Schleicher

the need for us and the Council to give the Commission sufficient finance for this difficult job. It is not enough just to call for more stringent laws after a disaster, God forbid; we must ensure that the laws can actually be put into practice.

(Applause)

JEPSEN (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, we have learned from experience that there is a need to tighten up the regulations on the use and storage of hazardous chemical products. Safety at the workplace must be given a very high priority in the development which is taking place in these years to secure a better working environment. But it is not just persons at workplaces exposed to hazardous substances who must be protected, since leaks and spills can threaten large areas with pollution. It is therefore also important to protect the population in the vicinity. In many cases too the environment sustains long-term damage if a major accident occurs. Prevention in such cases is thus the best solution, and the necessary safety measures must of course be applied.

But, if an accident does happen, it is necessary that measures be taken to limit its effects on people and the environment. The first condition for this to be feasible is that all firms handling hazardous substances should be registered, that the nature of the substance should be known and that the workers and surrounding population should be fully informed on what action to take and what conduct to adopt in a given situation. This duty of information and accident prevention is of course incumbent on the individual firm. Information is an absolutely crucial requirement in this context. In addition contingency arrangements must be ready to be put into effect at a moment's notice so that the best possible action can be taken to limit the extent of the accident.

Something can perhaps be done about all this, if it proves possible not only to get the directive adopted but also to get it implemented in all the Member States. But, for me, something of crucial importance is missing, namely agreements with other countries, at least with our immediate neighbours, on how a major pollution situation is to be handled. Clearly I am thinking here of the Nordic countries, Switzerland, Austria and, not least of course, the East European countries.

In this connection I cannot overlook the need to consider matters in a somewhat wider perspective, namely how we would be best able in a given situation to put the necessary emergency arrangements into immediate effect. The best idea in my opinion would be, in the Community and in cooperation with the surrounding countries, to set up an environment fund so that we shall have the financial resources immediately available at any time to launch large-scale operations which an individual firm or Member State would not have the means to take on in the first instance. I think this is an important aim, and I feel it is something we should work to achieve in this Parliament.

PRESIDENT. — The debate is now suspended to make way for the formal sitting. It will resume at 4.30 p.m. this afternoon.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.30 a.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: LORD PLUMB

President

6. *Formal sitting*

(The formal sitting was opened at 11.45 a.m.)

LORD PLUMB, *President of the European Parliament.* — Your Holiness, it is a great honour for me, on behalf of the European Parliament, to welcome you most warmly to this House. The European Parliament, directly elected on the basis of universal suffrage, is a symbol not only of reconciliation between peoples who had for too long been torn apart by fratricidal wars. It is also the symbol of their will and of their capacity to establish a new order of relationship between countries founded on the principles of solidarity and of mutual assistance. While the road chosen is that of progressive economic integration, the goal pursued by the European Community has been and it remains that ever closer union between the peoples of Europe, people who cherish in common values of civilization based on respect for the individual, personal responsibility and liberty. This Parliament is the guarantor of democracy in our institutions and it is a keen defender of fundamental liberties on our continent and elsewhere in the world.

We share with you your deep concern for justice and for peace. Those ideals must remain the spiritual and the practical goals of Europe in our fight against poverty and deprivation in our own countries. They must also inspire our actions elsewhere in the world as we strive to combat hunger and to promote development. We have admired your own tireless efforts throughout the world in the defence of human dignity and in the search for peace with justice in so many troubled lands.

(Applause)

We for our part believe that we are contributing to the same goals through our political commitment and our material assistance.

Lord Plumb

I now, with great pleasure, invite Your Holiness to address this House.

(Loud and sustained applause)

HIS HOLINESS POPE JOHN PAUL II. — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all permit me to say how much . . .

(Interruption by Mr Paisley)

PRESIDENT. — Mr Paisley, I call you to order and ask you to stop this disturbance.

(Further interruptions)

For the second time, Mr Paisley, I call you to order and I ask you to respect the dignity of this House.

(Further interruptions)

Mr Paisley, I now exclude you from this House for the remainder of this sitting.

(Applause)

HIS HOLINESS POPE JOHN PAUL II. — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen,

(Applause)

. . . first of all, permit me to say how much I appreciate the words of welcome and consideration which you have been good enough to express in my regard. I wish to thank you most warmly, Mr President, for having personally renewed the invitation first extended in 1980 to come and address this prestigious Assembly. The hope which I expressed more than three years ago before the representatives of the European institutions is now being realized. I am very conscious of the importance of my present meeting with the representatives of the 12 countries which make up the European Community, that is to say, representatives of some 330 million citizens who have entrusted to you the mandate of directing their common destinies.

Now that your Assembly, which has been the centre of European integration since the beginning of the European Coal and Steel Community and the signing of the Treaty of Rome, is elected by direct universal suffrage and consequently enjoys increased prestige and authority, it rightly appears to your compatriots as the institution that will guide their future as a democratic community of countries desirous of integrating their economy more closely, of harmonizing their legislation on a number of points and of offering all their citizens greater freedom in the perspective of mutual cooperation and cultural enrichment.

Our encounter takes place at a special moment in the history of this continent when, after a long journey not without difficulties, we stand at the beginning of new and decisive stages which with the coming into force of the Single European Act will hasten the process of integration which has been patiently conducted during recent decades.

Since the end of World War II, the Holy See has not ceased to encourage the construction of Europe. Indeed, the Church has for mission to make known to all men their salvation in Jesus Christ, whatever be the conditions of their present history, for there is never any preliminary to this task. Therefore, without going beyond the competence that is hers, she considers it her duty to enlighten and to accompany the initiatives developed by the peoples and which are in conformity with the values and the principles which it is her duty to proclaim, attentive to the signs of the times which require that it express in the changing realities of existence the permanent demands of the Gospel.

How could the Church be indifferent to the construction of Europe, she who has been implanted for centuries in the peoples who compose her and whom she brought to the baptismal fonts, peoples for whom the Christian faith is and remains one of the elements of their cultural identity?

The Europe of today may certainly welcome as a sign of the times the state of peace and cooperation solidly established among her Member States, which for centuries have exhausted their strength by waging war against one another and by trying to obtain hegemony over others.

Another sign of the times is the greater sensitivity to human rights and to the value of democracy, of which your Assembly is the expression and would also be the guarantor. This attachment is, moreover, always to be confirmed so that respect for the rights and the dignity of the human person may prevail in all circumstances.

Another sign of the times, we believe, is the fact that this part of Europe, which up until now has invested so much in the domain of its economic cooperation, is more and more intensely in search of her soul, and of an inspiration capable of securing her spiritual cohesion. On this point, it seems to me, the Europe you are representing here stands at the threshold of a new stage in her growth, as much for herself as in her relation with the rest of the world.

The single market, which will come into force at the end of 1992, will hasten the process of European integration. A common political structure, emanation of the free will of the European citizens, far from endangering the identity of the peoples of the Community, will be better suited to guarantee more fairly the rights, particularly cultural, of all its regions. These united European peoples will never accept the domination of one nation or one culture over others, but will support the equal right for all to enrich others by their difference.

His Holiness Pope John Paul II

The empires of the past, which tried to establish their supremacy through coercion and a policy of assimilation, have all failed. Your Europe will be that of the free association of all her peoples and of the pooling of the multiple riches of her diversity.

(Applause)

Other nations may certainly join those which are represented here today. My wish as supreme Pastor of the universal Church, and one who is from Eastern Europe and who knows the aspirations of the Slav peoples, that other 'lung' of our same European homeland,

(Applause)

my wish is that Europe, with sovereign power, equipping herself with free institutions, may one day enlarge the dimensions given to her by geography and even more by history. How could I not wish this, since the culture inspired by Christian faith has deeply marked the history of all the peoples of our unique Europe, Greek and Latin, Germanic and Slavonic, in spite of all the vicissitudes and beyond the social systems and the ideologies?

The European nations have all distinguished themselves in their history by their openness to the world and the vital exchanges they have established with the peoples of other continents. No one can imagine that a united Europe might shut herself up in her egoism. Speaking with one voice, uniting her forces, she will be able — even more than in the past — to devote new resources and energies to the great task of development of the countries in the Third World, especially those with whom it already maintains traditional links. The Lomé Convention which initiated an institutionalized cooperation between the Members of your Assembly and the representatives of 66 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries, is in many respects a model.

(Applause)

European cooperation will be all the more profitable in being pursued with no thought of domination, with the intention of helping the poor countries to take in hand their own destiny.

Mr President, the Church's message, concerning God and the ultimate destiny of man are questions which have had the highest impact on European culture. In truth, how could we conceive of Europe without this transcendent dimension?

Since the time when there developed on European soil, in modern times, trends of thought which have little by little removed God from a comprehension of man and the universe, two opposite visions nourish a constant tension between the point of view of believers and those who uphold an agnostic and sometimes even 'atheist' humanism.

The former consider that obedience to God is the source of true freedom, which is never arbitrary or aimless, but a freedom for truth and good, these two being ever beyond the capacity of men to possess completely. On the ethical level, this fundamental attitude is expressed by the acceptance of principles and norms of behaviour that appeal to reason or derive from the authority of the Word of God, of which individually or collectively man cannot dispose as he wills, according to fashion or changing interests.

The second attitude is that which, having abolished all subordination of the creature to God, or to a transcendent order of truth and good, considers man himself as the principle and end of all things, and society — with its laws, its norms and its accomplishments — as his own sovereign work. Ethics thus has no other foundation than social consensus and individual liberty, no other brake than that which society deems necessary to impose upon it in order to safeguard that of others.

With some, civil and political liberty — formerly won through an overturning of the old order founded on religious faith — is still considered as going hand in hand with the marginalization, and even more, the suppression of religion, in which they have a tendency to see a system of alienation. For some believers, conversely, a life in conformity with faith would only be possible if there is a return to the old order, often idealized. These two antagonistic attitudes offer no solution compatible with the Christian message and the European genius. For, when civil liberty reigns and freedom of religion is fully guaranteed, faith can but gain in vigour by taking up the challenge set by unbelief, and atheism can but measure its limitations when faced with the challenge set by faith.

In face of this divergence of viewpoints, the highest function of the law is to guarantee equally to all citizens the right to live in conformity with their conscience and not to breach the norms of the natural moral order admitted by reason.

From this point of view, it seems important to recall that it is in the soil of Christianity that modern Europe drew the principle — often lost from view during the centuries of Christendom — which most fundamentally governs its public life: I mean the principle, proclaimed for the first time by Christ, of the distinction between 'what is Caesar's' and 'what is God's' (cf. Mt 22:24). This essential distinction between the sphere of the organization of the external framework of the earthly city and that of the autonomy of persons is understood when considering the respective natures of the political community to which necessarily all the citizens belong, and the religious community to which the believers freely adhere.

His Holiness Pope John Paul II

After Christ, it is no longer possible to idolize society as a collective being that devours the human person and his irreducible destiny. Society, the State, political power belong to the changing and always perfectible structure of this world. No project of society will ever be able to establish the Kingdom of God, that is to say, the eschatological perfection on this earth. Political messianisms lead most often to the worst tyrannies. The structures societies set up for themselves never have a definitive value; neither can they procure by themselves all the goods to which man aspires. In particular, they cannot take the place of the conscience of man nor of his quest for truth and the absolute.

Public life, the good order of the State, depend on the virtue of the citizens, which invites them to subordinate individual interest to the common good, to give oneself to or to recognize as law only that which is objectively good and just. The ancients already had discovered that there is no democracy without the subjection of everyone to the law, and no law that is not founded on a transcendent norm of the true and the just.

To say that the management of 'what is God's' belongs to the religious community and not to the State, means setting a salutary limit to the power of men, and this limit is of the domain of the conscience, of the 'last things', of the ultimate meaning of existence, of openness to the absolute, of the tension towards a perfection never reached, which stimulates efforts and inspires correct choices. All the families of thought of our old continent should consider to what dark perspectives could lead the exclusion of God from public life, of God as the ultimate judge of ethics and supreme guarantor against all abuses of power by man over man.

Our European history abundantly shows how often the frontier between 'what is Caesar's' and 'what is God's' has been crossed in both directions. Latin Christianity of the Middle Ages — to mention only this — which none the less had elaborated theoretically, by borrowing from the great tradition of Aristotle, the natural conception of the State, has not always escaped from the 'integrist' temptation to exclude from the temporal community those who did not profess the true faith. Religious integrism, with no distinction between the sphere of faith and that of civil life, still practised today elsewhere, seems incompatible with Europe's own genius, as it has been moulded by the Christian message.

(Applause)

But in our time, the greatest threats have come from elsewhere, when ideologies absolutized society itself or a dominant group, regardless of the human person and his liberty. Wherever man no longer takes his stand on a grandeur which transcends him, he risks surrendering himself to arbitrary power and pseudo-absolutes that destroy him.

Today, other continents are experiencing a measure of symbiosis between Christian faith and culture, which is full of promise. But for nearly 2 000 years already, Europe has offered a very significant example of the cultural fruitfulness of Christianity which, by its nature, cannot be relegated to the private sphere. In fact, Christianity has a vocation of public profession and active presence in all areas of life. Therefore, it is my duty vigorously to stress that if the religious and Christian substratum of this continent should some day be marginalized in its role of inspiring ethics and in its social efficacity, it is not only all the heritage of the European past that would be denied but also a future worthy of the European man — I mean every European man, believer or unbeliever — which would be seriously compromised.

(Applause)

In conclusion, I would like to mention three areas in which I think the integrated Europe of tomorrow, opened towards the East of the continent and generous towards the other hemisphere, should resume her role as a beacon in world civilization.

First of all, to reconcile man with creation, by seeking to preserve the integrity of nature, of its animal and plant life, its air and its water,

(Applause)

its subtle balances, its limited resources, its beauty that extols the glory of the Creator.

Second to reconcile man with his fellow man, by accepting one another as Europeans of diverse cultural traditions or families of thought, by being welcoming to the foreigner and to the refugee, by opening up to the spiritual riches of the peoples of other continents.

(Applause)

Finally, to reconcile man with himself: yes, to work to reconstitute an integrated and complete vision of man and the world, away from cultures of suspicion and dehumanization, a vision in which science, technical know-how and art do not exclude, but invite faith in God.

(Applause)

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in responding to your invitation to address your illustrious Assembly, I had in mind the millions of European men and women you represent. It is to you they have entrusted the great task of maintaining and developing the human values — cultural and spiritual — which correspond to the heritage of Europe and which will be the best safeguard of her identity, of her liberty and of her pro-

His Holiness Pope John Paul II

gress. I pray God will inspire and strengthen you in this great design.

(The Assembly gave the speaker a standing ovation)

LORD PLUMB, *President of the European Parliament.* — Your Holiness, thank you so much for your very clear and inspiring message, a message which I am sure will be conveyed through our Members, through our many friends who are here with us in this House at the moment in the gallery and through the media to the citizens of Europe and way beyond. May I, Your Holiness, wish you, on behalf of the Members of this House, health and strength to continue to defend the freedom and the liberty of our peoples. You set a very fine example to us all.

(Loud and prolonged applause)

(The formal sitting was closed at 12.30 p.m. The sitting resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROMEOS

Vice-President

PRESIDENT. — *(GR)* To wind up yesterday's debate on the Commission's statement on American protectionism, pursuant to Article 56, paragraph 3 of the Rules of Procedure the Bureau has received the following six motions for resolutions with request for an early vote:

— Doc. B 2-834/88 by Mr Arndt and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on United States protectionism.

— Doc. B 2-835/88 by Mr Cassidy and Mr Patterson, on behalf of the ED Group, on the entry into force of the US Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988.

— Doc. B 2-836/88 by Mr de la Malène and others, on the new US trade legislation.

— Doc. B 2-837/88 by Mr Piquet and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on US trade measures violating GATT rules.

— Doc. B 2-838/88 by Mr Gasòliba i Böhm and Mr Pimenta, on behalf of the Liberal Group, on the US Trade Bill.

— Doc. B 2-839/88 by Mr von Wogau and Mr Zahorka, on behalf of the EPP Group, on the entry into force of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988.

The vote on the request for an early vote will be taken tomorrow morning at the beginning of the sitting.[1]

VAN DER LEK (ARC). — *(NE)* Mr President, I should like to bring the following matter to your attention with respect to the order of today's business. This morning we had a normal Parliamentary sitting which lasted until 12.30. The sitting was then suspended for the solemn proceedings. During the normal sitting it was not possible for visitors interested in the debate to follow it from the public gallery. I specifically tried to obtain access for a number of interested parties and was told that this was not possible because of the solemn proceedings which were to follow. I must honestly say that quite apart from the question of whether or not it can be considered reasonable to invite all these Heads of State or Government, I think that as long as we are conducting our normal work the publicity of proceedings should be upheld and guaranteed. I expressly object to this state of affairs. I categorically insist that a situation in which visitors are unable to follow a Parliamentary debate from the public gallery should not be allowed to arise in future. If this is really necessary in the case of solemn proceedings, then we cannot conduct our work as normal under such circumstances. As a Member of this Parliament, I personally find that unacceptable. I would ask you to bring this point to the attention of the Bureau and ask it to state its opinion.

PRESIDENT. — *(GR)* Mr Van der Lek, I take note of your protest and will certainly refer it to the Bureau and the College of Quaestors.

TONGUE (S). — I refer to certain events that took place in this House prior to the solemn proceedings. I understood that we were supposed to be welcoming His Holiness John Paul II here today and that we had designed to make him feel very much at home. Could the President therefore tell the House why beautiful sculptures of nudes emulating those to be found in the Vatican itself were removed from the IPE building during the Pope's visit? Obviously those who took the decision have no sense of the history of art and are unaware of the Papal sponsorship of such works of art. Would the President therefore raise this matter with the Bureau of Parliament?

PRESIDENT. — *(GR)* Mrs Tongue, your protest will certainly be referred to the Bureau.

PRICE (ED). — Mr President, I wish to know whether the Commission will make a statement this week on their attitude to the takeover bid for Consolidated Goldfields. If the bid succeeds it would give

[1] *Deadline for tabling amendments:* see minutes.

Price

control of one-third of the entire Western world's gold supplies to the Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa. It would place unprecedented economic power in the hands of a single company. It would also give South Africa control of the Western world's supplies of key strategic minerals, even those produced in Australia, the United States and Canada. I believe the implications are such that the Commission should conduct a full investigation under Article 86 of the Treaty. Will the Commission make a statement as to their intentions?

I have discovered that, unfortunately, Commissioner Sutherland is in Australia this week. However, the closing date for acceptance of the bid is 25 October. If such a statement cannot be made during this part-session, I seek an assurance that the Commission will look into the issues involved urgently and consider launching an immediate investigation. I see that the Commission are not present at the moment to respond. Could my request be passed on to them as soon as possible?

PRESIDENT. — *(GR)* Mr Price, as you yourself have observed, no representative of the Commission is here at present. Your request will be referred to the enlarged Bureau tomorrow.[1]

LALOR (RDE). — Mr President, I do not want to delay Question Time any further. But my point of order is this: are you aware that of three people who raised points of order none had questions and they were not a bit worried about cutting into Question Time. Could you therefore assure us, Mr President, that questions to the Council will be given their full hour and will go on until 4.10 p.m.?

PRESIDENT. — *(GR)* Yes Mr Lalor, but we will have to see whether the Council's President-in-Office has enough time at his disposal, particularly since the time wasted up to now was not of his doing.

CLINTON DAVIS, *Member of the Commission.* — Mr President, I understand that in the absence of anyone from the Commission a point was raised by Mr Price about the issue of Consolidated Goldfields, a matter which he has discussed with me and with Commissioner Sutherland. Suffice it to say that the Commission are always ready to make a statement if we are required by the Parliament to do so. This is an important issue. It is, of course, not up to me to pronounce on the matter as far as the Commission is concerned, but I can undertake to advise Commissioner Sutherland of the point raised this afternoon and it will be for him to be in touch with the honourable Member. And if a further request for a statement is made, I have no doubt the Commission will accede readily to it.

[1] *Debate on topical, urgent and important matters (announcement):* see minutes.

7. *Question Time*

PRESIDENT. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-794/88).

Today's questions are addressed to the Council and the Foreign Ministers.

We shall begin with questions to the Council.

As the author is not present, Question No 1 will be answered in writing.[1]

Question No 2, by Mr Rogalla (H-505/88):[2]

Subject: Heads of State or Government — parliamentary control

1. Does the Council agree that, in the exercise of their duties, all national government bodies are bound both jointly and severally by loyalty to the Community, as laid down in Article 5 of the EEC Treaty?
2. Does the Council agree that, in essence, that loyalty to the Community involves fruitful cooperation in the spirit of the Treaties, including the Single Act, and that all those with political responsibility in the Member States and EC organs should be regularly reminded of this basic precept?
3. If so, is the Council prepared to help to ensure that this is done by proposing that these questions and the Council's answers thereto be taken as a separate item of major importance on the agenda of the next meeting of the European Council and ensuring that the European Parliament is informed of the deliberations on this item on the agenda and the outcome thereof?
4. If not, how does the Council view the legal and political relationship between, on the one hand, the Heads of State or Government and the performance of their Community functions, as embodied in the Single Act, and, on the other, the European Parliament?

PANGALOS, *President-in-Office of the Council.* — *(GR)* I concur with the views expressed by the honourable Member in the first part of his question relating to Article 5 of the Treaty and the explanatory paragraphs of the Single European Act. Clearly, the day-

[1] See Annex 'Question Time'.
[2] Oral Question (Rule 59) converted into a question for Question Time, on the instructions of the President.