

ORAL QUESTION H-0148/04

for Question Time at the part-session in April 2004
pursuant to Rule 43 of the Rules of Procedure
by Per Gahrton
to the Council

Subject: Special representative for Tibet

On a number of occasions, the European Parliament has expressed its wish that the Council should appoint a special representative for Tibet. The budget appropriations for such a post have been allocated twice. The EU already has special representatives for Macedonia, the Middle East, the Southern Caucasus, Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe, as well as a special envoy for the Great Lakes region of Africa. As in these cases, a special EU representative for Tibet would be able to actively promote a peaceful resolution of the conflict, inter alia by supporting the dialogue which has been in progress for more than a year between representatives of the Beijing government and of the Dalai Lama. The fear expressed in a reply to a similar question by Mr Newton Dunn (H-0828/03) in January 2004¹ that a special EU representative would be able neither to visit Tibet nor to meet representatives of the Beijing government has not been substantiated in any way.

Why will the Council not heed the European Parliament's clearly expressed wish in this case and appoint a special EU representative for Tibet, as has been done for seven other regions of conflict in Europe, Africa and Asia?

Tabled: 03.03.2004

sv

¹ Written answer of 13.1.2004.