

President

started to debate this item, I would ask you to agree that we should carry it through.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, I have formally moved the adjournment under Rule 87. I request you now to vote on the adjournment.

President. — Mr Patterson, the Assembly cannot at this point set aside what was adopted an hour ago when so many more Members were present.

I call Mr Price.

Mr Price. — Mr President, what was put earlier on was a motion under quite another Rule of our Rules of Procedure to change the agenda. What is now happening is quite different. It is first of all to raise under Rule 59 a point regarding the distribution of texts, which was not raised previously. This is coming to the presidency for the first time for a ruling and, Mr President, you have no option, in my submission, because what the Rules of Parliament say is that, except in the cases of urgency referred to in Rules 48 and 57, a debate shall not be opened on a text unless it has been distributed at least 24 hours previously. You have indicated, Mr President, that it was not distributed at least 24 hours previously, and so according to our Rules you have no power to enable the debate to proceed.

Now what Mr Patterson offered to you as an alternative suggestion was to apply Rule 87, because if you simply applied Rule 59 there would be a hiatus in that there would be no point on the agenda when this could be resumed. Mr Patterson offered the alternative of moving the adjournment under Rule 87, which would put it back on the agenda later this week. But if you choose not to go as far as his second proposition, you can only apply Rule 59 and take it off the agenda completely.

Mr President, it seems to me that the way round it is the one that Mr Patterson has offered — namely, to put his motion under Rule 87 to the vote. Indeed, if you do not rule the debate under Rule 59 as being out of order, you are obliged under Rule 87 to put that motion to the vote.

President. — In view of the point you have just made I shall put the motion to the vote.

I call Mr Price.

Mr Price. — Mr President, could you indicate under what Rule you are conducting this vote, because under Rule 59, under which the primary issue which you appear to be putting to the vote was raised, there is no discretion, there is nothing for Parliament to decide,

because the Rules are quite specific that the debate shall not be opened in these circumstances. Parliament has no power to overrule its own Rules. It can only do it by a rule amendment — and of course I need hardly say that we are not in the situation of being confronted with a rule amendment.

President. — Mr Price, allow me to refer to Rule 87(1):

‘Before or during a debate on an item on the agenda, any Member may move that the debate be adjourned to a specific date and time.’

I put the motion to the vote.

(The motion was adopted)

This item is therefore removed from the agenda.

I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — As my proposal has now been carried — I am glad of that — could I remind you that according to Rule 87 I did name a specific date and time, which was 3.30 on Wednesday? As my proposition has now been carried, I imagine the debate will now be resumed at that time.

President. — The debate will be resumed on Wednesday in accordance with your proposal.

5. Reform of the Treaties and European Union

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-305/82) by Mr Spinelli, on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, on the European Parliament's position concerning the reform of the Treaties and the achievement of European Union.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, it would have been difficult to imagine a more suitable time to hold a parliamentary debate on the guidelines to be given to the Committee on Institutional Affairs for its further work.

What we are now witnessing on the international and Community scene demonstrates with appalling clarity the profound contradiction between what we will have to do and what we are able to do.

First, let us dwell briefly on the role of the Community in world politics. For decades we allowed the principal responsibility for our destiny in this regard to remain in the hands of our American ally, adopting an auxil-

Spinelli

ary role and being content to pursue, in the shadow of American international policy, a European commercial policy, a modest policy of cooperation for development and a search for a precarious intra-Community monetary stability, with occasional statements of intent in relation to various events.

This convenient abdication, however, is no longer possible. The course of events, which I will not describe here since it is well known to everyone, has brought us to a point where not one or other of the Community countries but all of them together urgently need to assume new, great and serious responsibilities. These responsibilities concern our contribution to peace, to security, to the proper and productive management of alliances, to the freedom of international trade, to monetary stability, to a new world economic order which firmly binds the recovery of our more advanced economies to growth in the less advanced countries.

In our countries there is a broad and fundamental agreement on the need to assume these new responsibilities. This awareness, however, is accompanied by many uncertainties, contradictions, lapses, moments of resignation.

It is perfectly natural that within the context of a general agreement there should be nuances and variations from one country to another and from one party to another within each separate country. It would be strange indeed if this were not the case. What we lack is an adequate European institutional system able to mould the common feeling into a common political will through a joint effort to find the necessary compromises; a system able to create a broad and reliable consensus around the common will and ensure the necessary continuity in international action.

The methods so far employed by the countries of the Community have included initiatives by one or other of the Member States, taken in the belief — and sometimes the legitimate belief — that the country in question was giving practical effect to a frame of mind shared by all. They have included intergovernmental agreements laboriously reached through so-called political cooperation or intergovernmental monetary cooperation. On issues concerning commercial policy there has been recourse to the complicated procedure laid down in Article 113 of the Treaty of Rome, but it is a noteworthy fact that recently, on the first occasion when the application of this article had strong political implications, the failure of two Member States to comply with the Community decision was tolerated.

One has only to consider these chaotic methods employed to deal with the serious problems of the European presence on the world scene to understand that it is impossible for us to be satisfied with them much longer. Indeed, there is a great danger that the very meaning of our Community in the context of world politics will dissolve in the face of these inconsistencies, and that each of our countries will return to

the pursuit of the delusion of anachronistic national sovereignty.

The picture is no different if we shift our gaze from world scene to the Community one. During the great development of the 50's and 60's the treaties establishing the Community, together with their commitments, their supporting institutions and the laws and policies derived from them, did fail in some areas and were affected by certain institutional distortions, but they were on the whole adequate to perform the central task of the Community and made a considerable contribution to its development. Thanks to the rules of the Common Market, an unprecedented degree of interdependence and integration among the countries of the Community was attained.

In the 70's, however, and even more so in the early 80's, the picture changed completely. Unemployment, inflation, high energy costs, structural inflexibility, decreasing competitiveness on the world market and acute regional imbalances began to take their toll. The ecological crisis, which threatens the proper relationship of man with nature, became more acute, as did the crisis of the quality of life, which threatens the proper relationship of man with his fellows and flaws the democratic consensus of which we were so proud. All of these are the new ills now shared by all the countries which make up the European Community. But these ills strike to a different degree and in different ways in each of them. In each country our governments, and with them the political forces — the governmental ones no less than those of the opposition — are desperately struggling against all these ills. I say 'desperately', because in nearly every case coherent action at the national level alone is either impossible — because it needs to be completed by converging and compatible action by the other countries to which we are most closely bound, that is, the other countries of the Community — or possible only at the cost of destroying a greater or lesser degree of interdependence with these other countries. The Community, which should guarantee this convergence and compatibility and, when necessary, assume direct responsibility for action on the European level, has neither the necessary authority nor the institutions suitable for dealing with these problems.

For this reason we have a Commission which promises great programmes and then does not even dare to elaborate them because it fears they will not be approved; we have a European Council which outlines great objectives and then allows the Councils of Ministers, prisoners all of ten different national ways of thinking, to obscure these objectives and let them melt away; we have a Parliament which solemnly approves great resolutions on hunger, on own resources, on the better functioning of the present institutions and so on, but must then resign itself to having its resolutions ignored and never put into effect.

Spinelli

These are the reasons which necessitate a reform of the Community and of the para-Community institutions of Political Cooperation and the EMS.

The brief summary just made of the great internal and external tasks facing the Community should be more than sufficient to answer once and for all the criticism that the development of the Community in the direction of an ever more meaningful European Union demands not so much institutional reforms as a common political will.

It is obvious that at the beginning of every development of a stronger union there must be a sense of a shared destiny, a *destin partage*, a feeling of 'togetherness'. The very fact that we in this Assembly, elected by our fellow citizens in each of our countries, have for years been able to hold discussions, to join together in defining aspirations, plans, demands, to understand one another even when we see things differently, proves that this common political ground exists.

So that this feeling may be translated into a *common political will*, however — and by these words I mean a *decision to carry out joint action* — it is essential that there should be democratic institutions with a European background representing a consensus on the part of both the citizens and the Member States, that there should be parliamentary institutions for European legislation, that there should be an executive institution to oversee the implementation of common policies and that there should be a judicial institution to guarantee that European law is respected.

The task given to our committee on 9 July of last year by this Parliament was to formulate the major objectives of European Union — of which the Community, Political Cooperation and the EMS are only partial forms — and redefine institutional competences and the necessary institutional reforms.

For five months we have discussed the general characteristics of such reforms and the reasons why they are necessary. We have re-written the text of the resolution three times on the basis of long general discussions, and a fourth time on the basis of some 90 amendments presented by Members from each part of the political spectrum of this Assembly — amendments which have nearly all become part of the definitive text. This text, then, which nevertheless has its own unity, is the result of a collective effort on the part of the entire committee, which finally approved it with 31 votes in favour and 2 abstentions out of a total of 37 members. The committee, therefore, presents this text to you with a considerable amount of political authority.

After its presentation some twenty new amendments were tabled for the debate in the Chamber. Some of these suggest clarifications of concept or style which harmonize with the decisions of the Committee on

Institutional Affairs. I therefore feel authorized to suggest their adoption to you.

Others have already been incorporated into the committee's text, but they are amalgamated with other clarifications requested by other colleagues. I will ask their sponsors to withdraw them so as not to jeopardize the compromises already attained. If they are not withdrawn, I will ask you to reject them.

Finally, others are in direct opposition to the spirit and the letter of the committee's text, and I therefore call upon you to reject them. In any case, I have the impression that none of these amendments has sufficient scope to make its adoption or rejection a condition for your final vote on the resolution.

To facilitate matters for each group and for each one of you, I have had a note prepared — unfortunately only in French — which contains my suggestions for each amendment and the reasons behind them.

The debate which will now take place and the vote which will conclude it will show that the work undertaken by this Parliament is not, and has no intention of being, the semi-secret work of a committee ignorant of the nature and size of the consensus supporting it; rather it is, and aims to be, an effort carried out with the active participation of Parliament as a whole.

On the basis of these guidelines, once they have been adopted here, our committee has already drawn up a plan for further work. Six rapporteurs, assisted by a coordinating rapporteur, will present you early next year with a detailed plan for an overall resolution outlining the practical solutions to be applied to the various questions raised in the general guidelines. Only after having received your definitive and reasoned approval will we elaborate the formal plan of reform. We will then submit that to your judgment and final vote, so that it can be sent to the Member States for ratification before the next European elections.

At a time when the Community and the Member States are wondering about their own and the Community's future, at a time when the feeling of bewilderment is widespread, when there is a strong temptation to seek inspiration in outdated forms only because there is no courage to speak of new ones, at such a time the present debate and the vote which will conclude it cannot fail to have great political significance. If, as we hope, the outcome is positive, this will mean not only that the European Parliament will have had the courage to lead the way, but also that all those who vote for the guidelines will have committed themselves to explaining these guidelines to their parties, to their electors, to their national parliaments and governments. It will mean more than the adoption of just one more parliamentary resolution to join the innumerable others; it will signal the beginning of a demo-

Spinelli

cratic political battle for the Europe of the 80's, for a Europe made by Europeans for Europeans.

(Loud applause)

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Radoux. — (FR) On behalf of the Socialist Group, I offer my thanks to the Bureau of Parliament which, at the initiative of its President, has consented to give this report the place it deserves.

I congratulate the rapporteur on the resolution he has produced as the basis for our debates, a resolution that has been modified several times at the instigation of the majority of the group representatives within the Committee on Institutional Affairs.

The rapporteur's moderating influence has enabled Parliament to be presented with a sensible and balanced text, even if it is subject to further amendments. My colleagues in the group will in due course be explaining the Socialist amendments and their respective positions.

I should like, at the start of this debate, to clear up a misconception. It has from time to time been suggested that the work of the Institutional Committee is of only limited value in the context of the 1984 elections. We do not share this view, rather do we tend to go along with what the President of the European Trade Union Confederation said at a hearing before that very committee: 'One can have good institutions and bad policies; what we need is both good policies and good institutions'. Now, what does the committee's resolution largely contain if not proposed guidelines relating to the tasks and responsibilities of European Union? The section devoted to the institutions seems to imply quite clearly that they are instruments through which policies can be implemented. Even the work of the six rapporteurs who are due to start work this coming September is going to have an effect in the short term on the conduct of Community affairs. In other words, if the job of the Committee on Institutional Affairs is to draw up the legal texts in connection with the alterations to the existing treaties, the matters dealt with will have an impact on what the Community actually does between now and 1984. The operation could be doomed to failure unless it can be proved that what has just been initiated is a movement entailing more rapid progress towards completion of the internal market, the introduction of new policies and the formulation of more radical measures to overcome the economic and social situation.

This view of things is the rationale, the justification of the amendments of the Socialist Group as a whole. Having accepted the *how* of things, we wish to state the *why* of things, the why of our acquiescence in an undertaking to update the treaties and to move on to the ultimate goal of the European venture.

But who will believe that the twenty million young people who are going to be voting for the first time in 1984 will be satisfied with the promised improvements in the functioning of the Community, whatever they may be and however excellent the programme, if Community action between now and then should fail to do something to improve their living conditions?

Let us now answer the following questions: Whose job should it be to take the radical measures needed to get the Community out of its present disarray, to prevent it being nothing more than a free trade area, to see to it, rather, that it develops towards a genuine union of our countries? Whose job is it to replace stray impulses with will, whose job is it to select, decide, propose, from among the vast number of projects that are so often abandoned almost as soon as they are presented? Who or what is better entitled than Parliament to set about reinforcing the powers of each of the institutions, working out a new balance between them, and establishing European Union in accordance with the wishes expressed just exactly ten years ago by the Heads of State and Government and based on the structures defined, at their request, in 1975 in the report by Mr Tindemans? It is our duty to democratize the Community institutions, just as it is our duty to pull the Community out of the doldrums. It is also our duty to see the Community involve itself more deeply, bearing in mind the principle of subsidiarity, in measures aimed at raising the level of social justice in each of the Member States at a time when the economic situation is tending to widen the disparities between the social strata. Given the very specific nature of the Council's interests and the multiplicity of tasks that fall within the Commission's responsibility, clearly it is up to Parliament to take on the most practical aspect of the operation bringing us closer to European unification.

It would of course be absurd, indeed it would be wrong, to deny or to ignore what the Member States themselves have achieved in the Community, or to underestimate the Commission's contribution in drawing up proposals and carrying out its executive functions in often very trying circumstances. But for some time now we have been hearing calls from all sides for us to rise above all the difficulties and start forging ahead again. We had no option but to respond to these calls.

Have we chosen the right moment? To tell the truth, we had no choice. Are these the ideal conditions in which to embark on the Community's planned transition to Union? The answer is no. But is it time we made a bold start on a project that has been more talked about than the weather? The answer is yes.

There is a certain amount of scepticism about. People have been prepared to put up with this muddled state of affairs, but they do concede that if things really are that bad, they do need changing.