we could choose between presenting you with some purple patches or with a rather dreary but realistic report. We chose to present you with a realistic report on what is possible at the present moment. It tries on the one hand to take stock of the situation, and on the other to define the logistic basis from which the Council of Europe can operate in future.

I must explain something else to you. The recommendation before you deals with what we want to say to the Committee of Ministers. The working party remains at the disposal of the six "Wise Men" whom the Committee of Ministers have appointed to examine the problem that we have been dealing with for the last six months. A number of points in the report which concern the

Mr. Reverdin (continued)

Assembly alone are not covered by the recommendation. Perhaps we might draft an order directed to ourselves. The Assembly is master in its own house and therefore does not have to put these points in a recommendation to the Committee of Ministers.

The first and most important point to be kept in mind is, in my view, that the Council of Europe is not the only organisation working for democratic European unification or integration. There are others. One of those others, the Community, has just acquired a great deal more power and influence than it had before. Relations between the Council of Europe and the Community must therefore be adapted to fit the new situation created by enlargement.

As we progressed in our conversations in the capitals, it became clear that there was one principle which must underlie all we do: the principle of complementarity between the two institutions. I say complementarity deliberately, not "subsidiarity". Obviously, there are a great many fields in which the Community, with its enormous resources, with all the money it has at its disposal, with its legions of officials, will take action, and in which the Council of Europe, too, will be active. A small field, that no one will dispute, will be reserved for the Council. In other fields, the Community alone will act. But there are vast fields in which both organisations will work. It is in the interest of all the member States - of the governments of the Nine in particular that there should be a constant exchange of information between the two institutions at all levels, that there be permanent co-ordination between the two, for our governments would never agree to our squandering their resources and entering into unhealthy competition at their expense to the detriment of European unity.

Hesiod, in his day, drew a distinction between the two forms of contest: rivalry, which is productive, and mere competition, which is ruinous and destructive. In our relations with the Common Market there is room for rivalry, but in no circumstances for sterile competition. Both sides must think not in terms of prestige, but of service, of service to a cause which is the same for us both — of the difficult road that the whole of democratic Europe must tread to reach a flexible and effective form of unity.

In the present state of affairs it will not be easy. On the Council's side there is a certain amount of scepticism — quite wrongly, I believe — and on the Common Market's side there is often a quite unbelievable self-confidence, which would make such a get-together psychologically difficult. We feel that very strongly when we meet our colleagues from the European Parliament in this hall at one of our Joint Meetings — that is, when they condescend to come here and occupy the places reserved for them.

What we have to do now is try to make everyone realise that both organisations have the same work to do for Europe and that therefore they really are complementary.

If we fail in this attempt, we shall inevitably find that in Europe, in that democratic Europe which is trying so hard to give some kind of shape to its unity, two classes of State — as the Secretary General said just now — are growing up — first-class States, and second-class States which will have no part in the deliberations of the Nine, and who will inevitably feel themselves to be inferior. And nothing makes people more aggressive than a feeling of inferiority. Fortunately, the governments of the Nine — we became convinced of this — know that this problem exists and give it its full political significance.

It is not so clear that that is the case where the Brussels administration is concerned. We must do everything possible to see that it becomes so.

The recommendation says nothing about relations between our Assembly and the European Parliament. As I said, they have no place in a recommendation to the Committee of Ministers. But that does not mean that we should not tackle them with all possible energy — and the working party is convinced that we should. That

Mr. Reverdin (continued)

is the job of our President, of our Bureau, and until it is dissolved the working party will naturally remain at their disposal.

We have to get our relations with the European Parliament on to a new basis. There will be a certain amount of resistance to overcome, but we can deploy some very good arguments. The essential thing is to find a sufficiently flexible formula to permit of complementarity between the two organisations and to ensure that the one in which all the democratic countries of Europe have an equal place preserves some important functions, if not all it has had up to now.

At real political level, we are presenting a recommendation which seems to us essential.

The Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, who is with us this afternoon, will have noted that only one of the Nine was represented by its Foreign Minister at the session which has just taken place. Sir Alec Douglas Home was there in his capacity as Chairman. His eight colleagues were represented by Secretaries of State or by senior officials.

We cannot blame them for this. The unfortunate Foreign Ministers of the Nine spend their lives commuting to Brussels or Luxembourg. But we believe it essential that at least once a year the Committee of Ministers should meet at ministerial level just after the Council of Ministers of the Nine if possible, so that contact may be maintained between the Foreign Ministers of the Nine and those of the other Eight. That is extremely important if we want the whole of democratic Europe to adopt an unambiguous attitude in its relations with Eastern Europe, with the non-member countries of Western Europe, and with the rest of the world.

The Council of Europe would have greater political weight if these meetings took place as we suggest, and if in this way the Foreign Ministers of the "non-Nine" could, at least once a year, co-ordinate their ideas with those of their colleagues of the Nine. I personally belong to a country whose Federal Councillors — Ministers — were never, in the old days, expected to go abroad. That was very useful when one of them

was able to say in 1938 or 1939: Schweizerische Bundesräte pilgern nicht nach Berchtesgaden (Swiss Ministers do not go on pilgrimage to Berchtesgaden). But that was also the cause of our real diplomatic isolation, and I would be rather afraid of the "non-Nine" coming to feel a little isolated in Europe if those responsible for their foreign policy had no regular opportunity of exchanging views and making their opinions known to their colleagues of the Nine.

The draft recommendation before you deals with the Council of Europe's internal problems. In our view — and we have tried to be as honest as we can — the report and the recommendation reflect the consensus of opinion among the Foreign Ministers of the member countries of the Council. Regret was expressed everywhere that the Council of Europe, with its restricted administrative and financial means, had rather a tendency to blossom forth, to expand, to disperse its forces. Everywhere, it was recommended that the Council of Europe concentrate its activities in fields where it can really do something effective.

We have drawn up a list, which is not absolutely complete, of the fields in which we believe the Council of Europe should now concentrate its activities. We are convinced this would make them more valuable. It is always dangerous for an organisation to dabble in fields in which it is not expert, where it lacks the really competent personnel to tackle the problems it claims to solve. We were told this so insistently in all the capitals that we felt it essential to put it in the report.

The thing that seems most essential to us members of the working party, who have done what work we could, taken up, as each of us was, by political crises, elections, and parliamentary or other obligations in our own countries, unable to meet as often as we would have liked — the most essential thing, I repeat, is that the Council of Europe — as Mr. Kirchschläger said — shall remain a political body, and not become an academy for human rights, for the environment, or for what have you.

Up to now, the Assembly has been able to bring to this rostrum not only a large number of personalities from the member countries, but also representatives of close by and of far away

Mr. Reverdin (continued)

countries, representatives of the parliaments of countries with a political system and democratic outlook similar to our own. The Assembly must make a point of continuing along this line, and the announcement made yesterday that Mrs. Golda Meir was coming to visit us proves that we have genuine political prestige. The Assembly must make sure that there is always, here in Strasbourg, a political forum for the dialogue between European countries and between Europe and the rest of the world.

So far as the Committee of Ministers is concerned, we have been forced to admit that the Organisation as it is at present leads to one disappointment after another for those who would like it to become a real force and to be really effective. That is not the fault of the Ministers' Deputies, still less of the Ministers who take the trouble to come to the meetings. The fault lies in the excess of work and of meetings which weigh too heavily on the Foreign Ministers, particularly those of the Nine.

In conclusion, I want to repeat that in the report before you we have done our best to reflect the present consensus of opinion between the member States. Our aim is to outline as specifically as possible the basic programme for the Council's future activities. It is a kind of operation in logistics. The report is not trying to set up a model of what the Council of Europe should become and to make the facts conform to it. It is a report in a deliberately minor key. We thought it was more honest to present it to you like this and to tell you what the real prospects are, than for us all to launch out into some rhetorical exercise and present the Ministers with recommendations which would probably never be followed up.

That does not mean that the working party's conclusions are in any way defeatist. Quite the contrary. But we have assessed the effort we shall have to make everywhere in the Council to increase our efficiency, and the immense importance of the formula which must be found if complementarity between Strasbourg and Brussels is to become a reality.

I said in the report and I repeat now: the onus is essentially on the governments of the Nine.

I think I am interpreting the feelings of the working party in addressing a very urgent appeal to the governments of the Nine. It has already been put to them by the Italian Foreign Minister. The Council of Europe must be made an increasingly effective instrument if there is not to be a divorce in Europe between the first-class States and those who, at least so far as anything important is concerned, may occasionally be accorded a seat on the side-lines as observers at meetings of the Nine in Brussels. If it comes to that, it will be a sad day both for the Community and for Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Before I call the many speakers who are down on the list, I want to thank the working party and its Chairman, Mr. Reverdin, for the excellent work they have done in consulting the governments and contacting the different departments concerned. I think the draft recommendation will provide a good guide to the future for the Council of Europe.

I also want to thank Mr. Kirchschläger, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria and Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers, who is here with us now and has agreed to speak at the end of the debate.

I have to remind the Assembly that the list of speakers will close in quarter of an hour.

The first speaker in the debate is Mr. Withalm, whom I now call.

Mr. WITHALM (Austria) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, politicians and journalists are again discussing whether the Council of Europe has a raison d'être and if so what are its tasks.

For lack of time I shall only be able to deal with the fundamental question of its existence which also seems to me to be the crucial preliminary one; there is surely little point in discussing the tasks of an organisation as long as its right to exist is under discussion.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am fully aware of the significance of the role of the European Com-

Mr. Withalm (continued)

munities. But I do not believe that only the European Communities can form the core of a future greater Europe. The tasks of the European Communities on the one hand and those of the Council of Europe on the other are at very different levels. Both institutions have tasks of great importance for Europe, each according to its nature.

And this brings me to the question of the Council of Europe's right to exist. Let me answer this question with a definite, a convinced, I would say passionate "yes", in my dual capacity as a European and as a native of a small neutral country which is not a Member of the European Communities.

Ladies and Gentlemen, how often have we neutrals had to point out during the past ten years that Europe does not merely consist of the Six; similarly, Europe today does not consist merely of the nine member States of the European Communities.

Nor can the seventeen member States of the Council of Europe be identified with Europe. We must always keep the whole of Europe in mind and must do everything to keep the paths leading to this greater Europe open and, if necessary, to open them.

On 18 April, the Zurcher Weltwoche wrote: "Austria would like to put the Council of Europe back on its feet". Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, that is precisely what we Austrians would like to do, but we have absolutely no illusions about the possibilities open to us as a small State.

We can, however, make a small, modest contribution and this we do gladly because we are convinced that the Council of Europe has a very great deal to offer Europe.

If all of us, great and small, member States as well as non-member States of the European Communities, are ready to make such a contribution, the debates about the raison d'être of the Council of Europe will soon cease and all Europe

will look to the Council of Europe with hope and confidence.

In conclusion, a very frank and personal comment. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Assembly of the Council of Europe for a year and throughout that year I have listened to discussions at each session on the meaning and purpose of the Council of Europe, on its right to exist, on its future tasks.

Is it really surprising, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the Council of Europe is discussed publicly, when we in the Assembly never stop chewing over this question in our debates? In my opinion it is high time to stop and to breathe life into the Council of Europe. Otherwise — and I speak as an Austrian — the same might happen to us, Ladies and Gentlemen, as happened to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy fifty-five years ago. For years and decades this structure in the heart of Europe in which, after all, more than a dozen nations had lived for centuries in peace together, was pronounced incapable of existence. Everything was done to destroy this structure. And in 1918 that actually happened. Something which now, decades later, we are desperately trying to rebuild, was destroyed deliberately, or at least by gross negligence.

Ladies and Gentlemen, beware lest it be said in future years: in the seventies of the twentieth century we Europeans had a Council of Europe. Those then responsible were unfortunately incapable of making use of the opportunities it offered Europe.

In this connection a brief comment on the actual report. The Council of Europe has always been a political body. It still is and must remain a political body; otherwise, one day, it will simply have vanished.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am glad, indeed I am happy that the revised version of the report clearly shows the vocation of the Council of Europe as a political body. I thank the Rapporteur for this. I feel we should all congratulate him on the report, and above all thank him for the months of work which he and his working party have put into it.

Mr. Withalm (continued)

Ladies and Gentlement, I am delighted — and on this note I end my speech — that this morning the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers declared his unequivocal support for the political mission of the Council of Europe.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Renschler.

Mr. RENSCHLER (Switzerland) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the debate in the Assembly on the future of the Council of Europe coincides for us Swiss with the tenth anniversary of our membership of the Council of Europe. This gives us, therefore, a special opportunity of reviewing the past while looking towards the future.

From the Swiss point of view, membership of the Council of Europe has been well worth while. The Consultative Assembly is the only European forum at parliamentary level where we have a say and a share in decisions and where the special concerns of the small neutral countries can be discussed. We feel at home here and securely in Europe. In this House there is tolerance, mutual respect and freedom of decision.

The structures and the powers of the Council of Europe ensure that it not become a European centre of power where the pawns can be moved around at will. The strength of the Council of Europe lies less in actual decision-making than in the voluntary execution of joint decisions at national level. The force which supports and distinguishes the Council of Europe is thus a moral, rather than a political force, based on solidarity.

This necessarily leads to a certain feeling of weakness in comparison with the Brussels Communities which, with the expansion and realisation of their aims, are becoming a growing power factor in Europe. This feeling of weakness has doubtless cast its shadow over today's discussions. But it would be wrong and a waste of

effort if we wished to compensate for our lack of political weight in comparison with Brussels and the Community by re-orienting and reshaping the work of the Council of Europe. Without a basic structural change — which in my opinion is hardly desirable at the present time — this aim cannot be achieved. We would be doing European integration ill-service if we tried to make the Council of Europe compete with the Community, and the Consultative Assembly compete with the European Parliament.

I note with satisfaction that both the working party and the governments contacted by it see no contradictions in the Brussels-Strasbourg relationship, but rather consider it a useful partnership. This point of view also forms the basis for the excellent report by Mr. Reverdin and for the recommendations resulting from it. Both have my hearty agreement.

I have, however, one criticism of the Political Affairs Committee's recommendation. Paragraph 11 draws attention to the establishment of priorities. However, paragraph 12 has now been so expanded that the priorities are no longer visible. Very few fields excepted, such as for instance refugee questions, all the activities of the Council of Europe are mentioned. I personally would have welcomed it if we had indeed restricted ourselves to priorities. The more so since the penetration of the Council of Europe into various areas is or will in future be weakened.

Although I am a member of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development and an Alternate in the Political Affairs Committee, I nevertheless believe that the Council of Europe is not of decisive significance in economic questions nor — and here I differ from Mr. Reverdin and Mr. Withalm — in the field of politics in the narrower sense. This will not be changed by upgrading the two committees of the Consultative Assembly and giving them more importance. The Council of Europe does not exist merely by the will of the Consultative Assembly, but also as a result of the action, and unfortunately of the omissions, of the Committee of Ministers.

Mr. Renschler (continued)

As regards the fixing of priorities, let me select a few individual points which I consider worthy of special attention and which in my opinion show the Council of Europe very emphatically as a moral force of European integration.

Human rights are doubtless in the foreground and the Council of Europe is their European conscience and their guardian. The application and building up of the European Human Rights Convention is one of the Council's most important and noblest tasks. I regret that the recommendations only mention the protection and not the development of human rights.

The European Social Charter which forms, as it were, a socio-political supplement to the Human Rights Convention, also deserves priority. We shall be discussing the report on the application of the Social Charter during this session, and we shall see that in this field too, in social questions, there is much to catch up with and much to complete.

A further subject which should be greatly emphasised in the Council of Europe's work is the question of migrant workers, and in this connection we should like to see the final adoption of the European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers referred to this morning. I also believe that in this connection it would be worthwhile if the Council of Europe considered what is to happen to the Resettlement Fund which could be supplemented and extended.

One last point. The report rightly mentions the significance of the Consultative Assembly as a forum for a dialogue with other continents. I too consider this task meaningful, but it should not be given excessive importance. European integration must remain our main task. For this reason I am glad to see the suggestion in the report that members of East European governments should also have the opportunity of addressing the Consultative Assembly. It is, however, my opinion that we should not only invite members of governments to speak here but also leading personalities from important European organisations of employers and em-

ployed and of scientific and cultural organisations.

The Council of Europe has become a part of Europe. It has already done remarkable things and will achieve further successes. In my opinion its future will be assured if we do not measure the value of the Council of Europe by its usefulness to us, politicians, but by its value to the European peoples.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The list of speakers is closed. There are nineteen names on the list, so I must ask speakers to keep to their time-limit.

I call Mr. Capelle.

Mr. CAPELLE (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, it is very fortunate for us that, at this turning-point in the life of the Council of Europe, we have had Mr. Reverdin with all his authority acting as Chairman in a very critical undertaking, that of acquiring information, drafting a report and presenting recommendations to us. He quite rightly said that, to be any use, these recommendations must be both wise and cautious, and that there must be no purple patches. That is quite right, but as I personally have no need to make what I say sound good since I am speaking only for myself, I can be quite specific about three particular points.

First, we must avoid internal disputes in the Council when they lead nowhere and worse still when they are harmful. I am thinking not only of the disputes about method that the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers was warning us against this morning, but also of disputes about intentions, such as those we witnessed this morning on the subject of the exercise of democratic freedoms in a member country.

Really, the countries which are peaceful and prosperous should try to reach a better understanding of those faced with a serious crisis. The appearance of covetousness in the Mediterranean basin has turned it into a political volcano. We must remember, too, that it is the melting-pot of ideas, the cradle of our civilisation and our democracy. Comfortably-off Europe

Mr. Capelle (continued)

needs Mediterranean Europe, even when it is sick. It needs the friendship and co-operation of the Turkish Republic. It also needs the participation of Cyprus, whose soil, so steeped in history, is common to two great civilisations.

In the second place, it should be recognised that there are certain privileged fields where the Council of Europe is concerned. There will be no reserved fields, as Mr. Reverdin says in his report, but the Brussels Nine should be brought to realise the existence of fields in which the Council of Europe provides a privileged forum. Those are the fields set out clearly in section IV of the recommendation.

My third point is that we must try to increase the effectiveness of political action by one institution not only for purposes of co-ordination, but also for purposes of decision. We welcome what the Committee of Ministers has done since the Council of Europe was created, but fortunately things have advanced a little since then, and we have to recognise that European affairs do not constitute the sum total of the foreign affairs of the member countries. European affairs are above all the sum total of internal affairs.

That is why, without giving up the discussion and agreement between specialised Ministers which is so essential, the time seems to have come to draw certain conclusions and to make a precise proposal which does not feature in the draft recommendation. That may be regarded as a purple patch, but it is a very sincere wish on my part. I also note — as our Rapporteur said — that it is very difficult for the Foreign Ministers actually to be present at meetings concerning Council of Europe affairs, and that is a second reason for my wish, which is this:

I wish each of our governments, in view of the importance of our common programmes, would agree to create a Minister for European Affairs. I would like this Minister's task to be a "horizontal" one, that is to say, I would like him to be empowered, as the French Ministers of State system would put it, to enter into contact with his opposite numbers, and I would like the creation of these Ministers to be the prelude to the establishment of a real European Cabinet, opening the way to the creation of a supernational authority which, in certain specific fields of common interest, will take and apply

decisions of common interest to the seventeen countries of the Council of Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Fletcher.

Mr. FLETCHER (United Kingdom). — I thank Mr. Reverdin for his report, largely because it was written as a report. It could easily have been a death certificate, for there are many voices, not all of them present in Strasbourg this week, which have written off this Assembly. They belong to people who imagine that, since the task set for this Organisation in 1949 was the unification of Europe, and since the Six have now become the Nine, and since the Nine have an institution which is called a Parliament, that becomes pre-eminent among all European institutions, and other institutions in Europe thereby are relegated to an inferior status. According to this view, all that we have to do now is. first of all, to conduct ourselves as a very genteel and rather middle-aged debating society, and, secondly, over the next ten years say nothing about anything, annoy nobody, and then disappear into the sands of time as though we had never existed.

Quite frankly, whilst I have the greatest respect for the parliamentarians whe come here and belong to the Parliament of the Nine. I feel no inferiority complex at all when I meet members of that Parliament. In the first place, it is not what I was always brought up to believe in my own country is a real Parliament. Perhaps here and there in its deliberations there might be an observation made about whether it is right to charge so-and-so per pound for the cheap butter which is sold to Russian housewives as a consequence of this lunatic Common Agricultural Policy, but the Parliament has no power whatever to modify that policy or to throw it into the dustbin. It has the theoretical power to sack the Commission, the executive organ of the Europe of the Nine, but it has no other powers whatever. I fervently hope that it will acquire further powers. As its members have been reminded by Mr. Michael Stewart, one of the members of my own delegation, parliaments acquire power not by praying and waiting for it to drop from heaven but by grabbing it and fighting for it.

In my own country, not only was the evolution of parliament a painful process; it was a bloody process. We had to cut off the head of a king Mr. Fletcher (continued)

and defeat the same king in no fewer than a dozen bloody battles before parliament became established as the sovereign institution.

I am not suggesting that I want that particular period of history repeated in Europe — God forbid. Nevertheless, it illustrates in a rather dramatic form that parliaments get nothing that they are not prepared to demand and fight for and that it is the duty of parliamentarians not to pass votes of thanks to Ministers, pat them on the back, say what nice chaps they are and cover them with all sorts of eulogies and praise. It is the job of parliamentarians to make themselves nuisances and to be thorns in the flesh of Ministers.

I hope this will happen in the Parliament of the Nine. It is not happening yet. Until it does happen, I do not feel myself to be an inferior being as a member of this Assembly in relation to the "superior" beings who belong to the other Assembly.

Mr. Reverdin complained that he had to produce a dull report and said he would have liked to produce a more lively one. Frankly, I wish he had. With his wisdom perhaps he might produce a second much more fiery report. There is, I think, something in this institution of democracy and the freedom that flows from it about which in 1973 we ought to be getting fiery.

Most of the constituents in our home countries are unfortunately becoming bored with democracy. It cannot deliver the goods immediately. Everybody wants everything at once, and democracy is necessarily a slow process. This is bringing parliaments, including my own, to a certain degree of contempt — fostered by irresponsible demagogues — in election after election.

Other things, too, are happening to democracy. There is the very serious threat which is again dramatically illustrated by the breakdown of society in that tormented province of the United Kingdom, Northern Ireland. Incidentally, I challenge very strongly the view of the last speaker that there should be no political controversy in this Assembly, that there shall not be criticism, that people shall not stand up and make fiery remarks about citizens of other countries when they feel those other countries are neglecting the duties of democrats. I have

frequently defended certainly the policy of the British Army in Northern Ireland, if not exactly the policy of the British Government in Northern Ireland, and will continue to do so. But I concede to every member of the Assembly the right to challenge the policy pursued both by the government of my country and by the people as a whole. Were that not so, this would become a lifeless debating chamber.

In so far as we are the custodians of democratic values in Europe and in so far as we write, discuss and vote on reports and the prescribed minimum standard of behaviour in a score of different fields, we have the duty now to be somewhat more aggressive about our democratic beliefs.

As an Assembly, whilst maintaining the friendliest of relations with the Parliament of the Nine, we ought at the same time, as an organisation of democrats, to level continued criticism at the bureaucracy that is growing up inside the Common Market and may very well twist and distort the genuine idealism which went into the creation of the Community of the Six. Not only have we a right to do that; we have a duty to do it, because we are an association of seventeen nations committed to democratic values. We are older than the Parliament of the Nine. Dare I suggest that by virtue of that fact we may be a little wiser than the parliamentarians of the Nine.

I sincerely hope that before my term in this Assembly comes to an end, we will see back in this Assembly representatives of that Greece which invented democracy in the first place.

I want the influence of this Assembly to extend itself both geographically and in depth. Because I want that, I want this to become a much more argumentative and aggressive Assembly than it is perhaps now. Our proper relationship with the Parliament of the Nine is certainly that of a friendly critic, but equally certainly that of a formidable critic and a formidable advocate of democratic values in all levels of society.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Karasek.

Mr. KARASEK (Austria) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, following

Mr. Karasek (continued)

the example of previous speakers, I too would like — as an Austrian — to thank Mr. Reverdin, the Rapporteur, most warmly for the excellent report he submitted to us.

The report is proof indeed that this Assembly is fully aware of its responsibility for the future development of the Council of Europe and thus for the future development of our European continent.

It is no accident that the Austrian members of this Assembly have, whatever their political allegiance, been very active in the debate on the future role of the Council of Europe.

Nor is it by accident that in the Political Affairs Committee we introduced an amendment to Mr. Reverdin's admirable report, asking that the future role of the Council of Europe as a political instrument in the consultation and coordination of the seventeen European States should be emphasised in the report far more strongly than it was in the original version.

The Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Mr. Toncic, mentioned in his report today that the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe had actually never used the Council of Europe as an instrument for political co-ordination during the past twenty-five years. I must say it is very distressing to hear this said about an institution which was set up for the purpose of creating a greater Europe, a greater Europe as a political instrument.

The very emphatic request that the Council of Europe should in future be considered as a political instrument is not addressed primarily to ourselves but to the Committee of Ministers. I would like to say here clearly and without leaving any room for doubt: this is addressed not in the first place to the Foreign Ministers of the Seventeen, but mainly to the Foreign Ministers of the Nine. This must be said very clearly, because it seems to me depressing — and I shall not preserve the same courteous discretion as Mr. Reverdin who shows such great

understanding — that precisely after a mission such as the one undertaken by Mr. Reverdin in the seventeen States, only one of the nine Foreign Ministers has considered it worthwhile to attend this Assembly on the occasion of so significant a debate. I personally fail absolutely to understand this attitude. It would have been correct if the majority of the nine Foreign Ministers had appeared here in Strasbourg at such a moment in order to demonstrate their real understanding of the request conveyed to them by the Assembly through this mission. Let me repeat that it is for this reason that we Austrians insisted so strongly that the political role of the Council of Europe should be emphasised in section I of paragraph 12 of the recommendation. I say this as the representative of a neutral country which identifies politically with Western Europe, and I hope our neutrality will not be taken as meaning the kind of neutrality which attempts, wherever possible, to remain aloof from political decision-making. Our contribution vesterday in the Political Affairs Committee as well as today should surely prove that we as neutrals recognise our political role, our political duties towards all Europe, towards Western Europe, towards free Europe, towards democratic Europe. That is the first point.

My second point. The Foreign Ministers, Mr. President, complain that there is so much on the agendas of the various sittings of the Committee of Ministers that they do not get around to discussing the real problems, the problems that really matter. I could recommend to the Foreign Ministers a simple way out of their difficulties, and my proposed amendment of yesterday which is echoed also in paragraph 12, section V (b) of our draft recommendation is along these lines.

Both the machinery and the possibility exist for delegation of powers by Foreign Ministers in respect of technical questions. To my mind this delegation of powers should not merely cover consultation, but it should — and this seems to me important — mean authority to take decisions. It is difficult to see why, when Ministers of Justice or Ministers of Culture meet under the auspices of the Council of Europe, they can, as it were, move only as directed by

Mr. Karasek (continued)

the Foreign Ministers. It is difficult to understand why everything has to go through the bottleneck of the Committee of Ministers which consists of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. I consider this way of treating a specialised Minister indefensible. I believe I see the Foreign Minister nodding his agreement. He knows that my sympathies are both with diplomacy as such and also with the concerns of the Foreign Minister, but I nevertheless believe that we must say that this is a completely outdated rule which has somehow slipped into our Statute. In future, when the Ministers of Culture, Science or Justice meet, they too should have the possibility of taking decisions without the approval of the Foreign Ministers being required, I cannot imagine any of our national governments sending specialised Ministers to conferences without empowering them to say Yes or No.

My third and last point. How can we find out if there is any willingness to give the Council of Europe new possibilities of future development? In this connection I would very briefly mention two issues. The Council of Europe should be far more liberally provided with staff than it is today. It is not reasonable that the European Community should have a staff—I do not know the exact figure— of approximately 7 000 or more while the Council of Europe has to manage with between 700 and 800 officials. That is a ratio of 1: 10 and can by no means be justified.

There is a second but very significant point. If various powers are delegated to the Council of Europe which is asked to do certain work, the individual governments must also be prepared to provide for these activities under the budget. Otherwise we can meet three times a year, pass splendid resolutions three times a year and declaim our wishes three times a year, but unless the money is available to implement the plans and proposals developed here, we shall never get beyond the stage of pious wishes.

In conclusion let me say that, as indicated by the previous speaker, this Assembly has no cause to feel inferior to other European Communities and Assemblies. The Council of Europe has an assured future if it tackles its work with self-confidence, faith and the conviction that it is in its rightful place. Thank you for your attention. THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Digby.

Mr. DIGBY (United Kingdom). — I feel that as a member of the working party who was present at the conversations in five different capitals I should intervene in the debate. The five different capitals consisted of three inside the Communities and two outside. I was most encouraged by the reception we received and by the time that busy Foreign Ministers gave up to

My views on the future of the Council of Europe were modified as we went along. Mr. Reverdin has made the very good point that the attention of foreign ministries was obviously focused on the Council of Europe merely in the preparation for our visit.

I congratulate Mr. Reverdin on his report. It is very difficult to summarise all the views that we heard, and he has done it very well.

I suppose that it could be said that it was a weakness of the working party that its composition of two or three had to vary between capital and capital owing to difficulties of arrangements, so that complete continuity was lacking in what we said and what we tried to hear. But it was certainly very interesting and encouraging to find the universal way in which the Council of Europe and its general tasks were accepted, although it must be admitted that there was perhaps a lack of striking or original ideas about the future.

I welcome the statement of the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers that another working party is to be set up consisting of Permanent Representatives. I very much hope that it will try to draw from the experience we gained in visiting the various capitals and meeting not only Foreign Ministers but officials and parliamentarians, who all had their slightly different points of view. I believe that the Permanent Representatives can gain something from what we heard.

It is not surprising that views seemed to me to vary between the Nine inside and the Eight outside. It seemed to me that in the Eight outside, appreciation of the importance of this Assembly was rather more marked than it perhaps has been at times in the past.

Mr. Digby (continued)

To begin with, I had hoped that we should be able to return with a clear-cut demarcation between what should be done at Brussels, what should be done by the Nine, and what should be done by the Council of Europe. But I think that it was at Brussels that I was finally persuaded that that was quite impossible in the circumstances immediately after enlargement. There is still uncertainty about the direction in which the Communities are moving, and that alone precluded a complete demarcation.

Consequently, I believe that we must face a certain overlapping for the time being, but I very much hope that later on that overlapping can be eliminated and that a clearer demarcation will become apparent.

The agreed roles of the Council of Europe are set out in section IV (a) of the recommendation. It is a convincing but not very glamorous list. Parliamentarians like glamour, and we must go on attracting the best parliamentarians to this Assembly. For that reason alone, I am convinced that the continuing political role of the Assembly is of the utmost importance. We should not lose sight of it for one moment.

I detected in some capitals a slight reluctance to accept this political role of ours. I suggest that it has two aspects. There is the discussion of the future development of Europe — and there are many ways in which co-ordination can take place. There are also, and almost equally important, talks with those outside with similar interests. The annual report of OECD comes to mind immediately.

In the political sphere we must go on pressing with these two types of debate. The Secretary General said that there had been a lot of unused possibilities in respect of the second of these alternatives. Those unused possibilities should be taken up quickly. Meanwhile, there must be coordination with the Nine and a certain apportioning of work. It is fairly readily accepted that there has been a lack of liaison between Brussels and our work here. This has to be improved and there are important suggestions in the resolutions which could put it right. I believe there were certain preoccupations in Brussels immediately after the enlargement, for they are very busy there. Perhaps this is one of the reasons liaison has not come about easily.

As to the concrete proposals in the resolutions and in the report, there is something for us in

this Assembly. It might be said, perhaps, that we are not doing enough as a self-denying ordinance to cut down the proliferation of work in all the subjects we tackle. As we went around we found that was a fairly universal complaint. There has been no mention about cutting down the number of committees. Certainly we should look at that, and we should restrict the number of reports which go out. When it came to the question of giving advice to the Committee of Ministers, it was of course very much easier and the ball is now in their court. It is to a large extent up to them to bring about a certain shrinkage in our activities.

One thing about the work of the Committee of Ministers which is very important is that specialist Ministers should be able to come here. What has struck me most in this connection since Britain entered the Communities is the tremendous pressure there is on one or two of our British Ministers, such as the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs and the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, to be constantly going to Europe — Brussels. There are other Ministers on whom there are not so many calls who might be not too sorry to have an excuse to come here and to meet other Europeans. A lot can be done by calling in specialist Ministers as well as Foreign Ministers, who are very busy indeed in the Communities.

The agenda of the Committee of Ministers is one of the salient points. Until the agenda is relieved of some of the things which waste the Ministers' time at present, our work will not proceed on the right lines. It has been said that we should be the bridge between the Eight and the Nine, but I do not think that is the whole story. It is obvious enough, but our role as an initiator — this is brought out in the report — is extremely important. I think most important of all is our task here to prevent a gradual drifting apart of the Eight and the Nine. That is something which must not be allowed to happen; and it can be prevented only here.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Czernetz.

Mr. CZERNETZ (Austria) (Translation). — Mr. President, in the English idiom, a person who has been in an organisation for a long time is known as an "old hand"; in the German-Austrian idiom such a person is known as ein alter Hase (an old hare). I count myself as one.

Mr. Czernetz (continued)

I am therefore rather surprised that we are now behaving as though it were the first time we were facing the question: What are our tasks and what part have we to play? I have been part of this Assembly for quite a few years. This question arises perennially. It is not a new one.

It is in the very nature of this body that the governments which founded the Council of Europe have not the slightest intention of dissolving it, but at the same time they do not give it the means to live and work. That was so in the beginning and it has not changed. Even after the Six became the Nine, things remained the same. The Council of Europe is not to be disbanded, but it is to be kept on short commons. It will largely depend on parliamentarians and on Ministers with whom the former have a good working relationship in their countries and who also favour co-operation here, whether or not we make any progress. I do not think I am exaggerating if I say - and we all feel this that this Assembly can count on the wholehearted support of the Austrian Foreign Minister, the present Chairman of the Committee of Ministers.

The necessary consultation and co-ordination of the policy of the Committee of Ministers was discussed here. I once put a question here to a Minister — I shall name no names — "Are you in favour of the Committee of Ministers being used for purposes of political consultation and co-ordination?" His reply, short and to the point, was: "Yes!"

Only nothing has happened. So little has happened, Mr. President, that not a single attempt was made in Helsinki at the preparatory conference of the Conference on European Security and Co-operation to call together the official representatives of Council of Europe countries as a single delegation, to discuss possible common tasks along the lines of Assembly decisions. Daily there were preliminary discussions in the framework of EEC and of NATO, but the representatives of the Council of Europe member States did not meet as such in Helsinki. It is a very serious matter that these possibilities were neglected.

It is therefore necessary to insist repeatedly— and also to tell ourselves— that we as members of parliament must concert our actions in respect of the Council of Europe more thoroughly in our parliaments, in order to be able to organise more joint activities.

The absence of members of the Committee of Ministers once or twice a year is an endemic problem. It is easy for me to speak critically as an Austrian, because I know what great efforts are made by the Austrian Foreign Ministers to attend all these meetings.

I said this once before in the absence of the Minister; let me today repeat the request to Mr. Kirchschläger to tell his colleagues that this Assembly is convinced that it is the duty of the Ministers, despite all difficulties, to meet at least once a year at ministerial level, namely in December, and not to leave everything to the Deputies who are in truth overburdened with details. I am sure Mr. Kirchschläger will be kind enough to tell his colleagues that the parliamentarians of this Assembly insist on this and that it is their urgent request that they should attend at least once a year without fail.

Mr. President, we talk so much about EEC as having an advantage over us that we forget that it not only has certain everyday difficulties, but also very serious structural difficulties inherent in the construction of this Community which was, from its inception, built on a technocratic basis.

It was only recently, during the monetary crisis, that Netherlands Ministers were heard to say: We feel like a mere associate of EEC. We have as little to say as the associate Members. Everything is decided by the big powers!

We must also say quite frankly that the democratic structure of EEC leaves much to be desired. We are told, and this is also mentioned in Mr. Reverdin's report: No competition with EEC! Nevertheless, Mr. President, I think a few words should be said about this.

If you call yourself presumptuously a European Parliament although the Rome Treaty speaks only of an Assembly, and if this European

Mr. Czernetz (continued)

Parliament has no legislative powers but only a Council of Ministers, if, moreover, it does not even have democratic powers of controlling and supervising EEC funds, then you really are in difficulties.

I am glad that Mr. Karasek spoke of an unnecessary inferiority complex. I agree with him. When we think of the arrogance of others, there is no reason for us to have an inferiority complex.

When speaking of possible co-operation beyond the framework of the Council of Europe with Eastern Europe, let us repeat that certain adjustments are needed in the Assembly which cannot be made by us but which need to be made by our French and Italian colleagues. We shall have to see to it that these two countries send delegations to the Assembly whose political composition appropriately reflects the parliaments in their countries.

I know that the President is himself of this opinion, though he loves the communists as much as I do. But after all, as they represent 20 % of the Italian electorate in the Italian Parliament they have the right to be represented here. The same is true of the French.

We are surely all of the opinion that contacts with the Eastern bloc States should be maintained and cultivated at official and expert level.

Perhaps, and I can say this here, it may be possible to achieve Round Table conferences between European parliamentarians from East and West. I should say Round Table conferences of European politicians rather than parliamentarians, because no one who has not been elected to a parliament by truly free and democratic vote can be called a parliamentarian, as is unfortunately done by IPU. But they are certainly politicians and we have reasons for talking to them. I think this should be quite possible.

Mr. Reverdin will, I hope, not mind if say that the mention in paragraph 8 of the implementation of the conclusions of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation worries me slightly: I do not know the conference will continue, where it will lead and what the conclusions will be. I do not yet see what is to be implemented.

One thing I do see: the great future problem of East-West relations in Europe, even of relations between the two German States, will be that of the free exchange of people and ideas.

The Assembly knows well how strongly I have advocated the *Ostpolitik*, while adding that I had no illusions. I had no illusions and I have none today.

We know how great the difficulties are between the two German States and we see the difficulties between East and West. Cultural exchange is not merely an exchange of orchestras and ballet companies; the issue is how far are we capable of exchanging literature.

Let me make one comment. It is not merely a question of the Russians sending us literature in German, English or French but our being able to send them our literature in Russian. This will be an interesting problem. Unless and until this is possible, everything will remain problematical.

When we know that the communists even deny in principle ideological co-existence, namely the ability to live side by side, we see how slender is the foundation for this exchange. This does not mean that we reject this idea, but that we shall continue to insist on it with all our might.

One final comment, Mr. President, regarding the role of the Council of Europe in future. We shall continue to have innumerable difficulties, but let me again return to the point that we ourselves must generate less of that feeling of inferiority which causes the press to lose interest; on the contrary, we should act with greater self-confidence and greater decisiveness. Let others call themselves what they will, this Council of Europe and its Assembly remain the greatest and most comprehensive parliamentary forum in Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Margue.

Mr. MARGUE (Luxembourg) (Translation). — Mr. President, Mr. Reverdin's report covers such a vast field that the contributions of the different members of the Assembly can merely represent a few small pieces of a mosaic which, set side by side, will almost provide a picture of the Assembly's views about the future work of the Council of Europe. I, too, will confine myself to adding a few more small pieces to those already laid, or to be laid, by my colleagues.

Some time ago, I was a Rapporteur at one of the Joint Meetings of the Assembly and the European Parliament. It was before General de Gaulle's first veto, and we believed that enlargement was just round the corner. In fact, it was ten years before it came about. In the interval, although the Communities could not expand geographically, they intensified their activities and increased their hold over the lives of the inhabitants of all the member countries. At that time already I tried, no doubt unsuccessfully, to warn our colleagues of the European Parliament against the temptation, which existed then and exists now in the departments of the Commission and of the Council of Ministers, to spread their activities over the whole gamut of European common interests. I did that in particular in reference to the European University, which I would have preferred to be a university of the Seventeen rather than of the Six. We know how that turned out in the end.

The Community has a means of action which the Council of Europe has not, and that is directives. The departments of the Community work out directives which, once they have run the gauntlet of the Council of Ministers, are binding on all the member countries and affect their national legislation in fields which it cannot be said positively are covered by the Rome Treaty. Once the Ministers have agreed to these directives, the national parliaments and their governments have no option but to conform to them.

The position is rather different in the Council of Europe. Even when we succeed in drafting a convention with the agreement of the seventeen members of the Committee of Ministers, no country is obliged to ratify it and put it into force.

That leads me to stress two particular points in Mr. Reverdin's report.

Mr. Reverdin is quite right when he says there is no need for the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to meet exclusively at the level of the Foreign Ministers or their deputies, who are members of the Foreign Ministries and diplomatic representatives of their respective countries. He points out that the Foreign Ministers' deputies could equally well be other members of the governments concerned. That would be quite logical, for although it was possible to imagine twenty-five years ago that the Council of Europe would have a general policy — a euphemism which is still in use — we have been forced to realise to our great regret that that has hardly been possible.

But we must not forget the very effective work the Council has actually done in spite of all the criticisms that can be levelled at it.

The Council has drawn up a great number of conventions in the most varied fields, in particular in those of cultural, educational, legal and social co-operation, in that of public health and in some others.

The only thing I regret is that, once this is done, there is no means of obliging the States to ratify and put into force the conventions thus concluded.

It seems to me somewhat illogical that those in this Assembly who discuss all the subjects covered by the conventions very rarely have an opportunity of discussing them with the national Ministers responsible for the subjects of those conventions. That is why there have grown up alongside the Council of Europe and allied to it the conferences of different departmental Ministers.

We have just had a meeting of Ministers of the Environment. Next month there will be a meeting in Stockholm of Ministers of Justice—it is not the first—and in the past we have already been able to send to these ministerial meetings delegates from the Assembly who are members of the committees concerned and who have spoken there on behalf of the Assembly.

Mr. Margue (continued)

I myself was at the Conference of Ministers of Labour in Rome last November. Matters were discussed there which are the concern of this Assembly. But when we get back here, we find that those responsible for carrying the Council's work a stage further — the European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers, for instance — are not the Ministers of Labour, but the Foreign Ministers or their deputies, the Permanent Representatives.

We have asked for permission to discuss matters with the specialist Ministers. We shall be allowed to do so in the legal field, and I hope in others as well. I fully approve the suggestion that, from time to time, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe should consist of Ministers of Education, Ministers of Labour, Ministers of Justice, and so on.

Now I want to say a few words on another point. As is quite natural, Mr. Reverdin talked about Council of Europe action in the field of human rights. We know that the Human Rights Commission is swamped with work and that the Court has not enough to do. That is due to the slowness of the Commission in their preliminary investigation of cases. But there are other reasons as well, one of which is that not all the countries which have ratified the convention have accepted individual right of appeal and the competence of the Court. We here must really insist that when a country takes the decisive step of ratifying the convention - and we hope that very soon that will have been done by all the member countries — it will take another equally decisive step and recognise the right of individual appeal. I am thinking in particular of Turkey, with which we were so preoccupied here yesterday. Our Turkish friends could take a decisive step towards appeasing all those who become so excited about events real or fancied - it is not for me to say - which are supposed to have taken place in Turkey, if they allow the inhabitants of that country to exercise the right of appeal to the European Court of Human Rights.

I also feel that the members of the Court and of the Commission should be able to get together and discuss the possibility of using the existing human rights structure to better advantage, instead of always dreaming up new conventions, protecting new rights or extending their powers.

The first thing we should do is to ask ourselves seriously whether we are really making full use of the structure we have. That would certainly be all to the good.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Kahn-Ackermann,

Mr. KAHN-ACKERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, to start with I would like to say how pleasant it is to see the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, again in our midst after quite some time, following and indeed participating in the debate. This is a purely external demonstration of the fact that the Council of Europe has two parts, a Consultative Assembly and a Committee of Ministers, and that things can be set in motion only by their joint efforts. To this extent I am extraordinarily grateful to Mr. Kirchschläger for spending the whole of this day with us.

During discussions in the Political Affairs Committee on the content of the recommendation on our future tasks, some members yesterday expressed concern that our future tasks were insufficiently politically formulated and that it was to be feared that general policy was being pushed into the background by technical questions.

The recommendation was ably formulated by Mr. Reverdin and his committee. The Assembly does not become political by our writing down on paper that it is to be political; only we ourselves can determine how political this Assembly is. That is what decides. There is nothing that we cannot discuss in this Hall in the context of the Orders of the Day established by us. Those who insist that political decisions should on no account be excluded from discussion by the Assembly will, if they think about it carefully, discover that they may sooner or later have to discuss matters here which they do not wish to discuss, for instance questions of security. Even that is not out of the question.

The fact that we are entering an era of change does not mean that the nature of this Assembly

Mr. Kahn-Ackermann (continued)

is changing in any way; the great change and everybody must see that - lies in the fact that the centre of gravity of the Committee of Ministers has moved in a new direction towards the Nine. This is a fact which we cannot ignore, and as the Committee of Ministers is both our partner and an integral part of the Council of Europe, we shall have to deal with the results of the fact that in a number of questions the centre of gravity within the Seventeen will necessarily move in the direction of the Nine. We may or may not deplore this, but it is a fact. It makes no political sense to discuss matters which cannot be set in motion by us but only by others. We can act politically as the Council of Europe only in fields where we ourselves can get things moving.

To this extent the original version of the recommendation in the Reverdin Report seems to me to have been wise. It contained a list of matters with which we could and should deal in future, matters which we can ourselves get under way without our requiring the co-operation of others, or, let us say, without the need of integrated co-operation with, for instance, the European Parliament. In addition there are certainly numerous questions which the European Economic Community would find it very difficult to deal with. We should make it our duty to contact the Community wherever we can take the initiative or help it along. There has been talk of the Assembly being used to ensure a dialogue between the Eight and the Nine. But. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I remember rightly, in recent years all the dialogues here amounted to expressions of agreement. We have not so far used the Council of Europe to bring out clearly the political or more likely economic differences between these two groups and, as I see it, this will in future be a legitimate and useful task which will be to the benefit of this entire Assembly. Quite understandably we have hitherto attempted to find common solutions and formulations to bridge existing differences.

Lastly, we have an important task which we must not disregard. I believe we are nearing the

time when we have to consider that all our conceptions should be passed on to the national political forces in Europe. I personally was very happy to see that a conference of the Social Democratic Parties of Europe with a real political content was held in Bonn a short time ago. An attempt was made there to see that these many parties steer a similar course in respect of European problems. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, when I think of what we have to do here, I must say we are neglecting this task. In this Assembly we have political groups, but in the past we certainly made too little use of them as part of the political forces of Europe for coordinating joint political events and for discussing and solving various national differences. Usually we made use of these groups to prepare the agenda and occasionally for trivial discussions. I would, for instance, see it as a legitimate future task of the Council of Europe to ensure that the political groups in his House help in an attempt to bring about more joint consultation and a more concerted approach than hitherto in the political groups in Europe.

If you try and get to the bottom of the matter, you will find that there is nothing more nationalistic in our Europe than the individual parties in national politics. I do not wish to make too much of this — some try to catch their own shadows, some do not. But there is a great deal of truth in this.

I have no wish to repeat what others have said here. It would be a good thing if we had concerted action here between the specialised Ministers. We have been preaching this for years. Let us hope we achieve this.

Something should also be said here about the occasionally disquieting provincialism evident within the European Economic Community. Either yesterday or today somebody spoke of Europe contemplating its navel. There is something in this. We are not frank enough about this. We ought to take ourselves to task occasionally and ask ourselves whether we should not discuss many of the problems which concern us with others, including non-Europeans, and cooperate with them. We do sometimes try to do this, but perhaps we should do it more often.

Mr. Kahn-Ackermann (continued)

Lastly, Ladies and Gentlemen, in such matters we should set our own house in order. I expressed my concern about the future of the Council of Europe to the head of our government and as such he gave me a reply which I would not wish to keep from you since I consider this reply from a big European member State as important. He said inter alia:

"The Council of Europe has an outstandingly important function in the present political situation of this continent as a link between the nine EEC countries and the other democratic countries of Europe, and as a forum for constitutional democracy. Both functions appear to me vital. The Federal Government is thus making every effort not only to maintain the political substance of the Council of Europe, but to strengthen it where possible."

I find this a reassuring and helpful contribution to our debate.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Ladies and Gentlemen, I am now going to call on Mr. Kirchschläger, Foreign Minister of Austria and Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers, who wishes to take part in the debate.

Mr. KIRCHSCHLÄGER (Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria, Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers) (Translation). - Mr. President, may I first of all assure you that I found it particularly valuable to attend this sitting of the Assembly because it provides me with a cross section of the views of European members of parliament, and thus of the elected representatives of the peoples of our part of Europe, on two points: one is an issue in world politics, namely international terrorism, and the other is a European matter, namely the role to be played by the Council of Europe, I have deliberately omitted the word "future", thus, I believe, following your example, Mr. President, because I really believe that it is not all that necessary to worry about the future of the Council of Europe, and because I would like to see this discussion which is under way interpreted only as a necessary stock-taking, and not as a calling into question of the Council of Europe.

One thing became very clear to me today. That is that the Committee of Ministers and the Assembly should possibly co-operate more than hitherto. I shall also make use of my temporary function as Chairman of the Committee of Ministers to inform my colleagues by personal letter of these impressions and also of the concern which was expressed today in this Assembly.

Mr. President, as Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers I believe that I am authorised, on the basis of the discussion which took place yesterday in our Committee, to thank Mr. Reverdin very warmly for this report and the entire working party for the extensive and many-sided work which went into it.

I am convinced that the six Ministers' Deputies who were yesterday instructed by the Committee of Ministers to deal with this subject at ministerial level will be well advised to familiarise themselves very thoroughly with the results of this working party, and not only with the results but also with the parliamentary members of the working party.

As a member of the government of a member State I would also like to congratulate Mr. Reverdin on the European speech with which he introduced his report today. As an Austrian I am glad that the work of the working party of the Assembly which was set up in summer of last year coincides with the work of an ad hoc Group of the Committee of Ministers set up during this session as the result of an Austrian initiative last December.

Today's debate on the role of the Council of Europe was very pronouncedly carried on from the angle of competition between the Eight and the Nine. I believe, and here I go along with Mr. Reverdin, that we should not allow ourselves to be forced into a competitive situation. We are all openly in favour of the European Communities, we recognise their great value in the development of Europe. And we say "Yes" to them because we know what a stimulating effect the Nine have on the whole of Europe.

All that we ask for ourselves is that the Nine should say the same frank and willing "Yes" to the remaining Council of Europe member States and that they should not say it in a

Mr. Kirchschläger (continued)

manner that suggests that they feel sorry for us, or that they are bestowing a favour, but that they say it in their own interest. For in the long run — and politics are always concerned with the long view — the work of the Nine can only succeed in the manner intended, it can only be really successful if the remaining Council of Europe member States are not excluded from this joint development towards a greater Europe.

We so often speak of European integration and I have the feeling that we sometimes understand different things by it. We frequently confuse national integration, the merging into political union or a federation of States with a different type of integration which also appears to be vital — and this was confirmed by today's debate — namely, spiritual integration, integration on the basis of our very being, both as democratic States and also as human beings in these democratic States.

We shall not achieve the United Europe, for which we met together in 1949 when we signed the Statute of the Council of Europe, within the near future, but I believe that we can now and in the coming years become a Community of States which will bring out the common basis known as the common heritage in the Statute of the Council of Europe and which will emphasise our common concept of democracy. I know I am repeating myself, but surely it is the task precisely of this Consultative Assembly, namely of the seventeen democratic States - democratic according to our lights, which I believe to be correct — to deal more intensively with the basis of our existence, with the common basis which will really bring us together, so that we, as members of States in which Social Democrats, Christian Democrats, and Liberal Democrats bear the responsibility of government or have a large majority in the parliaments, keep this common basis rather more firmly in mind. I believe that if we are successful here, coordination at various conferences, possibly now in Helsinki or elsewhere, will be relatively easy; we should then have, starting with ourselves, namely with the governments which give the delegations their various instructions, that common basis which makes agreement relatively simple.

Mr. President, I believe that precisely if we are able to make this Council of Europe a centre for this common heritage of our peoples, if we place great emphasis on this common heritage, we shall also be creating in the best possible way the prerequisites necessary for peaceful coexistence with countries with communist governments, for peaceful coexistence which favours everything that unites us, that allows us to co-operate between States and which also makes us conscious of having a different conviction in respect of our basic beliefs regarding life and the values of life, and of being ready to stand up for this different conviction.

If we succeed in this then I believe we can calmly put aside the various anxieties and sceptical views aired here and there in respect of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, for we shall then be able to co-operate in every situation in the construction of a greater, wider, continental Europe and to make our contribution as democratic States.

Thank you, Mr. President. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — During the eighteen years that I have been a member of this Assembly, Mr. Kirchschläger, this is the first time, so far as I know, that a Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of Ministers has spent the whole day listening to the Assembly's debates, and I want to thank you most sincerely.

I am sure that the integration of ideas, opinions and perspectives of which you spoke will lead to a genuine spiritual integration which, as you said, will provide the essential basis for the future of the Council of Europe, even more for the future of Europe as a whole. I thank you once again.

5. Change in the Orders of the Day

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The number of speakers on the list will take us almost to 7.30 p.m. I therefore propose that the votes on international terrorism and the mission of the Council of Europe take place at the beginning of tomorrow morning's sitting.

The President (continued)

The Orders of the Day for tomorrow morning's sitting will thus be as follows:

- 1. International terrorism (Replies by the Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee, and vote on the draft recommendation, Document 3285, amendment and sub-amendment).
- 2. Mission of the Council of Europe (Replies by the Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee, and vote on the draft recommendation, Document 3281 and amendments).
- 3. About 11 o'clock, statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, President of the Italian Council of Ministers, parliamentary questions and debate;
- 4. If time permits, relations between Europe and the United States of America.

Are there any objections ?...

That is agreed.

6. Mission of the Council of Europe (Resumed debate)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Oguz.

Mr. OGUZ (Turkey) (Translation). — Having heard the report on the way the Council works, I want to make a few remarks which I believe may be useful for its future.

Obviously, we are glad to be able to summarise in a few words the importance of the Council for the whole of Europe.

The European Economic Community now includes nine countries which play a preponderant part in the Council of Europe because they represent the majority which can take decisions directly affecting themselves, and also affecting other Members.

Certainly, the decisions taken by the Council are those of a purely consultative body, but ours is the only Assembly in which European countries other than the Nine can put forward problems which concern them directly and have a real chance of explaining and supporting them. That is one of the main reasons why the Council

should not only be maintained but enlarged, with the new unit which is the enlarged Community as its basis, since the Council provides equal opportunities and fair openings for all its Members, without according any special privileges to the present Members of the European Community.

A novel structure of that kind would enable an understanding overall agreement, to be reached within the framework of a united and thus economically strong Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Schuler.

Mr. SCHULER (Switzerland) (Translation). — It is no doubt the duty as well as the legitimate need of any organisation to examine its tasks and aims from time to time. The recent enlargement of the European Community certainly provided a valid occasion for the Council of Europe to do this once again. The report by Mr. Reverdin provides a valuable basis which will allow of the necessary adjustment of our activities to the requirements of a changed situation.

Further elements are supplied by the report of the Group of Six set up yesterday by the Committee of Ministers. In connection with this decision, it also appears to me excellent that the Committee of Ministers has allotted its working group a relatively short term of office. This will prevent discussion on this subject from dragging on, as it seems to me that however important it is to undertake such revisions in good time, it is nevertheless vital to prevent the discussion from degenerating into a permanent debate which might not only undermine the self-confidence of the Organisation but also shake the confidence of the public in this Organisation.

The desire to complete the examination of the tasks of the Council of Europe and of its methods of work in the foreseeable future would also appear to me to be a good reason for limiting this report of our working group to essentials. Many people may find this report too critical in some respects. I myself consider it correct that during the examination of the mission of the Council of Europe, its organisation, its working methods should also be put under the microscope. Certainly they can be improved on.

Mr. Schuler (continued)

I wholeheartedly agree with the conclusions of the document submitted to us. I am delighted to hear the statement of the working party, according to which all the governments consulted expressed their views that the enlargement of the European Community has in no wise jeopardised the Council of Europe's raison d'être. I also base my hopes on the expectation that the governments of the member States will be ready in future to grant the Council of Europe the resources in staff and finance which it needs in order to be able to work effectively.

As regards the various comments of the Reverdin Working Party on the improvement of the drive and effectiveness of the work of the Council of Europe, I would also like to draw attention to the need to make better use of our work, particularly in the field of publications. To achieve this is doubtless in the interests of Europe, as has already been said, because the Council of Europe will remain, even now that the European Community has been enlarged, not merely geographically the most representative, indeed the only fairly comprehensive European forum, but also the one that deals with the most representative subjects.

The fact, felt by many to be a deficiency, that the Assembly cannot take any binding decisions on cultural, legal or even genuinely political questions, is counterbalanced by the great advantage that Europe in all its variety can find expression in the Council of Europe without loss of identity — a loss which would certainly not improve Europe's standing in the world.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Dankert.

Mr. DANKERT (Netherlands). — I heard that there were some budgetary problems because of the many capitals visited by the Reverdin Working Group. In reading the report I had the feeling that travel pays, and that the visit to so many European capitals by the working group had had an influence in the sense that the group has come forward with a very reasonable and realistic report and originally a reasonable and realistic proposal for a recommendation. I felt that on the basis of the original proposals it would have been possible to enter into a serious dialogue with the Committee of Ministers with the EEC Ministers included, on the future role of an organisation which has a vital role to

play in numerous aspects of European co-operation.

Perhaps, as has been already said, there should have been a second report which examined in depth how the problems can be tackled and where the maximum levels of intergovernmental co-operation can be made more effective than certain methods of co-operation practised in EEC. But, as the Rapporteur explained at the beginning of the debate, the working group could finish its travels only by the end of last month, so I could not demand from the group that it should produce these full details. Perhaps they may come.

The report is a realistic piece of work. It attempts to limit the activities of the Council of Europe to what the Council of Europe machinery can in fact handle and, at the same time, indicates what I would describe as a satisfactory means of communication and division of labour where possible between the Nine and the Eight, or among the Nine plus the Eight. I thought it would have been possible on the basis of the report of the working group to avoid EEC's being present in discussions without the Eight and taking important decisions affecting the Eight. I regret that the realism in the original proposals does not appear so strongly in the draft recommendation. For that reason in committee I voted against it.

The realism of the original recommendation has been seriously undermined by the introduction of paragraph 12 (1), a paragraph which demands in substance that all political questions concerning the seventeen member States have to be co-ordinated in the Council of Europe. In my opinion such co-ordination is absolutely excluded for many reasons. I shall mention only the practical ones. What is now asked in the first part of paragraph 12? It is asked that the NATO countries should co-ordinate their defence policies - no one will deny that that very much touches on the interests of the Seventeen - with those of the non-NATO Members. That is something which without doubt is excluded. It is impossible.

Apart from the defence and security problems, such co-ordination which could take place in many other areas is excluded. In practice, it would lead only to the Nine meeting beforehand to engage in a co-ordination process among themselves and then confronting the Seventeen with the decisions already taken, which would be unchangeable. It is perhaps regrettable that the Nine, concerning the activities of the Council of

Mr. Dankert (continued)

Europe, are having this prior consultation process on issues specifically relevant to the Council of Europe and not directly related to what EEC is doing. But to ask for wide co-ordination in all fields is asking the Nine to decide before consultation with the others, and that would be regrettable.

In my view, paragraph 12 (1) in no way contributes to the solution of the real and specific problems of the nine EEC countries. It is asking for the moon, and nowhere in the Reverdin Report can I find indications of how to reach the moon. It is also an effort to make the Council of Europe — this is a common aim of all these bodies — a kind of navel of the world, and I believe it is definitely not that. Perhaps the paragraph would be improved quite a lot if the word "co-ordination" were replaced by the word "consultation". Even then Mr. Renschler's problems remain because the paragraph in no way indicates priority and makes us get lost in all it says about consultation on all questions of common interest to the seventeen member States and other States. That would simply lead to no consultation at all. The apparatus of intergovernmental co-operation at the level of Ministers Deputies cannot carry such a burden.

I hope that the Assembly will reject the first part of paragraph 12. That would help me to vote in favour of the recommendation. It is essential that this part of the paragraph should be taken out.

From some of the contributions made in this debate one gets the impression that we should be afraid of the European Parliament and all European or EEC institutions, that we should become a kind of retail shop for the European institutions and, in particular, for the European Parliament. I do not think this danger is real. In the report of the working group and in the recommendation, I think there are more than enough areas indicated where we can do extremely useful work in our own right and where no EEC or European Parliament in the foreseeable future could do better. The Seventeen have enough in common and I am grateful to Mr. Kirchschläger for indicating that the real basis of co-operation among the Seventeen is to keep the Council of Europe alive and keep it a living institution.

We should be careful not to kill it simply by fearing that there are other European institutions which might do so. We should also avoid killing ourselves by believing that we are the only ones doing all the serious work. I know many EEC politicians who would take that — I believe with some justification — as a declaration of war which they certainly would win. We have no need of such a war for our future.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Portheine, Chairman of the Liberal Group.

Mr. PORTHEINE (Netherlands). — In entering this discussion on a matter which, when we discussed it in January on the preliminary report of Mr. Reverdin, I called one of extreme importance, I want first to pay tribute to the Rapporteur for the tremendous amount of work that he has performed during his visits and for having enumerated the results in a clear and definite statement about the future tasks of the Council of Europe.

I must reveal here that there has been comment in the Political Affairs Committee on the fact that there was little time for a good sound study of the report, although from this debate in which there have been so many participants one might not have thought so. I really feel that we have not had sufficient time to study this report, and perhaps Mr. Dankert's comments support the view that the discussion and final achievement of all this has been a little too fast.

Some speed is necessary, but I must remind Mr. Reverdin of what I said during his visit to The Hague and the Dutch Government. I said that in the opinion of many distinguished politicians in my country, to precipitate a definition of this report could perhaps harm the Council of Europe in a way which would not happen if things were studied more quietly. Earlier this year, as many of those present will remember, I said that I was in favour of a discussion, treating these things in a good and thorough but speedy way, and that we should then end this discussion. I felt that we should not continue this discussion about our own tasks.

In reviewing some of the conclusions of the report by Mr. Reverdin, I want to stress the statement in the report, in paragraph 7, that:

"The Council of Europe is the only body in which all the democratic States of Europe... can co-operate on an equal footing."

Mr. Portheine (continued)

I want to emphasise the importance of the statement that the activities of the Council and of the Communities, both sharing the aim of European unity, should not be competitive. Many worthwhile suggestions have been made in this report aiming also at practical ways and means of getting mutual information about the work of both the Council and EEC, on the basis of mutual personal understanding — and I believe that that is very important — to secure practical results from collaboration. These are enumerated in points I to III of paragraph 12 of the recommendation.

Generally, I agree with these suggestions, except one — that in relation to the special bureau in Brussels. I wonder whether other members have noted this particular suggestion. With regard to the proposed bureau here and a mission in Strasbourg of EEC, I would refer again to Mr. Reverdin's visit to The Hague. Speaking on close collaboration between EEC and the Council of Europe, the Dutch Minister for Foreign Affairs, in the presence of members of the Council of Europe, agreed that this kind of thing should not be overdone and that one should avoid creating new institutions in the field of collaboration before such collaboration takes sufficient shape.

After the suggestions that have been made, I do not feel that there is a need for a special bureau either in Brussels or in Strasbourg. I am also convinced, in view of other practical means of collaboration such as have been suggested, that from the point of view of its budgetary consequences that suggestion is not very wise.

I may also reveal here, frankly, that there is discussion about the situation of the Bureau of the Council in Paris. Certainly, I prefer to maintain it there. I do not accept that the danger may arise that it will be closed in the expectation that a bureau will be established in Brussels. In my view, that is not necessary in the short term and perhaps never will be instituted.

I have so far dealt with suggestions with which generally I agree, apart from that of the bureau. I am fully in agreement with the chapter in the report on East-West relations. In my view — and it was also the view of the Netherlands delegation during the visit of Mr. Reverdin — the Council of Europe's task should lie not only

in the field of well-being but also in the field of prosperity.

In the sense of that opinion I accept the priorities mentioned in paragraph IV. I appreciate also the changes made in this chapter towards greater prosperity. I am glad the Political Affairs Committee has been willing to strengthen this element in item 7 of the list of activities in accordance with the conclusions of Lord Walston's report on the Intergovernmental Work Programme, adopted by the Assembly on 23 October last. I welcome the changes with regard to science policy and research, which I am sure are welcome also to the Rapporteur, and I am pleased that the Committee on Science and Technology has been able to discuss this point thoroughly.

I had hitherto taken it for granted that in item 8 — participation of local authorities in the building of Europe — some aspects of regional planning could be included; but now that I have before me Mr. Ahrens's amendment I feel that they would take care of this matter in a better way. Proof of a change under item 7 is afforded by this week's discussion of the Consumer Charter, which fits in with the tasks described in this item.

I agree completely with the suggestion for a regular review of the Council's activities and those of the Intergovernmental Work Programme and the setting of priorities.

I would also underline the importance of the suggestion made in point (e) about the possibility of partial agreements. The suggestion was made by the Dutch delegation that we ought to consider whether certain regulations contained in EEC legislation could be applied throughout the Council of Europe's area by means of a special European convention.

This leads me to emphasise the very important work of both the Council of Europe and of the Assembly in the drafting of conventions in various spheres of interest. We now have 80 of these conventions, and I hope the Council will continue to be dynamic in drafting more.

The suggestions in paragraph V about working methods are very worthwhile. These working methods, particularly the decision-making process, differ from those of EEC; they are more flexible and constitute a greater safeguard of the interests of various countries. The Council of Europe can therefore act in accordance with such decisions in the interest of the seventeen

Mr. Portheine (continued)

countries, where the collaboration of the Nine is not particularly appropriate. Particularly good examples are the work on human rights and the institution of the European Youth Foundation.

I endorse the suggestion for improving contact between the Assembly and the Council of Ministers, the importance of holding regular meetings of the specialised Ministers and the importance of allowing the Secretary General, in effective collaboration with the Assembly, to fulfil his tasks by improving the decision-making process. The Assembly should increase its scope by inviting to the yearly OECD debates — for they are the parliamentary forum - representatives of countries belonging to OECD but not to the Council; but it should, on the other hand, also try to restrict its own work, as mentioned in item 11. I believe that the concentration of our energies in this way would also make us more popular with the Council of Ministers. Perhaps the task of the Secretariat could be lightened to a certain extent by a certain amount of collaboration with the University of Strasbourg which would be willing to make studies with the Secretariat on certain matters. Perhaps this sort of collaboration could be given serious consideration.

I believe that this report and debate will have a decisive influence on the development of the Council's tasks and on the improvement of its organisation; this is in the interests not only of our members here but also of our beloved Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call on Mr. Ahrens to move his amendment.

Mr. AHRENS (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I first thank the Rapporteur, Mr. Reverdin, very warmly for his report which I consider a successful synthesis based on long experience and optimism. If I have nevertheless asked to speak and have tabled an amendment, it is because I believe that the considerable achievements and tasks of the Council of Europe in respect of regional planning and local authorities should be given rather more emphasis.

The Consultative Assembly, its Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities and not least the European Conference of Local Authorities have repeatedly stressed the significant and leading role of our local authorities and municipalities in the construction and reinforcement of our democracy.

I therefore consider that it is too restricted merely to mention the participation of local authorities in the building of Europe in section IV of paragraph 12 of the recommendation. As has been decided again and again in this House and on numerous occasions, I believe that local and regional authorities must have a part in forming our national awareness. The Council of Europe must continue to see that this is so. I therefore believe that we should complete the eighth sub-paragraph of section IV (a) in accordance with the second part of my amendment.

European regional planning should also be expressly mentioned as an important future task of the Council of Europe. If I remember rightly the Consultative Assembly has repeatedly stressed, following the report of our former colleague Mr. Flämig in 1968, that the quality of life in our States can be improved only on the basis of a long-term and comprehensive regional planning policy. This was also the conclusion reached at the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning which met for the first time in 1970 and is to meet again in September of this year. As in the case of the first conference, the Consultative Assembly will also attend the particularly important conference to be held in September.

There are two reasons why I consider it vital to include regional planning in Mr. Reverdin's report. For one thing, the protection of nature, of our historical heritage and above all of the environment can only be successful if carried out within the framework of a far-sighted regional planning policy. Appropriate and consistent regional planning is the best way of preventing damage to our environment. This was again confirmed by the European Ministerial Conference on the Environment held in Vienna in March.

But there is yet a further reason why regional planning should be emphatically mentioned as

Mr. Ahrens (continued)

a task of the Council of Europe. The regional planning policy of the Community needs to be integrated into a European regional planning policy if it is to develop beyond mere economic advancement, which may easily lead us astray. The point at issue is the improvement of living conditions in the backward areas of our continent. This means more than just creating jobs. For this reason regional policy will, precisely in the future, remain one of the important political tasks of the Council of Europe. I therefore believe that we should certainly include it in the list of our future tasks. I hope the Assembly will accept my amendment to the recommendation.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Alemyr.

Mr. ALEMYR (Sweden). — I have been a member of the Reverdin Group and have been able to take part in some of the discussions with the governments. I can agree with what has been said today by the Rapporteur, Mr. Reverdin, and I have noted that the Secretary General expressed the same view on most points as the draft recommendation. I asked for the floor in order to make only a few short remarks.

During the conversations with the working group all the governments declared their belief in the Council of Europe and expressed the urgent need to strengthen the Council's possibilities to work. The same thing has been said by the parliamentarians that the group has met. It is now a responsibility for us as members of the Assembly to guarantee that all these declarations will be more than declarations. The governments and the parliaments have to take the necessary steps to achieve the declared goals, and I hope that the Ministers' working group will be able to find solutions for the problems indicated in this draft recommendation. But without any further discussions it would be possible for all member States to have permanent representations in Strasbourg.

The question of the future of the Council of Europe is also a question of the knowledge of and trust in the Council of Europe, not only among politicians, but also in regard to public opinion. People in general know almost nothing about the Council of Europe and it will be a difficult but very important task to make the public aware of the possibilities for the future of Europe which lie in a realistic and meaningful co-operation in the Council of Europe. But if it is possible to make the public interested in this and other international bodies it is of the utmost importance that the work shall be effective and that overlapping between different organisations is avoided. In that respect this document is very important.

The Swedish Parliament and Swedish Government have on many occasions declared how important for the small countries co-operation in organisations like the Council of Europe can be, and today, as a member of the Swedish delegation, I should like to express what was said in my parliament a couple of months ago — that the Council of Europe has played a very important role during many years and that in the future it can play a still more important role.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Reale.

Mr. REALE (Italy) (Translation). — I shall not comment in detail on Mr. Reverdin's valuable report nor on the interesting speeches of so many distinguished colleagues. I should merely like to fill in the report, if possible, with regard to the Council's political role, on a matter which it seems to me has not yet been sufficiently discussed, namely, the very special attitude we must adopt to relations with the Mediterranean countries. And here I am of course not referring to France, Italy, Malta, Cyprus or Turkey, who are all Members of this Council, but to all those countries, whether in Europe or Africa, whose shores give on to the sea which has been called mare nostrum, but which, with the rise and strengthening of American and Russian power, is a source of great problems and a testingground of the endurance and vital force of our Europe.

The Greeks and Romans always felt they shared a common destiny with Africa. Christianity had its saints and solitaries on African soil. We need to understand Mediterranean Africa, with all its contradictions and instability, but above all with its will to live. There is no lack of precedents on this subject. Barely two years ago the Council of Europe reaffirmed, in a resolution, the vital interest not only of the countries of southern Europe, but of Europe as a whole, in the problems of countries with a

Mr. Reale (continued)

Mediterranean coast-line. It spoke of pursuing a policy of economic, social and political development of the Mediterranean and Middle East as a zone of economic and political stability rather that a zone of outside influence.

Of course it is desirable to evolve a unified Mediterranean policy within the framework of the European Communities; of course it is necessary to launch a plan for economic aid to Middle Eastern countries; but no less interesting and pressing are the problems of improving the quality of life, of literacy, of awareness of human values and, in the last analysis, of the enrichment of the individual through the values of freedom, which are the values of democracy, all of which, it seems to me, falls pre-eminently within the scope of the Assembly.

We are discussing the future of the Council. Very well. But here I cannot but remind you of something that happened only yesterday evening here in the Assembly. Yesterday evening the Council showed considerable interest, as indeed it had already done in January, when the problem of the full operation of democracy in Turkey was raised. And just as there were those who in this Assembly expressed reservations and doubts on this matter, having participated with a troubled conscience in the problems of democratic society in that Mediterranean region, there were others who, speaking with deep-felt emotion as representatives of their country, spoke in its defence.

But to come back to the Mediterranean. The first point is the geographical situation, since surely there is nobody left who still believes that Europe is to be found exclusively on the shores of the North Sea, and that the Alps represent its extreme southern limit. A transitional zone where its climate is concerned, the Mediterranean is African in summer and European in winter. Its inhabitants, because of its climatic variations, always wear wool. Man's obligations with regard to conservation of the Mediterranean forests was emphasised by the Assembly as recently as last January's session.

But let us move from geography to sociology. Tourism would seem to be the most recent form of integration in the Mediterranean area. The French and Italian coasts have been opened up to the tourist trade. The Greek, Yugoslav, Catalan and Spanish coasts, the countries of the near East, are taking part in this process. It is a hu-

man and hence a social phenomenon, with which are interwoven artistic and archaeological interests, if it is true that this is what draws people south from the Ruhr, from England and from Holland. The theme remains a particularly interesting one when we pass from sociology to history. For Mediterranean society, through both Roman law and Christianity, has contributed essential elements to European society. The Mediterranean area gave birth to family morality and to democracy in our conception and realisation of this term.

For this reason the Assembly of the Council of Europe is bound to encourage and solicit the Committee of Ministers on this subject. It is necessary, in other words, to urge the Committee of Ministers to formulate a coherent overall policy with regard to the whole subject of relations with Mediterranean countries, whether European or non-European.

The tasks of those striving for European unity are not limited to fixing the price of butter and oranges, nor to making choices designed to obtain economic successes; beyond these and above all, they are resolved to keep Europe democratic and parliamentary.

This is the desired end, and it should be pursued together with all those Mediterranean countries who do not enjoy parliamentary democracy.

It is, moreover, hardly realistic and perhaps more negative than useful to strengthen economic links with those countries, when just this kind of link with the Communities may help to consolidate non-democratic regimes at present in force, rather than overcome them, as should be our aim.

Thus, with economic problems, with problems of literacy, are interwoven problems of health and of leisure, but all of them come together and are absorbed in those intellectual problems which constitute the basis of any true democracy.

This morning the Minister of the Austrian Republic said that Europe, now a viable presence in the interplay of the continents, should spread throughout humanity the values of her civilisation.

I fully share this firm conviction that the Council of Europe has the primary purpose of not only giving widespread expression to the many ideas it has taken up, but, what in my view remains the essentially and uniquely political mission, of having to intervene in order

Mr. Reale (continued)

that our human conscience may always play a major role in our relationships, so that democracy may have substance and not merely form, above all on the Mediterranean coast. This is a theme of great importance which it seems to me should be emphasised in the present report, and I should like, on this subject, to present an amendment, precisely so that by this means it may be possible to take account of the future activities of the Council of Europe, whose Assembly I personally preferred to join rather than the European Parliament.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I must remind you that the time-limit for tabling amendments has already expired.

I call Mr. Schieder.

Mr. SCHIEDER (Austria) (Translation). — Mr. President, so much that I consider important and would like to emphasise has been said in this debate, that I shall be brief and restrict my contribution to four points.

Firstly, I believe, Mr. President, that as so many of the previous speakers have stressed, the preservation and strengthening of the Council of Europe is a political question, not merely between Strasbourg and Brussels, but one which will be decided above all in the capitals of the member States of the Council of Europe.

There must be no double-thinking in our attitude towards the Council of Europe, no split-personality approach on the part of the member countries. I would like to emphasise that much of what has been said here so emphatically would, if said half as emphatically in the individual countries, possibly have twice as much success.

Secondly, I believe, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we should not lose our nerve in this situation. One of my colleagues, for whom I have the greatest admiration, stated here today that he believed that in this crucial situation we should go gently on debates, discussions and analyses. He then said that debates such as were held yesterday on Turkey were no good, since they showed the weakness of the Council of Europe, and that precisely in this situation it was inappropriate to show weakness.

I am not of this opinion. The struggle to achieve a Council of Europe attitude, to achieve a common opinion, a critical approach towards itself and towards the member States, insistence on the democratic behaviour of each individual member State is in my opinion, Mr. President, less a sign of weakness than of the strength of the Council of Europe.

Thirdly, I believe that in the debates regarding the Council of Europe and EEC we in this body are rather too preoccupied with ourselves and our continent. It would be a mark of strength if the Council of Europe concerned itself more intensively with East-West relations. It would be a mark of strength for the Council of Europe to bring about contacts with other continents. It would also be a mark of strength if the Council of Europe were to pioneer development assistance to the third world. In this, the Council of Europe could be the first organisation in this continent.

Fourthly, and I conclude with this, I am convinced that facts speak for themselves, that what has happened and what has been done is a proof of strength. Let us ask ourselves less in this Organisation what we may do, what we should do, and let us do what we think is right, let us translate into action what we as parliamentarians believe we should do. No invitations are issued in European politics, least of all to the Council of Europe. And for the Council of Europe modesty is not the best policy. In this Organisation modesty and self-restraint would be wrong and would indeed amount to a betrayal of the European idea!

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. de Stexhe.

Mr. de STEXHE (Belgium) (Translation). — Mr. President, the mission of the Council of Europe is exceptionally far-reaching and fundamental for its future, and although it is quite right that this subject should have been included in our agenda, I am rather afraid that, preoccupied as we are with immediate and short-term problems, we shall be tempted to devote all our attention to them.

After the enlargement of the Community to nine countries it was certainly necessary to try to clarify the respective missions of the Community and the Council. In those terms Mr. Reverdin's report is realistic about the complementarity that is needed, or, in other words, as he said just now, in terms of service and not of prestige. But at the risk of Mr. Reverdin calling my speech a rhetorical exercise or a purple patch, I must say that in the medium and long term it must also be the Council of Europe's

Mr. de Stexhe (continued)

mission to launch out beyond the narrow confines of the Nine or the Seventeen.

What I want to stress is the Council of Europe's role in Europe's confrontation with the rest of the world.

To use a well-known term, the Council of Europe should have an "External Affairs" department. Mr. Reverdin quite rightly pointed this out in paragraph 9 of his report, and I am happy to see that this consideration has been further stressed in principle by Mr. Hofer's amendment to paragraph 12 of the recommendation, which was adopted unanimously.

We must take care not to exult in Europe's past glories, hugging them to our bosoms in the narrow confines of the Nine or the Seventeen, without taking any account of the upheavals in the world which are now increasing at a quite fantastic rate.

As Mr. Hofer's amendment states, the Council of Europe is, and should become even more, the main and normal forum for discussion between the European States, Members of the Council of Europe, and the rest of the world. For example, there are international organisations such as OECD and NATO which include among their Members both European States and States which belong to the free world but are not Members of the Council of Europe. Should not the Council of Europe act as a political forum for them?

I want to make special mention of what several of us felt when we were on mission in Japan last month. While we were there we met numerous Western and Japanese personalities. On 23 April 1973, a week after our return, Mr. Kissinger made a speech in which there was striking confirmation of our own personal findings that we had put in writing before reading his speech. He said that 1973 was to be the Year of Europe because the era fashioned by decisions taken a generation ago was coming to an end. The success of that policy had given

birth to new situations which required a new approach.

Further on, he pointed out that other areas of the world had acquired a new importance, and added that Japan had become a major centre of power in many fields so that solutions to Atlantic problems, to be viable, would have to include Japan.

He stressed this at length.

What I want us to realise is that, compared with the economic strength of Japan, Europe, whether of the Nine or of the Seventeen, simply does not exist, or exists only as a phantom that no one takes seriously.

It might perhaps be worthwhile remembering that, with its 107 million inhabitants and thanks to a cohesion and unity of action unique of its kind, Japan's growth in gross national product for the last two decades has been of the order of 10 to 11 % per annum in real terms, and that current forecasts reckon the average annual rate of growth for the period 1970 to 1980 at some 9 %.

I might also remind you of the recent figures published in the Economist of April 1973. From them I deduce that this country, with its unique characteristics and impressive industrial, commercial and financial potentialities is still, at diplomatic level, in search of a policy of its own which will correspond to its economic power and the duties that power implies. And although, in spite of serious commercial and monetary difficulties, the United States are, and will no doubt remain for years, Japan's favourite partner and ally, Tokyo will still want to branch out beyond the rather exclusive framework of its relations with Washington and diversify its contacts, its friends and its connections. The renewal of relations with Peking and probable Japanese-Soviet co-operation in Siberia are a case in point.

In my view, Europe should not merely take the exact measure of present Japanese aspirations, but should seize the opportunity to help "anchor" Japan to the countries of the free world. Japanese-European political co-operation linked to the already existing co-operation

Mr. de Stexhe (continued)

between the United States and Europe and between Japan and the United States would be a determinant factor for the future of the free world.

And pursuing the same long-term line of thought, I wonder whether the Council of Europe should not branch out in another direction from the narrow confines of the Nine or the Seventeen, towards the European non-member countries.

Is it credible that the real Europe should be limited to nine or to seventeen countries? Should we not begin by entering into special relations with all the European countries with a Western civilisation, a civilisation inherited from ancient Greece, Rome or Christianity? Is it wise to treat some State or other as a black sheep simply because its political regime is not that of parliamentary democracy in the British tradition?

I quite understand that some people are against the creation of a European Community that includes some States which are not "democratic", but if we looked a little deeper at what unites the Western European countries — the same basic form of civilisation — rather than at their differences, I think Europe would play a more important part in the world instead of steadily losing influence. It is in our interest, I believe, for Western Europeans to stand more closely shoulder to shoulder, and that is as true of Switzerland and Austria as of Sweden, Spain, and other European countries.

Is it or is it not true that the Mediterranean, the mare nostrum of the Romans, is the natural link with Africa? And we all know that for the first time for centuries Russia is deploying a powerful fleet there, with the risk of some day taking Europe in a pincer movement. In the defence of Europe against that danger, do we really believe that the Iberian Peninsula has not the same part to play as Turkey and Italy?

But in my view the need for a rapprochement with the Iberian Peninsula is still further justified by the fact that these countries provide the normal family links with the whole South American continent because of their common language. I am convinced that the South American countries have a stronger sentimental attachment to Europe — to Rome, Paris, Madrid —

than to the United States, whose material and financial power they fear, or to the USSR, or nowadays to Japan, influential as she is in Brazil where, for example, 35 % of Japanese emigrants settle.

We were certainly cut off from that continent by the 1940-45 war, but I wonder why Japan is so much stronger industrially in Brazil than Europe is. It is still our culture that the world wants; it is still that which is the inspiration of all corners of the earth.

I believe, Mr. President, that the Council of Europe could be a powerful factor in opening European windows still wider on the world. I believe our influence in areas outside the Nine and the Seventeen is still great because of our civilisation, our culture, and our concern for human beings and their environment.

We must develop all these possibilities. That is one of the missions of the Council of Europe that we must not lose sight of, because today we are faced with the immediate necessity of trying to settle the respective functions of the Nine and the Seventeen.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Cravatte.

Mr. CRAVATTE (Luxembourg) (Translation).

— Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, as I myself was a member of this working party, it goes without saying that I am in full agreement with the report presented to you by Mr. Reverdin. I want straightaway to pay tribute to our Rapporteur, who has produced a report which is complete, lucid, logical and full of promise for the future activities of the Council of Europe.

In the course of this brief speech I shall have some remarks to make along the same lines as Mr. Reverdin's report. First of all, no one can doubt that the task entrusted to the Working Party on the Future Role of the Council of Europe over which he presided was an important one, all the more so because, after a period of stagnation, vacillation and uncertainty lasting between fifteen and twenty years, we have now, I believe, arrived at the moment of truth. There may be some regrettable shillyshallying; there may be some necessary delay; but in a more or

Mr. Cravatte (continued)

less brief space of time the fate of our Organisation will be decided.

Of course, I know that the problem we are discussing is not a new one. The task that Mr. Reverdin's working party undertook on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, although not in exactly the same terms, followed the same line as previous attempts to make people understand why the Council of Europe should continue to exist. In the joyous early days, during the euphoric period immediately following its creation, the Council seemed the most suitable instrument for making Europe. It even looked like a mock-up of the future Europe. But we must also remember that the enthusiasm soon evaporated. People quickly began to doubt whether the Council of Europe really could make Europe. Our Organisation served no purpose, and people realised that only too clearly. There were many devoted spirits who were worried and anxious about it.

At this moment, when we are discussing the fate of this Organisation, I think back to the debates we had here about a dozen years ago. On the initiative of a French Senator, Mr. Auguste Pinton, a working party was set up very similar to Mr. Reverdin's. I think I am right in saying that I am the last remaining member of that former working party in this Assembly. At the time, we were talking about reactivating the Council of Europe, which seemed extremely necessary. Just listen, Ladies and Gentlemen, to some extracts from a report by Mr. Junot, a Paris member of parliament, who had presented a recommendation on creating a working party. Mr. Junot said:

"The Council of Europe was the first European organisation to be created. Its membership is the largest. When it was set up in 1949 its distinguished creators nourished vast ambitions for it and they believed that the Council would be the cradle from which a united Europe would emerge.

In fact, these hopes have not materialised, especially during the last five or six years. Introducing a brilliant report in December 1957 on the institutional reform of the Council of Europe, Mr. Pierre-Henri Teitgen noted that the Council of Europe is passing through critical times and he added that for several months past all those who had followed the

work of the Council had noticed the symptoms and were aware of the seriousness of the crisis.

Since 1957 the situation has certainly not improved, and one could read recently in an important article in the German press that the present French leaders had a very clear tendency to consider that the Council had been useless and that its time was over. For his part, so sincere a European as Mr. C.J. Gignoux, in examining what kind of Europe could now be achieved, writes: We apologise for not taking the Council of Europe into consideration but its only role is one of supervision, which is interesting but entirely academic.

Many of our colleagues in the Council of Europe have come to the same conclusion. This has led some of them to undertake praiseworthy efforts to try and and find solutions. Thus more than fifteen proposals for reactivating the Council of Europe have been made and, quite recently, following the interesting proposal of Mr. Radius, Mr. Fens submitted a very able report... All these efforts have not so far led to any practical results."

So, in 1960 already fifteen efforts had been made to reactivate the Council and none of them had had the slightest effect. You see how people felt even then about our Organisation, which was accused of having served no purpose whatever. So I want to put this question: from 1960, 1961, 1962 to the present day, that is during the last twelve years roughly, has any progress been made towards reactivating the Council of Europe?

We may beg leave to doubt it. We may even feel that things have got even worse. Although the governments know the problem exists, although they have been told it is their responsibility, they have not done much in the meantime, despite constant prodding by the Assembly.

That is the situation in which we find ourselves. At the same time, I do believe that the efforts now being made by the working party, the Political Affairs Committee and the Assembly as a whole may lead to some much more promising results. The assurances we have been given by the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers should also be heartening, at least in one sense.

The most important thing is that there should be a sincere determination on the part of the

Mr. Cravatte (continued)

governments to do something. Lip service is not enough. Above all we need determination on the part of the governments of the uncommitted countries, that is to say on the part of those who are not Members of the Community. Those States should insist that the Council of Europe must be saved and should demonstrate their interest in it, as the Austrian Foreign Minister has done today.

The Council of Europe will soon have existed for twenty-five years, and for twenty years it has been in a state of crisis. So we are bound to ask whether it still as a raison d'être, whether it has any real chance of survival. Things cannot go on like this. The governments are now faced with a deadline. What will they do between now and the end of the year?

Past experience should make us pessimists, but that does not mean we must abandon all hope. As the French philosopher, Ernest Renan, said, only pessimism is fruitful.

So let us be pessimists? But, joking apart, at long last this atmosphere of surrender, of renunciation, this psychosis of resignation which has grown up around the Council of Europe must be dissipated, for it does immense harm to our Organisation. I personally have the courage to believe that today's debate will lead to much more fruitful results and will give us reason for hope for our Organisation.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Piket.

Mr. PIKET (Netherlands) (Translation). — We can certainly be optimists because I am the last speaker. Since 1973 is the Year of Europe, it is fitting that we should have in our hands Mr. Reverdin's brilliant report — on which I would like to congratulate him. We are faced with the question of the future of the Council of Europe, and this report provides an answer.

Coming after twenty other speakers, I will try to be brief in my comments on the various aspects of the matter described to us by the Rapporteur and which have already been touched on in previous speeches.

I just want to underline one point which seems to me vital for the future of the Council of Europe, and that is unification of law. If we want Europe to be strong and to play an important part as a political partner on the world stage, its mission must not be limited to economic affairs, but must extend to cultural and legal affairs as well. The law varies so much from one European country to another that the Council has an important part to play in its unification. The various national laws are still too different. For example, in the Netherlands, the percentage of alcohol in a motorist's blood must not exceed $0.5\%_0$. If it does, he is booked. In Belgium, the permitted proportion is 1.5 %, and in France it is 1.2 % .. In these circumstances it is very difficult to drive a car from France to the Netherlands by way of Belgium. The same is true of revolvers and rifles. In the Netherlands you require a licence to possess that kind of weapon, but this does not hold good in other European countries.

In view of the historical and national character of law in Europe, it will be very difficult to change it quickly and to make national laws more or less uniform. However that may be, the Council of Europe has a very important part to play in this field. The day on which the civil and penal codes become uniform in all countries of Western Europe, we shall have taken an enormous step forward for the future. Legal frontiers will have disappeared with territorial frontiers. For all men to be equal, the same law must apply all over Europe.

As members of parliament, we have right to be really worried when people claim that the Council of Europe is now out of date, that it no longer has any function to perform, that it has lost its raison d'être. But if we are to establish legal equality for all in Europe, there is still a great deal for us members of parliament to do.

7. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — In accordance with the Assembly's decision, the vote on the draft recommendation, Document 3285,

The President (continued)

and on the amendment and sub-amendment on international terrorism, will take place tomorrow morning after we have heard the Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee.

- I therefore propose that the Assembly hold its next sitting at 10 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, with the following Orders of the Day:
- 1. International terrorism (Replies by the Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee and vote on the draft recommendation, Document 3285, amendment and sub-amendment).
- 2. Mission of the Council of Europe (Replies by the Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee and vote on the draft recommendation, Document 3281, and amendments).

- 3. Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, President of the Italian Council of Ministers;
 - Parliamentary questions and debate.
- 4. If time permits, relations between Western Europe and the United States.
- Presentation by Sir John Rodgers of the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Document 3279 and Addendum:
- Presentation by Mr. Dequae of the introductory report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Document 3278;
 - Joint debate on the two reports.

Are there any objections ?...

The Orders of the Day of the next sitting are agreed.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

The Sitting is closed.

(The Sitting was closed at 7.15 p.m.)

3rd Sitting	Appendix
o. w withing	pp::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::

APPENDIX

Names of Representatives or Substitutes who signed the Attendance Register in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure: 1

MM	Aano	MM	Hofer	MM.	Pica
******	Piket (Aantjes)		Urwin (Jones)		Portheine
	Cravatte (Abens)		Jung Louis		Castellucci (Preti)
	Ahrens		Kahn-Ackermann		Radinger
	Akçali		Karasek		Grussenmeyer (Radius)
	Alber		Kiratlioglu		Renschler
	Alemyr		Külahli		Reverdin
	Amrehn		La Loggia		Richter
	Weber P. (Beauguitte)		Legaret		Rivière
Miss	Bergegren			Lord	St. Helens
	Blumenfeld		-(Schieder
******	Brincat		Letschert		Schlaga
	Christiansen		Schuler (Leu)		Yvon (Schleiter)
	Collins Edward		Leynen	Mrs	Schuchardt
	Governey (Collins Gerard)		Mammi		Morris (Shore)
	Cornelissen		Margue		Steel
	Czernetz		Mart		Stewart
	Dankert		Mende		de Stexhe
	Delforge		Moneti (Minnocci)		Tanghe
	Borg Olivier de Puget	Mrs.	Cattaneo Petrini		Treu
	(De Marco)		(Mrs. Miotti Carli)		Üstündag
	de Bruyne (Dequae)	Mr.	de Montesquiou		Van Lent
	Digby		Munkebye		Vedovato
	Enders		van der Werff (Nederhorst))	Wall (Dame Joan Vickers)
	Fletcher		Oguz		Voogd
	Capelle (Flornoy)		Öktem		Schmitt Henri
Mrs.	Aasen (Mr. Frydenlund)		Pecoraro		(Weber Joachim)
	Withalm (Goëss)		Critchley (Sir John Peel)		Weiberg-Aurdal
	Farr (Grieve)		Pendry		Wyler (Wenk)
	Hansen		Péridier		Wiklund
	Hedlund		Péronnet		Müller (Mrs. Wolf)
	Hedström		Petersen Erling		Zaloglu
	Hocaoglu		Hauret (Petit)		-

List of Representatives absent or apologising for absence:

Dist of Representatives at	present or approach	TOT BODGINGE .		
MM. Arnason	MM.	Kristjansson	MM.	Rossi
Arnaud		Labbé		Salvatore
Averardi		Lemmrich		Schmidt Hansheinrich
Bettiol	Sir	Fitzroy Maclean		Schmitt Robert
Bohman		Mason		Schugens
Coppola		Muscat		Schwencke
Desmond		Nessler		Sieglerschmidt
Dregger		Oestergaard		Stinus
de Félice		O'Leary		Talamona
Feyzioglu		Osborn		Tisserand
Gessner		Peart		Tomney
Gislason		de Préaumont		Vitter
Holst		Quilleri		Zamberletti
Kempfler	Sir	John Rodgers		
-		•		

^{1.} The names of Substitutes who replaced absent Representatives are printed in italics, the names of such Representatives being given in brackets.

TWENTY-FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION

OFFICIAL REPORT

Fourth Sitting

Wednesday 16 May 1973, at 10 a.m.

	Summa	RY
1. Adoption of the Minutes	105	Adoption of Amendment No. 2 as amended.
2. Attendance Register	105	Adoption of Amendment No. 3.
3. International terrorism (resumed debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3285, amendment and sub-amendment, and vote on the draft recommendation)	106	Amendment No. 1: Speakers: The President, MM. Ahrens, Reverdin (Rapporteur). Adoption of Amendment No. 1. Adoption of the draft recommendation as amended: Recommendation 704. 5. Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, Prime Minister of Italy
as amended: Recommendation 703. 4. Mission of the Council of Europe (resumed debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3281, amendments and sub-amendment, and vote on the draft recommendation)	110	 Relations between Western Europe and the United States (joint debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3279 and Addendum, and the introductory report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Doc. 3278). Speakers: The President, Sir John Rodgers (Rapporteur on Doc. 3279), MM. Dequae (Rapporteur on Doc. 3278), Critchley. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting

Mr. Vedovato, President of the Assembly, took the Chair at 10 a.m.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Sitting is open.

1. Adoption of the Minutes

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Minutes of Proceedings of the last two sittings have been distributed in accordance with Rule 21 of the Rules of Procedure.

Are there any comments?...

The Minutes were adopted.

2. Attendance Register

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The names of the Substitutes present at this sitting which have been notified to me will be published in the list of Representatives appended to the Minutes of Proceedings and to the Official Report of Debates.

3. International terrorism

(Resumed debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3285, amendment and sub-amendment, and vote on the draft recommendation)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the continuation of the debate on international terrorism and the vote on the draft recommendation, Document 3285, amendment and sub-amendment.

The list of speakers is closed.

I call Mr. Czernetz, Rapporteur of the Political Affairs Committee, to reply.

Mr. CZERNETZ (Austria) (Translation). — Mr. President, let me first thank those who took part in yesterday's debate most warmly; the report and my presentation of it have been generally well accepted. I therefore wish to dwell only on a few controversial points although I do not know whether the speakers who expressed themselves critically are present or not.

Mr. Micallef thought our recommendation conflicted with the United Nations resolution. I would say that, on the contrary, it is evident that the actions in question are, as I demonstrated yesterday, in flat contradiction to the Geneva Convention of 1949 and that we are therefore completely justified in acting as we do.

I do not believe that the Council of Europe can be accused of being over-hasty. The ground swell of terrorism reaching as far as Europe has been continuing for two years; it is in fact already rather late for the Council of Europe or the Consultative Assembly to decide to propose immediate action to our governments.

Mr. Hofer mentioned inter alia that international law is being threatened. I drew attention to this development yesterday and to the change in the methods of the terrorists. Let me emphasise again: the terrorists, whatever their motives, commit crimes and provide an example for psychopaths and common criminals. There have been certain cases in which domestic law and order has been upset. To mention only two

countries — Germany and Austria — there have been cases of common crime linked to the kidnapping of hostages and the attempted blackmailing of the government and the authorities to obtain the freeing of criminals. This is a growing and very serious danger.

Mr. President, I do not know whether Mr. Stinus who made certain critical comments yesterday is present. We purposely avoided speaking against any particular group of States in our recommendation. We spoke very generally and carefully of "certain governments". No, it is not one-sided!

Mr. Stinus has now made the same request as Mr. de Stexhe made in his proposed amendment; he ask for a clear definition of terrorism.

The definition of terrorism, that is to say, the use of force outside the framework of acts of war, has been unequivocally defined in the Geneva Convention of 1949, namely as acts of violence committed by persons to whom the definitions of the Geneva Convention do not apply, persons who do not carry weapons openly, persons who do not show in any way that they belong to fighting units, who are not under anybody's command and who do everything that is expressly prohibited by the Geneva Convention, even in case of war. Thus a definition exists at least from the point of view of international law. Let me say to Mr. Stinus that the actions in question were indubitably in contradiction to the Geneva Convention.

Mr. Stinus has said that the American bombings were also a kind of terrorism. I shall now speak, not on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, but for myself.

Without being sympathetic to any act of war, I must say that until the bombings in December of last year, the American war effort was very dubious and did not constitute effective action on the part of the American war machine. However, after the withdrawal of half a million American soldiers, leaving behind some 20 000 or 30 000 troops, the December bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong was a purely political terrorist measure.

Mr. Czernetz (continued)

This was not stated in my report, but I wrote an article in my own country in which I drew this distinction.

Mr. Stinus mentioned South Africa. I stated very clearly in my report and particularly in my oral introduction that there are despotisms and dictatorships in a whole number of countries. I attempted to classify the various dictatorships politically, but naturally it was impossible to mention all the different kinds. However, they certainly exist and this fact is not ignored either by the Assembly or by me personally.

I also said very emphatically that I recognised the right to self-determination and the right to resist foreign occupation and oppression. The question is, how is this struggle to be waged?

Mr. President, I would not like to repeat what I said nine months ago regarding the early days of the workers' struggle and its necessary separation from anarchy. I then quoted Frederick Engels who stated clearly that it was a struggle waged not against guilty oppressors but against third parties with absolutely no result, a struggle that served the purposes of the anarchist terrorists.

I should also like to say, Mr. President, that the terrorist acts of Lod, Munich and Khartoum cannot in any way be considered as part of the struggle for self-determination. That much is clear. These acts were common crimes against uninvolved persons, crimes which had been planned to the last detail.

With your permission, Mr. President, I would like to repeat that, as mentioned yesterday, I have personal experience of this question. At the beginning of 1935 we got to know a man in the illegal underground movement who had denounced a number of active socialist functionaries to the police. The present Federal Chancellor, Mr. Kreisky, was arrested as a result and the present Federal President, Mr. Jonas, was, together with many others, brought before the court. At that time I was very active in the Austrian underground movement and it was a very difficult thing to convince our friends that secret tribunals were a crime. It seemed the obvious thing to eliminate the informer. Believe me, we had to work hard for many months and

argue with our friends: For Heaven's sake, no summary justice. Nothing can justify that! I am happy that we succeeded.

Since 1945 we have been known in the Austrian Republic as those who fought and resisted fascism, unstained by the crime of summary justice by secret tribunals. This will surely be considered a valid guideline wherever men oppose despotism and dictatorship.

A few words on Mr. de Stexhe's amendment. It will not be easy for the lawyers to define a political offence. My guess is that the definition will not relate to the nature of the act but to its motives. And then we shall be in trouble. We state in paragraph 1 of our recommendation; let me read it in English:

"Condemning international terrorist acts which, regardless of their cause, should be punished as serious criminal offences involving the killing, kidnapping or endangering of the lives of innocent people."

If the lawyers find a definition they will have to answer the question whether political motives can erase the stain of common crime from just such a crime.

However, since Mr. de Stexhe was willing to accept the proposal of the Chairman of our committee, Mr. Blumenfeld, and include it in his amendment, taking account of paragraph 1, let me merely draw his attention to the contradictions in the content and say that I shall not oppose it but shall vote for it. I would only say most emphatically: Let us have no illusions, no erroneous views suggesting that political offences cannot be recognised by type of action but only by motive, and that in the case of terrorism the motive becomes of no interest because it leads to acts of violence against uninvolved and innocent people. These are crimes which we wish to see punished.

Lastly, a few words to Mrs. von Bothmer who said that it was necessary to get at the roots of terrorism. I entirely agree. An attempt at this is being made in the United Nations. I fear, however, that it will take quite a few years. The roots of terrorism are legion. In addition to social, economic and political roots, there is the tendency of people to resort to violence first and to think afterwards. This will probably not be studied.

Mr. Czernetz (continued)

I repeat, our predecessors fought passionately as social democrats in the early days of the European workers' movement against the anarchists' idea that the guilty ones at the top should be physically eliminated. This idea was vanquished and the European workers' movement and social democracy became an integral part of our democratic society striving after a new social order. Had the opposite happened, the European workers' movement would have been swallowed up in a sea of violence and counter-violence, in the blood bath which was preparing.

We should reflect on this today. Around 1840 and 1860 the conditions of European workers in Great Britain, Germany, Austria and France were nearly as bad as those of the people in many Middle East States and the developing countries are today. Poverty is no reason for the indiscriminate use of violence against innocent people. Nor does it put an end to the indiscriminate oppression of large masses of human beings. It is possible to learn from experience. I hope that we in the Assembly shall do so.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Czernetz.

I call Mr. Blumenfeld, Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee.

Mr. BLUMENFELD (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, I would like to thank the Rapporteur on behalf of the committee for the splendid report which he and his sub-committee have submitted and for his significant underscoring of the political content and background of the report.

The report which was followed yesterday by an interesting debate for which I also wish to express my thanks, constitutes a very definite challenge to the member governments, that is to say to the Committee of Ministers, finally to act and to make use of the present relative lull in air piracy and international terrorism for joint and consistent European measures to prevent criminal attacks on the civilian population in the future.

We note that, partly thanks to the searches which have been strictly carried out at all European airports since the beginning of the year in connection with air travel, there have only been

very few and, thank Heaven, unsuccessful attempts to hijack civilian aircraft. To this extent certain measures have been taken. But we believe that the recommendation submitted by the committee, and which has been commented by the Rapporteur, provides the lever needed by all member governments to implement what this Assembly has been calling for for so long and has now defined exactly. Let me stress: all governments! For we have long known that there is at least one member government which has hesitated and is indeed still hesitating on the question under discussion here.

We believe that the recommendation to convene a special conference of Ministers of the Interior and to discuss measures will take care of the reservations of the French Government. We also believe that all member governments can agree and endorse our statement in the last paragraph of the recommendation to governments. I mean the passage stating that the governments should and must support the demands of the international transport workers, airline pilots and public in the case of a criminal attack.

We heard representatives of the International Transport Workers' Federation, of IATA and of IFALPA in our sub-committee. These organisations fully supported our views. They agreed fully with the conclusions of the report which was submitted by the Rapporteur, Mr. Czernetz.

With your permission, Mr. President, I shall read you two sentences from a telegram sent to us, to yourself and the Assembly by the Chairman of IATA, Mr. Hammarskjöld. In it he states:

"IATA fully supports the conclusions reached by your Rapporteur and the draft recommendation presented by the Political Affairs Committee. These recognise the essential responsibility of governments in this matter. We have consistently maintained that this menace to civil aviation can only be satisfactorily dealt with by determined government action."

Precisely the last point, determined action by all our governments, is what the Rapporteur, what the Political Affairs Committee wishes and expects of the Committee of Ministers.

Mr. Czernetz has had his say about the definition of terrorism. Let me add, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we need only see that all parliaments of the member States agree that perpetrators of attacks on innocent civilians must under no circumstances be allowed

Mr. Blumenfeld (continued)

to plead political motivation, but that these attacks must be branded as crimes. It is as simple as that. I believe that is what is now needed. The terrorist, whether he hijacks an aircraft, threatens people with a machine gun or otherwise plans or carries out a criminal attack, will probably — unless he belongs in a lunatic asylum which, as we have seen, is also possible — be deterred only by the knowledge that he will find no sanctuary anywhere, in any country, and once all governments see to it that such terrorists are properly sentenced and punished in the country on whose territory or against whose aircraft the criminal attacks were committed. That is the point at issue and that is what we wish to see implemented.

This has nothing to do with the more farreaching question raised here in the discussion and answered by Mr. Czernetz, which can be summarised under the heading "Do sanctions lead to escalation?" Our colleague from Malta put this question yesterday. I can only reply: "No, sanctions do not cause crime to escalate; crime causes crime to escalate". We must see to it in our part of the Europe, in the civilised part, that this terror no longer occurs.

With this I shall conclude my few comments as Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee. Everything that had to be said was said in the debate. Its clarity left nothing to be desired.

Our recommendation is not aimed at anyone in particular, for terrorism is to be found everywhere. But the Arab governments know — since they can read — that this is addressed particularly to them. They in particular have carried terrorism beyond the confines of their own territory to Europe, and that is what we wish to prevent, irrespective of the fact that in any case all kinds of terrorism must be stopped with the means available to our governments within their own frontiers.

Mr. de Stexhe has tabled an amendment. After conferring with Mr. de Stexhe and with the Rapporteur, I submitted a sub-amendment to the amendment with which Mr. de Stexhe agrees. The Rapporteur has just gone on record as agreeing to it. That is the only amendment that has been tabled. I would now ask that our recommendation be accordingly put to the vote.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Blumenfeld.

I would also like to thank the committee as a whole for its excellent work.

I will now read the draft recommendation in Document 3285:

"The Assembly,

- 1. Condemning international terrorist acts which, regardless of their cause, should be punished as serious criminal offences involving the killing, kidnapping or endangering of the lives of innocent people,
- 2. Considers that the disappointing response of the international community makes joint action among member States of the Council of Europe all the more necessary and urgent;
- 3. Deplores the fact that the political and material support of a certain number of governments and organisations permits acts of international terrorism;
- 4. Appreciates the good intentions of the Committee of Ministers in response to its Recommendation 684 (1972) in setting up an ad hoc Committee of Senior Officials to study the legal aspects of international terrorism, but considers that this will not in itself contribute in the immediate future towards a reduction of terrorist acts;
- 5. Realises and shares the deep concern of airline pilots and international transport workers, and their manifest desire for effective sanctions against terrorism;
- 3. Recommends that the Committee of Ministers:
- (i) invite the governments of member States:
- (a) to ratify most urgently the Tokyo, Hague and Montreal Conventions against hijacking and unlawful interference with civil aviation;
- (b) to use all their political and economic influence to dissuade the States concerned from pursuing a policy which allows terrorists to prepare their acts or to reside or find asylum on their territory;
- (ii) work out a joint European front to combat international terrorism, and in particular:
- (a) co-ordinate their proposals for action at United Nations level, both in the follow-up to Resolution 3034 and in ICAO on the basis of recommendations which should be made by the ad hoc Committee of Senior Officials;
- (b) urgently convene a special conference of the Ministers of Interior of member States or other Ministers who are responsible for the police and home security, in order to work out proposals and co-ordinate measures aiming at the prevention of acts of terrorism on the regional basis of the member States of the Council of Europe;
- (iii) take seriously into account the fact that, failing effective and urgent European governmental action, parliamentary and public opinion will openly support retaliatory measures by the airline pilots and international transport workers against service to and from offending States."

Mr. de Stexhe has tabled an amendment to the draft recommendation, which reads as follows:

- "In paragraph 6 (ii) of the draft recommendation, add a new sub-paragraph (c) as follows:
 - '(c) to endeavour to establish a common defi-

The President (continued)

nition for the notion of "political offence", in order to be able to refute any "political" justification whenever an act of terrorism endangers the life of innocent persons;'"

I may remind you that he moved it yesterday.

There is a sub-amendment to that amendment tabled by Mr. Blumenfeld, which reads:

"In paragraph 6 (ii) (c), to replace the words to endeavour' by:

'in accordance with paragraph 1 of this recommendation, to establish etc...'"

The sub-amendment is accepted by Mr. de Stexhe, so I put the amendment as amended to the vote...

The amendment as amended was adopted.

We shall now vote on the whole recommendation in Document 3285 as amended.

A roll-call vote has not been requested, so will you please vote by show of hands on the draft recommendation in Document 3285 as amended...

Is there anyone against ?...

The draft recommendation in Document 3285 as amended was adopted.

It will be published as Recommendation 703.

4. Mission of the Council of Europe (Resumed debate on the report of the Political Attairs Committee, Doc. 3281, amendments and sub-amendment, and vote on the draft recommendation)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the continuation of the debate on the mission of the Council of Europe and the vote on the draft recommendation in the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Document 3281 and amendments.

I remind you that the list of speakers is closed. I call Mr. Reverdin, the Rapporteur, to reply. Mr. REVERDIN (Switzerland) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, twenty of you took part yesterday in a long debate on the report and, generally speaking, you approved its conclusions.

It is impossible for me to reply to everything that was said, so I will confine myself to a few comments.

Several of the speakers strongly emphasised their desire to see the political role of the Council of Europe increasingly recognised and the Council itself increasingly used as a political body. That is quite natural, especially in the case of the representatives of countries which do not belong to the Community — the four Austrians, the two Swiss, the Swede and the Turk — who spoke, and who all pointed out how important it was for them to have a forum in which they found themselves on an equal footing with all other European States, particularly the Nine.

Great stress was also laid on the Council of Europe's role as a liaison between the member States and the rest of the world.

Mr. Czernetz gave us details of his proposed Round Table with politicians from the East European countries. We cannot call them parliamentarians because of the way in which they are appointed, but they are nevertheless politicians who play a part in their own countries not unlike our own.

Mr. de Stexhe made one remark which I thought very true. We are now extremely anxious to open the door to the East, but we tend to forget that there are countries in Western Europe which do not belong to our Organisation because of their system of government, but whose peoples are part of our family — Spaniards, Portuguese and Greeks — just as certain Eastern European peoples also belong to our family — Hungarians, Poles and many others. I think we should do something about opening the door to them too.

Mr. Digby thought the Assembly should exercise a self-denying ordinance and produce fewer texts, perhaps even cut down the number of its committees.

Mr. Reverdin (continued)

Mr. Fletcher wants us to become more aggressive. He reminded us of the history of parliaments, particularly the parliament of his own country. Obviously, the Assembly being a parliamentary body must be aggressive. If it were not aggressive the Council of Europe would really be nothing much. We therefore have an essential part to play and should seek to enlarge it by the quality of our debates and also of our devotion to the European cause. So the Council of Europe as a whole must exercise a self-denying ordinance.

Mr. Margue, Mr. Piket and others stressed particularly the part the Council could play in European legal co-operation. It is very significant that that was so strongly emphasised in our debate.

The cardinal point at the present stage of the Council's development is our relations with Brussels, with the Community. Till we can hold a real dialogue at all levels with the countries and governing bodies of the Community, we shall be going round in circles. That dialogue should therefore be initiated as quickly as possible. If necessary, we in the Assembly must demand that our partners' hand be forced and they be made to start this dialogue without too much delay. That, too, is essential from our point of view.

The Community has been enlarged, but that should not lead to a widening of the gulf that, in spite of everything, divides the Nine from the "non-Nine". Our Assembly played a very important part in preventing the gulf between the Seven and the Six having disastrous consequences for Europe. We never stopped insisting that this gulf should be filled in. Now, the Nine are all on one side, but there remain the others. I repeat - enlarging the Community must not lead to widening the gulf. We must insist that the goodwill, shown by the governments of the member States through their Foreign Ministers whom we visited, be converted into an active determination to use the Council of Europe as the essential tool for building that larger Europe, the Europe of the Seventeen — which is the present limit of democratic Europe - as the effective tool which the Council of Europe would become if it were regenerated and rejuvenated, and reorganised its activities.

The working party has fulfilled its task for the time being, but it remains available for the later stages of the work it has begun. We are now in a position to present the Committee of Ministers with a very interesting file. It will contain the recommendation on which you are going to vote, the report on which it is based, the the twenty speeches made here yesterday, and the statement by Mr. Kirchschläger, Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, who did us the honour not only of being present, but of taking part in our debate.

There are Minutes of our seventeen visits. I suggest that, with the authorisation of the governments concerned, they be placed at the disposal of the six "Wise Men" whom the Committee of Ministers have appointed to pursue the task and to act on our recommendation.

I would like to draw their attention to a document which seems to me specially important. Our Dutch friends prepared for our visit with quite particular care. Their delegation to the Assembly drew up a document and discussed it with the Dutch delegation to the European Parliament. The result was an amended document which was discussed by a joint meeting of the Political Affairs Committees of the two Assemblies. That document is really very important, and the six Wise Men should take note of it. They might perhaps also ask to see the documents drafted by the ministries in preparation for our visits. We have those documents. A great deal of consideration was given to the matter in all the capitals. The results of this work should be made available to those whose task it will be to say how our draft recommendation could be followed up.

Some amendments have been tabled. When they come up for discussion, I shall have something to say about them. I repeat, what we have done is only a part of the task. The matter now goes to the Committee of Ministers. I hope the Chairman of our committee will tell the Committee of Ministers how anxious we are to go full speed ahead so that this period of uncertainty for our Organisation, which has lasted far too long, may at last come to an end.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Reverdin.

I call the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. BLUMENFELD (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, I shall be brief. Mr. Reverdin, our Rapporteur and former President of the Assembly, discussed the most important issues both in his introductory report of yesterday and in today's summing up of the debate for which I also wish to thank him. I have three points to make.

First, Mr. President, we should not call into question the Council of Europe, its Assembly and its many subsidiary bodies in the coming months while we consider future possibilities of work and the dovetailing of our tasks with the European Parliament and other international organisations and institutions in Europe. We are — and in this I follow the Austrian Foreign Minister and Chairman-in-Office of the Ministers — the oldest European parliamentary organisation and we have, thank Heaven, in the Committee of Ministers, the oldest ministerial organisation in which our member governments can consult each other and co-ordinate their views. For this reason we should not call it in question.

Simultaneously we should — and this is my second point — be clear about the fact that the work of the Council of Europe and its Consultative Assembly will only be able to continue in future if we establish priorities, and provided we restrict our activities. In the recommendation submitted by the Rapporteur with the complete and unanimous support of the Political Affairs Committee, we point out, as parliamentarians, that we are ready to give a good example and to examine our tasks, hitherto far-flung, that we are ready to name those which we believe concern all member States and which should be dealt with urgently in Strasbourg by the Council of Europe, its Assembly and Committee of Ministers, and to concentrate our efforts on solving them.

The third point is that we expect the Committee of Ministers and its Group of Six set up on Monday by the Committee of Ministers to keep in touch with the Assembly — possibly with the Reverdin Working Party or an Assembly delegation — so as to be in a position to take decisions with the consensus of the parliamenta-

rians in December of this year and to announce them in our Assembly.

Mr. President, the report we are submitting speaks for itself. The few amendments tabled during yesterday's debate were dealt with early this morning in the Political Affairs Committee. We voted on them. I am sorry that the members of the Assembly have only just received the amendments, but we have been working under pressure and the Secretariat was not able to make them available earlier. I nevertheless hope, Mr. President, that the amendments which have been approved by the Rapporteur, the Chairman of your committee and the majority of the committee itself will also receive the approval of the Assembly.

The Rapporteur will, as announced, comment on the individual amendments when they are read out.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I will read the draft recommendation in Document 3281:

- "The Assembly,
- 1. Having regard to the report of the Political Affairs Committee on the mission of the Council of Europe (Doc. 3281), and expressing its gratitude to governments for the assistance they have given its working party;
- 2. Noting with satisfaction that all the member governments have emphasised the importance they attach to the Council of Europe and to the role which it must continue to play;
- 3. Considering that the Council of Europe is one of the key elements in an articulated system of European co-operation answering the needs and interests of all the countries engaged in the quest for European unity;
- 4. Considering that the Council of Europe's role should be reviewed, particularly in the light of the Community's enlargement and development and of the efforts being made to step up co-operation between Western and Eastern Europe;
- 5. Considering that the Council of Europe has a supremely political mission which includes:
- achieving 'a greater unity between its Members', founded on the principles of democracy, the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms;
- identifying the current and future needs of the European society, and above all, those of the individual, and satisfying these needs by contributing towards a steady improvement of living conditions;

The President (continued)

- 6. Considering that the Council of Europe is the only organisation in which all the democratic States of Europe can co-operate on an equal footing;
- 7. Considering that the activities of the Council of Europe and of the Community, which both share the aim of European unity, should be complementary and not competitive, and that it is therefore essential to ensure a regular flow of information and effective liaison between the two Organisations at all levels;
- 8. Determined to pursue an 'open door' policy, and convinced that the Council of Europe would be qualified to assist in implementing the conclusions of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in specific fields in which it is recognised as having special competence;
- 9. Believing that it is essential to improve working methods and expedite the decision-making process in the Council of Europe, so that it can play its part fully and efficiently;
- 10. Considering that the Council of Europe's efficiency depends largely on the quality of Secretariat staff and that it is thus important to promote a real staff policy within the Organisation;
- 11. Determined, without interfering with the right of parliamentary initiative, to establish priorities for its own work and to concentrate that work on problems to whose solution the Council of Europe, and in particular its Assembly, can make a specific contribution,
- 12. Recommends that the Committee of Ministers:
- I. With regard to the political role of the Council of Europe:

invite member governments to recognise the important political role of the Assembly as the widest parliamentary forum in Western Europe and to use the Council of Europe as the instrument for co-ordination on all political questions of common interest to the seventeen member States concerning relations between themselves and other States, and in particular the USA, Japan, European non-member States and the developing countries;

- II. With regard to the relations between the Council of Europe and the Community:
- (a) invite member governments, particularly the governments of the Nine, to co-ordinate the activities of the Council of Europe and of the Community, having due regard to the role and resources of each, without drawing a hard and fast line between their respective activity sectors, and applying the following criteria:
- geographical criterion: the Council of Europe must be empowered to deal with all questions which transcend the geographical boundaries of the Community;
- methodological criterion: the Council of Europe must be given preference in matters which are not suited to integration by the Community methods:

- (b) use its meetings to foster the dialogue between Members and non-members of the Community, on the basis of a progress report by the Community's Council of Ministers and a report on co-operation within the Nine on matters of foreign policy;
- (c) time its ministerial meetings so that some of them are held immediately after meetings of the Foreign Ministers of the Community countries;
- (d) ensure continuous and effective liaison between the Community and the Council of Europe, at ministerial and parliamentary level, and between the various departments of the Commission and the Secretariat General:
- (e) set up a Council of Europe office in Brussels and ask the Community to appoint a mission to the Council of Europe;
- III. With regard to East-West co-operation:

see to it that the Council of Europe is available in particular, when political conditions permit, to make an effectual contribution to co-operation between Western Europe and Eastern Europe and to implementation of the conclusions of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe;

- IV. With regard to the Council of Europe's activities:
- (a) concentrate and develop the Council of Europe's activities in the following fields:
- protection and extension of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in face of the challenges inherent in modern society;
 - harmonisation of legal systems;
- cultural co-operation, reform of education and European youth policy;
- problems facing society and democratic parliamentary regimes as a result of scientific and technological advance;
- protection of nature and the historic heritage, and right to an environment and living conditions conducive to the full development of the human personality;
 - science policy and fundamental research;
- social rights and status of migrant workers, public health and human economic problems such as consumer protection;
- participation of local authorities in the building of Europe;
- (b) prepare a medium-term policy plan giving priority to activities which the Council of Europe can really carry through successfully;
- (c) review the Organisation's Intergovernmental Work Programme periodically, without hesitating to drop certain non-priority activities and transfer the resources freed in this way to priority activities;
- (d) having thus rationalised its Work Programme, provide the Council of Europe with the budgetary resources required to carry out its mission;
- (e) have recourse whenever necessary to the 'Partial Agreement' procedure or other methods

The President (continued)

which enable governments to implement specific projects in which they have a particular interest;

- V. With regard to the Council of Europe's working methods:
- (a) strengthen the dialogue and introduce regular consultation between the Committee of Ministers and the Consultative Assembly;
- (b) make full use of its power to meet with a membership of specialised Ministers entitled to take decisions, in order to allow for the variety or requirements of European co-operation;
- (c) give more scope to the Ministers' Deputies and allow them to concentrate on their executive role by improving the decision-making process, so as to leave to the Secretary General, who should be able to make more use of his right of initiation and of the executive powers attaching to his office, and to the committees of experts the duty of settling the largest possible number of administrative and technical questions;
- VI. With regard to follow-up action on this recommendation:

clarify at its next ministerial meeting, the Council of Europe's future role by the adoption of a resolution taking the foregoing considerations into account and associate the Assembly in the preparation of that resolution."

Mr. Hofer has tabled Amendment No. 2 as follows:

"In the draft recommendation, add after paragraph 4 a new paragraph reading as follows:

'Considering the profound interest to maintain and develop the relations between the Council of Europe and North America, Japan and other overseas countries and non-member States.'"

I have a sub-amendment to Amendment No. 2 by Mr. Blumenfeld, which reads:

- "The new paragraph to read as follows:
- 'Considering the profound interest for the Council of Europe to be the normal forum to maintain and develop relations between its Members and North America, Japan and other overseas countries and European non-member States.'"

But Mr. Hofer also has down Amendment No. 3, which says:

- "Replace paragraph 12. I. by the following:
- 'I. With regard to the political role of the Council of Europe invite member governments to recognise the important political role of the Assembly as the widest parliamentary forum in Western Europe and to use the Council of Europe as the instrument for co-ordination and consultation on questions of common interest to the seventeen member States.'"

I call Mr. Hofer.

Mr. HOFER (Switzerland) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I was unfortunately not able to be present at the meeting of the Political Affairs Committee because I had to chair my own committee. I would therefore be glad if the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee could tell us what has happened and is to happen to this amendment.

If there is any opposition, I shall be glad to offer some comments.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Rapporteur to reply to the amendments.

Mr. REVERDIN (Switzerland) (Translation).—Mr. Hofer's first amendment was discussed this morning by the Political Affairs Committee. The intention of that amendment is to point out how important we feel it to be that the Council of Europe, and particularly the Assembly, should act as the forum for relations between member countries and the rest of the world.

It was unanimously agreed that that statement should be moved from paragraph 12, where it was previously. On the proposal of Mr. de Stexhe, Mr. Hofer's wording was strengthened a little, and you now have before you the text the committee proposes be included in the recommendation.

Mr. Hofer's' Amendment No. 3 slightly weakens the formula agreed on Monday by the committee regarding the political role of the Council of Europe. The committee felt that in a very realistic recommendation it would perhaps be unwise to introduce a somewhat extreme demand.

The substance of the demand remains. We want the Council of Europe to continue playing an important political part. We want its machinery to be used for co-ordination and consultation between the Seventeen on problems of direct interest to all those governments. But we have watered down the manner of saying so, and that was the wording adopted unanimously by the committee.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Dankert.

Mr. DANKERT (Netherlands). — I announced yesterday that I would vote against the resolution because of paragraph 12,I. I feel that Amendment No. 3 proposed by Mr. Hofer is a substantial improvement. The Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee has just said that it is a minor improvement, but I say it is a major one and meets my demand. But I still have great difficulty with Amendment No. 2, because I feel that the wording included in Mr. Blumenfeld's sub-amendment, that the Council of Europe is the normal forum for maintaining and developing relations between its Members and North America, Japan and all other countries in the world, is still widely exaggerating the importance, certainly of the Council as such.

I would have agreed with some amendment stating that the Assembly is the normal forum for parliamentary relations with other democratic countries, but because of its present wording I will vote against Amendment No. 2 but will accept Amendment No. 3.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I put Mr. Blumenfeld's sub-amendment to the vote...

The sub-amendment was adopted.

Does anyone wish to speak?... I put to the vote Mr. Hofer's Amendment No. 2 as amended...

The amendment, as amended, was adopted.

Does anyone wish to speak ?... I put to the vote Mr. Hofer's Amendment No. 3...

The amendment was adopted unanimously.

Mr. Ahrens has tabled Amendment No. 1 as follows:

"In the draft recommendation, paragraph IV (a):

- 1. Add to the end of the fifth sub-paragraph beginning 'protection of nature...' the following words:
- 'within the context of a European regional planning policy;'
 - 2. Add to the end of the last paragraph begin-

ning 'participation of local authorities...', the following words:

'and in decisions taken at all levels, which affect the life of local and regional communities'."

I call Mr. Ahrens.

Mr. AHRENS (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, I gave my reasons for the amendment yesterday and I should be glad if the Rapporteur announced the results of the discussions of the Political Affairs Committee. I need not repeat myself.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — What does the committee think?

Mr. REVERDIN (Translation). — The committee was unanimous in feeling that Mr. Ahrens' amendment was a very useful addition to the recommendation. The committee suggests it be accepted.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Does anyone wish to speak?...

I put to the vote Mr. Ahrens' amendment accepted by the committeee...

The amendment was adopted unanimously.

We shall now vote on the whole draft recommendation in Document 3281 as amended.

A roll-call vote has not been requested, so the Assembly will vote by show of hands.

I put to the vote the whole recommendation in Document 3281 as amended...

The draft recommendation in Document 3281 as amended was adopted unanimously.

It will be published as Recommendation 704.

5. Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, Prime Minister of Italy

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, Prime Minister of Italy.

The President (continued)

I am especially glad to welcome you, Mr. Andreotti, to this Assembly as Prime Minister of Italy.

Since Alcide De Gasperi took part in the debates of the Assembly in the 1950s, no other Italian Prime Minister has done us the honour of attending, and your acceptance of our invitation thus assumes a special significance. It is my pleasure, on behalf of the Assembly, to welcome you not only as the leader of Italian political life, but also as the spiritual heir of a great man, Alcide De Gasperi, who worked for European unification with such fervour and commitment. When the Christian Democratic Party, as a token of its gratitude to Alcide De Gasperi, presented a bust of him to the Assembly, you were present at the ceremony, and you must have been deeply moved, when coming into this hall, to see the bust at the entrance.

The primary aim of our Organisation is to establish closer unity between democratic countries, and, as was clear from the debate that started yesterday and was concluded this morning with the adoption of the draft resolution on the Reverdin Report, it has done important work in all fields.

Allow me merely to recall — since it is a matter of special interest to our country, Italy — this Assembly's campaign to save Venice. An exhibition on this very subject has just been opened, and I hope you will honour it with a visit after this debate.

While thanking you for coming to Strasbourg in spite of your many important engagements, and on your return from your recent visits to the United States and Japan, let me take this opportunity of saying once again how much we appreciate this gesture, and invite you to the rostrum to present your statement. (Applause)

Mr. Giulio ANDREOTTI (Prime Minister of Italy) (Translation). — I am happy and honoured to have this opportunity of accepting your kind invitation to address this distinguished

Assembly in my capacity as Prime Minister of the Italian Republic.

To anyone who casts his mind back to what I would call the heroic period of the European adventure, when the horror, the blood and the bereavement of a fratricidal war were still with us, although the dawn of hope and rebirth could be glimpsed on the horizon, the foundation of the Council of Europe was above all an act of faith — an act of faith in ourselves and in the destiny of Europe.

The subsequent progress, even when it was achieved in other places, cannot alter this fact: you were the first to work for a united Europe, even when the time did not seem ripe in the dark Europe soon after the war, even though — inevitably — your destiny was to be that of pioneers.

You will hardly be surprised, then, that I feel that I am appearing before the mother of the European assemblies. It was here that the idea of giving a democratic dimension and a popular outlet to the building of Europe first became a reality. After twenty-four years, your Assembly is still the one that handles a range of subjects which, for number and variety, give no cause to fear comparison with the work of the other European parliamentary assemblies.

Today I cannot help remembering another day just four years ago — 15 May 1969 to be precise — on which I was here in this Chamber when the bust of Alcide De Gasperi was presented to the Council of Europe.

The presence in this Europe House of the portrait of the man who, in one of the most critical periods of the history of my people, guided the reborn Italian democracy with a sure hand, is evidence of the place he has conquered in the saga of European unity: a tremendous place which he earned by his faith in the European ideal and by the doggedness with which he fought every battle right up to the last day of his political career. Anyone who, like me, experienced every day at his side his untiring drive to convince his compatriots of the necessity, indeed the inevitability of the European option can tell you that his confidence in Europe never

wavered but drew new strength from the obstacles of very kind which beset his way.

Thanks to De Gasperi, the achievement of European unity became one of the basic objectives of the foreign policy of each successive government which took the helm of our country; it is today an essential feature of the programme of the government over which I have the honour to preside.

Just now I recalled the years in which, for Europe, the uncertainty was most painful and the outlook most gloomy, when — as it was put by a sincere European and eminent son of the great European city whose guests we are, Pierre Pflimlin — Europe was nothing but a promise. I also recalled that, just when Europe was groping in the dark, terrorised by the threat that was taking shape outside, without belief in her own ability to react and to rise up again, the birth of the Council of Europe allowed us to have confidence in the future of our peoples.

I thought I would dwell shortly on the dawning of the European post-war renaissance and underline the part played by the Organisation because, in my opinion, it is a fact whose importance must not be forgotten, especially now that relations between the Council of Europe and the European Community are, as it were, on the agenda for all our meetings. The two organisations are cast in the same mould, European and democratic. We can even say that the Community is, in a way, the daughter of the Council of Europe; but it seems to me more pertinent to observe that each of them, within the European world, has taken a different road. Two different roads, then, but both European and each valid in its own context.

I say this because we believe it would be wrong to think of the two organisations as rivals or as alternatives. The Europe of the Seventeen and the Europe of the Nine both have an important task to perform for the future of our continent. So it is difficult for us Italians to imagine that relations between the Council of Europe and the European Community could be presented in terms of feelings and policies that are not dictated by the awareness of common aims and by the requirement of close, trustful collabora-

tion. I will return to the argument when I talk about the future role of the Council of Europe.

But permit me to indicate, here and now, the importance we attach to our relations with the eight Council of Europe countries which are not Members of the Community, and to the part they are playing in the European effort. I am referring to the three Nordic countries - Sweden, Norway, Iceland - which contribute a very special example of social democracy to our joint enterprise. I am also referring to our two neutral neighbours in central Europe - Switzerland and Austria — with whom we have a fruitful co-operation in political, economic and social questions which we regard as fundamental, I am referring, lastly, to the three Mediterranean countries to which you will allow me, as a Mediterranean myself, to extend a special greeting. While we already have a point of Community contact with Turkey in the Council of Association, for Malta and Cyprus the Council of Europe is the only European multilateral forum in which we can work together. This Mediterranean dimension of the Council of Europe is of great significance to us, as you know, and is not the least of the reasons for the importance we attach to the existence and activity of your Organisation. Here, as in the other European institutions, we have consistently emphasised the importance of the Mediterranean for the whole of Europe, including the continental and Nordic regions, at once politically, economically and militarily. As a link with the young States of North Africa and the Middle East, from which our highly industrialised society receives such abundant energy supplies, as a focal point in the balance of East-West relations, the Mediterranean can exercise a decisive influence on the destiny of our continent.

Since the now distant days when the first calls for European unity went out from this Organisation, we have travelled a long way and overcome innumerable obstacles. Do the results we have obtained come up to the hopes that were kindled? To what extent have we fulfilled the task entrusted to us by the pioneers of the European idea?

Let us acknowledge in all honesty that we should and could have done better; but we need not despise the targets that have been achieved.

European unity attained in one go by speeding up the stages and sweeping aside the obstacles

is a dream which we have had to abandon. Our strength was not commensurate with our hopes. Yet, with that renunciation, we developed the certainty that our common destiny was ineluctable. For us, there is no alternative to the European option. That is the deeper significance of the message bequeathed to us by men like De Gasperi and Schuman, Adenauer and Spaak, who had the first great vision of the political, economic, spiritual and moral rebirth of Europe through her unity.

This certainty about our common European destiny can also be found in the Final Act of the Paris Summit meeting of last October. I have no intention at all of praising everything that came out of the Paris Summit or of claiming that its conclusions were in line with all our expectations. But if the merit of the previous Summit at The Hague in December 1969 was to open the doors of the Community to Great Britain, Ireland and Denmark, giving a wider dimension and renewed impetus to the unification of Europe, the merit of the Paris Summit of October 1972 was undoubtedly to show us an objective and specify the time within which we are required to reach it. That objective is called European union. The deadline for its attainment is the end of this decade.

Somebody once said that European union was too vague an objective to be viable and credible. But I think that the fact of having decided in favour of a unitary political solution (which European union is) and of having given ourselves eight years to carry it through is something that must not be underestimated.

It is the first time that the Community has assumed a solemn commitment of such scope. European union is, at the same time, the recognition that unity, and nothing but unity, represents the goal towards which we are moving and a challenge we have issued to ourselves. From now on, our destiny is in our own hands, and the successes or failure of our work for unity will depend on what we are determined and able to do.

The Paris Summit assigned to the institutions of EEC — Council, Commission, Parliament, Court — the task of preparing a report by 1975 on the way in which a European union could be organised by 1980. We can say, therefore, that

the time-limit within which our fate will be decided has come much closer: about two and a half years to make up our minds where we want to go and how we must set about it. The moment of truth for European unity is approaching swiftly.

By 1975 — we may as well say it — the die will be cast. And not only because we shall have to take decisions inside the Community which will inevitably influence our future, but also because, in the outside world that surrounds us, a new international equilibrium will probably become crystallised during the same period, and Europe will not be able to avoid playing a part commensurate with her potentialities, her aspirations and her responsibilities.

The years 1973, 1974 and 1975 will be crucial for Europe and the world. In those three years, as a result of a series of large-scale political, economic and military negotiations whose preliminary skirmishes are now being conducted before our eyes, a new world order, designed to replace the bipolar equilibrium born in the postwar years and consolidated during the cold war, will be taking shape.

These negotiations are so interwoven and condition each other to such an extent that it is better to regard them as parts of one great world-wide negotiation which embraces all the aspects of international relations. We know the names of these rounds of negotiations in the various sectors: CSCE, MBFR, SALT II, GATT, negotiations for a new international monetary system. Even when Europe is not a direct participant, she is aware that her interests are seriously at stake.

Those interests and, together with them, the place to which Europe aspires in world affairs, in order to fulfil her mission of preserving a balance and furthering peace and progress — a place to which in the new international climate she may legitimately aspire — can only be safeguarded on one condition, namely that we Europeans have profound common awareness of the convergence of our fundamental desires and goals. Only in this way shall we be able to give proper weight to our influence and become once more actors on the world's stage.

In this sense it can be said that the Summit Conference in Paris was in tune with the needs of the day because it laid special emphasis on the need for Europe to present a united front on

the international scene, inviting us to assume a European identity, or, if you prefer, a European personality, in our dealings with other countries.

The recent speech by Henry Kissinger, President Nixon's adviser on international and security questions, in the United States Congress, and the series of presidential statements in the report on the world situation, although they remain on a more general level, show how immediate and concrete the invitation extended at the Paris Summit Conference was meant to be. If ever there was a time when it was imperative for us without delay to achieve a united front, to speak with a single voice, it is now.

On the one hand, we are involved in the negotiations for European security and co-operation whose preliminary meetings are in progress in Helsinki. These negotiations have launched discussions which, we hope, will lay the foundations for more stable and fruitful relations between Europeans, marked by a sense of mutual trust, by better organised economic relations and by exchanges on as broad a basis as possible in the spheres of culture and information as well as in the human sphere. In the last analysis, it is only thanks to more human contacts, better mutual knowledge and a serious effort at understanding on all sides, as well as the creation of an atmosphere of trust, that the people of our continent can achieve a more intimate and stable coexistence.

Through the Conference on Security and Cooperation, Europe is seeking to define itself, so to speak, in the European context. This means, today, in the first place — let us say so frankly — defining itself vis-à-vis the Soviet Union and the other countries of Eastern Europe. At the same time Europe has to take on an identity in its relations with the United States. This is an attitude imposed upon us by the political, economic and strategic developments of the 70s, but which at the same time the Americans themselves are asking us to adopt, desirous as they are to establish relations with Europeans which, without rejecting the ties of the past, take sufficient account of the realities of the present.

In the American documents, the Italian Government has picked out two particularly important features: the assurance of a lasting

American contribution to the Western defence forces (and in particular President Nixon's opposition to the unilateral withdrawal of United States forces from Europe) and the confirmation of American support for the furtherance of European unity.

The Atlantic Alliance and the presence of American troops in Europe represent, in the eyes of the Italian Government, a guarantee of a balance of force in the present and hence a basic factor in European security and at the same time an instrument of progress and real détente in East-West relations.

Thanks to a mutual and balanced reduction of American and Soviet forces on the European chessboard, it will be possible to create conditions capable of maintaining a European balance at a lower level, both as regards personnel and as regards costs, without any change, unless it be an improvement, in the security situation.

The American attitude recognises the reasons which militate, in our view also, in favour of a conception at the same time directed towards an easing of tension and inspired by considerations making for the reduction of forces in Europe. As such, it corresponds to principles which we also share.

The other point that seems worthy of note is, as I have said, the confirmation of American support for European unity. That this attitude is expressed in different terms from those that characterised relations between Europe and America in earlier times need not be a matter for surprise. Today America is different and Europe too is different, but the reasons which bind them together in a common call to preserve peace have lost none of their value. However, we must give a new content to these relations in the context of the development of the international situation. Our own view is that the new Euro-American relations are destined to reflect Europe's new political and economic dimension and the greater international responsibilities that she is very able to assume.

In the presentation of this full and up-to-date report on the European policy of the United States, there is something to which Italy attaches special importance. The dialogue that the Americans are seeking to engage with the Europeans requires, as Washington sees it, a single spokeman on this side of the Atlantic. In Italy,

we also are convinced that no dialogue could be fruitful or open the way to a new era of Atlantic solidarity if the Americans were to find themselves confronted with a certain number of separate European countries, each with its own desires and unable to agree on a common attitude.

And so we see that the establishment of a European identity vis-à-vis the outside world has become something which the evolution of the international situation does not allow us to put off any longer. In the last analysis it is from inside that Europe will have to take stock of itself and become aware of its own unity. This is something that Italy has already recognised as being of the first importance.

What matters, in our opinion, is the acceptance of the principle that European unity is first and foremost a European thing, depending, that is to say, on the will and determination of Europeans. We have been resigned for too long to the idea that at the root of our desire for unity there are the encouragements we receive from the one side and the threats we hear from the other. Today we cannot and do not wish to hide behind the thoughts and desires of others. The choice is now for us to make. Europe's fate is in our hands and the decisions and responsibilities with which our common future is bound up are ours and ours alone.

To speak of the problems and progress of the European Community is to raise automatically the question of relations between the Council of Europe and EEC.

We are well aware of the fact that the new situation coming about in Europe with the enlargement of the Communities has led the Council of Europe to "rethink" its role and redefine its sphere of action. That the Europe of the Seventeen should keep a close watch on the Europe of the Nine and wonder how the two organisations can coexist and together form the cornice of the European edifice, is not only very natural but, it seems to me, a sign of insight and of a sense of responsibility.

It gives the Italian Government great cause for satisfaction that this question, with its highly important implications for the achievement of European unity, should be taken up in the Council of Europe — the natural forum for a debate of this kind — in a spirit of understanding and with a will to co-operate that induce us to look at the future with confidence and optimism.

Two days ago the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe took a decision in this connection which marks the first step on the way to a revised conception of the role of the Council of Europe and its relations with the European Community.

The procedure adopted by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs seems to us the right one. The working group composed of six Ministers' Deputies is a competent and agile body. It is in close contact with the manifold daily problems of the Council of Europe and at the same time knows what is going on in the Community. We consider it important that this working group, whose members are appointed by governments, should establish close contact with the other working group set up for the same purpose by this Assembly. It seems right, in other words, that the governmental and the parliamentary bodies, having a similar mandate, should consult one another and act in concert. For us, this Assembly is at once the conscience and the motive force of the Council of Europe. We are convinced that it would be impossible for member governments to define the future role of the Council of Europe without taking account of the experience and opinions that the parliamentary organ, of which the report of Mr. Reverdin's Working Group is a constructive expression, has to offer.

Mr. Reverdin has had two exchanges of views on this question, which is of interest to us all, with the Italian Foreign Minister, Mr. Medici, in the presence of the President of the Assembly, Mr. Vedovato. For us the contacts on this occasion were particularly fruitful, since they revealed the considerable similarity of interest and ideas between this Assembly and the Italian Government. Such contacts encourage us to look with confidence to our common European future.

In the next six months, we shall have to endeavour to go beyond questions of procedure and seek solutions to the basic problems. We are ready, for our part, to help look for constructive solutions, in the knowledge that the problem we are tackling is of great importance for the future of Europe.

We firmly believe that the foundations exist on which to establish firm and lasting relations between the Council of Europe and the European Community and so give the Council renewed faith and vigour.

Generally speaking, Italy feels that the possibilities should be explored in at least four distinct fields.

In the first place, the Council of Europe could play a major political role. It can offer a forum in which to discuss with the democratic countries of Europe that are not Members of the Community the great issues of foreign policy in which the Nine, like the Eight, have basic interests to be safeguarded from a common European standpoint.

In the second place, it would be useful, without seeking actually to allocate spheres of action to one organisation or the other, to recognise that there are certain sectors in which the Council of Europe has acquired valuable experience. In such sectors the Council should continue to be active with the encouragement and in the interests of the Community. We do not believe that there should be spheres exclusive to either organisation. It is possible to do the same thing with nine countries or with seventeen, in a different context, and in that case the role of coordinator might fall to the Council of Europe.

In the third place, it might be useful to establish close and efficient co-operation between the Council of Europe and the Community at the three levels on which they act: the governmental level (Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe and Council of Ministers of the Community), the parliamentary level (the Consultative Assembly and the European Parliament) and the organisational level (the Council of Europe Secretariat and the Commission of the Community). Thanks to co-ordination at all these levels, the two organisations should find it easier to achieve the harmonisation of their spheres of activity that we all desire.

Lastly, we must not omit to explore all the possibilities of making use of the Council of Europe in East-West relations by allowing it to play a part, to the fullest extent possible, in the process of détente in which we are involved and which finds today its most concrete expression in the preparations for the Conference on European Security and Co-operation. Perhaps at the start we cannot hope for too much in this regard. but it would be useful to investigate whether and how the Council of Europe might constitute a meeting-place for engaging in activities of a technical nature which are of interest to the countries of Eastern and Western Europe alike. The Council's competence and practicality are recognised and appreciated even beyond the frontiers of the Seventeen and that should encourage us not to give up our pursuit of this goal.

At this point I cannot omit to mention the special merit the Council of Europe has acquired in the legal sphere. I am thinking in particular of the European Convention on Human Rights, which is certainly the Council's most important achievement — one that, more than anything else, is destined to leave a deep and indelible mark, and, as it were, constitutes a symbol of which the Council can justly be proud.

I am particularly happy today to announce that the Italian Government has just accepted for a period of two years the optional clause of the Convention on Human Rights concerning the right of individual petition and the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

And now I feel it is my duty, as Head of the Government of a State that has more than five million of its citizens abroad, of whom 2 340 000 are in Europe helping the immigrant-receiving countries to develop their economies, to say how interested Italy and my government are in the work the Council of Europe is sponsoring in favour of migrant workers.

It would be a serious omission on my part if, coming here to Strasbourg to tell you of my country's profound European sentiments, I were to omit to say what great importance Italy attaches to the action which this Organisation, adding its efforts to those of other praiseworthy multilateral bodies, is promoting in order to smooth out the difficulties that migrant workers have to face in the receiving countries and to make their work more productive.

Your manifold efforts to facilitate the reuniting of families and the schooling of migrant workers' children, to ensure more real equality of treatment, in a word to make international migration a genuine occasion for social and professional advancement, are being followed by us with respectful attention.

After what has been said about the situation of migrants in Europe by the President of this parliamentary Assembly and by the seventeen Ministers of Labour whom the Italian Government had the honour to invite to Rome last November, after the increasingly pressing and serious demands regarding the need to improve the lives of people who are labouring with their hands for the common good, inter-

national society is doing no more than justice when, as the Council of Europe is doing, it affords the means of recognising migrant workers as European citizens in their own right.

This leads me to invite once more the Assembly and the Committee of Ministers to approve the Migrant Workers' Statute in a form which, as the Assembly asked at the time, will ensure the progress of European laws and regulations in this matter and thus complete — with the Convention on Human Rights and the European Social Charter — the trilogy embodying the rights of the European citizen.

I have spoken of things that are at present under study, but which perhaps give a clear enough indication of the direction in which we are moving. For us it is important that the Council of Europe should have faith in the part it is called upon to play and should possess the means it requires to achieve its ends.

Europe today is facing a decisive moment in its history. It has to gather up its strength and unite its efforts in order both to defend the values of the civilisation it has built up over the centuries and spread to the ends of the earth. and to be among the makers of the great decisions that are giving shape to the world of tomorrow. These values and aspirations are common to the Council of Europe and the European Community. It is from here that the first impassioned and confident appeal went up for European unity. From the Council of Europe we expect today, at a time just as crucial for the fate of Europe, a no less decisive contribution to the consecration of the mission of preserving a balance and furthering peace and progress that Europe can and must undertake in the world.

Thank you, Mr. President. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The prolonged applause underlines the Assembly's appreciation of your speech, with its broad European outlook and high degree of political realism.

Let me thank you, and, as President of the Assembly and as an Italian citizen, let me add

a word of special appreciation to the Italian Government — and may I also thank Mr. Gonella, the Minister of Justice (Applause), not to forget our esteemed Vice-President — for their acceptance of the competence of the European Commission of Human Rights to receive individual petitions, and of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court of Human Rights.

As you yourself recalled, human rights are a cornerstone of the Council of Europe, and so much so that respect for human rights is, under the Statute, a necessary condition for membership of the Council.

It was our Assembly, way back in 1949, that proposed the conclusion of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights, and the Ministers accepted the proposal soon after. It was precisely at Rome, in the Palazzo Barberini, that the convention was signed in 1950, to be ratified by the Italian Government in 1955.

With the acceptance announced by you today, and eagerly awaited, as was made clear by the Assembly's applause, the European protection of human rights has in fact been extended to some 200 million people. This is why the Assembly is delighted that Italy has just confirmed her devotion to the protection of fundamental human rights — the right to freedom and justice — and confirmed that it regards the Human Rights Convention as an indestructible part of the heritage of our civilisation.

As some members of the Assembly have expressed the wish to ask a few questions, I am sure that you will agree to reply, and I therefore call Mr. Blumenfeld, who has the first question to ask.

Mr. BLUMENFELD (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, like you, I would like to congratulate and thank Mr. Andreotti. I am most anxious to tell him on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee how very grateful we are for his support for the ideas set out in our report on the role of the Council of Europe and its future work in the presence of the enlarged European Economic Community.

The Prime Minister of Italy made a very interesting and comprehensive speech which could

Mr. Blumenfeld (continued)

give rise to numerous questions. I have two questions to put to him, namely regarding the report on relations between Western Europe and the United States which we shall discuss immediately following its presentation.

Mr. Andreotti visited the United States recently during his journey round the world and he had the opportunity of talking with members of the American Government and the President's adviser, Dr. Kissinger. In his speech, Mr. Andreotti set out his government's position on certain points in Dr. Kissinger's speech.

I would like to ask Mr. Andreotti whether, in view of the mixed reception given to Dr. Kissinger's speech in Europe, he shares my view that it could only be a misunderstanding if the new Atlantic Charter referred to by Dr. Kissinger when calling for a dialogue with Europe, represented merely another symbol of a superpower, America, in relation to Europe. In Mr. Andreotti's view, and this is my question, has this misunderstanding occurred because the Americans appear to want to insist on a package deal covering the three major questions, finance, trade and economy as well as defence?

My second question to Mr. Andreotti is also connected with Dr. Kissinger's speech made on behalf of the President of the United States, and relates to the global responsibility of the United States and the regional responsibility of Europe or, as it was here understood, in Europe. Is it not true, for instance, that in the Middle East, in the immediate vicinity of his country and Europe, in the Mediterranean, Europe has so far demonstrated little responsibility. Could we have Mr. Andreotti's views on what was said in America or during his journey, on this subject. We would be most grateful and it would greatly enrich our discussion.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Andreotti.

Mr. ANDREOTTI (Translation). — Let me thank Mr. Blumenfeld for his kind words, also spoken on behalf of the important committee of which he is Chairman.

My answers to his two questions are as

follows: I think that calling 1973 "Europe Year" on the part of the US Administration (this is what I have gleaned from talks with President Nixon and many others in the United States) signifies highlighting the fundamental political importance of relations between the United States and Europe.

These relations are, of course, played out in various fields, and in some of them (trade, currency, finance) there may be and indeed are, serious disagreements. But it seems to me that the American Government consider it essential that none of these special areas should efface the overwhelming importance of the far stronger factors that link the United States with Europe.

The Kissinger proposals are perhaps intended, taking the latter of the proposals, to sound out the first general impressions of governments and public opinion, but their basic point is, to my mind, the recognition that the situation today is radically different from what it was in 1949-50, now that we have detente instead of cold war, and now that Japan has emerged as a major industrial power.

It is thus impossible to talk of a plan for Europe over the next ten or twenty years without discussing and taking into account this twofold fact. That this has been laid on the table is not, I think, a negative factor. It is not necessary to discuss all problems together, but it is necessary to have a political spirit that is ever mindful of the primacy of politics over any other matter of debate.

The second question is about the Middle East. In America, as everywhere else, the feeling is that, unless preliminary discussions can be brought about to prepare a gradual settlement of the conflict in the Middle East, the situation there presents a far greater danger of escalation than did the situation in Indo-China. The United States is not perhaps in the best position to serve as mediator in this conflict because one of the parties has some prejudice as regards American sympathy for the State of Israel, but I can say here, in all responsibility, that the President of the United States and his government have stated categorically that they share the view we and everyone else hold about the serious danger this conflict represents, and that they do not side with either party.

Of course, it is for them to decide about any initiatives they may wish to take, but it is my view that a European initiative would be a great achievement for Europe. We must try to adopt such an initiative in a European forum and in a European spirit, not only because of the economic and political interests that bind us to the Middle East, but also because such a move would be a great success for peace and a confirmation of the political reality of Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Grieve.

Mr. GRIEVE (United Kingdom). — The Prime Minister of Italy has just announced the acceptance by the Italian Government, for a limited period but a period which we hope will in due course become a permanency, of the optional clauses in the European Convention on Human Rights, and their recognition of the right to individual application under Article 25 and the competence of the European Court under Article 46. I am sure that I speak on behalf of all my colleagues in this Assembly when I say how much this decision by the Italian Government is welcomed by the Assembly.

Last October when the Legal Affairs Committee of the Council met in Rome, Mr. Gonella, whom we are so happy to see accompanying the Prime Minister today, announced to the Legal Affairs Committee that so far as the Ministry of Justice was concerned, all obstacles to recognition of the optimal clauses had been removed. We know that Mr. Gonella has made great efforts within the Italian Government to convince his colleagues in other ministries. We are very happy that he has succeeded and believe that he played a very large part in this important step forward in the field of human rights.

May I say, as Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Human Rights of the Legal Affairs Committee, how happy I am with this result and congratulate Mr. Gonella on the part he has played. May I add one short question? We will be grateful if the Prime Minister could say something on the difficulties that his government found they had to overcome before Italy could take this important step forward.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Prime Minister.

Mr. ANDREOTTI (Translation). — I may say that Mr. Grieve was right about the important part the Minister of Justice played in persuading our government to adopt the decision. It is no accident that Mr. Gonella has for many years breathed the European air of this Assembly.

The difficulties were of a special nature. Lawyers are always bound by tradition, and government lawyers are bound, in addition, by the special traditions of their own sector. It takes a great deal of perseverance and political determination to win acceptance even where objections and procrastinations seem virtually inconceivable.

I can also say that there were perhaps fears of a consequence that would certainly not be in the spirit of this major instrument of the Council of Europe, fears that the special campaign we have to conduct against an evil inherited in one small part of Italy — the Mafia — would be weakened. It has now been made clear that a weakening of this campaign would not only not be in the spirit of the convention but would actually be contrary to it. It is in the spirit of the Council of Europe convention to defend human rights, and certainly not the rights of those who wish to continue committing crimes.

Once this was cleared up, it was easy for the government to win unanimous support.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Stray.

Mr. STRAY (Norway). — Mr. President, you yourself and Mr. Grieve have just mentioned that the Prime Minister of Italy is accompanied by his Minister of Justice, Mr. Gonella. For that reason, I feel I may ask the following question:

The Legal Affairs Committee has proposed that during the Conference of Ministers of Justice which is to take place in Stockholm next month, an exchange of views should take place between the Ministers of Justice and the Legal Affairs Committee of the Council of Europe. The Swedish Government have let it be known that they are fully in favour of such an exchange of views but that they will leave the decision to the conference itself, after having taken the advice of its European Committee on Legal Cooperation.

Mr. Stray (continued)

Last October Mr. Furgler, Head of the Swiss Department of Justice and Police, expressed himself in favour of the idea. It would be interesting to know how the Italian Government feel about such an exchange of views between the Ministers of Justice and the Legal Affairs Committee.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Prime Minister.

Mr. ANDREOTTI (Translation). — I am glad to be able to say that the Italian Government have agreed to this exchange of views between the Legal Affairs Committee and the Ministers of Justice who will shortly be meeting in Stockholm.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Amrehn.

Mr. AMREHN (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, a vital aim of the Helsinki Conference is to further economic co-operation between West and East. The future trade policy between West and East is no longer a matter for bilateral negotiation for Members of the Common Market but a matter in which the European personality is already to find its identity. The West has consequently tried hard to bring the Common Market, the Community of the Nine as such, to the conference table in Helsinki.

Could Mr. Andreotti tell us how far such attempts have been successful or are likely to be successful? Is the Community of the Nine more united in this question than it is in its efforts to achieve trade agreements with the United States?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Andreotti,

Mr. ANDREOTTI (Translation). — In the preparatory work for the conference, the nations of Europe have so far fortunately always been in agreement on the various problems that have come up on the agenda.

There are two things to be said, I think, about the whole matter of trade relations between Europe and the Soviet sphere. The stronger the Europe of the Communities becomes, the more natural it will be to co-ordinate and harmonise the relations of each of its member States with the world outside. But this does not mean that there will not be plenty of room for manœuvre within which each country, whilst fully complying with its Community obligations, may conduct relations with the Soviet or any other region of the world. Indeed, the relations between almost all the countries of the Community and the countries of Eastern Europe have expanded considerably since the European Community was set up.

I know that there is considerable anxiety that Europe might mean increased rigidity, but it is my view that since our European aim is steadily to increase the development level, and hence also the trade level, of each and every country of the Community, no one outside the Community need fear that we will shut ourselves in. We are bound to be active elements for increasing contacts with countries outside the Community, especially if we keep up the rate of development.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Kahn-Ackermann.

Mr. KAHN-ACKERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. Andreotti was kind enough to devote a considerable part of his speech to-day to discussions on the future work of the Council of Europe, and he also mentioned that there were traditionally areas in which this Assembly had particularly proved itself.

I would like to ask him whether he could at this stage comment, from the point of view of the Italian Government, on an idea raised in this Assembly during the debate on this subject: Should we not make better progress in Europe in these areas if, for instance, during the debate of such special subjects, the Committee of Ministers delegated its powers to the conferences of specialised Ministers of the Seventeen, so that instead of these matters having to be filtered by the foreign ministries, the specialised Ministers of the seventeen member countries could increasingly take decisions in areas which particularly concern the Council of Europe? This would probably mean prior consultation in the national governments.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Prime Minister.

Mr. ANDREOTTI (Translation). — I have said that the more frequent the direct contacts between specialised Ministers in various sectors, the more effective will our common action be. But I am not sure the time is yet ripe for crystallising these contacts in institutional terms, if only because each country has a different kind of organisation, and we need effective co-ordination and a unified view at national level, too.

Sometimes (and I think this is more or less the experience of every country) we feel the effects of this lack of co-ordination internally. If we were to have only direct contacts between specialised Ministers, a number of difficulties might arise, despite the good offices of our diplomatic representatives and the co-ordination of the Assembly and Secretariat. I would reply, then, that I agree, in principle, on the need for more competent and effective discussions between Ministers operating in the same sector. But we must also bear in mind the considerable importance of co-operation and an overall view.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Brincat.

Mr. BRINCAT (Malta) (Translation). — You said, Mr. Andreotti, that the solution to the Middle East problem must be tackled at regional level. Is it true that Italy, together with other countries, is already seeking this solution?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Andreotti.

Mr. ANDREOTTI (Translation). — We are, indeed. We do not claim to have more weight than any single country can have, but we are throwing all our efforts into the search for solutions, because of our concern at the unsettled conflict, because of our relations with the Arab countries, which are not merely economic but also links of long-standing friendship, and because of the concern, in a country like ours that once suffered racial persecution in fascist times, at the confusion of a political problem with a problem that could reawaken inhuman sentiments against Jews.

We believe that the settlement must be gradual, and that it must be both political and socio-

economic. Our government has drawn up proposals. If these are to be effective, the Israelis and the Arabs must, of course, first be favourably disposed. It is to this end that we are working with determination, though without claiming to be any better than others.

We only wish to lend our whole-hearted support to this cause that is vital to the harmony not only of one region, but of the whole world.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Pecoraro.

Mr. PECORARO (Italy) (Translation). — The European Economic Community has recently encountered serious difficulties, especially in the monetary and agricultural fields, or, if you like, difficulties in the monetary field that have shown up the difficulties in the agricultural.

Do you think that strengthening the structural and working links between the Community and the Council of Europe is likely to make these difficulties, and especially those that may arise in the near or distant future in the economic sector, easier or more difficult to overcome?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Andreotti.

Mr. ANDREOTTI (Translation). — I think that the stronger the links between the different countries of Europe, and certainly between the Community and organisations like this one, the better the possibility of finding constructive answers to the problems that crop up and, above all, of fostering a spirit that will make the difficulties easier to overcome.

The Europe of the Community showed great courage in choosing agriculture as the testing ground for the first Community structures. Without blinding ourselves to the difficulties, we may say that we are progressing, and progressing with the conviction that we are on the right path.

As for monetary problems, we must all try, jointly and severally, to take a stronger stand on currency speculation. The closing months of last year and the first months of this saw a campaign of international financial speculation

on a frightening scale. We had to adopt temporary protective measures, not because our European spirit had failed, but because we were all aware that if we had collapsed under this massive speculation we would have been pretty useless as a part of Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Leynen.

Mr. LEYNEN (Belgium) (Translation). — As I found myself quite by chance on the same plane as the Prime Minister on 26 April between Tokyo and Osaka, I want to ask him if the Japanese talked much about the problems which exist between Japan and Europe. I would very much like to know if his views about this are the same as mine.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Prime Minister.

Mr. ANDREOTTI (Translation). — I am sorry that I did not have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Leynen earlier. We could then have exchanged views on the plane that took us from Tokyo to Osaka.

My view of relations with Japan is briefly as follows. Japan is aware of her enormous industrial strength and also of the mistrust that this very strength creates around her in various parts of the world. The volume of trade between Japan and the countries of Europe has so far been comparatively small, and Japan would like, I think, to have more consistent, integrated relations with Europe. Japan, as we all know, certainly has good relations with the Soviet Union and reasonable relations with China and, whatever people may say, good relations with the United States of America. But I feel that Europe, which can be both unified and articulated, may give Japan some satisfaction and less worry as a partner than other "giants" that are not articulated.

Let me add that one means of co-operation with Japan that is open to many European countries is three-sided joint activity in other countries, especially in Latin America. I believe that business, economic and industrial associa-

tions between European countries, Japan, and the country in which the projects are to be carried out can be a very sensible and constructive procedure. But it is a procedure that must be instituted fairly promptly.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Let me thank you once again, Mr. Andreotti, for your kindness in answering the various questions so clearly.

6. Relations between Western Europe and the United States

(Joint debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3279 and Addendum, and the introductory report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Doc. 3278)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the debate on relations between Western Europe and the United States of America.

We shall first take the report by Sir John Rodgers on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, Document 3279 and Addendum, and then the report by Mr. Dequae on behalf of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Document 3278. After that, there will be the joint debate.

I call Sir John Rodgers, Rapporteur of the Political Affairs Committee.

Sir John RODGERS (United Kingdom). — I have the honour to present, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, a draft report and resolution on relations between Western Europe and the United States. I have also circulated to my colleagues the address made by Dr. Kissinger in New York on 23 April. Following the receipt of the full text of this speech, I have also circulated an addendum to my report arising from Dr. Kissinger's remarks.

This debate, as you have said, Mr. President, is a joint one with the Economic Affairs and Development Committee.

Mr. Dequae has produced a paper on economic relations between Western Europe and the United States of America, and the draft recommendations arising from his report have been included Sir John Rodgers (continued)

in the draft resolution presented by the Political Affairs Committee, so we shall vote on one single resolution.

Mr. Dequae will be speaking on his own paper immediately after me. In my brief introductory remarks I shall therefore say little about the economic, monetary and trade matters, except in so far as they appear to me to have a political content.

I hope Mr. Dequae will forgive me if I make one general observation. That is that, although factually accurate, the way sometimes in which the facts are presented does occasionally make them a little more critical of the Americans than is deserved, but as I want harmony to prevail between our two committees I do not propose to elaborate that remark.

I do not wish to go through the paper that is before the Assembly paragraph by paragraph, but I would like to make a few short general observations. It is true that the United States has been critical of recent developments in Europe. In particular it has objected to what it regards as the highly protectionist common agricultural policy of EEC which, it alleges, limits export possibilities for the American farmer. It has also queried the preferential trade agreements which have proliferated with many African countries and elsewhere which, it maintains, discriminate in third markets against American exports.

On the European side we too are critical of the United States for the punitive tariffs on such commodities as chemicals, which otherwise would sell well in the States, and we are upset by the American tendency to clamp down quotas on anything which starts to sell well in the States, whether it be shoes, steel or textiles.

Successive American administrations have supported the creation, development and enlargement of the European Economic Community in the belief that a stronger, more united, Western Europe would increasingly ensure that Western Europe not only would share more of the responsibility for paying for the defence of Europe but, much more importantly, would also share the responsibility with them in helping to create a prosperous and stable world order.

Paradoxically, the greater the progress that has been made in the integration of Western Europe the more problems it has created for the United States. My own country apart — though we are beginning to catch up — West Europeans have achieved a faster rate of growth, with lower unemployment, if higher inflation, than the United States.

The Community has overall built up a balance-of-payments surplus with the rest of the world while America has moved into a deficit. In any negotiations it must now be realised that the enlarged Community makes up an economic and political bloc that accounts for one third of all world trade. No wonder therefore that Mr. Heath two days ago in a speech in London said that a new Atlantic Alliance between the United States and EEC is urgently needed, along with a new major international monetary system which would end the recurring crises that have plagued world commerce for so long.

But Mr. Heath equally stressed that the new Atlantic Alliance must be something quite different from what had gone before, for the old concepts of Atlantic partnership, we must all agree, are today no longer valid.

In the first place, the more progress there is towards détente between the East and the West, the weaker become the common concepts of what we are defending ourselves against.

Secondly, European integration is more than ever a pre-condition of genuine partnership in order to reflect the growing economic weight of Western Europe. But the stronger Western Europe becomes, the more able we will be to play a part in relieving the United States of its single leadership.

In the Atlantic Alliance as we have known it since the end of the war, the United States has been incomparably the biggest and most powerful partner. Now this is changing. In terms of population and economic capacity the European Community is comparable with the United States.

Thirdly, Atlantic partnership can no longer be a defensive alliance just of the rich countries. As I say in the report, the idealism which must motivate Atlantic relations can come only from a common effort to eliminate the growing discrepancies in the sharing of the world's wealth. The negotiations mentioned in my report and Sir John Rodgers (continued)

that of Mr. Dequae on both trade and monetary reforms could provide such an opportunity.

Fourthly, we need to strengthen the mechanisms for dialogue between the United States and Western Europe. For the Members of the Economic Community, it is no longer just a matter of the relationship of each individual European country with the United States. In this field of economic and monetary reforms, it is now increasingly a matter of the relationship between the United States and the Community as a whole. This is what membership of the Community is all about. The European Economic Community must learn to think and to act as an entity. It is therefore essential that progress be made on the political front as discussed by the Italian Prime Minister in his brilliant, imaginative and statesmanlike speech.

For all these reasons, I feel sorry that the response to President Nixon's invitation for an updated modern peace-time Atlantic Charter was in some quarters, though not in all, somewhat cautious, mundane and in one or two cases even greeted with suspicion.

I think part of the reason for this was the suggestion that by the time the President visits Europe in the autumn, the Americans would have worked out a new Atlantic Charter setting the goals for the future, a charter not only inviting European nations to participate, but one in which ultimately Canada and Japan would also join.

There is also concern at the suggestion that political, military and economic issues, since they are all undoubtedly interrelated, should be dealt with together and at the highest level.

While the Community is committed to maintaining and improving the constructive dialogue with the United States, in Britain at least — and I think this view is shared with other West European countries — we believe the discussions on money, trade and defence could not be dealt with effectively in one forum and by the same people. There is bound to be hard bargaining between the Members of the Community and the

United States. The details involved are often complex and can be resolved only by experts talking to each other in the appropriate international organisations. There are significant differences in the experts involved: for example, the experts in NATO differ greatly from those concerned with the International Monetary Fund and the Contracting Parties of GATT.

Furthermore, the timetables are, and we believe must be, different. We would agree that the greatest urgency lies in the need for monetary reform. The burden of maintaining an international reserve currency, long sustained by the United States and to a diminishing extent by Britain, will now have to be carried on the shoulders of other nations as well.

Trade talks are to begin in September, but they can hardly be completed before 1975 at the earliest. In economic, monetary and defence aspects what is essential is that the underlying belief in co-operation and mutual help should permeate all the discussions rather than lead to a feeling of rivalry between the two blocs, that is, America and Western Europe. The problems faced by the United States and Europe in maintaining the burden of defence are common ones. The approach therefore should be as allies and never as rivals.

Any adjustment in the defence relationship between the United States and the West European allies and between NATO and the Warsaw Pact must be most carefully thought out.

All of us welcome the recent statements by Dr. Kissinger and Mr. Rodgers that the United States will maintain its security commitments in Europe. As regards force reductions in central Europe, such reductions should in my view follow, and not precede, further progress in East-West détente.

In my report I have also stressed that we too believe that other industrial countries such as Japan should become involved and certainly the less developed countries' interests must be preserved and safeguarded. Any new system must create the best possible conditions for continuing economic development and ensure the participation of the less developed countries. The

Sir John Rodgers (continued)

composition of the International Monetary Fund Board reflects this, since the Committee of Twenty has representatives of both the developed and the developing countries with ten members from each group. The machinery is therefore already available for the less developed to participate directly through, for example, the World Bank.

The Atlantic Alliance as we have known it cannot be reborn, nor can it be allowed to die. All of us should therefore welcome President Nixon's invitation to review the problems and opportunities facing a "new look" Atlantic Alliance.

As Mr. Heath said a day or two ago, the Alliance needs to be revivified and to be reinvigorated. Up to date America has rightly assumed the role of "big brother". Now in the new peaceful Atlantic Alliance it must — and I stress this — be as equal partners with equal partnership between the West and America.

I personally welcome Mr. Nixon's determination to make 1973 "the year of Europe". All of us owe so much to American generosity, understanding and help in the post-war period. Today, despite misunderstandings and even bitter arguments, for the sake of our own security and world peace I personally feel deeply that we must welcome this opportunity to strengthen the Atlantic Alliance so that it can be a major factor in preserving the peace of the world.

I hope, therefore, that the report on relations between Western Europe and the United States and the draft resolution will receive the Assembly's approval and support.

(Mr. Portheine, Vice-President of the Assembly, took the Chair in place of Mr. Vedovato.)

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Sir John, for presenting the report.

I call now Mr. Dequae, Rapporteur of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, to present the introductory report of that committee.

Mr. DEQUAE (Belgium) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, this report covers a vast, complicated and above all sensitive subject. I realise that. I began by analysing the data on relations between the United States and Europe during the last quarter of a century. The most outstanding feature, in my view, is the increased rate of growth and of internationalisation in the economic and financial fields, with increased interdependence as its corollary. It is also true that at the beginning of this quarter-century the United States were the only real economic power in the free world whereas now, both Europe — especially the Community — and Japan have to be taken into account.

But in spite of the existence of the Community, Europe has no central decision-making authority, either from the political or from the economic and monetary points of view. Even in that field, Europe is practically speaking a giant with feet of clay and, what is much more serious, one without a central decision-making brain.

The balance-of-payments problem, in spite of the enormous growth in external trade, is becoming less and less a matter of the movement of goods; it is now far more concerned with the movement of capital, and particularly of short-term capital in its most flexible form, Eurodollars. It is more than ever clear that in spite, I would even say because, of this development, the links between the countries of the free world have become both closer and more complex.

In spite of a good deal of tension on both sides, I tried to analyse the problem as objectively as I could and to find some factors for its solution. I used two methods to this end. First, I contacted people and organisations concerned with the subject.

I began by interviewing both sides. First I saw representatives of the United States delegation to EEC, and then I saw representatives of the economic section of EEC itself. No need to add that their points of view were entirely different.

Mr. Dequae (continued)

Then I contacted two organisations in which both sides are represented, OECD and GATT. There, one felt there was a desire to align the two points of view more closely, but in spite of everything there were so many difficulties in the way that at best only rather vague and hesitant moves towards rapprochement could be detected.

After that, I tried to analyse the problems by eliminating minor details and using the maximum objectivity.

The economic and financial points of view are, or in the next few months will find themselves, face to face at two levels in GATT, first on the enlargement of EEC and its agreements with the Mediterranean and African countries, and then on the large-scale negotiations which have to be prepared for July and will in fact, I believe, begin next autumn. And finally, in the monetary field, there are the discussions taking place in the Group of Twenty which should, in the normal course of events, find wider expression in the International Monetary Fund as from this year.

In listing the problems in detail and looking at them very briefly, I think we should deal first with that of the Community's sphere of influence and its system of preferences. In my view, the attitude of the United States is quite comprehensible but not always justified if we look at the figures. And it gets progressively more critical.

Where the results of the enlargement of EEC are concerned, they believe they can get compensatory treatment, but they know they cannot contest the justice of the operation, even within GATT. That attitude is already a little more pronounced where the extension of agreements for the creation of a free trade area among non-candidate countries is concerned, and it is very pronounced with regard to association with the Mediterranean and African countries.

However, I believe that both integration and the establishment of free trade areas are compatible with the rules of GATT. But in other respects I think the time will come when a limit must be put to spheres of influence and I believe it would be a major political blunder to push associated countries into a system of reverse preferences.

Second set of problems: negotiations with GATT about tariffs, not only those which will no doubt be the least difficult now that we have had the Kennedy Round, but especially about non-tariff factors which are very difficult to calculate. I think it will be much harder to achieve results in this field.

Coming to the agricultural sector, forgive me if, as Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I linger here for a few moments, for Europe always seems to be the scapegoat in this field. This is simply due to the fact that, where agriculture is concerned, the United States pursue an entirely different policy from Europe. They have a system of deficiency payments, whereas, in Europe, agricultural policy is a market policy which should therefore guarantee a decent income to European farmers.

There is no point in letting the United States imagine that the very basis of European agricultural policy will change. However, there are areas in which some rapprochement is possible. European production should take a speculative turn to help meet certain world shortages. Surpluses should also be prevented from flooding the world market when it is already over-stocked, and the policy regarding stock-piling should be improved. There will also have to be support for structural development so that there will be less difference between the two policies in future.

In my view, the European proposal during the Kennedy Round to open negotiations for world commodity agreements still holds good.

Now I come to monetary problems. The main point is the new monetary order now that Bretton Woods has come to an end and the Smithsonian Agreement has failed so spectacularly. But that is something for the Group of Twenty and the International Monetary Fund to deal with. I am afraid the road to this new monetary order will be long and full of pitfalls. In the meantime, it is the imbalance-of-payments problems leading to the sort of movements we deplore that worries us most.

Mr. Dequae (continued)

In my report, I have naturally been led to link this problem with that of direct foreign investment which causes immediate shifts in the balance of payments and will ultimately produce more.

I will not dwell long on movements of short-term capital in the form of Eurodollars. Two years ago, I compared this phenomenon to that of an elephant in a small boat, and since then the elephant has been rocking the boat at least every three months. Here there is one problem which becomes increasingly clear, that of multinational companies which certainly hold short-term capital and perhaps even create short-term capital movements which are by no means negligible.

Faced with these two phenomena, we shall have to exercise self-discipline; otherwise we shall never achieve the essential monetary stability, even in the intermediate period pending the new international agreement.

In spite of the complexity of this business, it should be possible to adapt the spirit and the letter of the Atlantic Treaty to present circumstances. Personally, however, I am afraid of two factors which came to light during the preliminary approaches and which, psychologically speaking, are of bad omen.

The United States Trade Act too obviously provides the President with great retaliatory powers by making it possible to impose increased duties and to limit the movement of goods both quantitatively and geographically.

On the European side there is the danger, recently become manifest, of once more linking tariff negotiations with a final monetary settlement. That being so, everyone realises that a solution necessarily becomes problematical.

The psychological approach — and that is the danger — might be described like this: on the one side we have a nation which is certainly powerful, but is above all young and impulsive and takes a rather "cowboy" attitude; and on the other there is Europe, which is really too traditionalist with its historical wishful thinking.

And that does not make it easy to reach a solution.

I am particularly afraid that the tendency we are faced with to restore equilibrium to the balance of payments by the movement of goods as a corrective to the movement of capital, which is left to do as it likes, is really too dangerous and may compromise everything.

So we should act on two levels: balance in the movement of goods and services, and discipline in the movement of capital.

In conclusion, let me say that the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development is in entire agreement with the draft resolution presented by the Political Affairs Committee, and I would like to take this opportunity of thanking its Rapporteur. Economics and finance should no longer be separated from politics. We know our Assembly is unfortunately only consultative, but we hope that every Representative to the Council will applaud and approve the positive line we have sought to take in this important confrontation between the United States and Europe which will be decisive for the future. We can then report on this to our respective parliaments and thus ensure that it is brought to the notice of our governments.

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Mr. Dequae.

Before opening the debate I wish to inform the Assembly that the list of speakers will be closed in a quarter of an hour. Mr. Beauguitte, who was to speak first, has said that he wishes to speak this afternoon, so now our first speaker will be Mr. Critchley.

Mr. CRITCHLEY (United Kingdom). — I do not think I am qualified to follow the very subtle and complicated arguments of Mr. Dequae. I know nothing about money and, like a character in an American film comedy, I "use it only for spending".

I wish, however, to congratulate my colleague, Sir John Rodgers, on the quality of his report, which was up to the standard of his previous reports.

I take the opportunity as a Conservative member of this Assembly to welcome a reinforce-

Mr. Critchley (continued)

ment who has just arrived, Mr. Peter Shore. No doubt he will have a marked effect on Strasbourg, but I hope that the effect of Strasbourg on Mr. Shore will be even more marked.

If we, as Western Europeans who are looking at the interests of Western Europe, should have any anxiety, it is because within the context of Europe we have failed to make progress towards any economic, monetary, political or defence union. Our anxiety is all the more acute because Western Europe is today obliged, not only to enter into negotiations with the East at a time of growing Soviet nuclear and conventional strength, but also to enter into very complicated negotiations with the West — the United States of America — at a time when American force reductions in Europe are an inevitability.

If one asks the question: who shall lead Europe? one can come up only with an answer that is profoundly depressing; because if one looks towards Germany for leadership - and here is a nation with the military power and economic potential to do precisely that — she appears to be inhibited, and unable to give to Europe that leadership that she alone is in a position to give. If one looks to France, quite clearly France has always preferred to mould Europe and its institutions in her own image and to her own interests. If one looks to the United Kingdom, perhaps we have the will, but I doubt whether we have the economic strength that would be necessary if we alone were to stimulate the growth of unity within Europe itself.

The British dilemma is in a degree illustrated by what is happening in another body which meets in this Hall from time to time, the European Parliament itself; because our short-term interest in Europe is to change the rules in our favour, for the cost of entry was remarkably high. Yet if that is our short-term interest within Europe, in the European Parliament, our long-term interest, quite clearly, is to build the unity of Europe. I fear there is a conflict between the two attitudes.

Quite clearly, the Conservative Group in the European Parliament, ably led by Mr. Kirk, has had a very great deal of success. They have been

noisy, but successful; but I suspect the time has come for our own Conservative members of that delegation to remove their feet from the "loud" pedal, and to place them firmly upon the "soft" one. The inevitability of United States force reductions in Europe must be accepted as a fact. On behalf of Western European Union, of whose Defence Committee I am Rapporteur, I went to Vienna last month for discussions on mutual balanced force reductions. The leading American negotiator in Vienna told me that he expected results from Vienna this time next year. If this means anything at all, it means a percentage reduction of American and Soviet forces - not a proportionate, but a percentage reduction.

If this is so, I am making the point that we in Europe will be able to live with such a percentage reduction only provided two provisos are met; firstly, that if the Americans are to withdraw 5 to 10% of their forces, and the Soviets do likewise, our first provision must be to make certain that none of the European land powers follows suit. This is the first provision. The second is that it is of tremendous importance that the Americans and their European NATO allies embark immediately upon a study of forces deployment, reinforcement capabilities, and the supply structure in Europe, in order that a smaller number of forces might be able to do the job they do at the moment, but do it more efficiently. The sooner those studies are undertaken the better, because quite clearly, as I assert, there is going to be an American force reduction.

If we were to tell the truth, the American Seventh Army is probably the worst army on the allied side in Germany. But the point is that when the Americans go over to an all-volunteer army. and as the effects of the Vietnam war work themselves out, and if at the same time America is prepared to redeploy and improve her reinforcement capability, then, in the medium-term at least, we shall be left with a more efficient American military presence in Europe than we have at the present moment. There is, therefore, no need to despair if Mr. Nixon, seriously weakened by Watergate, is likely to take next year a political decision which means a percentage reduction vis-à-vis Soviet forces in Europe of 5 to 10 %.

Mr. Critchley (continued)

I believe these are the provisos that are essential if we in Europe are to live with a reduced number of forces and provided these studies are undertaken, and provided we are realistic as to what is likely to come out of Vienna, I believe Western Europe can live with a smaller number of land forces. I will say no more now, Mr. President, since I do not wish to stand between the Assembly and luncheon.

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Mr. Critchley.

I now propose to the Assembly that the joint debate should be adjourned at this point.

Is there any objection ?... There is not.

The debate was adjourned.

7. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting

THE PRESIDENT. — I propose that the

Assembly hold its next sitting at 3 p.m. with the following Orders of the Day:

Relations between Western Europe and the United States:

— Resumed joint debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Document 3279 and Addendum, and on the introductory report of the Economic Affairs and Development Committee, Document 3278.

At about 4 p.m., statement by His Excellency Mr. John N. Irwin II, Personal Representative of the Secretary of State of the United States of America.

Are there any objections to this programme ?...

The Orders of the Day of the next sitting are agreed to.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

The Sitting is adjourned.

(The Sitting was closed at 12.55 p.m.)

APPENDIX

Names of Representatives or Substitutes who signed the Attendance Register in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure: 1

MM.	Aano	мм	Mendelson (Jones)	мм	Radinger
	Piket (Aantjes)		Jung Louis	.,	Grussenmeyer
	Abens		Kahn-Ackermann		(Radius)
	Ahrens		Karasek		Renschler
	Akcali				Reverdin
	Alber		Müller (Kempfler) Kiratlioglu		Richter
	Allemyr		Külahli		Rivière
	Amrehn		·	C:-	
			La Loggia		John Rodgers
X.Zinn	Beauguitte		Reale (Leggieri)		Rossi St. Helens
	Bergegren		Leitner Letschert		
	Cattaneo Petrini (Mr. Bettiol) Blumenfeld			ĮVIIVI.	Schieder
IVIIVI.			Leu		Schlaga
	Bohman		Leynen		Yvon (Schleiter)
	Brincat		Mammi	* *	Schmitt Robert
	Christiansen		Spautz (Margue)		Schuchardt
	Collins Edward		Mart	MIM.	van Hoeylandt
	Collins Gerard		Morris (Mason)		(Schugens)
	Coppola		Mende		Schwencke
	Cornelissen		Miotti Carli		Shore
	Czernetz		de Montesquiou		Büchner
	Dankert		Munkebye		(Sieglerschmidt)
		MM.	Muscat		Steel
	Borg Olivier de Puget		van der Werff (Nederhorst)		Stewart
	(De Marco)		Nessler		de Stexhe
	de Bruyne (Dequae)		Oestergaard		Stinus
	Digby		Oguz		Tanghe
	Enders		Öktem		Tisserand
	de Félice		O'Leary		Roper (Tomney)
	Feyzioglu		Wall (Osborn)		Treu
	Fletcher		Peart		Üstündag
	Capelle (Flornoy)		Pecoraro		Van Lent
Mrs.	Aasen (Mr. Frydenlund)		Critchley (Sir John Peel)		Vedovato
MM.	Gessner				Joan Vickers
	Withalm (Goëss)			MM.	Vitter
	Grieve		Stray (Petersen Erling)		Voogd
	Hansen		Hauret (Petit)		Primborgne (Weber J.)
	Hedlund		Pica		Weiberg-Aurdal
	Hedström		Portheine		Wyler (Wenk)
	Hocaoglu		Bizet (de Préaumont)		Wiklund
	Hofer		Castellucci (Preti)		Zamberletti

List of Representatives absent or apologising for absence:

	•				
MM.	Arnason	MM.	Kristjansson	MM.	Péronnet
	Arnaud		Labbé		Quilleri
	Averardi		Legaret		Salvatore
	Desmond		Lemmrich		Schmidt Hansheinrich
	Dregger	Sir	Fitzroy Maclean		Talamona
	Gislason	Mr.	Minnocci	Mrs.	Wolf
	Holst			Mr.	Zaloglu

^{1.} The names of Substitutes who replaced absent Representatives are printed in italics, the names of such Representatives being given in brackets.

TWENTY-FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION

OFFICIAL REPORT

Fifth Sitting

Wednesday 16 May 1973, at 3 p.m.

		Summary		
1.	Minutes	137	Speakers: The President, MM. Irwin, Blumenfeld (Chairman of the Political	
2.	Attendance Register	137	Affairs Committee), Sir John Rodgers (Rapporteur of the Political Affairs	
3.	Relations between Western Europe and the United States (resumed joint debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3279 and Addendum,		Committee), MM. Dequae (Rapporteur of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development), Critchley, Amrehn, Delforge, Czernetz, Fletcher.	
	and on the introductory report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Doc. 3278)	l l	Relations between Western Europe and the United States (resumed joint debate)	162
	Speakers: The President, MM. Beauguitte, Stewart, Gessner, Delforge, Grieve, Kahn-Ackermann.		Speakers: The President, MM. Nessler, Irwin (<i>United States Ambassador</i>), Mendelson, Oguz, Shore, van der Werff, Leitner, de Bruyne.	
4.	Statement by His Excellency Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, Personal Representative of the Secretary of State of the United	6.	Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting	171
	States of America	148	Appendix: Attendance list	172

Mr. Vedovato, President of the Assembly, took the Chair at 3 p.m.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Sitting is open.

1. Minutes

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Minutes of Proceedings of the last sitting have not yet been distributed. They will be submitted to the Assembly later.

2. Attendance Register

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The names of the Substitutes present at this sitting which have been notified to me will be published in the list of Representatives appended to the Minutes of Proceedings and to the Official Report of Debates.

3. Relations between Western Europe and the United States

(Resumed joint debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3279 and Addendum, and on the introductory report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Doc. 3278)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the resumed debate on relations between Western Europe and the United States of America, Documents 3278, 3279 and Addendum.

I have to remind you that the list of speakers is closed.

I call Mr. Beauguitte, the first speaker on the list.

Mr. BEAUGUITTE (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have

Mr. Beauguitte (continued)

read the reports by Sir John Rodgers and Mr. Dequae with the greatest interest, and I want to congratulate them on the very high quality of the work. I have just a few comments to add.

No one can deny that in the last three years a profound change has taken place in the whole balance of world affairs. The cumulative effects of the Federal German Chancellor's Ostpolitik, the cease-fire in Vietnam, the new relationships between the United States and the Chinese People's Republic and the USSR, the goodwill that has prevailed from the very beginning of the negotiations on European security, have created a propitious climate for improved international relations. The links that are being forged between the adversaries of yesterday must be matched by the establishment of fresh cooperation among the allies.

It should be noted in this context that the factors behind the United States' present attitude to Europe are perfectly plain, and of these, three, I think, demand our attention.

They are: the crumbling of the bonds which at present hold us together in the Atlantic Alliance; the overall nature of the contacts to be established between the United States and Europe, since politics, economics and military matters are now intermingled; and the uncertainty about what Europe really is, in spite of the progress made during the last two years.

And to what I have just said I would add this: although a comprehensive reply is required to the question of what future there is for cooperation between Europe and the United States, such co-operation will be of no real value until we can at last say who speaks for Europe and who can represent Europe as a distinct personality.

For far too long, the burden of their engagement in Asia on the United States and the inability of Europe to organise its own defence have led to the abandonment of the belief that co-operation within the Atlantic Alliance was one and indivisible. The results of that state of affairs are now only too clear. The American economy has deteriorated under the pressure of military expenditure, and that deterioration has had a disastrous effect on the international

monetary system. On the other hand, the European economy, assured of protection by others, has continued to expand, and thus threatens the reconversion so necessary to the United States. Relations between the two parties have suffered by means of this difference.

The Americans take increased competition by European products on the world market very badly, and the Europeans find a monetary machine which makes all progress unstable extremely irritating. On both sides of the Atlantic people are wondering if the price of common security is not too high.

Once Vietnam is over, there will be a great change in the American economy. That leads us to believe that when the international tariff negotiations open during the summer of 1973, the American negotiators will be rather tough. Basically, if these negotiations are designed to contribute towards redressing the American balance of payments, they should be made the occasion for ending certain misunderstandings due more to the economic climate than to economic realities, for establishing a code of trade practices which will prevent GATT regulations being misunderstood and often rendered inapplicable, and for making it clearly understood that the Nine are now an economic fact and the Community an entity. European agricultural problems in particular must be clearly shown to be political and social as well as economic. Liberalisation of trade between the industrial countries should promote social improvement. But that cannot come about until the real social requirements are frankly set out.

Monetary relationships will doubtless be even more ticklish to deal with. Their present basis will have to be completely reformed and this implies the establishment of an international currency properly adapted to trade requirements. They must constitute a stabilising factor in the development of the economies, and must also include a method of controlling the market in Eurodollars so as to prevent any recurrence of the crises which have been hitting Europe for some years.

I am certainly being rather bold in making two such specific proposals in connection with a problem of such well-known complexity. But these two proposals are basic because they are political. Any common policy for Europe and the

Mr. Beauguitte (continued)

United States necessitates the adoption of joint solutions in this field to prevent the adoption of any retrograde formulae which might jeopardise Western military security. The establishment of new economic and monetary contacts must lead to the renewal of the defence machine in the West, not destroy the one that has existed for twenty-five years.

The temptation is great for the United States to pursue a policy of universal military disengagement. Some American personalities, such as Senator Mansfield, find plenty of economic reasons for regarding the defence of Europe, the presence of American forces in our continent, as being partly responsible for the difficulties which exist on the other side of the Atlantic. But Western defence in its proper sense should mark the end of the era of blocs, because real detente between East and West is possible only if European security is allied to Atlantic security.

The defence links to be established on both sides of the Atlantic require us Europeans to take a good look at the mission we now have to fulfil.

The bipolar world, terrifying because of the antagonisms it displayed, but reassuring in its simplicity, has almost completely disappeared. It looks as if it will be succeeded by a world which appears more open-minded, but within which, unless we are careful, national selfishness may lead to fresh disputes.

We can but applaud the relations now existing between the United States and the USSR and China, both political and economic, but they must not lead to agreements in which Europe would have no place. Our American partner must therefore learn to accept the fact that Europe exists and must not challenge its right to be present. That implies, in the very first place, the establishment of economic and monetary relations quite different from those of the past. Europe must have access to all world markets and share in solving all international problems as a senior partner. The Helsinki negotiations show that the European States, with all their diversity. can be a source of détente. The establishment of European security necessarily involving cooperation will tend to strengthen the mutual security of the West by putting an end to the obvious risk of clashes. Co-ordination without any exclusive alignment — that is the form future international co-operation between Europe and the United States should take.

What I have just said does not, of course, apply to the problems of the developing countries. There, the industrial countries of Europe, as of America, tend to try to multiply Yalta economic systems, which are perfectly suitable for increasing the growth of the developing countries but pay little heed to the interests of the peoples concerned. The third world can represent no real element of competition, of economic rivalry; the final aim of all modern international relations should be to meet its human needs.

The international trade negotiations about to take place will have a decisive effect in this field. On the place that is accorded to the developing countries, on the attention that is paid to their problems, on the joint guarantees for development that are given to them, will depend in the long run not only peace, but the idea of social and human progress so dear to the West. I hope that, here, Europe will play the part her civilisation demands of her. This makes the adoption of a policy confirming and extending the traditional links between Europe and the United States not only possible, but essential, and Europe is capable of playing a part corresponding to its vocation.

But the question remains: who is to speak for Europe?

In the face of these economic and political realities, Europe seems still to be structurally shapeless. Of course, there is the Community of the Nine which may be the basis on which the policy of the future will be built. But there is no point in denying that the Community suffers from two important deficiencies: too little power and too narrow geographical limits. Although the Europe of the Nine can talk to the United States at military level, it cannot do so at monetary level. It does not exist as part of the Atlantic Alliance, still less when it comes to being represented internationally.

So it is essential, as a first step, to hasten the foundation of European structures. The time-

Mr. Beauguitte (continued)

table drawn up last autumn was encouraging, but should it not be speeded up? It certainly should be in the economic and monetary fields, if the negotiations to take place in the summer of 1973 are to do so in the best conditions. It should be even more so where the co-ordination of foreign policy is concerned. More essential still, in my view, is that defence problems should be considered as from now. The present compartmentalisation cannot continue. It is the pressure of events that demands European unity - economic, monetary, military - with political union as the future goal. But the union of the Nine is not enough. It is dictated by special circumstances, which cannot justifiably keep out other countries.

A united Europe should be open to the real Europe whenever necessary and should associate with its activities all the countries which do not belong to it, but have the same interests. That is obviously a task for the Ministers and diplomats, but there is also a political forum as represented by our Organisation.

My conclusion is very simple.

For the future of relations between Europe and the United States, for the maintenance of peace and independence, our Organisation could become the principal parlamentary forum responsible for following the international negotiations which will take place this year and for sending recommendations to the governments in that connection. If this idea were adopted, the Assembly's external relations programme should be directed to that end.

The work entailed would obviously be heavy, but it would be stimulating and worthy of the peoples we represent. It would also enable us to rise above nationalism and defend with all the dignity that characterises our debates the treasures of our civilisation.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Ladies and Gentlemen, may I remind you that each speaker must keep strictly to the time-limit allotted to him, as there are eighteen names already down on the list for this debate.

I call Mr. Stewart.

Mr. STEWART (United Kingdom). — Mr. President, Sir John Rodgers in his report says we must define the relationship between the democratic countries of Western Europe on the one hand, and the United States on the other, in terms of what we are for rather than what we are against. It is that part of the argument I wish to pursue.

I am sure he is right to say that because no organisation of human beings, no alliance nor any kind of grouping can long survive unless its members have a certain degree of common faith, common purpose and objectives they want to achieve together.

What are the things we are for? If we start to look for them I believe we shall find this obliges us to consider not only our relations with each other — international relations — but also to look at our own domestic policies.

For example, presumably the first thing we are for is the maintenance of human liberty in our own countries and, as far as possible, in the world. Liberty and democracy can be threatened by armed dictatorship from outside, but democracy can also be betrayed by the danger that democratic processes will be too slow and too confused to deal with modern complex problems - the energy problems referred to in Dr. Kissinger's speech, the problem of pollution and that of population. To devise appropriate policies for them and to carry through the exercise of persuasion and explanation that is required in democracies can be a very difficult task. We ought, all of us, therefore, to consider how far our democratic processes are up to date.

Secondly, I hope that all of us — all the democratic nations of Western Europe and the United States — stand for a policy of seeking an understanding with the Communist world. I say deliberately "an understanding".

The old conflicts between Christendom and Islam were not ended by one side being converted to the faith of the other. They were ended by a realisation on both sides that they must leave each other at peace.

This, I believe, is the situation here. Therefore, there will remain a very important and profound difference in beliefs as between us and the Communist world. We must not let that stand in the

Mr. Stewart (continued)

way of reaching a peaceful way of life, for I trust, a very long time. There is an apparent, but not a real, paradox: if you want to achieve that degree of understanding, your defences and your alliances meanwhile must be extremely firm.

One of the reasons I believe we are now approaching détente is that the Soviet Union is satisfied the North Atlantic Alliance will not just fall to pieces. If the Soviet Government believed that, I doubt if they would be particularly interested in talking about conferences and détente.

One school of thought says, "If you want to make the international climate less frigid, dissolve these military blocs". This is rather like a man on a cold winter's day saying, "I will take off my overcoat and that will make the weather warmer". We must trust that, with time and patience, we shall be able to make the weather warmer. We are more likely to be able to do that if meanwhile our overcoat is on.

Thirdly, I trust that we all stand for attempts to promote prosperity. This is developed in the Economic Affairs and Development Committee report and I will not attempt to go into it in detail. I wish merely to quote the penultimate paragraph of the draft resolution arising from the report of Sir John Rodgers.

"Considers that the aim of reform of the international economic system should not only be to liberalise trade among all industrialised countries but to improve the terms of trade of developing countries and try to reduce the growing gap between richer and poorer nations."

I wholeheartedly endorse that.

In the long past, trade was hampered by restrictive nationalist policies. We have been moving away from that towards more liberal policies, but we now recognise, as that paragraph does, that a purely liberal approach to international trade is not sufficient. There must be a deliberate planning element in it if the poorest nations are not to be the losers. I trust, again, that that is among the list of the things that we, Europe and America, are for.

On that list of three things that we are for, I believe that I would carry most people with me. I should like to add two other things that I hope we shall be for but which might be more argued about.

I hope that it will be made increasingly clear in any joint pronouncements between the United States and the countries of Western Europe that we believe in racial equality, and that the countries of this group will, wherever and whenever possible, use their influence in the world to promote equal rights for people of all races.

A fifth thing that I think we should be for is the realisation that prosperity is not sufficient unless it is interpreted into welfare. Many European countries are becoming increasingly aware of this. In country after country there are policies to see that regions of the country which in the ordinary working of the economy might be impoverished are helped by deliberate governmental action. There is redistribution of wealth in the interests of the elderly and those who suffer from other handicaps. There is the growing realisation that a modern State will always be at risk unless it ensures that every one of its citizens has a reasonable standard of housing, health and education.

The strength of belief in this kind of thing varies from country to country. I believe that unless it becomes stronger, unless it becomes an avowed objective of policy of the West, we shall not create among our people, particularly the people of the rising generation, enough nerve and resolution to defend the civilisation that we are talking about.

Some voices will be raised in Europe — not, I think, in this Assembly, but certainly elsewhere — asking me at this point, "Do you really think it is any use talking to the Americans about this sort of thing? When you look at the conditions in which some of their coloured citizens live, do you expect them to be champions of racial equality? When you read the harsh language in which some of them talk about the Welfare State, do you expect them to agree with that last point you made? Do you expect a shining example of how democracy works from the country of the Watergate scandal?"

Those things will unquestionably be said, though not in the polite atmosphere of this hall.

Mr. Stewart (continued)

But I am convinced that there is an overwhelming answer. The harshest things ever said about any kind of abuse in the United States have been said by Americans in America, in a free press, and that is the mark not only of a free country, but of a vital country, a country with a mind and a conscience. Sometimes, as with human beings, that conscience is sharper and more alive than at others, but it is always there.

Those who make that kind of criticism also forget the immense energy of the American people, and how we should be talking in very different terms about the standard of life of the whole human race if it were not for the enormous energy of the American people, their power to conquer nature to produce wealth.

Those who make these criticisms also forget the immense outbursts of generosity that from time to time, and not all that infrequently, have come from the United States, and the Americans' capacity to make great leaps forward and adapt themselves with startling speed, more quickly than we sometimes adapt ourselves in Europe, to the needs of the time.

There are some Americans who, from their side of the Atlantic, will ask, "What is the use of talking about getting together with Europe, that lazy, quarrelsome continent, with its people all demoralised as a result of welfare legislation, chronically at war and always expecting us to rescue them when they quarrel and pull them out of the economic disasters into which, with their quarrelsomeness, they land themselves?"

There is also an answer to that kind of criticism. If we are to go ahead, we must have confidence in ourselves, we must be able to answer that kind of criticism. We must look at what is best in ourselves and each other and live up to what we know we are really capable of. As it is put in Sir John Rodgers's report, we must remember our cultural heritage, but let us not treat our cultural heritage as a magnificent clock inherited from our great-grandparents that we set on the mantlepiece and admire.

The greatest part of our cultural heritage, something that has been hammered out and has emerged over the centuries, is belief in liberty and belief in justice. Our business is to find the modern political and economic techniques in which those beliefs can be kept alive.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Gessner.

Mr. GESSNER (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish to express my thanks for the remarkable report submitted by Sir John Rodgers. Generally speaking, I agree with the analysis contained in it, as well as with the conclusions.

I am sure the Assembly will pardon me if I link my comments to a passage which I quote from the actual report, namely:

First, the Ostpolitik of the Federal Republic of Germany has met with the approval of all Western governments, including the United States, and has been built into the policies of the NATO Alliance.

It is not complacency or self-righteousness that leads me to quote this passage. I have three basic reasons for this.

One, the Alliance to which we belong, consisting of the States of the European and the American continents, has proved the value of common political strategy and tactics. The result of the *Ostpolitik* as hitherto practised by the Federal Republic of Germany is also the result of Atlantic solidarity.

My second reason is that acceptable settlements with East European States are posssible.

My third point is that the *Ostpolitik* of the Federal Republic of Germany serves not only the interests of the Federal Republic itself, but also those of Europe and America, because its aim is to safeguard peace generally.

It is along these lines that I wish to encourage the Assembly to continue the détente in progress and to work in this direction, without haste but very intensively, and without being discouraged by setbacks which cannot but occur. I feel that this encouragement is the more timely now that the power of the European States has increased. It will be quite in keeping with partnership with the United States if the European countries make every effort on their own behalf to promote and support the present process of détente between East and West. This would be in the interest of the European States if only because

Mr. Gessner (continued)

it would surely be injudicious for the two superpowers to conclude agreements over the heads of the European countries and without Europe being allowed her say.

The manner in which the policy of détente has so far proceeded shows very clearly how vital it is for the Western democracies to find a common denominator for common interests. While this is no easy matter and one that will not be easy in future, I am convinced that a solution is possible. The States of free Europe taken as a whole now have a greater say and have a greater influence on the shaping of world political events than they had in the past postwar years. Let us see that this is put to good use.

The importance of this is clear from the fact that it would by no means correspond to the role of the European States if, with the transformation of the world political stage, they had to make do with a walking-on part. Let me give you my personal views about this.

If we pull the cord of common interests we shall set more in motion than if we pull on a thread here and there. I am fully aware that it makes a great difference whether or not a country is a member of an alliance. I say this here because I want to make it quite clear that nobody wishes to do without the positive contribution of the neutral and uncommitted States. I think it is correct to say that agreement on joint political aims need not mean uniformity of political method. Agreement on the political aims of a policy of détente certainly provides opportunities for special contributions and achievements, according to the conditions and premises of the foreign policy and the security policy pursued by each individual State.

Agreement or alignment on common political intentions will by no means end the debate. I can very well imagine that the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe is likely to gain in significance during the further process of West-East détente, as a discussion forum and as a clearing house for intentions and desires.

I would emphasise this possibility since I believe that the more intensively and successfully the Helsinki and Vienna talks proceed, the

greater will be the compulsion to co-operate. There are no doubts at all in my mind that not-withstanding Europe's greater importance, the military presence in our continent of the United States of America will continue to be essential. I would go further and say that the presence of the United States in Europe is an essential pre-requisite for the successful continuation of the East-West dialogue. Nor will this change in the coming years. And this military presence is not only in the interests of the European countries, it is also in the interests of the United States of America.

At this point I would like to make a further comment. That our countries are fully in favour of détente is certain. But we face the fact that relaxation in the world faces a difficulty of a different kind. In other words, we are attempting to reach reasonable settlements with States whose social system contrasts with ours. It goes without saying that it is easier to reach agreement with the Western States because the conclusion of reasonable settlements is not hindered by additional difficulties in the form of opposing ideologies and all their consequences. However positive the political and disarmament process, the ideological situation of conflict will continue. The communist doctrine of peaceful co-existence does not include ideological co-existence. This means that it is vain to assume that agreements or settlements between East and West could lead to the convergence of different social systems. The opposite is more likely to happen. We have to allow for the possibility that additional and fresh emphasis will be introduced into the ideological discussion by the communist States. This challenge is nothing new. It has existed for as long as the communist States have existed, and it is my firm conviction that it will enter a new phase.

The Federal Chancellor, Mr. Brandt, recently stated in a speech to the German Bundestag that what kept democracy alive was not its hostility to the dictatorships of this world but its own values. I have nothing to add to this. Confidence and faith in the strength of the democratic idea are the prerequisites for the continuance of the political dialogue with the Warsaw Pact States. Our confidence in the strength of democracy is unshaken. We therefore have no reason to stop the process of détente because of continuing ideological rivalry. We subscribe to

Mr. Gessner (continued)

the historical view that Europe and the United States of America, together with Canada, not only have the responsibility for maintaining the balance of power to ensure their safety, but that they also bear a joint responsibility for a balanced policy of détente in the world.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Delforge.

Mr. DELFORGE (*Belgium*) (Translation). — I too want to congratulate our Rapporteur, Mr. Dequae, on the very full report he has presented to the Assembly.

I want to make a few comments about the economic relations between Europe and the United States of America. As Mr. Dequae explained so well in his report, there are two main factors which explain the lop-sided character of these relations. These are the absence of any European authority in the economic policy field, and the more highly developed American economy, characterised by the growing size of their foreign investments as compared with their external trade.

Undoubtedly, in the commercial field Europe, and the European Economic Community in particular, have important powers of negotiation where trade is concerned. But when it comes to economic policy, that power is non-existent, since it is the national capitals that continue to take the decisions — decisions which are generally taken without any prior consultation and agreement between the member States.

That, in fact, is one point where the lack of adequate consultation and agreement between the member States of EEC is at once most noticeable and most dangerous for the future construction of Europe, and even for the simple preservation of what has already been constructed.

The following are the points I want to deal with here: the geographical scope of the trade negotiations, European monetary union, and the problem of Eurodollars, on which the Rapporteur hopes we may achieve a common attitude.

First of all, the geographical scope of the negotiations. The negotiations on economic

relations will bring the United States and Europe face to face. I believe that the parties to these negotiations should be Western Europe and representatives of the North American continent. Even though the American and Canadian economies are very closely integrated, we have to remember that Canada supplies Europe with non-ferrous metals and paper on a favoured basis.

Joint or parallel negotiations with Canada seem to me all the more important in that a great many people in Canada are officially advocating decreased economic dependence on the United States by enlarging the scope of Canada's trade relations. And let us not forget that one of the first countries to show an interest in this idea was the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Why should not Western Europe in general and EEC in particular exploit this opportunity?

Similarly, comprehensive negotiations should be entered into quickly with Japan. Some agreements are now being negotiated between EEC and Japan, but they are not enough. In view of the dynamism of the Japanese economy which, alone and unaided, remember, put the United States trade balance in the red, comprehensive solutions must be found. In terms of gross national product, Japan is now the second country of the Western world after the USA. It comes before any of the European countries.

Furthermore, contrary to what was generally expected, the revaluation of the yen under the Smithsonian agreements was certainly no handicap to Japanese export companies, and after a period for readjustment the same may be true of the second revaluation, just precisely because the revaluation of the Japanese currency in terms of the European currencies is not very great. Japanese products sold in Europe are highly competitive, for they are very sophisticated and include considerable added value.

All this leads me to hope that there may be extensive official negotiations not only with the United States, but with Canada and Japan.

As to European monetary union, most observers agree in saying that recent events have brought things to a halt and have jeopardised the work for monetary unity in Europe. The recent devaluation of the dollar has once again demonstrated how dependent Europe is on the

Mr. Delforge (continued)

United States in the monetary field in spite of the latter's adverse balance of trade.

We Europeans must strengthen our control over the flow of capital from outside the Community. We must also find some machinery for facilitating greater freedom of capital movement within the Nine. Let us remember in this connection that the Werner Report foresees among other things a common EEC currency by 1980.

I feel that high priority should be given to the rapid realisation of our economic and monetary objectives. I have just been talking about freedom of capital movement within the Community and the need for better control of hot money. In that context, I want to say a few words about the Eurodollar problem.

In paragraph 6 of the draft resolution in his report, Sir John Rodgers calls for an international agreement for regulating the Eurodollar market. Euro-currencies, about 70% of which are Eurodollars, are now held responsible for the recent crises which have shaken the money markets. The Eurodollar market has certainly increased for it has now reached a total of 100 000 million American dollars, and this capital, intended for short-term investment, shows a tendency to develop certainly towards the desired profitability, but also to the advantage of the speculator.

These short-term capital movements in Eurodollars, when viewed from the standpoint of the Central Banks, have many but on the whole negative consequences. The movement of floating capital from one country to another seems to me difficult to prevent in a free market economy such as exists in Europe. And the difficulty seems to be increased by the European credo of free circulation between member countries of men, goods, services and capital. The problem of finding a valid modus vivendi is made harder by the type of people who bring capital into the Eurodollar market. As an example, we might mention here the commercial banks, in regard to which each country can decide for itself how it should act.

There are three other sources of funds which may, however, be difficult to control: multinational companies; the Eastern European countries, which prefer to preserve their anonymity when it comes to transactions in dollars, and certain Middle East countries, whose dollar reserves are rising rapidly as a result of the regular increase in the price of oil.

I personally believe that this last factor will inevitably prove the disturbing element on the markets during the next few years.

So what solutions can be found to the crisis afflicting short-term capital? Any overall coordination at world level seems to me utopian. Even within the framework of EEC the problem is by no means easy to solve.

Various solutions can be envisaged: the creation of a European Central Bank, but I will say no more about that because you all know how difficult that would be; general closure of the exchange markets for an indefinite period, but, by definition, that would provide only a temporary solution; an identical attitude on the part of the member countries in refusing to admit speculative capital — a possible solution. but that implies control of capital movements as well; the closure of exchange markets by a country which sees speculation developing against its currency, but that again is a temporary solution; a negative rate of interest and the establishment of reserves which would freeze part or, in extreme cases, the whole of the capital brought into a country, but this again would present serious difficulties; and finally, the two-tier exchange market, which recognises the existence of two markets, and I need not remind you how advantageous that has been for the countries which have adopted that system.

I believe the situation will improve during the next few months, however, and that we can take our time over finding an agreement for regulating the Eurodollar market. Rates of interest are definitely going up in the United States, mainly as a result of an increased demand for credit by producers, following the economic revival which is now taking place, but also in the expectation of inflation. Short-term

Mr. Delforge (continued)

interest has already gone up, but has still quite a way to go. Long-term interest is also beginning to show a tendency in that direction.

I believe, too, that real investment will increase in the United States under the stimulus of two factors: first in the Trade Bill which has just been sent to the American House of Representatives, President Nixon shows his willingness to modify the fiscal system; and secondly, European investment in the United States should progressively increase.

All these facts taken together lead me to hope for a slight diminution in the shocks that hit the exchange market. They also allow us to take our time over finding a method of controlling floating capital. In that field, I recommend the general establishment of two-tier exchange markets, since that would enable capital movements to be filtered and would prevent a large degree of speculation.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Grieve.

Mr. GRIEVE (United Kingdom). — I intend to make a very short contribution to our discussion this afternoon. I should like, as have all who have spoken in this debate, to congratulate both our Rapporteurs upon excellent, positive and constructive reports; and, in particular, Sir John Rodgers on the addendum to his report which was made following upon the recent speech of Dr. Kissinger. I do so because, although much has been said about the problems arising from the approach postulated by Dr. Kissinger, the importance of his speech, in my submission to the Assembly, was that it was a positive and constructive approach to the problems of European-American relations; and it is a positive and constructive approach that we in the free and Western world need.

I was much impressed by the passage in the addendum to Sir John Rodger's report where he said:

"A widespread tendency has developed to

react to current Atlantic problems with an exaggerated pessimism."

My plea this afternoon is for a constructive and optimistic approach. Surely a Europe which has achieved a measure of unity unimaginable thirty years ago will not flinch at problems between itself and the United States when there is goodwill on both sides, together with a common interest in the preservation of the free world.

The free world is as interdependent now as at any time since the war; this interdependence demands that we resolve the problems between the United States and Europe because our common interest makes it essential to do so. Our relationship is an evolving one - change is a factor in the world and without it we should be static — in which the respective strengths of the two parties are changing. It is natural that in such circumstances the United States should look to Europe, for instance, to take a larger part in her own defence and to pay a larger share of its cost. With goodwill, that should not create any real problem for either side. These problems are to be discussed and we shall see how the demands of European defence are to be met after the forthcoming conferences on European security.

I agree that we are not here to make a complete "package deal", an expression I dislike since defence is not to be put in a package with trade relations or with the reconstruction of the world monetary system. Nevertheless, there is an urgent need, recognised in both Europe and the United States, for such a reconstruction. As for trade, the Americans have been in the vanguard of the movement towards a united Europe which would constitute an economic bloc on a par with, and possibly in some ways going beyond, American economic strength. I do not believe that the United States will therefore seek to engage in a trade war: but we for our part must look to our own economic policies and make sure that we co-ordinate them with those of the United States so that we shall have free trade in the world rather than tariff systems behind which each side seeks to shelter.

Mr. Grieve (continued)

I do not claim to have made a profound or technical contribution to this afternoon's discussion; what I want to emphasise is the need to recognise our complete interdependence. If there is goodwill we shall not fail to find a solution.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Kahn-Ackermann.

Mr. KAHN-ACKERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are, as it were, in the second round of the debate on our relations with the United States of America in this European Assembly. A third round will be held in June in the WEU Assembly. I sometimes wish that American congressmen would, in some form or another, follow the example we set by occupying ourselves so intensively with relations between the United States of America and Europe. That would certainly be valuable for our dialogue. However, we know that this is not the case and we must take things as they come.

I shall restrict myself to a very few comments since in general I agree entirely with Sir John Rodgers. He never exceeded the bounds of what a loose alliance of European States, which are not world powers, can permit itself in addressing a world power, and in this he surely acted for the best from the European point of view. However, we all have our experiences with the United States of America. The intelligent and restrained manner in which the Rapporteur tackled a number of problems has one disadvantage. Too often only what has been said very loudly is understood on the other side of the Atlantic. Here we exercise a certain restraint in full consciousness of the relative sizes of the two partners. I sometimes fear that this restraint, however justified, may only too easily be misunderstood by the other side.

The focal point of these considerations is the question: What is the content of the present Atlantic partnership? We sometimes have the feeling that agreements on security within the Atlantic partnership are losing the support of the citizens, not only of our countries but also

of the citizens on the other side of the Atlantic. This is a development which we must oppose for the reasons stated in the report. I must say that I am not at all sure how best to do this. The military balance which has hitherto ensured peace in Europe and was, to a great extent, the most important component of the alliance with the United States, has necessarily become a subject for reflection. It has been our experience that during numerous deliberations on both sides, during the joint political and economic discussions on our aims, this question has increasingly been the subject of disagreements and doubts.

Nor can we ignore the fact that the younger generation, which has not experienced war and which is not so aware of its consequences and causes as the older generation represented here in the Assembly, is convinced that peaceful stability is immutable. The younger generation does not know that this conviction is questionable and can be changed overnight by harsh reality. But under the present circumstances, this feeling of substantial security which we have in all our political dealings on our continent, has remained unchanged. For years the political debate with many of our younger colleagues has centred on this issue. It is in actual fact sometimes difficult to explain why we doubt the permanence of this security.

The remark by Dr. Kissinger that all Europe's interests were only regional ones is of course objectively incorrect, but subjectively it is easy to understand. In this connection we must ask ourselves whether the Americans are not right from their point of view when, in view of the many facets of the policy pursued in Brussels and in other European capitals, they consider this policy as very provincial. This question should continue to be debated. We cannot merely pass lightly over it and say that the adviser to the President of the United States is quite wrong on this point. Perhaps he merely wished to show us what many Americans think about European policy in view of the form it takes. This will continue to be an important point in future talks and discussions.

I personally have the impression that we should sometimes remind our governments, when they over-emphasise the status quo of the

Mr. Kahn-Ackermann (continued)

Atlantic partnership, that we and our European concerns are not a closed circle and that there is certainly a whole number of areas in which our American partners — and possibly other partners — should have, I will not say a greater voice in these matters, but at least much greater possibilities of consultation than they have at present.

And, generally speaking, I was most impressed by what Mr. Michael Stewart said here this afternoon, namely that the most important thing in the readjustment of relations between Europe and America will continue to be common trust in a common purpose and the ability of democratic society on both sides of the Atlantic to develop. This is a crucial point in domestic policy which substantially influences our foreign relations and, let us remember, also largely influences foreign relations in the United States of America. On this point I think we have quite a bit to make up for, both in Europe and the United States of America.

4. Statement by His Excellency, Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, Personal Representative of the Secretary of State of the United States of America

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Ladies and Gentlemen, we shall now have the pleasure of listening to His Excellency, Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, Personal Representative of the Secretary of State of the United States of America.

Mr. Ambassador, it is with the very greatest pleasure that I welcome you to this Chamber where you will be speaking for the United States of America in your capacity as Personal Representative of the Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers.

I will not enumerate all the functions you have fulfilled in the course of your brillant career, but will confine myself to noting that you were successively Deputy Defence Under-Secretary from 1957 onwards, then Deputy Defence Secretary, and, in 1970, Under-Secretary at the

Department of State. Your recent appointment as Ambassador in Paris is thus right in line with your successful career under three successive Presidents.

The Assembly is awaiting your statement with the greatest interest, and I now ask you to come up to the rostrum.

I call Mr. Irwin. (Applause)

His Excellency, Mr. John N. IRWIN, Junior (United States Ambassador in Paris). — It is a great pleasure and privilege to appear before this distinguished Assembly today for your discussion of relations between the United States and Europe. My government appreciates your invitation to participate in what your agenda calls a "joint debate" on these relationships, a "joint debate" in which we hope the emphasis can be on "joint" consideration rather than on the rhetorical confrontations of "debate".

It has become a commonplace in my country to refer to 1973 as the "Year of Europe". And it may be an inevitable corollary that, for Europe, 1973 will be the "Year of the United States". Not that we on our side of the Atlantic or you on yours have ignored each other in earlier years. Certainly Europe was no less important to the United States in 1963 or 1953 than it is in 1973. But for us 1973 has been termed a "Year of Europe" because many issues of vital importance to US-European relations seem to be crystallising in the period immediately ahead.

The European Summit last October in Paris spoke of the need for a "constructive dialogue" with the United States in terms which my government welcomed.

President Pompidou, according to the report of a newspaper interviewer in the New York Times last December, sees 1973 as presenting a new phase in US-European relations calling for, in the words of the interviewer, "a thoughtful reappraisal, not only of money and trade questions, which tended to divide nations, but also for a little more reflection on the things that united them" and for discussions of these ques-

tions not just between the "technicians" but by the political leaders of the major nations involved.

Chancellor Brandt in his recent meeting with President Nixon affirmed "the readiness of the Federal Republic of Germany, together with the other Members of the European Community and its institutions, to participate in an open and comprehensive discussion concerning the nature of a balanced partnership between the uniting Western Europe and the United States".

Dr. Kissinger's speech of 23 April, entitled the "Year of Europe", which has been so widely reviewed in the press, was another step in this continuing discussion. The speech has received positive responses from a number of European leaders, most recently from Prime Minister Heath earlier this week, who said:

"We look forward to rethinking, with the United States and with Canada, the evolution of the Atlantic Alliance which is and will remain the cornerstone of the free world."

I understand that Prime Minister Andreotti made a distinguished and significant contribution to the overall dialogue on US-European relations, and I am happy to have the honour of following him on this rostrum.

Our "joint debate" today on US-European relations, therefore, gives me a welcome chance to carry this discussion one step further. The report which Sir John Rodgers presented this morning, together with Mr. Dequae's more detailed analysis of some of the economic and monetary aspects, provides an excellent point of departure. I saw that report, in draft, several weeks ago, just prior to Dr. Kissinger's "Year of Europe" speech. I was impressed then, and continue to be impressed, by the similarity of these two approaches — one European and one American. This similarity gives me hope that a new consensus may indeed emerge out of the continuing European-American dialogue.

Sir John Rodger's paper, it seems to me, makes these five key points:

- 1. That a new consensus of Atlantic interdependence must be established, based no longer only on a common conception of what we are defending ourselves against, but rather more clearly on what we are for.
- 2. That "a decision to share the responsibility and the burden of common defence by Western Europe is an essential step" in reaching a new overall consensus.
- 3. That European integration is a necessary precondition for genuine partnership.
- 4. That the countries of the Atlantic partnership must take some provision for the developing countries.
- 5. That some improvement in the mechanisms for dialogue between the United States and Europe is necessary even before Europe ultimately decides who will speak for it as a whole; and that as part of this improvement there is a need to raise disputes on monetary and trade issues to a higher political level. In this connection, he raised the possibility of a United States-European summit.

Perhaps a useful contribution to this "joint debate" might be to summarise my government's response to these points. The most up-to-date statement of our response can be found in Dr. Kissinger's speech and this year's foreign policy reports of President Nixon and Secretary of State Rogers. In essence, we agree with each of Sir John's points.

First, we agree there is a need to reinvigorate shared ideals and common purposes with our friends and allies. Over the past quarter century we have seen dramatic changes in the content and context of European-American relations: the economic revival of Western Europe and its significant progress toward economic unification, the shift in the East-West strategic balance from American preponderance to near equality, the emergence of Japan as a major power centre and some relaxation of tensions between East

and West. The need to adjust European-American relations to current realities is clearly perceived. This perception, I believe, lies at the very heart of Dr. Kissinger's proposal that both sides of the Atlantic rethink together the structure of "Atlantic" relations.

As Dr. Kissinger put it:

"The Atlantic nations must find a solution for the management of their diversity, to serve the common objectives which underlie their unity. We can no longer afford to pursue national or regional self-interest without a unifying framework. We cannot hold together if each country or region asserts its autonomy whenever it is to its benefit and invokes unity to curtail the independence of others.

We must strike a new balance between selfinterest and the common interest. We must identify interests and positive values beyond security in order to engage once again the commitment of peoples and parliaments. We need a shared view of the world we seek to build."

Second, again to quote Dr. Kissinger:

"America remains committed to doing its fair share in Atlantic defence."

We also look to others to carry an equitable share of that common burden. Together, we would like to be sure that we have a suitable common defence doctrine and posture in the light of the evolving circumstances.

Third, we continue to support, as we have throughout the post-war period, European unity. No element of American post-war policy has been more consistent. We have encouraged European unity on every possible occasion. We recognised from the start that a united Europe would be an independent partner and that as it grew in strength it would express its views and defend its interests with increasing vigour. But we also believed — and we continue to believe — that the increased strength of a unified Europe, with which the United States can work in co-operative

partnership, is increased strength from which all of us benefit.

Some Europeans have from time to time suggested that until European "unity" is fully achieved the United States should stay completely out of European councils and European affairs. For us this poses a dilemma. On the one hand, we certainly do not wish to intrude into these councils and affairs merely for the sake of meddling, nor do we wish to hinder the process of European integration. On the other hand, when European decisions and actions will have a direct impact on the interests of the United States, or when our actions and decisions will have a direct impact on Europe, we believe there must continue to be the closest co-operation and consultation. We believe this co-operation can continue, can grow, and can adapt to evolving circumstances even as European integration proceeds.

Fourth, we agree fully that continued efforts are required to help developing countries improve the lives of their peoples. Aside from humanitarian concern, all developed countries have major economic and political interests in the growth, stability and co-operation of these countries. The United States remains committed to helping them. As President Nixon said in his latest foreign policy report,

"We must pursue a realistic policy of development assistance and find better ways of dealing with trade and monetary interests of developing countries."

As for Sir John's fifth point, we ask for nothing better than the opportunity to strengthen and improve the dialogue with our friends and allies in whatever way can be worked out. In spite of the close co-operation the United States has enjoyed with Europe in the last twenty-five years, wariness and suspicion are evident in Europe as to the motives and intentions of the United States. Even though I believe such wariness and suspicion not to be deserved, I can accept a wary approach to the complex issues we face provided wariness does not preclude a frank and objective examination and discussion of these issues. Americans recognise

that there are and will be differences between us and our European partners. What we seek is to speak together frankly and objectively, free of emotion and prejudice, so as to discover, first, where our real differences lie, and, second, how those differences can be isolated, narrowed and perhaps eventually resolved.

President Nixon, as you know, is in the midst of a round of bilateral summit meetings with European leaders. He has spoken of his intention to make a trip to Europe in the fall where he will meet again with European leaders and with institutions of both European and "Atlantic" unity, respectively the Commission of the European Community in Brussels and NATO. These meetings are an effort on the part of the United States to improve the dialogue between the United States and Europe.

Further improvements may be possible, both as to form and substance. As to form several voices have suggested, as does Sir John Rodgers's report, the idea of a summit meeting between President Nixon and all of the European leaders grouped together where Europe could "speak with one voice". We recognise, however, that some Europeans are concerned that Europe may not have proceeded far enough with its own integration to make such a meeting desirable. We do not insist on any particular format. We will do our part to improve the substance of the dialogue in whatever form it takes place.

On substance, Dr. Kissinger's recent speech—which indeed echoes ideas that have sounded from many quarters in Europe— is a call for a joint effort of creativity to establish a set of common objectives and principles to guide us in handling specific issues that will confront us. Here again, the United States is not laying out a prescription. In due course we expect to contribute to the dialogue our own suggestions as to objectives and principles. At the moment, however, we are seeking the ideas and contributions of our allies so that we can better under-

stand European concerns and aspirations and so that these concerns and aspirations can be fully reflected in any consensus which Europe and the United States might reach together on common goals and principles.

Some critics have seen in Dr. Kissinger's speech a call for American hegemony or a proclamation of *Pax Americana*. Such was not Dr. Kissinger's intention. Read fairly, the speech is a call for European and American co-operation in building a genuine and balanced partnership.

One phrase of the speech particularly has been widely misunderstood, in the press and elsewhere, as assuming that Europe should keep to a regional role while the United States deals with global questions. In fact, Dr. Kissinger's remarks were intended only to be descriptive of the way things sometimes seem to be — not prescriptive of the way we would like them to be. Both in economic relations and in the wider diplomatic context the United States often gets an impression that Europe wishes to define its interests and responsibilities primarily in regional terms. Sometimes Europeans foster such an impression by arguing the primacy of regional necessities over possible global solutions.

The United States in fact would welcome a wider than regional definition of interests and responsibilities by individual European countries or by Europe as a whole. At the same time whether European interests are seen as global, as they are, or as regional, as they are, they are not necessarily in conflict with American interests; but then they are not necessarily identical either. This latter fact leads directly to the conclusion that we and the Europeans must work together at the highest political levels to achieve a comprehensive understanding of where and how our respective interests coincide.

To reaffirm America's faith that a community of shared goals and principles exists on which such a comprehensive understanding might be reached is not to ignore or under-estimate the seriousness of the differences we have with

Western European countries. The most pressing of these differences seem to be on economic questions. They arise against a background of radical change in the relative economic strengths of the leading industrial countries in the last twenty-five years. In 1945, with the economies of the European nations and Japan shattered by war, the United States stood alone as the world's most powerful economic power. As the principal surplus country in the early post-war years, we set out deliberately to reduce our surplus. We exported capital massively to the rest of the world, primarily in the form of government loans and grants designed to promote economic reconstruction and modernisation, while opening our markets widely to foreign imports. We were fortunately prosperous enough to be able to subordinate immediate commercial interest to long-term political goals.

Today that situation is dramatically different. While still unquestionably a great world economic power, the United States is no longer alone in that role. In certain fields of economic activity the European Community has outstripped us by a considerable margin. For example, the European Community's share of world trade is now more than twice that of the United States. In 1946 we controlled over one half of the world's monetary reserves. The figure today is less than 10 %. Our payments deficit, once a factor for restoring international economic balance, has increasingly become a cause of instability. Since 1971 the United States has been running trade deficits for the first time in this century.

Differences in the area of trade will, we hope, be resolved in the multilateral trade negotiations due to begin with the GATT ministerial meeting in Tokyo in September. These negotiations should aim at securing the conditions necessary for the continued expansion of world trade on the basis of equity and non-discrimination. United States objectives will be: to achieve a

further major reduction of industrial tariffs; to eliminate or harmonise the most important non-tariff barriers to industrial trade; to liberalise world trade in agricultural products; to recognise the needs of developing countries; and to agree internationally upon a system of safeguards which will allow industries adversely affected by shifting trade patterns time to adjust.

Agricultural trade is a particularly contentious issue between the United States and the European Community. We would like to discuss the problems of agricultural trade in a reasonable, frank manner, free of rhetoric and emotionalism. We would hope such discussion could lead to agreement on measures to liberalise world trade in agriculture, measures which would neither hurt the European Community economically nor prejudice European integration but which would bring about a substantial expansion of world trade and more efficient and rational patterns of production, thereby benefiting the farmers and consumers of all countries.

In saying we seek an expansion of agricultural trade, we are not, as some European commentators continue to insist, seeking to destroy the Community's common agricultural policy. I emphasise that we recognise that a common farm policy is an indispensable element in an integrated Europe. We also recognise that any modifications of this policy are likely to involve sensitive social and political issues, aside from the purely economic issues, which would have to be resolved. We believe, however, that a European agricultural policy can and should be implemented in a manner which takes into account the legitimate interest of third countries.

The United States has for years had a sophisticated agricultural policy of its own which also has evolved in a context of great political sensitivity. We too have a history of agricultural protectionism and farm price supports. In asking our trading partners to discuss changes in their agricultural policies which could contribute to

an expansion of world trade, we recognise that on our side we will have to put our protective agricultural policies on the negotiating block.

Agriculture is not the only realm in which there seems to be a misconception in Europe about United States objectives. We often are accused of wishing to use the trade negotiations to exact unilateral concessions to aid our balance-of-payments adjustment process and to supplement the trade advantages obtained through the recent dollar devaluations. This fear is then used to buttress an argument — at least, at times — that the trade and monetary negotiations must be completely separated, lest the United States use any leverage it may have in the monetary talks to extort the unilateral trade concessions we are supposed, erroneously, to want.

This view of our objectives is incorrect. In the trade negotiations, as we agreed in February 1972 with the European Community, we intend to negotiate on the basis of "mutual advantage and mutual commitment with overall reciprocity". What we hope to obtain from these negotiations is what all nations enjoy when barriers to world trade are reduced: a general increase in prosperity and a resulting improvement in living standards from which all parties benefit.

Six months ago differences between the United States and Europe on monetary questions might have seemed even more contentious than those on trade. A measure of agreement was reached however at last September's IMF meeting when President Nixon and Secretary Shultz both spoke outlining US proposals for monetary reform. The "Committee of Twenty" was launched and given a mandate to work towards agreement on broad principles of reform by the time of this September's meeting in Nairobi. Judging by the Committee of Twenty's latest communiqué, our monetary experts and negotiators seem to be finding, albeit more slowly than

we would have hoped, at least some degree of agreement on these principles.

In suggesting, as we have from time to time, that there is a relationship which must be kept in mind between the rules of a reformed monetary system and those of a revised trading system, we do not intend to imply that we wish to use monetary reform as a bludgeon to seek specific unilateral trade concessions. We are merely calling attention to what seems obvious; that unless some attention is paid to the interaction of the rules of both systems there is a danger that agreed reforms in one system will be negated by what is done or not done to reform the other.

The trade and monetary negotiations will, of course, take place in separate forums; trade in GATT; monetary reform in the Committee of Twenty and IMF. But neither negotiation can fail to take account of what happens in the other, lest incompatible solutions are reached for overlapping problems.

At a higher level of generality United States spokesmen have from time to time referred to the fact that, in Dr. Kissinger's words, "The political, military and economic issues in Atlantic relations are linked by reality, not by our choice nor for the tactical purpose of trading one off against the other." We do not draw from this reality an implication that bears directly on the details of the trade and monetary negotiations. Clearly we have no intention of using the presence of US troops in Europe as a bargaining lever in the trade and monetary fields. As in the case of the link between trade and monetary reform, however, we do not believe in hiding from the incontrovertible fact that for any of our countries military capabilities are unquestionably determined, at least, in part, by economic and political factors.

This reflection leads me to a comment on Atlantic security. Close co-operation will be required to achieve mutually acceptable policies for the years ahead. Fortunately the prospects for success, buttressed by our long experience

in co-operative defence, are bright. In the immediate post-war period the military threat to Europe and North America was clearly perceived. As a result Atlantic co-operation was relatively easy to achieve in the defence field. NATO has been an outstanding success. The habit of working together in the defence field has carried over into the preparations for CSCE and MBFR. If this co-operative spirit can be preserved, the Atlantic Community should more than hold its own in those difficult phases of multilateral East-West diplomacy.

But if today collective security has become a habit on both sides of the North Atlantic, we face the challenge of maintaining that common defence and the same degree of security under changed circumstances, including the opportunity we may now have to negotiate with the Warsaw Pact nations on mutual and balanced reductions of forces. Some members of the American Congress are urging a unilateral reduction of US troop strength in Europe. President Nixon, however, is adamantly opposed to a unilateral reduction. My government, like those of our European allies, is aware that over the past decade the Soviet Union has increased its military manpower by 30 %, doubled its published military budget, and vastly increased its nuclear forces. If ever there was a time not to withdraw our troops unilaterally from Europe. or to reduce them— which is the better term it is now.

Other factors conditioning the atmosphere of Atlantic-Community relations are the recent remarkable achievements in East-West diplomacy: an agreement on Berlin; a treaty between West Germany and the USSR, a SALT agreement, the start of multilateral preparatory talks for the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the start of negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions, a series of significant bilateral agreements between Western and Eastern countries, and a dramatic change in relations between the United States and the USSR.

On the latter point, the evolution of American-Soviet relations has given rise to a growing concern that super-power diplomacy might sacrifice the interests of traditional allies. In fact, the United States has kept in close touch with its allies in the process of improving relations with the USSR. In such important negotiations as the SALT talks, we kept our allies constantly informed and have tried to take their interests into account.

Given the philosophical, cultural and political heritage which the United States shares with Europe and the role which Atlantic co-operation has played over the last three decades, it is inconceivable to me that either would sacrifice the interests of the other as we both move towards improved relations with the rest of the world.

At the same time, this brief review of the problems which confront the United States and its traditional allies and friends reinforces in my view the need for a reformulation of our common principles and objectives. Some of these principles and objectives grow out of the shared heritage to which I just referred. Some grow out of the realities imposed by our economic, political and military interdependence. Some, I hope, grow out of our shared ideals and our aspirations for a better world. A clearer understanding of just what these common objectives and principles are would help all of us to see what we must agree to do together in the world and the limits we should impose on our autonomous interests in order to preserve and promote the larger community of interests which all of us share. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you very much, Mr. Irwin. I believe you will be willing to answer the questions to be put to you by members of the Assembly.

The first comes from Mr. Blumenfeld.

Mr. BLUMENFELD (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, I think that the statement made by his Excellency, Mr.

Mr. Blumenfeld (continued)

Irwin, the Personal Representative of the Secretary of State of the United States of America, affords us an excellent opportunity of putting a few questions which, I hope, he will be ready to answer. I would like to put two questions in particular.

To begin with I would, however, like Mr. Irwin to know that this Assembly, however much its views may diverge on individual questions of co-operation between the United States of America and Europe, is convinced of the need for very close relations between Europe and the United States of America and that we are able to endorse what Mr. Irwin said, particularly in the final part of his speech.

What worries us are the domestic preoccupations of the member governments of Europe and of the United States in view of the difficulties facing us. I am referring to the Helsinki and Vienna Conferences mentioned by Mr. Irwin. Without going into detail, I would like to ask whether it was not too obviously American domestic interests that led to certain compromises being offered in advance in Vienna in order to parry the pressure put on the United States Government by Congress for the unilateral withdrawal of American troops from Europe?

I believe that the fact of actually getting the Soviet Union to the conference table in Vienna induced the American Government to rush things rather and to exaggerate the importance of the time factor. I should be interested to hear Mr. Irwin's reply.

My second question can be stated more briefly. The relationship between Europe and America must, according to the message of the President of the United States as conveyed to us by Dr. Kissinger, be supplemented by relations with Japan as one of the big and important economic and political factors of our multi-polar world. In Mr. Irwin's opinion is it more urgent to equalise relations between Europe and Japan in this context or first of all to settle American-Japanese relations?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Ambassador.

Mr. IRWIN. — I assume that by his reference to the Conference of Vienna Mr. Blumenfeld is speaking of mutual and balanced force reductions. I believe that was first raised in a NATO Council Meeting in Portugal and, if my memory is correct, was not originally raised by the United States. I believe the United States moved to take further steps in that suggestion of mutual and balanced force reductions in order to meet the problem that affected us and the West, and which the Soviet Union itself also faced, with the continuing escalation in defence costs.

The whole purpose of the original proposal of mutual and balanced force reductions, and the purpose today, is to see if such reductions can be achieved without affecting the real security aspects of Western Europe versus the Eastern, Warsaw Pact countries. So I believe that the essence of it is to have a thorough and objective review amongst ourselves, continuing this negotiation with the Eastern powers — and we have been reviewing this amongst ourselves for a considerable period of time — to achieve a balanced reduction that will not affect security.

I would be the last one to say that the political situation in any one of our countries did not influence in some degree decisions as to what one should do. We talk about a mutual force reduction in order to move toward a defence budget that all of us would like to have as a more realistic base, if it can be achieved without any great difference in security. We would all like to do that. That was in part the genesis of SALT, though I believe in both these areas the budget factor is less than the political factor.

Certainly, in SALT the principal factor is, again, in order to ensure that the United States for their part keep a strategic deterrent and a strategic armament sufficient to meet the needs of the US and their allies. The US have no intention in either of these talks of doing anything that would affect the security of the Western world as you and I speak of it.

On the second question on Japan, again we have put forward no format to these talks as to how any talks should go, along with speaking among ourselves and with Japan. But it is perfectly clear, again, that Japan is a basic factor

as we look ahead in both the economic and monetary fields. Japan affects us internally in the United States. Japan's great energy and creativity affect you in Europe. We work together with Japan just as you work together with Japan; and we believe that, if we are to speak of the problems of economic and modern trade policy, we cannot proceed without taking Japan into account and having her at any negotiating table that we set up.

If we look in any perspective at the past, the United States have been able to achieve whatever we have been able to achieve in the past few years with respect to President Nixon's policy with China and the Soviet Union because of the relationship between the United States and Europe, because of the fact that we have been allies and partners over these many years.

I hate to get into a question of priorities, implied in Mr. Blumenfeld's question, but I would just point to the basic need, in any policy which the United States would wish to follow on their own behalf, to co-operate and work closely with Europe. That has really been the basis of our foreign policy ever since the war and I believe no one in the United States sees any need to change that.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Sir John Rodgers.

Sir John RODGERS (United Kingdom). — I would first like to thank His Excellency the Ambassador for the kind remarks he made about the papers we are discussing today and tomorrow on Western European and United States relations. I would like also to ask him a question: does he really consider that Western Europe "wishes to define its interests and responsibilities primarily in regional terms"? That is a quotation from his speech. The United States, after all, are reminding us, the European Community - and rightly, I may say of its responsibility always to take American interests into account. The enlarged Community also has substantial responsibilities on a worldwide basis, particularly towards the developing countries and in the Far East; and my own country, Britain, has of course its own interests with the Commonwealth. I would like the Ambassador, if he would, to enlarge on this question of a regional versus a global approach.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Irwin.

Mr. IRWIN. - I believe very clearly Europe has interests in the world and should have a world approach to problems, whether one is speaking individually of individual countries of Europe or speaking of Europe as a whole, I really believe those two sentences in Mr. Kissinger's reported speech have been emphasised in a way that is not deserved in its true substance. Of course you have a world interest. We hope you will have and we would be very disappointed if you did not. It is important to the United States that you do. I would like, in addition to what I have said in my speech, that one reads into what Mr. Kissinger has said that it is important that those interests of the United States which are global and those interests of Europe which are regional be handled in such a way that they do not conflict with each other.

This is not to say that the United States do not have regional interests nor Europe world interests; obviously we both have many.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Dequae.

Mr. DEQUAE (Belgium) (Translation). — I am a little disappointed by what Mr. Irwin said in regard to agricultural policy. I do not think I am wrong in remembering that there used to be agricultural protection and price support in the United States, which has resulted in a higher standard of living there than that provided in the Community by their level of protection. And if I am informed aright, for many years now the United States have occupied a position in GATT which allows them to limit their imports to not more than half their agricultural products.

Il is difficult to understand why the United States seem now to be speeding up the liberalisation of agricultural products. I am sure his government is as social-minded as we are, and I suppose if agricultural prices start falling again on the world market, they have to restore their farm price support.

Mr. Dequae (continued)

Why accept that might is right in a field which more than any other has a social and human aspect, particularly in Europe where our agriculture is not as developed as that in the United States? It is certainly not the time to do this. I really feel the Americans are past-masters in discouraging their friends. Here are some examples, which I will not take from agriculture.

From my childhood I have always been a friend of the United States where my sons now live. Before the war, my small country gave up manufacturing motor cars in return for a reduction in the duty on cotton table-cloths. During the war, when our country was occupied, we learnt that America had increased that duty and included cloths with a lace border. We were all delighted about this. We said to ourselves: the Americans are our friends; they want to protect us from competition by the Japanese, which was already making itself felt.

When liberation came, an American, the second one I met — a Fleming who had emigrated — was as convinced as I was that the duties would be reduced and standardised at 20 to 25 %. Not at all! The duties remained at the same level and even followed the general upward trend. Our export trade has never recovered.

Here is another example. The United States produce no linen. There is a high rate of protection on their cotton. Some European countries export linen materials to America. People in America want linen cloths for drying up the dishes. We were told the duty was going to be increased from 10 % to 40 %. We never thought our American friends would do that, seeing that they do not manufacture such materials themselves. But it appears that there is one single very influential firm which manufactures drying-up cloths in America that has done a lot of lobbying in Washington. And the rate of duty has in fact been raised from 10 % to 40 %.

I can assure the Ambassador that we are friends of the Americans, but I do feel that they might be a little less sparing with the milk of human kindness. Then we could really boast of being their friends.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Irwin.

Mr. IRWIN. — I would not attempt in any way to defend past industrial or agricultural actions of the United States which have been unfair. We speak of agriculture because we believe that if, by agreement, we can liberalise both industrial and agricultural trade, it would be to the benefit of all of us. I said in my statement that we have had a history of protectionism and farm price supports and if we asked you to discuss any of these matters we should, of course, be prepared to discuss them ourselves. Points such as you have just made should be raised in negotiation. Anything which gives rise to questions or disagreement or complaint should be fully aired. We are not at any time demanding a particular adjustment of barriers; this must be left for negotiation. We should, however, like to have a thorough and objective discussion of the subject. If, at the end of such discussion, Europe concludes that it wishes to follow a certain course whilst we decide to follow another, then, speaking for myself, so be it.

Nevertheless, we do believe that if agriculture, for instance, is examined carefully and economically, some parts of it might be administered in such a way as to make economic sense in both Europe and the United States. Whilst pointing out that I am far from knowledgeable about agriculture, one aspect of it which is of particular interest to us is a possible shift to greater meat production in Europe with less support of grain. This would lead to problems but it could make economic sense.

I mention this sensitive social side only because it has been mentioned very often to me when I have talked to Europeans, who told me that it is a question not merely of economics but of what is best for society. I concur in that. I agree that this should be discussed too. The whole purpose of any of these discussions is to work for the greater benefit of our society in all its aspects. This is why we have said that they should be approached at a high political level. The actual discussions will be at a technical level and economics will play a large part in them, but related aspects must be considered at the political level.

This may be neither a direct nor an adequate reply to your very interesting comments, Mr. Dequae, but in a general way, this is what I would say.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Critchley.

Mr. CRITCHLEY (United Kingdom). — On the question of MBFR negotiations in Vienna, when I was there in April I gained the impression from informal contacts with the Soviet delegates in particular that they were interested in raising the whole question of neutral and nuclear-free zones in central Europe as part of any general discussion of force reductions. What would be the response of His Excellency's government were the Russians seriously to press this point?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Irwin.

Mr. IRWIN. — This is an area in which I am not sure that I could answer very positively at this time. It would be incorrect to say what would be the response of my government. I think it is a question of what would be our joint response to a question raised by the Warsaw Pact to the Soviet Union, and we would not seek to provide a US response but we would seek to provide a US suggestion and hope to get everyone else's suggestions, so that we could reach a common position in the talks in Vienna.

Frankly, if I were to begin to talk about this type of question I would be sure to say something that would put me in evil hands in one way or another, and I think perhaps I had better not try to answer in detail what my estimate of our policy would be in the future, or even what our joint policy — which is perhaps even more difficult to suggest — would be.

I apologise for not answering the question directly and more specifically.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Amrehn.

Mr. AMREHN (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, no one can value

the preservation of the re-establishment of understanding with the United States more than a German coming from Berlin who has the United States as well as the other powers — the United Kingdom and France — to thank for the protection and preservation of freedom, for, as you know, we are in the front line. It is therefore in no spirit of criticism that I put my questions, but because of a need for information on questions which in my view have as yet been inadequately answered.

First, when the United States of America gave assistance to Europe, in particular capital aid to the Federal Republic of Germany to help it to help itself, its declared aim was surely to increase production to promote industrial and agricultural world trade, and to increase Europe's share in world trade. If that is so, then I must ask whether the fact that today Europe's trade has doubled and America's trade has correspondingly diminished can be considered an argument against Europe? I do not think so. Surely it is the necessary consequence of America's intentions.

Secondly, America feels aggrieved and considers the preferential agreements with the Yaoundé countries discriminatory. We concluded these agreements in order to honour our obligation not to give former colonial countries less advantageous conditions of trade with the metropolitan countries after the greater unification of Europe than before. Is America's reproach that it is being discriminated against justified?

Thirdly, figures show that United States' trade with Europe has never before been so voluminous, either as turnover or in terms of money. What, then, is the real basis of the reproach levelled at Europe by the United States of America? Unless, of course, a very large share of America's trade is being diminished by Japanese rivalry? But surely this cannot be made a reproach to Europe?

Fourthly, the undermining of the monetary basis by the seventy or eighty thousand million dollars floating around outside the United States of America has repeatedly been a bone of contention between America and Europe. What are the specific ideas developed by the United States Government to date for a new monetary system with the aim of consolidating this large amount of floating dollars? Has any consider-

Mr. Amrehn (continued)

ation been given to the question of a long-term loan in order to eliminate this disturbance factor when a basis is laid for new monetary regulations?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Irwin.

Mr. IRWIN. — Thank you, Mr. Amrehn, for some interesting and difficult questions. If I may speak to your first question and your third question more or less together — because it seemed to me that they are very closely related, as I understood them — we have been very happy as a result of the increase in European trade; from the figures I used, the more than doubling that has occurred.

Going to your third point, it is true that the United States have greatly benefited from the European market. As you say, in volume and monetary value our trade has increased a great deal, so we are in no way complaining of the fact that we, too, have shared in the benefit of what has come about in Europe because of your Economic Community and its success. It is just because of that fact, that you have had an increase in success, and because it has been to the benefit of all, that we believe it will continue to be for the benefit of all of us if we go a step further in liberalising trade, industry and agriculture.

You spoke of Japan versus Europe, and said that if we had a surplus with Europe, in effect, and a deficit with Japan, why should we impose on Europe when our problem was with Japan? Actually, we had a deficit last year with Europe, but perhaps I should not even mention that, because that is, I think, incidental to the point I would like to make, which is that the need today in the world is that countries should be in overall balance. The balance with a particular country is not the problem as we see it. There will always be a surplus with one country and a deficit with the other country, but we believe that on a world basis we should establish the monetary system and the trade system in such a way that there could be a movement toward general balance. If a country has a large deficit with one country but in the rest of the world it makes up for that deficit and comes out with an overall surplus, then we think that is the proper result, rather than saying to that particular country, "We must change our relationships". It may be true that those particular countries would want to work toward a better equilibrium of their trade, but the ultimate item is an overall balance of trade, and if any country has an overall balance of trade, except for discussing and working out the equilibriums with a particular country, we think that in general it should be satisfied.

With regard to the Yaoundé countries, we can only applaud the preference given to these countries. We can only applaud your individual countries and Europe as a whole for taking a close and great political interest in those countries and supporting them in every way. The only problem we raise is: is there a need, and is it desirable to have reverse preferences? We believe this does not help the individual country. It puts a block in the road of that particular country. Therefore, it gives a certain impression, and I say "impression" because at the present time and for the next few years this is not a great economic issue either for you or for the United States. It is a psychological problem in the United States in that it appears that Europe is ever moving toward a greater and greater free trade area and getting away from the most-favoured-nation aspect of economics.

Therefore I repeat that we applaud your developing relations, supporting all of these countries, but we question whether in that support, or to achieve that political goal, desirable from both your point of view and for the Yaoundé countries, it is necessary to go to reverse preferences.

While talking about preferences, I might mention there are other preferences, namely, the preferences to the EFTA neutrals, some of the Mediterranean countries. We hope these will not be an issue per se in the negotiations. These are in issue in GATT. We think we deserve compensation on some items, and perhaps you think we do not. We are arguing that out in GATT. Of

course, it may carry over — who knows? — but our hope would be that all differences on this type of preference, and the claims we would make on the compensation because of the expansion from Six to Nine, are primarily questions that we raise in GATT.

Again, the questions asked were very comprehensive and very good. I do not know whether I have been specific enough in my answers, but I appreciated the opportunity to try.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I must ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, to put specific questions to Mr. Irwin, not to make speeches.

I call Mr. Delforge.

Mr. DELFORGE (Belgium) (Translation). — The Ambassador said in his speech that, in his view, the Europeans seemed to be interested exclusively in regional matters. But the United States reacts very strongly when agreements like the Yaoundé Agreement are concluded between Europe and the African countries. Does he therefore think that there should be an agreement between the United States and the European Community before such special agreements are concluded? And if the answer is in the affirmative, how does he envisage such an agreement coming about?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Irwin.

Mr. IRWIN. — On the regional problems, again as I said in answer to Sir John's question, we feel you obviously have world interests. I tried to explain, in answer to that question, Dr. Kissinger's comments.

As to the Yaoundé agreements, again as I said in answer to an earlier question, we do not disagree with those agreements as a whole. We applaud the purpose of them. The only area of disagreement is the reverse preferences. This we feel is not necessarily to the benefit of the underdeveloped countries. Therefore, that is the issue we raise and not that of the overall agreement.

As to whether or not the United States should reach agreement beforehand in Europe, again, if that meant we should decide, and then impose a particular agreement on any under-developed country, I think the answer is, no, we should not do that.

I am not certain, therefore, that we should try to reach a United States-European agreement as to how we handle any particular question with any particular country. But I think it would be a wise move to discuss thoroughly not the particular agreement with the particular country, but we would be very prepared to discuss the pros and cons of reverse preferences versus not having reverse preferences, or preferences as in a particular area versus what it does to our trade to that country; or, if the reverse were true — if we give preferences and you have a problem — then to discuss that.

What we would like to see out of all these negotiations is a pretty thorough and frank discussion of the issues and problems. It seems to me so often today — it is true of my country as well as yours — that we see statements of problems that exist and we look at them in a national and emotionalistic way — certainly the United States do it in all sorts of problems — and we do not really get an opportunity to discuss the problem in depth to find out just where we agree or disagree.

It has been said in some of your reports that if we can have a frank and full discussion it does not mean we will not have differences but I think it will mean we will narrow those differences and we might see a way over time even to solve some of them if not all of them.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Czernetz.

Mr. CZERNETZ (Austria). — Mr. President, His Excellency the Ambassador was speaking about the unification of Europe and he was, of course, speaking mainly about the European Economic Community.

I should like to ask the Ambassador whether there is awareness in the United States that relations with this European organisation, the Council of Europe, are particularly important to Atlantic partnership. Relations with the Council of Europe could mean that the United

Mr. Czernetz (continued)

States have close connections, not with the Nine member States of EEC, but also with eight other European democracies outside EEC and particularly also closer relations with the three neutrals.

The point is mentioned in paragraph 5 of the recommendation Sir John Rodgers presented to the Assembly. The importance of this relationship became very clear to my countrymen in Austria in October 1968 when Dean Rusk made his statement which became public by some alleged indiscretion.

THE PRESIDENT (Transation). — I call Mr. Irwin.

Mr. IRWIN. — Yes, I think we should have close and good relations with this body and the other bodies of a Europe that extends over and beyond EEC. I think the United States try to have relations with all the countries individually and we are very pleased to have the opportunity to work with this body.

Not only am I delighted to have this opportunity to be here today and talk with you, but, as you know, we had a Congressional delegation here just recently. They came through Paris and spoke of the wonderful discussion they had here, how much they appreciated it, and how much they wanted to enliven the discussion over time.

I can only say that my government would welcome and applaud all that can be done to pursue that relationship between the United States Congress and this body. Also, the United States clearly wish to carry on and increase in every way their good relations with the other countries of Europe and the institutions of Europe that reach beyond the Community.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Fletcher to put the last question.

Mr. FLETCHER (United Kingdom). — I should like to ask His Excellency a question to which I cannot righfully expect an answer but which may express some of the anxieties current in Europe.

We are watching with some anxiety the obvious conflict between the Congress in the United States of America and the Presidency, between the executive organ of government and the legislative. Is there any possibility that in asserting itself, as it increasingly seems to want to do, the Congress may pull America into a slide towards isolationism, and thus nullify a good deal of the adumbrated programme of co-operation being discussed here today?

I repeat that I do not expect an answer. I do not want to embarrass His Excellency, but I believe that I am expressing fairly widespread anxieties.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Ambassador.

Mr. IRWIN. — That is the ideal type of question to have, giving me a choice. Perhaps if I do not completely answer, I can at least comment.

I think it is true that there is in the United States an increase in the problems of the relationship between the Executive and the Congress, in the sense that Congress, as you read daily in the newspapers, wishes to exercise greater authority, which it says it has not had in recent time.

As we look through history in the United States we see that there has been one period when there has been a stronger Executive and another when there has been a stronger Congress. I believe that because of this genius, from the American point of view, of the checks and balances in our systems, there will remain a proper and good balance between the Executive and the Legislature.

As to whether this relationship might result in isolationism, that truly is a question of the future, the answer to which I would hate to try to prophesy. I can only say that I cannot imagine the United States returning to isolationism or to a serious system of protectionism. It seems to me that if anything has been proved by the last twenty-five years, the two world wars and the whole history of this century, it is that no man is an island unto himself, to quote Sir John's countryman. I would hope that would be true in the philosophy of both Europe and the United States as we look to the years ahead.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you very much, Mr. Irwin, for the replies you have been good enough to give us.

5. Relations between Western Europe and the United States (Resumed joint debate)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — We now resume the joint debate on relations between Europe and the United States of America.

I call Mr. Nessler.

Mr. NESSLER (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, our Rapporteurs deserve all the greater praise in that political affairs in this day and age are like the rock of Sisyphus. Every time we think we have got it to the top, we find we have to push it up another hill. When Sir John Rodgers drafted his admirable report, he did not know that the United States were going to show their colours and put their cards on the table, first in Dr. Kissinger's already famous speech, and then in President Nixon's comments on it.

I have read Dr. Kissinger's speech several times. I will not say I have learnt it by heart, but I have tried by reading between the lines to get at its intentions. When I read it, I could not help remembering a brutally frank remark attributed to Cardinal Richelieu: "States have no feelings: they only have interests." It struck me all the more forcibly because in his speech Dr. Kissinger several times referred — quite tactfully, of course — to Europe's debt of gratitude to the United States resulting from its recent trials.

I do not forget my history, but all the same, just to clear this point out of the way once and for all, I would remind the United States — and I think I am justified in doing so because of their undoubted affinity with the European democracies — that they waited to join in the war until such time as it suited their national interest to do so. For two years, from 1940 to 1942, the United States remained on the sidelines, and

having a long memory I recollect that when Britain, standing alone against the Nazis, asked her cousins across the Atlantic for fifty destroyers to guard her convoys, the negotiations ended in Britain making some very considerable concessions in the Caribbean, Barbados and Bermuda.

All that seems to me perfectly natural so long as our attitude to these problems is a matter-of-fact one.

Of course we all benefited from the Marshall Plan, but, here again, the intention of the parties concerned was quite clear: what was needed in the Europe of 1945 was a fire-brake — an insurance policy against the extension of the Soviet tentacles which already held in their grasp essential and vital positions on the continent.

All this means that where our differences are concerned — if there are any — we shall start on a new footing. We shall tackle the problem not over-shadowed by the memory of the past, of the credits and debts we owe each other as a result of recent history, but by adopting the attitude that 1973 requires of us the search for conditions in which negotiations can take place.

Apart from what various Americans have said, and to which I alluded just now — the speakers who preceded me spent a long time on the details - a recent move by the Commission of the European Economic Community in Brussels has aroused severe criticism on the part of the French Government. The Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs yesterday referred to a number of weaknesses and gaps in the proposals by the Commission to the Council of Ministers. First of all, going well beyond any demands by the Americans, the Commission has agreed to certain concessions. That was anticipating the discussions themselves and was a bad way of tuning the violins, for at the same time, major objections have been raised by the Europeans to such a method of opening the debate.

Among other things, the Commission envisages a unilateral reduction in protective duties which have been abolished within Europe but still

Mr. Nessler (continued)

exist against countries outside Europe, with the manifest, or at any rate written, intention of redressing the United States trade balance.

I take it for granted that this trade deficit is due entirely to temporary circumstances. It is true that there have been one or two difficult years, but if things remain as they are it is by no means obvious that the deficit will persist forever.

We even have some reason to believe that, because of the monetary crisis, floating currencies and the fact that the dollar is inconvertible — and some of us in this building during the last few years, remembering that the arbitrary rate quoted for gold was 35 dollars an ounce when the price of gold had just exceeded 100 dollars an ounce, though that was probably one of the basic reasons for the crisis which was building up and which most unhappily broke out - we have a number of reasons for believing, I say, that so long as the dollar remains inconvertible, so long as there is no fixed parity for the currencies, that is to say so long as there is no real method of creating balance and harmony between them those are the expressions constantly used in this debate — any accord or agreement can be only fragmentary, fragile, even illusory.

The attitude adopted by the Commission in Brussels also raises a problem of principle for us. In view of its status, its composition, and the fact that it consists of officials belonging to various countries but who, in that capacity, are Europeans, is it permissible — and the Council of Europe may perhaps have to say what it thinks about this - for the Commission to commit itself, to however small an extent, without the prior consent of the Council of Ministers? That is not a problem which concerns our relations with our American friends; it concerns our relations with our friends in the European Community, and, even more so, with our friends in this Assembly which represents the larger Europe.

We feel that, since the negotiations had not yet started, it was ill-advised to increase the number of the statements of intent, differences of interpretation, explanations, thus provoking disagreement before the substance of the discussions had even been touched on. What we object to in Dr. Kissinger's thesis is that its object is to start, in a comprehensive form, negotiations which are essentially diverse, mixing economic problems with monetary problems, and threatening the Europeans, who are particularly preoccupied with this aspect of affairs, with military disengagement. My very sincere belief is that, if we are to achieve concrete results, we must proceed by stages, tackling one problem after another, and starting with the monetary problem, because that is the condition precedent for the others. So long as that problem has not been cleared up, the economic problem, the trade problem, and possibly the political and military implications will not be settled.

We also have a particular problem of our own—to work out a common attitude for Europe. We have often said in this building that there will be no political Europe until there is a European policy.

This debate seems to suggest that, just when real détente was becoming apparent between us, we are reopening a dispute of which we cannot yet foresee the consequences. If Europe were to enter the negotiations in extended order, the best we could hope for would be an agreement like the alliance for progress that was imposed on Latin America, and which it is not very happy about. When Dr. Kissinger blames us for our regional agreements, he forgets the preserves that circumstances have enabled the United States to stake out for themselves.

That is all I wanted to say before coming to what is for us Frenchmen the most important point because of its extremely far-reaching social repercussions: that is the conditions in which the proposals, not so far formulated in detail but simply outlined, might endanger the European agricultural settlement. We have used up a lot of grey matter in arriving at this European agricultural settlement, the only piece of European integration. It has meant finding some particularly clever and crafty machinery, because some European countries are exporters while others are importers, and agricultural productivity is not the same everywhere. That is why even the smallest threat to this fragile

Mr. Nessler (continued)

structure causes us acute anxiety, and in that sphere my country at any rate is not prepared to compromise.

Those are the few thoughts I wanted to share with you in the debate on the reports before us to which, to my personal gratification, the Ambassador's speech and the discussion which followed it have contributed so much.

I feel that by now we have put forward a number of fundamental objections, which it will be for the negotiators to deal with in future.

(Mr. Portheine, Vice-President of the Assembly, took the Chair in place of Mr. Vedovato.)

THE PRESIDENT. — Ambassador Irwin has asked for the floor. This is a little difficult. I believe he is to be present tomorrow and I would ask him whether, after his various other remarks, he could take that opportunity to answer Mr. Nessler. Is that a solution, Mr. Ambassador?

Mr. IRWIN. — I understood that I was not to be here tomorrow. I do not want to interfere at all.

THE PRESIDENT. — Then I would ask the Assembly whether it accepted that the Ambassador should now comment on the intervention of Mr. Nessler. Is that agreed?

I call the Ambassador.

Mr. IRWIN. — One of the geniuses of Western legislature is that it reminds one of what one should have said and did not say. The distinguished speaker raises many points. I will not attempt to answer them all, and perhaps I could not do so; but there were one or two to which perhaps I should speak.

I would agree fully that we should start from where we are today. We should start any negotiation from what are our practical problems and what we wish to achieve in the world. To talk of what one did for someone else last year or what they did for us in the year before is something we should leave to the historians and those who wish to proceed in that way. It should not be part of our consideration of world trade negotiations. I can only agree with Mr. Nessler

on forgetting the past and really working to build a better future for all of us.

On the convertibility of the dollar I would only say we too would love nothing better than to be able to make it convertible, and this is one of the principal points which we see would come out of monetary negotiations, along with its other principal aspects. We would approach that working together to achieve a goal that all of us would like to achieve.

Mr. Nessler spoke of the negotiations and of Dr. Kissinger, This, of course, gets into a question of interpretation. But Dr. Kissinger does not want to mix monetary, trade and military problems. These are to be handled in different forms and are to be addressed to their various problems. What he was saving, and what I attempted to say today, was that there is a fundamental relationship between the monetary, trade, strategic and political aspects that involve us all as countries, and that what we were talking of was not an initial negotiation that addressed particular problems but a statement of political will that we inherited and have followed, a common philosophy in the West that we wish to preserve; what we know as Western civilisation.

We wish to take a look at where we stand in the broad political, philosophical realm as a base to show that we have the political will to look at and to solve problems in particular detail. It is not an attempt at pre-negotiation. This has often been said in the past in Europe, and I do not suppose there is any way really to convince some of those who continue to speak of it until pre-negotiation really takes place, but that is not an attempt at pre-negotiation. It is not an attempt to trade off one of these fields against another.

On the question of taking the monetary issues and reform of the monetary system first, there is perhaps a difference of view. We believe we should follow them in parallel. We see no problem in doing so. Both will take considerable time. Trade will probably take much longer than monetary problems, and if there were disagreement a year or two years hence over what has been said earlier, because of a position taken on a change made in the other negotiation, it seems to me that a country would be perfectly free to raise this issue. If these problems are handled in parallel we can see what happens in each. If we solve one negotiation first and then an-

other negotiation comes up it could cause problems as to what was decided in the earlier negotiations.

We would think that the proper form is to be sure that we do not end up with certain rules in one negotiation that conflict with rules in the other negotiation. If we settle one subject completely before starting the other, that nice appraisal is difficult to achieve.

Mr. President, I appreciate what you said about a debate that turns into more of a debate than one had anticipated. I appreciate this opportunity to address this Assembly.

THE PRESIDENT. - Thank you, Mr. Irwin,

I now call the next speaker in the debate, Mr. Mendelson.

Mr. MENDELSON (United Kingdom). — Mr. President, in view of the late hour and the long list of speakers still to be called, may I withdraw my request to speak in this debate?

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Mr. Mendelson. Frankly, I do not intend to finish the whole list of speakers this evening. I will speak on this later.

I call Mr. Oguz.

Mr. OGUZ (Turkey) (Translation). — We have listened with great interest to the very detailed reports. I want just to make a few comments on some major points of importance to us all.

The development of trade has brought with it enormous economic and social advantages, but it comes up against political nationalism. That conflict of interests is at the bottom of the present international crisis. A new international economic order must be defined, formulated and regulated with sufficient flexibility to provide

for financial stability in commercial and economic affairs without inflation, but also without restricting or hampering the growth of international trade.

The Common Market negotiators are preparing for important trade negotiations which are to take place in September between the United States on the one hand and all the other economically developed countries on the other.

The very rapid expansion of international trade has been one of the main factors for prosperity during the last decade. That is why the negotiations with the United States should take place on the basis of a very liberal interpretation of commercial, agricultural and financial affairs, that is to say, in such a way as to ensure mutual profitability which will permit an increase in bilateral trade, for the greater profit and benefit of all the parties concerned.

In seeking a solution to the agricultural problem, it is absolutely essential to bear constantly in mind the preferential tariffs granted to certain countries, tariffs which must not be jeopardised, and might even be extended. It is to be hoped that an exchange of manpower between the United States and Europe may provide a real foundation for future co-operation within the framework of the agreement expected in all the fields concerned. For international trade is not merely a factor for growth and progress. Generally speaking, external trade encourages greater specialisation in businesses and in countries.

Obviously, the rules of international trade laid down in 1945 will have to be changed to take account of fresh contingencies.

The benefits of international trade are very unequally distributed. The developing countries, whose share of world trade has dropped in fifteen years from 34 % to 25 %, are the losers, which is why the movement of goods and services — manpower and capital — should be promoted without allowing nationalism to get too much in the way.

THE PRESIDENT. - Thank you.

I now call Mr. Shore.

Mr. SHORE (United Kingdom). — This debate about America, the countries of Western Europe and the changing relationship between them was well launched from the two excellent reports presented at the beginning of the debate. The whole problem has subsequently been well developed in the speeches we have heard, including the two interventions from Prime Minister Andreotti and the American Ambassador.

The debate has become urgent this year, not because Washington calls 1973 the "Year of Europe", nor because it featured in the marathon communiqué of last October's Paris Summit, but because of two major developments in the real world. The first is the continuing crisis in the international monetary system which has already brought two major convulsions this year and, with gold well above 100 dollars per ounce, a third which may not be far away. The second is the immense impact of the treaties signed between the Common Market Six and the applicant and non-applicant European countries which began to operate on 1 January this year. These events have of course implications going far beyond European-American relationships. They affect the entire world and they overlap with questions of politics and security such as burden-sharing and the extent and cost of the United States presence in Europe.

The agenda for discussion is therefore very large indeed. Perhaps its least difficult item is future trade in industrial goods. The reduction of tariff barriers, particularly the Kennedy Round, has already proved to be mutually advantageous and a post-Kennedy Round should not prove to be less so. A further reduction or abolition of tariffs would in itself remove the great anxieties which the United States and others have felt at the extension of the Common Market, at the free trade area treaties with other European countries and at the reverse preference arrangements which have been a feature of

EEC's treaties with the AOT countries and others in the Mediterranean area. A vast tariff-free grouping of the developed nations would encapsulate the community of Western Europe into a world community of trading nations. The Commission's new thinking on reverse preferences, as indicated in Sir Christopher Soames's recent speech, is clearly that reverse preferences will not be sought by Brussels when existing trade treaties are renewed. This is undoubtedly a forward step.

More difficult than tariffs on industrial goods is the whole question of agricultural trade. The common agricultural policy has no friends in Britain and, I suspect, many enemies in Europe. Whatever our future relationship with EEC itself may be, we shall seek fundamentally to change the CAP, not only in the interests of our own and other consumers, but to help those many countries outside Europe which grow food more efficiently and more cheaply than Europe itself does and whose prosperity depends on their export sales. It is essential, in spite of Mr. Dequae's caution in his report, that the CAP be brought into the scope of the trade negotiations and drastically reformed.

Most worrying of all is the need to make an urgent overhaul of the international monetary system. This is intrinsically the most difficult problem, involving as it does a new regime for exchange rates, capital movements, the phasing out of the old reserve currencies and the creation and distribution of new international reserves. It is also the most important for the growth of the world economy depends on our success. Failure to solve this problem could well be a barrier, if not a turning point, in our long, post-war march towards prosperity.

I can see little evidence that this question is being given the serious attention it merits. I find it extraordinary that President Nixon in his foreign policy report should have so little to say about it, still more that he should now be contemplating removal of control on outward movements of American capital, particularly short-term capital. I find it equally disturbing

Mr. Shore (continued)

that in Western Europe far more energy is going into the premature and, to many, unwelcome effort to create an economic and monetary union than into finding the international solution to the major problem now before us.

If we have to wait for Europe "to speak with one voice" on monetary questions before solutions can be contrived, then we shall either have to wait a very long time indeed, surviving as best we can one currency storm after another, or — far worse — we shall be driven step by step into economic protectionism and trade rivalry. It is no good hoping, as I fear some do, that the very strains within the international currency system will force greater unity upon the countries of Western Europe than they are ready for. The fact that Britain, Ireland and Italy had to burst out of the tunnel during this past year and are still floating their currencies should have made that point clear.

Equally it is no good hoping that separate and unrelated talks between European nations and the United States can usefully take place on trade in one forum, monetary reform in another, burden-sharing in a third, unless the interrelationship between all three is clearly recognised and, at some stage, an overall assessment made of the costs and benefits involved.

What we need now is to get our priorities right. No conceivable development of the "European personality" is worth the risk of seizure or of breakdown in the world's trade and payments system. As the experience of the United States in the 1920s and 1930s showed, continental States are not more immune than nation States from slump and depression if the world economy ceases to grow. The real problems, the immense technical difficulties, will be overcome only if we have the will to defeat them.

We must clearly recognise the dangers of economic regionalism in the years ahead. We must avoid becoming Euro-centric — or perhaps Community-centric — in trade, agriculture, currency and political affairs, not just in our dealings with the United States, who often have the

power and resources to look after themselves, but still more in our dealings with those other countries where the great mass of our fellowmen live.

We need an equally clear view of the benefits that will flow to the whole of mankind if we can develop and expand the emerging one world economic system of the post-war era. To say this, I hope, is to be neither pro-American nor pro-European but to be a sane citizen of the modern world.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. van der Werff.

Mr. van der WERFF (Netherlands). — The nature of the relationship of the States and nations on both sides of the Atlantic has been subject to more profound and serious inquiries in the past year than ever before. In the national parliaments and in the international and supranational organisations there is a growing diversity of opinion on a situation which seemed so clear-cut immediately after the second world war.

There is no need for me to look into the way things happened as they did. We all know them, and every report on this subject dwells on the various aspects of vital importance. All these reports, like the very distinguished ones in front of us — and I join with those who have congratulated Sir John and Mr. Dequae — not only give us the facts but also an interpretation of past, present and future. They vary from realism to idealism, from pragmatism to wishful thinking.

I would like to elaborate on some aspects of self-analysis. All countries involved are democracies, and all the governments respect and underline human rights. We all believe in democracy, in our own special, even peculiar brand of democracy, but we cannot say that as such this is a big source of ideological inspiration for the citizen. The essential consequence of democracy is diversity and variety of opinion, except perhaps in times of a real crisis and real stress.

Do we all agree, in the 1970s, on a long-term common interest on both sides of the Atlantic,

Mr. van der Werff (continued)

like we did in the time of, for instance, the cold war and Korea? Even if that were the case, the confirmation of the existence of such an interest will not be enough, either for ourselves or for our electors. Referring to a common cultural heritage will not do. As a matter of fact, the significance of sharing some ancestors is questionable. If, for instance, the confrontation with Turner's "frontier" was essential for the evolution and formation of the immigrant from Europe having to be converted to real Americanism, then the Europeans staying back here in Europe are lacking that essential aspect.

The cultural aspect becomes specially doubtful in view of the fifth conclusion in this report, because the basis for dialogue then has nothing to do with culture at all but only with the hard facts of economic and monetary issues. That means the necessity of a dialogue with Japan! We will have to give a definition of and a meaning to the principle of Atlantic Community, if that is what we really want — or do we prefer European unity? Perhaps the ideal would be to combine both ideas, like Mr. Kissinger suggested, in the address quoted in the report, when he referred to "European unity as a component of a larger Atlantic partnership". But would that not be burning the candle at both ends? How are the European States going to implement this imbroglio in their foreign policies?

Quite clearly, the Rapporteur put the basic question on page 5 of his report, and in the addendum, as "the fundamental central problem of who speaks for Europe".

Naturally, this problem becomes even more difficult when we ask ourselves how far a parallel of interest between the Western and Eastern Northern hemisphere goes.

That brings me to my second observation, that democracies, and not only in small countries like my own, have generally speaking a certain aversion against foreign policy. Naturally governments have to use their power also in exterior relations, but the citizen is usually more interested in governmental decisions on internal affairs and sometimes rather sceptical about principles and expenditure for foreign aid.

Here the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the different States not only have to deal with their own parliaments but also, indirectly, with foreign parliaments. Sometimes it even seems easier to get an idea across in the latter than in the former. It is regrettable, but quite true, what the political report states on page 8, that "in reality we prefer to preserve the status quo".

Let us be honest with ourselves. If we go on whining for support in matters of defence, if we will not shoulder our part of that burden, we or surely the next generation, will lose our self-esteem. That would be the beginning of losing liberty and freedom. We will have to face the consequences of our independence and our practically unlimited industrial growth and development during the last decade.

If Europe really needs the USA, and if, on the other hand, Europe, like the USA, really wants to reappraise and renew the relationship across the Atlantic, we will have to start with an analysis of the possibilities of a common European point of view, of an integrated policy on foreign affairs, on matters of defence, political, economic and cultural issues, and, to put it bluntly, of a common spokesman. But would not one European spokesman or a real common point of view, without exceptions or reservations, be a contradiction in terms when it depends on a group of democracies? Only on the condition of European unity and the political decision on that point can we have a real and successful dialogue on all the different aspects that are existing now with the USA.

But there is another point. All the time we should bear in mind that the democracy of the USA has its own responsibility, its own aim of foreign, military and economic policy. It will not be safe to assume that their goals and ours will be the same. If Europe wants to be treated as an equal in an Atlantic partnership — I will use the exact wording of Sir John this morning — we will have "to be more and better united than we are". Here in Strasbourg the unification of Europe has started. We should achieve the job.

THE PRESIDENT. — Before calling the next speaker, I want to communicate my intention

The President (continued)

for this evening to the Assembly. It is my intention to close this debate after taking two more speakers. Mr. Fletcher has indicated that he is willing to speak tomorow. The two speakers that I intend to call are, first, Mr. Leitner, and then Mr. de Bruyne, who cannot be here tomorow. Would the Assembly agree to my suggestion?

Is that agreed ?... (Agreed.)

I call Mr. Leitner.

Mr. LEITNER (Austria) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, agricultural questions in the context of economic relations between the United States of America and Europe occupied a large place in today's debate. I would like to thank the Rapporteur, Mr. Dequae, warmly for having emphasised the consequences to agriculture in his report. I believe that this is a very important subject for the negotiations which are to begin this autumn and which will certainly occupy us throughout the years to come.

I would characterise the demands made by the Americans to Europeans in this area as those of very capable businessmen who are attempting to impose their views on their business partners. But political acumen among friends demands that the partner's potentialities and limitations be known and respected. This acumen must also be expressed in a realistic attitude and assessment of mutual interests and points of view.

The Assembly's Committee on Agriculture discussed Mr. Dequae's report at its last meeting in Paris and instructed me to express its opinion here. As Mr. Dequae rightly emphasised, the favourable situation for American agricultural products on the European market has not changed since 1957. Europe is still the biggest buyer of agricultural products from the United States of America.

If the United States now requires economic concessions, negotiations may only be carried on globally, but not to the detriment of an individual sector. If such are to be made, they must be genuine reciprocal concessions. We cannot open our markets, while the Americans keep up their effective system of protection on their own market.

Let us merely consider the American sellingprice system. During the Kennedy Round, the abolition of this system was discussed. The then President undertook to submit a corresponding bill to Congress within a fixed time. In return the Europeans reduced their duties on chemical products by 20 %. The reduction and duty took effect but not the abolition of the system in force in the USA.

In the view of the Committee on Agriculture, American policy is more restrictive than that of many European governments. There will surely be difficulties in respect of details, even though today there is general agreement and goodwill.

It is not feasible to require the application of the market machinery on the world market, while retaining unilaterally protective domestic measures, and this moreover within the context of international trade agreements.

The press of the American farmers' unions recently called for a policy of subsidies. As grain and fodder supplies have dwindled and prices for certain products are rising, the Government of the United States of America did not comply with these demands. However, if the situation changes again, the United States of America will not be able to do without internal support measures. Today there is not a single country in the world whose agricultural market is submitted entirely to the market machinery. Price support is practised in every State.

The causes and forms of such subsidies are many. Dependence on nature in respect of production, the narrow limits of market expansion, the need to maintain supplies, and above all the low pay of those working in agriculture are some of them.

The report also showed that in 1971 the subsidy per agricultural worker in the European Communities amounted to 860 dollars a year and in the United States to 1 320 dollars.

I feel that the Council of Europe has taken on a considerable task in these reports. The European farmers are following this debate with interest. Our attitude will have decisive repercussions on negotiations in GATT and if the boundaries of the acceptable are exceeded our European farmers will certainly feel it.

I think we should not only make it clear to the United States but also to our European part-

Mr. Leitner (continued)

ners that the European farmer has a far greater function to fulfil than merely to produce food, although the latter function alone is of vital importance for our independence. Agriculture is also in increasing measure the preserver of amenities and recreational possibilities in the country. Agriculturists must show comprehension for this but must also be correspondingly remunerated.

I would like to mention a further point in which European agriculture probably differs considerably from American agriculture. A European farmer has a significant social role to play. He provides a considerable part of the labour needed by our crafts industry. He is a stabilising factor in an industrial society which seeks increasingly to escape to the country to regain its natural rhythm of life. The links between the rural and urban population will be increasingly strengthened. And we must surely be aware that in this integration the European farmer plays a special role which may possibly save our industrial society from the destruction so frequently predicted. There are many Assembly reports in which these aspects have been repeatedly stressed.

There are a large number of agricultural subsidiary industries in the European countries; in many States 50 % or more. During the coming negotiations, this group, which is an important link between primitive production and service industries, must receive the same consideration as must the preservation of hill-side farming.

None of us want a permanent trade war between Europe and the United States of America. But European agriculture must not be sacrificed to these negotiations either on the altar of agricultural relations between Europe and America or in the cause of eliminating the United States balance-of-payments deficit which is not due to agricultural transactions. I am in favour of genuine friendship between Europe and the United States of America but friends must know and respect each others' point of view.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Leitner.

I call Mr. de Bruyne.

Mr. de BRUYNE (Belgium) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I want first to thank the President for his kindness for arranging things so that I can speak today.

I have a few comments to make on certain passages in Mr. Dequae's report, rendered all the more topical by the most recent events on the stock exchanges and the exchange markets.

One does not have to be a prophet to foresee still more shocks in the speculative line before the governors of the International Monetary Fund meet in Nairobi in September. In the weeks to come, we shall no doubt often have occasion to consult our Rapporteur's excellent document, which will serve me as bedside reading for several nights.

I will not take up too much of your time, Ladies and Gentlemen, but will confine what I have to say to certain subjects which seem to me of great importance for the future. On pages 19 and 30 of the report, multinational companies are mentioned in terms with which I unreservedly agree. On page 11, there are some very discerning comments on the operations and status of American banks in Europe. These two subjects involve far-reaching consequences for financial, banking and commercial legislation in every one of the European countries we represent here. Are we prepared to undertake some work which will certainly be heavy, but which we cannot avoid if we really want to establish a balance between the immense and uncontrollable power of multinational companies on the one hand and the limited field of action of our national States, whose banking and finance laws apply only to a very restricted area?

I would be particularly grateful if Mr. Dequae, when he replies to the various speeches, would promise us to continue his studies in the direction I have just indicated, which, in the case of Belgium, for instance, would result in a re-

Mr. de Bruyne (continued)

definition of the powers of the Banking Commission and the National Bank. The whole of Belgian banking legislation as conceived in the thirties will have to be thought out afresh, and I suppose in the other Council of Europe member countries reorganisation of that kind will present as formidable a task as in Belgium.

The Committee on Economic Affairs and Development will certainly co-operate fully in our Rapporteur's future work.

I recommend to your attention paragraphs 44, 45 and 46 of Mr. Dequae's report on the freedom of movement enjoyed by the American banks in most of our countries. The presence of these huge establishments in Europe, because they attract not only American custom but also European clients and funds, will soon necessitate changes in the finance laws and regulations of the European States. I would be against any changes which would restrict the normal development of American banks in Europe, although the small States are thus faced with a challenge which may seem rather excessive. But the United States in their turn should reconsider the very restrictive legislation which they at present apply to banks of European origin. Mr. Dequae deals with that subject on page 11 of his report.

The European banks do not pursue banking activities properly so-called in the United States, because American law does not permit it. Mr. Dequae mentions that too, and points out that European banks in the United States have mainly assumed the role of sales promoters for their respective countries. It should be added that, in most cases, undertakings of international proportions are rare in the small European countries, and their influence, like the amount of their business in the United States, is relatively small. It follows that the banking establishments of the small European countries lack sufficient substance, although they would like to extend their operations to the United States.

Since European banks in the United States cannot have direct dealings with American

customers nor ask for their deposits, there is a flagrant disproportion between the opportunities enjoyed by American banks in Europe and the very limited area which, under American law, is accessible to their European counterparts.

May I perhaps ask our learned Rapporteur to turn his attention once again in the near future to the financial sector which, in fact, he has already analysed with all his well-known skill and perspicacity.

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Mr. de Bruyne.

The Assembly has agreed to interrupt the joint debate on the two reports at this point.

The debate was adjourned.

6. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting

THE PRESIDENT. — I propose that the Assembly hold its next sitting tomorrow at 10 a.m. with the following Orders of the Day:

Relations between Western Europe and the United States. (Resumed joint debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Document 3279 and Addendum, and on the introductory report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Document 3278, and vote on the draft resolution, Document 3279).

At about 10.30 a.m.

Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland.

Are there any objections?...

The Orders of the Day of the next sitting are agreed.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

The Sitting is closed.

(The Sitting was closed at 6.30 p.m.)

5th	Sitting
0010	~~~~~~~~

Appendix

APPENDIX

Names of Representatives or Substitutes who signed the Attendance Register in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure: 1

MM.	Aano	MM.	Hocaoglu	MM.	Castellucci (Preti)
	Piket (Aantjes)		Hofer		Reinhart (Radinger)
	Abens		Hoist		Radius
	Ahrens		Mendelson (Jones)		Renschler
	Akçali		Kahn-Ackermann		Reverdin
	Alber		Karasek		Richter
	Alemyr		Kiratlioglu		Rivière
	Amrehn		Külahli	Sir	John Rodgers
	Beauguitte		Reale (Leggieri)	Mr.	Rossi
	Wååg (Miss Bergegren)		Leitner	Lord	St. Helens
Mrs.	Cattaneo Petrini (Mr. Bettiol))	Letschert	MM.	Schieder
	Blumenfeld		Leu		Schlaga
	Bohman		Leynen		Yvon (Schleiter)
	Brincat		Fitzroy Maclean		Schmidt Hansheinrich
	Christiansen	MM.	Spautz (Margue)		Schmitt Robert
	Collins Edward		Mart		Schuchardt
	Cornelissen		Mason	MM.	de Bruyne (Schugens)
	Czernetz		Mende		Schwencke
	Dankert		Moneti (Minnocci)		Shore
	Delforge		Miotti Carli		Büchner
	Borg Olivier de Puget	MM.	de Montesquiou		(Sieglerschmidt)
	(De Marco)		Lillas (Mrs. Munkebye)		Steel
	Dequae		Muscat		Stewart
	Digby		van der Werff (Nederhorst))	Stinus
	Lagershausen (Dregger)		Nessler		Tanghe
	Enders		Oestergaard		Tisserand
	de Félice		Oguz		Roper (Tomney)
	Feyzioglu		Öktem		Üstündag
	Fletcher		O'Leary		Van Lent
	Capelle (Flornoy)		Osborn	_	Vedovato
Mrs.	Aasen (Mr. Frydenlund)		Peart		Joan Vickers
MM.	Gessner		Critchley (Sir John Peel)	MM.	Destremau (Vitter)
	Gislason		Pendry		Voogd
	Withalm (Goëss)		Péridier		Primborgne (Weber J.)
	Grieve		Péronnet		Weiberg-Aurdal
	Hansen		Petersen		Vontobel (Wenk)
	Sjönell (Hedlund)		Pica		Wiklund
	Hedström		Portheine		Zaloglu

List of Representatives absent or apologising for absence:

MM. Arnason	MM. Kristjansson	MM. de Préaumont
Arnaud	Labbé	Quilleri
Averardi	La Loggia	Salvatore
Collins Gerard	Legaret	de Stexhe
Coppola	Lemmrich	Talamona
Desmond	Mammi	Treu
Jung Louis	Pecoraro	Mrs. Wolf
Kempfler	Petit	Mr. Zamberletti

^{1.} The names of Substitutes who replaced absent Representatives are printed in italics, the names of such Representatives being given in brackets.

CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

TWENTY-FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION

OFFICIAL REPORT

Sixth Sitting

Thursday 17 May 1973, at 10 a.m.

	Summary			
 Adoption of the Minutes	73 Mr. Dequae (Rap Adoption of the 3279): Resolutio	orteur on Doc. 7279), oporteur on Doc. 3278). draft resolution (Doc. on 542.		
4. Relations between Western Europe and the United States (resumed joint debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3279 and Addendum, and on the introductory report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Doc. 3278, and vote on the draft resolution)	6. Statement by I Minister for Fore Speakers: The F son, Rossi, Pe- Ahrens, Gessner, Arnason, Prescot	Mr. Einar Agustsson, eign Affairs of Iceland . 185 President, MM. Agusts- art, Portheine, Wall, Schlaga, Alemyr, Yvon, t.		
Speakers: The President, MM. Destremau, Peart, Fletcher, Sir Fitzroy Maclean, MM. Schwenke, Aano, Sir John	the next Sitting	Orders of the Day of		

Mr. Vedovato, President of the Assembly, took the Chair at 10 a.m.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Sitting is open.

1. Adoption of the Minutes

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Minutes of Proceedings of the last two sittings have been distributed.

Are there any comments ?...

The Minutes were adopted.

2. Attendance Register

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The names of the Substitutes present at this sitting which have been notified to me will be published

in the list of Representatives appended to the Minutes of Proceedings and to the Official Report of Debates.

3. Tabling of a written declaration (Doc. 3298)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — A written declaration on Vestmannaeyjar (Iceland) was distributed today.

Declaration No. 19, Document 3298, has so far been signed by 32 members of the Assembly.

Any Representatives or Substitutes who wish to append their signature to this declaration can do so in the Table Office, Room A 93.

If there are further signatures, the declaration will be distributed again at the next partsession.

4. Relations between Western Europe and the United States

(Resumed joint debate on the report of the Political Affairs Committee, Doc. 3279 and Addendum, and on the introductory report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Doc. 3278, and vote on the draft resolution)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — In accordance with the Orders of the Day we shall now resume the debate on relations between Western Europe and the United States, Document 3279 and Addendum, Document 3278, and vote on the draft resolution, Document 3279.

May I remind you that the list of speakers is closed.

I call Mr. Destremau.

Mr. DESTREMAU (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, there is no need for concern about the future of the Council. Those who have read the remarkable reports by Sir John Rodgers and Mr. Dequae will know that the charge of harping on the commonplaces of outmoded political ideas, occasionally levelled at the Assembly, no longer holds good. The present situation is fully understood, and the Rapporteurs are not afraid to face the future courageously and objectively.

What I am not sure of is whether it was a good idea to bracket the two reports and to debate them together.

We tend to say that everything is interconnected. This would be logical, but it is not always true. Moreover, is it desirable? That financial, monetary and economic problems need to be dealt with simultaneously is something we see daily. Widely approved tariff measures which would ensure wise and gradual advance have occasionally been paralysed by the arbitrary attitude of a single government in regard to exchange rates. At the inception of the European Communities, the accent was too frequently on trade and not sufficiently frequently on the monetary consequences of the growth of transactions or of certain trends. Let us not repeat the same error and let us remember that, to begin with, money is a commodity.

That everything is interconnected in the sphere of economy is something we also notice when calculating the effect of the cost of taxation, social security and other contributions and of transport on the cost price of goods. But should all this be linked with political questions, with questions of defence? That is a different matter

and one on which I shall take the liberty of giving my views at the end of this statement.

Of the report of the former Finance Minister of Belgium, Mr. Dequae, I would say that it deserves thorough study by the Assembly if only for the ground it covers. He unfolds, in fact, a very striking historical phenomenon before us, namely that of a United States peacefully attacking a Europe which the day before yesterday was commercially not on the map, yesterday received financial assistance and today is envied from a monetary point of view.

We must counter this onslaught by an ally turned rival — and an onslaught not lacking in asperity — with our own economic power, without making any concessions to history, but without insulting the future. It is also essential that we should not dramatise this competition which is in the nature of things. The real tragedy would be if seeds of discord were sown during negotiations and if this discord were to be exploited.

We are starting on what is known as the Nixon Round — there is always a round when we negotiate with the Americans - without any feeling of inferiority. We have certain observations to make and we hope that any agreements arrived at will not be jeopardised by the internal regulations of the United States. The results of the Kennedy Round were, in fact, vitiated by successive devaluations of the dollar. The United States Congress never ratified the suppression of the American selling price, which had been agreed during the Geneva negotiations, and the non-convertibility of the dollar was aggravated by compensatory measures, not foreseen by those agreements. We must ensure that any agreements which may have been reached are not blocked overseas by wily moves. Precautions, and not unimportant ones, must be taken, side by side with the evident need to remain united, as was pointed out yesterday by many distinguished speakers.

As to linking trade negotiations to political and defence questions, this is something which must be carefully weighed. Sir John Rodgers's report contains a statement which I consider most significant in this connection. It is to the effect that current friction in the trade and monetary field shows the need for a political concept of the Atlantic partnership.

Such a political concept is desirable, but even if it existed I do not believe that the friction in the trade and monetary field would disappear as though by magic.

Mr. Destremau (continued)

Another link — a very disputable one — is referred to in the resolution contained in Sir John Rodgers's report in these words:

"... there should be no major withdrawal of US troops from Europe outside the framework of agreements reached on mutual and balanced force reductions".

I would say in passing that the phrase "balanced force reductions" is not a felicitous one and that it would have been better to speak of reductions tending towards a balance of forces. We for our part hope that even if the Vienna Conference progresses there will be no great reduction in forces, for we consider that these negotiations may be dangerous, that their results are likely to be insignificant and, in any case, uncontrollable.

The distances between the bases where troops are stationed are in any case not comparable and the levels at which negotiations are entered into differ widely. A shift towards the East of the Federal Republic which might lead to a certain neutralisation would have incalculable consequences for the defence of Europe. Moreover, the minor concessions made by the Soviet Union could deceive public opinion which is already rather too complacent.

For all these reasons we consider that détente—and here let me remind you that in this policy of détente the French Government were pioneers since the Head of State visited Moscow in 1966—should not be dependent on the results of MBFR, and that by discussing the military problem before the political one, the negotiators would only end up by reviving the existing blocs.

On the other hand, Sir John Rodgers's report makes very little mention of the SALT talks. They are mentioned in the explanatory memorandum, but not in the resolution. But the SALT talks are of extreme importance, since in their second phase they are likely to end in a quasicomplete neutralisation of Russian and American nuclear resources.

It is along the lines of the SALT talks rather than along the lines of the MBFR negotiations that Europe should organise its defence, that is to say should agree on the real strategic needs of Western defence.

The spectacular meetings between Heads of State who frequently discuss peace, should not be allowed to lull us into a false sense of security.

Let me ask the older ones among us who remember 1929: who, at that time, dared to predict that a world war was possible? Very few statesmen, to my knowledge.

Today we are threatened by a false sense of security. We never tell the peoples that men have not disarmed. Nor do we tell them that a nation which has become rich invites invasion by its neighbours; that it is likely to be the object of covetous eyes.

But we believe that this great problem of the defence of the free world must not be taken together with other problems.

It is as true that trade, monetary and financial affairs are interconnected as it is true that defence has its financial aspects and that a strategic organisation cannot be separated from the cost of military installations. Yet it seems to us improper and even dangerous that the defence of the Western world should depend on commercial transactions. There is no common denominator for the conquest of a market and the protection of tens of millions of people.

In order to avoid an intolerable package deal, Europe must organise her own defence, she must see to it that her defence gains consistency and autonomy within, for example, the framework of the Treaty of Western European Union.

No doubt the NATO Treaty will have to be re-nogotiated, no doubt we shall have to undertake certain revisions which need not, however, be harrowing. But Europe must exist by itself and for itself, because, on the eve of the great poker game now in preparation, the cards will

Mr. Destremau (continued)

be stacked against us if, though creditors in dollars, we remain debtors for survival.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Peart.

Mr. PEART (United Kingdom). — I will touch on some of the matters that have been raised by Mr. Destremau about our concepts of defence, what is necessary for the defence of Europe and our security. This is an important subject, but in a short period of time one can only sketch it.

I would like first of all to congratulate our two Rapporteurs, Sir John Rodgers and Mr. Dequae, on the way they have presented their reports and prepared the groundwork for our debate yesterday and today. We could branch out into many subjects. My right honourable friend Michael Stewart made an eloquent speech describing our alliance, its aims and the philosophical concept of liberty and freedom. I believe all of us here accept this.

We must bear in mind, as always, that we are seeking to extend freedom for the individual. I like to quote the words of a very distinguished political writer many years ago, Professor Graham Wallis:

"Freedom is the possession of continuous initiative."

So it is in this atmosphere that we discuss relations between Western Europe in particular and the United States of America. We are all pleased that the President's Assistant, Dr. Kissinger, made such a forthright address and declared the aims of the American Government in his speech on 23 April. I assume that every delegate here has read carefully that declaration of American policy. It really emphasises the stance of the United States, the American presence, relations with the Community and the need to liberalise trade.

I, speaking from the point of view of a socialist member of a Labour Party at Westminster, welcomed that speech. I welcome it here today. I know there are some people who are critical. Some people have been indifferent. In some ways the speech has been criticised in Europe itself. I believe it is an important step forward. Dr. Kissinger's speech was echoed here

yesterday by the distinguished Representative of the American Government, His Excellency John Irwin, the Personal Representative of the Secretary of State of the United States of America. Inevitably, if we consider defence we cannot ignore American attitudes, It is all very well for Mr. Destremau to speak about we in Europe needing to reorganise and think aloud and to think rightly on our defence strategy, but there are different viewpoints in Europe.

I can remember attending a meeting of Western European Union in December when Mr. Debré, who is not now Minister of Defence but who was a very distinguished Minister in the French Government, said:

"If defence is to be credible it must remain national in character."

I cannot accept that. The harsh reality is that we need NATO and the American presence, without which there is no possibility of Western Europe, as individual nations or as a whole, maintaining a defence position equal to that of the Soviet Union. We need the American nuclear umbrella. France may seek nuclear tests in the Pacific, but the reality is that the United States provides the shield for the defence of Europe and the Western world.

I am therefore heartened by the fact that Dr. Kissinger has reiterated this policy. Of course we believe in and want détente, better relations with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, but we should not be pessimistic. Ever since 1968 NATO has sought to pursue a policy of détente in Europe under various well-known labels: peaceful coexistence, renunciation of the use of force, the SALT talks, its initiative towards mutual and balanced force reductions. I would like to congratulate the West German Government on its achievements through its Ostpolitik, on the way in which it has signed important treaties, which have now been ratified, with the Soviet Union and Poland. By means of the West German Government's initiative we have loosened the diplomatic log jam. We are therefore discussing something which really means the strengthening of NATO but, above all, with an American presence on the continent.

We are all seeking to liberalise world trade; the Americans have always taken the initiative in this, despite criticisms, by means of the Kennedy Round and the talks in GATT. This has been reinforced by Dr. Kissinger's speech, by the

Mr. Peart (continued)

speech of the American Representative to this Assembly and by attitudes within the Community. Hans Friderichs, the Economics Minister of the German Federal Republic, said recently:

"The highest priority goal of a common policy for world commerce should be the achievement of the greatest freedom of trade possible.

We are convinced that the position the Federal Republic of Germany occupies in the world's trade today is largely the result of our determination to pursue the goal of free trade and our contributions to its liberalisation. Germany is second only to the United States in its volume of exports."

On a more controversial subject, I had the privilege for a long time of being the Minister of Agriculture in a socialist government and of representing my country at OECD. I believed then that the common agricultural policy would not work and I still believe it never will. I have always felt that for Britain it would be absurd to scrap our system for something which is not working in Europe. Ironically enough, many of us were accused of being communist stooges because we dared to criticise this part of the Community policy. Yet its only real achievement is to create surpluses in Europe which are then sold at subsidised prices to Eastern Europe. It is indeed remarkable that Western capitalism should be subsidising Russian communism.

The existence of a policy of self-sufficiency in Europe negates the full concept of GATT and of free world trade. Inevitably it will create an economical autarchy in Europe itself which will lead to "regional chauvinism", and to criticism of those who seek better relations with the United States and the improvement of agriculture and world trade. When Sir John Rodgers talks about our common heritage, I agree with him that we must get together; but a common agricultural policy harms some of my country's traditional friends such as New Zealand, Australia and the Caribbean countries. The CAP will inevitably harm the third world as far as sugar production is concerned. I believe there is still a danger that CAP, together with the practices and administration consequent upon it, can harm the International Sugar Agreement, of which the

Community is not yet a member. The latter would rather dump surpluses on to the world market, and this in turn could harm the less developed countries.

Both Sir John Rodgers and Mr. Dequae emphasised the need to help not just Europe, not just America, but those countries which need help. This, after all, is the great challenge.

When I was first a representative here in the 1950s I used to argue the need to stimulate world agricultural trade and world production in relation to agricultural commodities. In the end, as Ernest Bevin said, we can never build peace out of hunger. Britain, the European countries and America must refuse to adopt selfish policies which prevent progressive development.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Fletcher.

Mr. FLETCHER (United Kingdom). — I find very little with which to quarrel in the two reports under discussion. The line of argument in Sir John Rodgers's report is one which I find completely acceptable.

As for that of Mr. Dequae, although I do not like its tone in certain passages and although I resent some of the anti-Americanism which has crept into other passages, it is a very model of a report in that it seems to be factually accurate.

It is necessary however to look at these two reports in a more general context. What we must realise in all the organisations to which we belong — organisations which increasingly run world affairs because the nation State as an initiator or even as a political entity seems to be disappearing - is that we are continually, and often far too slowly, trying to adapt ourselves politically to a world whose economics have already been moulded by modern technology. The European Economic Community, for example, arrived on the world scene almost too late. Instead of being created in 1957, it ought to have been created in 1918 when all the economic preconditions for the European Economic Community were already beginning to appear. These institutions which dictate the political policies of the world adapt themselves all too slowly to a world which already exists.

What are the characteristics of the modern world? To list them all I would have to write

Mr. Fletcher (continued)

three books, and I came into politics because I was rather tired of writing books which seemed to exert no influence whatever upon those who read them, nor were there enough people actually reading them. But I will isolate one or two features.

Why is it that we now have to talk about defence in terms totally different from those that were current only twenty-five years ago? I suggest that it is not because we are wiser or because we are committed to larger ideals of unity. It is because the technology of modern warfare requires whole continents for its organisation and its deployment. The basic reality of the American relationship to our own continent of Europe lies much more in the Atlantic Ocean than in any expressed will and desires of Defence Ministers on either side of the Atlantic. For the Americans the main battleground in any future conflict is bound to be the Atlantic Ocean or perhaps the Pacific Ocean, and that geographic fact, allied to modern military technology, dictates an American presence in, and a vital interest in Europe itself.

Therefore I suggest that when we talk of defence in NATO terms we are not expressing a preference for American conceptions as against French conceptions. We are, in fact, merely acknowledging a geo-political reality. It may be unpalatable but it is the only reality we have, and we can neither think it away nor argue it away.

In the field of economics I want to make one thing quite clear. We in my country are now members of the European Economic Community. I am a conscript member of the European Economic Community. I did not volunteer to join that organisation and I am a most reluctant conscript; in fact, in so far as I participate in the institutions of that Community or the institutions of Europe, I shall participate in pretty much the same way as the "good soldier Schweik" participated in the activities of the Austro-Hungarian Army in 1914-18!

I want to add something to what His Excellency the American Ambassador said yesterday. He said very definitely that it is not the intention of the Americans to destroy the common agricultural policy. I serve notice through this Assembly to the members of the other Assembly that it is my intention to do everything I can to destroy the common agricul-

tural policy, which I regard as organised lunacy, and which most of the citizens, particularly the housewives, of my country regard as organised lunacy. I am not opposed to making special provision for the social needs of those in the agricultural sector, but I happen to believe, without being arrogantly British, that the system we have devised in my country is a hundred times better than this nonsensical monstrosity which happens to be dominant in the countries of the Community.

But I am concerned here not with the common agricultural policy as such. I am concerned with the question whether the kind of attitude which produced the common agricultural policy, the narrow regionalistic attitude, the regional chauvinistic attitude, the Eurocentric attitude, is an adequate response to the problems of 1973. I suggest that it is not. We cannot in Europe wall ourselves up in a little citadel of prosperity and just glare at the outside world and sneer at our American allies when they make certain comments about our inward-looking attitudes. The modern economy is for the first time in history a global economy, not a series of interlocking regional economies, and I believe that the Americans are more right in their appreciation of its necessities than we are.

I have never been noted as a pro-American. I have attacked the American Government for its policies in Vietnam and on practically every other issue about which I can think at the moment. I would never in any circumstances have voted for President Nixon. Mind vou. I would have had some difficulty in voting for the other fellow in the last election, but let that pass. I cannot be regarded in any sense as an advocate of, or spokesman for, the United States Government as at present constituted. As a socialist, I happen to be the virtual enemy of all existing governments and all existing systems, but nevertheless I feel that, as far as the growth of a world economy is concerned, the Americans are more correct in their appreciation than many of us in Europe; and because their defence needs are our defence needs, because the basic foundations of their democracy are the same as the basic foundations of our own democracy, and because I profoundly believe that their appreciation of present-day global economic necessities is even better than our appreciation, we must accept that the Americans are not only in Europe with guns and tanks, but are in Europe with everything else. They are here to stay, and I personally am profoundly grateful for that fact.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Sir Fitzroy Maclean.

Sir Fitzroy MACLEAN (United Kingdom). — I have listened with enjoyment, though not always with complete agreement, to the speech of my colleague, Mr. Fletcher. Like him and like Mr. Peart, I agree with and support both the draft resolution and the interesting explanatory memorandum submitted by our colleague, Sir John Rodgers.

Of one thing we can be sure, and the last speaker would, I think, support me on this. That is the immense importance of the subject we are discussing. If there were to be, as he said, a breakdown or a weakening of the partnership between Europe and the United States, or any defection or default by either partner, the consequences for Western democracy and, indeed, for Western civilisation, could be very serious indeed.

We naturally all hope to see Europe grow in unity and in strength. Some of us, like Mr. Fletcher, have reservations, but I think we are agreed on the main issue. We also hope that Europe will in due course become something like a super-power in her own right. But it is likely to be some time before that happens, and meanwhile there are only two real super-powers. the United States and the Soviet Union. Whether we like it or not, we must face the fact that Western security and world stability depend very largely on the continued ability and willingness of the United States to play their present role in the defence of the free world, and I was very much reassured by what Ambassador Irwin had to say on this issue yesterday.

I do not want to exaggerate the significance of what I hope and believe is only a passing phase, but I think we would be closing our eyes to reality if we failed to recognise that at present the United States are undergoing a serious crisis, an internal crisis admittedly, but one which could have very far-reaching international consequences especially if it led the United States to turn inwards and to become isolationist, as they have been at other periods in their history.

This crisis is particularly serious because it comes at a time when the international role of the United States is perhaps more important than it has ever been. I want to do no more than touch briefly on the problem with which the present American administration is beset. It is

of course fashionable today in Europe and elsewhere to sling mud at the United States. It is fashionable to decry the part played by the United States in Vietnam, to pooh-pooh attempts to tackle the thorny problem of race relations and civil rights. One cannot help noticing at present a tendency in some quarters on this side of the Atlantic to gloat over the so-called Watergate affair.

I would say only this. When the late President Kennedy went as far as he did to involve the United States in the war in Vietnam, he certainly believed at the time that he was upholding the cause of democracy. As for civil rights and race relations, these are not simple problems, but at least the United States are making a determined and, I believe from my own observation, a not unsuccessful attempt to solve them.

As for Watergate, I cannot imagine why any parliamentary party of the kind with which we are all familiar here should want to pry into the private affairs of its political opponents. It seems to me a most unrewarding pursuit. My own feeling is that one reads as much about these matters as one needs to or, indeed, could possibly want to in the public prints. But at least the Americans, like all of us here, have an opposition and that, without drawing any odious or fairly obvious comparisons, is something that a good many other countries do not have.

So much for President Nixon's problems. What we in Europe should certainly not do, is to allow these little local difficulties — because that in my view is all that they are — to distract us from what are major world issues.

If we want a good example to follow in this respect, we need look no further than Mr. Brezhnev who is quite rightly going ahead with his visit to the United States next month, Watergate or no Watergate, and thereby in my view showing extremely good sense and making a worthwhile contribution to the stability of President Nixon, which may be a desirable object or not according to how one looks at it.

My colleague, Mr. Fletcher, appeared to think it was not a very desirable object, but then I do not think he is a very wholehearted democrat either. However, that is an American internal affair.

Admittedly, it must be hard for Mr. Brezhnev to understand why there should be all this fuss about a few microphones, nor can the concept of Sir Fitzroy Maclean (continued)

an opposition be all that familiar to him. The fact remains he has not allowed any of this to interfere with his plans or with Soviet policy and his advisers have resisted any temptation they may have felt to fish in troubled waters.

I have commended Mr. Brezhnev's advisers. I should also like to commend at any rate one of Mr. Nixon's advisers. We have before us the text of Dr. Henry Kissinger's recent address in which he gives the main outlines of future American policy. For my part I regard this as an outstanding document by any standard and one that we in Europe should welcome wholeheartedly coming as it does — and this is worth remembering — from a man who in many ways is himself European in background and outlook. I was very glad to hear my colleague, Mr. Peart, who speaks with great experience of these matters, welcome it as I do.

Over the last thirty or forty years, I have given a good deal of thought to different aspects of East-West relations. I find it very hard to fault either the style or the substance of American foreign policy over the last year or eighteen months or, indeed, of the successive bold initiatives which have accompanied it. I welcome these as I now welcome the new initiatives announced by Dr. Kissinger. I believe that, taken together, they offer a good hope of Atlantic partnership, of improved East-West relations and in the long run of world peace and stability. For my part I would be very sorry to see any of the mud that has been stirred up in and round the Watergate affair have the effect of hampering them or bogging them down.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Schwencke,

Mr. SCHWENCKE (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, in the past few days we have heard some very important contributions to the debate, and it is thus likely to be difficult for one who comes at the very end of the list of speakers and is, moreover, a new member, to still command a hearing. I would nevertheless like briefly to draw attention to certain minor points which I think are important, even though

they are put forward by a new member of this House, in this case a young Social Democrat.

Our problem is the path to be followed by Europe. Probably few of us will find it surprising that the question is only now being so keenly discussed in public because Dr. Kissinger, the advisor to President Nixon, has dealt very thoroughly and in such detail with this particular problem. In my view, this question should be considered from three points of view:

One, Europe itself. Here I would use the phrase: European policy is defined by Europeans.

Two, Europe in the world. Where does Europe stand between the two real power blocs of the USA and the USSR on the one side, and Japan and China, powers which must be seen in relation to these, on the other? I feel that we must find our own place in this field of force (and I use the term "field of force" only with the greatest repugnance).

Three, our relationship with the USA. Let me describe this by means of an image. We are a grown-up son who dares to put things in a different way from his bigger brother, the USA. I believe this is useful and helpful for both sides, though reason and purpose are decisive here.

This brings me to the question which seems to be a very vital one, namely what is to be Europe's role for Europeans? What do European institutions and our own work mean to the 250 million Europeans? Surely not first and foremost the questions that occupy us at such length and so thoroughly, namely questions of trade, agriculture, the economy, defence and the details of the Common Market. It seems to me that people expect more of Europe and of European institutions.

The Rapporteur referred to the absence of a central brain in Europe. I do not believe we should establish such a central brain. We have 250 million individual European brains and these, I believe, are decisive in defining our political path for Europeans. If we accept this, then I believe it to be our duty to develop some sort of European strategy. This strategy would be the European contribution to the world concert with its point and counterpoint.

Mr. Schwenke (continued)

To my mind, the absolute priorities are the preservation and consolidation of peace. Their aspects differ according to whether domestic or foreign issues are involved. The Ostopolitik which has been so warmly supported by most member governments here, and the entry of the two German States into the United Nations which has been agreed but still has to be implemented, seem to me to be important and decisive steps forward on one aspect of this question.

The second aspect concerns Europe's domestic problems. There is the question of securing democracy in Europe. I believe that in this connection the events in Turkey, one of our member States, must necessarily affect us deeply. We must be careful not to pass on to the next item on the agenda too rapidly. When accusations of torture, of beatings and the like are written off as communist propaganda — although we know better — the re-establishment of democracy in Turkey needs to be treated as a European task. We cannot afford to let things go on in this way.

But the other question which preoccupies us on the domestic front is how we are going to ensure democracy in social matters throughout Europe and for everybody. The plan for social union contains much that is hopeful and it must not be restricted to the nine EEC States, but must become in the long term a political task of the seventeen Council of Europe States. Let me mention specifically a European unemployment, social insurance and pensions scheme. These are important socio-political questions and they should determine and guide our political debates along the path towards the realisation of Europe.

We shall also strengthen European democracy by ensuring that there is democracy in places of work. We certainly hope that democracy will take a step forward in the Federal Republic of Germany once we have introduced workers' participation in factories and firms. In our European society, there must be no special preserves for democracy. It must enter into every sphere. We hope that parity of representation will be not merely a German, but a European aim to be jointly implemented.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, allow me to end with the words with which Mr. Kirchschläger, the Foreign Minister of Austria, concluded his speech:

"All of us are faced with important tasks and bear a responsibility which may be greater than we are willing to admit in our everyday political life."

And let me add that our fellow-citizens will measure our contribution to Europe's welfare by our deeds, our ideas and finally by our specific actions.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Aano, the last speaker on the list.

Mr. AANO (Norway). — I have read with great interest the two very illuminating reports that constitute the basis of our discussion yesterday and this morning. I am in general agreement with their main thoughts and conclusions, which I find both positive and appealing. At this late stage of the debate I want only to emphasise two or three points.

First, I want to touch upon what is called in Sir John Rodgers's report "our common cultural heritage" on both sides of the Atlantic. However, I find that little is done to define the specific qualities of this heritage. I agree that it will be necessary in future for the democracies of the West to reconsider what are our basic values that we cannot dispose of without losing our souls, to use a figure of speech.

Maybe we can be helped by taking the new and hopeful détente between Eastern and Western Europe as an example. The ultimate goals of the negotiations in Helsinki and Vienna are always referred to as peace and security, and of course those words reflect a content that is of paramount importance for the future of us all. But is it only by chance that freedom is very seldom referred to in the talks; or is it a significant sign that political freedom is almost never mentioned as one of the goals of these

Mr. Aano (continued)

hopeful approaches towards détente in Europe and between the United States and the USSR? I am afraid that the latter may be the sad truth.

Increased political freedom, freedom of expression, of political activity, by individuals and mass movements is not on the agenda of the conference referred to. I say this without putting blame on anyone, but only as a statement of, as it seems, an inevitable fact.

In this rather negative way I have managed to hit upon what may be the most profound difference between the Eastern totalitarian system of government and the Western democratic system. This, if anything, is the basis of our common cultural heritage, developed out of a Christian, humanistic background of the idea of, and stubborn belief in, the value of man and the dignity of the individual. We are aware that this notion of the dignity of the individual is questioned seriously even in our own societies. It is my firm belief that, unless we can reinvigorate this idea of man, the very foundation of a democratic system of government as we see it is at stake, with all its basic freedoms, of religion, of conscience, of expression.

However, it seems that from a global point of view these ideals are sometimes referred to by the rest of the world almost in a detesting fashion as "Your so-called Western ideals". We know the reason for that. It is that world history seems to testify that we Europeans, while having developed these ideas in our own societies, have not adhered to them in our dealings with the rest of the world.

From this point of view, I want to comment on two other points in the reports. I refer first to what is said in the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, presented by Mr. Dequae, about multinational companies. I fully agree with the report that speculative movements of denationalised money, which is mostly handled by multinational companies, is contrary to the interests of the democratic nations and may destroy every effort on their part to steer the economic development of any one country and even destroy the establishment of a responsible international monetary system.

But if, as has been said by critics of our political systems, our democracies are not able to control this money, the peoples of the world will look elsewhere for guidelines for their own development.

I come to my third and last comment. I am happy that both the reports tabled today emphasise the relationship between the Atlantic countries and the developing countries. I was rather disappointed that no reference to this was to be found in the otherwise challenging speech by Dr. Kissinger. Therefore, I was pleased to hear the American Ambassador, Mr. Irwin, refer especially to this point taken out of the reports we are discussing when he spoke yesterday. This ought to be one of the most important purposes for the renewal of Atlantic co-operation.

To support my point may I be allowed to refer to a recent press conference in Brussels given by the President of Senegal, Dr. Senghor, who represented the view of developing Africa in such a splendid way as a guest speaker at this Assembly in its October Session.

Before the press he called UNCTAD III a farce, and stated bluntly that the effort to establish a dialogue between developing and industrial countries within the framework of the United Nations had failed. Europeans and Africans together have found something more concrete through the association between EEC and African countries, he said, and he added:

"Even if it is far from satisfactory it represents the least bad result so far."

In this serious context we must see our new efforts to strengthen our co-operation across the Atlantic and with Japan, or, in the words of Sir Rodgers's report:

"The idealism which should motivate Atlantic relations must come from a joint effort to try to reduce the growing gap between rich and poor countries."

Not only idealism should be our motivation but realism as well. If we do not make an ever stronger effort to share our wealth and our values with the rest of the world, the gap between the world's haves and have-nots will inevitably end in a catastrophe for us all. THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Sir John Rodgers, the Rapporteur of the Political Affairs Committee, to reply to the various speakers.

Sir John RODGERS (United Kingdom). — I think we all agree that this debate of a day and a half has been far-reaching, constructive, helpful and thoughtful. It has been enriched by contributions from the Italian Prime Minister and, even more importantly, from the spokesman of Mr. Rogers, Ambassador Irwin.

Very little heat has been engendered during the debate. One of the most encouraging signs in all the speeches, critical although some of the speakers were on this or that point, was the underlying concept that there is something which binds Europe and America together, not just our cultural heritage, not just the defence problem, but the underlying unity between these two communities which everyone wants to see preserved.

We were therefore all extremely delighted that Dr. Kissinger made that speech inviting us to join with America in a new approach creativity. That is a word which I hate, but it is one which the Americans use. I am very sorry that so little enthusiasm has been evident among the press and politicians in Europe in response to the invitation made by Dr. Kissinger on behalf of the American President.

My feeling is that this was a genuine attempt in the fixing of 1973 as the Year of Europe, a real attempt by the Americans to get us to come together as equal partners now; not as pensioners, as we have been for so long, but for the whole of Europe to work out a new consensus of Atlantic interdependence based no longer on the common concept of what we are defending ourselves against but rather more clearly on what we stand for.

I am delighted that so many speakers in the debate stressed that it is no good defending oneself and making oneself richer unless one has a purpose behind that. The purpose has truly been said to be, first, the maintenance of human dignity; secondly, the maintenance of democratic government; and thirdly, the continued growth of prosperity not only to improve the lot of people in European countries but, as Mr. Aano so rightly stressed as being most important, so that we can level out the differences between the countries of the world and share out the good things which modern technology is making

available in a way undreamed of fifty years ago. It now requires a much more realistic concept in the hearts and minds of politicians that it is no longer enough to create wealth selfishly to obtain comfort on the home front. Wealth must be shared with the rest of the world so that the standard of living of everyone rises.

Civilisation is what we are trying to support in Europe and in our Atlantic Association. Sometimes I think one of the things which perhaps America has done rather too much of is to confuse civilisation with comfort. Civilisation is not necessarily having more baths than the next man or more refrigerators or washing machines. That is very comfortable and all housewives love it, and we want to see it progress, but we want something which goes deeper. That is why I was glad that Mr. Stewart stressed that the facts of existence, pollution and all the rest, were just as important as the creation of wealth — the standards and quality of life are just as important.

Mr. Irwin summarised my paper by saying that I had made five key points. The first I have mentioned — the new consensus of interdependence. The second he said was the decision to share the responsibility and burden of common defence of Western Europe as an essential step in reaching a new overall consensus. The third was that European integration is a necessary pre-condition of European partnership.

We were all delighted with the speeches made during the last few weeks by Mr. Nixon, Mr. Rogers and Dr. Kissinger saying that there is no thought whatever of America withdrawing her troops from Europe, not that there will not be reductions in forces — that was a different matter — but the defence commitment will be honoured and maintained.

The next point, Mr. Irwin said, I stressed — and I am glad that Mr. Aano pointed it out — was that Dr. Kissinger was at fault in accusing Europe of being parochial, provincial and regional whereas America thought they were better in that they had a global approach. I could hardly find any reference in the speech by Dr. Kissinger — this was the only thing which disappointed me — to helping the undeveloped countries more than they have been doing at present. Both Mr. Dequae and I have stressed this.

Another thing that has come out of the debate is the general consensus of opinion that we need

Sir John Rodgers (continued)

to improve the mechanisms of dialogue between the United States and ourselves. The question has been posed, "Who speaks for Europe?" I do not think that we can for ever expect the Americans to go with a united view representing America to a partner of equal size and wealth, which is now to go to eleven or nine countries which eventually make the Community, and to go to each individual country to argue on bilateral terms.

We must produce an organisation which will speak vis-à-vis America with one voice; whether it is the Community, whether it is this Organisation or a new organisation is not for me to say. This is one of the most important factors in the situation. We have to find a way of expressing the European viewpoint, not the viewpoint of one nation against one America.

I should like to say a word or two about the subject which was raised very much this morning, CAP. I know what Mr. Peart and all his colleagues on the Labour benches feel about, first, the Common Market as a whole and, secondly, about the common agricultural policy. I do not think that he can complain about that when his government did not join the Community and, now that Britain has joined, only one half of our parliament is there and his side are not there to represent the point of view which Mr. Peart so eloquently put in this Assembly but did not put a week ago before the European Parliament in this very hemicycle.

Obviously, nothing is static in this world and I dare say there will be modifications in CAP voluntarily among the States which make up the Common Market; but it should not really take our minds off what this paper is about. It is much too small a subject. I very much hope, therefore, that the Assembly will approve the draft recommendations which are laid before it on behalf of both my own committee and the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Dequae, Rapporteur of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development.

Mr. DEQUAE (Belgium) (Translation). — Mr. President, I shall be very brief since I

entirely agree with the comments made by the Rapporteur of the Political Affairs Committee.

I cannot, however, forego the pleasure of thanking the various speakers, not only those who expressed their agreement so pertinently but also and more particularly those who drew attention to certain weaknesses in my report and even disagreed with it.

As you may have noticed in my speech yesterday, what I regret most is that a debate in this Assembly never has the character of a direct debate as in the national parliaments. Here we are listed, timed and not allowed to interrupt; in short, there is no room for spontaneity.

I regretted this precisely when criticisms were being addressed to me and I now wish to thank now those who emphasised the imperfections in my report. As I said in my statement, it deals with an extremely complex and vast subject and one which also requires careful handling.

However, this debate, even in the disciplined form imposed upon us, will have helped not only to fix and analyse the elements of the problem of relations between the United States and Europe, but to reconcile various points of view. This is something which is essential and which will, I hope, allow us to achieve a renewed Atlantic Charter which will also be balanced, live and imbued with enthusiasm.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I thank the two Rapporteurs.

The debate is closed.

The text to be put to the vote of the Assembly has been presented by the Political Affairs Committee in Document 3279.

I will read it out:

- "The Assembly
- 1. Considers that relations between Western Europe and the United States should take the form of a genuine partnership based on the common commitment to preserve the democratic way of life and the recognition of their mutual interdependence, which must influence their attitude towards the rest of the world:
- 2. Regrets the current friction in the trade and monetary field which reflects the absence of a political concept of the future of Atlantic partnership and regards these as inconsistent with the long-term common interests of both Western Europe and North America and also with their responsibilities towards the rest of the world, in particular developing countries;

The President (continued)

- 3. Stresses that the continued American commitment to European security is essential to guarantee the success of a policy of East-West détente and that there should be no major withdrawal of US troops from Europe outside the framework of agreements reached on mutual and balanced force reductions;
- 4. Considers that rapid progress by the enlarged European Economic Community towards economic, monetary and political union is a prerequisite before Western Europe can become a more independent and equal partner and thus relieve the United States of the burden of single leadership;
- 5. Regards the existence of the wider European organisation of the Seventeen of great importance for Western Europe; the Council of Europe comprises all nine Members of EEC and also eight other democratic States of Europe; it is of great importance for the Atlantic partnership too as democratic countries, including the three neutrals in the Council of Europe, can be in close relation with the democratic powers on the other side of the Atlantic;
- 6. Considers that repeated monetary crises have demonstrated the need for urgent reform of the international monetary system and that in particular:
- (i) the principle of equivalent obligations of both surplus and deficit countries should be acknowledged;
- (ii) the United States should seek a new balance-of-payments equilibrium and restrain capital outflows:
- (iii) a new international reserve currency should be created and managed jointly;
- (iv) the new system should provide for more effective control of inflation;
- (v) it should also deal with the problem of the Eurodollar market;
- 7. Considers there is an urgent need for the creation of a more open, non-discriminatory and liberal trading system and that the forthcoming negotiations in GATT should:
- (i) provide permanent machinery for defining priority targets, and steps for achieving them gradually;
- (ii) aim at the reduction of tariff and nontariff barriers in the industrial and agricultural fields;
- (iii) take account of social problems for example in agriculture which justify a more flexible approach;
- 8. Considers that the aim of reform of the international economic system should not only be to liberalise trade among all industrialised countries, but to improve the terms of trade of developing countries and try to reduce the growing gap between richer and poorer nations;
- 9. Draws attention to the need to strengthen the mechanisms for dialogue between the United States,

Western Europe and the other countries of the free world in order to create a framework in which crises can be effectively handled and that in particular it is necessary:

- (i) to establish high-level permanent consultation between the European organisations and the United States;
- (ii) to carry out a joint review by the European and North American nations of the existing institutions, e.g. GATT, IMF, OECD, NATO and WEU in order to meet present-day requirements; and
- (iii) to involve other industrialised countries, in particular Japan, in such a dialogue, but bearing in mind also the needs of the developing countries."

No amendment has been tabled.

The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in Document 3279.

No one has asked for a vote by roll-call.

The Assembly will therefore vote by a show of hands.

I put the draft resolution to the vote.

Those against...?

Any abstentions...?

The draft resolution contained in Document 3279 was agreed.

It will be published as Resolution 542.

5. Communication by the President

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I wish to inform the Assembly that the Political Affairs Committee which was to have met this afternoon at 2.30 p.m. will not meet.

6. Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is a statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland.

Mr. Minister, I am particularly happy to welcome you here in Strasbourg, since your participation in our debates will give us an opportunity of receiving first-hand information

The President (continued)

on the problems of your country which may seem to be rather far away.

I would take this opportunity of expressing the sympathy of the entire Assembly with the population of Iceland and in particular with the population of Vestmannaeyjar Island following the recent tragedy.

May I remind you that a declaration contained in Document 3298 has been tabled, expressing the sympathy of the Assembly with the population of your country for the hardships suffered by them.

I now invite you, Mr. Minister, to come to the rostrum. (Applause)

Mr. Einar AGUSTSSON (Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland). — Thank you very much, Mr. President, for your kind words about me and my nation and especially as regards the eruption in the Vestmannaeyjar Island.

It is a pleasure for me to attend this meeting of the Consultative Assembly and to be given the opportunity to address a few remarks to you.

In February of this year two distinguished representatives of the Working Party on the Future Role of the Council of Europe visited Iceland in order to have an exchange of views relating to the attitude of the Government of Iceland towards the Council of Europe.

During the friendly discussions I had with these representatives, I stated that in my view the Council of Europe was as necessary now as it had been in the past and that the enlargement of the European Community did not diminish its importance. The Council should also be the coordinator of intergovernmental co-operation in Europe. Priority sectors of the Council of Europe programmes should be social affairs, human rights, legal harmonisation, problems of small nations and minorities, environmental problems and education and culture.

Concerning the future role of the Council of Europe I stressed these three points: first, the responsibility of small States in persuading the bigger partners to maintain the Council of Europe as a forum where they could make their voices heard on an equal footing; second, agreement in principle for considering an opening towards the East, subject to safeguarding the democratic principle of the Organisation; and third, the necessity to pursue effectively the

intergovernmental co-operation in the Council of Europe.

In the course of these talks, the members of the working group stated very clearly that the problems among member States should, of course, be discussed in the Council of Europe. This was essential, if the Council of Europe was to be considered as a political organisation. On the question of relations between the nine Members of the Community and the others, the members of the working group stressed that it was of great interest to the smaller States that the Council of Europe should remain an effective organisation, and I wish to tell the Assembly that my government share these views.

I would like to use this opportunity to discuss one aspect of foreign policy of great interest to my country — the problem of fishery limits. In that connection I will first dwell briefly on the importance of the problem to Iceland. I will then explain what we have done about it and, finally, refer to the developments in the international arena so far, as well as the future prospects.

To this audience, it is hardly necessary to explain the importance of the coastal fisheries to Iceland. In one word, they are vital. They are the foundation of our economy. From them come 80% of the value of our exports. In fact, without them Iceland would not have been habitable. When you consider that almost all the necessities of life — apart from fish and certain dairy products — have to be imported and financed through the exports, it becomes apparent that the word vital is appropriate.

This, in turn, makes it clear why foreign fishing in Iceland has always been regarded with feelings ranging from uneasiness to fear.

In former centuries the fishery limits were gradually reduced from 48 miles to 3 miles in 1901. The 3-mile system was brought about by an agreement between the United Kingdom and Denmark, then in charge of the foreign relations of Iceland. When the 3-mile system had been applied for half a century it became quite clear that if it were to continue the fish stocks would be destroyed.

In 1948 the Icelandic Parliament therefore enacted a law authorising the Ministry of Fisheries to issue the necessary regulations to control fishing in the entire continental shelf area, which at the depth of 400 metres ranges to 50-70 miles from shore. The implementation of that law has been slow because of the opposition of some nations fishing in the area.

The limits were extended to 4 miles from straight base lines in 1950-52, to 12 miles in 1958 and to 50 miles in 1972. The 50-mile limit was chosen because it covers most of the continental shelf at a depth of 400 metres. All these measures were opposed by the United Kingdom. The development has been that the United Kingdom in 1964 adopted 12-mile fishery limits, whereas in 1952 our extension to 4 miles and our extension to 12 miles in 1958 were considered by them to be completely unjustified and illegal. And now there is opposition by the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany against our 50-mile limit which came into force on 1 September 1972. On the other hand, the new 50-mile limit has been respected by all other nations.

All this time, since 1948 - for twenty-five years - we have been told by our British and German friends that we should wait for an international conference to settle the issues involved. It should not be forgotten in that connection that it was Iceland that in 1949 proposed in the General Assembly of the United Nations that the International Law Commission should be entrusted with the task of studying the law of the sea and, on the basis of that work, the two Geneva Conferences of 1958 and 1960 were held, although they did not succeed in solving the matter of fishery limits. And the third Conference on the Law of the Sea will soon be convened in direct continuation of that endeavour.

After this short summary I now would like to deal with two points. First, why did Iceland not wait for the outcome of the third Conference on the Law of the Sea? And, second, what are the developments in the law of the sea?

Why did Iceland not wait for the third Law of the Sea Conference? My reply to that question is that although the conference is scheduled to start soon, experience shows that it may take quite a few years for the necessary number of ratifications to be made to ensure the entry into force of any conventions which might be concluded. And, of course, it is possible that the required two-thirds majority will not be found for any formula for the limits of coastal jurisdiction. That was the case at the 1958 and the 1960 Conferences on the Law of the Sea, and that may very well be the case again. In 1958 we were asked to wait for the 1960 Conference, which did not solve the problem,

and we did not wait for it. I will give you some additional reasons why we could not wait this time.

The fish stocks in Icelandic waters have already reached a dangerous degree of overfishing, as is clearly shown by the mortality rates and the greatly excessive landings of immature fish from the Icelandic grounds in United Kingdom ports. There was, in addition, immediate danger of the increased diversion of foreign fishing fleets to the Iceland area, particularly in view of the fact that the prolific grounds of the Barents Sea — which had kept these fleets busy for some time — had been fished out. These fleets were getting ready to move into the Iceland area.

We have been told many times that there is complete understanding of the need for conservation measures to prevent overfishing but that such matters would best be handled through the regional body concerned, namely the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission. We, on our part, have drawn attention to the fact that these regional bodies, according to their own statutes, have nothing whatsoever to do with fishery limits. In addition it should be kept in mind that more than conservation is involved and that is the coastal State's share in the total allowable catch. To refer that question to a body where we have one vote and others who also want to use our coastal resources have thirteen votes, is not a very realistic procedure. But the main thing is, as I said, that the regional body referred to has nothing to do with fishery limits. That is quite clear.

The second point to which I referred relates to developments in the law of the sea and future prospects.

It is a matter of common knowledge that a very clear development has taken place in the law of the sea since the two Geneva Conferences of 1958 and 1960. An ever-growing number of coastal States now support the view that the former doctrines regarding the width of fishery limits are obsolete. It is realised that the former system was based on the interests of distant water fishing nations who wanted to come as close as possible to the shores of other nations in order to utilise their fishing resources. In 1958 and 1960 the distant water fishing nations were able to gather considerable support for their views in the relatively limited membership of the international community at that time. But tremendous changes have taken place. Some of

the States existing at that time have come to realise that their interests are better served by protecting their own coastal resources and very many additional new members of the international community have emerged — nations who have gained their independence and are now in a position to take care of their own interests. And they have increasingly rallied to the support of widened fishery limits. This policy is now advocated not only by Iceland but also by a great number of States from Asia, Africa, Latin America and now, increasingly, also by Canada and powerful interests in the United States. Australia and New Zealand are now following a similar policy.

I would like to draw the attention of distinguished Representatives here to a few of the more important pronouncements in this field.

In August 1970 the Lima meeting of the Latin-American States on the law of the sea adopted a declaration of common principles on the law of the sea. The second of these principles relates to the right of the coastal State to establish the limits of its maritime sovereignty or jurisdiction in accordance with reasonable criteria having regard to its geographical, geological and biological characteristics and the need to make rational use of its resources. And in June 1972. at Santo Domingo, the Specialised Conference of the Caribbean Countries on the Problems of the Sea formulated a declaration of principles. It is there said that the coastal State has sovereign rights over the renewable and non-renewable natural resources which are found in the waters. in the sea bed and the sub-soil of an area adjacent to the territorial sea called the patrimonial sea. And it is added that the breadth of this zone should be the subject of an international agreement, preferably of a world-wide scope. The whole of the area or both the territorial sea and the patrimonial sea, taking into account geographic circumstances, should not exceed a maximum of 200 nautical miles. Similarly, in the conclusions in the general report of the African States' Regional Seminar on the Law of the Sea held in Yaoundé from 20 to 30 June 1972, the following recommendations were adopted:

"The African States have equally the right to establish beyond the territorial sea an economic zone over which they will have an exclusive jurisdiction for the purpose of control regulations and national exploitation of the living resources of the sea and their reservation for the primary benefit of their peoples and their respective economies, for the purpose of the prevention and control of pollution."

It is further said there that the limit of the economic zone shall be fixed in nautical miles in accordance with regional considerations, taking duly into account the resources of the region.

As we know, the Preparatory Committee for the Third Law of the Sea Conference is now in its third year of work. It held four meetings in 1971 and 1972. It recently concluded its fifth meeting in New York and will have a last meeting in Geneva in July/August this year. It is very instructive indeed to study the records of the meetings so far and they show that all the documents to which I referred are being constantly referred to with increasing approval. In addition, new draft proposals have been submitted along the same lines and it is a matter of common knowledge that still more are in preparation for submission at the next summer session in Geneva. When the various proposals have been adjusted and perhaps amalgamated, there will be strong and indeed formidable support for the new system, based, not on the obsolete protection of distant water fishing nations, but rather on a functional approach to protect the coastal resources as forming a part of the natural resources of the coastal State, without affecting the general freedom of navigation in the area.

However, the distant water fishing nations are still advocating narrow fishery limits. On the other hand they favour wide limits for the exploitation of sea-bed resources. The reason is, of course, that they want to keep the coastal resources of their sea beds for themselves and at the same time to ensure their right to exploit the marine resources of other States.

In that connection I would like to recall a statement which the Government of Iceland made to the International Law Commission twenty years ago in May 1952. It was there said:

"Investigations in Iceland have quite clearly shown that the country rests on a platform or continental shelf whose outlines follow those of the coast itself whereupon the depths of the real high seas follow. On this platform invaluable fishing banks and spawning grounds are found upon whose preservation the survival of the Icelandic people depends. The country itself is barren and almost all necessities have to be imported and

financed through the export of fisheries products. It can truly be said that the coastal fishing grounds are the conditio sine qua non of the Icelandic people for they make the country habitable. The Icelandic Government considers itself entitled and indeed bound to take all necessary steps on a unilateral basis to preserve these resources and is doing so as shown by the attached documents. It considers that it is unrealistic that foreigners can be prevented from pumping oil from the continental shelf, but that they cannot in the same manner be prevented from destroying other resources which are based on the same sea bed.

The Government of Iceland does not maintain that the same rules should necessarily apply in all countries. It feels rather that each case should be studied separately and that the coastal State could, within a reasonable distance from its coast, determine the necessary measures for the protection of its coastal fisheries in view of economic, geographic, biological and other relevant considerations."

When we made that statement we were taking the first step to implement our law of 1948 to which I have already referred. We were at that time extending our fishery limits by 1 mile to 4 miles from straight base lines. This created a furore and the matter was taken up here in the Council of Europe. The Icelandic Government presented two memoranda on the subject to the Council of Europe when a landing ban had been imposed on Icelandic fish in United Kingdom ports, and a very useful discussion took place on that occasion. This ban was lifted in 1956 inter alia through the good offices of OEEC. And in 1958, when we extended the limits to 12 miles, the Royal Navy sailed to Iceland. The 12-mile limit was accepted by the United Kingdom in 1961 and adopted in United Kingdom waters in 1964. And now we are encountering new difficulties in connection with our new limits.

My government has had extended discussions with the Governments of the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany in order to come to practical interim arrangements with them which would take into account the prob-

lems with which the trawler industries of these countries are faced because of our extension of the fishery limits. I regret to say that we have not as yet been able to reach agreement, but further efforts will be made on both sides to solve these problems. That would be in the natural interest of all concerned in order to avoid the present dangerous situation prevailing on the fishing grounds where dangerous clashes are taking place.

In this connection it should be recalled that in September 1972 an agreement was concluded between Belgium and Iceland whereby arrangements were made to meet the problems of the Belgian trawler industry. While that agreement was being negotiated, Belgian trawlers stayed outside our limits, and I want to pay tribute on this occasion to our Belgian friends for their goodwill and co-operation which we highly appreciate.

Mr. President, although we, for reasons which I have explained, could not wait for the third law of the Sea Conference, it is the conviction of my government that our new limits have the support of the majority of the international community today.

It is our sincere hope that our friends in this Assembly will agree that, after a struggle of twenty-five years' duration, the time has come to face the facts and accept Iceland's role in the functional system now favoured throughout the world, whereby Iceland would contribute its share in the international division of labour by supplying fish from her own waters.

It is to express this hope that I have used the privilege of addressing the Assembly of the Council of Europe today.

Thank you, Mr. President. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Mr. Agustsson, whom I thank most warmly, has agreed to reply to questions by members of the Assembly.

Before calling the speakers who wish to put questions, I would ask them to keep to specific questions. They will have a chance to speak a second time if the reply does not satisfy them.

If members wish to make statements, I would ask them to make this clear. I shall call them

The President (continued)

later, after the exchange of questions and replies.

I call Mr. Rossi to put the first question.

Mr. ROSSI (United Kingdom). — In thanking the Icelandic Foreign Minister for coming to this Assembly and putting so clearly his government's case in this unhappy dispute with my country, I should like to put to him the following question.

Did not the Icelandic Government enter into solemn agreements with the United Kingdom and the Federal German Republic in 1961 giving her exclusive fishing limits of 12 nautical miles from her coasts and do not those agreements provide for the reference of any dispute over fishing limits to the International Court of Justice, to whose Statute Iceland is a party and with whose decisions she has undertaken to comply under Article 94 of the United Nations Charter?

If so, why will Iceland not show a respect for international law and submit her claims to proper legal processes instead of pursuing a course of violence as unhappily seems to be the case at the moment?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Minister.

Mr. AGUSTSSON. — Mr. President, I will answer Mr. Rossi's question to the best of my ability.

It is, of course, a well-known fact that in 1961 Iceland made an agreement with the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany in which a right was given to both sides to refer the extension of fishery limits to the International Court of Justice at The Hague. This right both the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany have used. But we have not chosen to send a representative, which we have a full right to do according to the rules of the Court, and thereby we in no way show the Court any disrespect — I want to emphasise that.

The reasons we have not sent a representative are the following: in this agreement it was

also stated that vessels from these nations should have the right to fish between 12 and 6 miles for a certain period of time. This time has long since elapsed and the United Kingdom has now taken 12-miles' fisheries jurisdiction herself. For twelve years we did nothing to implement our law — from 1948 — although we clearly stated in the agreement that we intended to do so.

From the Icelandic side we therefore claim that the agreement has achieved its objectives as we have given notice to two respective governments.

This agreement was not of a permanent nature and was therefore not made to last for ever. Although it has no termination clause, we have made use of the 1958 Geneva Convention in terminating this agreement by sending memoranda to both the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany to that effect.

Therefore, we do not consider ourselves bound by the jurisdiction of the International Court at The Hague and have given no consent ever since.

I hope this answers the question.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Mr. Rossi, are you satisfied?

Mr. ROSSI. — Mr. President, I am not happy with that reply. I would therefore like to make a short intervention, but I am in your hands as to whether I make my speech now or after question time.

THE PRESIDENT. — Would you make it now, please?

Mr. ROSSI. — Mr. Agustson has taken a personal part in the negotiations between his country and mine concerning fishing rights off the shores of Iceland and therefore nothing I can say will be new to him. However, since he has chosen to propound the attitude of his government before this multinational Assembly, I feel it only right to express some of the views of my own country.

Let me say at once that the United Kingdom recognises and understands the importance of fish and fish products to the Icelandic economy.

Mr. Rossi (continued)

We also recognise the importance of conservation of the fishing stocks to enable fish to breed and to continue to provide an abundant supply of food for the human race. That is why our interest is very similar to that of Iceland in many ways, for we too have large fishing communities utterly dependent upon distant water fishing and they supply half the fish that our people consume.

Therefore, the real question is: how do we balance this competitive interest of the British and Icelandic people in reaping the harvest of what still is at this moment our joint fishing grounds in law?

The International Court of Justice in August last indicated that the British catch should be limited to 170 000 tons a year. In the course of subsequent negotiations, the British Government have offered a reduction to 145 000 tons. However, the Icelandic Government suggest a maximum of 117 000 tons and have refused to move from this position. Surely, the measure of conflict having been reduced to one of numerical quantity, it could and should be resolved by the responsible negotiation and compromise?

Conservation of stock is essentially something to be controlled by agreement. If this were the only consideration there should be no problem at all, because the serious depletion is in herring which the British do not fish off Iceland. Our main catch is cod. Recent scientific reports suggest that the stock can sustain its present exploitation and, in any case, spawning stock is in the main caught by Iceland itself within the 12-mile limit.

The British Government have throughout been willing to discuss and have full regard to the interests of Iceland as a coastal State with special dependence upon fisheries, and to cooperate fully in trying to reach an agreement by discussions either at ministerial level or multilaterally within the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission.

Failing solution by negotiation, we are prepared to have the dispute resolved by the International Court of Justice under machinery laid down in an agreement to which the Icelandic Government, the British Government and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany are all signatories.

What we find totally unacceptable is the attempted unilateral abrogation by Iceland of an agreement solemnly entered into by the parties concerned and to be subjected to a territorial — in this case a maritime — demand for greater living space without having regard to the historic interests and rights of other nations.

Therefore, this is an issue which the action of the Icelandic Government places before this Assembly and the world at large in this form: whether international differences of this kind shall be resolved under the rule of law or whether nations revert to settling them by physical means. The choice is between international law and international anarchy.

The British Government have behaved, they believe, with considerable restraint in the face of continuing harassment of their fishing fleets and have responded to physical provocation simply by requesting further talks. However, there are limits to the patience and endurance of even the calmest of nations, and if Iceland were to attempt to seize a British vessel on what we consider are still legally the high seas and such a seizure cannot be avoided by means at present at our disposal, this, as our Foreign Secretary has said, can lead only to the intervention of the Royal Navy. It need not, and we pray will not, come to this. But the remedy and responsibility lie in the hands of the Icelandic Government.

We realise the problems of the Icelandic Government and the need they feel to discharge their promises to their own people. But this is a dilemma of their own making. We equally must take into account the feelings of the British people and the vital interests of our own fishing communities.

Therefore, all that we can do is to appeal—and I do so once again directly to Mr. Agustsson before this European Assembly—to the Icelandic Government to resolve our difficulties in discussions, in spirit of conciliation and cooperation, to honour international agreements

Mr. Rossi (continued)

and law, and not to follow a path of unilateral abrogation and of violence, an example which, if followed by other nations, can lead only to international anarchy.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Peart.

Mr. PEART (United Kingdom). — I think that the Minister has given us a fair summary of the Icelandic position. He said in his speech:

"I regret to say that we have not as yet been able to reach agreement, but further efforts will be made on both sides to solve these problems."

In other words, he agrees that there should be talks. Will not that means be a better way of solving the problem, as Mr. Rossi said earlier, rather than having incidents and harassment of fishermen from my country? Is it not better to have talks?

Why did not the Minister mention the International Court of Justice and the Interim Order of 17 August 1972, which states:

"The United Kingdom and the Republic of Iceland should each of them ensure that no action of any kind is taken which might aggravate or extend the dispute submitted to the Court."

I understand Iceland's position, but the Minister must understand that other countries, too, have rights. Is it not better to go on talking rather than harass people?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland.

Mr. AGUSTSSON. — We on the Icelandic side have from the beginning been of the opinion that we should solve the disputes with Britain through talks. It was in July 1971, the month in which we came to power, that the Icelandic Government sent a Minister to Britain to try to solve the dispute by negotiations. We have been trying ever since, but we have not succeeded. That is correct. But we have closed no doors to the solving of the dispute by negotiations. It is my hope that we can solve it.

Although there is a gap between us, I can safely say that it narrowed at the last meeting. Although I see no meeting in the foreseeable future, I am sure that we shall meet again, and it is my hope that we can solve the problem.

The indication of the International Court at The Hague is not a ruling. It is just an indication to both sides to do what the Court says. The final decision of the Court has not been taken. It will be taken later, and we shall see how that turns out.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Peart.

Mr. PEART. — I would rather not make a statement; I think that the question put my point of view.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Portheine to put three questions to the Minister.

Mr. PORTHEINE (Netherlands). — In appreciation of the Icelandic Minister, I want to express, as you have done, Mr. President, solidarity in general with this member State of the Council of Europe.

I want to ask the Minister to explain a little further. First, is Iceland alone able to exploit sufficiently all the rich fishing grounds around the island?

Secondly, would not this extension of the fishing limits mean a decrease in the supply of fish in the fish markets of Europe and elsewhere?

Thirdly, would not this result in higher fish prices?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland.

Mr. AGUSTSSON. — As we all know, the fisheries jurisdiction that Iceland has claimed is only 50 miles from base lines, so there is plenty of room left in the Atlantic for others.

We think that by our action we are doing two things — increasing our own share of the fishing, which is essential for us for reasons that I tried to explain in my speech, and at

the same time helping to conserve the fish stocks, something that is badly needed. Although Mr. Rossi said that the report shows that the fish stocks were exploited just to the extent that they could be exploited, we have other reports showing that they are over-exploited, and I think that that is the truth.

We think, therefore, that our move will in the long run result in more fish for everybody, which in turn should lower the price according to the law of supply and demand.

But if nothing were done, the only absolutely sure thing is that the fish would diminish, and the prices would be higher.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Wall.

Mr. WALL (*United Kingdom*). — May I ask two questions and waive any right to make a statement later?

First, the Minister referred in his speech to the dispute of 1958-61, and said that Iceland had lost its case by not getting the necessary majority at the two Law of the Sea Conferences. He did not mention that that dispute was ended by an international agreement referred to by Mr. Rossi and others. That is the first point I should like to press the Minister on. I have a copy of that agreement in my hand. It says that the Icelandic Government would continue to work for the extension of the limits, but in such event they were to give six months' notice. The Minister has already said that. It goes on to say that in the case of a dispute in relation to such extension the matter should, at the request of either party, be referred to the International Court of Justice.

I must press the Minister on that. Why have his government broken that treaty signed with my government? Why are his gunboats firing live ammunition at trawlers manned by my constituents? I saw one the other day with the bridge window shattered by rifle fire. Why have monetary awards been offered to Icelandic gunboats which capture British trawlers? Why are

these things being done in defiance of the ruling of the International Court of Justice, which was an interim order obeyed by my side but not by the Minister's?

I say straightaway that we respect the skill of the Icelandic seamen. We have a particular affinity and friendship with the Minister's country, as he knows only too well — we have discussed this many times. We respect the fact that his government allow the hospitalisation of any sick man.

We will agree — the Minister said this in his speech — that we are faced with no alternative between escalating violence, which is bound to lead to loss of life, or agreement. Here is my second question. The Minister will agree that the key to any agreement is the size of the catch. Our best catch a year ago was 207 000 tons. The International Court of Justice suggested a limit of 170 000 tons, which we agreed to. We have now decreased that to 145 000 tons, a reduction of 62 000 tons.

Iceland has made no compromise at all. All that we are discussing is a period of 12-18 months, an interim agreement, before the next Law of the Sea Conference, at which the Minister said he would win most of his points — and he may well do so. Therefore, I must ask him to agree that there must be an agreement on the size of the catch or there will be violence.

Would he not also agree that this dispute could escalate because of the party political pressures in Iceland, and endanger the whole North Atlantic Alliance? Are the Icelanders prepared to make a compromise on catch and to obey the interim order of the International Court of Justice and international law affecting the high seas?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland.

Mr. AGUSTSSON. — Mr. Wall put two questions to me. He began by saying that we did not get support for our extension of the fishery limits at the 1958 and 1960 Conferences. That, of course, is quite true and that is the

reason why there is no international law on the fisheries jurisdiction. That is a point I tried to make clear in my speech. Therefore, we find no hindrance in international law for the extension we have been making. We have terminated the 1961 agreement, as I said when I was answering Mr. Rossi's question, and we have not given our consent to the International Court's jurisdiction in this, for us, all-important case.

In the written question which I received from Mr. Wall, reference was made to "gunboats". These so-called gunboats are small coastguard vessels trying to implement what we consider our rights, according to the extension of the fishery limits. In very few cases have shots been fired. The reason for that being done has been British trawlers violating our regulations and fishing in conservation areas, trying to ram and sink our coastguard vessels.

The question was put to me whether we would like to continue discussions and negotiations. I think I have already answered that when I was replying to Mr. Wall. I repeat that we are willing to continue negotiations. We have given way in many respects, as Mr. Wall knows very well, because he is familiar with the subject as we have discussed this before. We have given in considerably. I shall not take the time of this Assembly to go into the details of our supposed agreements, but I emphasise that we are still willing to negotiate.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Prescott.

Mr. PRESCOTT (*United Kingdom*). — I should like to take the opportunity which you, Mr. President, offered of forgoing the invitation to put a question and making a contribution later.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Ahrens.

Mr. AHRENS (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, I would like to put three questions to the Minister.

The first one is: On what tenets of international law is Iceland's decision to extend fishing limits unilaterally from 12 to 50 miles based?

Does the Icelandic Government consider this measure in accordance with the international obligations assumed by Iceland in, for instance, the Council of Europe or the United Nations?

My second question is: How does the Icelandic Government justify harassment of ships and seamen of foreign nationality in an area declared open to the nations concerned for fishery purposes by a ruling of the International Court of Justice?

Thirdly: Is the Icelandic Government really seriously interested in settling the question under dispute by negotiation, and in a manner which takes due account of the concerns of fishermen of other States?

How does the Icelandic Government envisage such a settlement?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland.

Mr. AGUSTSSON. — I have already explained the reason why Iceland has extended her fishery limits. It is out of necessity, because we think that if we did nothing the fish stocks around Iceland would diminish and disappear like the herring stocks did, and we shall have nothing then with which to support our nation. We have seen no international law which denies us this right. We have discussed this before and we find that there is no international law on the subject.

I remind the Assembly that we are not the only country which has been extending its fishery limits. I believe that thirty-two nations today have a limit of more than 12 miles, and eight of them established that limit last year. No one had anything to say against that except perhaps a few comments which were made by the Spanish and the Moroccans. I shall not go into that. Many States have extended their limits without any objection being made by anyone. No one speaks about international law in their case; it comes into the picture only in our case.

If Mr. Ahrens contends that the 1961 Treaty is still in force, I should say that I have already answered that point. We do not think that treaty is binding any more on Iceland. We have terminated it and have not given our consent to the International Court of Justice jurisdiction.

We do not admit to any serious harassment on the sea. We are trying to implement our new 50-

mile rule. As I said when answering Mr. Wall, most of the time the British and German trawlers go outside that limit when the coastguard ships come in. It is only in very few cases that harassment is used, and as affecting German trawlers it is very few indeed.

The third question was whether the Icelandic Government are seriously thinking of solving this problem by negotiation. I shall answer Mr. Ahrens with the same reply as I have given to others — we are. It is true that we have recently had talks with Bonn to try to prepare a ministerial meeting between Icelandic and West German Ministers in which I hope we could find a solution which would be sufficient and would make both sides content.

I do not want to take too much time, so I shall end my answer now.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Ahrens,

Mr. AHRENS (Translation). — Mr. President, allow me first of all to thank the Minister for the frankness with which he put his government's point of view. I am sure he will not mind if I say that I am nevertheless not satisfied with his answer to my question.

No one denies the great importance of the fish stocks in Icelandic water for Iceland's population and economy. No person in his right senses would oppose a settlement aimed at protecting these stocks in the interest of Iceland, of other countries and ultimately also in the interest of a healthy environment — a problem which has frequently occupied us here.

However, I believe that the path pursued by Iceland will not lead to success — even for Iceland. The areas around Iceland are also of considerable significance for the deep sea fisheries of the Federal Republic, since 60 % of our deep sea catches come from those waters. We are therefore not merely concerned with maintaining our fisheries which, Mr. Agustsson feels,

could well be supplied by Icelandic fishermen; we are above all concerned about our fishermen and our fishing fleet.

In his speech and in his reply to a question by Mr. Portheine, the Foreign Minister of Iceland said that it was necessary to extend Iceland's fishing limits. He is, therefore, not merely concerned with protecting fish stocks. I cannot help feeling that the intention is here to repel foreign competition even at the risk of infringing international law. I do not think that such a procedure is likely to lead to success.

We have attempted, on our side, to put an end to the violence which has also affected our trawlers. Mr. Agustsson is aware that Mr. Koschnick, the Mayor of Bremen, had discussions with the Icelandic Government on this matter on behalf of the Federal Chancellor, Mr. Brandt. There have nevertheless been two further cases of violence since then. Violence may easily escalate; this is something over which none of us has any control, neither the Icelandic Government nor anyone else. We must not wait until human lives have been lost. All this is happening in an area in which, by ruling of the International Court of Justice, our trawlers have the right to continue fishing.

As regards a possible settlement of the dispute, we shall get no further if one side continues to repeat the same maximum demands. Iceland's last offer was an interim agreement to last two years. During these two years, German trawlers would be completely excluded from the 12 to 30-mile limit and German refrigeration vessels from the 30 to 50-mile limit over which only Iceland would have jurisdiction. An interim agreement lasting a mere two years is certainly not tenable for us. I should be delighted, also in the interests of the Council of Europe, if the talks - which as far as I know are to be held in the middle of June at ministerial level - produced a successful solution — a solution which would take account not only of Icelandic requirements but also of the vital interests of our fishermen, many of whom have followed this calling for generations and who must not now be deprived of their occupation.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Gessner.

Mr. GESSNER (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, we have heard that the Government of Iceland is contemplating a fourfold extension of fishing limits. This is a very considerable extension. It does not exclude the possibility that within a few years, a few decades or indeed at any time, the Icelandic Government may again demand a further extension of the fishing limits. It is necessary to view this problem against the background of possible further developments.

Does the Foreign Minister of Iceland not agree that if ever fourfold extensions became the rule, the principle of the freedom of the seas would be seriously jeopardised?

Moreover, we have heard that the Icelandic Government is not willing to wait for the third Conference on the Law of the Sea. The conclusion is that Iceland has acted unilaterally. It seems to me that this is a dangerous and recent precedent and one which might lead States to invoke this precedent in other areas of policy, and despite anything that might be on the agenda, claiming that on this occasion the international law family had raised no objection. I see in this a very great danger, and one which threatens the safeguards of law. I would be glad if Mr. Agustsson would briefly give us his views on this question.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland.

Mr. AGUSTSSON. — I was asked whether we would not make new claims for still more extensive fishery limits if we succeed in having a 50-mile limit. I will answer this question very truthfully. It has been our aim since 1948 to gain jurisdiction over the whole of the continental shelf around Iceland, which goes out in some places to 70 miles; so that will be our ultimate request — not demand. I do not believe we will request anything further, but we are not seeking absolute jurisdiction over the seas around Iceland. We are not going to forbid ships to sail in those seas. The only thing for which we are fighting is fisheries jurisdiction, which is quite another thing.

I am not sure that I fully understood the second question, as my English is not very good,

but it had something to do with what other nations would consider to be right with regard to fisheries jurisdiction. I believe this is what is happening in the world. As I have said, more than thirty-two States now have more than 12 miles of fisheries jurisdiction and the number of such States is increasing. We very often see that some new State is extending its fisheries jurisdiction. Our policy is that fisheries jurisdiction should be decided in relevance to the situation in each case, geographical, geological, biological, and so on, as I have tried to explain in my speech. I hope this answers the question.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Schlaga.

Mr. SCHLAGA (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, I am not yet well acquainted with the customs of this Assembly, but I am sure it is not possible to put questions to the questioner. Consequently, I must ask the Foreign Minister of Iceland to give me a reply. I have every comprehension for Iceland's situation and I do not intend to deal here with the extremely complicated international law situation.

Threats have been uttered by two members of this Assembly — members of the British delegation — that if Iceland does not give in, there will surely be violence, whereupon the British Navy would intervene. My question to the Minister is: How could such a massive infringement of Iceland's present territorial waters be countered? How does he envisage this? My other question is whether the Minister and indeed the Assembly do or do not see in this the violation of rights of a considerably higher order than those being debated here?

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland.

Mr. AGUSTSSON. — I am not going to predict what will happen if the Royal Navy comes into Atlantic waters. It came in 1958, and we were fortunate enough to lose no lives. We managed somehow to operate side by side, but we will in every case try to implement our new regulations with the limited means we have. We are not a naval power and we do not think it possible to enter into any kind of war with Great Britain. That is absolutely out of the question. But what

will really happen if the Royal Navy comes is something the future will have to answer. I cannot answer the question. I am sorry.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — There are no more questions.

I call Mr. Alemyr who wishes to make a statement.

Mr. ALEMYR (Sweden). — I should like to congratulate Mr. Augustsson on his excellent address to the Assembly.

Like all my fellow-countrymen who have followed the exciting drama of the volcano on Vestmannaeyjar, I sincerely hope that the town of Heimaey can be saved from the volcano's grip and that its patient and hardworking population will soon be able to resume their normal lives. The rescue operations have been exemplary and the calm and resolution of the Heimaey population have impressed us all.

I would like also to express my admiration to Mr. Agustsson for the excellent work done by his government and people to save lives and property. Sweden and other Nordic countries have shown solidarity with Iceland by giving substantial material assistance for the reconstruction of Heimaey or the resettlement of its inhabitants, but more assistance may be required in the future.

The attention focused on Iceland because of the volcanic eruptions has made us realise more clearly the vulnerability of this island's economy and its extreme dependence on its fisheries. In consequence our understanding of Icelandic claims for a further extension of its fishing limits is also growing, and I hope that this increased understanding will be shared by all those countries immediately involved in the exploitation of North Sea resources. I trust that the whole question can be resolved in a spirit of mutual understanding and reconciliation at the forthcoming Law of the Sea Conference.

As a member of a delegation which visited Iceland recently, I would like to express my satisfaction with what Mr. Agustsson said about the importance of the Council of Europe. I hope it

will be possible for him and the members of his parliamentary delegation to play a lively part in the work of this Organisation.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Yvon.

Mr. YVON (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, Mr. Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen, although I have the honour to chair the Assembly's Sub-Committee on Fisheries, I am not now speaking in that capacity but in a personal one, although I think I may say that several of my colleagues who are members of this sub-committee will agree with the points I have to make.

We know what difficulties Iceland is facing as regards its fishing areas which it has tried to protect by extending its territorial limits from 12 to 50 miles.

What is the reason for this measure, which it is not the sole maritime country to adopt? It is that in view of the intensive development of fishing gear and the considerable means deployed by large trawlers equipped with modern gear, the fishing grounds traditionally reserved for the Icelandic population will rapidly be exhausted. Overfishing is a very great danger to the populations which live almost exclusively from the products of the sea. And this is certainly the case of Iceland whose national economy is essentially based on such products.

A recent document published by OECD provides very interesting information on this subject. It shows that Icelandic catches have fallen considerably between 1965 and 1970 while during that same period United Kingdom catches in the same fishing areas have increased considerably.

The document which I have before me states that herring catches in Iceland, which amounted to 762 000 tons in 1965, fell in 1970 to 51 000 tons.

On the other hand, during that same period, between 1965 and 1970, United Kingdom catches increased from 99 000 to 145 000 tons.

Total Icelandic catches in that part of the North Atlantic fell from 1 185 000 tons in 1965 to 723 000 tons in 1970, while total United Kingdom catches increased during that same period from 954 000 to 1 014 000 tons.

Mr. Yvon (continued)

This shows clearly the size of the increase in United Kingdom catches in Icelandic waters, while Iceland's catches were diminishing in the proportions indicated.

We cannot of course disregard the fact that certain countries such as the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany have traditionally had rights in those waters which Iceland claims should be the preserve of its fishermen.

The International Court of Justice at The Hague was notified by these two States, and last year we could read in the press: "Will there be a cod war?"

In my opinion the problem has two aspects.

From the strictly legal point of view, may any country whatsoever prevent anyone exercising a right acquired by custom, for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of its nationals and of its economy? I think not.

But there is another side to the problem which cannot fail to move any individual who has any feeling for human values.

Is it possible to ignore the living conditions of the people of Iceland — two hundred thousand in all — who live on the edge of the polar circle in a particularly inclement climate and live essentially by fishing?

Should the unrestrained exercise of an acquired right be permitted to continue to the detriment of the future of a population worthy of our keenest interest?

It is worth mentioning the case of Norway which has just signed a free trade agreement with the European Economic Community.

At the time that country was considering the question of accession to the Common Market, your Sub-Committee on Fisheries suggested that the Community rule of free access to territorial waters be accepted by Norway after a ten-year trial period.

We know what the outcome of the Norwegian referendum was — non-accession of Norway to the European Economic Community because of the special situation of its fishermen. Since the referendum, the Sub-Committee on Fisheries of

the Council of Europe has visited the Lofoten Islands, and it noted that local conditions were such as to justify Norway's non-acceptance of the Community rule, in order to prevent the destruction of fishing grounds and a population exodus not to be conceived of.

This example shows that it is very important to examine problems on the spot in order to appreciate them fully. I still remember the remark made a short while ago by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland, namely that Iceland's survival depends on the solution of this problem.

It is surely appropriate that the Members of the European Economic Community should consider this problem. Since an agreement was recently reached with Norway, would it not be possible to reach an agreement with Iceland? This would surely make a humane solution possible, one which would allow Iceland to safeguard its future and at the same time allow Europe to preserve fishing grounds which the overfishing of these areas would certainly destroy. The solution, as many speakers have just emphasised, will be found in discussion, in negotiation, and not in the use of force, which would be an expression of despair.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Arnason.

Mr. ARNASON (Iceland). — As an Icelander I should like to say a few words in this debate. Mr. Rossi in his speech said that there were similarities between the British and the Icelanders regarding fishing: similar interests. As has been said here by our Minister, fish products constitute 80-90% of our exports, and fish constitutes 30-40% of our gross national product. But fish constitutes only 0.2% of the gross national product of the United Kingdom. So obviously if there is a similarity here between the Icelanders and the British, we are at least 150 or 200 times more similar to them than they are to us!

There has also been some talk of violence by Icelanders. Truly there is growing anger in Iceland because of the activities by the British trawlers and the vessels that the British Government has sent there to "protect" them, as it is called, and there are many reasons for this growing anger. One of them is that when the eruptions

Mr. Arnason (continued)

started in the Vestmannaeyjar Islands on 23 January and all our coastguard vessels were called to the rescue, the British trawlers increased their activities. This was not only within the new 50-mile limit. They also started fishing within the old 12-mile limit.

This happened under the very noses of the vessels that the British Government had sent there — vessels that are called Statesman, among other things. Englishman is another name. There is also an Irishman and there is a Lloydsman on the way. We expect the fifth one will be called Gentleman! This happened under the very noses of those vessels that the British Government claims were sent there to see to it that the trawlers respected the old 12-mile limit recognised by the British Government.

By the way, there are two skippers, two captains, on each of these vessels. One of them is a naval commander, and he has to take over when there are any incidents. That means, in my opinion, that the presence of these vessels constitutes naval intervention by the British. So when these vessels lie there and watch the British trawlers fishing within the limits the British Government recognises, the Royal Navy is to blame. This, as I said, is one reason for the growing anger in Iceland.

When the eruptions started, that meant the loss of our most important fishing town and we had to evacuate 5000 people, which is 2.5 % of the population of Iceland. It was similar to Britain having to evacuate a city of one and a half million people, or losing it completely, as a matter of fact. The houses there are being buried under ashes and lava. To give an example that my friend, Mr. Patrick Wall, might understand better, it is similar to Britain losing the city of Hull seven or eight times over. Of course, we did not expect any sympathy from the British trawlers when this happened, but I must say that we were startled by their brutal reaction, and since then many incidents have taken place that have increased the anger in Iceland.

There is much talk of endangering life, and it is claimed by the British that we are doing this.

What the coastguard vessels of Iceland are doing is cutting the wires of the trawlers. They are cut deep in the sea. The wire does not come up on the deck as a whip, as is claimed. It comes up loose. It does not cause any danger. The skipper, if he is responsible, will warn his crew. He gets two or three warnings before this happens, so there is no danger to life. The danger to life is caused by the British vessels, both the trawlers and the protection vessels, when they are trying to ram our trawlers and our coastguard vessels. They are trying to ram them right in the side, and ramming a vessel in the side is far more dangerous than firing a few rifle shots into the side of a trawler. If a vessel is rammed right in the side, that is comparable to sending a torpedo into it, with the explosion and everything that follows if the engine room is hit. There is a real threat to life there by the British, not the Icelanders.

Incidentally, Mr. Wall mentioned the few rifle shots that were fired at one of the trawlers. This happened after two or three trawlers tried to ram one of our small coastguard vessels which had no cannon on board. These people were threatened, therefore, with being sent to the bottom by these British trawlers if they did not do something. It so happened one of them had a rifle on board and he fired a few warning shots. I ask you to think this over when you may wonder sometimes what is happening.

I turn to what the British call "gunboats". They have not always been called gunboats. As a matter of fact, some of the guns or cannon on these boats are so old that their origin can be traced all the way back to 1874. They have lasted a very long time, because usually we do not use them. No shells are fired by them. There are no shells on board these vessels; they are solid balls. If, therefore, they were ever fired at the side of a ship it might result in a hole the size of a fist, but there would be no explosion. That is another falsification we have constantly to put up with in the British press. There are no shells. Icelanders have never sunk a ship up there in those waters, nor have the coastguard vessels ever killed anybody. On the other hand, they have picked up a few hundred British trawlermen from the sea. On those occasions the

Mr. Arnason (continued)

vessels are called not "gunboats" but "lifesaving vessels", which are what they are primarily.

Our Minister was asked what would happen should the Royal Navy be sent in. He said that of course one cannot tell for sure. To express my personal opinion, I would say that the loser in such a war would be the one who had the greatest number of guns.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Prescott, the last speaker.

Mr. PRESCOTT (United Kingdom). — Mr. President, we have heard statements from various parties, some representing my government's point of view and the industry's point of view, and some representing the Icelandic position. Mr. Arnason spoke as one of the latter. What he said may be understandable, but it was rather unfortunate because it does very little towards solving the problem.

As a member of parliament representing Hull, a constituency mentioned by Mr. Arnason, I am very interested in whatever agreement is reached between the parties in this dispute. I therefore have a very strong vested interest in the problem.

There is considerable sympathy — I express a personal point of view here as a member of parliament representing a fishing constituency in which capacity I meet many of the people involved in this dispute — in my country for a number of the reasons and justifications given for the extension to the 50-mile fishery limit.

However, there is no sympathy whatsoever for the harassment of civilian workers on trawler vessels, the firing of rifles for whatever purpose and the firing of shells or shots. If one were hit by either a "shell" or a "shot" I do not believe one would be able to tell the difference too much. Civilised nations do not pursue such courses of action if they wish to reach some form of agreement. I believe it necessary to say that in view of some of the statements that have been made and, in particular, as yet another incident was reported only on Monday involving an Icelandic gunboat and British trawlers.

There is considerable justification in the arguments put forward by Iceland for the extension of the 50-mile fishery limit as a nation which has the right to conserve its own natural resources, even though there may be a small distinguishing difference. I say "small" because I do not fully accept, because the Continental Shelf Act refers only to the sea bed and not the waters adjacent to it, that the principle applies to both. I refer here to the resolution recently passed by the United Nations. On that issue alone I therefore believe a reasonable case may be made for Iceland's position.

We have heard conflicting evidence on the question of the depletion of resources. From the figures given by all parties, there is clearly considerable over-investment in the fishing fleets of the world, not only in traditional kinds of vessel but, with technological developments, in ships that are sweeping the oceans clear of our natural resources. It is true not only of Icelandic waters but of other fishing areas that the catches have been decreasing despite ever-increasing intensive activities to reverse this trend.

I also believe that a nation is justified in adopting a certain attitude where it considers a depletion of its natural resources is a threat to its economy. The argument that 80 or 90 % of the total export effort of Iceland is devoted solely to fish or fish products is one we cannot ignore. Indeed, in all circles in Britain it is not ignored but is recognised as a very powerful point.

It is also justifiable, as I believe all nations recognise, to break international agreements, provided that sufficient notice is given so to do (as in this case Iceland did) if they are not serving to protect the interests of the country in question,

As to international law, we must here concede that the situation is very confused. There is no clear body of law to impose upon nations whatever decision may be reached. Therefore, because of this confusion, the International Court of The Hague, whilst undoubtedly having a valuable role as an arbitrator, cannot necessarily be accepted as a court able to make a judicial decision that must be observed in a case such as this.

It must also be recognised that world trends are away from the free laissez-faire philosophy of "the freedom of the seas" of traditional

Mr. Prescott (continued)

imperial powers like Britain from which they thereby gained and regarding which they have done everything to protect and preserve their interests. This applies not only to fishing but also to other interests. The move is away from the freedom of the seas towards conservation of our natural resources for the wealth of our planet with the objective of harbouring and developing these natural resources. This cannot be done in any capitalist way. I do not seek to make a political point here, but that is the fact. The profit motive can no longer be used to motivate the production of our wealth and the exploitation and waste of many of those resources.

As has been mentioned in the debate, many countries are now moving towards protection of their natural resources. This means they must extend their territorial limits in some cases and, as in these circumstances, their fishery limits.

Having said that, I wish to point out to the Council that this would not be totally acceptable in my constituency, nor would it be received very happily by many of those in my constituency who might or might not vote for me as the case may be.

The problem here turns on a recognition by all parties to the dispute of where the area of agreement is to be found and identified in order to make those compromises and sacrifices that both parties may necessarily have to make to enable them to reach some form of negotiated agreement.

The problem in the long term must be resolved by the law of the sea. We in Britain are concerned with the law of the sea, not only because of our fishery interests, but because, with the development of supertankers, the problem of pollution, merchant shipping laws and a whole host of other matters, we are greatly concerned that a proper body of law should exist for our open seas.

In the short term, the negotiated differences and agreements must be arrived at, as was mentioned earlier, possibly in a shorter period, say two years.

The agreement between Iceland and Belgium is not a proper or fair comparison, Belgium is not in the same position as Germany or Britain with regard to the consequences of any agreement between the present parties.

The short-term argument is on how we solve the problems. I shall not go into the economic details, but it is clear that Iceland has particular problems, greater than most. It is said that fish accounts for only 0.2% of the United Kingdom's gross national product, but in the port of Hull it represents 45% of our industry. A great deal of our investment and employment is involved in it, in a town where unemployment is higher than in Iceland and where the standard of living is considerably lower than that in Iceland.

In the adjustment processes to be made in agreements, there are sacrifices to be made. The challenge for the politician is to find the area for agreement. We have to find some form of agreement acceptable to all. The present position is not acceptable. It is not agreeable, and it is highly dangerous to all the parties. If I, as a politician, am prepared if necessary to make the contribution of losing face in my own area, and trying to justify my views there, I call on the Icelandic politicians, who may have taken certain postures in their domestic policies and feel that they cannot withdraw from them, to make a similar contribution, because those postures are possibly making the achievement of any agreement more difficult.

A negotiated agreement is to be found on the base amount. But the figure of 117 000 tons is one that in the short term it is not possible to reach agreement on.

In a short speech I have tried to state the problems that are for us as politicians to solve. The alternative to a negotiated agreement is force, something that must be rejected by all Members of the Council. There must be an agreement based on the laws of justice and equity. There is a solution to be found by the politicians, giving justice on both sides, but it will not be found by reiterating the incidents of the past and further inflaming the position.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Does anyone else wish to speak?...

Yesterday and the day before we discussed the future and the tasks of the Council of Europe. Today's debate has provided proof of its exceptional vitality and has shown that it has

The President (continued)

indeed a raison d'être. In conclusion let me therefore once again thank the Foreign Minister of Iceland for having given us the possibility of demonstrating the Council of Europe's vitality beyond the confines of the Assembly and of conveying our good wishes for the future.

7. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I propose that the Assembly hold its next sitting this afternoon at 3 p.m. with the following Orders of the Day:

1. Consumer protection

- Presentation by Mr. Darling of the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development on a Consumer Protection Charter, Document 3280 and amendments;
- Presentation by Mr. Alber of the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee, Document 3295;
 - Presentation by Mr. Primborgne of the

opinion of the Committee on Social and Health Questions, Document 3283;

- Debate and votes on the draft resolution and draft recommendation, Document 3280 and amendments.
- 2. Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development
- Presentation by Mr. Darling of the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Document 3282 and amendment;
- Presentation by Mr. Ahrens of the opinion of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities, Document 3296;
- Debate and votes on the draft resolution and draft order, Document 3282 and amendment.

Are there any objections ?...

The Orders of the Day of the next sitting are thus agreed.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

The Sitting is closed.

(The Sitting was closed at 12.55 p.m.)

APPENDIX

Names of Representatives or Substitutes who signed the Attendance Register in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure: 1

MM.	Aano Piket (Aantjes)	MM.	Marquardt (Kahn-Ackermann)	MM.	Castellucci (Preti) Radinger
	Abens		Karasek		Radius
	Ahrens		Kiratlioglu		Vontobel (Reverdin)
	Akçali		Külahli		Holtz (Richter)
	Alber		Gautier (Labbé)		Grussenmeyer (Rivière)
			Destremau (Legaret)	Q:	John Rodgers
	Alemyr Arnason		Reale (Leggieri)	Sir	Rossi
			Leitner	T 1	St. Helens
	Bergegren				
	Negrari (Bettiol)		Lemmrich	IVIIVI.	Reinhart (Schieder)
	Blumenfeld		Letschert		Schlaga
	Bohman		Leu		Yvon (Schleiter)
	Brincat		Leynen		Schmidt Hansheinrich
	Christiansen		Fitzroy Maclean		Schuchardt
	Collins Edward	MM.	Mammi	MM.	de Bruyne (Schugens)
	Cornelissen		Margue		Schwencke
	Czernetz		Mart		Shore
	Delforge		Mason		Steel
	Borg Ölivier de Puget	Mrs.	Miotti Carli		Stewart
	(De Marco)	Mr.	de Montesquiou		Hulpiau (de Stexhe)
	Dequae	Mrs.	Munkebye		Stinus
	Digby	MM.	Muscat		Cattaneo Petrini
	Enders		van der Werff (Nederhorst)		(Mr. Talamona)
	Dardel (de Félice)		Schlüter (Oestergaard)		Tanghe
	Fletcher		Oguz		Tisserand
	Capelle (Flornoy)		Öktem		Morris (Tomney)
	Aasen (Mr. Frydenlund)		Osborn		Üstündag
	Gessner		Peart		Van Lent
	Gislason		Wall (Sir John Peel)		Vedovato
	Grieve		Pendry	Dame	Joan Vickers
	Hansen		Péridier		Vitter
	Sjönell (Hedlund)		Péronnet		Voogd
	Hedström		Petersen Erling		Primborgne (J. Weber)
	Hocaoglu		Petit		Weiberg-Aurdal
	Holst		Portheine		Schuler (Wenk)
	Prescott (Jones)		Bizet (de Préaumont)		Wiklund
	Frescon (Jones)		Dizer (de l'Ieaumont)		Zaloglu
					Zatogiu

List of Representatives absent or apologising for absence:

-		
MM. Amrehn	MM. Goëss	MM. Pecoraro
Arnaud	Hofer	Pica
Averardi	Jung Louis	Quille ri
Beauguitte	Kempfler	Renschler
Collins Gerard	Kristjansson	Salvatore
Coppola	La Loggia	Schmitt Robert
Dankert	Mende	Sieglerschmidt
Desmond	Minnocci	Treu
Dregger	Nessler	Mrs. Wolf
Feyzioglu	O'Leary	Mr. Zamberletti

^{1.} The names of Substitutes who replaced absent Representatives are printed in italics, the names of such Representatives being given in brackets.

TWENTY-FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION

OFFICIAL REPORT

Seventh Sitting

Thursday 17 May 1973, at 3 p.m.

	Minutes	205	Adoption of the draft recommendation (Doc. 3280): Recommendation 705.	
3. 4.	Change in the membership of a committee Consumer protection (debate on the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Doc. 3280 and amendments, the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee, Doc. 3295, the opinion of the Committee on Social and Health Questions, Doc. 3283, and votes on the draft resolution and draft recommendation)		5. Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development (debate on the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Doc. 3282 and amendment, the opinion of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities, Doc. 3296, and votes on the draft resolution and draft order) Speakers: The President, MM. Darling (Rapporteur on Doc. 3282), Ahrens (Rapporteur on Doc. 3296), Urwin, Roper, Steel, Dame Joan Vickers, MM. Osborn, Radius (Chairman of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities), Alemyr (Chairman of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development). Adoption of the draft resolution (Doc. 3282): Resolution 544.	228
	Amendment No. 1:		Draft order (Doc. 3282):	
	Speakers: The President, MM. Reinhart, Darling (Rapporteur).		Amendment No. 1: adoption of the amendment.	
	Rejection of the amendment.		Adoption of the draft order as amend-	
	Amendment No. 2: rejection of the		ed: Order No. 336.	
	amendment.	ł	6. Date, time and Orders of the Day of	
	Adoption of the draft resolution: Resolution 543.		the next Sitting	

Mr. Vedovato, President of the Assembly, took the Chair at 3 p.m.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Sitting is open.

1. Minutes

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Minutes of Proceedings of the last sitting have not yet been distributed and will be submitted to the Assembly in due course.

2. Attendance Register

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The names of those Substitutes present at this sitting which have been notified to me will be published in the list of Representatives appended to the Minutes of Proceedings and to the Official Report of Debates.

3. Change in the membership of a committee

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Netherlands delegation moves the nomination of Mr. Piket as Alternate on the Committee on Agriculture.

Are there any objections ?...

The nomination is agreed.

4. Consumer protection

(Debate on the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Doc. 3280 and amendments, the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee, Doc. 3295, the opinion of the Committee on Social and Health Questions, Doc. 3283, and votes on the draft resolution and draft recommendation)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Order of the Day is the debate on the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Document 3280, and on the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee, Document 3295, and the opinion of the Committee on Social and Health Questions, Document 3283, on a Consumer Protection Charter, as well as the votes on the draft resolution and draft recommendation, Document 3280 and amendments.

I call Mr. Darling, Rapporteur of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development.

Mr. DARLING (United Kingdom). — The main part of the report which, on behalf of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, I ask the Assembly to adopt, is a list of principles to guide the scope and content of legislation which we present in the form of a European Consumer Protection Charter.

The need for protective legislation has been recognised for centuries. I suppose it began with the first attempts to have standard weights and measures enforced by royal decrees or magisterial rules, so that in buying the basic necessities of civilised life — bread, meat, clothing, spices and fuel — the people would get standard quantities for their money.

From the beginnings with these simple rules each country has developed its own system of

protective laws to protect people from being cheated by traders who may give short weight or misdescribe the goods they sell to the detriment of their customers, and protection against adulteration of foodstuffs — watering of beers and wines — and protection against goods that are dangerous to the health and safety of the public.

All these laws, extended and enlarged over many years, are concerned with trading standards. Today we live in a complex society in which years of technical progress have given even the poorest among us a great variety of goods to buy. We enjoy the benefits of mass production, increased purchasing power and a massive extension of markets, and with all this social and economic progress we face an equal widening of the opportunities for fraud by unscrupulous traders. We have to contend with the misdescription of goods and services, with health and safety hazards and unfair practices, and for our protection in all these trading activities we must impose by law a comprehensive net of trading standards.

But these standards, by which all trade must be conducted, are devised not only for the benefit of consumers; they are necessary also for the protection of honest traders against dishonest competitors. Trading standards are not solely concerned with the prohibition of dishonest or unfair trading practices; they have also a positive side in promoting good methods of helping consumers to get improved value for the money they spend.

The Charter we therefore present in this report sets out the standards to which we believe consumer trading practices should operate in our modern and complex society. It is in one sense a narrow Charter, for the new concept of consumerism that has become popular in recent years ranges beyond trading practices.

It expresses people's concern for the quality of life in a much wider sense, concern for the environment, concern to clean up and prevent pollution, concern for clean air and pure water supplies, concern to avoid dereliction and the problems created by the disposal of industrial and domestic waste. But we cannot cover the whole field of consumerism, important though all these issues and problems are to all of us as consumers.

Mr. Darling (continued)

The Charter, therefore, is limited to expressing the rights and wellbeing of consumers in their multitude of trading transactions; but even limited in this way it covers an immense field. Just how enormously wide it is can be gauged by each of us here if we pause to think of our own daily, weekly or monthly trade transactions, the things we buy, the services we ask to be provided for us. We take our protective laws for granted, but there is some law governing every bit of shopping or trading in which we have engaged.

I have mentioned standard weights and measures and these are essential basic rules of trade. There are laws governing the purity of food and drinks, laws for credit trading, laws for the labelling and advertising of goods and so on. But not all in any country are fully satisfactory. Some are incomplete, inadequate or out of date, and the enforcement of protective laws is not always as effective as it might be. Neither is what we have called active assistance to consumers sufficiently recognised.

The Charter attempts to lay down the principles which should guide the scope of protective laws and the provision of legal redress for fraud or damage, and the range of advice and assistance that consumers should have as rights. It has been compiled from a comprehensive study of consumer legislation and administration in many countries, and in preparing it we have had the advice and assistance of OECD and the EEC Consumer Division, and the help of trade associations and of voluntary consumer organisations.

I cannot say that all the views expressed to us have been incorporated in the Charter. That would have been impossible for in some cases the views were contradictory. We have had to avoid giving examples of what are clearly excellent legal innovations — excellent, that is, for the countries concerned; for, as we point out in the report, the institutional structures and legal traditions differ considerably as between countries and therefore each must adapt the principles that we offer to its own circumstances. We also say that the harmonisation of consumer laws and practices throughout the countries represented here is not yet a feasible proposition. Each country has, or should have,

common aims and choose its own way of achieving them.

The Consumer Policy Committee of OECD in this excellent report has listed the objectives of consumer action under five heads: protection against hazards to safety and health; protection against deceptive and other unfair practices; provision of adequate rights and means of redress; provision of information and education; and involvement of consumers' representatives in the formulation of regulations and economic policies that concern them. This is the pattern we have followed in preparing our own Consumers' Charter.

We begin by offering a legal definition of a consumer. This itself is difficult and we felt it necessary to express it in a rather general way, but to make it clear that we are concerned only with consumer rights in trade transactions. We then go on to say that legal protection is essential but is not enough. We say that governments must give consumers active, not passive, assistance, by ensuring that full information about the composition and performance of goods and services must be provided where this is considered to be necessary, and that education courses should be available to children in schools and also for adults.

There have been some criticisms of the Charter on the grounds that it does not specifically mention certain trade practices that we would consider undesirable and should be banned. We have incorporated some of these, such as the demands that are made by some companies for payment for unsolicited goods; but the laws and practices differ so much, as we have discovered, that we have had to keep to rather general proposals. For instance, the right to cancel a doorstep agreement within, say, one week would not be a specific rule in some countries; but we try to cover this in a general reference to acceptable terms of sale.

Equally we have had to avoid a reference, for example, to the Swedish Ombudsman and his market court which has been set up to consider and judge consumer complaints. We could give other examples. For example, we in the United Kingdom have about 500 Ombudsmen to look after the welfare of consumers and I believe we have devised in the United Kingdom what is to us a much better form of administration

Mr. Darling (continued)

through the trading standards offices of local authorities. These offices now have powers to provide free shopping advice, advice on complaints or the prosecution of complaints in the courts, effective help in getting financial compensation where a legal offence is proved, and also of asking our courts to act as arbitrators where trader and customer are in dispute; and to do this with very low legal costs.

I am of course prejudiced in all this. I believe that the British administration of consumer protection is the best and most effective in Europe or North America. After all, I had some ministerial responsibility for some of the legislation. But it would be quite wrong to offer the British system as a model for other countries. It would simply not fit into their legal traditions and methods. But, as I have said, there are common principles to be observed; and an essential one is that consumers, through enforcement officers or consumer organisations, or directly, must have easy and inexpensive access to the courts for the prosecution of offenders, and redress for damages.

It has also been suggested that we should say that legal action should or must be taken at the place of the consumer's domicile, but this again would not always be possible or even in the consumer's interest in some of our countries. Easy access, we think, adequately covers the point.

I have mentioned the importance we attach to giving adequate information about goods and services to allow consumers to know what they are buying and make a rational choice between competing products and services. We refer to the important provision of government support to voluntary organisations of consumers, which we say should be consulted on legal rules and regulations; and we suggest that consumers should have the right to be represented in the management of State-owned industries and public services such as transport, electricity, gas and postal services. We take note of the voluntary codes of trading practices that many trade associations have developed to check unfair or dubious methods — in advertising, for example, in selling goods or in providing services. Where such codes are clearly beneficial to consumers and not detrimental to them in any way, we ask that they should be recognised and supported, and we would like them to take on a European character.

These are the main points of our Charter, a European Consumer Protection Charter. Mr. Alber, for the Legal Affairs Committee, has given an opinion in which he said that to call the principles we have put forward a Charter was perhaps too ambitious, but this view has not been pressed by his committee and I am glad and grateful to the Legal Affairs Committee for agreeing with us that we should try to make the fullest possible impact on the general public and show that the Council of Europe is concerned about their welfare. No one would disagree that we need to demonstrate our concern in a Charter that can be publicised and generally understood. I am grateful also for the constructive comments of the Committee on Social and Health Questions.

For these reasons, I hope the Assembly will not accept Mr. Reinhart's two amendments. We cover a very wide field and there is much more work to be done in examining the consumer protection laws and administrations in all our countries to advance in more detail from the more general views that we express in the Charter. In the draft resolution and the draft recommendation, therefore, we ask the Committee of Ministers and the Council of Europe itself to continue to examine many of these problems incorporated in the report.

The Council of Europe has a very special vocation to look after the individual. It was we who created the Human Rights Convention and the Social Charter, but we have also recommended a whole series of measures to improve social and living conditions, particularly for the more vulnerable sections of the population, the aged, the homeless, migrant workers and so on. No other body in Europe has this experience and no other organisation has this attachment to the individual. The European with whom we are concerned is a person. He must be our main concern and we must live up to his expectations. Not only should we remind ourselves constantly of this but we should also devote more of our energies and legislative skills to devising even better guarantees for the individual. The Consumer Charter is another step in that direction.

Mr. Darling (continued)

Intergovernmental co-operation is quite extensive and supremely important; it is carried on by several other organisations. Nevertheless, we, as an assembly of parliamentarians from the whole of Western Europe, have a very special duty to go beyond the governments towards the citizen. We cannot afford merely to pay lip service to democracy and freedom. We have to demonstrate to the individuals we represent what these notions mean in practice. Our Consumer Charter shows that we are not the defenders of an abstract economy; we prove it by our concern to protect the consumer. We are presenting guidelines for legislation to protect him and his freedom of choice, and this is our Assembly's special contribution to Europe.

Our Assembly, as the largest parliamentary forum in Europe, has the same duty in respect of all spheres of European co-operation. It is incumbent on us to keep watch from the point of view of the individual on the whole of the democratic process in Europe. It is up to us to safeguard not so much the functioning of organisations but rather respect for the individual's rights and aspirations in building a new Europe. I suggest that this should be one of the constant themes of our debates in the future.

Today I have the great honour of asking the Assembly to accept our proposals for this European Consumer Charter.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Darling.

I call Mr. Alber to give the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee.

Mr. ALBER (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is one of the aims of the Council of Europe to promote social and economic progress and to further the protection of the individual and the defence of his rights. These aims are secured by a comprehensive and active policy of consumer protection. Our Assembly has been giving close attention to this matter. There is a direct line leading from Recommendation 624 (1971) on the legal protection of the consumer — for which I had the honour of being

Rapporteur — to the draft Consumer Protection Charter before us now.

Exactly one year ago, this Assembly instructed the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development to prepare — in consultation with the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on Social and Health Questions — common principles establishing minimum conditions of consumer protection and assistance in Europe.

Mr. Darling deserves our thanks for not interpreting this task in a restrictive manner. He is proposing a Consumer Protection Charter. We are all agreed that it is right and necessary to have such a charter. But the concept "charter" implies high demands and standards and calls for specific, precise and comprehensive provisions. I feel that the Charter under consideration does not accord with this concept in every respect. I would therefore, personally, have prefered to describe the proposals put forward as "common principles establishing minimum conditions of consumer protection" or whatever terms were used in the order and to wait until these had been further elaborated and amplified before adopting them in the form of a charter. Mr. Darling thought it more expedient, in view of the importance of consumer protection, to draw up a charter straightaway. His approach may well be the right one, and so perhaps we should not quibble too much over the name of the brain-child whose birth which is after all the main thing - gives us all so much satisfaction.

We all agreed, too, that the provisions of the Charter will have to be further developed and adapted to present-day requirements.

Our reservations are not, therefore, criticisms, for we fully approve Mr. Darling's report. They should be interpreted rather as a desire for greater precision and scope. I can imagine that the same wish is shared by Mr. Darling, who has worked so hard to promote effective consumer protection.

Let me illustrate my plea for more specific provisions with some examples. The list cannot be, nor is it intended to be, exhaustive, for it is not possible to mention all the items individually in the short time available. I shall start with the definition of the concept of "consumer". It runs: "A consumer is a physical or legal person to whom goods are supplied and services provided for private use". This definition is too broad, as it includes middlemen, big consortia, registered

Mr. Alber (continued)

traders and others. I believe, however, that the term consumer, as we understand it, should exclude all members of the trading profession and be restricted to the final purchaser, who has no inside knowledge or experience of the market and is therefore at a disadvantage.

Another example of this lack of precision is to be found in Section A (ii) of the Charter, which says that the State has a recognised duty to give consumers comprehensive legal protection and active assistance, or in Section C (ii), which states that the purchaser shall have the right to any information or warning necessary to enable him to use a product or service safely and to his full satisfaction. All this is right in itself. But, in my opinion, it is not enough simply to say what should be done. It ought also to be specified how it should be done. I know that this is difficult, but we must have the courage of our convictions.

By stating in paragraph 3 (a) of the draft resolution that each member State should implement the principles set out in the Consumer Protection Charter in accordance with its own traditions, we are ourselves creating the risk that national laws will develop along different lines. We could and indeed should obviate this by specifying more clearly how we believe the principles should be put into effect. Let us take, as an example, the general conditions of a contract: it would not be a good thing for one country to require general approval of these conditions, while another left them in small print, and a third insisted on all conditions derogating from the law being physically and visually separated from the others, or whatever other possibilities there might be. The result would be hopeless confusion.

Let us take another instance. The individual consumer shall be protected against the abuse of power and, in particular, against one-sided standard contracts. Agreed — but how is this to be done? Should such contracts be prohibited? Should they be voidable? Should it be possible to cancel them within certain timelimits — and if so, what are these to be? Prerequisites, conditions and legal consequences should not be left entirely for national legislation to settle; rather should we point the way and propose guidelines from the start.

At another point the text states that "detailed information provided on the label shall be accurate". No one will quarrel with this. But the decisive factor is what should appear on the label, I welcome the fact that Section C (iii) provides for certain mandatory regulations. It is particularly gratifying that specification of the production date and keeping time is required. Frequently, tinned goods merely bear the warning that the contents will keep only for a limited time, even in cold storage. Such indications are pure eyewash when no date of manufacture is given.

As already mentioned, Section C (iii) contains labelling specifications. These are, however, still not quite complete. For example, the manufacturer's full postal address should be required. In addition to information on the ingredients in foodstuffs, particularly in the case of fruit and vegetables, details should also be given of the kind and quantity of the fertiliser and/or pesticide used. The health aspect, especially, deserves more attention as it is more important than the purely economic considerations.

With regard to the right to damages, it is stated that provision must be made for easy and inexpensive access to a judicial authority. This is certainly necessary. But here again, ways and means should be indicated in order to avoid extreme diversification of laws. Relevant questions here concern local jurisdiction of the Court, the burden of proof, the right to seek redress, the role of the Ombudsman, and the arbitration board or court. It should be possible to find uniform solutions to these matters, too.

More thought should be given to the burden of proof, in particular. In Section B (ii) it is merely stated that "where there is a prima facie case of misdescription of a product or service to the detriment of a consumer, the burden of proof shall rest with the supplier". This seems to me superfluous for, if it is a prima facie case, then surely no further proof is necessary. It would have been desirable to settle the question of the burden of proof in a general way for normal cases.

There are one or two further points in which greater precision would have been an advantage.

But let me now go on to the second part of my commentary, to more rights for consumers,

Mr. Alber (continued)

for it is undoubtedly true that one can do no more at international level, to start with, than concentrate on the lowest common denominator. But it would be desirable to show how far legislation in the individual States already goes in this regard. Although, for the time being, we can achieve only minimum standards, we ought nevertheless to set our sights on maximum and optimum conditions.

I should like to dwell for a moment on the right of the consumer to information and the duty of the State to conduct consumer research, which are covered in Sections C and E of the report. It is right and proper that full information should be made available to the consumer. I believe, however, that such information should include the results of tests. The question might be considered whether individual products, especially of a technical nature, should not be subjected to a general test and the results centralised. The test number would then have to be mentioned on the label or brochure so that anyone could enquire about the results at the appropriate place.

This proposal may at first seem a rather alarming one. But I believe that ultimately it would even encourage healthy competition and would not cause any discrimination. For hotels and restaurants, we have the Michelin and Baedeker guides and so on. Each hotel makes efforts to get another star and no one feels that this classification is discriminatory; on the contrary, it is regarded as a mark of distinction. It may be a long time before this principle is applied in the economic world too. But it is not to be ruled out.

Consumer rights should also include a more extensive after-sales service, for the purpose of not only mending faults, but especially of carrying out the repairs necessitated by normal wear and tear resulting from constant use. Every supplier should be obliged to operate a repair service. Many people buy a washing machine from a large store. If repairs are required after a few years, that is, long after the guarantee has expired, the store often lacks the necessary facilities and the electrician round the corner is unwilling to do them because the machine was not bought from him in the first place.

One way of simplifying eventual repairs would be to standardise spare parts. There is no need for every machine to have different screws and thread sizes or for every car to have its own wheel-size or style of bumper. Standardisation would be greatly to the advantage of the consumer.

One is tempted to extend the theme of consumer protection to other neighbouring and related sectors, from shop-closing regulations to legislation on publicity and advertising. Unfortunately, there is not enough time to go into this in detail, although it would also be fascinating to talk about extended opening hours for shops or the admissibility of creating needs through advertising, for example by means of publicity by children and for children. I shall just briefly mention a few points.

When consumer protection is being considered, reference must also be made to certain areas of environmental protection, and I am thinking particularly of packaging materials, non-returnable bottles and all the virtually indestructible plastic products. We must find some solution to this problem.

Where the protection of the environment is concerned, it frequently happens that firms alter their products according to the country of export. This is a well-known fact, especially in the motor-car industry. Whether exhaust-filters are fitted or not depends on the national legislation applicable. This should not be. The best and most effective device should be available everywhere, and not only where it is required by law.

The same is true of safety requirements. For example — to keep to motor-cars — safety-belts should not be fitted only in cars which are to be exported to countries where they are compulsory. One is tempted to suggest introducing a kind of "most favourable conditions" clause as far as environmental protection and safety regulations are concerned, in the interests of consumers and users.

Safety should mean more than the mere absence of danger. To take the example of cars yet again, is it absolutely necessary for each model to have the switches for the lights, windscreenwipers etc. in a different place? Someone who rents a car may be surprised to find, if he chances to have to switch on the windscreen

Mr. Alber (continued)

wipers quickly, that he had got hold of the cigarette lighter instead.

I would like to mention one more related field, namely the law on patents and licences. One hears occasionally of inventions being bought up and never exploited. Cases range from the everlasting electric bulb to ladies' non-ladder stockings. This is not a healthy situation. If we wish to make real progress, then the most must be made of inventions. This might, of course, cause difficulties to many a firm, but these could be solved by transitional arrangements and industrial conversion aid. In order to protect consumers' and users' interests, all inventions ought to be applied and exploited.

Last but not least, I should like to take this opportunity to thank all the bodies concerned — consumer protection associations and trade organisations — for their work. I hope that they will continue to lend us valuable guidance in the work of elaborating the Charter.

To sum up, I would like to say that we welcome this Consumer Protection Charter.

We feel, however, that many points require to be made more precise and specific. There is also a need to extend the scope of consumers' rights and of the provisions for their protection in an effort to attain not just minimum but maximum standards. Moreover, the related fields which I referred to in my closing remarks should be included in future discussions. The further elaboration of the Charter to meet present-day needs is not only a duty but almost a challenge for us. We must and shall accept this challenge.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Primborgne, to give the opinion of the Committee on Social and Health Questions.

Mr. PRIMBORGNE (Switzerland) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the interest aroused by the report submitted by Mr. Darling on behalf of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development has led the Committee on Social and Health Questions to give its views on the Consumer Protection Charter.

Our opinion concerns socio-economic and health aspects. They can be summed up as follows: consumer protection has become necessary because of the consumer's position and conduct in modern society.

Advertising together with the large amounts of ready money makes the consumer vulnerable, since the acquisitive instinct is no longer or barely restrained by thought.

In this connection we shall make a general comment. We are not unmindful of the insufficiently developed situation of many sections of our respective populations. Whether we are thinking of the "powerful consumer", the one who chooses very deliberately what he wishes to buy, or whether we are thinking of the one who is swayed by the "hidden persuaders", we must recognise that in most cases producers are in a better position than consumers.

We do not say that the first always do exactly what they want, but we do say that the fact that they are organised makes it easy for them to prevail over those who have few or no means of organised protection.

Our opinion also refers to goods and services which the State and the local authorities supply to the public. Here too the users are seldom consulted and this situation is to some extent due to the absence of machinery to draw attention to the need for this.

The Committee on Social and Health Questions considers that there is a need for measures to protect the consumer because there are certain advertising and trade practices which must be opposed.

We are also of the opinion that the consumer needs to be protected against himself. The committee has therefore pointed out the need for a simplified procedure, for the setting up of bodies to deal with consumer complaints and able to make binding decisions, with the possibility of appeal.

As regards the purchaser, we wish to recall Resolution 29 adopted in 1971 on "Consumer education in schools". Such training is to enable the consumer to act in a discriminating and informed manner.

Mr. Primborgne (continued)

Information on the quality of goods and services offered must not be invalidated by misleading advertising. Here again we recall Resolution 8 adopted in 1972 in which the Council of Europe asked the governments of the member States to take certain measures, both of a legal and practical nature, to protect consumers against such publicity. We suggest that the Assembly should watch with keen interest how the governments implement such measures.

Nor should we overlook the consumer organisations which have borne and are bearing responsibilities and costs which the States could at least share, if not take over entirely, and which should in any case receive financial assistance. The public authorities should also be interested in the establishment of quality standards, whether at the production or at the sales stage. In the latter case, correct labelling will ensure a proper relationship between seller and buyer.

To sum up, social and economic aspects require a charter which will provide a solid basis for the above-mentioned measures. We are, however, of the opinion that any real consumer protection policy must not be restricted merely to the legal approach, but should also actively promote knowledge among consumers of the goods and services available to them and stimulate the improvement of quality. It seems to us that the consumer's first task is to learn to choose. It is necessary to find means of counteracting the almost innate tendency to choose the most expensive item without making sure that the choice is justified by the quality.

The opposite is no more desirable. The defects of the cheap product should not be ignored, as one of our experts demonstrated at a meeting of our committee. Clearly consumer education should not be one-sided.

Let us now look equally briefly at the health aspect of consumer protection. Our concern is mainly concentrated on measures to reduce sickness and death rates, we know that these are closely dependent on the level of nutrition, the

safety of pharmaceutical and other chemical products and the safety of the numerous household appliances available and means of transport.

This does not mean that we are forgetting the great amount of work done by health and hygiene services in many of our countries. A charter would certainly facilitate the general implementation of these health measures, particularly if the implementation of Resolution 26 adopted in 1968 on the protection of foodstuffs, which calls for political, legal and administrative measures in the five areas which we shall recapitulate, is insisted upon: first, food shops or retail handling units; secondly, food vending machines; thirdly, retail distribution of frozen foods; fourthly, hygienic preparation and handling of food in restaurants, clubs, canteens and other such places; and fifthly, markets, stalls and vending vehicles.

We also wished to comment briefly on the possibilities provided by the partial agreement under which ten member States co-operate. We mention the suggestions contained in it in order to show the great significance for the consumer of our earlier work on foodstuffs, pharmaceutical and cosmetic products. It would surely be a good idea to review what has been done in this field, where people certainly have much in common, and to obtain Council of Europe recognition of their requirements.

The promulgation of a charter which for the first time allows of a comprehensive approach to consumer protection is a matter for satisfaction. We shall thus facilitate the working out of various measures at national level while ensuring better co-ordination at European level.

In the view of the Committee on Social and Health Questions, this co-ordination has been insufficient. The 1973-74 Intergovernmental Work Programme contains an item headed "Consumer protection: consumer education—preparation of a recommendation to governments". That is why we have requested that, in view of the work in progress and to ensure that the document in question is applied, a

Mr. Primborgne (continued)

general study should be made on the state of consumer protection policy from the legal, economic, social and health point of view.

It is therefore right that a paragraph has been added to the document now under discussion, containing our recommendation, namely that the Committee of Ministers should provide the Assembly with a comprehensive report on the progress made in its various intergovernmental activities relating to consumer protection and in particular on the implementation in Council of Europe member States of the relevant resolutions adopted by the Committee of Ministers, including those adopted in the framework of the Partial Agreement in the social and public health field.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the committee on behalf of which I am reporting notes with satisfaction that the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development has complied with this wish and that it supports the draft submitted.

I would also mention that the Committee on Social and Health Questions did not approve Mr. Reinhart's amendments at the meeting held this morning, and that it hopes they will be rejected.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I thank my eminent colleagues who presented the report and the opinions of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, of the Legal Affairs Committee and of the Committee on Social and Health Questions.

The list of speakers will be closed in fifteen minutes.

I call Mr. Wiklund, the first speaker in the debate.

Mr. WIKLUND (Sweden). — In business relations the consumer is nearly always the weaker partner when compared with the producer. It is therefore gratifying that this report has been produced, containing a draft Consumer Protection Charter embodying the general principles for improved consumer protection within the member States of the Council of Europe.

I congratulate Mr. Darling most warmly on his excellent report. I also find the opinion of Mr. Primborgne and the Committee on Social and Health Questions on the report to be a document of great value and interest.

By and large, I find myself in general agreement with Mr. Darling's report and the protective principles proposed therein. However, I should like to make a few general remarks.

First it does not seem out of place to supplement the proposed text of the Charter to some extent, namely, in paragraph A (iii) which deals with the duty of the State to ensure that consumer protection and assistance be effectively afforded to all sections of the community, and especially to the poorest sections. These sections or groups enjoy no freedom of choice, and in extreme cases they cannot act as consumers at all. It might sound a bit hollow to make pronouncements on consumer protection without at the same time giving a reminder of the important fact that society should afford these sections such social assistance that they can act as consumers in the proper sense of the word.

I have to admit, however, that the question of social welfare properly belongs not to this subject but rather to the Social Charter, which will be dealt with tomorrow.

But since that particular sentence or paragraph appears right at the beginning of the proposed text for a Consumer Protection Charter, it draws special attention to itself and so becomes a bit provocative as it stands. These poorest sections of the community have to be given the real possibilities of being consumers if we are to be entitled to speak of their rights to consumer protection at all.

I should like to react a bit against paragraph A (b) (v) of the Charter, where it says that:

"An advertiser unable to provide such proof" —
a specific type of proof mentioned in the paragraph —

"shall, if so requested, issue at his own expense equivalent corrective advertising."

I think that that is to go too far. Will you please, Mr. Darling, give us some comments on that last part of the paragraph, because we Swedes have difficulty in accepting it? I should like it to be deleted or better considered during the further treatment of the Charter.

Mr. Wiklund (continued)

Paragraph 3 of Mr. Primborgne's opinion elaborates on the need for

"Special bodies ... to deal with consumer complaints, and ... entrusted with the power to make binding decisions with the possibility of appeal."

I should like to refer to the fact touched upon by Mr. Darling that Sweden has had for a number of years already a special consumers' Ombudsman for the protection of the consumer's interests and to deal with consumers' complaints.

I also want to underline in this context paragraph A (a) (iii) of the draft Consumer Protection Charter, which speaks of the need for minimum standards for protection against damage due to unsafe products. I think that I know, by and large, which kind of products are alluded to here.

However, I would like to go a bit further at this point and cite as an example second-hand cars. A buyer of such a car should not only have the possibility of complaining about defects by applying to a suitable organ to obtain redress after he has bought the car. Legislation should also exist to the effect that such second-hand cars must be tested within a certain time limit before the sale takes place, and at that test meet certain minimum standards. Then the buver would avoid having to seek redress only after the defects had appeared. They will have been discovered beforehand, as far as possible, through the advance testing. The same goes for other products, the properties of which might and should be tested already at the production stage.

This leads me naturally to the information questions. It is my general impression that the draft Consumer Protection Charter perhaps shows too much belief in the effectiveness of consumer education and consumer information — see paragraphs C and D. Of course, we should give information to present consumers and education to future consumers. The two sections C and D should possibly even be expanded somewhat, particularly Section D (ii), which is a bit thin as it stands. The same point, by the way, is strongly emphasised in point 4 of Mr. Primborgne's opinion.

Alongside efficient consumer information, consumers may also be protected through special legislation of a kind that has been introduced, for example, in Sweden. One of these laws is our law on improper trading practices. According

to a general clause of the law, a producer or tradesman, for example, may be forbidden to use such advertising methods as are deemed to be contrary to proper business practices or to mislead a buyer.

I also have in mind a new Swedish law on domestic sales. This gives the consumer the legal possibility of breaking a purchase contract domicile. Thus the entered into in his buyer is legally entitled to break a contract by writing to the seller that he no longer accepts the agreement. This right to break a contract runs for a week, which is called the "repentance week". In the domestic sales situation the buyer of, say, a carpet or a cleaner is frequently unable to make proper comparisons as to price and quality on the spot, but he can very well do so afterwards. He is easily overwhelmed by an efficient salesman's stream of words. The law does not, however, for the time being cover cash sales or sales by telephone to people in their homes. Proposals to this effect are being prepared at present.

I wish to return for a moment to the question of consumer information. Such information has a good chance of reaching the consumer provided it is available in the actual buying situation or at the moment when the product is to be used. In certain cases this information is of the utmost importance. As an example, I draw attention to medicines which frequently contain a narcotic substance of some kind or other. By means of a careful declaration of content, it should always be made perfectly clear to the user what serious risks such a medicine might entail when used, for instance, in combinations with alcoholic beverages, which is particularly dangerous when driving motor vehicles.

In the short run, a substantial improvement in consumer information might also be achieved if retailers of capital goods were obliged in the first place to keep up to date sets of testing reports or declarations of content conspicuously available in their shops or displays. Then consumers could gain a better survey of all choices available on the market. Local or regional information centres may also be created, as has already been done in some places. This is alluded to in Section E (iv) of the draft Consumer Charter.

The contribution which I intended to make covers much more, but my time is now up. I am inclined to support Mr. Reinhart's amendments.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call

Mr. Portheine, who will also be speaking as Chairman of the Liberal Group.

Mr. PORTHEINE (Netherlands). — I am very grateful that today we can discuss Mr. Darling's report dealing with a Consumer Protection Charter and that the Assembly of the Council can start laying down and accepting some essential basic principles for consumer protection incorporated in the Charter. I am convinced that by setting up this Charter the Council will be performing a very valuable task. Many European institutions have deliberated on these questions, and this Council and the Assembly act, live up to and give very good proof of what can be realised in the sphere of human economics as mentioned in the opinion adopted by the Assembly last October and which also appeared in the report on the future of the Council of Europe by Mr. Reverdin which we discussed this week.

At first I was of the opinion that this matter was of such importance, not only in its content but also because the collaboration of seventeen countries could be obtained, that we could have made the Charter into a draft convention. I have been convinced since then that the procedure would take a long time, and I want the Charter to be practicable at once. Therefore I agree with the chosen procedure of recommendation. Then the Assembly and various national delegations gathered here have the duty of implementing these general principles in detailed deliberation in their various countries. That underlines what Mr. Alber of the Legal Affairs Committee has said on this point.

Mr. Alber also said that there should be an internationally harmonised model for this legislation. This also is my ideal. I underline the necessity for it. I believe it politically not wise to say, as I regret Mr. Wiklund said, that we should not today accept all these points as general ones. I say we should accept them today, and after that we shall have the task of evolving internationally harmonised legislation in which the Legal Affairs Committee can perform a very important function.

I make a further remark about the general principles not going into enough detail. There should be a draft convention when necessary, but now, because of the time factor, we have not a draft convention and the procedure of a recommendation has been chosen, so that we can have these general principles followed by legislation

in the national governments. I repeat that there should be an internationally harmonised model for this legislation.

I must insist on the name "Charter". The impact on the consumer internationally and nationally of that word is so great that other things such as "minimum principles" and so on, as suggested in Mr. Reinhart's amendment, will not do. I insist on the name "Charter", and this refers also to our performance this afternoon and especially the impact on the consumer in the various countries of Europe.

In my opinion the content of this Consumer Charter speaks for itself. Nevertheless, I want to speak generally on points which I believe are important in it. Before doing so I want to express deep gratitude to the Rapporteur, Mr. Darling, who has given himself a tremendous amount of work and has been very helpful in meeting the various ideas brought forward by the members in the Economic Committee. One could perhaps describe it as a Darling Charter, in both senses agreeable to the consumer, him or her. The Charter stems from the basic idea that there are many common interests of the consumer and the trader, especially small and medium-sized enterprises, in certain essential fields of consumer protection. In this connection I would refer to the control of restrictive practices, to effective administration of laws prohibiting unfair trading, to the requirement that advertising shall not be misleading, to the setting up of an independent authority representing the interests of consumers and traders and finally to the suggestion that there should also be the possibility of the setting up by trades of private codes. It is an idea of mine that there should be objective enforcement between trades and consumers of these codes such as that which is working in my country in the fur trade.

All these lines that I have mentioned go in the direction of a sense of the common interests of consumers and trade interests, but there are in addition many other important points, such as the innovation of the right to redress the legal side and information for the consumer about regulations particularly in the field of labelling; and, last but not least, the necessity to educate children to act as informed consumers in the future, as represented, for instance, in my own country by the Family Council. These are already essential lines of consumer protection. These should be completed with other activities of the Council already in progress or undertaken as mentioned, for example, in the report of Mr. Primborgne of the Committee on Social

Mr. Portheine (continued)

and Health Questions. I refer to the field of health protection. There are already what are, in my opinion, partial agreements; and there is the necessity to maintain and broaden these. There are also draft conventions in this field of health protection. These are proof that the Council is working on various points of consumer protection, and especially protection in the health sector.

Other points mentioned by the Committee on Social and Health Questions are to be added to this and I accept that there will be work in other fields. Mr. Darling's report mentions that studies are to be undertaken. All this only underlines the very valuable step we take today in enumerating the general principles in this Charter. I hope that the Assembly will recognise this very valuable initiative, valuable not only to the interests of the consumer but also to the interests of the image of the Council of Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Fletcher.

Mr. FLETCHER (United Kingdom). — I put my name down to intervene in the debate because I anticipated that we would have a rather vigorous debate about the Darling Charter, if I may so describe it. There is always a conflict, when a Charter of this kind is presented, between those who want to present it now and want the document to become a kind of green light to other parliaments and other organisations, and those who feel that it must be held back in a pigeonhole until every last detail has been settled and decided. I thought there might be a difference between these two points of view here this afternoon, and I was prepared vigorously to participate in favour of sending out a Charter from this session of this Assembly, however imperfect that Charter might be in certain details.

As Mr. Darling is well aware, there is argument in the United Kingdom about the precise legal definition of a consumer. This argument is flowing at this moment into the debates on a major bill going through the British Parliament. I suppose I should be passionately interested in these definitions, but I confess I am not because it is totally impossible to define what a consumer is, whether the definition is attempted by a lawyer or by a poet. We just

have to accept that to use the word "consumer" is to define not a person but a changing relationship.

We are all producers and consumers, sometimes at one and the same time, usually at different times: so we have to settle for the kind of attitude we adopt when we are in the field of zoology.

I cannot describe an elephant zoologically accurately, but I would recognise one if one walked into the Assembly. I cannot describe a consumer in a way that would satisfy legal counsel advising the Department of Trade and Industry in my own country. But I recognise myself in the consumer relationship and I know what a consumer is, broadly speaking. I happen to be the most incompetent consumer in the United Kingdom. If it were not for the sage advice of my wife, I would be swindled by every "con" man in London, to say nothing of other cities I visit from time to time.

On the Charter itself one could make many detailed suggestions. I am particularly interested in the passages dealing with advertising, but I do not think it would be very helpful if we concentrated too much on that this afternoon because for once I believe it is not so much parliaments that we should be thinking of in sending out this Charter but associations outside parliament. We have them in our country, and in the United States of America, in the person of Mr. Ralph Nader, the consumer protection movement has assumed almost gale force. It is perhaps the most significant single political current operating in American politics today. Mr. Nader, from being an author, has now become a political force.

We should bear in mind those in the Consumer Association in the United Kingdom and in similar organisations in other countries so that they will feel that this Council, when it has finished with such weighty questions as the relationship between the United States and EEC and the problem of the environment, has found time this afternoon to deal with what appear to be very mundane problems which go right to the heart of many of our major economic problems.

If we do not have intelligent consumption, in which intelligent choices are made continuously, we cannot have an efficient economy. The economy is geared to the market. If the market is not functioning effectively, if there are no sanctions against the inefficient or the useless, if the consumer is not making a choice between

Mr. Fletcher (continued)

the useful and the useless, then a large part of the operating mechanism of the economy itself is being lost, to the detriment of the economy as a whole. The role therefore of the consumer in present-day society is one of paramount importance.

I feel instinctively that to shore up the consumer with a large battery of State or quasi-State protection seems rather silly. When I go to buy a used car — the only kind I can afford — I do not want to pass first through seven government offices and two local authority ones.

I also find the idea of consumer education — unless its scope is widened — rather silly at first glance. If, however, we broaden that term to include such propositions as the provision of State assistance to organisations like the Consumers' Association so that they can give freely to the whole population what now has to be paid for by a relatively small section of the population, then we tackle this problem in the correct way.

There are some problems which defy solution. The Darling Charter states quite correctly that we have to do something about misleading advertising. We all know to what this refers. In my experience, however, all advertising is misleading since very little of it is directed to reason. It is directed rather to the instincts and operates almost entirely on a level at which what is suggested is infinitely more important than what is said. It is suggested, for example, that if I drink a certain type of beer I shall acquire enormous muscles and every girl in the United Kingdom will chase after me. No self-respecting motor car manufacturer would dream of presenting his latest model unless a half-naked girl is sitting on the bonnet; there is an association between the car and the pleasurable things of sex. One can do nothing about this kind of advertising but it is nevertheless misleading, because in fact ownership of a certain car can have no connection with the quality of one's sexual performance.

In presenting a Charter of this kind, with which we can quarrel in detail and in which we can pick holes, we are performing a valuable service to those who sent us to the parliaments who in turn sent us to this Assembly. I hope that the voluntary organisations in all the countries represented at this Assembly will take up this Charter, bring pressure to bear on parliaments and governments and transform it into

a major step forward, not only in the protection and education of the consumer, but also in the improvement of the standard of living of all consumers.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Voogd.

Mr. VOOGD (Netherlands). — I have nothing much to add to the excellent reports of Mr. Darling and Mr. Primborgne. They are, as one would expect from these Rapporteurs, both sensible and thorough, and I agree with their conclusions.

I have no particular proposal therefore for a modification of their conclusions and recommendations, but I would like to comment on one particular point which they raise. On several pages of both reports mention is made of the influence on the consumer's life of the modern mass media and of advertising. I would like to comment on the influence, the impact, of advertising in broadcasting and television on our pattern of life.

The first thing to be realised is that often consumers are persuaded, without their being aware of it, to buy things they hardly need. I shall not dwell on this because since Vance Packard's Hidden Persuaders — referred to in Mr. Primborgne's report — we all know examples. I remember the advertisement — this time in an American paper, but it has appeared a great deal on television too — showing the photograph of a lovely child with a tear-stained face and carrying the sub-title: "Parents, could you refuse your dear child a colour television set any longer?"

We must be aware of the fact that, notwithstanding much reasonable, factual and even cultural examples of television advertising, consumers are often lured into purchases because they are told that if they do not use a special kind of toothpaste, of washing powder or of deodorant they are committing a crime against their families.

Another remarkable thing is that the way in which consumers are often approached from a television screen is almost an insult to them. We are spoken to as if we had just learned to read, write and hear. I will not say that we are spoken to as if we were children because that would be to insult our children. The smooth, reassuring, simplified way in which we are told that only if we buy the products of such and such a company can our conscience be clear,

Mr. Voogd (continued)

our body healthy, our character pleasant and our soul pure is a clear example of not taking people seriously, and of considering them as yet unemancipated. It is a constant annoyance that in a society which is based on citizens being emancipated and capable, advertising companies apparently do not recognise that they have a task in this too, and I take this opportunity to appeal to them to amend their ways.

But there is a further and more serious aspect on which I hope you, Mr. President, will allow me to say a few words, even though it concerns us more as citizens than as consumers — but then consumers are citizens too.

What generally in advertising, and more particularly in television advertising, is presented to us is the picture of a so-called "normal" pattern of life: a family, man, wife, two children, reasonably well-to-do, lovely dogs and cats, living in peace, a car, a washing machine, a nice house. They are well dressed, they never quarrel, they are pleasant, clean people, free, in most cases white, and over 21.

I am worried that this picture is affecting our view on and our relations with other people. It is this so-called "normal" family on which we test all those who do not live up to that pattern. They are not "normal", they are "different"; they are, in fact, not as they should be. Sometimes we think it is their own fault that they are not "normal". Sometimes we realise that they cannot help it, and then we pity them. But anyway they deviate from what we have in mind as being "right" and "normal", as this is presented to us and is forced into our minds by advertising. In other words, we are discriminating.

Of course, in most of our countries we are not discriminating in the disgusting way that it is done, for instance, in South Africa and Rhodesia. We are tolerant people and we accept those who do not live up to the pattern of the TV advertising: old aged, spinsters, unmarried mothers, disabled persons, non-white people, long-haired youngsters, homosexuals, cannabis smokers etc. But nevertheless, even if we accept them, very often our tolerance does not go so far that we really integrate them in our society. We consciously — or, more often than not, un-

consciously — make them feel that they are "not like us" and that if possible they ought to become like us, that is to say, conforming to the family pattern that the commercial television spots present.

There is a real danger in this. It may be thought that I am exaggerating, but I am convinced that problems will arise if we are not aware of the danger. The situation of migrant workers is a well-known example. Although I may be a little out of order again, I should like to take this opportunity to appeal to those who bear responsibility in this field to do their utmost to prevent a silent discrimination creeping into our society as a result of this false and distorted picture.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. De Clercq.

Mr. De CLERCQ (Belgium) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, in his capacity as member of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities, our colleague, Mr. Minnocci, had intended to speak on Mr. Darling's excellent report.

Since he is unable to deliver his comments in person, I shall do my best to summarise them.

He notes first of all that in the industrialised countries much has been said about the Consumer Protection Charter, but that, unhappily, little has hitherto been done, and that the local authorities, which by their nature are the basic units of citizen representation and could play a strategic role in this question, are practically powerless either because of their often outmoded structure or because of the lack of precise rules to fall back upon.

In some ways, the crisis situation in this field is dramatic because of the size of the forces involved — population, consumption — which increase continuously, to the point of involving all production factors and the whole of society.

The next question is: what is the cause of this crisis? It is due to the consumer relinquishing — consciously, subconsciously or unconsciously — all forms and possibilities of control over an immense and varied range of products and services available, even over his own output as well as over that of others, over

Mr. De Clercq (continued)

all decisions and any choices which affect him directly or indirectly.

Noting that is is necessary to prepare the proper machinery to prevent information addressed to the consumer from causing further damage, Mr. Minnocci sums up the means of action as follows:

First, joint action: consumer organisations, representatives of undertakings, advertisers, journalists and politicians.

Secondly, various kinds of individual and joint control by the producer, by advertising agencies and different information agencies.

Thirdly, public control by means of civil and penal legislation.

Generally speaking, public control is most effective, because it is the only control which can impose adequate penalties. It should be exercised along the following lines:

A. Legislation obliging producers and tradesmen at every level to provide a precise, full and comprehensible definition of the characteristics of the products sold or the services offered without resorting to illustrations, descriptive writing, packaging and other methods to divert attention from the product and to make the customer believe that it is better than or different from other products.

B. Control and complaints' bodies which could be regional committees whose members would be representatives of different trades and occupations.

In this connection, Mr. Minnocci pointed out that the necessary training — which had hitherto been conspicuous by its absence — could be taken over by the local authorities.

In his view, the work programme of the local authorities for the protection and information of the consumer should aim at giving the public generally, as well as the qualified sections of the public, access to local authorities in order to facilitate and stimulate their work. It should also aim at devising different and indirect forms of information and participation and at organising broad exchanges of views.

After again recalling the aims of the Consumer Protection Charter, Mr. Minnocci emphas-

ised that the local authorities could provide a very effective machinery for this.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mrs. Aasen.

Mrs. AASEN (Norway). — Mr. President, I wish to make a few general observations in the debate.

I think it is correct to say that there is a growing interest in consumer policy in our countries and a growing awareness on the part of the consumer of the need for increased protection through legislation in this respect.

In Norway, we have a special ministry for consumer questions. We have had a consumer council since 1953, and very recently a consumer Ombudsman was appointed.

In spite of the fact that we have improved and extended our legislation to protect consumers, it is obvious that legislation alone is not enough. It is of great importance to extend the knowledge about products of different kinds, their quality, their costs and, most important of all, their place in our society.

Consumer policy is often too narrowly defined. Consumer policy more broadly defined would give people a chance to take part in the decision-making which is of interest and importance to them. Consumer policy should also educate people on how best to spend their money from the point of view of economy and equality.

The influence of the consumer on production and distribution of goods must also be increased. Improved standards of living mean not only an increase in private consumption but also increased demands for public services. It is, I believe, a task of the utmost importance to change the situation which in many respects is characterised by poverty in the public sector and affluence in private consumption.

We must support the creation of bodies that can increase the influence of consumers on the production of goods, public services and political decision-making in various spheres. Consumer information must be given in a way that will make it possible for the individual consumer to make a real choice based on a real demand. This can be done by limiting the harmful influence

Mrs. Aasen (continued)

of advertising, by education and by information of importance to the consumer.

An active policy must also be pursued on the way society can function in order to promote full equality between men and women.

In the light of this I wish to see a Consumers' Charter, which I would welcome.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — There are no more speakers on the list.

I call the Rapporteur.

Mr. DARLING (United Kingdom). — Mr. President, I entirely agree with Mrs. Aasen that to have a Charter which looks after the trading interests of consumers is not enough and that we must look at the quality of life in the community. I also agree with her that improved standards of living involve improved public services. But to try to bring all these factors into a Charter that is primarily — and I would think it ought to be solely — concerned with trade transactions would make the Charter too long and, accepting that its purpose would be to make an impact on the public, would probably make it extremely confusing.

I owe Mr. Alber an apology. I was so impressed with some of his arguments when I attended the Legal Affairs Committee that he will see, if he compares the provisional with the final report, that many of his points have been incorporated. For instance, in the definition of a "consumer" we have added three words which I hope he will find acceptable. We now say that a consumer is a physical or legal person to whom goods are supplied and services provided for private use.

Mr. Fletcher has pointed to the fact that a discussion is currently taking place in connection with a bill now passing through the British Parliament on the definition of a consumer.

In British legislation, as I mentioned to the Legal Affairs Committee, there are four different definitions of consumers. In each case, the definition given is for the purposes of the legislation in question, In one case, the consumer is defined as a person to whom goods and services are supplied. This of course could include tradesmen themselves because they are the consumers of goods and services. That, how-

ever, was for the purpose of that act where it was proper for the wider definition to be used. The Fair Trading Bill to which Mr. Fletcher referred seeks to define the consumer more or less in the way now expressed in the Charter. It excludes the trader from being defined as the consumer, but again that is for the purpose of that legislation.

Mr. Alber said he wanted more precise provisions in the Charter in future, the point Mr. Wiklund took up. It is an attractive proposition, but I must warn anyone who wishes to get involved in making more precise provisions and in widening the scope of the Charter what he must face up to.

I can do this by quoting British examples. We have 20 acts of parliament dealing exclusively with consumer protection. Some of them are major laws covering a very wide area. Some of them are wide in scope but small in the wording of the act because the act provides for the government to introduce regulations in order to give specific legal provisions on specific subjects. Every day we continue to add to the number of regulations.

At present as regards narrow consumer protection — "narrow" in the sense that we are dealing with trading transactions only — we have in the United Kingdom more than 200 specific regulations dealing, for instance, with the amount of lead that can be used in the paint on children's toys, with the labelling of pesticides and herbicides, with the design of babies' sleeping cots so that they do not fold up and harm the baby inside, with the design of oil-burning stoves so that they will not fall over and set houses on fire and so on. We are adding to these every day.

If we are to put all these points into a Consumers' Charter, it will be incredibly long. Already the stack of legislation is enormous. To get down to specific definitions in my view would be an impossible task and would make our attempt to lay down the principles on which all this legislation should be based quite impossible.

Mr. Alber hit on one difficult problem that must be understood when he said that the general conditions of sale which take us into the law of contract but are very important in regard to consumer protection differ between the various countries. He was, I believe, pleading for some harmonisation. This can be achieved.

A convention has been approved by the United Kingdom Parliament, but I understand it has not been approved by many other countries, on the international sale of goods. It does not provide for the harmonisation of regulations or laws, but it says that if an offence is committed through misdescription or whatever may be involved in the legislation, the parties to the contract — one party in one country and one in another — can decide beforehand which law they will accept in the case of a conflict between them.

If they do not decide beforehand, they can decide which country's law they will accept after they become involved in the conflict.

With that example of the difficulties of getting general agreement, we see that the harmonisation of laws and regulations, and achievement of the specific, precise provisions that have been asked for, are completely impossible at present. For instance, in much of our legislation we in the United Kingdom have to express the legal provisions differently for Scotland than for England, because our two legal systems have been built up quite differently.

I should like to give one important example. Under the general legislation dealing with consumer protection, and the misdescription of goods in particular, in England and Wales the prosecution of an offence is done by the trading standards officer, the man who used to be the weights and measures inspector, one of the 500 Ombudsmen that I talked about, employed by the local authority. But in Scotland he cannot prosecute. A prosecution can be undertaken only by the prosecutor employed by the local authority, who prosecutes for everything, no matter what the offence; he is certainly not restricted to consumer protection. Therefore, we cannot leave the matter to harmonisation if we want to make progress.

Mr. Alber said that we must not leave the matter entirely to national legislatures. I am afraid that we must for some time to come, but we should press as best we can for as much harmonisation as we can achieve.

Mr. Alber's point on after-sales service is covered. We refer to it specifically. We also refer to standards, saying that minimum standards shall be set and enforced in certain fields.

It will be very difficult to lay down in a Consumers' Charter how the design of safe cars

shall be achieved. We must leave that to other authorities, but we can at least say that we want everything to be safe, without specifically mentioning cars. In fact, that is what we do in the Charter, saying that goods shall be safe and they shall not cause any health or other hazards.

I agree with Mr. Primborgne that producers' powers and strength and the powers and strength of consumers must be matched. We cannot have one more powerful than the other. That is what we are trying to achieve. Although the producer can be strong without any legislation to assist him, the consumer's strength is embodied in the protective legislation that we can provide. I quite agree — in fact, we set it out in the Charter — that consumers' organisations should receive State assistance so that they can speak on behalf of consumers and help them.

Mr. Wiklund made the point that the consumer's position must be strengthened in our trading transactions. I hope he will accept that the Charter covers all the points he raised. It is a matter of wording. He said that social assistance must be given to help people to become effective consumers, that the poorest people in the community are not effective consumers because their pockets do not contain enough money. I agree with him, but I do not know whether in a charter of this kind we should go further than we have done to say that the poorest sections of the community should be properly looked after, that their welfare should be our concern.

I have been asked to say what I think about the section on advertising, particularly the statement that:

"An advertiser in any media shall be required to provide on request a proof of the validity of claims made in an advertisement."

The request could come from anybody, but it would be valid only if it had a legal sanction behind it, so we go on to say that:

"An advertiser unable to provide such proof shall, if so requested, issue at his own expense equivalent corrective advertising."

I am not happy about that, but it was the committee's wish that it should be put in, because it was requested by almost all the consumer organisations that we consulted.

I think that there is a far better way of achieving the object, which is to prosecute the person who commits the offence of misdescribing goods in an advertisement, on a label or wherever it may be, and to make the penalty so

effective as to be a deterrent. I am sorry to keep quoting United Kingdom experience, but obviously I know it best. Our experience in the working of our law dealing with dishonest advertising, deception, misdirection, shows that the deterrent of a number of prosecutions is really effective.

Under that one act alone the local officers with the job of enforcing it are dealing with about 100 000 consumer complaints a year. Many of the complaints are trivial. Most should not and do not result in prosecution. Some of them arise from inadvertent mistakes and so on. In many cases it is much better for the officers to get in touch with the trader responsible for the misdescription and say, "We do not want to say that you have committed an offence. We do not want to prosecute you. The easiest way to deal with the matter is to give the customer her money back or replace the article." That happens in about 70 % of the cases. About 20 % of the cases are trivial, and about 70 % are dealt with in the way I have just described. Only about 10 % are prosecuted in the courts. But that 10 % amounts to a really effective deterrent.

We should keep the wording in, because the consumer organisations have suggested it, but in general I believe that an effective act, a law, dealing with misdescription of goods is far better than asking the advertiser to put the matter right by a corrective advertisement. He does not commit an offence to begin with, and the person who has been misled may not see the corrective advertisement. It would be much better not to have the misleading advertisement in the first place.

I turn to the question of second-hand cars. Although the words in the Charter do not seem to have any relation to cars, the question of proper description, whether a car is roadworthy or not, is covered by the next paragraph, which says:

"Detailed information provided on the label, at the point of sale or in advertisements, shall be accurate. This includes information on nature, composition, quantity, performance, availability, quality, price and antecedent characteristics of the goods and services."

In other words, there must be a full and honest description of the second-hand car. We could also say in a Charter of this kind, perhaps, that all second-hand cars should be tested before they are put up for sale, but if we started with that, the list of goods which had to be considered in that way would be too long.

We have dealt with consumer information education. I agree that it might be extended. I agree that the proposition in the draft recommendation also covers test reports and their availability. We say that we want consumer advice centres and that they should be easy of access - in other words there should be plenty of them. We say in the draft recommendation that intergovernmental work should include a further inquiry into "the provision of national and local consumer advice services". In any case the results of tests are covered by paragraph (iv) E, the right to representation and consultation. By that we mean that the consumer should be able to ask for information about the results of tests which have been carried out.

I must thank Mr. Portheine, not only for the kind words he said about me and the Charter itself, but for performing a very great service in the Economic Affairs Committee when we were preparing the Charter. I think he would allow me to say that I treated him as the representative of honest traders' interests just to make sure that we did not commit any mistakes on that front. Mr. Portheine carried out that duty which I imposed upon him — if that is the way to express it — very well indeed, and I am very grateful to him.

I know that Mr. Fletcher would not wish me to reply in detail to his very kind remarks. I agree with Mr. Wiklund that the influence of television advertising and the influence of mass media advertising certainly does induce people to buy things which they do not want or really need, but I do not know how one could stop that by legislation. I quite agree that much of the advertising is insulting to our intelligence. We have discussed this, but again I do not see how we can legislate for good taste and, shall we say, adult advertisements in place of advertisements which, it has been said, would not be applicable even to undeveloped children. This is a problem, but I do not think we can state in a Charter how legislation should be devised to deal with it.

On the final point by Mr. De Clercq, speaking for Mr. Minnocci, I agree about the important part which local authorities have to play in all this. I had better not pursue that any further

because this is where we run into differences in our various countries. In the United Kingdom we use local authorities almost completely for the enforcement of legislation in this respect and as advice centres. They will also be in charge of the advisory services all over the country. I naturally agree with what was said by Mr. Minnocci, but the suggestion that this should be the system for all other countries requires much further examination.

I thank all Representatives who have contributed to the debate, and I hope that the Charter can be approved without amendment.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Margue, Chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee.

Mr. MARGUE (Luxembourg) (Translation).— Mr. President, among those who made their contribution to this debate, the Rapporteur of the Legal Affairs Committee has run the risk of being a kill-joy. I would ask the members of this Assembly not to hold this against me. We lawyers have certain professional idiosyncracies. It is natural that we should be concerned with the legislative and legal implementation of the principles we proclaim.

We are perhaps rather too hasty in asking ourselves how these principles can be incorporated in texts which are to form a European agreement, and how they are to be put into practice.

I realise that that is not the concern of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development. Mr. Darling has explained that to us. It would in any case be difficult for this to be so. In this sense we are happy that the no doubt rather specific criticisms we have made have nevertheless helped to modify the form of the Consumer Charter.

Though the Legal Affairs Committee has authorised its Rapporteur to inform the Assembly of its comments and criticisms, it nevertheless does not intend to oppose the adoption of this Charter.

Let me only insist on one little-mentioned aspect of the texts which we are asked to adopt. Almost all the speakers have spoken on the Consumer Charter as such and have put the accent on one or the other of its provisions, emphasising what has seemed to them of importance.

I would myself press the point that there are two texts to be adopted: first a resolution in which we express our support for this Charter which will doubtless be widely distributed, in the first place among the consumer organisations and the national parliaments when opportunities occur for us to intervene in the development of new legislation.

But there is also a draft recommendation. We therefore ask the Committee of Ministers not merely to transmit to the governments the Charter which intend to submit to it — I have no doubt that this will be done — but also to extend the intergovernmental activities of the Council of Europe in order to protect consumer interests.

The Committee on Economic Affairs and Development is submitting certain points in particular to the Committee of Ministers. Let me here express the hope that this part of the recommendation will not be neglected and that the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development will have the satisfaction of seeing some of its suggestions retained in what, in years to come, will be the intergovernmental work of the Council of Europe.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Document 3280 contains a draft resolution and a draft recommendation.

I shall first read out the draft resolution and Appendix:

"The Assembly,

- 1. Considering that, in the words of the Preamble to the Statute of the Council of Europe, '... in the interest of economic and social progress, there is need of a closer unity between all like-minded countries of Europe';
- 2. Considering the attachment of the Council of Europe to the protection of the individual and to the defence of the rights of certain particularly vulnerable sections of society;
- 3. Believing that each State should implement, in accordance with its own traditions, a comprehensive and active policy of consumer protection;
- 4. Stressing, however, the need for some international standardisation in the field of consumer protection policy in order to avoid prejudicing trade,
- 5. Declares solemnly its support for the principles set out in the appended 'Consumer Protection Charter'.

APPENDIX

Consumer Protection Charter

A. The right of consumers to protection and assistance

(i) A consumer is a physical or legal person to whom goods are supplied and services provided for private use.

- (ii) The State has a recognised duty to give consumers comprehensive legal protection and active assistance.
- (iii) The State has a recognised duty to ensure that consumer protection and assistance is effectively afforded to all sections of the community, especially to the poorest and underprivileged sections.
- (a) Protection against physical damage due to unsafe products
- (i) National legislation shall include general requirements for the safety of food, other products and services. Specific requirements shall be prescribed, as necessary, for particular goods or services.
- (ii) In general, goods shall not be distributed or services provided which, when used in a normal and reasonable way, are likely to be injurious to consumers.
- (iii) Minimum standards shall be set and enforced, in order to eliminate or reduce, as far as possible, any risk of danger in the content of goods and the containers thereof, their handling and use.
- (b) Protection against damage to the economic interest of the consumer
- (i) The individual consumer shall be protected against the abuse of the power of the supplier of goods and services, in particular against one-sided standard contracts, the exclusion of essential legal rights in contracts, demand for payment of unsolicited goods and high-pressure selling methods which do not allow consumers to make reasonable assessments of the terms of sale.
- (ii) The individual consumer shall have the right to a reasonable after-sale service for durable consumer goods.
- (iii) Restrictive practices agreed between companies or operated by monopoly suppliers shall be controlled by legislation, in the interests of consumers.
- (iv) The promotion of goods and services, including financial services, shall not be designed to mislead either directly or indirectly the person to whom they are offered or by whom they have been requested.
- (v) National legislation shall include a mandatory requirement that all forms of advertising visual and audio shall not be designed to mislead the potential buyer of the product or service. An advertiser in any media shall be required to provide on request a proof of the validy of claims made in an advertisement. An advertiser unable to provide such proof shall, if so requested, issue at his own expense equivalent corrective advertising.
- (vi) Detailed information provided on the label, at the point of sale or in advertisements shall be accurate. This includes information on nature, composition, quantity, performance, availability, quality, price and antecedent characteristics of the goods and services.

- (vii) Laws prohibiting unfair trading practices shall be effectively administered and enforced, and kept under constant review to ensure that consumers' genuine complaints are being adequately dealt with.
- (viii) Improper, biased or undesirable trading practices which are not illegal shall be considered for legislative changes which would make them unlawful; in the event of loss or damage caused by such practices, the consumer's right to obtain redress shall not be impaired.

B. The right to redress against damage

- (i) A complainant shall have the right to seek redress from a supplier of goods or services for any loss or damage suffered by misdescription, or faulty products or performance, and for this purpose shall have easy and inexpensive access to a country's legal system or to an accepted form of arbitration for small claims.
- (ii) Where there is a prima facie case of misdescription of a product or service to the detriment of a consumer, the burden of proof shall rest with the supplier, but the law shall make provision for reasonable defences of inadvertent mistakes and of relying on misleading information for which the supplier cannot be held responsible.
- (iii) Legal actions against suppliers of goods and services shall, according to the legal administration of each country, be assigned to one or more specified authorities, but shall not be so restricted as to prevent consumers' organisations and individuals from initiating their own actions.

C. The right to consumer information

- (i) The purchaser of goods and services shall have the right to sufficient information, including the identity of suppliers, to enable him to make a rational choice between competing products and services.
- (ii) The purchaser shall have the right to any information or warning necessary to enable him to use a product or service safely and to his full satisfaction
- (iii) Specific and mandatory regulations shall be established as to the declaration of the weights and measures, quality, ingredients, date of production and keeping time (of foods, drugs and photographic films), directions for use or care, terms of contract, true rate of charge or interest on credit, and (where it is considered necessary or appropriate) price, including price per unit of measure.

D. The right to consumer education

- (i) Such consumer training shall be given to school-children as will enable them to act as informed consumers throughout their lives.
- (ii) Education facilities in the field of consumer problems shall equally be made available to adults.

E. The right to representation and consultation

(i) Voluntary organisations of consumers shall be encouraged and recognised by governments and

consulted on laws, regulations, administration and advisory services for consumers, and such recognition shall imply an obligation on such organisations to publish accurate information with advice.

- (ii) Each country shall establish in accordance with its own traditions a strong, independent and effective authority representing consumers and responsible trading interests to advise legislatures and governments on all aspects of consumer protection, and to ensure that at national and local level there is full compliance with consumer laws and regulations, and that adequate information and advisory services are provided.
- (iii) State and public services shall have full regard to the interests and rights of consumers, and shall provide for the appointment either of consumers' representatives to their boards of management in such number as is considered appropriate or of consumers' committees to express such interests to the boards of management.
- (iv) It shall be a duty on each government, directly or assigned to a national consumer authority, to conduct research into and publish information on the composition and performance of products, on labelling and use of products, efficiency of services and all matters of interest to consumers, and where appropriate to provide for the establishing of local consumer advice centres where this information related to the services offered by local traders will be readily available.
- (v) The enforcement of protective laws and administration of advisory services shall as far as possible be at local level.
- (vi) Responsible associations of manufacturers and traders, nationally and collectively in Western Europe, shall be encouraged to formulate their own codes of trading practices which, while basically conforming to national laws, shall seek to promote higher standards, and shall be submitted together with proposals for a private and objective enforcement of such codes in collaboration with the consumers to national consumer authorities for approval. The authorities shall give public support and backing to approved codes."

I shall now read out the draft recommendation:

- "The Assembly,
- 1. Considering the report of its Committee on Economic Affairs and Development on 'A Consumer Protection Charter' (Doc. 3280);
- 2. Believing that consumer protection is a field of activity perfectly in keeping with the aims and role of the Council of Europe, and that international cooperation should be further developed in this field,
- 3. Recommends that the Committee of Ministers:
- (a) urge the member States of the Council of Europe to implement, each in accordance with its

- own traditions, the principles of consumer protection set out in the 'Consumer Protection Charter' appended to its Resolution...;
- (b) develop intergovernmental work in the Council of Europe on the protection of the consumer as an individual in European society, inspired by the principles set out in the above-mentioned Consumer Protection Charter, with regard to the following specific matters:
- (i) the provision of national and local consumer advice services;
- (ii) the recognition and application of voluntary codes of fair trading practices;
- (iii) appropriate measures to ensure an adequate after-sale service;
- (iv) abusive or dubious commercial practices;
- (v) the role and fields of action of voluntary and semi-public consumers' organisations;
- (vi) the need for international co-ordination and standardisation, in particular the establishment of the maximum permissible levels of chemical contaminants in foodstuffs for human consumption;
- (c) provide the Assembly with a comprehensive report on:
- (i) the progress made in its various intergovernmental activities relating to consumer protection, and in particular on the implementation in Council of Europe member States of the relevant resolutions adopted by the Committee of Ministers, including those adopted in the framework of the Partial Agreement in the social and public health field;
- (ii) the implementation of the principles of the Consumer Protection Charter in Council of Europe member States;
- (d) examine the possibility of drawing up a European Convention on Consumer Protection turning to account some of the principles of the Consumer Protection Charter and the experience gathered by intergovermental co-operation."

As the amendment proposed by the Committee on Social and Health Questions in its Opinion, Document 3283, has been included in the draft recommendation of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, there remain only two amendments tabled by Mr. Reinhart.

Amendment No. 1 concerns both the draft resolution and the draft recommendation. I shall read it out:

"In paragraph 5 of the draft resolution and paragraphs 1 and 3 (a), (d) of the draft recommendation, and in the title of the Appendix to the draft resolution, replace the words "Consumer Protection Charter" by: "Minimum Principles for Consumer Protection."

Amendment No. 2 tabled by Mr. Reinhart concerns the draft resolution. I shall read it out:

"At the end of the draft resolution add a new paragraph 6 as follows:

'6. Instructs its Legal Affairs Committee to prepare, in co-operation with its Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, a draft "Consumer Protection Charter" within two years' time, which should be transmitted to the Committee of Ministers in order to be adopted for signature by the member States.'"

The committee to which it was referred for report and the Committee of Social and Health Questions oppose these amendments.

I call Mr. Reinhart.

Mr. REINHART (Austria) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like a vote to be taken on my amendment proposals, the reasons for which are briefly as follows.

It has emerged clearly from the speeches we have heard today that consumer protection is a matter of major concern to any modern constitutional State. It has also been clearly shown that consumer protection affects a wide range of sectors including substantive civil law, criminal law, civil procedure and company law, and that it has a bearing on the protection of the environment and of health and even, as we have heard, on educational administration.

I should like to state clearly at the outset that I have nothing to say against the draft before us; on the contrary, I would even describe it as exemplary.

But the point I wish to make is that I would consider it premature to call this report, this text in its present form, a Charter.

I would urge you most insistently to approve this report unanimously, but would ask you at the same time not to call it a Charter.

People in our countries take the word "charter" to mean an instrument that has been very carefully thought out and frequently reappraised, a polished, perfected document that is the outcome of long years of work.

Now, can it be said, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the document before us has been thoroughly considered from all angles? Were all those whom it concerns consulted or asked for an opinion? I do not think so. As Mr. Alber has already pointed out, quite a number of points need clarifying: for example, the definition of the term "consumer" could be improved, the right to compensation for damage ought to have been more thoroughly considered and the principles to be applied rather more carefully defined.

For this reason, I have suggested in my motion that the text under consideration, the report before us, should be described, not as a charter but as minimum principles for consumer protection.

The purport of my second amendment is that this exemplary project which has been submitted to the plenary Assembly for approval after one year's work should not be considered as definitive, but that a real charter embodying binding provisions should be presented to the public within two years, a charter which member States will have the opportunity of ratifying.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Does the Rapporteur wish to speak again after having opposed the amendment?

Mr. DARLING (United Kingdom). — I would like to say only one sentence. We have consulted all the organisations that I am sure would be included in even Mr. Reinhart's list and this Consumer Protection Charter has been sent to them; and we have embodied many of their comments in the final draft.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Does anyone wish to speak?...

I put Amendment No. 1, which has been rejected by the committee, to the vote. The Assembly will vote by a show of hands...

The amendment was rejected.

The committee has also rejected Amendment No. 2 tabled by Mr. Reinhart.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

I ask the Assembly to vote by a show of hands on Amendment No. 2...

The amendment was rejected.

We will now vote on the draft resolution contained in Document 3280.

No one has asked for a vote by roll-call. The Assembly will therefore vote by a show of hands.

I put the text, including the Appendix, to the vote...

The draft resolution contained in Document 3280 was adopted unanimously.

It will be published as Resolution 543.

We shall now take the vote on the draft recommendation contained in Document 3280.

No one has asked for a vote by roll-call. The Assembly will therefore vote by a show of hands.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

I put the text to the vote...

The draft recommendation contained in Document 3280 was adopted.

It will published as Recommendation 705.

5. Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development

(Debate on the report of the Committee on Economic Attairs and Development, Doc. 3282 and amendment, the opinion of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities, Doc. 3296, and votes on the draft resolution and draft order)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the debate on the report by the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Document 3282, and the opinion of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities, Document 3296, on the repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, and vote on the draft resolution and draft order.

I call Mr. Darling to present the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development.

Mr. DARLING (United Kingdom). — As this is probably the last speech that I will make in the Assembly I had better begin by reminding myself of the first speech I made here twenty-

two years ago. It was a speech on the need, for all kinds of reasons, to have a co-ordinated transport policy throughout Europe; and one of the reasons was that, unless we had co-ordination of rail transport, road transport and sea, canal and river transport, we would not be able to give effective help to the under-developed regions of our various countries. That, after a lapse of twenty-two years, as it were, is more or less the theme of the subject that we are to discuss today because it falls to me to present this extremely useful and important report on behalf of my colleague, Mr. Marquand, who is no longer a delegate to this Assembly.

We are both willing victims of the British Labour Party's deliberate intention to give as many of our parliamentarians as we can an opportunity to take part in the work of the Council of Europe, and I understand that at the last count it had almost a hundred volunteers. So Mr. Marquand and I retire to allow at least two of them the chance they want to come here. I am sorry, however, that Mr. Marquand has not been able to be here to present this report himself, for I believe the Assembly will agree that it not only deals with a subject which is of the utmost importance to all our countries but it is also a challenging and in some respects very disturbing report which draws attention to the grim consequences of mistaken policies and calls for a reappraisal of our thinking on the problems of regional economics. Mr. Ahrens also makes similar observations in his report.

I believe it would be correct to say that only those of us who have been personally involved in some way in the consequences of unemployment or who represent areas where industries are declining and living standards are low can properly understand the human tragedies of people who have no jobs or whose wages are so much lower than the workers' pay in more prosperous areas. Quite simply, what we have to try to do is to spread work and wages more evenly in our countries; to try by whatever means we can devise to level up the work opportunities and bring standards up to the best that may obtain. That aim can be expressed in simple terms, but it is not so easy to determine the means through which we achieve something like social equality and a balanced economic system. It is, in fact, incredibly difficult.

Mr. Marquand has considered the repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, which was the task assigned to him, but to get this aspect of a difficult subject into proper perspective he has had to go beyond that assignment, look at what is happening in Europe today, with the growing disparities between prosperous and poor regions, and examine the results of policies which each country has devised to remedy its own regional imbalance. It is this examination which is disturbing because the evidence which he presents shows that some of the measures taken to promote industrial development in regions of low incomes and high unemployment may be self-defeating. He also points out that the enlarged Community, committed as it is to an active development of regional policy, may have harmful effects on the weaker regions of those countries which are neighbours of the Community and which are represented in the Council of Europe.

We must therefore examine carefully the analysis offered by Mr. Marquand in what he calls the underlying factors, the social, political and economic factors which have created rich and poor regions with such marked disparities in several of our countries. In order to be as brief as possible, I will follow Mr. Marquand's example and quote instances from the United Kingdom's historical causes of what we used to call "distressed areas".

The major cause of our imbalance in the United Kingdom is that the basic industries on which Britain's earlier prosperity was founded were weakened between the wars by intensive overseas competition and by the growth of new industries which were not located in our traditional industrial areas. Coal, textiles and shipbuilding declined and motor cars, electronics and man-made textiles took their place in the economy but not in the same areas. They went into new areas of expansion, which is a fairly common experience in all our countries.

Not only have the older industries and the jobs they provided declined, but too often these older industrial areas have become industrial slums, scarred by abandoned coal mines and

empty factories, ugly relics of our 19th century industrial expansion. Their very existence makes the whole area thoroughly unattractive to new development. Indeed, if the market economy were left free to develop without government intervention, few, if any, private companies would choose to be located in such places, in a worn-out environment, away from their own prosperous customers.

Government intervention has been necessary for social and political reasons, even though it may interfere with sound economic judgment on the part of the companies with whom it interferes. We have had "the stick and the carrot", the stick in refusing to allow all expansion to take place in the prosperous areas — since this, if uncontrolled, would lead, as has been the case in some areas, to congestion of social services and over-employment — and the carrot in the form of financial and fiscal inducements to companies and enterprises to locate their new plants in areas where there is a desperate demand for jobs and decent wages.

These measures in the United Kingdom have been successful at least in halting the decline of the poorer areas and of course have given support to the cleaning up of squalid environments. But, as the report points out, that success is inevitably now limited in time and we can see this in Britain. For example, the steel industry, for good historic reasons, is in general located in coalmining districts and in what are now or have been declining areas. But there is now a high programme of expansion for the steel industry with new plants to be built and new techniques introduced in these areas where employment is so necessary. During the period of construction of the new steel plants, there will be more job opportunities, but when the new steel plants come into operation they will, because they are up to date, employ fewer workers to produce a greater quantity of steel than did the old plants. In my own city of Sheffield, another part of which is represented by Mr. Osborn, the steel industry has calculated that because of the technical improvements in the steel industry alone we are going to lose within the next three years something like 10 000 jobs. Sheffield is not a distressed area in the same way that most of the other areas

considered in this report are distressed; it needs help but not on the same scale.

New policies therefore for regional development seem to Mr. Marquand — and to all of us — to be urgently needed because the "stick and carrot" interference in the market economy is insufficient and may, as I have said, be self-defeating. The fact that an unbalanced prosperity is a stimulus to inflation, another important point made in the report, should not be ignored.

It is against this background that Mr. Marquand examines the likely effects of EEC policies and of economic and monetary union. We cannot yet judge how or to what extent the proposed EEC Regional Development Fund will change the rather bleak situation in some parts of the Community. The report points out that the Fund will have to be substantial and a vigorous policy initiated if there are to be noticeable changes in regional economies.

On economic and monetary union, the report argues that the aim is to have a single integrated economy for the Community and that provision will therefore have to be made for the distortions of that economy which regional policies inevitably require. If part of the aim of integration is to have Community monetary parity, further difficulties arise, because if parity demands that a country pursue deflationary policies to redress a possible or actual balance-of-payments problem, it is the weaker regions in that country which will suffer. On the other hand, the Community's policies may well prove to be increasingly attractive to overseas investment which might otherwise go to Western European countries, Members of this Council of Europe but not of EEC.

I have already referred to some of the report's conclusions. I want to mention only two others which are of outstanding interest. One is that employment subsidies — wage subsidies — are essential if we want to encourage industrial development in under-developed regions because the stick and the carrot will not be sufficient.

The other — which I think we must all consider in terms of getting our governments to face

up to the problems involved — is that because private enterprise, even when forced or cajoled into poorer regions, will not alone reduce unemployment or raise incomes to desirable standards, the State itself must intervene as an employer and locate public industries in the poorer regions as a deliberate policy.

This is a most important report, which compels us to look again at our regional problems and which offers constructive proposals. On behalf of the Economic Affairs Committee, I now ask the Assembly to adopt it.

(Mr. Hansen, Vice-President of the Assembly, took the Chair in place of Mr. Vedovato.)

THE PRESIDENT. — I now call Mr. Ahrens to present the opinion of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities, Document 3296.

Mr. AHRENS (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, as Rapporteur of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities, I welcome Mr. Marquand's report. I should like to thank him, the Committee on Economic Affairs and Mr. Darling most heartily for the trouble they have taken in examining and describing the manifold interrelations between economic and monetary union and regional development in Europe. The report before us constitutes, in my view, a sound basis for further efforts to remove regional disparities in our continent.

This report, Mr. President, relates essentially to the nine EEC member States, that is, to a community of nations which is tending increasingly towards a common economic and monetary policy. For that reason, the revelations in the report must come as all the greater a shock.

The difference in per capita income as between northern and southern Europe is horrifying. Within the European Community figures vary between \$4 775 per head in the Hamburg region and \$765 per head in Calabria. This difference is greater than the productivity gap between the highly industrialised countries and South America.

Mr. Ahrens (continued)

The figures are even more appalling when it is remembered that thousands, tens of thousands, of people from the poorer areas are employed in the more prosperous regions of the Community, and that this reduces to some extent, or at least partly compensates, the extreme disparity between rich and poor. As members of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe we ought, moreover, to bear in mind, when studying this report, that the inequality between rich and poor in our seventeen member States is without doubt even greater than in the nine-nation Community.

The report shows — and here I touch upon the first concern of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities — that there are not sufficient statistical data available in our countries to allow any accurate assessment of the situation. Such as exist are tailored to national needs and, when used for purposes of international comparison, are not infrequently "touched up" or altered in some other way. Our first request, therefore, is for appropriate, internationally comparable statistics to be compiled by Council of Europe member States, so as to permit a reliable and irrefutable assessment of the situation.

It must be patent to anyone who makes a careful study of the report that regional policy is synonymous with economic development: it is obvious, for instance, from the list of measures introduced in the individual countries. This need not surprise us, for in the European Community, too, regional policy is seen first and foremost as the creation of jobs. From the regional planning angle, restricting regional policy in this way merely to labour-market considerations or the promotion of the economy is not without its dangers. If efforts to close the gap between rich and poor in Europe are to succeed, we must not be satisfied simply with creating new jobs in economically weak regions. A general improvement in both private and public infrastructures and the opening up of new communications are also necessary. At the same time, the natural resources and features of these areas must be maintained and preserved. All this is possible, however, only if based on a global planning policy. We therefore believe that we ought to insist on comprehensive European planning as a foundation to all our efforts to define regional policies.

There is yet another reason why the Council of Europe should press for comprehensive European planning. If the European Community's efforts to develop backward regions are successful, this will create further tensions on the perimeter of the Community. Even today we are witnessing the effects of the pull exerted by the promotion of peripheral areas in the Community on adjacent areas of Europe outside EEC. Here is one example. Development measures in eastern Bavaria have exercised a considerable attraction on workers in Austria, thus causing economic complications there. These difficulties, which are just beginning to appear, are bound to intensify with the continuation of such regional policy measures and they could very easily make themselves felt throughout Austria and Switzerland. In order to prevent this, due account must be taken of these areas, too, in development strategy.

May I make one final remark from the standpoint of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities. We believe that regional policy measures can only be successful if they are not dictated by a State or by the European Community, but are the product of close cooperation with municipal associations and local authorities. Measures to reform the structures of a region - for that is what is involved here must be accepted and adopted by the local population as well as by the local government authorities. We therefore consider that this aspect of greater local government involvement in efforts to achieve a better economic balance throughout the countries of Europe also deserves attention.

THE PRESIDENT. - Thank you very much,

The debate is now open.

I remind members that the list of speakers will be closed in fifteen minutes.

I call Mr. Urwin.

Mr. URWIN (United Kingdom). — I take this early opportunity of congratulating my colleague, Mr. Darling, on the splendid service he has given to the British Labour delegation during his three years' tenure of office as a delegate to this Assembly. As my colleague Mr. Fletcher has said, the rest of our colleagues will share in the sentiments which have been expressed here today and the sincerely deserved tributes paid to Mr. Darling. I would also like to thank

Mr. Urwin (continued)

him for the excellence of his remarks in presenting this report as a deputy Rapporteur, and yet at the same time I feel rather sorry that my other colleague, Mr. Marquand, who has been responsible for the preparation of a most objective report on regional planning, and which compellingly focuses our attention on the difficult questions relating to this subject, is denied the privilege of presenting it.

I believe it is one of the most fundamentally important problems that this Assembly and the nations we represent are called upon to face. It is a great indictment of parliaments and perhaps of this Assembly when Mr. Darling reminds us that it is twenty-two years since the Council of Europe was discussing the basic principles of regional development. Quite frankly, I think we have not made a great deal of progress during that period of time. I am deeply mindful of the fact that the concept of free competition which is so firmly enunciated in the Rome Treaty has obviously been the greatest deterrent to the evolvement of a regional policy within EEC. Yet I find it almost impossible to believe that the Community could subordinate this aspect of essential economic planning to long-protracted and somewhat bitter negotiations on what has been described as a nonsensical common agricultural policy which has created so much controversy, especially in Britain, and has quite properly been subjected to some rather critical comments in the Assembly this week, particularly when it occurs to me that the whole question of agriculture is of such importance to the nations of the world and could well have formed an integral part of a comprehensive regional policy.

I am also mindful of the fact that since the inception of EEC we have witnessed the continuing, and in some cases ever-widening, gap between the rich and less prosperous regions. Despite the cushioning efforts of governments, it is inevitably the weaker regions which are first to suffer from the cold blasts of economic depression and the last, paradoxically, to benefit from the boom periods in national economies.

Mr. Darling has referred to some of the more important aspects of regional imbalances as they apply to Britain. Our experience truly has been that imbalance has been more heavily acceler-

ated in Britain in recent years largely because of this enormous decline in employment in our heavy traditional basic industries, characteristics which undoubtedly similarly apply to other countries and which in our case have resulted in extensive government intervention in a determined effort to diversify the industrial base of our declining regions and to make them more attractive to industry in these deprived areas. But massive financial inducement to industrialists and hitherto somewhat strict control of industrial location, whilst having a stabilising effect, have so far failed to raise the weaker regions — our development and special development areas — to the same plateau as the more prosperous regions.

The strong indication here, and, indeed, a continuing outstanding requirement, is that national governments have asserted the right which must remain unchallenged to intervene on behalf of the under-developed areas and thus protect them from the full effects of the interplay of free market resources.

In this context there must be deep reservations concerning the movement towards full monetary union and any ultimate forefeiture of such national powers.

Ideally, of course, a fully co-ordinated regional policy should have been agreed prior to the extension of EEC as an integral part of the negotiations for the entry of the three new countries. However, following the rather belated Paris Summit, the more recent decision of the Community to embark upon a regional dimension is given a qualified welcome. As both Mr. Darling and Mr. Marquand have said, the very nature and seriousness of the problem demand that a very large sum of money must be allocated to the proposed Regional Development Fund even though aid can merely be regarded as complementary to resources made available by individual nations. Urgent consideration might even be given to funding an administration on the basis of "from each according to means and to each according to needs".

The Rapporteur in this excellent work has canvassed several commendable ideas and recommended acceptance of certain criteria for the shaping of a regional policy, though, as he admits, based largely upon the requirements of the Nine, yet he attempts to take into consideration the needs of the wider Europe which we

Mr. Urwin (continued)

here represent. I certainly take full account of the cautionary note he introduces regarding the distinct possibility that a successfully operated Community policy will inevitably act detrimentally against the economic interests of the remaining eight European nations.

Bearing in mind again what Mr. Marquand has said about the contributory factors towards industrial decline and economic depression, I crave your indulgence and that of the Assembly to agree with many of the findings and recommendations which emanate from the report. I suggest there is complete justification for nations who are involved in this way to continue to look, in addition to whatever policy might emerge within Europe itself, at the way in which they propose to intervene and to help the weaker nations to the economic strength to which they are entitled.

First, I suggest the introduction of an employment subsidy, preferably, for those who do not know about its operation, based on the regional employment premium which has been of enormous value to firms in the British manufacturing industry.

Second, though there is a wide divergence of opinion about the value of incentives of cash inducements, I am firmly convinced, having had some experience of regional policy in my own country, that, even though the efficacy of financial inducements to private industry is doubted, it nevertheless has been undisputably proved that investment grants have provided an effective incentive to industrialists to change location to a development area.

Third, I believe it is imperative that there should be the establishment of a strict control of distribution of industry through the medium of industrial development certificates especially applicable to new industrial projects, thus ensuring diversification of the under-developed and declining regions.

I link closely with this my fourth point, the overriding necessity to influence the industrial development of multinational companies to introduce new disciplines and so harness their huge resources for the ultimate benefit of the less prosperous areas.

Fifth, there should be expansion of the activities of nationalised industries rather than res-

triction of such industries as sometimes happens, and the consideration of the establishment of new publicly owned industry in selected places, especially where private enterprise has failed to measure up to its responsibility.

I can, of course, agree with Mr. Ahrens in the report he has presented that no one concerned in any way at all with the planning of economic development based on renovating and innovating industry can escape the absolute necessity to take into account the other aspects of planning. Industrial development clearly ought to take place and harmonise with comprehensive regional planning. Here I suggest briefly that the regional economic planning councils as they are comprised in the United Kingdom might well be a model to copy.

Finally, full account must be taken of the commitments to improve radically the environs in which people live and work. It is not enough to provide new jobs, to relieve the stigma of unemployment from so many thousands of shoulders which is absolutely vital and necessary in the United Kingdom. It is not enough to arrest migration. It is not enough to arrest migration. It is not enough to prevent people from continuing to be fugitives from depression. Of course we must improve their quality of life. We must provide the cultural, educational and recreational facilities and amenities and the communications which are all so important to regional development.

All these things comprise the least that people are entitled to expect from those who represent them in the world's parliaments. Here is a formidable challenge to us European parliamentarians to evolve a regional policy which is not only acceptable to us but, in the final analysis, eminently satisfactory to the constituents we represent.

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you very much, Mr. Urwin.

I give the floor to Mr. Roper.

Mr. ROPER (United Kingdom). — It gives me great pleasure to speak in this Assembly for the first time, and to begin by congratulating my friend, Mr. Marquand, on the excellent report that we are considering. I add to the words of Mr. Urwin in saying how sad it is for many of us that, in presenting the report, George

Mr. Roper (continued)

Darling was making, at least for the time being, one of his last speeches to the Assembly. In his usual manner, he did that introduction extremely well.

I found Mr. Ahren's point of particular interest. Like my colleague, Tom Urwin, I agree absolutely that regional planning has three dimensions. It has, as it must have, the economic dimension, because without jobs regional planning might as well not bother to exist. But it also has the vital physical dimension of ensuring that the environments in which people live are satisfactory, and that we make proper use of them for the future, that we do not leave to the 21st century the kind of legacy that the 19th century has left to us in so many parts of our regions. Thirdly, a regional policy must have a social dimension. We should be particularly mindful of that.

The second point in Mr. Ahren's remarks that I found of particular interest, because I have dabbled in this field myself, concerned the need for satisfactory comparative regional statistics. The fine document produced by the new Commissioner, George Thomson, on the Community's regional policy, is weakened by the absence of satisfactory comparative regional statistics.

My colleague David Marquand in his report draws attention to the imperfections of the market economy in dealing with some of the problems of regional policy. We have all learned from the writing and thinking of the distinguished Swedish economist, Gunnar Myrdal, in this respect. He developed the concept of cumulative causation, the concept that the more prosperous regions increase their prosperity while the less prosperous regions become less and less prosperous in a market economy. St. Matthew said it a long time ago, when he said that to him that hath shall be given and from him that hath not shall be taken away.

As Mr. Urwin, who had considerable responsibility for these matters in the last British Administration, has dealt with regional policies in Britain, I should like to supplement the parts of the report on the implications, for two of the problems we are considering, of economic and

monetary union, because that is the subject before us.

There is a great danger of misunderstanding what is meant by economic and monetary union, and a substantial danger to all of us who are, for better or worse, within the Community, that the monetary cart will be put before the economic horse. It is no secret that in my party there are differences of opinion about the desirability of British membership of the European Community. On that question I, for the moment, find myself in a minority. However, I think there is unanimity amongst us that premature attempts to impose the straitjacket of monetary union upon the Community would be a great mistake.

I believe — I do not know how far I would carry all my colleagues with me — that if the preconditions of economic union had been achieved — we should need to discuss what they were — it might be possible to move to a monetary union. But it is very dangerous to propose the unattainable. It is unrealistic to assume that we could hope to remove entirely the possibilities of varying exchange rates between Members of the Community by the end of the decade.

I should like to make three further points on that matter. First, the Six who were Members before January this year had to change their relative parities several times during the first fifteen years of the Community's existence. I think I am right in saying that the Federal Republic of Germany had to adjust its currency upwards four times after 1958, while the Republic of France has effectively devalued three times.

In part, those parity changes were necessary because the removal of the tariff barrier increased the sensitivity of national balances of payments to small differences in unit costs between countries and to other aspects of competitive performance. The new Members who have now become part of the Nine are likely to go through similar strains in the years ahead.

It is no satisfactory solution to suggest that special drawing rights arrangements or the pooling of reserves would solve the problem because, as we have some experience of knowing in the United Kingdom, it merely postpones the Mr. Roper (continued)

problem and does nothing to deal with the fundamental disequilibria where they exist.

Secondly, even where parities are such as to ensure equilibrium at any particular point of time, that is not in itself a sufficient condition for monetary union. We need to have a much greater degree of economic homogeneity between countries before they can become part of a monetary union. We have at present differences of economic structure between countries, different patterns of industrial relations, differences in the relative rates of growth in productivity in in both agriculture and industry - the very complex factors known in the professional jargon as the differing propensities to inflate. While they are differing, to impose a straitjacket of monetary union would have serious implications for the regions, particularly the less prosperous regions of our country, as outlined by Mr. Marquand.

Thirdly, these questions are of a fundamental political importance for the prosperity of all our countries, and particularly for the less prosperous regions, as we have heard today. I am rather worried that the question of monetary union is sometimes treated as a rather technical matter to be left to the technicians of central banks. As parliamentarians, we must ensure that there is as much public and parliamentary discussion and explanation of these important political issues. They are far too important to be left to central bankers or even to Ministers of Finance by themselves.

I should like to say something about the role of the Council of Europe in such discussions. Economic and monetary union, if it occurs within the Nine, will affect not only the Nine and the less prosperous regions within the Community. It will also have important implications throughout Europe, in particular for those countries which are Members of this Council and have regions which abut upon the Community, such as Mr. Ahrens mentioned in his example of the Austrian-German frontier area. But it is also the case that countries whose economies are closely connected, through historical commercial patterns, with those of the individual Members of the Nine - I think particularly of Scandinavia, Austria and Switzerland — will be seriously

affected by the development of economic and monetary union.

Therefore I hope that our Consultative Assembly, and in particular its Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, in studying the draft order as proposed by Mr. Alemyr will be able to play a useful role in discussing and clarifying these issues.

THE PRESIDENT. — I give the floor to Mr. Steel.

Mr. STEEL (United Kingdom). — I first apologise for any apparent discourtesy by leaving almost as soon as I have finished speaking so that I may catch the last available plane back to London this evening.

Secondly, in parenthesis, at the start I add to the warm expressions extended to George Darling. I gently correct my colleague Tom Urwin. It is not just for his services to the British Labour delegation that we shall remember him. He has kept an avuncular eye on stray young Liberals who occasionally wandered into the Labour delegation. The entire delegation very much regret Mr. Darling's leaving.

Mr. Darling referred back to twenty years ago, and I am sure that the principles which motivated his speeches then were the same as they are now, but I suggest that there is an entirely new and hopeful factor now which was not present twenty years ago. It is that we can ally a concern for regional policy with a concern for environmental policy. A few years ago a colleague in the House of Commons used to refer to my constituency as one of the "pork barrel" constituencies because it was always receiving handouts as part of a development area. I believe that that attitude has now changed and that people all over Europe are beginning to realise the adverse effects which drift has on economic power.

We have seen this imbalance in connection with the construction of the London Motorway Box, and one reads from time to time in the newspapers protests made in other European cities about the effects on environmental development by the invasion of the motor car. In other words, there is now something which was not present twenty years ago, a realisation that uncontrolled economic prosperity and concentration in the Mr. Steel (continued)

London/Hamburg axis can result in a reduction of the quality of life there as well as in what are traditionally called the poorer areas. For that reason I thought that Mr. Ahrens was right to point out on page 3 of his report that regional policy is not just something to be seen in economic terms, but that the policy should concern itself with socio-cultural policy and living conditions of the population in each particular region.

Those of us who have always argued in favour of Britain's entry to the Common Market have recognised that action on regional imbalance is now required, not just on a national scale but on a continental scale as well. If we accept that one of the objects of economic and monetary union is to increase the welfare of all our people in Europe, we must also recognise that that laudable objective could be frustrated if regional imbalances are allowed to persist. The effects of regional imbalance in the poorer areas have been described by other speakers. The most notorious are a high level of unemployment and environmental spoliation of areas by decaying industries, but I wish to dwell on drift of population and low wages in particular parts of the country. The committee made a detailed study of Dr. Holland's figures, some of which are quoted in Mr. Marquand's report.

The comparison to which I draw attention is that of Hamburg with Calabria, which was 6.3 to 1. That comparison is on the European scale, but it is an economic fact of life within each of our countries. In the United Kingdom, for example, the variation in average weekly wages last year for an adult male was £37 in the highest earning area to £23 in the lowest. In my part of Scotland in was £23; it is a subject in which I have for long taken an interest.

As others have said, the answers lie in the creation of public enterprise, the use of the public enterprise system and development of labour subsidies, but I suggest that it would be a mistake if, in pursuing regional policies, we attempted to create uniformity of economic

and social opportunity throughout our countries, for there is something to be said for diversity of life in one region compared with another. For that reason, I should like to see greater efforts made in all our countries to increase wage-earning opportunities in agriculture and tourism, aspects of working which are traditionally rather low-paid.

If we try to analyse some of the reasons for the failure of regional policies so far to have a serious impact on regional imbalance. I think one of them is the tendency to leave regional policy to one particular government department. If we take this seriously, we must accept that all our governments must use all their policies to the same end of reducing regional imbalance. This may mean all sorts of matters such as broadcasting, posts and telecommunications and some of the more obvious such as transport and freight charges. A development of the infrastructure of transport thoughout Europe is essential. I am sorry that the report which we discussed two years ago on a hovertrain network does not seem to be any nearer implementation.

In the United Kingdom at the moment while arguments are raging on civil aviation grounds for and against the development of a new airport at Maplin, it seems to me that the strongest case against such an expenditure of over £800 million in one area rests on the regional development case rather than on the civil aviation case.

The closer economic and political integration of Europe will, I believe, have a natural tendency to pull decision-making and economic investment to the centre. It is because of that natural tendency, which we must recognise will exist, that we have to create a deliberate policy to counter it in the wider Europe.

I think Mr. Marquand and those associated with this report have done a great service. I think the draft order which is proposed is of crucial importance in asking the committee to continue its study of this matter and pleading in particular for greater co-operation in the wider Europe in reducing regional imbalance.

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you very much, Mr. Steel.

I give the floor to Dame Joan Vickers.

Dame Joan VICKERS (United Kingdom). — First, I offer my congratulations to Mr. Darling, and through him to Mr. Marquand, for this excellent report. I also thank my colleague on the committee, Mr. Ahrens, for his contribution which I have read very carefully. As the first Conservative to speak in this debate, I thank Mr. Darling personally for his contribution to the Assembly and for the work he has done in his own country in which he has sincerely tried to help anyone whom he felt to be in need.

This morning we provided a very useful example of discussions between the EEC countries and those of the Council of Europe in the Icelandic fishing debate. I stress this particularly as I hope we shall carry on this type of discussion because this is a great role which the Council of Europe can play in trying to coordinate the activities of the European Parliament and the Council of Europe. I remind the Assembly that under the chairmanship of Mr. Radius, the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities has played a very active part in regional development and regional development conferences.

We are very fortunate in that EEC has appointed a Commissioner for Regional Development and that his report was discussed on 14-15 May by the Committee of Ministers. I hope that it will be discussed not only by Members of EEC but also by those of the Council of Europe, because we shall need to have further co-operation in future. In what was known as the Summit communiqué, high priority was given to the all-important task of providing persons within EEC with a good structural regional basis in which to live in future, an opportunity for people, irrespective of the area in which they live, to have the chance of a full life. This is what we have to do, and by "a full life" I mean not only full employment, but adequate housing, social services and good environmental conditions.

I agree with Mr. Darling that the other thing we must avoid in particular is what happened during the industrial revolution, not only in our

country but in many countries of Europe, when people rushed from the countryside to the town, contributing to the slums we have today. We must, therefore, tie up any regional plans we have with the social services. The best place in which to be ill is Great Britain. If one wants to raise a family the best country in which to do it is France, because if one has three children of 8, 10 and 15 one gets a payment of £8 whereas in the United Kingdom the amount is £1.80. The best country in which to retire is Germany. and if a widow wishes to remarry, one of the best countries for her to live in is Luxembourg because she will get a lump sum every year for three years to help in her marriage. I mention this because I do not think we can consider employment alone. We have to provide the social services to go with it, otherwise we shall never get an economic entity in the area.

The document emphasises, as have some other speakers, that it is essential to take fairly quick action because the fantastic differences between the rich and poor are growing more noticeable every day. I am afraid that in reading the report one notes that there are a great many families living below the subsistence line and therefore it is necessary to get action quickly. I hope we will get co-operation with the EEC countries. because going through the report one notices that the concept of regional policy has taken on a very narrow sense indeed and is limited to purely economic considerations. I will not go into the details because several speakers have mentioned that we want a wider basis. That was the feeling when we discussed this in the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities. I hope that this point will be borne in mind.

I have myself seen what enormous improvements can be made if a region is looked into in detail and a plan made. For example, I have been to southern Italy and seen Bari, Brindisi and Taranto; and the differences in that area and in the standard of living were outstanding a few years ago when I was there. I gather that since then they have even increased. If one takes another example, I gather that over one million people left the Tuscany area of Italy to go to Turin in order to find employment. This is what we wish to avoid. While appreciating the need for progress in regard to economic

Dame Joan Vickers (continued)

and monetary union, it is essential for all countries to have a national policy and not local policies. Some countries, including the Federal Republic of Germany, are divided into States. It is for this reason I feel there should be an overall national policy, to avoid one such State becoming richer than another.

I consider the success or otherwise of EEC will depend on two main factors. The main one is keeping peace between nations, and the second is providing adequate opportunity for the provision of the necessities of life for people without being forced to work very long hours and often having to take two jobs so as to get an adequate sum to keep their families. There must be adequate provision for people to have a job in which they can really have some satisfaction. I feel these are points which should be examined if we are to have peaceful working conditions in future. Therefore, with careful planning in the future in EEC we should be able to effect something on these lines in the coming years.

I was very pleased to read in paragraph 6 (e) that environmental aspects are to be considered, particularly in order to avoid future planning congestion. This is one of the worst things in many of our countries. I would like to consider for a moment what will be the future of the member States of the Council of Europe. I hope there will be close co-operation with and help from the EEC countries, or we may get the unfortunate position of having two different standards of living within Europe. I hope that it will be possible in the future to have a liaison committee to discuss these matters; or perhaps OECD could make periodic reports.

For example, I am very worried at present that there is a need for large numbers of people to migrate from one country to another in order to be able to support their families. In many cases this means months, perhaps years, away from their home and family. Otherwise, it means breaking up the family unit and bringing families into some other country in Europe with all the difficulties of housing, schooling and so on, particularly for the children. With modern methods of production, mentioned by Mr. Darling, and the change in the use of materials, we really must look ahead far more

in bringing new industries into areas where the original industry is likely to run down.

Before people were as well educated as they are today and when there was no television or radio, the differences between different regions and different individuals were not so well known and naturally did not worry people or affect them. But it worries them today. Many people feel that if they could only get out of one region into another they could support their families in a better state and give them a better chance in the future.

I would like to suggest that where possible, member States of EEC, instead of importing workers to their countries, do what is being done by a large number of countries, including the USA — put factories into the countries that really need them. After all, there is full employment in a number of EEC countries or they would not need to import migrant workers in such large numbers. I hope, therefore, that it may be considered both economic and wise to place factories in these various countries so as to prevent the necessity for migration which to my mind brings so much unhappiness.

Any regional development fund should be used as a regional fund for Europe and not for EEC only. I know that this is difficult at the moment under various treaties, but should a country not in EEC wish to contribute, I hope that some way may be found for it to do so.

By contributing to the regional fund they might be able to help their countries in the future. I hope, therefore, that the EEC countries and the Council of Europe will be able to have an opportunity in the near future, not only to study Mr. Thomson's proposals, but to find out how they can be effective and then to invite the Commissioner, Mr. Thomson, to attend a meeting of this Assembly. This is not too difficult to arrange.

Recently a conference was held in Vienna on environmental subjects which was attended by members of the Council of Europe and members of the European Parliament besides those from seven European non-member States and representatives of the European Conference of Local Authorities. I would like to suggest that as soon as we have had a real opportunity of studying the EEC proposals, such a conference

Dame Joan Vickers (continued)

should be called of the various bodies concerned so that we can have, right at the beginning, a policy which will suit reorganisation in regard to regional prospects.

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you very much, Dame Joan.

I give the floor to Mr. Osborn.

Mr. OSBORN (United Kingdom). — I am the second Conservative member to speak in this debate and as a relatively new member of the Economic Affairs Committee I rise to intervene in a series of speeches which have been very thoughtful. I do so with some trepidation because this seems to have been a British debate with only one contribution from a member outside the British Parliament. In fact, I had to pinch myself a few seconds ago to make quite certain I was in Strasbourg at the Council of Europe and not in the House of Commons in London.

Mr. Darling has had a field-day today. He has introduced two important papers. The first was on consumer protection which I know has been a main subject; but, secondly, he has been concerned with regional problems. He is a member of parliament, not of exactly the same political party as I am, from Sheffield. He and I have been in conflict, and have supported each other, on many occasions. But this time I take the opportunity of congratulating him on the chairmanship of an important committee and congratulating the authors on presenting an informative document which I value. But it contains one or two issues of controversy on which I should like to comment.

The most important aspect of the early part of this paper is the statement on page 8 that:

"Only one United Kingdom region (the southeast) is above the EEC average, while ten are below it"

in terms of income per head. This is therefore of some significance to us in Britain.

This brings my mind back to the other extreme where there has been no regional policy at all. I was told by those who had attended the Duke of Edinburgh's second Study Conference in Canada that they had visited a deserted mining

village. The company which owned the mine had come to the conclusion that the deposits were uneconomic to operate and had closed it down immediately. The visitors had found a number of deserted houses, and the Canadians to be pitied at that particular time were those who had bought their homes and had found almost overnight that they were valueless. However in the mobile society of the new world—and this is being repeated in Australia—these people were able to cut their losses and move elsewhere. This alternative is not so readily available to us in Europe today, which is why this subject is of such relevant and urgent interest to all of us.

In Britain, London and the south-east are areas of major congestion. It could be argued that the construction of a channel tunnel will increase this, and reference is made in the report to the social costs of congestion. Nothing would induce me to live in the south-east of England, but this point of view might cause a certain amount of controversy, particularly among members of parliament of my own political persuasion.

Sheffield and south Yorkshire have had their own particular problems, including those of rationalising the steel industry, which the European Coal and Steel Community seems to have handled for the last twenty years by using money from other sources. Sheffield therefore has to attract new industries, and indeed next week there will be an "operation airlift" when some 250 guests from Germany are being flown into that area in the hope that many who want to buy goods will purchase them from that part of Great Britain, and perhaps in the hope that many who wish to invest in new factories will bear in mind that there are opportunities in south Yorkshire. Other areas have used other devices to attract industry where it is lacking.

The challenge which faces us in this debate and which faces Europe as a whole is whether our regional policy is to provide employment or provide highly efficient, productive industries which are competitive with those in other parts of the world. Those of us in the Council of Europe who are associated with Western European Union made a visit to Japan and saw the results of long-term investment in heavy industry and engineering. The Nippon Steelworks at Kimitsu, with an output of 10 million tons a year, has an output of 1800 tons per man per year compared with about 350 to 400 tons per

Mr. Osborn (continued)

man per year in Dunkirk and at Taranto and 100 tons per man per year in Great Britain. We must also bear in mind that in the United States those employed in manufacturing industry form only 8 to 9% of the total population, whereas the UK figure is 14 to 15%. Future employment therefore may be much more involved with tertiary industries, services and those activities which are concerned with the quality of life.

This very valuable report also deals with the effect of monetary union on regional policies. The first move towards such union is the fixing of exchange rates. Both a dollar crisis and a currency crisis have recently faced Ministers of European countries and the pound sterling has floated in recent months. Only today we read that as a result of this Britain has had record exports, so the short-term policies may well be justified. I accept however that once there is monetary union with fixed exchange rates between the countries of Europe, the importance of regional policies will be that much greater. My colleague Mr. Urwin, who has had responsibility for these matters, talked of the control of distribution of industry and the role of multinational companies, suggested that nationalised industries should be expanded, and referred to publicly owned industries. On page 25 of this report under (d) we find the words:

"... it seems clear that it is no longer enough to rely on bribing, cajoling and (occasionally) coercing the private sector. Private enterprise will always have an important part to play in regional development, but if the dangers referred to in paragraph 27 are to be averted, public enterprise will have to play a more important part..."

This does of course wander into the realms of political controversy between perhaps Labour and Socialist Parties on the one hand and Christian Democrats and Conservatives on the other. This might well be an object of further study by this committee because nationalised industries, as the Labour Government of Great Britain discovered, are not always the complete solution to the shortcomings of private enterprise. In Britain we are discussing the future of the Atomic Reactor Construction Company.

There has been an announcement in the House of Commons, and this has presented quite a challenge. This company will have to compete against well-established companies — as will other European companies — in the United States which are essentially multinational private sector companies.

The reconciliation of the need for profitable and successful private enterprise with the public interest is something which must exercise the minds of politicians, financiers and industrialists in Europe particularly but also in other countries in the years to come. Most European countries have mixed economies with a large public sector, and, of course, in Italy there is IRI, for instance. If the public sector companies are not profitable, how does one avoid the drain on the taxpayer? In a mixed economy, how can public interest be balanced against the need for profitable private enterprise?

Those who visited Japan cannot but be impressed by the relationship between government institutions, including banks, and industry. Perhaps Japan has learned the lessons of Europe and the United States, but one marvels at the extent to which the private savings of the citizens have been harnessed to industrial investment. Perhaps it has been accomplished by high gearing, perhaps a willingness to forgo an immediate short-term return on capital.

What is needed is to establish ways and means of financing industrial activity to provide employment in those regions where it is needed and to look after the public interest. This is a challenge which we in Europe and in the Council must consider in greater depth.

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you very much.

That concludes the list of speakers.

Does anyone else wish to speak ?...

Does the Rapporteur wish to reply?...

Mr. DARLING (United Kingdom). — At this hour I do not think I would be very popular if I tried to reply to all the points raised in the debate. In any case, there is no need for me to do so because most of the speakers — all of them have made excellent contributions — have asked that the study of the problems of

regional development in association with economic and monetary union, including wider aspects if necessary, be continued. The draft order says that it

"instructs its Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, in collaboration with the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities, to continue its study".

I should have drawn attention earlier to the fact that an amendment has been suggested to the first sub-paragraph. We are willing to accept it, and so is the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Auhorities. It will now read:

"to continue its study on repercussions of economic and monetary integration within EEC on the regional development of Council of Europe member States not Members of EEC".

The second sub-paragraph is:

"to make proposals for better co-ordination of regional policies for Europe and for more co-operation in this field, in particular within the framework of a European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning".

Those two instructions will stand and they will cover all the issues that have been raised in the debate.

I have only one further comment to make, and that is in reply to observations of Dame Joan Vickers. Apart from Mr. Ahrens, this is an all-British debate of the kind we have fairly regularly about regional policies. It has been suggested that other delegations have not been taking part because they appreciate that action is not being taken here. EEC action is being taken in Brussels and then action in the other countries is taken at the headquarters of their governments. I accept that, but it has been suggested that regional development would be a suitable subject for a debate at the Joint Meeting of the Council of Europe and the European Parliament, I am not going to quarrel with that, except to say that I feel convinced that whatever parliamentary influence can be brought to bear on regional policies, it can be effectively exercised, at least for a considerable

time, only through our national parliaments, and, as members of the Consultative Assembly know, I am rather critical of and not terribly enthusiastic about Joint Meetings with the European Parliament. We usually find that the Council of Europe members have turned up to speak to themselves.

I would not use that argument to stop the suggestion for a joint debate which I gather is going to be put forward, but I stress the fact that parliamentary influence is going to be exercised through our national parliaments, and it is there that we must work hard to make sure that regional policies within and outside EEC, but within the European context, do work effectively for the benefit of all the regions that are suffering and are likely to suffer from high unemployment and low living standards.

THE PRESIDENT. — I call Mr. Radius.

Mr. RADIUS (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I think perhaps somebody other than the British should say something.

We could of course give many examples from all the countries of Europe. However, my reason for taking the floor is to speak to the proposal made by Mr. Darling as the Rapporteur of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development to call a joint meeting of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe and the European Parliament, with regional development as its theme. I wish to support this on behalf of the committee of which I am Chairman, since this joint meeting could be beneficial both to the European Economic Community and to us within the framework of the Europe of the Seventeen, and perhaps even beyond.

I would be happy to see this proposal taken up at a very early joint meeting.

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you.

I call Mr. Alemyr.

Mr. ALEMYR (Sweden). — As Chairman of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development elected this morning, I have nothing to add to what Mr. Darling has said during the

Mr. Alemyr (continued)

debates today. During this afternoon Mr. Darling has played a very important role as an excellent spokesman for the Economic Affairs Committee. Let me, on behalf of the members of the Economic Affairs Committee, and, I believe, on behalf of all the members of this Assembly, say how grateful we are to you, Mr. Darling, for what you have done in the committee and what you have done in this Assembly. I hope I can say "Welcome back to the Council of Europe". Thank you very much for your efforts here over many years.

THE PRESIDENT. — There are two texts for the Assembly to consider in Document 3282. The first is a draft resolution. There is no amendment. Then there is a draft order, to which an amendment has been proposed by Mr. Alemyr.

We will now proceed to vote on the whole of the draft resolution contained in Document 3282, which I shall read:

"The Assembly,

- 1. Noting that, despite the efforts of the governments concerned, the gap in living standards between the most prosperous and least prosperous regions of Western Europe remains unacceptably wide;
- 2. Recognising that present trends in manufacturing employment are likely to produce an acute crisis in the poorer regions of Western Europe;
- 3. Considering that a sustained attack on regional inequality is a precondition of further economic integration in Europe;
- 4. Believing that although private enterprise has a necessary part to play in the development of the backward regions, recent experience has demonstrated that the forces which produce regional inequality cannot be offset without continuous State intervention.
- 5. Welcomes the declaration of the Heads of Governments of the European Economic Community (EEC) at the Paris Summit in October 1972, and in particular welcomes the decision to set up a Community Fund for regional development;
- 6. Calls upon those member States of the Council of Europe which belong to EEC to ensure:
- (a) that the proposed regional development Fund is of a sufficient size to make possible a significant transfer of resources from the more prosperous regions of the Community to the least prosperous:
- (b) that objective criteria, taking account of the many diverse dimensions of regional inequality, should be laid down to determine how the Fund's resources should be allocated;

- (c) that employment subsidies play an appropriate part in any future Community strategy for regional development;
- (d) that the activities of the public sector in the various member States of the Community are coordinated, and that a study is made of the possibility of setting up a Community holding company, with special responsibilities for regional development, modelled on the Italian State holding company, the IRI;
- (e) that urgent consideration is given to the environmental aspects of regional development, and in particular to the need to develop more effective decongestion policies in the most prosperous regions of the Community;
- (f) that all aspects of policy, both at the national and at the Community level, form part of a co-ordinated strategy for regional revelopment;
- 7. Calls upon all member States of the Council of Europe to ensure by all appropriate means that the regional development policies of EEC and its Members are properly co-ordinated with those of the member States of the Council of Europe which do not belong to EEC."

The Assembly will vote by show of hands.

Will those in favour of the draft resolution please raise their hands...

Those against ?...

Are there any abstentions ?...

The draft resolution in Document 3282 was agreed unanimously.

It will be published as Resolution 544.

I shall now read the draft order:

- "The Assembly,
- 1. Considering the report of its Committee on Economic Affairs and Development on repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development (Doc. 3282);
- 2. Considering that the regional policy of the European Economic Community (EEC) will eventually reduce regional imbalances within EEC member States;
- 3. Considering that significant regional imbalances are likely to persist and even increase within the remaining Council of Europe member States,
- 4. Instructs its Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, in collaboration with the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities:
- (a) to continue its study of the problems of regional development in Europe with particular regard to Council of Europe member States which are not Members of the European Economic Community;

(b) to make proposals for better co-ordination of regional policies in Europe and for more co-operation in this field, in particular within the framework of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning."

Mr. Alemyr has tabled an Amendment No. 1 to the draft order: to delete paragraph 4 (a) of the draft order and insert:

(a) to continue its study on repercussions of economic and monetary integration within EEC on the regional development of Council of Europe member States not Members of EEC."

Does anyone wish to speak against the amendment ?...

Then I shall now put the amendment to the vote by show of hands.

Those who are for the amendment please raise their hands...

Against ?...

Abstentions ?...

The amendment was agreed to.

We will now proceed to vote on the draft order contained in Document 3282 as amended.

The Assembly will vote by show of hands.

Will those in favour of the draft order please raise their hands ?...

Those against ?...

Are there any abstentions ?...

The draft order contained in Document 3282 as amended was agreed to.

It will be published as Order No. 336.

6. Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting

THE PRESIDENT. — I propose that the

Assembly hold its next sitting tomorrow at 10 a.m. with the following Orders of the Day:

- 1. Ratification of credentials (Presentation of and debate on the supplementary report of the Bureau of the Assembly and vote).
- 2. Constitution of the Standing Committee.
- 3. Civil aviation in Europe (Presentation by Mr. Rivière of the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, debate and vote on the draft resolution, Document 3275).
- 4. Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe (Presentation by Mr. Erling Petersen of the report of the Committee on Science and Technology, debate and vote on the draft order and the draft resolution, Document 3286 and Addendum).
- 5. Application of the European Social Charter (Presentation by Mr. Voogd of the report of the Committee on Social and Health Questions, debate and votes on the draft opinion and draft recommendation, Document 3276 and amendments).
- 6. Aid to the countries of Indo-China:
- Presentation by Mr. Enders of the report of the Committee on Population and Refugees, Document 3294;
- Presentation by Mr. Holtz of the verbal opinion of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development;
- Debate and vote on the draft recommendation, Document 3294.

Are there any objections ?...

The Orders of the Day of the next sitting are agreed to.

Does anyone wish to speak?...

The Sitting is closed.

(The Sitting was closed at 6.40 p.m.)

7th	Sitting
-----	---------

Appendix

APPENDIX

Names of Representatives or Substitutes who signed the Attendance Register in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure: 1

MM.	Aano Piket (Aantjes)	MM.	Roper (Jones) Jung Louis	MM.	Renschler Vontobel (Reverdin)
	Abens		Marquardt		Holtz (Richter)
	Ahrens		(Kahn-Ackermann)		Moulin (Rivière)
	Akçali		Kiratlioglu	Sir	John Rodgers
	Alber		Külahli	MM.	
	-		Reale (Leggieri)	101101.	Reinhart (Schieder)
₹ <i>X</i> iaa	Alemyr		Lemmrich		Schlaga
	Bergegren	١	Letschert		Yvon (Schleiter)
	Cattaneo Petrini (Mr. Bettiol) Bohman	,	Mammi		Schmidt Hansheinrich
IVIIVI.			_:	Х <i>Л</i> +c	Schuchardt
T. 7	Micallef (Brincat)		Margue Mart		Adriaensens (Schugens)
	Madsen (Mr. Christiansen) Collins Edward		Mason	IVIIVI.	Schwencke
IVIIVI.	Cornelissen	T. 7	Miotti Carli		Urwin (Shore)
					Steel
	Czernetz	IVIIVI.	Peijnenburg (Nederhorst)		Stewart
	De Clercq (Delforge)		Bourgeois (Nessler)		de Stexhe
	Digby		Oguz		Stinus
	Enders		Öktem		
	Dardel (de Félice)		Osborn		Tanghe
	Feyzioglu		Peart		Morris (Tomney)
	Fletcher		Hunt (Sir John Peel)		Üstündag Van Lent
* *	Capelle (Flornoy)		Darling (Pendry)		
	Aasen (Mr. Frydenlund)		Péridier	D	Vedovato
MM.	Gessner		Péronnet		Joan Vickers
	Withalm (Goëss)		Petersen	IVIIVI.	Voogd
	Hansen		Pica		Primborgne (Weber J.)
	Sjönell (Hedlund)		Portheine		Weiberg-Aurdal
	Hedström		Radinger		Wiklund
	Hocaoglu		Radius		

List of Representatives absent or apologising for absence:

MM.	Amrehn	MM.	Karasek	MM.	Pecoraro
	Arnason		Kempfler		Petit
	Arnaud		Kristjansson		de Préaumont
	Averardi		Labbé		Preti
	Beauguitte		La Loggia		Quilleri
	Blumenfeld		Legaret	Lord	St. Helens
	Collins Gerard		Leitner	MM.	Salvatore
	Coppola		Leu		Schmitt Robert
	Dankert		Leynen		Sieglerschmidt
	De Marco	Sir	Fitzroy Maclean		Talamona
	Dequae	MM.	Mende		Tisserand
	Desmond		Minnocci		Treu
	Dregger		de Montesquiou		Vitter
	Gislason	Mrs.	Munkebye		Wenk
	Grieve	MM.	Muscat	Mrs.	Wolf
	Hofer		Oestergaard	MM.	Zaloglu
	Holst		O'Leary		Zamberletti

^{1.} The names of Substitutes who replaced absent Representatives are printed in italics, the names of such Representatives being given in brackets.

TWENTY-FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION

OFFICIAL REPORT

Eighth Sitting

Friday 18 May 1973, at 10 a.m.

	SUMI	MARY
1. Adoption of the Minutes	. 246	Speakers: The President, MM. Erling
2. Attendance Register	. 246	Petersen (Chairman and General Rap- porteur), Czernetz (Rapporteur), Ca-
3. Announcement concerning a written declaration		pelle (Rapporteur), Osborn (interim Rapporteur), Warren, Small, de Bruyne. Adoption of the draft order: Order
4. Change in the membership of a committee	ee 246	No. 337. Adoption of the draft resolution: Reso-
5. References to committees	. 246	lution 546.
6. Ratification of credentials	. 246	11. Supervision of the application of the European Social Charter (debate on the
7. Appointment of members of the Standin Committee		report of the Committee on Social and Health Questions, Doc. 3276 and amendments, and votes on the draft opinion
8. Nominations for the Joint Committee .	. 247	and draft recommendation) 20
 Civil aviation in Europe (debate on to report of the Committee on Econom Affairs and Development, Doc. 3275 and amendments, and vote on the dre resolution) 	ic id ift	Speakers: The President, Mr. Voogd (Rapporteur), Miss Bergegren (Chairman), Dame Joan Vickers. Postponement of the debate to the next part-session.
Speakers: The President, MM. Riviè (Rapporteur), Warren, Mason, Corn lissen, Valleix, Mrs. Aasen, Mr. Alem (Chairman). Amendment No. 1: adoption of the control of the con	e- yr	12. Aid to the countries of Indo-China (debate on the report of the Committee on Population and Refugees, Doc. 3294, the oral opinion of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, and
amendment.		vote of the draft recommendation) 27 Speakers: The President, MM. Enders
Amendment No. 2: adoption of the amendment.		(Rapporteur on Doc. 3294), Holtz (Rapporteur of the Committee on Economic
Adoption of the draft resolution amended: Resolution 545.	as	Affairs and Development), Renschler (Chairman of the Committee on Popu-
 Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe (debate on the report the Committee on Science and Technology 	of	lation and Refugees). Adoption of the draft recommendation: Recommendation 706.
logy, Doc. 3286 and Addendum, ar votes on the draft order and draft res	nd	13. Adjournment of the Session
lution)	. 257	Appendix: Attendance Register 27

Mr. Karasek, Vice-President of the Assembly, took the Chair at 10 a.m.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Sitting is open.

1. Adoption of the Minutes

THE PRESIDENT. — The Minutes of the last two sittings have been distributed.

Does anyone wish to comment on these Minutes ?...

The Minutes of both sittings were adopted.

2. Attendance Register

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The names of the Substitutes present at this sitting which have been notified to me will be published in the list of Representatives appended to the Minutes of Proceedings and to the Official Report of Debates.

3. Announcement concerning a written declaration

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — A written declaration on the situation in Greece is being distributed today as Document 3303.

This Written Declaration No. 20 bears at the moment the signature of twenty-five members of the Assembly. If other Representatives or Substitutes wish to add their signatures, they may do so in the Table Office. A 93.

If new signatures are added to the declaration, it will be redistributed at the beginning of the next part-session.

4. Change in the membership of a committee

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Turkish delegation nominates Mr. Kiratlioglu as a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Does anyone wish to oppose this nomination?...

Mr. Kiratlioglu is elected to the Committee on the Budget.

5. References to committees

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Bureau has referred to the Legal Affairs Committee the motion for a resolution on the abolition of capital punishment, Document 3297; to the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities and, for opinion, to the Committee on Science and Technology the motion for a recommendation on a joint European advanced high speed inter-city and modern urban transportation system, Document 3299; to the Legal Affairs Committee the motion for a recommendation on a European Driving Licence, Document 3300.

Does anyone wish to oppose these references ?...

The references are approved.

6. Ratification of credentials

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next item on the agenda is the ratification of the credentials of a new Turkish Representative.

In accordance with Article 6, paragraph 3, of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau has examined the credentials of Mr. Ertug, who has been appointed to occupy the Turkish delegation's vacant seat.

The Bureau has agreed that these credentials, which have not been contested, may be accepted.

Does anyone wish to oppose this acceptance ?...

The credentials are accepted. In consequence Mr. Ertug is admitted to sit in the 25th Session of this Assembly.

7. Appointment of members of the Standing Committee

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the appointment of the Standing Committee. I remind you that this committee is composed in part of ex officio members and in part of members elected by the Assembly.

The ex officio members are the President of the Assembly, the Vice-Presidents and the Chairmen of the general committees.

The number of members elected by the Assembly is determined in such a way that each

The President (continued)

national delegation has in the Standing Committee the same number of members as in a general committee of thirty-one members.

Nominations for the seats to be filled by the Assembly have been published in Notice No. 8. In conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 42 and paragraph 4 of Article 43, the Bureau submits these nominations to the Assembly.

Does anyone object ?...

The Bureau's proposals are adopted.

The Standing Committee is thus appointed. It will meet in Florence on 3 and 4 July 1973.

8. Nominations for the Joint Committee

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I invite each national delegation to nominate to the Clerk of the Assembly a Representative — and if need be a Substitute — to sit on the Joint Committee.

The Joint Committee consists of one representative of each government and an equal number of Representatives of the Assembly, that is to say seventeen parliamentarians, chosen from among the members of the Standing Committee.

Each delegation should therefore nominate one Representative and one Substitute.

9. Civil aviation in Europe

(Debate on the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, Doc. 3275 and amendments, and vote on the draft resolution)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next item on the agenda is a debate on the report of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development on civil aviation in Europe, and a vote on the draft resolution, Document 3275.

I call Mr. Rivière, Rapporteur of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development.

Mr. RIVIÈRE (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the oral report I am presenting today to our Assembly on civil aviation in Europe on behalf of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development will be a short one.

You will all indeed have been able to consult the written report contained in Document 3275 which I drew up with the aid of our experts, and which took account of comments or suggestions made in the course of three working sessions.

I should like to take this opportunity of thanking these experts for their infinitely valuable co-operation.

I shall deal with four points in particular. First, a short historical account of ECAC, the European Civil Aviation Conference; secondly, the way in which this body dealt with Resolution 440 of 1970; thirdly, the financial and economic situation of civil air transport; and lastly, civil airport policy.

Everybody knows the history of ECAC. It is a creation of this Assembly which, in 1951, decided to set up a body called the European Civil Aviation Conference. This was done in 1954.

We had the choice at the time of creating either a totally independent organisation, or a body subordinate to the International Civil Aviation Organisation, ICAO, or a body of intermediate status, which would determine its own work programme, call its own meetings and draw up its own agenda but which would work in the closest possible collaboration with ICAO.

We adopted the last solution, and ECAC is now an independent body which, however, receives directives from our Assembly.

Our role as politicians consists in defining the problems and their possible solutions, and then in studying the concrete proposals made by the authorities concerned and adopting them.

It is naturally not for us to intervene in the affairs of civil aviation companies and carriers. As members of this Assembly, we simply have

Mr. Rivière (continued)

a duty to see that everything goes as well as possible.

Resolution 440 adopted in 1970 represented the results of studies made by ECAC on certain questions raised by civil air transport. It dealt essentially with three subjects: first, overbooking by airlines; secondly, the need to arrive at more regular collective consultation between ECAC on the one hand and the Chairmen of European airlines on the other; lastly, the need to ensure that European air transport operations are conceived primarily with the interests of the users in mind rather than those of the carriers. I should like to insist on this point, for in my view it is one of primary importance.

The third item of my report deals with the financial and economic situation of civil air transport, with particular reference to competition from charter flights.

In recent years, ECAC has been faced with a sudden increase in charter flights.

It is obvious that the airlines flying the national flag have not taken kindly to the overabundance of charter flights, and our Organisation has accordingly made contact with a number of national and international carriers in an attempt to solve this problem, for, I repeat, it is of first importance that civil air transport serve the users rather than the carriers.

I have dealt in a lengthy appendix to my report with this question of charter flights. The problem exists and, though we have taken some steps towards solving it, we cannot say that up to now a solution has been found.

I believe, however, that in the not too distant future, a solution, a *modus vivendi*, will be found between North America and Canada on the one hand, and Europe on the other hand, which will allow both European and American passengers to travel between their respective continents at normal rates.

The fourth section of my report concerns civil airport policy. You will be aware that there is a continuously increasing need for civil airports. The question is whether it is preferable

to build new ones or to improve those that already exist. The protection of the environment is currently a major preoccupation: the pollution of the atmosphere and noise in the vicinity of airports are topics under constant discussion. These nuisances are matters of concern to the rising generation which fears for its future. Solutions must be found to these problems, which are already being considered by all the physical planning authorities in our respective countries.

But what are we to do?

Since civil air transport is continually increasing, it is imperative that we find a solution so that the aircraft can land.

I come now to the draft resolution adopted by the committee, which you have before you. It covers virtually all aspects of civil air transport and reads as follows:

- "The Assembly,
- 1. Considering the report of its Committee on Economic Affairs and Development on civil aviation in Europe;
- 2. Recalling that the European Civil Aviation Conference was set up as a result of an initiative of the Assembly, greatly appreciating the continued maintenance of close relations between ECAC and the Council of Europe, and looking forward to their further reinforcement;
- 3. Convinced of the great value to Europe of the work which has been undertaken hitherto by ECAC in facilitating European air transport operations;"
- and here I wish to congratulate ECAC once more on the remarkable work that it has done and continues to do
 - "4. Attaching great importance to ECAC's remaining an independent European intergovernmental organisation concerned with the regulation of civil air transport in Europe, as well as to a further development of the scope of its activities in the light of rapid changing technical, operational, economic and financial problems in this field;"

I take this opportunity to tell Mr. Cornelissen that I welcome most warmly Amendment No. 1, which is fully in line with what I was saying Mr. Rivière (continued)

earlier, since it concerns the environment and the interests of the community as a whole visà-vis air transport.

- "5. Stressing the need for European governmental action in the civil air transport field to be inspired by the need to give first place to the interests of the users and potential users of such transport including those whose main need is for cheap holiday travel that is to say charter flights rather than to narrower airline pressure group interests;
- 6. Believing that the European Communities have a particularly important role to play in securing greater co-operation than hitherto between their national flag-carrying airlines with a view to ensuring a Community approach to a co-ordinated and progressive multilateral liberalisation of air traffic rights (as advocated in Assembly Recommendation 391) in Community member States for air carriers of those countries, and in concerting measures to favour joint aero-space construction projects with a view to ensuring the continued development of a strong and competitive European aero-space industry..."

Here I am alluding to the bilateral European projects of France and England on the one hand and France and Germany on the other, thus both Concorde and the Airbus.

"7. Underlining the need for ECAC to reach an early agreement with the US and Canadian Civil Aviation authorities which will permit of some effective control of the capacity offered on scheduled air services in the North Atlantic;"

I mentioned this point a short while ago when speaking of charter flights between North America and Europe.

"8. Attaching great importance not only to the maintenance of existing safety standards, whether of aircraft or on the ground, but also to their improvement;"

At this point, I should like to approve Mr. Cornelissen's second amendment proposing the

insertion, after paragraph 8, of a new paragraph to read as follows:

"Underlining that a balance must be held between the interest of the customers of civil air transport services and the environmental interests of the community as a whole."

You will see that in the introduction to my report, paragraph 2 makes a reference to the environment. I am thus very ready to adopt Mr. Cornelissen's amendment. It is owing to an error that the following sentence of paragraph 2 of my introduction has been left out of the draft resolution.

"Again some balance must be held between the interests of the customers of civil air transport services and the environmental interest of the community as a whole, e.g. the problem of noise."

Paragraph 9 of the draft resolution reads as follows:

- "9. Recalling Assembly Resolutions 511 and 512 and urging member States to plan their airport construction policy with overriding regard to environmental (noise) considerations, and to take the necessary planning and development measures early enough to secure that these considerations can be fully respected;
- 10. Calling upon the member States of ECAC which have not already done so, to ratify urgently the Tokyo, Hague, and Montreal Conventions as a further step in curbing air piracy..."

Finally, our Assembly

"Thanks the European Civil Aviation Conference for the transmission of the latter's replies to Resolution 440 and to the views expressed in the accompanying report, and requests ECAC to inform it of the follow-up it has given to the proposals to which the present resolution makes reference, and which are further developed in the report mentioned in paragraph 1",

of which I have just spoken.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Rapporteur.

I remind you that the list of speakers will close at 10.45 a.m.

The President (continued)

I call Mr. Warren, the first speaker on the list.

Mr. WARREN (*United Kingdom*). — I would like to use as the theme of my speech the wise words of Mr. Anthony Duynstee in 1964, quoted on page 6 of Document 3275:

"... the task of the politicians is first to point to problems and possible solutions — thus stimulating the authorities concerned to put forward concrete proposals...".

Without doubt, Mr. Rivière and the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development have produced an excellent report on which all the members of the committee are to be congratulated; but the report leads me to the conclusion that the Assembly should not merely pass it on to the European Civil Aviation Conference but should ask the politicians of the twenty-one ECAC member States to review the role required of them, if the rightful expectations of the users and potential users of European air transportation are to be met. European politicians must attack key barriers which are not mentioned in this report but which are inhibiting the necessary faster growth of European civil aviation.

This may be illustrated by three facts facing passengers of European airlines flying within Europe. First of all, the cost of scheduled air fares per kilometre flown is more than twice the cost of air fares per kilometre flown in the United States, using identical types of aircraft. The cost of the flight from Strasbourg to London is, per kilometre, four times that of the equivalent distance in the United States. I would suggest to Mr. Rivière that his problem of overcapacity on scheduled airlines arises directly from this fact.

Secondly, international traffic revenue pool agreements in Europe act in the interests of the airline rather than that of the passenger. Furthermore, these pool agreements exist with the full knowledge of the airlines' parent governments. I hope that Mr. Rivière will see this as an example of the way in which the interests of the carrier are put before those of the user.

Thirdly, no political efforts are being made to give passengers or airlines cabotage rights within Europe which should be open to all ECAC airlines.

Each national government protects its airlines from competition from other foreign airlines, but the result in this case is the restriction of the proper utilisation of transportation capacity.

The politicians of the Council of Europe need to look at air transportation in Europe as a system serving a continent rather than as a multiplexed service to twenty-one separate nations. Civil aviation demand in Europe is at the level of that in the United States ten years ago. Faster progress in Europe must not be damped by political barriers which we can remove.

In paragraph 6 of the draft resolution Mr. Rivière has said that he believes that the European Communities have a particularly important role to play in ensuring the continued development of a strong and competitive European aero-space industry. I notice that on page 9 of Document 3275, Mr. Rivière quotes General Ziegler who has said that 90 % of the free world aviation market is supplied by the United States of America.

General Ziegler is a very distinguished man of great renown in civil aviation, but I fear that he omitted to add a second vital statistic, that 75% of world civil aviation demand is generated in the United States. This is why the US civil aviation manufacturing industry dominates Europe. Concorde alone challenges the North American industry. When Europe produces aircraft of world calibre they sell on a world scale; the products of Sud Aviation, Marcel Dassault and the British Aircraft Corporation testify to this fact.

I would, however, sound a strong warning against the development of a European nationalism in civil aviation construction. Aviation manufacturing capability is now being created in Europe more in order to satisfy political demands for nation-State capabilities than to ensure the best use of scarce and expensive technical resources. In consequence, existing capacity is being wasted. Where a European capability exists in any sector of industry, it should be encouraged to continue and expand its success-

Mr. Warren (continued)

ful work. The national location of that capability must be a secondary consideration. One country in Europe contains two thirds of Europe's entire aero-space capability, aircraft design and manufacture, aero-engine design and manufacture and aircraft equipment manufacture. This British capability should be regarded as a European asset.

The strength which this report seeks in Europe must be based on concentrating European capability where it already exists rather than on the construction of more capacity to enable one European State to compete with another. Civil aircraft are bought by world airlines from manufacturing companies which are known to practise the conservation of precious industrial resources. Aircraft are not bought by foreign airlines because they are American. British. French or of any other national origin. The European Airbus will be bought by world airline customers who decide that the aircraft offered meets their needs. They will not buy it merely because it is assembled in Germany and France or because it has American engines.

The politicians of this Assembly must recognise that, whilst civil aviation knows no frontiers, many frontiers still remain to be erased in our political minds. If we are to understand how to use European civil aviation resources for the joint benefit of the manufacturing industry and the airline passenger, we must view the passenger within the frontiers of a continent and the manufacturing industry within the market frontiers of the whole world.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Mason.

Mr. MASON (United Kingdom). — I am pleased first of all to note that the European Civil Aviation Conference is working well and developing with the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO). It is obvious that there is a very close working relationship between the

two, and this must be encouraged. I think that what the Council wishes can be achieved, and that is a measure of independence for ECAC allied with understanding and partnership with the International Civil Aviation Organisation. ECAC cannot divorce itself from ICAO and it would be foolish for it to try to do so. Air travel and civil aviation is international and it cannot break itself up into regional packages. I hope, therefore, in this regard that ECAC is now establishing good working relationships with our newly formed United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority and British Airways Board.

Aviation is undergoing a great change at the moment. The technology obviously is evolving all the time, but we are to witness very soon the barriers being broken between subsonic and supersonic civil flight. Supersonic transport will soon be plying for trade around the world under Aeroflot, Air France and BOAC colours. But the change we must see quickly is the one of developing a European aero-space industry. My colleague, Mr. Warren, made reference to this and warned us about European nationalism. It is not necessary to go so far but it is essential that we start thinking more seriously about developing a European aero-space industry. We cannot go on, as individual, relatively small nations, saddling ourselves with great research and development cost burdens for our own design of aircraft and having no home market to help control the price of the product. The paper points out the dominance of American aircraft in Europe and being used by European airlines, which is really emphasising the point that more collaboration between European countries is urgent and necessary if we are to retain any aircraft industry at all.

There is a dearth of aircraft projects within Europe at the moment. Nearly all our collaborative projects have gone through their research and development phase — the Airbus, helicopters, the military Jaguar aircraft, Concorde, and so on. There is only really the multi-role combat aircraft in which a number of countries are involved and on which development work is in being. So there is a slump in that sense, there

Mr. Mason (continued)

is a dearth of aircraft projects in Britain and, generally speaking, in Europe.

One of the anxieties about further collaboration between European nations is the future of Concorde. Concorde has taken a great slice of United Kingdom and French government finance which is afforded the aircraft industry, much to the detriment of other developments within the aircraft industry, such as short take-off and landing aircraft (STOL), the quiet short take-off and landing aircraft (QSTOL), the vertical take-off and landing aircraft (VTOL) etc. Concorde has practically sucked dry the French and British aircraft industries.

There is also concern that, nations having withdrawn their options, the future of Concorde is placed in doubt. My personal view — and it is also the majority view of the Labour Party Civil Aviation Group in the United Kingdom Parliament — is that the point of cancellation has gone, and that as long as the Chinese People's Republic hold their options and they materialise into orders, Concorde will break through the blanket of doubt, achieve its goal of rapidly scanning the globe, bringing nations closer together than ever before, and firmly establishing supersonic civil flight.

How will it succeed? First of all, the commercial Concorde will be quieter, cleaner, than the prototype, and therefore environmentally it will be more acceptable. That message is now getting across.

Secondly, landing rights at the major airports of the world are not being denied to Concorde at all. Supersonic over-flying, yes, but not subsonic approach and landing.

Thirdly, the most recent survey within the United States has shown that 75% of those people that were polled, people who are in executive positions and are usually financed to travel, are prepared to pay for speed.

Fourthly, it is encouraging to note that supersonic corridors are now being negotiated from the United Kingdom right down to the tip of South Africa, and with the Soviet Union on a northern Siberian supersonic corridor across to Tokyo.

Also, we must remember that at the same time as the UK and French Concorde take the air the Russian Concordski will be taking the air. When all three nations' Concordes are landing in New York, Tokyo, Moscow, and London (Heathrow), skirting the Latin-American coastline, flying around the world as a fantastic prestige airline symbol, it will provoke a fresh wave of interest. But when it starts touching down in Peking, and then in Chinese colours, what then of the reaction of the Japanese airlines and Quantas? They will not be able to ignore it, especially being alongside such a potentially powerful nation which is now building up its aircraft fleet and is ready to go international. Pan Am, too, will change as Concorde proves to be such an aerial attraction in the sky and a crowd-puller at Kennedy Airport, and as executives queue for seats to cross the Atlantic.

I know that commercial decisions have to be made, that airlines have to reckon with the unquantifiable factor of "attraction". We made a big mistake in Britain with the VC10 when the Chairman of BOAC started cancelling VC10s and then we found out about the unquantifiable factor of "attraction", and instead of 60% or 70% payload it became 100%, and people at every major airport in the world were queueing to go on a VC10. That is the factor that has not yet been reckoned with on Concorde.

Finally, on this point, there is a production line difficulty at Toulouse and Bristol, because the orders are not there. I only hope that members realise that it will be sensible to keep both production lines going, with a lessened workload and a reduced work force, and with no argument between France and the UK as to which should continue and which should close. I think that both ultimately will be required.

Mr. Mason (continued)

If we want a European aero-space industry, if we want European countries to be prepared to collaborate, not just the UK and France but more of the nations, as with the multi-role combat aircraft collaborative project, and if we want more European nations to join, pool resources and launch major civil aviation and aero-space projects, then all of us must try to promote Concorde, for in its wake, flowing from its success, European nations will then be prepared, will have been encouraged, to go for collaborative projects. If it fails, all that we want to achieve in this paper — a Eurospace industry — might well fail with it.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Cornelissen.

Mr. CORNELISSEN (Netherlands). — Mr. President, I have read with much pleasure the interesting report on civil aviation in Europe. First I wish to compliment the Rapporteur.

The report clearly indicates the many complex problems with which we are confronted, not only when we try to formulate a common civil aviation policy, but more particularly when we try to implement such a policy.

The report shows clearly that we still have a long way to go. I would say that we have taken only the first, though important, steps on this path.

Although I wish to express my appreciation for the work done up to now by the European Civil Aviation Conference, I must nevertheless confess that I am not too sure that the rate of progress in our co-operation in civil aviation is as high as the dynamic development in air transport.

In my view, it is of particular importance that on a European level we pay more attention to the negative aspects of civil aviation for society as a whole. In this case, I think especially of people living close to airports. Some colleagues may feel that I am exaggerating somewhat, but may I ask them to review the developments of our attitude towards the motor car during the past few years. I refer to the anti-car campaign in many parts of Europe in contradiction to feelings of only a few years ago.

Here I think of an article in *Der Spiegel* of 7 May from which I wish to quote:

"Zwei Jahre erst ist es her, da sah Willy Brandt für die Deutschen eine 'grossartige Chance'. Das eigene Auto, verkündete der Kanzler, gebe Gelegenheit zu einer 'noch nicht dagewesenen Erschliessung der Umwelt'. Und immer mehr Bürger nahmen die Chance wahr, ihre Umwelt zu erweitern."

I should like to appeal for an effective common approach to environmental problems. I shall mention here three points where in my opinion more can and must be done.

The first concerns restrictions on air movements during the night. Some airports have taken appropriate steps with good results, but I feel that in many airports more could be done.

Secondly, in the designs of new aeroplanes much attention is being paid to reducing the noise level and substantial progress is being made in the development of quieter aircraft engines. However, I believe that provisions could also be made to reduce the noise level of existing aeroplanes.

Thirdly, we all know from experience that often two or more planes of different companies leave at the same time for the same destination whereas the passengers could easily and comfortably be taken by one plane instead of two thus avoiding doubling noise and costs. This excess capacity is wasteful and must sooner or later be paid for either by the customer or by the taxpayer.

I draw attention to these point for two reasons. The first is that new types of planes are being constructed and put on to the market.

Mr. Cornelissen (continued)

The second is that I am not without concern about the ease with which we adopted Resolution 511 last year accepting the introduction into commercial service of Concorde in early 1974.

Against this background I should like to say that in my opinion in a resolution the interests of the customers of civil air transport services as well as the environmental interests of the community as a whole must be incorporated.

For this reason I have two amendments to the draft resolution. I believe that they strengthen the general intentions of the report and that they can contribute to the realisation of one of the main tasks that the Council of Europe has set itself, namely, to improve the quality of life of the individual in a European society as was so well said by the Rapporteur. I am of course prepared to explain the amendments further if required to do so.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Valleix.

Mr. VALLEIX (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this debate unduly, but I should like in the first instance to stress the high quality of our colleague Mr. Rivière's report, and then to make a few comments on it.

I was most interested in the way in which our Rapporteur insisted on the rights of users of air transport.

Our colleague, Mr. Cornelissen, for his part, was emphasising only a moment ago the right of every European to be protected from undue disturbance caused by aircraft flights. And we must, of course, also take account of the problems of the aircraft industry and of air transport, for if we fail to do so, any solution, if I may say so, would be reduced ad absurdum.

In this context, and in order to add a little to this analysis of the rights of users and of the measures for safeguarding the environment in particular, which we must keep continually in mind throughout the whole European continent, I should like to speak of the problems of the industry and of the carriers, for we are talking

here of the interests of a large number of European workers.

My first remarks relate to charter flights. I was most interested in the Rapporteur's comments on this subject and also by the points contained in his draft resolution. We must indeed remember that by 1974, air transport across the Atlantic will be divided equally between the regular airlines and the charter companies.

This completely new factor in air transport may well, if we are not careful — and ECAC is well placed to deal efficiently with the problem — upset the economic and financial equilibrium of most of the airlines, in particular the European ones.

I shall now deal with a delicate topic: that of reciprocal landing rights.

It is, in my opinion, interesting to link this problem with that of European cabotage, for we may fear that our European airlines will not have the same manoeuvering possibilities as American airlines within Europe itself as well as for their inter-continental flights with the possibility of successive stops in European cities.

This represents a handicap in the management of our European airlines which we have been unable to remove up till now, just as we have not yet solved the problem of the 5% which weighs on our exports of aeronautical equipment to America. This situation penalises European air transport and I think it would be a good idea for ECAC to take further action in this area.

I shall now turn to the, in my view, somewhat contradictory remarks of our British colleagues, Mr. Warren and Mr. Mason, on the subject of European policy on aircraft production.

We shall all doubtless agree that we do not wish to encourage nationalist reflexes in this area, but I believe that we have the duty not only to defend but also to promote this aircraft industry, both because it corresponds to economic needs and also because it provides work for 400 000 employees — in general highly-qualified — 200 000 of whom are in Great Britain and 200 000 on the continent, 100 000 of them in France, the other 100 000 divided between five or six European countries, including in particular Germany and Italy. We cannot disregard these considerations.

Mr. Valleix (continued)

We have also reached a stage in technical development where we have no right to sacrifice either to American competition, or, in a future much less distant than is generally believed, to Japanese competition. In fact, the Japanese are currently planning the mass production of military aircraft, but with a version that could be readily adapted to civil transport and which could reach an output of up to 1600 in two or three years. This is likely to give rise, in five or six years' time, to competition that will weigh extremely heavily on the world market.

Be that as it may, we are now witnessing magnificent successes in the field of co-operation, such that we dared not even hope for ten years ago, from the Airbus to the Concorde, and corresponding to very different levels of technical expertise. The success of this co-operation is an example set by Europe that has no equal elsewhere.

What concerns me, as it does no doubt also many of our colleagues, is that at the same time we are witnessing parallel operations - I do not know what our British colleagues think about this. The Tristar, which is making it possible to equip the Airbus, is its direct competitor: to put it clearly, it is a question of using British engines and, with American collaboration, of trying to save Rolls-Royce. These are considerations which, while not nationalistic, may well be national, and prejudicial to the European aircraft industry as a whole. There is talk now of building a "7x7", a new type of aircraft, with the participation of the Americans and also of BAC who at the same time are working on Concorde. We must realise if we reflect on these matters that we really cannot follow all these policies simultaneously, and we must make a choice. Although our choices must not be directed against anyone, we must at least make them European. I should like to ask our Rapporteur if ECAC, in so far as it is able to participate in determining the present and future needs of aviation, cannot lend its weight to helping Europe to establish more satisfactorily the ideal types of aircraft that will be needed in the coming years, and use its authority to help us also to discipline ourselves in this matter.

I quite agree that there must not be amongst us Europeans too great a degree of complaisance; but we must impose a minimum discipline. In the last analysis, this will benefit not only the employees and the workers in the aircraft industry, but the aircraft users as well.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mrs. Aasen.

Mrs. AASEN (Norway). — I had not intended to take part in this debate, but I was provoked by the speech of Mr. Mason. I did not think that the report and draft resolution would give rise to such appraisals of supersonic flight as I heard from him.

I have taken part in earlier discussions on the subject, especially when we had a special meeting on environmental questions in Stockholm some years ago and the Social Committee was invited to take part and did so. Therefore, I shall not today repeat all my worries about supersonic flight and the environment.

But I do not think that the last word has been spoken on the matter. Those of us who do not want our environment spoilt by supersonic flights will go on fighting against the spreading of such flights. I hope that our worries will be respected and that our feelings will be considered.

Mr. Mason called the supersonic projects prestige projects. Can we on this earth of ours afford to go on with prestige projects, as he so rightly described them? After all, we have only one earth, and we should preserve it for generations to come.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — There are no more speakers on the list. I call the Rapporteur.

Mr. RIVIÈRE (France) (Translation). — I shall reply briefly to the speakers who have taken the floor, first to Mr. Warren who said that in Europe the price of air transport is infinitely higher than in America. He feels that this difference is due to the fact that European aircraft have a much smaller capacity than American ones. He is right. But given the number of aircraft that are being built in European countries and the continuous competition, how can we ensure that the interests of the carriers, which he also spoke of, are balanced by the interests of the users? Our chief concern, after all, is that the users should receive satisfaction.

Mr. Rivière (continued)

In my view, the interests of the carriers should be considered after those of the users. This is why I referred to this question in my report. We must at some future date achieve this multilateral and co-ordinated liberalisation of air traffic dues so that the cost of European air transport may be considerably lower than at present.

Mr. Mason dealt with the same problem — that of co-operation between the national airlines of Europe, which should be much closer in order to permit, once again, the multilateral and co-ordinated liberalisation of air traffic and, in particular, to achieve the reduction of air traffic dues, which are higher in Europe than in America.

Mr. Cornelissen spoke a moment ago about duplication of flights, and said that efforts should be made to avoid this. If this is to be achieved it must be through the co-ordinated action of all European countries. In fact, with regard to the environment, which figured prominently in the speeches of both Mr. Cornelissen and Mrs. Aasen, it is essential that, in the near future, the population in all our countries should no longer be subjected to disturbance of the kind caused in particular by night flights where the aircraft of two airlines, for example, take off at the same time, when a greater degree of co-ordination between the airlines would have made it possible to avoid this duplication.

Mr. Mason also said that in his view ECAC should not divorce itself from ICAO. We fully agree on that point. The ECAC is an independent organisation set up by our Assembly. It has nonetheless the same Secretariat as ICAO, the officials are the same. But, in my view, it should remain independent and, while preserving its autonomy, also keep its very close links with ICAO.

Mr. Cornelissen spoke of the environment. With regard to this I should like to put a question to him. Certainly, the conservation of the environment is of concern to us all, and in particular to young people. But this conservation must not be allowed to interfere with safety. I should like to quote in particular the case of the aircraft which crashed on take-off from London because it was not allowed to use its jets to full capacity and the pilot had a slight heart attack. That accident caused one hundred

and eleven deaths. We must thus ensure that problems of noise do not take precedence over problems of safety which are, in my view, even more important where the passengers are concerned.

Mr. Valleix spoke of the reduction of air traffic dues. That is the purpose of paragraph 6 of the resolution. If, once again, we can manage to co-ordinate work in all European countries so as to achieve an aircraft industry that is really European, we shall indeed be able to reduce first traffic dues and likewise the cost of flights in Europe.

I have perhaps overlooked a certain number of questions, but I think the essential things have been said and that the Assembly will wish to adopt the draft resolution as it stands.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call the Chairman of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development.

Mr. ALEMYR (Sweden). — On behalf of the committee I thank the Rapporteur for the excellent work he has done on this very important subject. I also thank all who took part in the discussion for their valuable speeches. I accept the two amendments tabled by Mr. Cornelissen.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I shall read out the draft resolution in Document 3275, presented by the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development:

"The Assembly,

- 1. Considering the report of its Committee on Economic Affairs and Development on civil aviation in Europe (Doc. 3275);
- 2. Recalling that the European Civil Aviation Conference (ECAC) was set up as a result of an initiative of the Assembly, greatly appreciating the continued maintenance of close relations between ECAC and the Council of Europe, and looking forward to their further reinforcement;
- Convinced of the great value to Europe of the work which has been undertaken hitherto by ECAC in facilitating European air transport operations;
- 4. Attaching great importance to ECAC's remaining an independent European intergovernmental organisation concerned with the regulation of civil air transport in Europe, as well as to a further development of the scope of its activities in the light of rapidly changing technical, operational, economic and financial problems in this field;
- 5. Stressing the need for European governmental action in the civil air transport field to be inspired by the need to give first place to the interests of the

The President (continued)

users and potential users of such transport — including those whose main need is for cheap holiday travel — rather than to narrower airline pressure group interests;

- 6. Believing that the European Communities have a particularly important role to play in securing greater co-operation than hitherto between their national flagcarrying airlines with a view to ensuring a Community approach to a co-ordinated and progressive multilateral liberalisation of air traffic rights (as advocated in Assembly Recommendation 391 (1964)) in Community member States for air carriers of those countries, and in concerting measures to favour, possibly within the framework of the European Space Agency to be established by January 1974, joint European aero-space construction projects with a view to ensuring the continued development of a strong and competitive European aerospace industry;
- 7. Underlining the need for ECAC to reach an early agreement with the US and Canadian civil aviation authorities which will permit of some effective control of the capacity offered on scheduled air services on the North Atlantic;
- 8. Attaching great importance not only to the maintenance of existing safety standards, whether of aircraft or on the ground, but also to their improvement;
- 9. Recalling Assembly Resolutions 511 (1972) and 512 (1972), and urging member States to plan their airport construction policy with overriding regard to environmental (noise) considerations, and to take the necessary planning and development measures early enough to secure that these considerations can be fully respected;
- 10. Calling upon the member States of ECAC which have not already done so to ratify urgently the Tokyo, Hague and Montreal Conventions as a further step in curbing air piracy,
- 11. Thanks the European Civil Aviation Conference for the transmission of the latter's replies to Assembly Resolution 470 (1970) and to the views expressed in the accompanying report (Doc. 2738), and requests ECAC to inform it of the follow-up it has given to the proposals to which the present resolution makes reference, and which are further developed, in the report mentioned in paragraph 1 above."

Mr. Cornelissen has presented two amendments to this document.

The first reads as follows:

"In the draft resolution, at the end of paragraph 4, delete all the words after 'economic', and insert the following:

'financial and environmental problems in this field $\dot{}$,"

The second reads as follows:

"After paragraph 8, insert a new paragraph worded as follows:

'Underlining that a balance must be held between the interest of the customers of civil air transport services and the environmental interests of the community as a whole'."

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

I put to the vote, on a show of hands, Amendment No. 1, which has been accepted by the committee...

The amendment was adopted unanimously.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

I put to the vote, on a show of hands, Mr. Cornelissen's Amendment No. 2, which has also been accepted by the committee.

The amendment was adopted unanimously.

We shall now proceed to a vote on the draft resolution contained in Document 3275 as amended.

There is no request for a roll-call vote. The Assembly will accordingly vote on a show of hands.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

I put the document to the vote...

The draft resolution as amended was adopted unanimously.

It will be published as Resolution 545.

10. Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe

(Debate on the report of the Committee on Science and Technology, Doc. 3286 and Addendum, and votes on the draft order and draft resolution)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the debate on the report of the Committee on Science and Technology on scientific and technological co-operation in Europe, and also the votes on the draft order and draft resolution, Document 3286 and Addendum.

I call Mr. Erling Petersen, Chairman and Rapporteur of the Committee on Science and Technology. Mr. Erling PETERSEN (Norway). — On behalf of the Committee on Science and Technology, I have the honour to present a progress report. The reason is that the committee presented a report to the sessions of the Assembly in October 1972 and in January 1973 and also to the Standing Committee in March this year. The present report covers all the main areas of the committee's present activities.

Before touching on those I shall say a few words about the general state of affairs of European scientific co-operation. I start with the scientific technological co-operation in the framework of the European Communities. The work in the Communities started in 1965 with the setting-up of a working party of scientific and technical research policy — the PREST Group — the aim of which was to prepare measures for the launching of a co-ordinated or common policy on scientific and technical research.

In October 1967 the Council of Ministers confirmed the amplified terms of reference of the PREST Group. The extended mandate included a general comparison of national methods, plans, programmes and budgets for research and development; an examination of the possibilities of European co-operation possibly enlarged to take in countries other than Community member States, beginning with the seven sectors of activity: data processing, telecommunications, new means of transport, oceanography, meteorology, metallurgy, pollution; and an examination of the ways and means of creating a Community system of scientific and technical information and documentation and a speeding up of scientific training and exchanges.

On the basis of this mandate, the PREST Group proposed co-operation in activities to be undertaken between the Community countries and ten non-member European countries in all these areas. A special group, the COST Group, was set up.

In addition, the PREST Group set up the following working panels to assists it in its work. First, there was the Working Panel on R and D Statistics; then the Committee on Information and Documentation for Science and Technology; the Urban Development — Structures of the Habitat; the Committee on Medical Research and Public Health; the Committee on Monitoring of Seriously Ill Persons: and Computer Training.

So far, however, no concrete proposals for

specific co-operative action have been put forward by the six working panels I have mentioned, although some are expected to be forthcoming in the not-too-distant future.

On the whole it must be said that experience of COST has shown that it is extremely difficult to implement a concerted research and development policy between countries which have very different levels of industrial development. The Summit Conference of the Nine in Paris on 19 and 20 October 1972 gave an added impetus to scientific-technological co-operation in the Community; and a multinational research programme for the years 1973-76, involving a total of almost 180 million units of account and approximately 1 700 persons, was adopted. Details of these programmes will be found on page 6 of the report so I will not go into details.

Turning to another field, European space cooperation, on 20 December last the European Space Conference took four principal decisions. It agreed that a new organisation should be formed out of ELDO and ESRO to be called the European Space Agency. Secondly, it agreed that the national space programme should be integrated into a European space programme. Thirdly, it agreed to go ahead with the construction of a launcher based on the French launcher proposal, L3-S. Fourthly, it agreed on European participation in the post-Apollo programme.

On 27 April this year, however, the Council of ELDO decided to abandon construction of the Europa II launcher which created a new situation. That is why the committee is presenting an Addendum to Document 3286, with the draft resolution. It will be seen from paragraph 9 of the draft resolution that it is proposed that the Assembly:

"Resolves to urge member States of the European Space Conference not only to participate in the proposed conference but also to make a serious political, technological and financial effort to agree without further delay on a European satellite and launcher programme and participation in the post-Apollo programme."

in short, a real European space policy.

The next point is East-West scientific-technological co-operation. One development in East-West relations which has tended to pass unnoticed is the effort of ECE in Geneva to increase

Mr. Erling Petersen (continued)

East-West scientific-technological co-operation. To this end, the Commission of ECE set up, about two years ago, Senior Advisors to ECE Governments. The first session took place in Geneva from 11 to 14 December 1972. This session had been prepared by the holding of three seminars.

It is interesting to note that a proposal was put forward to hold a conference on technology and economic growth in 1975. In order to be associated with such an important European conference, the following alternatives seem to be open to the Council of Europe: joint participation in the organisation, planning and agenda, and/or members of the Assembly should participate in the conference; or the Secretariat alone would attend as observer.

The committee secretary has been an observer at the Senior Advisers' meeting which I have mentioned. At that meeting the following reports emanating from the Committee on Science and Technology were distributed: first, a prelimiminary examination of intergovernmental cooperation in science and technology affecting Western Europe - Project Perseus; secondly, the final report of the third Parliamentary and Scientific Conference in Lausanne from 11 to 14 April 1972. Both these reports aroused considerable interest amongst the participating delegations and the point was made by some delegations that in establishing the ECE Work Programme, and in its future work, it would be desirable to co-operate with other international organisations, one of which would be the Council of Europe.

I turn now to special Council of Europe projects on which the Committee on Science and Technology is working. I will not go into details as we have specific Rapporteurs on these items. The first is the follow-up of the third and preparation for the fourth Parliamentary and Scientific Conference. It will be seen from the report that we have done really extensive work in the follow-up of the third conference and are now preparing for the fourth. I believe Mr. Czernetz, who has done some excellent work in this connection, will speak on this.

I will now touch on computer-based aids to parliamentary work. A sub-committee which has for some years been seized of the problem first presented a report on the hardware of the data which has aroused great interest in the data industry. Lately, we have turned to the problem of data processing as a means of giving parliamentarians better information. We have lately visited Bonn where a parliamentarian databank has been started.

The sub-committee has drawn some tentative conclusions. It would not be practicable to establish a mammoth data-bank within the framework of European parliamentary assemblies and organisations. This idea has been discussed here before and it would be more practicable to provide a link by terminals between international parliamentary and governmental bodies, on the one hand, and national parliamentary and governmental data-banks and information systems, on the other.

The sub-committee feels that is important for the seventeen parliaments of the Council of Europe to agree on the division of labour and tasks in order to avoid waste and overlapping. It is not necessary to install a computer in the parliament building itself, but it is important for parliament to have access to computers in governmental ministries, in universities and in other private institutions. A computer terminal with links to national computer data-banks ought to be set up in the new Council of Europe building.

On European co-operation in specific scientific fields, Mr. Capelle, who has had a very important task in getting this going, will undoubtedly say a few words. I will just say that this task has been very successful. The work involves three different stages: long-range forecasting studies, study groups and established working parties. At the present time we have four working parties: that on space biophysics which was set up on 22 December 1970, that on geodynamics which was set up on 24 March 1971, that on polar research, set up on 26 May 1971 - I myself am specially interested in the work of this group which is now before the Committee of Ministers — and finally the working party on aero-space physiology and medicine which was set up on 14 December 1971. These scientific working parties have made it possible to create research teams covering a wide range of disciplines; these teams carry out studies as part Mr. Erling Petersen (continued)

of a clearly defined joint European research programme.

We have presented a draft order to enable us to continue the work I have mentioned. We also have a draft resolution on space policy. I hope that both will be accepted.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Czernetz, Rapporteur of the committee, who will speak on the follow-up to the third Parliamentary and Scientific Conference, and on the preparations for the fourth conference.

Mr. CZERNETZ (Austria) (Translation). — Mr. President, I very much regret that this item comes at the end of the session, but one of the items always has to come last, to the regret of one committee after another.

I have a twofold apology to make: firstly because those colleagues who are present would like to be off home, and also because I myself must leave at twelve.

Mr. President, when expressing my regret, it is above all because this is not just some minor technical matter, but rather a political issue of the first order. In this age of scientific and technological change one of the most decisive questions is whether, as a matter of scientific policy, we are capable of drawing the right conclusions to shape the institutions of our parliamentary democracy in harmony with scientific innovations. The very fate of our parliamentary democracies may depend thereon.

Professor Petersen, the General Rapporteur and Chairman of the committee, has already referred to the third European Parliamentary and Scientific Conference held in Lausanne last year. In our national parliaments we still have to put into effect the numerous decisions taken there.

May I state clearly that the science policy of each country is a national matter. But this does not mean there cannot be a European science policy and this should not be restricted to Europe of the Nine but must be dealt with in the widest possible framework of our seventeen member States.

This is especially obvious regarding the proposed European Science Foundation, a matter already discussed by the Ministers. There can be no question of simply by-passing countries such as Sweden and Switzerland — to take only two examples — and saying that the Nine can do without them.

I would like to draw attention to one further question which has been under consideration for many a year and does not only date from the third conference of last year but from the second one in Vienna. It concerns the setting-up of parliamentary and scientific committees or working parties in all countries; where such bodies still exist and have not, as is unfortunately the case in our country, disappeared soon after having been set up, they have acquired very great significance.

We are now faced with the task of preparing the fourth conference. For this purpose and at the express wish of the scientists, an ad hoc committee of parliamentarians and scientists has been set up, which is not merely a subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Technology, but a joint committee consisting of 11 parliamentarians and 11 scientists and experts.

Scientists are urging that the fourth European conference should be held as soon as possible to avoid the long delay which took place between the second and third conferences.

One decision concerning preparations for the fourth conference has been taken; on 13 and 14 September a colloquy will be held here in Strasbourg which again will be attended by equal numbers of parliamentarians and scientists, and which will not be restricted to members of the ad hoc committee. We hope that other members of the Science Committee will also show interest and I would like to say that if Chairmen of other committees so desire and apply in time, we shall be delighted to invite them also to the colloquy. We have moreover already invited quite a number of well-known scientists.

The subject of the colloquy is: "Science and the decision-making machinery of society" with the sub-title: "The evolution of science and technology in relation to society and the need for a corresponding evolution in decision-making machinery". The subject is more straightforward than the typically complicated title makes it

Mr. Czernetz (continued)

sound. What really matters is that parliamentarians, together with the scientists who will prepare and submit a series of basic studies. should be able to make up their minds on one question, which the ad hoc committee has already thoroughly discussed: Is it possible, with regard to decision-making machinery, to form an abstract concept of the ideal scientific requirements and then go on to study how this ideal may be applied to the various political systems and to our own parliamentary democracy? That was one idea. The other one, which I freely admit was mine, was whether parliaments should step in at the earliest possible stage in the planning process so that democracy and parliament do not become rubber stamp formalities, merely accepting and sanctioning what has already been settled elsewhere. There will, I hope, be very serious and lively debates on these issues which are of far-reaching political import. The findings will be reported first of all in the Committee on Science and Technology and finally in this Assembly. We do not for one moment lose sight of the fact that we are dealing here with questions of life and death for parliamentary democracy in our day and age of scientific and technological innovations.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Capelle, the committee's Rapporteur for the subject of European co-operation in specific scientific fields.

Mr. CAPELLE (France) (Translation). — Mr. President, at the request of our Chairman, I shall say a few words on European co-operation in specific scientific fields.

I should like to deal in turn with three points.

The first is a brief historical recapitulation to explain that if our committee has come to deal with a certain number of scientific projects, it is because directors of research laboratories in our various European countries felt the need to approach the Council of Europe, considering it to be a forum where they could meet and at the same time an agency through which contact could be established between their laboratories so that their scientific potential could be used for operations of a scientific nature in which they have a common interest.

Having thus been made aware of the existence of a need which did not duplicate needs catered for through other channels, our committee made its preparations, and these are the subject of my second point.

First, we needed to know what type of project we were going to be dealing with. The projects had to meet the following three criteria: firstly, they had to be specific, that is to say, have a limited objective and a practical application, for example, the study of cosmic rays on the behaviour of human beings, or on life at supersonic flight altitudes. Thus, the specific character of the project, as I have just defined it, is a primary condition.

Secondly, the projects had to be interdisciplinary. This requirement corresponded in particular to the wishes of our colleagues, the directors of research laboratories; that is to say, the pooling of means which are used separately to study very different questions — and the problems of living beings are generally of an interdisciplinary nature.

The third criterion applied to these projects was that they should be international, that is to say call on the resources existing in several member countries.

With the projects thus delimited, we can now go on to consider how they are chosen. Mr. Petersen reminded us just now of the three essential stages leading to the acceptance of projects which the Council of Europe takes, so to speak, under its wing.

The first stage is the forecasting of problems that may arise. The second stage is a study of the documents assembled in order to determine, after detailed consideration, which projects can be selected and which are better left to others. The third stage gives tangible expression to the initial interest in the projects by the setting-up of working parties — those working parties that are sometimes known as "science clubs" and which provide a meeting ground for those in charge of the various laboratories whose equipment is involved in carrying out the project. Mr. Petersen gave some examples when he referred to the space biophysics group, the geodynamics group and the glaciology group. I should just like to add to this non-exhaustive list of working parties the existence of a European Joint Committee on Scientific Co-operation. This Institution, unofficial but very useful, has two

Mr. Capelle (continued)

purposes: the first is to help concert the activities of the various working parties for mutual information purposes; the second but by no means less important purpose is to establish a dialogue between scientists and parliamentarians.

A certain number of our colleagues who are members of the Committee on Science and Technology sit on this body, together with those in charge of the scientific working parties, in order to consider jointly the problems raised.

As Mr. Czernetz has just pointed out, on the rather higher plane of co-operation between parliamentarians and scientists, we are concerned here with a link in the chain that will eventually lead to greater mutual confidence between parliamentarians and scientists, and will mean that parliamentarians will not be dispossessed of their political responsibilities as a result of the technical difficulties of the scientific problems on which they will have ultimately to pronounce.

Thirdly, I propose to give you some of the latest information on the development of this committee's work in this field. For example, a recent meeting held at CERN in Geneva of the members of the Working Party on Space Biophysics has produced a report on the conditions governing cosmic radiation and its effects on human beings at supersonic flight altitudes — a problem that was mentioned this morning.

Another item of topical interest is the preparations being made for the Antarctic expedition. As you know, the layers of ice of the southern Antarctic can be thought of as archives of world history, of the evolution of the environment and, more particularly, of pollution.

The Soviet Union, on the one hand, and the United States, on the other, are already engaged in an extensive scientific investigation of the Antarctic. This work is very costly. It will be useful for Europe to take part in it and it is this that we are asking the Assembly to approve. I should merely like to point out that the Council of Europe's financial commitment for this type of operation could be compared to that of what the chemists call a catalyst. The estimated expenditure for the Council of Europe's "catalysing" action is of the order of 50 000 francs, while that chargeable to the States taking part

in the scientific operation itself is around 17 million francs. You will realise immediately that there is no question here of those scientists who have approached the Council of Europe in this matter requesting an additional subsidy.

Finally, I should like to add that the field of immunology, which is under current consideration with a view to setting up a working party, will be the subject of an international conference to be held in Strasbourg next September. It should bring together several hundred people from many different countries.

Another specific question — and I mention it because it underlines the sense in which I used the word "specific" at the beginning of my speech — is the setting-up of a working party to study the problem of the Rhine valley watertable. Here is an example of a specific problem limited in space which concerns neighbouring countries and which is naturally multidisciplinary in character.

I should like to conclude by saying that at this time, when the future of the Council of Europe is under discussion, it is comforting to reflect that its future in several fields is assured, notably in that of formulating a science policy with the threefold aim of improving the material conditions of human life, enhancing its quality, and, in so doing, ensuring the preservation of our planet's resources for future generations.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Capelle.

I call Mr. Osborn, in the absence of Mr. Richter, to present the report on the Council of Europe's special project on the use of the computer for parliamentary activities.

Mr. OSBORN (United Kingdom). — I rise to speak for the Rapporteur, Mr. Richter, who gives his apologics for not being here at the present time. I rise as Chairman of the sub-committee but I would also like to comment on the tributes that have been paid to my predecessor, Mr. Lloyd, the British MP, who has done so much to bring together computer interests in Europe and who has demonstrated the vital role that this Council can play in this field, as in many others. I hope I shall be able to catch your eye again, Mr. President, as I would like separately and not in this contribution to talk about the space resolution.

But first I wish to deal with the computer-based aids to parliamentary work. All I wish to do at this stage is to give an interim report on the work of the sub-committee which has been referred to by Professor Petersen. I would obviously want to outline what we have done so far, and what we propose to do, but I believe members of parliament outside the Council of Europe must know more about the philosophies that go behind librarianship and the work we are doing, and I will touch on that.

First, I wish to make reference to what other parliaments are doing in this regard. In January there was a conference in Geneva run by the Inter-Parliamentary Union informing the MP—is he sufficiently well informed? One wag says he knows and learns too much. The conference was a useful forum in which to discuss the matter on a world-wide basis.

Reference was made to new techniques and new technologies. An important feature of the conference was that it included librarians and academics. There is a special expertise on storage and retrieval of information librarianship. Anything we may think we want as members of parliament must be achieved in co-operation with those who provide us with a library service and a research service.

If this was a feature of the Geneva Conference, it was also a feature of the conference held in Bonn. Those committee MPs who attended benefited very much from the wisdom and expertise of those who spent their lives in librarianship.

Whatever we do in the Council of Europe or as a parliament we must do in co-operation with those who are experts in providing us with the data we need. But, of course, the member of parliament always wants information. The librarian is a link in providing that information, as is the research worker, and that link will always remain. All we are talking about is the new tools that are available for those who assist us. To think that we can replace those tools is nonsense. The committee has reiterated this time and time again.

We have been in touch with the Congress Library of the United States of America. First, of course, that is basically a research service to representatives and senators. Secondly, it is a store of documents and books which are kept on shelves, and books that are kept on shelves inevitably get dusty and require much handling. But now we as MPs, those in government as well as those in industry and science, want data today, not tomorrow, next week or next month. Thus the element of speed has come into librarianship and research work. We as customers are asking that of those who provide us with a service.

The Congress Library is probably the most advanced in the world, and any information it is able to give us, as it has already given the Inter-Parliamentary Union, will be of value.

We have also been in touch with the New York Times, which is running a current affairs awareness service using computerised abstracting devices primarily for its own staff and editors, but it is intended that this will be available on a much wider basis.

This brings me to the question of techniques of communication of knowledge and information, which is what librarianship is about. The greatest advance was probably when mankind learnt to write. The second greatest advance in the communication of knowledge was when the printing press was invented. Over the centuries we have had to find the products of the printing press and find out where the material is. But in the last two decades the computer which provides us with up-to-date abstracting services is the latest tool that the committee is considering.

In science and technology, in the separate centres of excellence, various institutions and associations are now providing for their members up-to-date abstracting services of all the scientific and technological information that is available.

I have been associated with work in connection with setting up a British library to this end in as much as we as parliamentarians could well learn much in this respect.

Reference is made in the report to data-banks. There can be communication because data-banks

are a form of communication. All that is required is a remote terminal with a screen on which one can see the abstract and then demand a print-out if that is required. The House of Commons, for instance, will be having a link with the information data-bank of the Treasury in the near future. There is, of course, contact with the computer manufacturers, and they are arranging courses in the appropriate languages for members of parliament who are interested in this matter.

However, there are other techniques of information: photocopying, copying the prime documents, the telecopier, putting the prime document at the end of a machine and using a conventional telephone line to produce that document. There is microfilm, microfiche and ultra-fiche. In addition, there are new philosophies connected with the communication of knowledge and information.

Those of us who went to Japan were impressed at the techniques and with the orientation in that part of the world to the use of the computer. We hope to gain information from Japan in this respect.

In Great Britain there is an organisation called the Association of Scientific Libraries. Its director, a Mr. Leslie Wilson, prepared a valuable report for the British Parliament, which has done work on this subject. However, this is an independent institution and has a great knowledge. We look forward to asking it to give us information of the available techniques.

Librarianship is not so much a question of storing books on shelves and indexing them. It is now a question of communicating knowledge from where it is stored to those who want to use it, and do so quickly.

Mr. Petersen referred to our experience in Bonn. We are grateful not only to our Rapporteur, Mr. Richter, but also to Dr. Matthes, who is acting as adviser. We had an introductory paper from Professor Quaritsch, who has been in charge of the Working Party on Data Processing in the Bonn Parliament. Bonn is very grateful to the dynamic leadership of Mr. Kai-Uwe von Hassel. The sub-committee concluded

that Germany has done much to lead the way in Europe. We discussed the introduction to the planned parliamentary data-processing system, on-line interrogation, on-line machine interrogation of legal material and planned monitor systems of legislative process. We also discussed the information retrieval of the press and information services available in Bonn and had demonstrations which impressed those members of parliament present.

As a sub-committee, we were very grateful for the demonstration that Germany was able to put forward. I am of the view that Germany is an example to the other European parliaments of what can be done. We have had information from Paris, and we hope to hold our next meeting in Italy in November. We hope to return to Britain and have the joint meeting with the Parliamentary and Scientific Committee on this subject in either January or February next year.

If Germany, Italy and other nations are making progress, it is also important to do the thinking, prepare a thesaurus and have a philosophy as well as the softwear. I believe Britain has done much in this regard, and, having set up a British library, we could gain much from the new director, Dr. Hookway. We can gain much from ASLIB, as I have mentioned, but there is much we can learn from the abstracting services which are being based in Britain and carried out jointly with other nations in the scientific and technological sphere.

These new techniques apply to parliament. We shall learn in Britain that this excellent report has been turned down in the interests of cost: the service to members of parliament alone would be too costly. But there can be co-operation between nations. There are libraries in universities, in government and government departments. If what we are doing is thought of as a service to parliaments and members of parliament only, of course it will be considered too costly, but it could be a service to nations. Reference has been made to a data-bank at the Council of Europe and an OECD data-bank.

Parliaments in Europe can learn much from each other. We can bring in experts from outside parliament connected with other activities to provide national and European services.

Germany has been visited. Italy and Great Britain are to be visited. I said at the end of our visit to Bonn that I believed that this was an historic landmark in this new field of expertise for parliamentarians.

We are circulating parliaments again asking what their experiences are. How many parliaments of the world are adopting computer-based information services? What are the limits? To what extent are such services being used by parliamentarians? For what reasons are many parliaments not using computer-based aids and other modern techniques? Why was there an insular approach by individual parliaments and their libraries, in examining such methods on a national basis? To what extent can there be cooperation between parliaments? Mr. Petersen has referred to this matter. What are the possibilities open to parliaments of buying computer time from services outside our parliaments? What alternatives are there?

There are many questions that parliamentarians and parliaments should be aware of. The sub-committee has embarked on an interesting voyage of exploration. I am honoured to be the Chairman and to make this interim report on behalf of the Rapporteur, Mr. Richter.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The list of speakers will close in a quarter of an hour. May I please ask you to be very brief, seeing that it is already extremely late?

I call Mr. Warren.

Mr. WARREN (United Kingdom). — I shall heed your words, Mr. President. I shall be brief and speak as quickly as the interpreters can cope with my speech.

I am sure that we all welcome the intention to establish the European Space Agency, but it is important to recognise that, although the convention may be signed by 1 January next year, there is no indication that the Agency will start work on that day. I hope that members will not be misled into believing that the Agency starts then. I fear that the route to space collaboration in Europe will therefore perhaps be slower than we would wish.

The differing national views on launchers have not been resolved. I hope that the Agency will study all the space opportunities that we could bring together in a visible, rational European space programme, which will take account of the American, Russian and Japanese achievements and their future progress, and in which member States can participate by choice expressed at each step of the European programme. The Space Agency Agreement sets out to allow that.

I hope that we shall not forget the selectivity which is open to national governments. I am sure that Mr. Czernetz and Mr. Capelle would agree that the greatest danger in advanced technology is the propensity of engineers and governments to invent, and to encourage as a matter of professional and national pride the invention of devices already available from other friendly countries. The "not invented here" philosophy is one that we cannot afford in European space programmes.

I recognise the need to avoid complete dependence on single foreign sources of supply, but we must not spend money inventing technology that we can easily buy. There would be no merit in inventing the wheel again. At the same time, I do not think that there is any merit in establishing a European parallel capability in space work where others have already succeeded.

I appreciate the need to get on with the job in hand. We are faced with a critical date this year, 15 August, when we have to decide whether to participate in the American Sortie-Laboratory opportunity in the post-Apollo programme. We must have flexibility in our planning of European space programmes to take account of the effects on intercontinental collaboration when partners meet problems in their separate programmes.

Obviously it is distressing to read of the troubles that the Americans have been experiencing in the past few days with their Skylab accident. We all wish the American astronauts well who are going up a week today to try to repair the Skylab in orbit. The accident illustrates two questions to which we need to have answers from the American Government before 15 August. First, will it be the American's intention to take money from other sectors of the post-Apollo programme in which Europe may participate to continue Skylab to a successful conclusion? Secondly, would the United States Government put their national programmes before their international programmes in post-Apollo?

Mr. Warren (continued)

Delays in space science programmes are far too expensive for us to fail to take steps early to erase unnecessary expenditure when negotiation could save the money. There are so many opportunities for the use of space as a new dimension of benefit to man that we must be constantly vigilant to see that we invest the taxpayers' money selectively and that we monitor the progress of the investment with accuracy.

The European Space Agency will have to be able to guide national governments to programmes that will give the maximum benefits for the money invested. I wish it well in its creation and in its gigantic task,

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Mr. Warren. The next speaker is Mr. Osborn.

Mr. OSBORN (*United Kingdom*). — I shall try to be very brief on the subject, as I spoke on it in January. We have before us a very interesting draft resolution. I was not at the committee at which it was discussed.

My colleague Mr. Warren has a vast knowledge of aero-space questions. I can only underline what he has said. The space scene is continuously changing. I was involved in the British Parliament in trying to determine a British space policy and co-ordinate the activities within one nation that is part of the nations of Europe. That was difficult enough.

Financing a space programme is costly, particularly if it is thought of in national terms. All of us in the Assembly are agreed that at any rate within Europe we must work together; there is no point in duplicating. Perhaps across continents and between continental economies we must find a way of working together.

I welcome the setting up of a European Space Agency. It has an immense task. Because there are perhaps differences among governments, between Ministers and more particularly in the Assembly between members of parliament, it is all the more important to ease those differences and think in terms of what is best for Europe. We must work out what we want from space. It may have important military implications. That is a matter for Western European Union. We here are interested in space for peaceful purposes, for surveys and communication. Communication between continents by means of satellite is becoming more efficient and is enabling us to communicate more readily. In another context I have spoken about the communication of knowledge.

Communication between data-banks is very much a feature of modern computer technology. Here the satellite has an important role.

There are two aspects to space technology. One is the launchers and the other is the satellites. The development of satellites and satellite techniques and co-operation on an international basis through Intelsat continues to be important. Of course, individual nations tend to pine after an individual capability, because they gain strength from this.

Members of Western European Union, of which I was a member, saw what was happening in Japan. We saw the adoption of the Thor Delta and the NASDA I, because the Japanese wanted a capability, which they licensed. They were not setting up to a great extent their own research and development organisation to duplicate work that had been done elsewhere.

We have wanted to develop our own technology and spend the money on research. This has been the history of Europa I, Europa II and Europa III, and now the L3-S, to develop our own launcher technology. This will be a French and German exercise.

The British view is that those who want to develop their technology and spend money on the research to develop it — Germany and France — may well go ahead and do so, but there are other fields. My colleague, Mr. Warren, has referred to Skylab. Not all space programmes are without their difficulties and delays. What happens over Skylab will influence NASA and post-Apollo. I therefore underline that the post-Apollo programme must be looked at by Europe as a technology not only for putting satellites

into space but for other equipment and the means of repairing satellites once they are in orbit.

Resolution No. 5 deals not only with European participation in the post-Apollo programme but also shows concern for our own launcher. We may develop a capability, but what is the use of spending funds on developing a capability which is technologically obsolete when we have completed it? I very much hope that Europeans can put their minds to work with NASA on the post-Apollo project on which we are partners in mass up-to-date technology, if we believe that it will serve our ends.

We support this resolution, but the most important thing is to start building up a European space programme. This Council has an important part to play in bridging differences between nationalistic views. The discussion must continue in the committee as in this Assembly.

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Mr. Osborn. The next speaker is Mr. Small.

Mr. SMALL (United Kingdom). — As a parliamentarian and as a Scotsman, I believe in economy of words. They are so precious that if we invented a taxation system on the use of words we could solve the problem of the national debt

I am speaking particularly on Mr. Capelle's report on a European Antarctic Programme. I should like to add some information following the statement made by Mr. Capelle in order to point out the great interest in the proposed European Antarctic Programme presented in Recommendation 701, which has already been submitted to the Committee of Ministers.

First, at the international level, during the meeting in Moscow last year of the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research — SCAR — the European Antarctic Programme set up by the Working Party on Polar Research was discussed. The Executive Committee of SCAR has recommended that if a European expedition was organised any States participating which were not yet signatories to the Antarctic Treaty should "regard themselves as such for the duration of the European expedition". I underline the words "should regard themselves as such for the duration". The Executive Commit-

tee of SCAR is also considering the possibility of inviting a representative of the Working Party on Polar Research convened by the Committee on Science and Technology to attend SCAR's meetings as an observer.

Secondly, at national level, I give the example that in the light of the European Antarctic Programme the Italian National Research Council has decided to set up an Italian Committee on Polar Research. I address myself, not to the Loch Ness monster or the abominable snowman, but to nation-States which make up this Assembly. Concerning the grouping of the Antarctic Treaty the United Kingdom, the United States of America and France are members, but some member States of the Council of Europe, particularly Germany, are not members of the treaty. As a politician I address myself to the invitation. Here is a new scientific Ostpolitik, an opportunity for an international highway bridging many gaps. To that degree one should take note of Recommendation 701 and select candidates.

The situation in the world today and research for programmes of all kinds provides a meeting place for minds. Americans and others have been to the moon and support is needed for these projects. As Bacon said, reading makes an educated and informed man. Adopting this resolution would make a procedure for advance. I have much pleasure in supporting Mr. Capelle's report.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. de Bruyne.

Mr. de BRUYNE (Belgium) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is always a pleasure to listen to a speech by Professor Petersen, a scientist who gives an impetus at once lasting and always new to our Committee on Science and Technology. I thank him for his report and hope that this committee and the Council of Europe will be able to count for a long time to come on the collaboration of men of his calibre and worth.

So excellent is his report that it would be superfluous for me to make lengthy comments on it which could be no more than marginal. There is, however, just one point which I should like to bring out in rather more detail.

On the subject of Recommendation 701 of the draft European Antarctic Programme, I should

Mr. de Bruyne (continued)

like to comment that the countries of Europe have a scientific potential which should make it possible for them to contribute to these studies in a significant and original way. A European programme of polar research should allow Europe to make its contribution to the solution of problems which have a critical effect on the conditions of human life,

Our colleague, Mr. Capelle, has just spoken of these problems in his usual competent fashion.

The polar regions offer the possibility of studying the characteristic parameters of this environment and of measuring and, as far as possible, predicting their variation. There are very interesting and indeed unique possibilities in this field, principally in two areas.

First, the fact that there is no significant source of pollution in the vicinity makes it possible to set up bases that are not subject to any local influence, and to bring to light atmospheric phenomena of world importance.

Further, the archives contained in the layers of snow, bearing faithful witness to atmospheric conditions, will make possible a study of the chronology of variations in the environment and the natural levels which we need to know in order to be able to define the levels of pollution.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the country which I represent in this Assembly, namely Belgium, has played and continues to play a relatively important role in the exploration of the Antarctic. Baron Gerlache de Goméry, who is an active collaborator in projects that the Council of Europe is interested in, is a direct descendant of one of the great 19th century pioneers of the Antarctic, I can assure you that experience has taught us that the financial burden of an Antarctic expedition is too great for any one of our countries alone. Past collaboration within the framework of the Benelux countries seems to me to have been a useful stage.

But it is only in a European context that we are likely to have available the necessary means of action and the scientists who are experts in this field.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have to pronounce on a very important option with regard to the direction to be taken by scientific research.

What we are asking you to support, not so much financially as Mr. Capelle has emphasised, but rather in terms of organisation and logistics, is by no means a marginal adventure to be embarked on by a few well-meaning amateurs.

We are asking the Council of Europe to lend its support to the development of scientific research in a field which is of paramount importance for both present and future generations.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Mr. Erling Petersen, Chairman of the Committee and Rapporteur.

Mr. Erling PETERSEN (Norway). — At this late hour I do not think I should go into details but I want to thank participants in the debate for their contributions. The committee will come back to all these things in later sessions with a full report.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The debate is closed.

In Document 3286 and Addendum the committee presents a draft order and a draft resolution.

I shall first read these documents.

Here is the text of the draft order:

- "The Assembly,
- 1. Having examined the report on scientifictechnological co-operation in Europe (Doc. 3286), prepared by its Committee on Science and Technology;
- 2. Recalling Recommendation 655 (1972) on European co-operation in specific scientific fields, Order No. 323 (1972) on European co-operation in specific scientific fields, Resolution 513 (1972) on the use of computers in national parliaments, Recommendation 678 (1972) on the results of the third Parliamentary and Scientific Conference, Recommendation 698 (1972) on European space policy, and Order No. 332 (1973) on East-West relations in Europe,
- 3. Instructs its Committee on Science and Technology:
 - (a) to continue:
- (i) its examination of scientific-technological cooperation in the framework of the European Community, European space co-operation, East-West

The President (continued)

scientific-technological co-operation, computer-based aids to parliamentary work, and European co-operation in specific scientific fields;

- (ii) its preparation of the fourth Parliamentary and Scientific Conference;
- (b) to report back to the Assembly in due course on these questions."

The text of the draft resolution contained in the Addendum is as follows:

- "The Assembly,
- 1. Recalling its Recommendation 698 (1973), on European space policy, in favour of a European satellite and launcher programme;
- 2. Noting the decision of the Council of ELDO of 27 April 1973 to abandon the construction of the Europa II launcher;
- 3. Convinced that it is important not to lose the experience gained in the preparation of the projects Europa II and III, and noting with satisfaction the French heavy launcher proposal, the L3-S;
- 4. Noting that France will contribute 60% and that the Federal Republic of Germany has engaged itself to contribute over a period of eight years 20% of the construction cost of the L3-S;
- 5. Hoping that other European governments will agree to meet the remaining $20\,\%$ of the cost, and that an agreement can also be reached for European participation in and financial contribution to the post-Apollo programme;
- Taking note with satisfaction of the Belgian-French proposal to hold a new session of the European Space Conference at ministerial level in July 1973;
- 7. Having regard to the pressing and overriding need to determine Europe's future role in space research and technology;
- 8. Convinced that a European space programme will contribute to Europe's technological, economic and political status and enhance its cultural influence in the world,
- 9. Urges all member States of the European Space Conference not only to participate in the proposed conference but also to make a serious political, technological and financial effort to agree without further delay on a European satellite and launcher programme, and participation in the post-Apollo programme."

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

I put the draft order to the vote ...

The draft order was adopted unanimously.

It will be published as Order No. 337.

We shall now proceed to a vote on the whole of the draft resolution contained in the Addendum to Document 3286.

No request is made for a roll-call vote. The Assembly will accordingly vote on a show of hands.

Does anyone wish to speak ?...

I put the draft resolution as a whole to the vote...

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.

It will be published as Resolution 546.

11. Supervision of the application of the European Social Charter

(Debate on the report of the Committee on Social and Health Questions, Doc. 3276 and amendments, and votes on the draft opinion and draft recommendation)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The next Order of the Day is the debate on the report by the Committee on Social and Health Questions on the supervision of the application of the European Social Charter, together with the vote on the draft opinion and draft recommendation, Document 3276 and amendments.

I call Mr. Voogd, Rapporteur of the Committee on Social and Health Questions.

Mr. VOOGD (Netherlands). — Mr. President, may I take the floor on a point of order? The subject with which we are now dealing — the application of the European Social Charter — is a very important one in the scope of the Council of Europe. As you may have seen, there is some controversy on the subject and we should discuss it rather lengthily in this Assembly. As so few members are left in the Assembly at the moment, I would propose to the Assembly, quite in agreement with the Chairman of the committee, that we postpone the treatment of this subject to our next session.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — The Rapporteur is asking for an adjournment of the debate on this subject.

I call Miss Bergegren, Chairman of the Committee on Social and Health Questions.

Miss BERGEGREN (Sweden). — I welcome very much the proposal by the Rapporteur. It seems that because of a deplorable mistake it

Miss Bergegren (continued)

was stated on the first page of this report that it has been unanimously adopted, which is not the case. It may be that many members had the impression that this debate would be only a matter of routine; so I very much welcome the proposal to postpone this item until the next session.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I call Dame Joan Vickers.

Dame Joan VICKERS (United Kingdom). — I hope that as we are apparently to postpone discussion of this very useful and necessary document which affects so many people, particularly women, at the present time, this item will be placed early on the agenda of the next session. I understand the reasoning of the Chairman of the committee. There are very few people here, but this is one of the most important documents before the Council of Europe. If I can have an assurance that this will be discussed early in September next, and not on the last day, then I will agree, but otherwise I am afraid I cannot agree.

THE PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Dame Joan Vickers, for your intervention.

The request to give the report priority at the next meeting will be examined by the Bureau.

(The President continued in French.)

(Translation). — Since adjournment of the debate is requested by the Chairman and the Rapporteur of the Committee on Social and Health Questions, I propose, in pursuance of Rule 33 of the Rules of Procedure, to take a vote by sitting and standing on this request.

The adjournment was agreed to.

12. Aid to the countries of Indo-China

(Debate on the report of the Committee on Population and Refugees, Doc. 3294, the oral opinion of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development, and vote on the draft recommendation)

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — We now come in the Orders of the Day to the debate on the report by the Committee on Population and Refugees, Document 3294, and on the oral opinion of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development on aid to the countries of Indo-China, together with the vote on the draft recommendation.

I call Mr. Enders, Rapporteur of the Committee on Population and Refugees.

Mr. ENDERS (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Vietnam cease-fire agreement of 27 January 1973 unloosed a universal wave of offers to help to relieve the need of the almost 50 million inhabitants of Indo-China and palliate the disastrous results of the war. Humanitarian help and reconstruction aid should be provided for the benefit of the sorely stricken peoples of South-East Asia, some of whom have for decades suffered from the havoc wrought by armed conflicts.

Unfortunately difficulties have arisen in applying the conditions negotiated in the cease-fire agreement, so that peace has not yet returned to all areas. We still read today of fighting in Vietnam, delays in the exchange of prisoners of war, suspension of mine-clearing operations in the Gulf of Tonking and bombing around Pnom Penh. Until all weapons have been reduced to silence, it is unfortunately doubtful whether many forms of aid can be supplied, at least on the desired scale.

As was already the case after the ending of hostilities in other parts of the world, the Council of Europe and the European Community have responded favourably to the need for assistance measures following the armistice in Vietnam. The recommendation to prepare these was referred to the Committee on Population and Refugees which, under the chairmanship of our colleague, Mr. Renschler, gave the matter thorough study. I myself as Rapporteur, assisted by Mr. De Jonge, have had talks with the responsible bodies of the Red Cross and the World Council of Churches in Geneva. Finally, mention should also be made of the support from our colleague Mr. Holtz, representing the Committee on Economic Affairs, who favours aid to Indo-China.

I shall avoid making individual mention of relief organisations and their activities on behalf of Indo-China. That would sound too much like meting out praise and blame. In addition to numerous donations from private individuals and charitable bodies, many governments spontaneously offered to make available sums of no small importance for development aid in the countries of South-East Asia. Furthermore, there is still an obvious place for bilateral schemes of aid between European and non-European States on the one hand and those in South-East Asia on the other hand.

Mr. Enders (continued)

The Red Cross has created an "Indo-China Operational Group" in Geneva, which sponsors relief projects and directs and co-ordinates the action already being taken. To date, this group has received or been promised 30 million Swiss francs from donors both in Europe and from governments and associations overseas and in the Far East.

The extent of the help necessary for the warstricken population far exceeds the funds at present available and is estimated at 100 million Swiss francs. Appeals from Council of Europe member States to their national governments will be necessary if this vast sum is to be collected.

Aid should be made available to all the peoples of Indo-China without discrimination or preferential treatment for one or other group. The relief programme will be carried out in three phases: first, immediate humanitarian help, such as catering for people's day-to-day needs for food and supplies, not forgetting the provision of houses and shelter for refugees and the homeless, medical care and attention for the sick, the wounded and those threatened with disease, including the provision of prostheses and orthopaedic appliances.

Secondly, medium-term relief measures, such as the repair of lines of communication — streets, canals and railways, and the building of bridges and ports. It is also an important task to recultivate the war-damaged countryside in order to make agricultural exploitation possible and to increase yields by making available fertilisers and seeds. In this connection, thought must also be given to improving the education system, building schools, training teachers and to promoting training in the business and scientific sectors.

Thirdly, the long-term programme cannot be drawn up in full at the outset, but requires to be continuously adapted to new prospects and requirements. It should ensure the improvement of living conditions, the creation of new jobs, the increase of the national income and the raising of the standard of living and be shaped in accordance with the social and political problems of the South-East Asian States.

In no event should our efforts give rise to the sort of accusations made in the days of colonialism. They should neither favour one class of society nor be detrimental to another, consolidate the rule of particular circles nor weaken that of others, and they should take account of the political distribution of the population.

We therefore beg this house to approve the recommendation to provide humanitarian relief for Indo-China. Far from considering, however, that our duty ends there, we should continue to feel responsible for supervising the effectiveness of relief and verify and follow up its development. The experiences of the Red Cross and its co-operation with other organisations and partners offer a guarantee for the efficient use of goods and funds.

Irrespective of this, we representatives should not allow successes in relieving need and want to hinder us from taking a firm stand against any form of military solution and preserve the peoples of Asia and the world from the sufferings and wounds of war.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Enders, for your report.

I call Mr. Holtz to present the oral opinion of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development.

Mr. HOLTZ (Federal Republic of Germany) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, for many people in Europe the sordid war in Indo-China had become more and more intolerable. For this reason, European States can be sure of extensive support from their populations for any aid they may decide to offer to Indo-China. The Committee on Economic Affairs and Development considers it to be natural and necessary for Council of Europe member States to provide far-reaching aid. On the whole, it welcomes the proposals which, after intensive consultation and enquiry, have been put forward by Mr. Enders, Rapporteur of the Committee on Population and Refugees. The Economic Committee has charged me to express its point of view with regard to aid to Indo-China. I should therefore like to stress the following points.

The European donor countries must consider the special historical situation of Indo-China. The war which lasted several decades in Vietnam and hampered socio-economic development, indeed at times stopped it altogether, increasingly took on the character of a war of liberation from Mr. Holtz (continued)

the European and American intruders. This more or less bred a resentment-charged nationalism, which was further nourished by the fact that the invaders frequently sought the support of privileged ruling minorities. It is therefore no wonder, as Gunnar Myrdal has pointed out, that an economic and social consciousness made its appearance in the Vietnamese population, creating a desire for radical reforms.

It is understandable that some receiver countries still hesitate to accept the offers of aid from the industrialised nations of the West. Assistance to Indo-China must not be adulterated with neo-colonialism.

If this is to be achieved, the following principles must be observed with regard to the still partly under-developed areas; absolute respect of the right of each individual nation to maintain or create the kind of socio-economic system it wants; the abandonment of all instruments likely to compromise political sovereignty; protection against pressures from multi-national concerns; free access to their own natural resources; subjection of foreign capital to the laws of the land; suppression of discriminating export practices on the part of industrial nations; the making available of adequate technologies accompanied by favourable terms of payment, either by special drawing rights or loans at preferential rates, in order to avoid the massive accumulation of debts.

A distinction has to be made between humanitarian assistance and reconstruction or development aid. We endorse the proposal by the Population Committee to implement humanitarian measures as quickly as possible, mainly by means of international co-ordination and through the agency of organisations such as the International Red Cross, UNO and other public and private institutions.

With regard to reconstruction aid — to which the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development has devoted special attention — our view is that we should offer both technical help in the form of staff and materials and financial help in the shape of capital aid to the countries of Indo-China. It is difficult to calculate the pro-

portional share of aid for each individual beneficiary. The size of population could be used as a possible yardstick. Although the detailed requirements of all parts of Indo-China are not yet known, forms of technical help that would come into consideration would be, for example: help for health and education services, together with the rehabilitation of war victims and the resettlement of refugees, advice in sectors such as energy, agriculture and forestry, and help to rebuild management and administrative machinery.

Cash aid for reconstructing the war-damaged infrastructure and industry should take the form of financing projects and supplying commodities. Aid in kind could be provided in the form of fishing boats and maintenance equipment for canal and dyke systems.

South Vietnam would certainly also require reconstruction aid for its infrastructure and industries, together with electrification and irrigation schemes. As far as measures affecting agriculture are concerned, care should first be taken, if the population as a whole is really to benefit, to reform land and grazing laws. Regarding development aid in general, Council of Europe member States can only be recommended to avoid taking over-hasty action.

Donor countries require comprehensive information containing all relevant data concerning structural and development policy and describing the current situation and the effects of bilateral and multilateral action. Here, use might be made of the OECD or World Bank information systems.

I believe that reconstruction aid should be made subject to the following conditions:
(a) those affected must be willing to receive aid; (b) in order to avoid supplying unwanted items, requirements should as a rule be listed and specified by the recipient countries; (c) the necessary precautions should be taken both in donor and receiver countries to ensure that aid reaches those in need and does not disappear down the black market drain; (d) aid should be distributed according to social need and contribute satisfactorily to regional and sectorial economic reconstruction.

Mr. Holtz (continued)

A further condition would be at least a minimum of international collaboration. We therefore recommend all Council of Europe member States to establish diplomatic relations with all countries of Indo-China. Some small measure of political consolidation would also be required. Lasting partnerships between individuals and institutions in the beneficiary country should also be created.

The Economic Committee holds the view that all considerations regarding the aims of development policy should necessarily be based on the system desired by the individual country concerned. Reconstruction programmes should not — as was formerly the case in practice with the Marshall Plan — be harnessed to ideological stipulations, especially as large sections of the population of the USA still have the reputation today of tending to make cut-and-dried judgments.

We welcome the cease-fire agreement and hope that all signatories will actively contribute to the efforts towards peace and create a situation in which a new conflict in Vietnam will be impossible. The aid offered should be used to encourage self-help and independence. It should not, nor is it intended to perpetuate or cause economic and political dependence.

We therefore appeal for the adoption of the proposals and recommendations of Mr. Enders's report and urge all member States to contribute to programmes of aid according to their own capacity and to supplement their own bilateral measures by sharing in a long-term, integrated, multilateral reconstruction programme. This multilateral aid should be provided through existing international organisations as well as through specially created supranational European co-ordinating and consultative bodies or indeed consortia.

In this way the Council of Europe may demonstrate its solidarity with the countries of Indo-China. It calls upon all its member States to encourage genuine and lasting peace among the protagonists, and to offer disinterested humanitarian and development aid.

European aid for Vietnam is necessary. Let us be prepared to work together in a spirit of positive and constructive co-operation with the whole of Indo-China! THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — I thank Mr. Holtz for stating the views of the Committee on Economic Affairs and Development concerning Mr. Enders's report.

I call Mr. Renschler, Chairman of the Committee on Population and Refugees.

Mr. RENSCHLER (Switzerland) (Translation). — Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, from the absence of many colleagues I conclude that everyone in this Assembly approves our report and our resolution and that our recommendation will be adopted with an overwhelming majority.

I wish to thank Mr. Enders sincerely for his report and also Mr. Holtz for expressing the opinions of the Economic Committee.

I would like at the conclusion of this debate merely to mention, or if you prefer lay particular stress on, two points.

The first point was already brought up by Mr. Enders in his report and was referred to again in one of the speeches; it concerns the supervision of the supply of aid. It is not enough to display goodwill and collect supplies which are then sent off to the countries concerned without further supervision. We members of parliament are responsible to the people we represent for guaranteeing that supplies are properly distributed.

Of course it is impossible with schemes of aid on the scale necessary in Indo-China for abuses to be completely avoided; a certain number must be expected. But one can at least endeavour to limit such abuses to an acceptable minimum.

If efforts are made in this direction, then it will also be possible to prevent these very accusations of misuse from being used as an alibi by populations and parliaments for no longer having to provide aid.

The war in all the affected countries of Indo-China is also scarcely an excuse for trying to lay the responsibility for aid primarily upon those who have been directly involved in the conflict. I believe that all of us, every country, irrespective of how closely involved we were in the Vietnam war, now have a duty to offer help. Although not sharing the blame, we all at least share responsibility for this war. Such common responsibility can only be atoned for by actually providing aid.

Mr. Renschler (continued)

A final point which deserves emphasis is that the aid which it is hoped and planned to supply through the International Red Cross Committee's Indo-China Operational Group must benefit all stricken areas of Indo-China. A conscious effort is being made to avoid attaching ideological strings to such aid and I believe that we too should beware of giving too much political or ideological weight to our aid.

I am in a position to inform you that, of the 77 million Swiss francs of the original budget, 21 million are intended for South Vietnam in the first three months, 20 million for North Vietnam, 10 million for the area under the control of the provisional revolutionary government in South Vietnam, 8 million for Laos, 18 million for the Khmer Republic and a certain amount of aid, which in April could not yet be expressed in a definite sum, for territory controlled by the Pathet Lao. It is obvious from this distribution that all groups and areas are to qualify for aid, which in the meantime has now reached a total of 100 million francs.

I would ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, to approve our recommendation and to bring pressure to bear in your own parliaments to enlist support from governments and aid organisations for this motion. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Thank you, Mr. Renschler.

There are no more speakers in the debate.

In Document 3294, the committee presents a draft recommendation which I shall now read:

"The Assembly,

- 1. Heartily welcoming the agreement on ending the war and restoring peace in Vietnam, signed on 27 January 1973 in Paris;
- 2. Conscious that the Vietnamese war, as well as the hostilities in Cambodia and Laos, have caused tremendous human and economic suffering to the populations of these countries;
- 3. Realising the great immediate task with which the countries of Indo-China are faced in supplying humanitarian assistance to their populations and in reconstructing and developing their countries;
- 4. Appreciating the efforts of the Red Cross organisations and other voluntary bodies to channel humanitarian assistance to the victims of war in Indo-China;
- 5. Supporting the idea that the United Nations set up a relief and reconstruction programme to the peoples of Vietnam;

- Welcoming the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 15 February 1973 on Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia;
- 7. Expressing its gratitude to the member governments of the Council of Europe who have already given financial and technical assistance to the distressed areas;
- 8. Being of the opinion that in a spirit of European solidarity all Council of Europe member States should provide and co-ordinate aid to the countries of Indo-China.
- 9. Recommends that the Committee of Ministers adopt a resolution inviting member governments of the Council of Europe;
- (a) to support substantially the Red Cross organisations and other voluntary bodies providing immediate humanitarian relief for victims of the war in Indo-China;
- (b) to define and co-ordinate as soon as possible medium and long-term aid projects designed to reconstruct and economically develop the countries of Indo-China;
- (c) in addition to such projects, to stimulate and participate in projects of the United Nations and its specialised agencies for aid to these countries."

No amendment has been submitted.

We shall therefore proceed to a vote on the draft recommendation contained in Document 3294.

No request is made for a roll-call vote.

The Assembly will accordingly vote on a show of hands.

I put the document to the vote...

The draft recommendation contained in Document 3294 was adopted unanimously.

It will be published as Recommendation 706.

13. Adjournment of the Session

THE PRESIDENT (Translation). — Ladies and Gentlemen, we have come to the end of our work.

I should like to thank all the colleagues who have participated in it and in particular those who have remained with us right up to the final stage of our first part-session.

The second part-session will be held from Tuesday 25 September to Wednesday 3 October 1973.

I declare the 25th Ordinary Session of the Assembly adjourned.

The Sitting is closed.

(The Sitting was closed at 12.55 p.m.)

APPENDIX

Names of Representatives or Substitutes who signed the Attendance Register in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure: 1

MM.	Aano	MM.	Karasek	MM.	Radinger
	Piket (Aantjes)		Kiratlioglu		Radius
	Alber		Külahli		Renschler
	Alemyr		Grussenmeyer (Labbé)		Vontobel (Reverdin)
	Arnason		Reale (Leggieri)		Holtz (Richter)
	Beauguitte		Lemmrich		Rivière
Miss	ergegren		Letschert	Sir	John Rodgers
	Cattaneo Petrini (Mr. Bettiol))	de Bruyne (Leynen)		Rossi
	r. Bohman rs. Madsen (Mr. Christiansen) M. Collins Edward Collins Gerard Cornelissen Czernetz Enders Entug Dardel (de Félice) Fletcher Capelle (Flornoy) rs. Aasen (Mr. Frydenlund) M. Withalm (Goëss) Grieve Hansen Pettersson (Hedström) Hocaoglu Holst Small (Jones)		Page (Sir Fitzroy Maclean)		Schieder
			Mammi		Schlaga
			Margue		Schmidt Hansheinrich
			Mart		Adriaensens (Schugens)
			Mason		Schwencke
			Munkebye		Shore
			Peijnenburg (Nederhorst)		Pawelczyk (Sieglerschmidt)
			Bourgeois (Nessler)		de Stexhe
			Schlüter (Oestergaard)		Stinus
			Oguz		Negrari (Talamona)
			Öktem		Hulpiau (Tanghe)
Mrs.			O'Leary		Moulin (Tisserand)
			Osborn		Roper (Tomney)
			Peart		Üstündag
			Warren (Sir John Peel)		Van Lent
			Pendry		Vedovato
			Péridier	Dame	Joan Vickers
			Péronnet	MM.	Voogd
			Petersen Erling		Wiklund
			Portheine		Zaloglu
			Valleix (de Préaumont)		

List of Representatives absent or apologising for absence:

MM. Abens	MM.	Gessner	MM.	Pica
Ahrens		Gislason		Preti
A kçali		Hedlund		Quilleri
Amrehn		Hofer	Lord	St. Helens
Arnaud		Kempfler	MM.	Salvatore
Averardi		Kristjansson		Schleiter
Blumenfeld		La Loggia		Schmitt Robert
Brincat		Legaret	Mrs.	Schuchardt
Coppola		Leitner	MM.	Steel
Dankert		Leu		Stewart
Delforge		Mende		Treu
De Marco		Minnocci		Vitter
Dequae	Mrs.	Miotti Carli		Weber Joachim
Desmond	MM.	de Montesquiou		Weiberg-Aurdal
Digby		Muscat		Wenk
Dregger		Pecoraro	Mrs.	Wolf
Feyzioglu		Petit	Mr.	Zamberletti

^{1.} The names of Substitutes who replaced absent Representatives are printed in italics, the names of such Representatives being given in brackets.

SUBJECT INDEX

Volume I

Page references are those of the Official Report

A

Amendments,

Tabling of — to the report of the Political Affairs Committee, 38

В

Bureau of the Assembly,

Progress report of the —, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 8, 12

 \mathbf{C}

Civil aviation in Europe, 247

Committee of Ministers,

Communication from the — to the Assembly, 38

Committees of the Assembly,

Appointment of members of -, 7

Appointment of members of the Standing Committee, 246

Changes in the membership of -, 37, 206, 246

Reference to --, 246

Selection of members of the Credentials Committee, 4

Consumer protection, 206

Council of Europe,

Mission of the --, 71, 91, 110

Credentials.

Examination of -, 4

Ratification of -, 246

Selection of members of the - Committee, 4

D

Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe,

Election of the -, 8, 12

E

Economic and monetary union,

Repercussions of — on regional development,

European Social Charter,

Supervision of the application of the -, 269

I

Indo-China,

Aid to the countries of -, 270

International terrorism, 46, 106

Arrangements for the debate on -, 38

J

Joint Committee.

Appointment of members of the -, 247

0

Order of business,

Adoption of the — for the first part of the 25th Ordinary Session, 7

Orders of the Day,

Change in the --, 90

P

President of the Assembly,

Address by the -, 5

Address by the provisional -, 1

Communication by the --, 6, 173, 185, 246

Election of the -, 5

Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 8, 12

R

Reference(s) to committee(s),

Ratification by the Assembly of -, 20

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 127, 137, 162, 174

S

Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Communication by the —, 65

Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe, 257

Session,

Interruption of the —, 274 Opening of the —, 1

Standing Committee,

Appointment of members of the —, 246 Progress report of the Bureau, the — and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 8, 12 \mathbf{T}

Time-limit,
— to speeches, 20

 \mathbf{v}

Vice-President(s) of the Assembly, Election of the —, 6

W

Written declaration,
Announcement concerning a —, 246
Tabling of a —, 173

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

Volume I

Mr. AANO (Norway)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 181

Mrs. AASEN (Norway)

Civil aviation in Europe, 255 Consumer protection, 220

Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 11

Mr. Einar AGUSTSSON
(Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland)

Statement, 186, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196

Mr. AHRENS
(Federal Republic of Germany)

Mission of the Council of Europe, 95, 115
Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, 230
Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 194, 195

Mr. ALBER (Federal Republic of Germany)

Consumer protection, 209

Mr. ALEMYR (Sweden)

Civil aviation in Europe, 256

Mission of the Council of Europe, 96

Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, 241

Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 197

Mr. AMREHN
(Federal Republic of Germany)

International terrorism, 60 Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, 125 Statement by Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, 158 Mr. Giulio ANDREOTTI (President of the Italian Council of Ministers) Statement, 116, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127

Mr. ARNASON (Iceland)

Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 198

Mr. BEAUGUITTE (France)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 137

Miss BERGEGREN (Sweden)

Supervision of the application of the European Social Charter, 269

Mr. BLUMENFELD (Federal Republic of Germany)

Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, 44

Date, time and Orders of the Day of the next Sitting, 62

International terrorism, 108, 112

Mission of the Council of Europe, 112

Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, 112

Statement by Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, 154

Mrs. von BOTHMER (Federal Republic of Germany)

International terrorism, 62

Mr. BRINCAT (Malta)

Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, 126

Mr. de BRUYNE (Belgium)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 170

Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe, 267

Index of speakers

Mr. CAPELLE (France)

Mission of the Council of Europe, 78 Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe, 261

Mr. CORNELISSEN (Netherlands)

Civil aviation in Europe, 253

Mr. CRAVATTE (Luxembourg)

Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, 45 Mission of the Council of Europe, 100

Mr. CRITCHLEY (United Kingdom)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States. 132

Statement by Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, 158

Mr. CZERNETZ (Austria)

International terrorism, 47, 106
Mission of the Council of Europe, 83
Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe, 260
Statement by Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, 160

Mr. DANKERT (Netherlands)

Mission of the Council of Europe, 92, 115

Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing
Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 9

Mr. DARLING (United Kingdom)

Consumer protection, 206, 221, 227
Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, 228, 240

Mr. DE CLERCQ (Belgium)

Consumer protection, 219

Mr. DELFORGE (Belgium)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 144

Statement by Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, 160

Mr. DEQUAE (Belgium)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 130, 184

Statement by Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, 156

Mr. DESTREMAU (France)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 174

Mr. DIGBY (United Kingdom)

Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, 46

Mission of the Council of Europe, 82

Mr. ELIAV (Israel, Observer)

International terrorism, 58

Mr. ENDERS (Federal Republic of Germany)

Aid to the countries of Indo-China, 270

Mr. de FÊLICE (France)

Address by the provisional President, 1

Mr. FEYZIOGLU (Turkey)

International terrorism, 59

Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 14, 15

Mr. FLETCHER (United Kingdom)

Consumer protection, 217
Mission of the Council of Europe, 79
Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 177

Statement by Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, 161

Mr. GESSNER
(Federal Republic of Germany)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 142

Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 196

Mr. GRIEVE (United Kingdom)

International terrorism, 53

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 146

Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, 124

Mr. HOFER (Switzerland)

International terrorism, 55
Mission of the Council of Europe, 114

Mr. HOLTZ
(Federal Republic of Germany)

Aid to the countries of Indo-China, 271

Mr. John N. IRWIN, Junior (Personal Representative of the Secretary of State of the United States of America)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 164

Statement, 148, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161

Mr. KAHN-ACKERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany)

Communication by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, 71

Mission of the Council of Europe, 87

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 147

Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, 125

Mr. KARASEK (Austria)

Mission of the Council of Europe, 80

Mr. KIRATLIOGLU (Turkey)

Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 12, 13 Mr. Rudolf KIRCHSCHLÄGER
(Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria,
Chairman-in-Office of the Committee of
Ministers)

Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, 38, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46
Mission of the Council of Europe, 89

Mr. LEITNER (Austria)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 169

Mr. LEYNEN (Belgium)

Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, 127

Sir Fitzroy MACLEAN (United Kingdom)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 179

Mr. MARGUE (Luxembourg)

Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, 45

Consumer protection, 224

Mission of the Council of Europe, 86

Mr. MASON
(United Kingdom)

Civil aviation in Europe, 251 International terrorism, 50

Mr. MENDELSON (United Kingdom)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 165

Mr. MICALLEF (Malta)

International terrorism, 54

Mr. NESSLER (France)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 162

Mr. OGUZ (Turkey)

Mission of the Council of Europe, 91

Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 17

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 165

Mr. OSBORN (United Kingdom)

Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, 239

Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe, 262, 266

Mr. PEART (United Kingdom)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States. 176

Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 192

Mr. PECORARO (Italy)

Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, 126

Mr. PÉRIDIER (France)

Communication by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, 69, 71

Mr. Erling PETERSEN (Norway)

Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe, 258, 268

Mr. PIKET (Netherlands)

International terrorism, 57

Mission of the Council of Europe, 102

Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 18

Mr. PORTHEINE (Netherlands)

Consumer protection, 216 Mission of the Council of Europe, 93 Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 192 Mr. PRESCOTT (United Kingdom)

Examination of credentials, 4

Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 194, 200

Mr. PRIMBORGNE (Switzerland)

Consumer protection, 212

Mr. RADIUS (France)

Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, 45

Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 8, 18

Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, 241

Mr. REALE (Italy)

Mission of the Council of Europe, 96

Mr. REINHART (Austria)

Consumer protection, 227

Mr. RENSCHLER (Switzerland)

Aid to the countries of Indo-China, 273
Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, 42
Mission of the Council of Europe, 77

Mr. REVERDIN (Switzerland)

Mission of the Council of Europe, 72, 110, 114, 115

Mr. RIVIÈRE (France)

Civil aviation in Europe, 247, 255

Sir John RODGERS (United Kingdom)

Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly, 43

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 183

Statement by Mr. John N. Irwin, Junior, 156

Mr. ROPER (United Kingdom)

Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, 233

Mr. ROSSI (United Kingdom)

Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 190

Mr. SCHIEDER (Austria)

Mission of the Council of Europe, 98

Mr. SCHLAGA
(Federal Republic of Germany)

Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 196

Mr. Henri SCHMITT (Switzerland)

International terrorism, 52

Mr. SCHWENCKE
(Federal Republic of Germany)

Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 13

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 180

Mr. SCHULER (Switzerland)

Mission of the Council of Europe, 91

Mr. SHORE (United Kingdom)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 166

Mr. SMALL (United Kingdom)

Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe, 267

Mr. STEEL (United Kingdom)

Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, 235

Mr. STEWART (United Kingdom)

International terrorism, 51
Relations between Western Europe and the United States, 140

Mr. de STEXHE (Belgium)

International terrorism, 61 Mission of the Council of Europe, 98

Mr. STINUS (Denmark)

International terrorism, 56

Mr. STRAY (Norway)

Statement by Mr. Giulio Andreotti, 124

Mr. Lujo TONCIC-SORINJ
(Secretary General of the Council of Europe)
Communication, 65, 70, 71

Mr. URWIN (United Kingdom)

Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, 231

Mr. ÜSTÜNDAG (Turkey)

Progress report of the Bureau, the Standing Committee and the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, 16

Mr. VALLEIX (France)

Civil aviation in Europe, 254

Dame Joan VICKERS (United Kingdom)

Repercussions of economic and monetary union on regional development, 237

Supervision of the application of the European Social Charter, 270

Index of speakers

Mr. VOOGD (Netherlands)

Consumer protection, 218 Supervision of the application of the European Social Charter, 269

Mr. WALL (United Kingdom)

Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 193

Mr. WARREN (United Kingdom)

Civil aviation in Europe, 250 Scientific and technological co-operation in Europe, 265 Mr. van der WERFF (Netherlands)

Relations between Western Europe and the United States. 167

Mr. WIKLUND (Sweden)

Consumer protection, 214

Mr. WITHALM (Austria)

Mission of the Council of Europe, 75

Mr. YVON (France)

Statement by Mr. Einar Agustsson, 197

SALES AGENTS FOR PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

AUSTRIA Gerold & Co. Graben 31 VIENNA, 1

Snaebjörn Jonsson & Co. A.F. The English Bookshop Hafnarstroeti 9

REYKJAVIK

ICELAND

CANADA Information Canada

OTTAWA

IRELAND Stationery Office Dublin

ITALY

Libreria Commissionaria Sansoni

Via Lamarmora, 45 Casella Post 552 FLORENCE

DENMARK Ejnar Munksgaard Nörregade 6 COPENHAGEN

> **NETHERLANDS** N.V. Martinus Nijhoff Lange Voorhout, 9 THE HAGUE

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY Verlag Dr. Hans Heger

Goethestrasse 54. Postfach 821 D-53 BONN-BAD GODESBERG

NEW ZEALAND

20 Molesworth Street

WELLINGTON

SWITZERLAND

Buchhandl. Hans Raunhardt

Kirchgasse 17 8000 Zurich 1

Librairie Payot 6. rue Grenus 1211 GENEVA 11

TURKEY

Librairie Hachette 469. Istiklal Caddesi

Beyoglu ISTANBUL

UNITED KINGDOM H. M. Stationery Office P. O. Box 569, LONDON, S. E. 1

UNITED STATES

Manhattan Publishing Company 225, Lafayette Street New York. 10012 - N.Y.

Government Printing Office

STRASBOURG

Librairie Berger-Levrault

Place Broglie

SWEDEN

Aktiebolaget C. E. Fritze Kungl. Hovbokhandel

Fredsgatan 2 STOCKHOLM

Librairie Kauffmann 28, rue Stadiou

ATHENS

GREECE

PRINTED IN BELGIUM BRUSSELS
