

BANGEMAN

however, require the Member State in question to give sufficient priority to soil analysis and the setting up of advisory services when drawing up the aid programmes for the Objective 1 and 5(b) areas.

LANE (RDE). — I thank the Commissioner for his reply. However, there are a number of concerns here, the first being from the farmer's point of view to get the best possible value out of the land. The second concern must be for the environment and we must see to it that sufficient research is done to ensure that there is not over-use of fertilizers. I would suggest that the Commission has, in fact, got a role here. In the poorer areas of the Community there are not sufficient funds available for research, soil analysis etc. Apart from national involvement in soil analysis the Commission should also finance the funding of research in some Community countries for soil analysis to make sure we are not over-using nitrates and thereby creating problems for the environment. I would ask the Commissioner what is his view in relation to the possibility of over-use of these nitrates and what the Commission feels is its role in financing such research?

BANGEMANN. — As I have already said, over-use of these fertilizers is harmful both to the environment and to farming and the Commission has no responsibility for that. It is a matter for Member States and they do the advisory work etc. on it. Nevertheless, promotional actions can and must be undertaken under the existing legislation on the tasks of the structural funds. I indicated that within Objective 1 and Objective 5(b) areas there is a wide range of measures possible and the Commission in its new research programme starting in 1989 and extending to 1993 will endorse agricultural research, that is to say the reduction and improvement of use of fertilizers is an element of the new research programme.

PRESIDENT. — The second part of Question Time is closed ^{1 2}.

(The sitting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 4.50 p.m.)

10. Events in Central and Eastern Europe

IN THE CHAIR: MR BARON CRESPO

President

(The sitting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 4.50 p.m.)

PRESIDENT. — Ladies and gentlemen, at the outset of this historic occasion in the work of our Parliament, I

should like to begin by announcing on behalf of the enlarged Bureau its decision to award the Sakharov prize this year to Mr Alexander Dubcek.

(Loud and sustained applause)

I see that the House like the enlarged Bureau unanimously supports this gesture insofar as Mr Dubcek symbolizes for all Europeans our fondest hopes for peaceful reform in Eastern Europe. As I said in my speech to the House following my election last July, we believe that parliamentary democracy forms the cornerstone of our 'common European House' and therefore we note with satisfaction everything which is happening with a view to creating democratic systems throughout Europe.

I hope that it will be possible for me to present this award to Mr Dubcek personally during the December part-session. I felt that it was appropriate to make this announcement which, I am sure, will be welcomed throughout Europe...

(Applause)

...before giving the floor to the President-in-Office of the Council.

Similarly, I have to make a brief statement in relation to a terrorist outrage: I am referring to the assassination of the president of Lebanon, Mr René Muawad, which has inspired us with a feeling of the most profound horror. President Muawad was a source of hope to the Lebanese people and the international community. More than ever before we must condemn this barbaric act which has put an end to the fragile hopes which had emerged following his election. The international community and in particular the European Community must recognize its commitment to demonstrate its solidarity with this country which is undergoing the martyrdom of an internecine civil war.

In the past in Ireland and in Spain, and today in Lebanon, terrorism violates the basic principles of democracy. The European Parliament, representing the peoples of Europe, will not cease to combat resolutely this evil growth which is seeking to undermine the civilized world.

On behalf of the House I should like to extend a warm welcome to the President-in-Office of the Council and the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, a member of the Council.

(Applause)

We are experiencing today two historical events. Last Saturday a meeting of the Council in Paris showed the will of the Council to respond to the challenges of the present day and, above all, to what is happening in Central and Eastern Europe. The House has the special privilege today of welcoming for the first time two members of the Council who symbolize the European union which we are trying to build.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

² Communication of common positions of the Council. see Minutes

PRESIDENT

I call on the President of the Council, the President of the French Republic, Mr Francois Mitterrand.

(Applause)

MITTERRAND, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as you know, and as you have just been reminded, a special session of the European Council was held in Paris last Saturday. The agenda was simple: to look at the events taking place in Eastern Europe and draw the first conclusions.

After talking to the President of this House, I thought it would be helpful to the smooth running of our institutions if, in my capacity as President of the European Council, I were to speak to you briefly, without holding up your work too much, about what happened at that meeting.

It was less than a month ago, on 25 October, that I spoke to you here in this chamber as I am doing today. I mentioned the situation of our neighbours in Eastern Europe where, as you know, history is being made every day. I referred to the vast movement towards democracy and freedom. I referred to the determination of the people which was dictating the course of events, bringing down walls and opening frontiers and I said: once again the people are on the move, and when they move the effect is decisive.

Well, in Berlin on 9 November the onward march of history offered the world a sight which had still seemed unlikely even the day before — the sight of a hole in the wall, that wall which for nearly 30 years had been the very embodiment of the division of our continent. It was on that day that democracy and freedom — inseparable from one another — carried off what I see as one of their finest and most telling victories. The people moved. The people spoke, and their voice carried beyond frontiers and shattered the silence of an order which they did not want, which was imposed on them and which they clearly wished to reject in order to recover their own identity.

I am therefore delighted to be able to express here, before Chancellor Kohl, before the representatives of the peoples of the twelve Member States of the Community, how deeply moved we were at those stirring events, a depth of emotion which it is pointless to dwell upon, since it is personal to each of us, a part of our inner experience of history, as well as being a formidable example of a mass movement in which we can, I believe, be proud to have played a part.

The movement began in Poland and then spread to Hungary. I am talking of course about recent events, because for a very long time, indeed from the very first, free men have hoped, free men have fought. Many risked the loss of their freedom, risked death. Many met that fate. How then can we pinpoint the moment of the first sign, the first awakening? If we are talking about recent events, then it has to be what happened in Poland, in Hungary, a movement sought and encouraged by the Soviet Union, and we can never

overemphasize the role played in this situation by Mr Gorbachev.

(Applause)

Here is a man who is certainly a product of his own culture and history, the history of his country, but a man who has understood that it is time to move on to new ways of doing things, that his country, like others, must now bow to the dominant forces in human society which are — let me repeat the words, it is such a pleasure to do so — democracy and freedom. In short, the movement is gathering pace, it is expanding, it is spreading throughout Europe, and we want this to happen — and I hope you don't mind if I speak for you here, even though you have not empowered me to do so, but I feel we are in unison — we even want the movement to continue. Our hunger is not assuaged, we see what has been happening in towns throughout Poland, what is happening in towns throughout East Germany, what has happened in Hungary. We hear the call of the crowds in Prague; and if we do not hear the voice of the Romanian people it is because it is still stifled.

(Applause)

But we are aware of it. The silence is deafening. Sooner or later that people will join the concert of nations already formed by our twelve countries which have been much divided by the history of this century and which have come together again because they wished it and perhaps also because necessity taught them that they must so wish.

Why then hold this meeting in Paris on 18 November? Would it not have been better to hold it sooner? I do not wish to reopen this argument, which had its merits, but it is a difficult matter to decide. I was thinking about it from the very first day. It seemed to me that perhaps it was necessary to stand back a little from events, the breathing space was not very long, some eight days. It allowed us to distance ourselves a little from the feelings and emotions of the first hours, before we began to see our way more clearly, before the peoples themselves began to discern what separated their ambitions, their deepest desires and sometimes their dreams from the reality of today, from the realities of our political debates, our parliamentary assemblies, our government decisions.

I did not bring forward the Strasbourg European Council meeting, for what seemed to me an obvious reason: it is due to take place on 8 and 9 December. Everything in its time; you know very well, ladies and gentlemen, from having experienced it in other places besides our Community, that meetings need to be prepared and matters need to be ripe for discussion. The Strasbourg meeting was arranged to coincide with a decisive moment for the future of our Community, for reaffirming its structures, for defining its principles. I wished it to retain all its importance.

On Saturday we spoke chiefly, I would say almost exclusively, about the events in the East and what we

MITTERRAND

should do about them, we the countries generally regarded as the Western countries. I shall come back to this in a minute. What should we do? Answers are beginning to emerge. We need to amplify these answers. Both you and I have a great deal of work before us. We are all faced with the situation, we must decide how we are to forge the Europe of tomorrow. But we had a twofold objective: to make a joint analysis of the situation in Eastern Europe and weigh up the possible consequences for the balance of Europe and at the same time to express the wish of the Community and its Member States to assist the countries of the East in the process of reform.

We wish to assist all the countries of the East but more specifically and more precisely those which have committed themselves to a course of action, those which have made promises, not verbally to us, but to themselves. The arrangements already announced show that they are on course towards democratic systems. The circumstances clearly justified the meeting. The matter was one which required detailed consideration without further delay, the issues at stake required the Community to look at what was going on and define its position on events which were of direct concern to it.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, you wished to organize a debate on political developments in Central and Eastern Europe and their implications for the future of Europe and consequently for the future of the Community. I congratulate you on that initiative. Your debate will, I am sure, enhance the message which the Twelve are holding out to the countries of Europe. Given my present role and the fact that I am currently responsible for this task, I felt that I could not accomplish it without at some stage reporting to you on the matter, that is what Parliament is for, it seems to me, even if it is also in a state of permanent flux, and evolution; it is at least necessary to mark certain stages in a significant way, and I hope that is what will be done today.

(Applause)

Do not think that this is merely a duty. It is also a pleasure for me, even if it is something of a repetition, to have this opportunity of laying our conclusions before you.

But as I was speaking to you about the European Council meeting on Saturday, and it was that which occasioned and which is the reason for our meeting, I shall just dwell on that a little, if you will permit.

The first of our conclusions, and I think I can say that it affects the very future of our Community, let us use terms which have already been employed, is that it is the existence of an ever-stronger Community which has provided a point of reference and a stimulus to events in the East. We do not take the credit for those events, that belongs primarily to the peoples of those countries and then to their leaders who understood the need for this development, who permitted it, who facilitated it. Some credit is also due, I am convinced of it, to that Community which today represents the only real point

of attraction around which to build a structured future for this, our continent.

And then there are the values, those fine values which are so often talked about, you know the ones I mean. The values which these peoples are laying claim to are very close to our own, we ourselves have expressed the same aspirations. They are our own aspirations, aspirations which we hold in common; but, civilization being what it is, the course of centuries has seen the birth of Europe, has seen it come together, split apart and come together again. These values exist independently of fixed points, frontiers, splits and walls: we have the proof — walls are coming down, we are meeting up again, and we understand one another.

I am convinced, as I have already said that existence of a strong and structured Community is a factor for the stability and success of the whole of Europe. We should therefore affirm our identity as a Community, confirm our determination, strengthen our institutions and set the seal on our union. That in my view is the first lesson to be learned, because I can see no other alternative to the opening up of the East and the completion of the Community construct. The two things go hand in hand. I have said it before, and I say it again, they are complementary. We must not look inwards but must draw on the Community's success, its strengths, its reserves of energy, the driving force which will enable Europe as a whole to come together. I used that expression at the press conference which followed our meeting on Saturday evening, when I said that the great political lesson to be learned from all this is that we are two inseparable factors in the European equation. As events unfold in the East, the Europe of the Community, — at the same pace, and indeed why not even a little more quickly in order to anticipate the result — must decide to strengthen itself more than it has yet done, must press on rapidly towards the full realization of its structures. And those structures will depend absolutely on the Community's political will to see unity — political unity — finally hold sway over all the measures initiated since the founders conceived the idea of Europe.

(Applause)

And I think I can say that that was the spirit in which the twelve Heads of State and Government met. That was what they wished to express, what they wished to see happen. They wanted to encourage and support steps towards democracy wherever such steps were being taken, but also to take those factors as an indication that our Community should itself learn something from the lesson of events.

You can make the connection after what I have just said between the meeting on 18 November and the meeting which awaits us on 8 and 9 December.

But a lot has happened in the meantime and will happen yet. I would nevertheless like to tell you straight away how the few specific measures were examined, according to the very different circumstances of the East European countries in the process of change. To turn

MITTERRAND

first to Poland and Hungary. The Twelve have stressed the urgent need for these two countries to conclude agreements with the International Monetary Fund, and it was decided that the Community bodies would take energetic steps to urge that body to come to a decision before the end of the year. Of course Poland and Hungary will also have to make an effort to arrive at a sound agreement which is in keeping with the rules which must govern our international institutions. But the matter is so urgent that the Community should back up these two countries in pleading a difficult case which nevertheless deserves to succeed.

The recent visit to Warsaw and Budapest by the President of the Commission, Mr Jacques Delors, and the President of the Council, Mr Roland Dumas, provided an opportunity for assessing those two countries' needs. Poland needs a stabilization fund estimated at one thousand million dollars, while Hungary is requesting a bridging loan for the same amount. I can tell you that these two things can already be regarded as agreed in principle.

The Twelve have also discussed cooperation with other countries. They have considered and entirely agreed to the signing of a trade agreement with the German Democratic Republic. We perhaps have a tendency to forget it in the hurly-burly of events, but we must not forget that the country was perhaps the first to show a power of resistance and a courage such that, even though the economy was not thereby improved, we really are morally obliged to help its people, along with the others, especially since the country is going through a severe economic crisis, as you know.

Furthermore, to support the movement for reform, we examined what measures might be introduced. These were of several kinds, and I shall come back to them in a moment. There was discussion on one question which indeed requires some discussion. Should conditions be imposed on the countries which need our help? Yes and no. In the case of countries which have shown a clear intention of acquiring democratic institutions based on certain simple themes: respect for human rights and free, and hence secret, elections, those are the countries for which we felt we should make an extra effort and pass straight on to helping them obtain a number of the advantages they should enjoy, as well as entry to certain institutions, as if the Community (while not contemplating enlargement without due process) considered that there already existed a community, a group of nations and of peoples, which could take such a step. A certain link has therefore been established for this kind of measure between Poland, Hungary and the countries of the Community. This does not of course mean that we are abandoning countries which have not reached the same stage to their fate.

We would not want aid from our countries in any way to provide fresh fuel for perpetuating the dictatorial and totalitarian regimes which persist in certain places. That would be absurd, but at the same time we can see how unfortunate it would be if we were to refuse our aid,

simply because, if we did, those countries which have not had the opportunity to free themselves earlier from oppressive regimes would be deprived of our assistance and friendship. We must therefore tailor our intervention, and that is what we are trying to do. And although we have decided on a course of action, have arranged for a series of agreements, something now clearly in prospect for Poland and Hungary, we are also blazing a trail and providing pointers for the others, so that the way ahead is clear.

If we are to support the reform movement we cannot simply remain passive observers, merely counting the blows struck. We must enter into the movement, help to carry it further. The measures to be taken have already been outlined and are to be discussed again in the days and weeks to come. I shall mention a few, for example the project which I referred to on 25 October, that of a bank for the development and modernization of Eastern Europe.

I was speaking personally at the time; decision taken in Paris was a mandate to the 'Troika'. I believe that such a bank, comparable to the regional banks for South East Asia and Africa, should involve widespread participation by all those who wish to contribute to its capital, starting with the 24 countries which attended the Arche Summit on 14 July of this year. That is what would constitute — until such time as there is explicit agreement among the members of the Community — the unusual feature of this bank.

Of course the EIB was mentioned. It springs to mind immediately. It is not that we have a mania for creating new bodies at every opportunity, or at least I don't, I don't like bureaucracies any more than you do, it is simply that this is not a role for the EIB. The task of the EIB is basically linked to the structural funds, it is oriented towards another part of Europe; the EIB consists only of the twelve Community countries.

I believe — and there are several of us who think this way — that the new bank should have a special flavour, that of the East European countries, and that instead of involving only the members of the Community it should involve all the well-wishers of the world and all types of capital, from whatever source, in order to launch a powerful movement on a scale commensurate with the size of the task ahead. This therefore is the characteristic that I wish to highlight and which I shall continue to highlight. The 'Troika' has begun its discussions; it will report on 8 and 9 December. I hope that this project — an idea which has sprung from several quarters, including a number of benches in this House and in our national Parliaments, an idea which many have thought of — I hope that this bank for Eastern Europe will really tackle the development question, and help to form new forces, to pull them back from the brink of the abyss before which they stand. And from this point of view matters are extremely urgent, I think that since the setting up of this bank might take some time, and I fear that it will, it is necessary to find an immediate solution. That is to say that from next week we must begin to

MITTERRAND

mobilize the bodies capable of carrying out this task until an institution is set up.

In a similar vein, thinking about the sort of things we have all heard, I remember a conversation I had with Mr Gorbachev. I do not usually confide the contents of private conversations at meetings of this kind, but it is something that has been said so often that I feel I can repeat it. I remember the day he said to me: 'what we need most is to train our managers'. How many other countries have we heard say that? We need to train bosses — it seems that the men and women called on to run these countries are no longer able to do so because they have not been trained for it, they were trained for something else. They have not been able to adapt to the new forms of management. That, after all, is our job; let us do it, without attaching conditions.

Let us draw up a plan for the training of managers in all these countries, just as we have decided to open up to the East European countries the programmes which the Community already has for education and training. One day we may see — and I am giving my imagination free rein — a Hungarian student doing an Oxford doctorate under the Erasmus programme, a student from Leipzig following a training course in a Dutch or Italian, or indeed French firm under the Comett programme. We could see a teacher of French from Warsaw perfecting his knowledge of the language under the Lingua programme. I don't think I need to go on, you get the idea. These programmes are not exclusive. We have already taken our activities way beyond the Community framework in a number of areas, especially that of technology, and we shall continue to do so.

Other suggestions have also been made, such as allowing certain East European countries to have access to the Council of Europe and GATT, initially as observers. Each of these suggestions will of course be examined in the appropriate forum and by the appropriate procedures, to use the language of our administrators. We shall see what the appropriate procedures are when the European Council meets on 8 and 9 December and takes up the matter. I hope that there will not be any going back over the issues, or at least if there is that it will be in order to do more and to do it better.

Has the Community lived up to the expectations of those who have placed their faith in it? Has it really responded to the anguished appeal of Mr Mazowiecki that there should no longer be a Europe of the poor and a Europe of the rich? Has it lived up to your own expectations, the expectations of you who have put forward projects on many occasions? Has the Community met the aspirations of those men and women of Europe who want it to make its voice heard in all world affairs and to confirm its place as a protagonist in a new European balance and as one of the fundamental protagonists in human life on this planet.

We can never go far enough or quickly enough. Swiftmess of action does not mean lack of thought. But it must be said — and here I am preaching to the

converted, since you remind us of it often enough, and I hope that the message will spread beyond these walls — none of this will come about if we are unable in the next few days, among ourselves, within the Community, to agree on the fundamental projects which will endow our Europe with the instruments of an economic and monetary policy, the instruments of a social policy, of an environmental policy. It will not come about if we do not complete the internal market according to the pace and timetable we have already decided on.

(Applause)

This is what we are going to turn our hands to now. This is what we shall be looking at and these are the questions which I shall be asking in Strasbourg in a few days' time. Everyone will have to respond. And, while I am on the point, I am sure that within the minds of each of us, as responsible people, light will dawn, not a blinding light but one which will illuminate the whole horizon: from what we are able to do among ourselves and for ourselves will flow the things which will seem valuable, worthwhile and lasting for others. In short, we hold in our hands much more than our own fate. We can now show the way, without pretension, without any wish to dominate, without the feeling of fulfilling some authoritarian role, but out of a profound desire for democracy, as demonstrated time and again by each of our countries. We want the way in which the Community decides on its action to serve as an example for the countries of the East who are on the move, searching for something, suffering, hoping, an example to those millions who dream, like us, that one day Europe will be Europe.

This then, ladies and gentlemen, is what I expect of the European Council in Strasbourg. You are aware of what is at stake, I have no need to tell you how important it is, I am speaking to an assembly in which the vast majority is already convinced that this is the path we should follow, that this is where our duty lies; we must embark on the venture together.

(Loud applause)

PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Mr President-in-Office of the Council.

I now call on the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr Helmut Kohl.

(Applause)

KOHL, member of the European Council. — *(DE)* Mr President of the European Parliament, Mr President of the French Republic, ladies and gentlemen, each of us senses that what is now happening in Europe — and especially Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe — is of historical importance. I thank you, Mr President, and the House very sincerely for this opportunity to explain the position of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany at this time.

President Mitterrand has just described and explained the conclusions reached at the special summit meeting

KOHL

of the Heads of State and Government of the European Community held in Paris last Saturday. I should like to thank President Mitterrand once again for giving us the opportunity to have a detailed exchange of views on current events, which are of interest to us all, and to pave the way for the decisions that now need to be taken, and to do so before — and I want to stress this — before the summit meeting between the Presidents of the USA and the Soviet Union and before the regular European Council meeting to be held here in Strasbourg in a few days' time, on 8 and 9 December.

We are all witnesses to radical changes in Europe. In the West of Europe the Member States of the Community are actively preparing for the challenge of the 21st century.

The large European internal market, which we together intend to complete on 31 December 1992, will make Western Europe the world's largest economic area with over 320 million inhabitants.

In addition, we are already making preparations for the further development of the European Community beyond this date, with Political Union as our goal. For the Federal Government this large market is an important, but intermediate stage. What we want is the political unification of Europe.

(Applause)

The steps that must now be taken — giving substance to the social dimension of the internal market so that the many millions of workers and their representatives in the trade unions feel enthusiastic about this Europe not only in their minds but also in their hearts, and taking the decisions needed if there is to be an Economic and Monetary Union — are important milestones on this road. In short, development in the European Community must continue.

At the same time, the political, economic and social systems of more and more countries in the East of our continent are undergoing fundamental change at breathtaking speed. One of the main factors that has triggered this development has been the policy of perestroika initiated by General Secretary Gorbachev. He deserves our respect for this.

(Applause)

I share his view that the success of the reforms in the Soviet Union are of fundamental importance for overall development in Europe. The same is true — and we should not forget this in this debate — of the need for further progress with disarmament and arms control. It is crucial that the negotiations in Vienna succeed.

In Hungary and Poland — and now in the GDR — it has been the people themselves who have cleared the way for radical reforms. The same will be true — we all hope — of Bulgaria and, in the near future, Romania. As everyone knows, the process is already under way in Czechoslovakia. The pictures from Prague arouse in us

heart-felt sympathy and hope for the people of Czechoslovakia.

(Applause)

For the first time since the end of the Second World War there is thus legitimate hope that the East-West conflict will be overcome, that there will be lasting stability and freedom for all throughout Europe. I realize, of course, that this is only the beginning of the process, and none of us must underestimate or overlook the risk of failure and the dangers that may entail.

At this time of hope I should also like to warn against ignoring the facts and giving way to visions and illusions, but — and this gives us hope — there is now a genuine prospect of change throughout Europe, a genuine prospect of a peaceful European order, of a Europe of freedom, human rights and self-determination.

It has been the renewed dynamism of the process of European unification in recent years that has given the processes of reform in the countries of Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe such strong encouragement. We would therefore be making a bad mistake and completely misjudging the situation if we were to deprive this process of European unification of its momentum at this of all times.

(Applause)

From many of the talks I have had and from much of the information I receive I know that the aura and appeal of the European Community have the people throughout Europe under its spell. We therefore have a common interest and a joint responsibility in Europe for ensuring that these processes of reform make progress and succeed.

The European Community and all its Member States must play their part in this with wisdom and discernment, with imagination and flexibility and also with willingness to participate in a vigorous, far-sighted programme of cooperation. Let us help together for the simple reason that what is at stake is Europe, *our* Europe. And Europe — I will say again at this time — happens to be more than the Europe of the Twelve of the European Community. It is not only London, Rome, The Hague, Dublin and Paris that belong to Europe, but Warsaw, Budapest, Prague and Sofia and, of course, Berlin, Leipzig and Dresden as well.

(Applause)

The events in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe in particular make it more than clear to us all how the Single European Act points the way: it tells us to establish a common foreign policy and then to implement it. If we act in solidarity with these countries, we shall be on the right road.

On the other hand, there would be little comprehension in these countries if we failed to make significant progress towards economic and political integration in our European Community. Let all those who have doubts about the position of the Federal Republic of

KOHL

Germany take note: the Federal German Government stands by the Single Act and its goals in every respect. It is a staunch supporter of the completion of the European Union. We see no alternative to the continuation and strengthening of the process of European unification.

Our position is clear, and no one has the right to question it. Given the history of this century — and only ten years separate us from the beginning of the 21st — we Germans are aware of our special mission and, speaking personally, of our European vocation.

The historic events of the last few weeks and months in Poland, Hungary and recently the GDR and especially Berlin have changed the face of Europe and, with it, the face of Germany.

This was also particularly noticeable during my visit to the People's Republic of Poland from 9 to 14 November. Our relationship with Poland and the developments in the GDR are very closely linked. If Poland and Hungary — along with the Soviet Union — had not gone ahead with radical political, economic and social reforms, current developments in the GDR would have been impossible.

(Applause)

It is equally true to say that, if the reforms in Poland and Hungary do not succeed, the opportunities for change elsewhere, not least in the GDR, will be at risk. These reforms must not fail. Their success is in the interests of the whole of Europe.

Those who now refuse to have any part of this are betraying Europe and the cause of freedom for all Europeans.

(Applause from the centre)

For this very reason my main message to all Poles was: 'You are not alone as you go down this difficult road, which will require hard work and sacrifices. You can rely on your friends in the West.' I should also like to pass this message on to the European Parliament.

(Applause)

Now is the time for European solidarity. We all owe our European neighbours in these countries, where decades of mismanagement have robbed the people of the fruits of their labour, the solidarity they need. I have personally advocated extensive economic and financial aid and an offer of wide-ranging cooperation with Poland. We have also given this careful thought in the Federal Government. We have taken our decision conscious of our national and European responsibility.

With a view to sharing the burden within the western community, we are thus making a substantial contribution to the tasks Europe faces in the future.

During my visit to Warsaw to Warsaw Prime Minister Mazowiecki and I referred to the trade and cooperation agreement recently signed by the Community and Poland as forming an important basis for future cooperation. All the various opportunities this provides

must be seized and — again as proof of our solidarity — access for Polish goods to the European market further improved. But we must not content ourselves with this initial success. It is now essential that the European Community approach these countries with an open mind, all the countries that have actually made a start on radical political, economic and social restructuring.

We intend and have a duty to support these reforms with a wide-ranging programme of cooperation and, in this, to join with the appropriate international bodies, like the International Monetary Fund and the Paris Club. We want to give the trade and cooperation agreement more substance and, on this basis, to achieve even closer cooperation in the medium and long term.

As I see it, this is especially true of Hungary. In the often tragic history of our continent there can be no doubt that no two countries have lived in peace and harmony as long as Germany and Hungary. From their long joint history has sprung firm friendship, which has proved its worth in recent times.

I would remind you of the Hungarian Government's exemplary policy towards minorities, which enables Hungarian Germans to retain their language, culture and traditions in their hereditary home instead of seeking salvation in emigration.

I would also remind the European Parliament of the courageous step taken by Hungary in removing the Iron Curtain, in opening its frontiers, and this not only for its own citizens but for the Germans too.

(Applause)

We all remember the pictures we have seen this summer. They have moved people in Germany and in Europe, and we will not forget them. In the process of political and social reform Hungary and Poland are pressing ahead towards a system of government and a social order based on the principle of liberty like no other country in the Warsaw Pact.

Radical economic reforms have been launched, with a market economy and private initiative as their goals. We can only welcome this. But these reforms require painful adjustment processes in Hungary, and these processes take time. In these difficult times western aid is essential.

For Hungary too this means closer cooperation with the European Community, an early conclusion of the negotiations with the International Monetary Fund and other western bodies and not least bilateral aid from the western partner countries. We have done what we can in this respect: since the autumn of 1987 the Federal Republic of Germany has made over DM 2bn available to Hungary. I would very much welcome it if the other countries of Europe provided Hungary with substantial aid.

Last Sunday Hungary's Prime Minister, Nemeth, made it very clear to me in a personal conversation that in the next few months in particular it will be essential for this country and, I suspect, for other CMEA countries to

KOHL

avoid bottlenecks in energy supplies and to remain solvent. What he especially underlined was that western aid must be seen to be very closely linked to the undisturbed continuation of the political reforms in his country.

The spring of 1990 will see the first really free parliamentary elections to be held in Hungary since 1945.

In the build-up to these elections the aim must be to maintain and strengthen the commitment of all citizens to the Hungarian reforms. Last week Hungary applied for full membership of the Council of Europe. We should all give this application our full support.

(Applause)

Let me repeat what I have just said about Poland: the success of this process of reform is in our interests, in the interests of the whole of Europe. I therefore take this opportunity to reiterate the appeal I made at the Elysée Palace last Saturday: let us join together in helping Poland and Hungary, let us join together in helping the countries of Central, Eastern and South-eastern Europe which have initiated genuine political and economic reforms. Let us join together in helping them as they progress towards democracy — at national level, at European level and in the international organizations.

But we are all under an obligation to ensure that the fine words uttered by so many are followed by many good deeds. One thing must be made clear at this juncture: the world economic summit last summer made the Commission responsible for coordinating aid to Poland and Hungary. Let us help the Commission and its President, Jacques Delors, to perform this important task. National egoism is particularly out of place in the present situation.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I therefore appeal to you: go on giving all these political developments the necessary support, along with all the Members of the national parliaments.

People not only in Germany but throughout Europe and the world have been held spellbound by the dramatic events in the GDR. Since the night of 9/10 November the situation in Germany — in the heart of Europe — has changed fundamentally. The yearning of Germans in East Berlin and in the GDR for freedom has resulted in the Wall and the barbed wire being breached peacefully. After almost three decades of division the people of Germany have been celebrating the fact that they can meet again, that they belong together and that they are one nation.

We have been able to witness on our television screens and in person moving scenes of human happiness and joy, fraternity and active compassion. These pictures have made it clear that the Germans who are now at last coming together in a spirit of freedom will never be a threat and are in fact a gain for the unity of Europe.

(Applause)

The events in the GDR are also a factor in this unity. The division of Germany has always been a visible and particularly painful manifestation of the division of Europe. Conversely, Germany will be completely united only if progress is made towards the unification of our old continent. Policy on Germany and policy on Europe are completely inseparable. They are two sides of the same coin.

(Applause)

Like no other city, Berlin, this European metropolis in Germany, has become the symbol of Germany's division and so of Europe's division. The whole world saw the Wall as an inhuman frontier, separating the Europe of freedom and the Europe of dictatorship — and, therefore, people who belong together.

Today we look towards Berlin with hope. We feel joy and satisfaction in the knowledge that the peaceful strength of freedom can overcome frontiers and unite families and friends, compatriots. This is also a sign for the future, because we are banking on this strength in our vision of a peaceful European order. Wherever frontiers can be crossed without hindrance, ideas and opinions can be freely exchanged and people can meet, distrust and enmity are bound to be overcome in the end.

The best guarantee of lasting and secure peace in Europe is and remains the freedom of the people.

This is a conviction that constantly inspired the founding fathers of European unification — Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet, Alcide de Gasperi and Konrad Adenauer. They knew what is all too often forgotten today: the construction of United Europe is above all else an act of peace. And it is something we must do together.

(Applause)

The citizens of the free part of our continent — and especially the younger generation — take it for granted today that they can cross frontiers in freedom and make friends. We want this to be taken for granted throughout Europe. Here again, Berlin becomes a symbol — a symbol of hope for a future that unites all Europeans and all Germans in peace and freedom.

In its Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950 the Council of Europe laid the foundations for a joint future of this kind — or, if you like, drew up the absolutely essential house rules for a 'common European house', to introduce this image. The preamble of the Convention refers to the common 'heritage of intellectual assets, political traditions, respect for freedom and the supremacy of the law'.

That above all is what the Germans in the GDR now want. Happy as we are about the newly gained freedom of movement in the GDR, we must not forget that this is only the beginning. The goal is still a long way off. The people of the GDR now want freedom in every sphere of their lives. They want freedom of speech and inform-

KOHL

ation and a free press that obeys only the rules of journalistic responsibility in the information it provides and the comments it makes, not the instructions handed down by some party headquarters. They want really free trade unions representing the interests of the workers not of the State or a party. They want the right to form really independent, free parties, and in particular they want free, equal and secret elections as an expression of the genuine, real sovereignty of the people.

The statement made by the GDR's new head of government, Hans Modrow, includes a number of items that point in the right direction. What is now crucial is how these announcements are put into practice. The reforms must continue and be made irreversible — anything else, I can tell you now, will be unacceptable to the people of the GDR.

(Applause from the centre)

This also means that the Socialist Unity Party must give up its claim to have the sole right to govern the country and that its monopoly on power must be removed from the GDR's constitution. The right of all Germans to self-determination has not been respected. Germans in the GDR have this right just as Germans in the Federal Republic do. Freedom was, in and remains the crux of the German question. Above all, this means that the people of the GDR must be able to decide for themselves which way they intend to go. They do not need to be told by anyone else.

(Applause from the centre and left)

They know themselves what they want, as anyone can see. This is true of the question of the unity of the nation and of reunification. Everyone — in Europe and in the Federal Republic of Germany — must respect whatever decision the people in the GDR may freely take. This does not relieve us of the obligation to make it clear what we in the Federal Republic of Germany want. The Federal Government holds fast to the goal once formulated by Konrad Adenauer: *in a free and united Europe a free and united Germany*.

The Basic Law, our constitution, commits us to both. It calls on the German people 'to achieve in free self-determination the unity and freedom of Germany', and it testifies to the will of the German people 'to serve the peace of the world ... in a united Europe'. The two belong together and must be understood not as contradictory but as a joint mandate for the future of the Germans.

Freedom, human rights and self-determination remain crucial building blocks in the architecture of a pan-European peaceful order. What are now needed are perceptiveness, reason and political imagination. The people of the GDR are particularly dependent on our help. Like the Poles and Hungarians, they need our support. A decisive question in this connection will be how far fundamental political, social and economic change can be achieved.

I should like to repeat something I said before the German *Bundestag* a few days ago: 'If such change is now set in motion as a binding and — of necessity — irreversible process, the Federal Government will be prepared to create a completely new type of aid and cooperation — especially one that is of immediate benefit to the people.'

I discussed this with the Chairman of the GDR's Council of State on the telephone. On my behalf Federal Minister Seiters has had initial discussions on these subjects in East Berlin in the last few days, and I intend to go to the GDR myself soon to have talks with the people in charge there.

It is not only the Germans who have a responsibility to support change in the GDR. It is a task, and I must emphasize this, with a pan-European dimension, because what is now happening will have a very profound effect on overall developments in Europe — to keep to the architectural metaphor: the statics of Europe.

Please accept that we are aware of our special responsibility — in this as in other connections — as a partner of our European friends and our European neighbours. This is a challenge for all Europeans and for the Community too, of course. I see it as an important step that the Commission is shortly to receive a mandate to negotiate a trade agreement between the Community and the GDR and that Commissioner Andriessen will be starting the discussions in early December.

Last Saturday the Community's Heads of State and Government particularly welcomed the developments in Germany. Above all, they expressed admiration for the calm and peaceful way in which the people of the GDR are demanding freedom. They supported the efforts of the people of the GDR to gain freedom. I am very grateful for this attitude and for these statements. We know that we cannot solve our problems alone. Germany's problems can only be solved under a European roof. This is true of us in the Federal Republic of Germany, and it is, of course, true of the Germans in the GDR. What is at stake is their freedom and the freedom of the Poles and the Hungarians and the future of the people in the Soviet Union, the future of the Czechs and Slovaks, the Bulgarians and the Romanians.

What is at stake is the freedom of *one* Europe. What is at stake is a future in joint freedom for all Germans and for all Europeans. Let us join together in this spirit and work for a just and lasting peaceful order for the whole of Europe. The Federal Republic of Germany is prepared to make its contribution to this major task.

(Loud and sustained applause)

PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Chancellor Kohl.

COT (S). — (FR) Mr President, confronted with the momentous events unfolding before our eyes to the East. What did the President-in-Office of the European Council do? He invited his colleagues to a special meeting in Paris in order to adopt emergency measures,

COT

and now he comes to report to the European Parliament, to the elected representatives of the peoples of the Community. All that is perfectly normal, and yet, what remarkable progress this marks for our democracy in Europe!

President Mitterrand, by setting such a precedent and associating Chancellor Kohl with it, you honour Parliament, but the most important effect of your action is a form of democratic transformation of the European institutions outside the framework of any revision of the Treaties.

(Applause)

Whereas the problem of how the institutions are to be made more democratic is to be considered by the next intergovernmental conference, constitutional practice, if I may put it that way, has just taken a major step forward, thanks to you, and this in order to debate the situation in Eastern Europe.

Is there anyone among us who has not yearned for the winds of change, the winds of freedom which are at last sweeping over Eastern Europe? Is there anyone here who has not longed to see our divided Europe reunited, the Wall of Shame demolished, the cold war consigned to the pages of history? Let us not pretend to be surprised by these developments, for which we had hoped, but which we had also helped to shape. We could not of course have imagined the electrifying turn of events, the pace of these historic changes. But we must shoulder our responsibility as politicians and each of us must now work together and play our part in mastering the forces we Europeans helped to unleash.

We Europeans — let me cite two who have played a special role in bringing the present situation about. Mikhail Gorbachev, by his bold and courageous decision to embark on the policy of *perestroika*, shook the system to the core. It is his name that the young people invoke as they demonstrate in Prague and Leipzig and Sofia. Just as they did in Tienanmen Square. For all that, the active support he is giving to the changes in the East is not confined to setting an example. It was also he, President Gorbachev, who ordered the Soviet tanks to remain in their camps, a spectacular repudiation of Brezhnev's sinister doctrine of *limited sovereignty* in order to give democracy its chance.

(Applause)

The other European to whom I wish to pay tribute today is Willy Brandt. The young mayor of Berlin, who saw the Wall erected during his term of office, and who later became Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, laid the foundations of the new edifice through his *Ostpolitik*. The treaties signed in the 1970s opened the door to trade, offered the first guarantees of security, paved the way for the Helsinki process. The consequences we are witnessing today.

But it is above all the men and the women of Warsaw and Budapest, of Berlin and Prague, who are making history. As the President-in-Office of the European Council said here a month ago, and repeated just now, it

is the people who are making their voice heard, it is the determination of the people that is dictating the events that are bringing down walls and frontiers.

Yes, it is the people who are asserting their will to take their destiny in their own hands. It is the people that are setting the seal on the abject failure of totalitarian communism. And what a historic failure of a previously triumphant ideology! What a historic revenge for Léon Blum over Marcel Cachin at the Congress of Tours. How right socialists were when they said 'There can be no socialism without freedom: socialism can be achieved only through democracy'!

(Applause)

The peoples of Europe are taking their destiny in their own hands. What is their destiny? No one knows. That is the law of democracy, the law of democratic pluralism. But I wish on behalf of the Socialist Group to salute the rebirth of social democracy in Eastern Europe and say how delighted we are to welcome here in Strasbourg today the young leaders of the new Social-Democratic Party of the German Democratic Republic, headed by their secretary-general, Mr Böhme.

(Applause)

Their movement was born in a small church on 26 August 1989, two centuries to the day after the adoption of that great Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. What a happy omen!

Democracy means self-determination, democracy is the affirmation of the right of people freely to determine their future. In the case of the German Democratic Republic, we socialists say that East Germans must have that free and sovereign right, including the right to become part of a united Germany within a unified Europe.

(Applause)

The decision belongs to them and to no one else. But, some will say, that means destabilizing the European political system! Yes, it does. The problem is not one of stability, it is one of peaceful change. For let there be no doubt that what we are witnessing is a veritable revolution, and it is of the essence of revolution to destabilize, to overturn the old order and replace it with a new one. We must accept that. The challenge will be to accomplish this daunting transformation peacefully, whereas advances on such a scale have previously been achieved only at the cost of blood and tears.

What can we politicians do? In the first place help. Time is short, as we all know. The immediate economic aid agreed at the Paris meeting is vital. Democracy must not result in such a decline in living standards as to engender the worst forms of nostalgia.

Economic and financial aid, we shall be talking about that in the course of the debate. Political support, too, support for the forces of democratic revival, for Mikhail Gorbachev's courageous undertaking. Beyond that, we must strengthen our own structures. As Jacques Delors said a few weeks ago, 'To be generous, you have to be

COT

strong'. Only through greater unity can we build political will. A large market displays no will, no generosity. We must rapidly become a genuine Community, strengthen our cohesion, establish Economic and Monetary Union, create a social Europe, make our institutions more democratic.

The Socialist Group believes that it would be fatal to wait, to procrastinate, on the pretext that we must first study the lessons of history.

(Applause)

For to build the Europe that is now emerging will require determination, tenacity and patience. The task ahead is nothing more nor less than to lay the foundations of the new international order, that of the 21st century.

At someone who had previously helped to establish the system produced by the cold war remarked a few days ago, it will take not just a matter of weeks but many years, entailing major adjustments and difficult negotiations. And it will be up to us Europeans to accomplish that task. The two superpowers who are about to meet in Malta can, indeed must, make an indispensable contribution in the field of disarmament, in the establishment of what Olof Palme referred to as common security. But they will not redraw the map of Europe, as they did at Yalta. They no longer have the power to do so. Vietnam and Afghanistan have obliged them to show greater circumspection. Even the economic aid that can be expected of them will be limited. Let us be realistic, there will be no American Marshall Plan for Eastern Europe.

(Applause)

What then is to be done? We must use all the structures at our disposal to strengthen our ties. We must show imagination. The Council of Europe, about to be joined by Hungary, and by others before long, should play a pioneering role. We must find ways of associating the countries of Eastern Europe more closely with the Community. We must look for areas that bring us all together, Europeans that we are. One such area is undoubtedly the environment. It was the clouds spreading from Chernobyl that awoke in many people an awareness of the environment. It became a symbol. We must understand that signal and translate it into political action. As we set up the European Environmental Agency, let us be bold and establish it as a pan-European agency, with its seat — and why not? — in Berlin.

(Applause)

For the rest, we should avoid too many preconceived ideas about the structures of the future. We have to come to terms with the complexities of our time. Enlargement of our Community might be the right answer. I do not know. And I do not want to put forward at this stage ideas that might divide us at a moment when we need to unite.

Happiness is a new concept in Europe. Could it be that this ideal, launched by our ancestors two centuries ago, will at last become a reality? As France and Europe celebrate the bicentenary of the Revolution and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, what a striking manifestation of these ideals, which gladden the hearts of men of liberty!

(Applause)

KLEPSCH (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, seldom has an event been more worthy of the adjective 'historic' than the radical change that has been gathering momentum in Eastern and Central Europe in the past few days and weeks. Recent events in Leipzig, Dresden and Berlin and now in Czechoslovakia can rightly be described as a non-violent revolution. We the elected representatives of 320 million Europeans want to make it clear today how pleased, enthusiastic and shaken we feel about this non-violent revolution in Eastern and Central Europe.

The unrestrained desire for freedom felt by people who have lived under a totalitarian dictatorship for years has won through in the historic situation we are now witnessing.

I quite appreciate that General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, now the Soviet Union's head of State, triggered off this process when he turned the tide of events in his own country, but we should not forget two other aspects in this context, one being the peace-making power of European unification, which since the Second World War has shown that systems based on the principle of liberty can emerge and cooperate to the benefit of everyone living in the areas in which they apply.

This model — and reference has rightly been made to the founding fathers — has proved so successful and attractive that we have also managed to bring about the downfall of the authoritarian structures in Greece, Spain and Portugal. Today these countries are members of the European Community, which has continued to make an impact, building on the splendid ideas that we have endorsed. Today it is also clear that, with growing opportunities to make comparisons and given the growing problems they face, the people of Central Europe have realized that the way in which we respect human rights, insist on respect for them, foster them and show everyone what they are is the model to which they themselves aspire.

We know that we can say today that the State based on freedom and the rule of law and pluralist democracy are the two elements that the people in Eastern and Central Europe are now eager to achieve for themselves. We are happy about this, and we have a duty to help them on the difficult road they have to take to this end. But I am not forgetting those who have fought and struggled for freedom in Central and Eastern Europe for over 40 years and have had to live in prisons and forced labour camps. Our thoughts go out to them today. They were one of the reasons why this House established the

KLEPSCH

Sakharov Prize. What we want to say above all else is that we want to see freedom in Central and Eastern Europe now becoming freedom for all, we want to see the prisons emptied once and for all, and we want to see walls and barbed-wire barriers disappearing.

(Applause)

This, ladies and gentlemen, is not a vision. It is a reality that the people want to achieve. Anyone who remembers the Berliners dancing on the Wall, anyone who thinks of the endless line of Trabis, those little cars, anyone who tried to re-establish contact with long lost friends and relations will know what tremendous strength there is behind this desire for freedom.

It is therefore crucial that we Europeans in the European Community clearly appreciate two things: firstly, that we continue to regard the model of an order based on the rule of law and the principles of freedom and democracy, the further development of the European Community as one of the principal tasks of our political work. We therefore expect the summit meeting to produce results.

But, secondly, we also expect this Community to do what is needed at this historic hour and to set about helping the people in this process of development with the commitment of which there is so much talk. I listened to the announcement with considerable interest, and I would like to say that we are grateful for what has already been done. Federal Chancellor Kohl should certainly be thanked for the fact that the Federal Government has acted in exemplary fashion towards all its neighbours.

But now it is *our*, the European Community's turn, and we should think about the contribution we are going to make. I remind myself that we face the difficulty of finding the US\$ 600 million still needed for the US\$ 1 billion stabilization fund for Poland. And that we face the question: who is going to provide the money for the bridging loans of, again, US\$ 1 billion for Poland and Hungary? And how is the planned European development fund to obtain the capital it needs? Mr Cot has said we do not want to be entirely dependent on American aid. That is undoubtedly a fine sentiment, but we want to make it quite clear that we too can do something. I therefore say to President Mitterrand, Council President Dumas, Federal Chancellor Kohl and President Delors that we can certainly do more than just talk. We have a surplus of over ECU 800 million in the monetary reserve this year. Is this money simply to be returned to the national treasuries under Article 207, even though they were not expecting it, or do we not have here a large sum that we can do something with?

(Applause)

Expenditure from the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF has been well over ECU 1 billion less than expected. The Council now wants to approve the repayment of 1 billion of this, despite the Commission's opposition. I believe we would be putting this money to far better use

if we actually financed the measures we are always talking about.

(Applause)

It may not be possible to quote a precise figure. Thanks to the boom in the internal market, we have quite a sum in additional VAT revenues, which are also to be refunded to the Council next year. But why are we saving them and collecting them for the European Community if they are to go back to the national treasuries? The question that surely has to be asked here is this: how is this Community to solve today's major global problems? When we shortly set about drawing up the financial forecasts, the budgets for 1990 to 1992, this will, frankly, be the time for this House and the Council to consider whether we should not together think about drawing up a budget for the future, to plan what we can do together for the continent of Europe, because the Community's policy cannot consist solely of measures that complement national policies. The Community's policy must be so formulated that we are able to solve problems in the world on a global and also a continental scale. When we talk today about how hard the Hungarians, the Poles, the Germans in the GDR, perhaps the Czechs tomorrow, perhaps the people of Bulgaria and Romania in the near future are trying and how much help they need, we are talking about an appeal to us all, to the political forces: we must try to give the forces of freedom emerging in these countries — as Mr Cot has rightly said — our joint support and to help them with their development. And we must ensure that this Community grows together more quickly and more strongly so that it can do what needs to be done if we are to cope with our future together this decade.

Ladies and gentlemen, we Christian Democrats are aware that we have this obligation, and you may rest assured that we will put our money where our mouth is when it comes to helping the people of Eastern and Central Europe in their quest for freedom, so that they may lead lives fit for human beings in the future. That is what we want to see.

(Applause)

GISCARD D'ESTAING (LDR). — (FR) Mr President, today perhaps marks the political birth of the European Parliament, for events mould institutions. At a time when the tide of liberty is bursting all the dykes in Eastern Europe, it is here that the two representatives of the European Council, the President-in-Office and the Head of Government of the country closest to these events, have chosen to explain their views and their proposals to the elected representatives of all the peoples of the Community. We listen to you on behalf of Europe.

The meeting of the European Council was necessary and we congratulate you for having called it, for each of the Community institutions must at all times, but especially when grave events unfold, play its proper part. After listening to your statements on the proceedings, I shall give you this response on behalf of

GISCARD D'ESTAING

my group: Yes to faster progress towards union of the Community; yes to massive Community aid to assist reform in the countries of Eastern Europe; yes to the right of all the peoples concerned, including of course the East Germans, to determine their future freely and democratically within the framework of the commitments entered into.

But I would add two essential qualifications. Given that the military alliances do not at the moment threaten peace, it would be a senseless risk to call into question our commitments under the Atlantic Treaty or to encourage others to leave the Warsaw Pact. Let our twelve countries join together in recognizing the present frontiers of Europe.

Yes to faster progress towards union of the Community. This is what we hope for, what we demand. It will be the task of the forthcoming European Council in Strasbourg to take the two necessary decisions, a decision to set in train the negotiations on the treaty on Economic and Monetary Union, and a decision on what President Mitterrand referred to here as the democratic *aggiornamento* of the Community. Parliament wishes to be closely associated with these two steps and my group believes that the objective must be a modern form of federalism based on subsidiarity.

(Applause)

For a federal Europe will be better able to respond and adapt to the needs of Eastern Europe.

We want aid to the countries of Eastern Europe to be on a massive scale, organized at Community level, and accompanied by technical assistance as a matter of priority. The President-in-Office of the European Council has accepted the proposal for a modernization bank unanimously adopted here on 15 September. Excellent!

But a word of caution. We have no need of a new international institution, for we already have the World Bank and the European Investment Bank. What must be done is to create banks adapted to the situation of each of the countries of Eastern Europe, with half the capital subscribed by the Community institutions and half by the beneficiary countries. They must be close to the industries they will have to serve and acquainted with their needs, in other words they must be established on the spot. The European Investment Bank is ideally qualified to coordinate their activities.

You have so far declined, President Mitterrand, to accept the dimension and the vocabulary of a European Marshall Plan. The day will come when you are obliged to do so by the pressure of public opinion and by the gigantic scale of the needs.

(Applause)

Let us not be fainthearted in offering our help. Despite the efforts of the Commission and its President, to whom I pay tribute, we have a long way to go, even with our 1990 budget; as Mr Klepsch pointed out, we are still far short of the sums required.

We have listened very attentively, Chancellor Kohl, to the new undertakings you have given. We ask you to implement them without delay. You have appealed to us for our backing. You have it, for I believe that in this domain the European Parliament has shown itself to be in the vanguard rather than lagging behind. And let us not lose sight of other crucial issues in Europe. We must also think of the South — in Europe as in the rest of the world — the developing countries.

(Applause)

The next crisis in Eastern Europe could be an economic crisis capable of bringing in its wake despair and social revolution. We must not risk doing too little or acting too late.

Finally, we join you in asserting the right of all the peoples of Eastern Europe to choose freely and democratically their political and social organization and their form of government. Some will seek closer ties with our Community. Article 238 of the Treaty of Rome offers the possibility of negotiating with them association agreements adapted to individual circumstances.

It will be only natural if, after a period of reform, the East Germans strive for closer political links with their compatriots in the West, and hence with us. That is their legitimate right, a right we fully endorse. Let us not close our eyes, but let us not deny ourselves the right to reflect.

We have been observing with unbounded joy, these last few days, the reunion of the German people. One day we shall have to address the question of the political relations between the two Germanies and of the return of Berlin to the status of a free and united city.

In his memoirs Jean Monnet describes the frame of mind of the German delegates on his Committee for the United States of Europe in 1962, representing every political spectrum, some of whom later became Federal Chancellors.

European integration, that is to say the union of the free peoples of our continent, was for them the only hope, and whilst they dreamt, like every German, of the reunification of their country, they did not see that as an alternative to the Community. On the contrary. No, it is not an alternative to the Community. Our response must be this: The more united and federal the European Community becomes, the better able it will be, when the day comes, to meet the wishes of those who seek to join it or enter into an association with it. It is the European Community as a whole that must make ready, by moving forward rapidly, to provide a framework for the political reunification of the German people. Faster progress towards the union of Europe is thus the only way by which we can outstrip the march of history.

(Applause)

PROUT (ED). — Mr President, I would like to congratulate the President of France on his prompt initiative in calling last Saturday's European Council

PROUT

and to say how delighted we are to see Chancellor Kohl here today.

Some 40 years ago the Iron Curtain came crashing down, savagely dividing our continent. Now the subjugated peoples of East Central Europe are repudiating spontaneously and courageously their totalitarian governments. They are entitled to expect a great deal from us and we must not falter in the generosity of our response.

We must do everything in our power to sustain the momentum towards genuine democracy in East Central Europe. But let us be under no illusions about the scale of the task these nations face. Free elections are a necessary but not a sufficient condition for a free society. The whole relationship between the State and the individual will have to be recast. Judges must become independent, political parties nurtured, the press freed from shackles of censorship and individuals guaranteed the right to free association; and there will be much more to do besides.

Throughout this phase of social reconstruction the newly elected governments will be under immense pressure from their citizens to satisfy the expectations arising from their new-found freedoms. Above all, living standards will have to improve steadily if the fledgling democracies are to win enduring popular support. In principle, our help should not be given without some conditions on progress towards democracy and human rights. But Hungary and Poland have already made great steps down the road to freedom and it is right that increased aid should be forthcoming without attaching any further conditions. My group is greatly encouraged to hear that the European Council is to make these additional commitments to help these crisis-torn economies.

But if economic reform, based on open market economies, is to be established and to endure our response will have to go beyond financial aid and trade agreements, as the European Council so rightly concluded last Saturday. The nations of East Central Europe will require managerial know-how, scientific and technological knowledge and a host of other schemes to bring their enterprises up to the competitive standards required of world markets. We must respond to these needs with flexibility and imagination in the framework of association agreements and other bilateral arrangements.

But bilateral relations are not our only option. Some problems are better tackled on a multilateral basis. Last month I suggested that the Community open negotiations to conclude an environmental agreement with as many countries in Central and Eastern Europe as are willing to participate. My source of inspiration for this idea was Jean Monnet. We should move ahead in our relations on a functional basis beginning as the European Community did with agreements in areas of clear common interest. The European Community began with the Coal and Steel Treaty. We might equally contemplate a similar kind of agreement for the

environment between the Community and the countries of the East.

Mr President, we have heard much recently about the pace of integration within the European Community. I am all for speed as long as it is in the right direction! And I am optimistic that it will be. The Single European Act, as Chancellor Kohl has emphasized today, has pointed us in the right direction, establishing a process of integration through deregulation, removing the powers of national bureaucracies to intervene arbitrarily in the market place and replacing them by a rule of law whose writ runs throughout the European economy, capable of enforcement by the individual citizen in his own courts. The Single European Act is succeeding because it enshrines the doctrine of subsidiarity. Let us make sure that future arrangements to ease the path to our shared goal of economic and monetary union do the same.

Above all, we must ensure that these momentous changes take place within a stable framework of international relations. It has been the steadfastness of the West, and the vision of Mr Gorbachev, which have changed the political climate between East and West. We believe that both NATO and the Warsaw Pact must remain in place as forces of stability and that the United States, to whom Europe owes so much, should continue to participate in the security arrangements of our continent. It is within this framework that we will best be able to build on the achievements of the INF Treaty and the Conference on Security and Cooperation.

(Applause)

FERNEX (V). — (FR) Mr President, the Greens, like all Europeans, were deeply moved as they followed the events which have brought down over the space of a few days whole sections of the walls erected by the cold war. We pay tribute above all to the remarkable victory of non-violence, which has unequivocally proved its superiority over the mighty police and military apparatus deployed in the service of sclerotic political systems. What was badly needed in Eastern Europe was the emergence of an ecological movement. Last weekend we all saw hundreds of thousands of people demonstrating in Bulgaria on behalf of the *eco-glusnost* movement. The Chernobyl disaster released a ground sweli which carried many ecologists first into the People's Congress and subsequently into the Supreme Soviet, prominent among them Yuri Cherbak, the Kiev paediatrician. This ground swell has led to the shut-down of many nuclear power stations, particularly in Armenia, and then to the abandonment of a number of new construction projects.

Again, the writer Itsmatov spoke in the Supreme Soviet of the assassination of the Aral Sea, which he described as a crime against humanity.

The President-in-Office of the European Council is truly unlucky, because every time he comes to address the European Parliament he does so the day after a nuclear test. And so it is on this occasion, for yesterday

FERNEX

France carried out a nuclear test on Mururoa Atoll. At a time when the Iron Curtain is collapsing, we are perfecting in Polynesia instruments of mass extermination, final solutions for the whole of humanity. Auschwitz on a planetary scale. I liked what François Mitterrand said about a great silence which was in reality a loud noise. We should listen to the great silence now to be heard in the South Pacific around Mururoa and Fangatofa Atolls!

The developments in Eastern Europe underline the anachronism of the situation inherited from Yalta. It is high time for the former Allies to sign the peace treaty provided for at Yalta, with both the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, on the understanding that no frontier will be called into question. This would imply the immediate repatriation of the armies of occupation, the Soviet troops leaving the German Democratic Republic and the French, British, American and Canadian troops leaving the Federal Republic. This would considerably speed up the Vienna negotiations on conventional arms and the Geneva negotiations on the banning of nuclear tests and chemical and biological weapons, as well as the bilateral and multilateral negotiations in progress.

In the present circumstances the Western military budgets appear utterly anachronistic, nothing less than a misappropriation of resources that ought to be spent on meeting real needs. These budgets could this very day be cut by half without further ado, thus allowing the debt accumulated by the countries of Eastern Europe with the West to be written off.

And speaking of the economic situation, the Greens do not want to see the countries of Eastern Europe colonized by bankers and rapacious businessmen. Remember that our wasteful economy, which has received such eloquent praise in this House, monopolizes 80 % of the world's resources for the benefit of 20 % of the population whilst two-thirds of the human race remain undernourished and 40 000 children continue to die of hunger every day.

Together with our friends, in East and West alike, we shall fight for a Europe of solidarity, justice, fraternity and democracy, a green Europe.

(*Applause*)

COLAJANNI (GUE). — (IT) Mr President, Mr Chancellor, ladies and gentlemen, I have no need to recall the vast scale and new nature of events, with which we are all familiar. Now, Czechoslovakia too — without which, in the opinion of Mr Gorbachev, no European Common Home policy could be developed — well, Czechoslovakia too is on the move.

There is no deed for me to express again my appreciation of the enthusiasm and promptitude with which President Mitterrand has endeavoured to give Europe a role commensurate with the present circumstances: I already did this on 25 October in a broad, detailed debate. I do not think that this new visit to the European Parliament is a purely formal one: a real

debate is expected from us. And the presence of Chancellor Kohl as well was not intended merely to be by way of celebration: it is recognised that this is a place — and Mr Giscard d'Estaing also reminded us of this — not the only one, of course, not the least important one, that makes Europe a reference point at this time. And we have to discuss the new, real problems clearly and with loyalty.

I am aware — I have to say this — of the sincere determination on everyone's part to support the process that is taking place in Eastern Europe, a process that everyone considers to be just and decisive. We must certainly go thoroughly into the most difficult questions; amongst these, there are two problems that must be tackled clearly — the conditions, as they have been called, for aid to the Eastern countries and the subject of the two Germanies. In recent weeks concern and uncertainty has arisen. I appreciate what Chancellor Kohl has said: it seems to me to be a step forward. But the two subjects have still to be looked at in detail. We know that there is not complete agreement on one essential point, that is to say, whether Europe should make its aid and cooperation policy dependent, and what it should be made dependent on. Some believe that intervention should be massive, in regard not only to the timing and manner of institutional reforms and elections but also to the nature of the economic system. In my view, it is not for us to decide on behalf of the Poles, the Hungarians, the East Germans and the Czechoslovaks, all of them people whose countries have very different economic and political structures and situations, whether in their countries as well a capitalist system or some other kind of system should be in force. We have to take a truly democratic line when we ask these countries to install a democratic regime. They must be able to decide using free, democratic procedures, and this must be our sole concern — for them to be able to determine, themselves, the ways and the timing of their democracy and the changes in their economic and social system. We shall see them following paths that are quite different, because the base from which they set out is different. If that were not so the result would be a protected democracy, crossed by the incursions of the economic and financial groups — a new type, that is, of protectorate. I do not believe that this is what we want. I understand moreover that this can be consistent with a certain idea that some have of Europe: a Europe that is united in its market, without political institutions that have the power to control and direct.

I would like to emphasize that, since great social structures are not altered by decree, and since these changes are complex, and since it is necessary to change social relationships where production is concerned, if this was the way action was taken it would be preparing the ground for real, genuine disasters, for destabilization itself, and the building of a united Europe would be pushed further away.

President Mitterrand rightly said that the only condition to be made was the development of democracy and

COLAJANNI

respect for human rights, and he added that there could be different forms of democracy — liberal or socialist. We might add that the mixed economy also, towards which the Eastern countries are moving, can contain a quite varied mixture — if I can call it such — of the State-owned and the private sectors, of the individual and the social: we do not know, it is difficult to determine. It would be very serious if Europe, in face of the greatest historical, political and cultural happening of this end-of-century, put petty trade considerations first and failed to grasp the concrete opportunity for a new era, with new roads opening up.

I must add — to talk of still more concrete and also more dramatic things — that next winter is going to be very hard for certain Eastern countries, in particular Poland, which is fighting extremely serious food and energy supply problems; for all of these countries the next few years will be difficult, because the measures for restructuring the economy will have serious social repercussions. For example, they will cause unemployment, estimated at two million unemployed in Poland — such situations, in other words, as might cause social and political back-lash, with the risk of prejudicing the process of renewal and democratization that is taking place. And this is what we have to worry about! And it is for this reason that the sole concern that must guide us in the action to be taken is a concern that the democratization process shall continue. This is the only guarantee that we must ask for and, I believe, it is the only one for which we can ask.

And I should like to add that we emphasize the need for Community aid and action to be run in agreement with the interested countries, and for it to be borne in mind that at this stage only the foundations for the birth of a private sector can be laid, because there are not sufficient private savings in these countries for the factories that are closed to be reopened in private hands.

Community action must take this into account. And that is also why the idea of a bank for the development and modernization of Eastern Europe, that was put forward again here by President Mitterrand, seems to us to be both opportune and valid.

In any case, we have to look to a wider process, a process in which the progressive forces of Eastern Europe and the West — and we can now indeed say 'and Eastern Europe' — must link up and move together in the direction of the progressive disarmament and dismantling of blocs, in the direction of joint security, cooperation and growing economic and cultural integration. And, jointly, they can seek the roads that will lead to a fairer, more closely integrated society than at present, with no other condition than the search for a strong democracy, capable of tackling today's problems. Today we can look towards the objective of a common European home, and this is possible because reforms and democracy in the East are more credible today.

It seems to us that President Mitterrand, the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, the French Government

and certain groups in the European Parliament — including our own, the federalist parties and the Socialist Group — have made a clear choice: namely that we must speed up political unity and the integration of the Europe of the Twelve, because with this Europe of the Twelve — as has been said — will gradually be associated, as the pattern of events spreads concentrically outwards, the countries of the East, in a process that is guided and directed democratically.

As part of all this there is another great problem, which is the problem of the German question. Let me say this very specifically, for it is an extremely delicate point — the right to self determination of the German people, like that of any other people, is unquestionable. We must all of us be aware that, in the case of the Germans, they have a history that affects the present. It does not help anyone to disregard this; equally, it is unacceptable to use this as a means of preventing the healing and forgetting of deep wounds.

But the first thing we have to talk about, however, is not reunification. This question, which is decisive for Europe's future, must be tackled along the lines indicated by some people, for example Mr Brandt. Unity does not necessarily mean reunification; the frontiers with Poland are inviolable; the unity of the German people is to be resolved within the sphere of European unity.

I see that these ideas are gaining ground, and that they are being confirmed again here, and this is important. We have to clear the decks of all misunderstandings in this field, because we know that other things, also, have been said, and that there has been pressure in other directions. This is the road! — because what we can and must do today concerns a new type of relationship between the two Germanies and between East Germany and Europe. Holding aloft now the image of reunification will block reforms in the East and even raise doubts about the process of European unity.

It would be a historical error if we were now to slow down the building of a political Europe in order to shift our interest into the reunification of the two Germanies. Chancellor Kohl gave an undertaking here: we will check this against the facts, first at the December Summit and then at the Intergovernmental Conference and in attitudes actually adopted.

And, finally, there are a whole set of questions that concern the administrative bodies and contacts between the capitalist economy and the planned, State economy. These are all things that require political guidance. In order to guide processes, to solve these problems, to go forward in a fair, effective manner a Europe is needed that can decide with one voice. We must accelerate the processes of political unity.

(Applause)

DE LA MALÈNE (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, in the face of the events in Eastern Europe our initial reaction, our basic reaction, the reaction of us all, is obviously one of joy. Here we have the nations of that part of

DE LA MALÈNE

Europe, subjugated for 50 years by a communist dictatorship, in a movement gathering pace with every week, repudiating the false ideals imposed upon them and forcefully asserting their political and economic freedoms.

Already the results of this great movement are politically tangible in Poland, Hungary and elsewhere. Already the Berlin Wall has started to crumble. Let us not hold back your joy, at the same time acknowledging the calm but firm resolve demonstrated by the people concerned.

Of course it is important to look beyond the media headlines and make an accurate assessment of today's political and economic reality in that part of Europe. Of course we have to remember that, despite the growing irreversibility of this process, it is above all in the hands of Moscow that the future lies. Of course we must not forget for one moment that the Warsaw Pact's military strength is still intact, its weaponry still being built up, and that the contrast between these military certainties and the political uncertainties is an element of instability and consequently a matter of grave concern. It would therefore be premature to lower our guard, whether it be at the economic, political or military level.

Having said that, we have a right and a duty to consider, as the President-in-Office of the European Council did throughout his address, the adequacy of Western Europe's — indeed the entire West's — response to the question posed by the other nations of our continent through their repeated demonstrations. It must be our prime concern to find the right response to that question. And what has been our response so far? President Mitterrand listed the financial and economic measures: In the short term, humanitarian aid for Poland and other countries; in the medium term, the guarantee of a billion dollars for Poland and Hungary; in the medium term also, other investments, a special European Bank, a training centre. But bear in mind that part of all this is, quite rightly, conditional upon political or economic progress.

We do not underestimate these efforts but feel it necessary to point to the overriding importance of immediate emergency assistance being given virtually unconditionally. It is imperative that the first steps made by these people towards freedom should not be accompanied by an even lower standard of living and even greater misery. Apart from direct financial measures, a growing number of high-level visits and consultations are taking place. Problems are examined, agreements drafted. Summits have been held — the topic of our debate today — others are imminent. For the moment, however, and without wishing to carp, the response has not been such as to make a striking impact on the people affected. This two-pronged political and economic effort on behalf of Eastern Europe is accompanied by repeated affirmations of the need to speed up the unification of the Twelve along traditional lines.

All this is highly commendable. But can we really be sure that these efforts measure up to the circumstances? Can we really be sure that they take sufficient account of all the consequences of these upheavals, some of which are already becoming apparent? Can we, above all, really be sure that on the other side of what used to be the Iron Curtain they will be perceived as an encouraging response to the anguished appeal directed at us? Can we really be sure that this justified strengthening of the Community should not be accompanied, in the event of decisive progress towards democracy, by a generous and open attitude towards the countries of Eastern Europe? That is the crux of the matter. Our response will be at two levels, the external and the internal. At the external level our response is clear, even though it is still not certain. The internal response, however, has still not been formulated, and it is this formulation which could no doubt constitute the message we must address to Eastern Europe.

Chancellor Kohl, President Mitterrand, the world order established by war and ideological conflict is changing. The division of our continent in two, which has survived for over forty years, is beginning to crumble. We are of course all aware that these developments are due to the strength of our ideals, to our democratic structures, to our economic success, in short to what our Community has achieved. But should we today be satisfied with merely setting an example? Should we not go further? Should we not, apart from speaking to governments, address to the peoples the message that they expect to hear from us? If the conditions that we — and indeed everyone else — impose are met, if the reforms are implemented, if the inviolability of frontiers is readily and wholeheartedly accepted, if nations are allowed to decide their own future, then Europe, all of Europe, can aspire to a new order. And it is this new order that ought to be the burden of our message.

We lived through the events of Berlin, Prague and Budapest. The West could do nothing. Today the appeal is heard again, more loudly, on all sides. But now we are so much better placed to respond. We must do so with the conviction, disinterest and boldness demanded of us by the situation, inspired by the joy of which I spoke in my opening remarks.

(Applause)

SCHÖNHUBER (DR). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Chancellor, I have listened to this debate very carefully, and I must say that I have seldom heard so many empty words. Everyone has talked about the wind of change and ended up talking about business. I know full well — hence the scepticism I want to express here — that not a few Members of this House share the view of the French writer Mauriac, who once said: *I love Germany so much that I am glad there are two of them.* We Republicans take the view that there can and must be only *one* Germany. While fully acknowledging the guilt of the criminal National Socialist regime, we say loud and clear: the Federal Republic and the GRD are nothing but dreadful

SCHÖNHUBER

accidents in German history. We must set about making the necessary repairs after these accidents. In practical terms, this means our goal is a united Germany, and the capital of this united Germany will again be Berlin, not Bonn.

We in this House should not set the shameful example I now see in the Federal Republic, where the tragic and yet joyful situation is being abused for petty electioneering, for eyeing certain opinion polls — who is ahead, who is behind? I am not interested in whether Mr Kohl or Mr Vogel is ahead. All I am interested in is whether the German people are ahead, because it is the German people who speak, not their strange representatives in the political parties.

(Mixed reactions, applause from the Technical Group of the European Right)

Let me say what I have to say. I represent two million electors here, and I will not be shouted down. I will speak until I am finished. I am used to being interrupted in Germany, but I have always said what I have to say, and I shall do the same here. You can be sure of that.

We Republicans say: we do not want any national solo efforts at any price. We know who depends on whom. We also know about sensitivities, which undoubtedly have their roots in history, but we do not intend to leave it to the speed of the Community train to determine when our reunification comes — and we do not even know for sure that the Community train is heading for the reunification that is our goal.

Of one thing you can be certain. Despite all the tactical moves that are noticeable here, despite all the politicians' statements that can be heard here, the call from the people will be louder — and not only louder than the voices of those people you see today on the French or German television, those intellectuals who were obediently dancing to the Communists' tune only two years ago. Reunification will be forced through — read the *Zürcher Zeitung* — by the workers and farmers, who are sick and tired of the opportunists in the GDR, even if they are the favourites of the Socialists. One thing must be clear, and none of this Gorbomania will help at all: Communism is dead. Communism can be neither democratized nor reformed.

We therefore believe that, however much aid we may willingly give, the Communist regime must not be allowed to become stable. I warn against praising Mr Gorbachev. Mr Gorbachev has a past too...

(Mixed reactions)

... and it is not as noble as people here. Mr Gorbachev was once a KGB man too. Just remember that.

(Mixed reactions, shouts)

Schönhuber is not leaving. He is staying here. We take the view that plain speaking is needed in this Parliament. We must have honesty, not constant grovelling before public opinion or published opinion. That is not the opinion of the people, of that you can be sure.

We are cooperative. We believe we must help everyone, but we call on you too to shed all your distrust of the German people. We are reformed patriots. We know what we have been through, and the most decent patriots are perhaps the ones who do not deny their own history. We republicans believe the same anthem will one day be sung in East and West: unity and justice and freedom for the German fatherland.

EPHREMIDIS (CG). — (GR) Mr President, you spoke of this sitting as being historic, and it seems also to have been celebratory. That is confirmed by the presence of President Mitterrand and Chancellor Kohl. There has been talk of the historic and revolutionary changes taking place in the socialist states. We wish to point out that these changes are a natural historic development. The driving forces behind them are the social forces in those countries, the popular masses with the participation and cooperation of the organized political powers, even of the governments themselves. Indeed, in some cases the governments are in the forefront, as with *perestroika* and *glasnost* in the Soviet Union. In the light of these facts we are right to celebrate. To celebrate the toppling of the Berlin wall, that symbol of the cold war and of Europe's division. However, Mr President, if this celebration is to be justified, we should note the need for many kinds of wall to be toppled also from the other side, the West. Walls which foster mistrust, restrictions upon our economic, political and cultural relations with that area which makes up over half of Europe. Those walls must be knocked down too if we are to say that celebrations are in order. Walls must also be knocked down inside the Community itself. Those which bar 17 million unemployed within the European Community from the joy of creative work. We must topple the walls that separate off the 40 million Europeans who live below the hunger level, so that they too, when those walls fall, can live a decent life. We must knock down the wall which separates the Community's developed regions and countries from the less developed ones. And more still, the Community has responsibilities and must help to topple a wall that divides the Palestinian people, and here I want to point especially to the lyricism with which Chancellor Kohl spoke of the German people's right to self-determination. There is a wall separating the Palestinian people from its right to self-determination, from having its own homeland, its own State. The Community also shares responsibility for another wall, that which separates the people of Cyprus. It is the divisive wall imposed by the occupying army on the island of Cyprus.

Mr President, if we draw attention to all this, it is not to be different or contentious in this House. Our aim is to find common ground, and that is the intention of what we are saying. In truth, we must help those countries, but let us be careful not to justify the ancient Greek quotation 'Beware of Greeks even when bearing gifts'. If the help has ulterior motives, with attempts at indirect or direct intervention to divert the changes along other courses, then you will impede those changes, you will bear responsibility and you will give the remnants of the

EPHREMIDIS

cold war, and there are residues of Nazism even in here, the right to exploit the opportunity and to reverse the changes from which we all expect that an infrastructure will be built for an all-European home for all Europe's peoples, in a Europe marked by peace and creative cooperation.

PIERMONT (ARC). — (DE) Mr Mitterrand, Mr Kohl, the special summit laboured and brought forth a mouse. Not a word that, now the future of the Eastern Bloc, the Warsaw Pact is in doubt, NATO belongs on the rubbish heap of history. On the contrary. The developments in Eastern Europe are seen as a reason for stepping up efforts to turn the European Community, Western Europe's bloc, into an economic, political and military superpower. Not a word about comprehensive disarmament, especially the dismantling of all nuclear weapons, including the French. Not a word about the time having at last come for all foreign troops stationed in the Federal Republic, the GDR and Berlin to be withdrawn.

Mr Mitterrand, you presumed to say to the *Bundestag* in 1983: '*Les fusées sont à l'est; les pacifistes sont à l'ouest.*' Even at that time these words lacked geographical far-sightedness. Now at least even you must admit that you were also politically short-sighted. Those who have drifted into obscurity are quite different from those whom you have always accused of being short-sighted.

In the end, the Twelve chose the coward's way out and declared the subject which politicians, particularly in the Federal Republic — in other words, you, Mr Kohl, and the members of your party — have been shouting about for months and which has revived the nationalistically coloured atmosphere of the cold war in the Federal Republic to be non-existent, not to be on the agenda, instead of nailing their colours to the mast. I am talking about what is known as reunification. But plain language is needed, because, firstly, 74 % of the population of the GDR — as initial opinion polls show — want a reformed GDR, not an extension of the Federal Republic to the Polish border dressed up as 'reunification'.

Secondly, a reunified Germany is inconsistent with the history of Germany, which, apart from one 74-year period, has never had a central government. We do not feel the need to form a single State with the German-speaking part of Switzerland simply because German is spoken there. Exactly the same applies to the GDR as long as its people can decide how they want to live and have normal friendly relations with us.

Thirdly, the united Germany that emerged from a war with France has already provoked two world wars over supremacy in Europe and invaded Europe with the genocide of the Nazi regime. The so-called German *Reich* within the 1937 boundaries has therefore lost any right to exist or to exist again.

Fourthly, under international law it ceased to exist with the unconditional capitulation of 8 May 1945, which

was the same as liberation from National Socialism. What is known as the German question has not been open since then. Instead, two new sovereign German States have emerged in the last 40 years, not an 'accident' but a logical consequence of German history.

Another part of the former *Reich* is now the west of Poland, with the Oder-Neisse line as its western boundary. And that is how it must stay.

Fifthly, merging the world's largest exporter, the Federal Republic, and Eastern Europe's strongest economic power, the GDR, would produce a concentrated economic and military power in the middle of Europe with a population of 80 million, a threat to Europe as a potential hegemonic power, explosive in the eyes of the more and more downtrodden countries of the Third World.

Instead of clear statements on this, what we see is a carrot-and-stick timetable. Free and secret elections are the *conditio sine qua non* of any economic aid to those willing to adjust to the ways of the 'free West', a European Bank that pays out rewards in coin of the realm. In due course, the absorption of the GDR and Eastern Europe into the economic superpower that is the European Community can then be discussed.

Trained by Community programmes and lured by the western consumer paradise, the people will then, of course, opt for the right — or what the West considers right — kind of self-'determination' — self-determination that is denied the last European colonies. With a new order such as this in the European house the situation will be the same as it is with nuclear power. To that I say: 'No, thank you.'

(Applause from the Rainbow Group)

RAUTI (NI). — (IT) Mr President, Mr Chancellor, I think that, in substance, it all turns on this question: what to do and how to help in practice, and in the best way possible, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe?

We in the Movimento Sociale Italiano find it surprising that so far no mention has been made in any of the speeches of the problem of the indebtedness with which these countries appear once again on the European scene.

Now this state is not the fault of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The fault is the fault of the collectivist system. But if this is true — and it is true — whilst these peoples turn to Europe, whilst they are attempting to get away from collectivism and communism, we have a primary duty to them — the commitment to which Chancellor Kohl referred earlier, namely, the commitment to help them with all our strength.

This is the point from which we must depart, because it is not right to make those people pay the cost of the economic failure of Marxism, the indebtedness — past and present — of the communist regimes. Carrying this line of reasoning further, we intend to put forward a proposal to all the Groups in this Assembly, a proposal

RAUTI

that we put also to Chancellor Kohl and President Delors. The Community must write off, cancel, the indebtedness of the Eastern European countries, starting with Hungary, Poland and East Germany.

What does this mean — writing off indebtedness? There are many roads available, and undoubtedly the experts and the specialists will be able to find them. The Community, in our view, should first of all take on responsibility for the payment of interest, especially that which falls due in 1990, '91 and '92; then, it should make itself responsible for the entire debt, staggering the payments over a ten-year period. It was calculated in Paris that every citizen of the EEC would have to assume responsibility for an amount ranging between 25 000 and 30 000 lire, in order to implement this proposal, which is of such enormous social and moral importance.

In our view we are getting off on the wrong foot, because in the entire framework that was drawn up at the Paris meeting, and in all that we have heard here, it seems that the European Investment Bank must completely ignore this tragedy of the indebtedness. This means we are asking the Eastern countries to take a kind of a leap into what for them is a new economic system, taking with them the dead weight — which could be fatal — of indebtedness. As a Member of this Parliament who follows, in the competent committee, the problems of the Third World, we are now talking about the same mechanism that did not succeed in functioning for the Third World countries which, in fact, weighed down with indebtedness, are permanently, continuously isolated from one year to the next ...

DELORS, President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, in this exceptional debate which we, the members of the Commission, have the privilege of attending, the floor belongs first and foremost to you, the Members of the European Parliament, the directly elected representatives of the people and the expression of their will, and it is right that it should be so.

We have also had the chance to hear, barely four days after an informal meeting of the Community Heads of State or Government, the President-in-Office of the European Council, François Mitterrand, confirming that the Twelve were politically united and setting out the additional measures that were being taken as a matter of urgency. We have also had the good fortune to hear Chancellor Kohl reaffirming the Federal Republic's faith in and commitment to our Europe, our Community. President Giscard d'Estaing put it well when he spoke of the political birth of your Parliament. It is a major leap forward, and the momentum must now be maintained.

(Applause)

I should just briefly like to tell you that the members of the Commission share your sentiments, that they are ready to lend strength to your action and help you to turn your hopes in the future into reality.

In the first place, we share your sentiments. The words recurring time and again have been emotion and joy. I would add, if I may, solidarity, which must find expression in our hearts, solidarity towards our German friends on both sides of this Iron Curtain now in the process of melting away.

(Applause)

Our thoughts are especially with them. When a family member experiences joy or hope, then all the other members of the family should share that joy and that hope.

I would also say that, for a militant European such as myself, for militant Europeans such as the members of the Commission, I do not believe that any of us can recall a decision so important in the area of foreign policy cooperation as the political position adopted last Saturday. I hope that we shall be able to learn our lesson from it and ensure that political cooperation, in other words foreign policy cooperation, moves forward at the same pace as economic integration.

As everyone here has been quick to emphasize, the Community has for many years acted as a centre of gravity, a yardstick for freedom and for prosperity, and no doubt this has played a certain role in the events which the peoples of Eastern Europe have triggered.

That is why we are very optimistic. But at the same time, as some of you have pointed out in this debate — which has been of the highest quality, apart from one exception — we must be on our guard. We want also to lend strength to your action. You know that the Commission — Vice-President Andriessen will reply to your questions on this point — has been instructed to coordinate aid to Hungary and Poland, and soon I hope other countries. You are familiar with the principal items: food aid, modernization of production structures, training, modernization of employment policies — for these countries have no experience of what a labour market involves — and, finally, joint measures in the field of the environment.

I will tell you very frankly, what we need is more resources, more coordination, more rapid implementation. That is the view I have formed after my recent trip to Poland and Hungary, and I do not think that the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Dumas, who accompanied me, will have come to a different conclusion. When I speak of more rapid implementation, I have in mind the monetary and financial aspects which we shall have to tackle, not alone, but in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. If there is urgency, it is certainly in this domain. A country that has run out of money or that rejects its currency is no longer capable of creating the foundations of a sound economy. I was therefore happy that the European Council should have declared its willingness, something I believe to be unprecedented in the history of our international organizations, to indicate to the International Monetary Fund that it was necessary and possible to decide quickly. When I was a junior employee with the Banque de France, the

DELORS

governor would tell me: 'You might as well do everything in a day as in a week'. I believe that this precept still holds good today.

(Applause)

We wish to join you in turning into reality the hopes you have expressed today. To that end we must strengthen the Community, make it more dynamic, speed up its integration and sketch out already now the architecture of greater Europe.

First, then, strengthen the Community. Nothing must divert us from implementing the Single Act and the large internal market, *all* aspects of the Single Act, including its social dimension.

If we fail to implement the decision we have taken we shall be incapable of making progress beyond 1992.

We must go on to make the Community more dynamic above all, in my view, in regard to foreign policy cooperation. A good start was made last Saturday, and we must continue along that road so that, wherever Europe's responsibilities are brought into play, it can take an active part in the decisions and be able to show its generosity.

We must speed up European integration and, with circumstances as they are, I am confident that the European Council meeting in Strasbourg next month will take the only decision that will confirm our determination to move beyond the Single Act and commit ourselves fully to political integration.

To achieve all that, we shall need more resources.

(Applause)

I wanted to say that here, as you consider the 1990 budget. You will recall that in February 1988, after deciding on the great objective of the single market by 1992, after ratifying the Single Act, you adopted, under the German Presidency and with the notable support of Chancellor Kohl, the political and financial measures required to bring forward our common policies and demonstrate our solidarity within the Community.

I ask you, in the two years ahead, to take the same political and financial decisions so as to enable us to demonstrate our solidarity outside the Community, not only with the other European countries, but also with the countries of the Mediterranean, the countries of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific.

(Applause)

Finally, we must sketch out the architecture of greater Europe. In 1985 it was necessity that led Europe to awake, for we had to decide between survival and decline. We opted for survival. Today, in 1989, it is necessity again, but also ideals, the ideals of freedom and democracy. We must from this moment on map out the design of this greater Europe, not by arresting the construction of the Europe of Twelve, but by showing the imagination and coming forward with the novel ideas required to build this greater Europe.

It is said that luck can sometimes help, but that courage does so always. The peoples of Eastern and Central Europe have offered us the opportunity. It is we who must display the courage. My hope is that we shall display great courage.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT. — Thank you, President Delors.

I have received six motions for resolutions with a request for an early vote to wind up the debate on Central and Eastern Europe.¹

The vote on the request for an early debate will take place at the end of the debate.

WALTER (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I will begin with a sincere word of thanks to the President of the Commission for his very personal words on the situation in Germany.

(Applause)

In his inimitable fashion he has highlighted a previous contribution to the debate this evening. Let me therefore say this: what we are witnessing in Germany today is not an accident, but the result of a war which the Germans started, and we must never forget that.

(Applause)

I wish the Commission President's words could be heard by the Council because, whatever can and must be praised in connection with the meeting in Paris, it must surely be said that so far the Community has shown far less courage in reacting to the new situation in Eastern Europe than the people who are demonstrating on Wenceslas Square in Prague and elsewhere in Eastern Europe.

(Applause)

Much of what has been said here today calls for a great deal more. I feel we should take the President of the Commission at his word. We must get down to developing the European Community, which coalesces the hopes of the people in a political vision for the whole of Europe, a vision in which Germans too will be able to exercise their right of self-determination. I am talking about a European Community which, of course, steps up its own integration, as has been said several times, and there is nothing I can add to that. I am talking about a European Community that not only provides emergency aid but is also prepared for wide-ranging economic, ecological, scientific cooperation between East and West, perhaps along the lines of a comprehensive development plan for Eastern Europe's economic and social renewal. Details of a plan of this kind have already been referred to by Mr Giscard d'Estaing and Mr Klepsch in terms which I think we can approve.

I say this again because aid and support can also be delayed until the self-determination of the people in the

¹ See Minutes.

WALTER

countries where things are happening no longer has an economic and political chance.

(Applause from the left)

Chancellor Kohl said that those who refuse to have any part of this are betraying Europe. This is true of Poland, this is true of Hungary, this is true of other Eastern European countries, but it is particularly true of the GDR.

In the light of the debate that is taking place in some parts of the European Community and at home too, I say quite deliberately: anyone who lets the GDR go bankrupt will provoke unforeseeable developments in the middle of Europe, which none of us can want in this form.

(Applause from the left)

The open frontier between the Federal Republic of Germany and the GDR reminds us that there is a fundamental difference between the GDR on the one hand and Poland and Hungary on the other. We must, of course, discuss the conditions under which help is provided. I can understand all that. But what I cannot understand is that some people are giving the impression that aid is being made dependent on the other side — let me put it that way — accepting our social system down to the last detail. That would not be the self-determination that people in Eastern Europe are taking to the streets for. That would be the kind of patronage that the people in Eastern Europe have been sick and tired of for ages, and we should beware of adopting any such attitude.

(Applause)

I am talking — as the President of the Commission was — about a European Community which tackles Europe as a whole institutionally, which cooperates with EFTA as closely as possible, which brings about pan-European institutions and agreements. Let me remind you of the European environmental agency and Willy Brandt's European disarmament agency. Everything is conceivable.

But at some time or other the Community itself will have to cross the border with Eastern Europe. The next goal should be the association of the reformed countries of Eastern Europe with the European Community if that is what they want. The same goes for the GDR.

Some people may wonder how one European Community is to manage all this, how it will look in the future. I can only say that change is in the offing, not only in thinking in Eastern Europe but also in thinking in Western Europe. Sometimes it helps to take a look at the documents that the European Parliament has approved. Take, for example, the draft treaty on constitutional reform, which was approved by the European Parliament and is now in danger of being laid to rest in a first-class funeral arranged by the parliaments of our Member States.

The Community we are talking about — and I take up what Mr Giscard d'Estaing has said — must now

establish the political and institutional framework which will guarantee that the national flag cannot be played off against Europe anywhere, nor yet the question of the future unity of the Germans. By this I mean that the Community must now extend the European roof beyond the Community. Under this roof the Germans in the GDR and the Germans in the Federal Republic of Germany can then decide how they want to live in the future, in one home or two, with the connecting doors between them open to a greater or lesser degree.

I know there is a great deal of anxiety, in this Parliament as elsewhere, about so-called reunification. Let me therefore say once again very clearly: there can and will be no reunification of Germany within the 1937 boundaries. Poland as it is now has a right to live securely within its present boundaries.

(Applause from the left)

Poland's western boundary must therefore be recognized, with no ifs or buts. This is also a contribution to reform in a stable Eastern Europe.

The question about the future of the two German States, on the other hand, is open. No one, or at least no one who carries any weight, has it on the agenda for political debate in Germany at the moment. But nor can anyone — and I say this to Mrs Piermont — guide the feelings of the people with decisions taken by parliaments and party conferences. That is something we have learnt in recent days, weeks and months in Europe.

(Applause)

No one can seriously deny the people of the GDR and the Federal Republic of Germany the right to decide about the future of their countries themselves. If there is such a debate and decision, no one knows how it will turn out. But everyone would have to respect the decision taken. We must all join in ensuring that the future of the two German States and the future unity of Europe remain closely associated.

Mr Giscard d'Estaing put it another way: the sooner the Community begins the construction of Europe as a whole, in which the various conceivable answers to the German question have their place, the sooner we can and will make fears about Germany going its own, separate way superfluous. This too is an aspect of pan-European conceptual works we have to face.

Whatever we say about the developments in Eastern Europe, we should try to steer clear of the self-righteousness that occasionally holds up western society as the 'promised land' — as if we had no problems. As if we had no unemployed, no homeless people, no poverty-stricken regions where people live under depressing conditions.

Of course, the countries of Eastern Europe need reforms. Of course, the GDR needs drastic political reforms — God knows it does — but we need social reforms in the European Community too. The dictator-

WALTER

ship of 'might is right' in the West is no substitute for the dictatorship of one party in the East.

(Applause from the left)

Perhaps the people who are demonstrating in Eastern Europe have set standards for democracy that we should also apply in Western Europe. We cannot rejoice at the success of Solidarity in Poland while the Council of the European Community is blocking an effective social charter for the workers here.

(Applause from the left)

It would be ignominious for the European Community if the parliaments of the Eastern European countries beat the European Parliament to it in gaining the rights which it has been fighting for for a long time and which it is still denied. Here too, there is still a great deal to be learnt.

(Sustained applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS FONTAINE

Vice-President

GORIA (PPE). — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, what is happening in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe constitutes a process of an extraordinarily new kind. It is something that the European Parliament's Committee on Political Affairs, of which I have the honour to be Chairman, has considered very carefully, with great commitment and solidarity, and will continue to do so. This process offers the European Community an outstanding opportunity to confirm its leading role in the construction of peace and world development, and it offers all of us an incredibly important opportunity to show the superiority of our political and economic systems over those of the Communist world.

To achieve those objectives, however, we have to understand the role that we are called today to play, and we have to exercise it with intelligence and determination. Strengthening the process of unification of the European Community is the first and fundamental condition that will enable us to continue setting an example and providing stimulus, to which action much of the results that are today before our eyes can be attributed. We must beware, lest, in our emotion and confusion, we were to lose sight of the objectives of internal cohesion that alone have allowed us, and will still allow us, to guarantee peace and development for us and for everyone.

Careful, firm support for the processes of democratization that have already begun is the second and equally fundamental condition that will enable us properly to fulfil our part at this exciting time in the history of the world.

It is very important to try to find, in collaboration with the other democratic industrialized countries, as general

policy regarding the ways in which a possible change-over from a State-run economy to a market-oriented economy could be achieved. It will be equally important to make this political evolution towards freedom in the Central and Eastern European countries coincide with a perceptible improvement in the standard of living of the people, so as to avoid any summary, adverse popular view of the new political prospects. For those countries that we have to support in their efforts towards reform, substantial aid is therefore necessary — food and the other necessities of life — and this aid must go on until their own productive structure is sufficiently strengthened. With this in view it is at all events essential to provide for a massive transfer to those countries of machinery and appropriate technology, so as significantly to improve their means of production. It is equally important to make a great effort in terms of training and producing administrative and technical managerial staff, just as it is urgent to arrange for a strong system of insurance against political risks for private investments in Central and Eastern European countries.

Such a many-faceted and important initiative would however not be sufficient to consolidate peace and development if it were not accompanied by a number of highly significant commitments, particularly of a political nature. We must commit ourselves solemnly and with great conviction not to place any question marks over the commitments entered into within the framework of the Atlantic Alliance, but should rather develop its political role alongside the military one. We must commit ourselves solemnly and with great conviction to respecting the present frontiers in Europe, without questioning them. We must commit ourselves solemnly and with great conviction to not reducing our support for the Third World, in the light of the new needs that have arisen; indeed, we have to make every effort to make that support greater, more effective and more intelligent. It is possible, but only if progress is made — and this is another absolute priority — with the process of disarmament and thus the reallocation to international cooperation of a large part of the enormous resources that are today expended on armaments.

With regard to the process that has begun in East Germany, I have left this to last, but only so as to be able to reserve for this question all of the attention that it deserves. I was 18 years of age when the Berlin Wall was built. It fixed itself in my imagination, and in the imagination of many young people at that time, as a symbol of everything that is opposed to freedom. This image has stayed with us until now, casting a shadow over the happiness that we felt in our freedom. Now, hope is reborn: our freedom can be enjoyed without having that shadow over it any longer. But we must not be timid — frightened almost — by what we never dared to hope for. We must also be intelligent in deciding our attitudes. Not being timid and being intelligent today means that we have today to stress forcefully and clearly the need at the earliest possible date for free elections in East Germany, and the fact that

GORIA

these can only precede by a short period of time the exercise of the right of self determination, which we hope will be exercised for German reunification, and thus for the full accession of the East Germans to the European Community. Anyone with any objections can make them. If the reasons of heart and mind that impel us to express such a hope were to seem to us to be too imprudent, there are also the reasons of politics, which has almost never any heart and often not even a mind. It would be disastrous if our indifference were seen as hostility or even simply ambiguity, where reunification is concerned. In Germany, in today's two Germanies, there would explode again a nationalism that is out of place and out of date, that could only slow down — not to say weaken — the process of building a united Europe. That is all I have to say.

VON WECHMAR (LDR). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I have three minutes of speaking time, and you will therefore forgive me if I consider only one aspect in these three minutes. The events in the GDR, in West Berlin and along the former Iron Curtain have created a situation which now makes the hitherto inconceivable seem conceivable. Forty years of division have not made two German nations out of one. The Germans in the GDR, like the Hungarians and Poles before them, have written a new chapter in the history of European freedom in the last few days and weeks. The leaders of the GDR have now been called upon to prepare the way for early general, equal and free elections by allowing new political parties and by withdrawing the SED's sole right to govern the country. The Wall is no longer a frontier but a monument to times past.

The process of reform in Central and Eastern Europe would not be conceivable — and we can be proud of this — without the exemplary and steady advance of integration in the European Community. The steadfastness of the West, the constancy of our policy in overcoming the East-West conflict have borne fruit. The dynamic integration of Western Europe and the dramatic reforms in Central and Eastern Europe are not opposites. On the contrary. They are drawing divided Europe together. For us Liberals this means staying on course with the policy of European unification, staying on course in the alliance with the USA and also staying on course in a broadly based policy of dialogue and cooperation with the East.

The European Community faces a great challenge, and we must react credibly and thoughtfully, but also with imagination and flexibility. We want to help Central and Eastern Europe — and we Germans, of course, particularly want to help the people of the GDR — but without giving patronizing advice. Mr Walter has just referred to this in another context. The citizens of the GDR must decide for themselves under what economic and social system they want to live, and they must also decide what relationship they want with their neighbours and the Federal Republic of Germany. This will also include the question of German unity. Overcoming

the division of Europe also means ending the division of Germany, and I believe the more European a German policy is, the more national it is.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT. — Let me explain why I intend to be particularly strict. We still have 24 people down to speak which means that if everyone sticks to their speaking time, as Mr Wechmar just did, we will finish this debate towards 9.30 p.m. This means that if speaking time is not respected, we are likely to take all night.

JEPSEN (ED). — (DA) Madam President, we have seen the collapse of the Wall, the introduction of pluralist systems and the return to free elections and freedom of the press. In short, the restoration of a series of basic democratic rights is under way in a number of East European countries. And we are entitled to hope that others which today are still under the yoke of rigid totalitarian regimes will soon follow suit and yield to their people's legitimate demands for freedom and democracy.

The revolutionary developments we are witnessing are an unbelievably important and encouraging signal seen in relation to our common efforts to break down distrust and promote détente between East and West. Time and again we in the West have pressed for the introduction of democracy and respect for human rights in the East in the knowledge that the distrust that has now reigned for decades between the two sides of our divided Europe would persist until an open dialogue was established between democratically elected governments. There is now a real prospect of this essential condition for détente, peace and freedom throughout Europe being fulfilled. However, we West Europeans are now clearly under an obligation to help our East European neighbours. The economic assistance we can offer and the cooperation we can establish with Eastern Europe will serve a twofold purpose. We shall be stretching out a helping hand to countries plunged into economic crisis by decades of disastrous planned economy, and at the same time we shall be giving tangible proof of Western Europe's commitment to peace, disarmament and the creation of political, economic and social stability.

In conclusion, I just wish to point out that all these years of cooperation between the Community countries have not only helped to increase economic growth and prosperity in Western Europe, but have also safeguarded us against war and political tension among the Member States. In the same spirit, we must now be ready to cooperate with the countries of Eastern Europe as they move towards democracy. The natural consequence will be disarmament and a secure peace in our part of the world.

GRAEFE ZU BARINGDORF (V). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we too are shedding no tears for the system of so-called real socialism or for the

GRAEFE ZU BARINGDORF

rulers and their insane claim to represent the objective interests of the people and the nations on behalf of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The historical penalty has been decided and has been executed by the grass-roots democratic movements and the people themselves. We also believe that the central planning of an economy of State capitalism has failed economically and ecologically under this so-called real socialism. To this extent there is agreement on the assessment of the situation. But what conclusions do we draw from these developments, this non-violent democratic revolution in the GDR and the Eastern European countries? There is no cause for gloating, nor do we have any cause for praising ourselves to the skies. We have to realize that these developments were not triggered off by those in the West who make such claims but by an independent force of the people and nations themselves, and we congratulate the people of Eastern Europe and the GDR on this historic achievement.

(Applause)

If anyone deserves recognition, then it is Gorbachev because of the developments in the USSR, not because he has left the tanks at the barracks, but because he was first to break with the logic of maintaining peace with deterrence and more and more weapons and because he has dared to think along different lines and to opt for a different course.

Chancellor Kohl said just now that we want a united Germany in a united Europe, which will then serve peace in the world. We would point out that twice so far the world has been inflicted with war and destruction by a united Germany, and if this is never to happen again, where are the proposals from the Federal Government that take account of this new situation? Where are the disarmament plans, where the immediate cessation of the arms build-up? While Mr Walter does not want Germany going its own, separate way, I think it would be right if it went its own, separate way by demilitarizing. Let us have no more 90 fighters and instead make the 100 billion available to the GDR and Eastern Europe. In view of the peace movement in Europe, I call on the Federal Government to initiate demilitarization in the Federal Republic. The threat that once justified these things no longer exists. And call for the demilitarization of the GDR and the disbanding of the military blocs and so give the two German States the historic chance to have a fundamental peaceful order spread throughout Europe from German soil.

(Applause)

What lessons is the European Community learning from this? The summit in Paris did not produce a great deal. A bank is to be set up and managers are to be trained. They did not think of much else. I feel that, if the aid is going to be no different from the so-called development aid to the Third World countries, which are now making net capital transfers to us, Eastern Europe will be badly off. Its economy will be in danger of being sold out, and that may lead to the final division of Poland. We welcome free elections in the Eastern European

countries but — as Mr Walter has already said — if we are going to talk about free parliaments, we should take a close look at the development of our own.

If our economic system is to be held up as an example, we should also consider the destructive effects our capitalist economic system is having on the ecology and society. I will not list them now. The Federal Chancellor wants reality. He knows what it is, and if the Federal Chancellor sides with the grass-roots movement today, I too must call him an opportunist because these movements are anathema to him in our own society. I therefore call not only for measures to promote economic development in Eastern Europe — that is risky if we are urging an acceleration of the internal market here — but also for an immediate review of our economic and social system. Modesty will be needed in this context if we are not to endanger the social and ecological achievements of these incipient movements at some time or other.

(Applause from the Green Group)

PAPAYANNAKIS (GUE). — (GR) Madam President, the popular movements in Eastern Europe, which are dismantling the existing socialism, are movements of vast size, profoundly democratic, of the masses, peaceful, and they correspond to what I feel as a Greek and a socialist about political change.

Madam President, they are movements which challenge us and raise questions which transcend the political contrasts between East and West as we knew them, and we must find answers which also transcend them and apply at an all-European level. We must pay due respect to the democratically expressed will and to the democratic process itself. Especially now that those movements will develop the social and political contrasts which we ourselves also know, and which will certainly never die away. We owe them an answer on the inviolability of their frontier. Territorial claims are suited only to primitive hordes, Madam President. We also owe them assistance free from political motivations and wheeling and dealing, and we owe them solidarity towards the rest of Europe, Madam President, towards Yugoslavia which pioneered the reforms, towards Rumania, which is under the nationalistic and supposedly socialistic totalitarianism of the Ceausescu family. And, Madam President, we owe it to them to bring about changes of our own in relation to human rights, the environment, and our social development. Only then will we deserve their love and their solidarity.

DILLEN (DR). — (NL) Madam President, everyone is undoubtedly pleased to see the breaches that have been made in the Berlin Wall and particularly delighted for the Germans of the GDR. But pleasure must be accompanied by caution, delight with vigilance. Pleasure must not be accompanied by gullibility, delight by naiveté. We can help the Poles, Hungarians, Balts, the Germans of the GDR and elsewhere, but not by giving unconditionally. If we do, we shall once again be in danger of falling into the open trap of Communist

DILLEN

convulsions. Because bankrupt though Communism may be, it is not dead yet. So we can only help, and help appropriately and effectively, if free Europe gives not unconditionally but with clear conditions attached, based on its own strength. The main condition must then be self-determination, self-determination for all nations enslaved by the Gulag Archipelago, self-determination for the Balts, self-determination for the Germans of the GDR and elsewhere. I underline my solidarity with Mr Schönhuber in this respect. There must be no more of the sentiment echoed by the slogan *am deutschen Wesen soll die Welt genesen* and any French equivalent. There must be no more national egoism or imperialism and no more national whingeing or undignified begging. Europe is more than the EEC. In this larger Europe there is a place for a united Germany. In fact, a united Germany is a prerequisite for a larger Europe just as a larger Europe is a prerequisite for German reunification.

Finally, as a representative of a small, numerically small people I cannot celebrate until the three Baltic nations have regained their independence.

DE ROSSA (CG). — Madam President, on behalf of the Workers' Party of Ireland and the Left Unity Group I want to welcome the profound and democratic changes that are taking place in the GDR and in Eastern Europe generally. These developments are reminders to us that democracy is a constantly developing process on which no one can or should attempt to set limits.

These reminders are as necessary, even more necessary perhaps, in the European Community as they are anywhere else where commitment to what are politely known as Western values is lauded as a panacea in a society where there are tens of millions of people; women, unemployed, homeless, emigrant workers, migrant workers, the handicapped, nomadic groups and indeed the poor generally, who have no opportunity of participating effectively in our democratic political structures or indeed of controlling their own lives.

We should remind ourselves that movement towards disarmament in Europe arose from initiatives from Eastern Europe, not in response to the overwhelming demand which the people of Western Europe made for disarmament. We should remind ourselves that the Iron Curtain will not disappear until the tanks and the missiles on both sides of the divide in Europe are withdrawn and destroyed. We should, in fact, exercise some humility in our approach to the whole question of the democratic movement in Eastern Europe. Let us acknowledge that the ability of the Eastern European States to adapt themselves peacefully to the radical change that is taking place is an indication of their political maturity and treat them accordingly.

We must be conscious that revolutionary periods have always been times of great opportunities for human progress but that they carry great risks as well. We do not have to delve very deeply into history to find examples. There is evidence from my own personal

experience of Ireland. In the late 1960s a great upsurge in demand for political and democratic reform in Northern Ireland which united progressive people of all political and religious persuasions was overtaken and exploited by arch-reactionaries and extreme nationalists and the situation very quickly descended into the communal violence and terrorism which has continued for 20 years and continues to this day.

This Parliament must ensure that it does nothing to encourage extreme nationalist feeling in any part of Europe. We must acknowledge that the unity of peoples, that the security of peoples is more important than territorial unity. The great movement in Eastern Europe has not developed out of thin air. It can be linked, I believe, back to the Helsinki Final Act where East and West agreed to seek ways of reducing tension, avoiding conflicts between them and recognizing their own frontiers and their traditions. We should carefully weigh what we do in our efforts to assist Eastern Europe. We do not want to attach pre-emptive conditions to the development of economic, cultural or other relations with Eastern Europe which could be counter-productive in the long run.

BLANEY (ARC). — Madam President, on behalf of the Rainbow Group, I wish to take the opportunity tonight of saluting the Solidarity movement in Poland, the will and determination of the people of Hungary and, since this debate really is about East Germany, the much more dramatic, the much more traumatic happenings that have taken place there in the recent past and the determination of the people that has brought about a change of which we are so far only feeling the ripples. Coming from Ireland, a partitioned country with which I have a very close association, I feel more than most for the people of both Germanies, partitioned as they are, with the wall now crumbling and about to disappear.

But I would warn against our being presumptuous; we should approach anything that we wish this Parliament to do to help the emerging democracies with some circumspection and not attach conditions that are impossible to meet to every aid and assistance that we may propose. Urgent help is indeed needed — concrete financial help, support and cooperation from our Community. The bank suggested by President Mitterrand is a good idea, but where is the money coming from? Should we not have a bigger budget? Is that not the bottom line? Can we wait until the private investor actually puts money into such a venture? Should we not be acting now and have a supplementary budget or an additional budget that will tide us over as we meet the immediate demands and needs of these emerging peoples? I should like to urge as well that those who feel that the conditions may lead to nationalism of a kind that is deemed objectionable, I would ask those who have used such words in their particular motions to change them to chauvinistic, imperialistic nationalism. Such nationalism is bad but nationalism, 'as I know it' and as you know it is good, namely a pride in one's own people, a pride in one's own culture.

PANNELLA (NI). — (FR) I should first like to raise a point of order.

If I am not mistaken, the Council is not represented, not even by an official. Is that correct?

PRESIDENT. — Yes, the Council is not here, but it will respond in writing to the remarks made by Members.

PANNELLA (NI). — (FR) Does that mean, Madam President, that you think it right, in a debate on the Council's statements, for the Council, an institution financed by European tax-payers, to show such a lack of dignity, decorum and basic good manners as not even to have an official in attendance?

PRESIDENT. — Mr Pannella, I note what you have said and I shall communicate this to the Bureau.

PANNELLA (NI). — (FR) Madam President, when President Delors spoke about the militants at the Commission he said something very important. The Commission deserves commendation for following our debates so meticulously and so attentively. I would ask Mr Andriessen to convey that message to President Delors.

Madam President, today's debate is significant above all because of what has not been said, and also because Mr Mitterrand and Mr Kohl came. The fact of their coming enhances the standing of both the Community and Parliament. But what they did not say is more significant than what they did.

The President of the French Republic — today the President-in-Office of the European Council — confirmed the statements he made last month. Nevertheless, we put to the Council this question: when and how will Parliament at last be given legislative powers? It is high time to make that clear, because it seems illogical to be asking the countries of Eastern Europe to accord to their Parliaments something denied to us in Western Europe, a situation that results in what we describe with truly bureaucratic nicety as 'the democratic deficit'.

Solidarity with East European countries ought to embrace assistance with not only material needs, but also shortcomings in systems of justice, political democracy and tolerance.

Our Community is today a caricature of a parliamentary system. Our national parliaments have ceded a number of their democratic powers and transferred them to a Commission — which does not itself succeed in operating in accordance with a democratic institutional and constitutional dialectic — but not to another parliament.

The Iron Curtain has fallen, the Wall is falling, but what we need in my view to focus our minds on in this debate is Chancellor Kohl's apparently reassuring, but for me rather alarming, reference — when he cited Adenauer — to a united and free Germany within a united and free Europe. Today this is dangerous. For Adenauer it was a very important standpoint, and one that we accepted as

positive. Now, however, with the European Community in existence and with the issue of German unification to be seen only in terms of freedom and democracy, I believe all that to be out of date.

VERDE I ALDEA (S). — (ES) Most of what there was to say has already been said and perhaps the time has come to sum up the main points to emerge from this debate.

What we are witnessing is undoubtedly a genuine popular movement in Central and Eastern Europe. The pace at which the situation has been changing there has been truly historic. Let me underline once more one of the fundamental points: The driving force behind these changes, namely the peoples of the individual East European countries, has been fuelled by the existence of Gorbachev's *perestroika* in the Soviet Union, but the development of the European Community and the new perspectives for 1992 have also made a major contribution.

This is important, because it shows that we play a very relevant role in this Europe of ours, divided as it was as a result of the Second World War. The Eastern Bloc is disintegrating and it is too early to say what will become of the structures established since 1945. We cannot, therefore, conduct ourselves as if we were mere spectators at these events, because these countries are appealing to the West, to the European Economic Community.

Our response to this instability must be to reinforce the Community, not just economically, but also politically, so that the countries of Central and Eastern Europe have an example to follow in this new Europe dedicated to freedom and a pluralist political system.

Madam President, this latest challenge makes it even more important for the Community to become strong, because it comes on top of many other challenges which the Community is already facing and which it must accept. Countries in other parts of the world are looking to Europe as a champion of liberty, a place where fundamental freedoms are upheld.

We are, then, striving for a Europe that is open to the world, not just to the East, a Europe that is not purely Eurocentric. Europe has other obligations, for as well as these new challenges there are others which are no less important merely because they are of long standing.

The Community is at the moment discussing the new Lomé Convention. It has obligations towards the ACP countries, which are the poorest in the world, not just in the political sense through deprivation of freedom, but also in the literal sense of the world. The Community has obligations towards Latin America, which has for some time been making progress along the road to democracy, undoubtedly not as spectacularly as in Eastern Europe, but with no less hope. Elections are to be held in Chile and in Nicaragua, and the Community must make its presence felt in those countries too.

Finally, Madam President, at a time when we are faced with such momentous challenges from the East we must

VERDE I ALDEA

clearly look towards the future, not the past. At this juncture it might be tempting for Western Europe as well as for the East to look back, but this would be a grave mistake. Instead, we should call to mind Jean Monnet's words: 'We are determined to liberate Europe from its past'.

(Applause)

LUCAS PIRES (PPE). — (PT) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, with the destruction of the Berlin Wall and with the collapse of all the symbols of oppression, we have suddenly leapt into what one could call a new world at the heart of the old Europe. Once again it has been proved definitively in an area where it was least expected that human freedom is stronger than the might of the greatest empire and is still the highest imperative even in the history of technological society and the future. We can say that the century is ending not as predicted in George Orwell's famous novel but, on the contrary, the culmination of the whole of human history promises to be one of freedom, democracy and peace.

From any point of view this is what really counts. However, we should look closely at the concrete facts because a great historical leap must be made with, above all, security and stability. Hence the Atlantic Alliance must be maintained, hence the European Community must be strengthened and the right of the nations of Europe, particularly Poland, to live within their existing frontiers must be solemnly guaranteed.

It was, in fact, the durability of these guarantees which enabled the long-awaited transition which we are now witnessing to take place. If the break-up of an empire is to take place without the violence of revolution or war the European Community will have to make greater progress along the road to unity. Now that Europe without walls has overtaken Europe without frontiers, the latter will have to make up lost time. Delay, indecision or failure on the road to the single market, social cohesion, monetary union and political union would signal uncertainty, weakness and discouragement and contradict the signs of hope which are evident throughout Europe today.

For this reason the EEC as it now exists must be strengthened before it is enlarged. It clearly needs to be strengthened in the light of the new events taking place in the East. Similarly, at this time of solidarity with Eastern Europe we must not overlook those who have always been the most forgotten, namely those who live to the South of the Continent of Europe in the area called the Lomé Convention. For all these reasons too aid to the countries of Eastern Europe which are happily freeing themselves from Communism should be aimed primarily — and this should take precedence over any international political objections — at concrete economic development and effective democratization through free elections in the near future. In this respect the democratization of Eastern Europe is clearly a global phenomenon.

Certain aspects of the events in Eastern Europe and particularly in Berlin have implications which affect us more deeply. Some people believed that East Germany would be the last problem to be solved, the strongest link in the chain of social societies. But the vagaries of human freedom have meant that it has in fact been the weakest link and the first problem to be dealt with. One should not be surprised that the sacred principle of self-determination should lead to the reunification of Germany. This even seems natural and almost a part of European unification. It should in no way inspire fear.

Of course, certain balances will be disturbed, but not the basic equilibrium of democratic construction on the basis of the will of the citizens of Europe. The fact of the matter is that this is the era of the fall of empires and not of their reconstruction in other hemispheres or in other forms. Even we who have travelled further along this road share the hazards and hopes of this 'hour of Europe'. What we have heard here today, from the two major protagonists of the present era confirms our hope in a more community-minded Community and a freer Europe.

VEIL (LDR). — (FR) Madam President, since its first election by universal suffrage the European Parliament has known emotional occasions and solemn occasions. Today the two have come together.

This is an emotional occasion because, as we listened to President Mitterrand and to Chancellor Kohl, our thoughts turned to a people discovering, or rediscovering, freedom. It is a solemn occasion by virtue of their exceptional presence in this House, a recognition of our Assembly's growing role. Such *de facto* recognition, however, can in no way replace the institutional recognition which the citizens of Europe expect in order to make up for the Community's democratic deficit.

We felt happy and privileged, Chancellor Kohl, to hear you set out in generous and emotional terms the manner in which your country intends to assume its responsibilities, and in particular to hear you restate your commitment to the political union of Europe, in regard to which your country's responsibilities are especially important.

It is true that the procedure followed is unconventional. But is it not right to bend protocol and even the rules of representation within the European Council when events run ahead of us? We in this House have so often condemned the division of Europe and castigated Central and East European governments for breaches of human rights, and so often expressed our solidarity with these oppressed peoples, that it would be unthinkable and absurd for us to restrain our joy, even though a change of such magnitude necessarily gives rise to some uncertainty.

Let us rather salute the men and women in all these countries who were willing to sacrifice life and liberty in their struggle against bondage and dictatorship. Let us

VEIL

salute Jan Palach, who, by perishing in flames, became the symbol of this struggle.

But neither rhetoric nor the most fervent tributes are enough. We must show our solidarity through carefully weighed decisions and deeds, because the situation in these countries is still too precarious and unstable for us to speak of outright victory. It is up to us to ensure that enthusiasm does not give way to frustration and bitterness. Will our response measure up to the high hopes placed in us by these nations, inspired by their faith in democracy and their growing trust in our Community?

Whatever happens, we must not disappoint them. That would be to betray not only them, but also all those who have served the cause of European integration.

The President-in-Office of the European Council acknowledged the priority that the Community must give to strengthening its unity if it is not to be weakened by the shock wave produced by this revolution, even though its only violence lies in the determination that inspired it. We must also beware lest this Europe of ours be diluted by those who never really wanted it. Indeed, whilst Economic and Monetary Union is indispensable — and we shall very soon see whether the will exists to create it — I cannot conceal a certain disappointment, for nothing I have heard today offers the hope that we shall shortly take the significant and irreversible step towards federalism of which President Mitterrand spoke here in Strasbourg only a few weeks ago.

We know also that all these countries entertain high expectations because their needs are immense and their hopes great. It will take considerable imagination to respond adequately, with everyone cooperating to the full in all areas. Substantial financial transfers will also be required, for our assistance to our European brothers must not be at the expense of the peoples of the South.

Is it too much to ask that we renounce our petty attitudes and egotisms in the face of the enormous hopes placed in us by Eastern Europe, in the face of our historic responsibility?

(Applause)

BETHELL, The Lord (ED). — Madam President, having heard the initial contributions to this debate I rise to make a brief intervention of caution in the light of the contributions that have been made so far. Having returned recently from a week in Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan, it seems to me a little mysterious that the Soviet Government is prepared to contemplate the withdrawal of its military interests in the German Democratic Republic, in Hungary, Poland and maybe in Czechoslovakia, that it is prepared to think in terms of a pulling back of its previous interventions in Ethiopia, Angola, Nicaragua and Cuba and yet seems all the more determined to maintain a considerable amount of assistance, very extravagant assistance, to the regime of General Najib in Afghanistan, a person who was installed in Afghanistan by the Brezhnev invasion in 1979.

In Afghanistan Soviet influence remains even though the last soldier withdrew on 15 February. Millions of their mines remain in place exploding every day and maiming Afghan men, women and children. Their advisers are still there. 3000 million dollars a month are still contributed in military arms alone, including the devastating Scud missile and Mr Najib himself, the former head of the Afghan Secret Service is head of that government.

Is this essential to Soviet security? Can the Soviet people afford it? I am very dubious as to whether either question can be answered in the affirmative. In conclusion, therefore, I invite Mr Gorbachev to consider his position in Afghanistan, to think again, to end the war in Afghanistan, to allow the people to elect a true government, true democracy such as I profoundly hope will come to pass in Central and Eastern Europe.

IN THE CHAIR: SIR FRED CATHERWOOD

Vice-President

VERBEEK (V). — (NL) Mr President, Europe is an old volcano, and the volcano is active again, peacefully, we hope. Why are the leaders of Western Europe, including those who have spoken here this afternoon, so dreadfully wearisome? I am afraid it is because they think all the lava will come down on the eastern side, burning everything in its path, and that the thriving vineyards are on this side. This dreadful and dangerous feeling of superiority must change, and we must simply go on. One Member of this Parliament came straight out with it this afternoon, someone of whom all parliamentarians say they steer clear. He said: 'Communism is dead.' But how many people here think this? They think Socialism is collapsing, the free market is triumphant. Why have we not heard the leaders say a word this afternoon about capitalism itself being a permanent crisis and causing exploitation and destruction internally and externally, a system that causes poverty, leads to emptiness and kills minds and bodies. Why have we not heard a word about the West itself needing at least as radical perestroika. After all, the West accounts for 20 % of the world population but for more than 80 % of all energy consumed, all wealth, raw materials and reserves in the world. If other peoples were already able to live like this, how would the world manage?

Our deafening smugness about freedom and democracy, what does our compulsion to grow, our compulsion to consume, our conquering of markets have to do with freedom and a democratic world order? I think the model of the internal Community market is the least suitable basis for the East-West dialogue. Mr Andriessen, I am grateful to you for showing the same stamina as ourselves this evening. But I hope you will tell President Delors that his concept of the EEC in the middle surrounded by the EFTA and Comecon countries, that this Euro-centrism cannot be the model

VERBEEK

of a future Europe. We will help, but I would say 'physician, heal thyself first'. Our conditions, our Community regime, our IMF regime, our World Bank regime will suck the Eastern Bloc dry instead of helping it to find its feet.

(Applause)

MUSCARDINI (NI). — (IT) Mr President, the will, the enthusiasm and the hopes of peoples cannot be oppressed by any regime. The soul of the people runs through history, creating history. The collapse of the Berlin Wall, along with the great innovations that are starting to take shape in the East, reaffirm that the European people is finding again its own identity and is making each one of us feel the moral and political obligation to continue along the road on which it has embarked, which not even the strangely inexplicable Yalta Agreement was able to prevent. The bankruptcy of Marxism and of the dictatorship of the proletariat shows that the European people demand a social, free state, in which the different classes must collaborate and be integrated.

The European Parliament, which is the expression of the popular will of Member States, cannot accept that the problems and future of Europe shall be decided by agreements entered into between the Soviet Union and the United States.

That is why the Italian Social Movement, with a resolution and a letter to the President of the Assembly, has called for an extraordinary meeting of the Parliamentary Assembly to be held in Berlin, to emphasize the commitment of 320 million free Europeans to the German people and all the peoples of the East, and their readiness to help them. And in the meantime we also call on the President of the Council of Ministers to take the necessary steps to ensure Europe's presence at the Malta Summit, which was called by the two superpowers, so as to emphasize again the will for self-determination of the European peoples.

President Delors said: 'The same things can be done in a day or in a week'. But it is also true that one can promise to do, and then not do. And postponing, under certain circumstances, means not doing. Well then, let us find the courage to give immediate body to our words and to the commitments that Europe must have towards all people!

FORD (S). — Mr President, I am delighted to participate in this debate on recent events in Central and Eastern Europe and their impact on the future development of the European Community. May I congratulate Mr Kohl and Mr Mitterrand on their contributions and say how refreshing it was to hear someone who is committed to developing the future European Community compared with the kind of contribution we would have got if Mrs Thatcher had been here.

We are living in exciting times. Fifty years on from the start of the Second World War Hitler's last legacy to the

Community, a divided, frozen Europe, is dissolving in front of our eyes. Exactly where we are going to go we do not know. As Kierkegaard said, life is lived forward and understood backward. In Poland, Hungary and East Germany major developments are taking place day by day. New and dramatic changes arrive and confound and thrill us. Dead parliaments flower again as the nourishment of democracy arrives in these countries. The continent is opening up. Much of this can be attributed to the courage of Mikhail Gorbachev in recognizing and acting upon the realities in the Soviet Union that his predecessors refused to see.

But we must recognize that in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union there will be checks and even reverses on the progress that we are seeing now. We must maintain our support for those whose aims and objectives in the long term match ours. Eastern Europe does not need fair-weather friends. But one principle must guide us — self-determination. The possibility for the GDR of forming part of a united Germany within a united Europe is something that must be there. But, of course, they must make the final choice.

We must also ensure that European aid is available to all the countries of Eastern Europe that are moving towards democracy, financial and economic aid plus technical aid. The East is one of the areas where we must ensure that the Cocom list, which is used as a weapon of US industrial and trade policy, is torn up. But those who have had the ultimate aim of an enlarged European Community to the East must recognize that we have to build a European Community and not just a common market. Social Europe will be a magnet of attraction to those countries. We must not have the savage capitalism espoused by Mrs Thatcher with her dog-eat-dog view of the world.

One consequence not much talked about, of course, is the implications for European security policy. We have to beware of how this is going to be changed by what is happening now in Europe. It is clear that the evolution, the metamorphosis even, of global capitalism means that the United States and Europe are drifting apart economically. The more successful Europe is the more that is going to happen. Exactly the same is true of our security interests. Our European security interests must not, cannot, be determined by interests other than our own. We must find fora to discuss these issues together — East and West in Europe. Of course we must also have a dialogue with the United States but we cannot afford, cannot allow, others to determine our future in our absence while we are kept waiting outside the conference room. We have a chance, a wonderful chance, to build a new Europe, a wider Community, simultaneously one and different. Of course, it is going to have to be a dynamic process, but I have to say I am not terribly favourable to the proposal where we are going to have a kind of Europe that has more classes than the Indian railway network. We need to build, if we want a Europe that eventually is going to be one and united.

FORD

On security policy how strange it is that within the past six months we have gone from a situation where modernization was the big debate, to one where now virtually no one in the European Community talks about nuclear modernization. We can achieve a new Europe through peace. We have the possibility of the abolition and the removal of nuclear weapons in the European Community East and West. We have the possibility of massive step-downs in conventional armaments East and West. That can unlock resources so desperately needed on both sides of the rubble that used to be the wall that divided us. We can do this together. We can do this ourselves. Let us start this process. It will be seen with hindsight as the beginning of a new Europe in which we can all live in peace and harmony.

(Applause)

PENDERS (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, we see four groups of events occurring simultaneously, complementing each other. First, East-West détente with good prospects of arms reductions; secondly, perestroika and movements towards human rights and democracy in Central and Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union; thirdly, the removal of the dividing lines between West and East Germany and reforms in the GDR; and fourthly, the completion and strengthening of the Community as it evolves into a European Union.

Four processes, four fantastic processes are taking place, and they call for crisis management. That is not really the right term. It would be better to say 'management of opportunities' or 'managements of developments'. I have a few words to say about this.

Where East-West relations are concerned, I would say that arms control should continue within the framework of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. I also hope that this will be the main item discussed by Bush and Gorbachev. The continued existence of these alliances will also give Europe a guarantee of the stability that is absolutely vital.

The developments in Central and Eastern Europe primarily affect the people there. They are the first consideration. We in the West, and particularly the Community, must respond to these developments with economic support. We are busily doing this, with the Commission in the van. I have the impression that the aid plans are highly compatible: balance-of-payments support, debt management, management training, other training and vigilance as regards hikes in inflation. Training and contacts are essential.

Germany. I am very pleased to see Chancellor Kohl here. His presence underlines the fact that Germany's problems are European problems and so call for European solutions and managers.

Mr President, let us be honest. Only a few people are saying it out loud. Of course, the possible unification or reunification of the two Germanies is in everyone's mind particularly the Germans'. That is quite natural. Let us be clear about that. But the question is how we cope with and manage this situation, and I find it very

laudable that the Government of the Federal Republic, led by the Federal Chancellor, should explicitly say that the developments in the GDR are a European matter, something that affects the Community in particular.

This brings us to the Community itself, to the strengthening of our own Community with the aim of creating a union. What a brilliant idea it was, Mr President, for the world summit of seven industrialized countries to make the Commission responsible for the coordination of aid to Poland and Hungary. From that moment the Community in fact took centre stage in the four groups of events I have referred to. But this, of course, imposes obligations on the Community. We can respond appropriately to the events in the GDR, in Central and Eastern Europe only if we go on down the road towards the European Union. This has been explicitly confirmed by President Mitterrand and Chancellor Kohl. I must say frankly that, if I had been told five months ago that all this would be happening in Europe, I would have been far more anxious about the debate between those who want progress towards the union and those who may apply the brakes. Things have turned out differently, and I am very pleased about that.

So there must be an Economic and Monetary Union and a foreign policy and a security policy in the Community, not a Community that glorifies itself, not a provocative Community, but a Community that is open to Central and Eastern Europe. It is a great pity that Mrs Thatcher refuses to recognize this link between the events in Central and Eastern Europe and the development and strengthening of the Community. That puts her in the camp of those who seek to slow down European development, those who see the strengthening of the Community as provoking Moscow and Eastern Europe, a very regrettable trend. I object to that, Mr President. I am therefore happy with the resolution before us, and I shall take pleasure in voting for it.

DE CLERCQ (LDR). — *(NL)* Mr President, the historic and revolutionary developments we have witnessed in Central and Eastern Europe in the last few months and especially in recent weeks cannot and will not leave the European Community, the whole of Europe unmoved.

Aid to Poland, Hungary and East Germany and perhaps to other countries must and will come. It must be primarily Community aid, and it must also have condition attached, not out of any misplaced desire to interfere, but certainly made dependent on developments in these countries, development both toward political democracy with a multiparty system and free elections, where the rights of man reign supreme, and towards economic democracy in which an ossified planned State economy actually gives way to a free market economy.

The European Community's policy towards the countries of Central and Eastern Europe has always been based on two principles, a policy of normalization and a policy of specificity. By this I mean tailor-made

DE CLERCQ

treatment geared to the situation in the country concerned. It is therefore essential that optimum advantage be taken of the agreements that already exist between the Community and the various Eastern Bloc countries. In addition, if these countries continue to develop in the right direction, nothing must stop us entering into further agreements or adding to the existing ones. I am thinking, for example, of privileged and asymmetrical agreements like the one one concluded with Yugoslavia.

It is certainly not inconceivable that we shall eventually be considering association formulas or enlargement of the free trade area that we already form with the EFTA countries to include certain countries in Central and Eastern Europe, if that is what they want. But if these countries want to enjoy the fruits of their reforms, we must as a matter of urgency take additional and practical measures to make this possible. I am thinking, for example, of the establishment of an industrial development fund to provide risk capital for joint ventures between Community companies, and especially small and medium-sized firms, and Central and Eastern Europe. The Cheysson facility, as it is known, might be used to provide funds to finance joint ventures and, more specifically, vocational training and exchanges. Some of the funds needed could be obtained from a debt-equity swap programme. So you see there is a great deal of work to be done, but we must set to. The process of democratization and reform is a matter for the Central and Eastern European countries themselves, but without our help it will never succeed.

SPENCER (ED). — Mr President, more than 150 Members of this the third European Parliament, were born after the war. God willing, some of us may live to sit in the ninth European Parliament that will meet here in 2019. So, if I may, I want to look ahead.

My generation, Mr President, is one of the few since Charlemagne not condemned to a European civil war. That gives us the right, but much more the duty, to say gently but firmly how we want our Europe to be after the millennium. For me, at least, the future is clear. We need a Community of 20 or more countries; a Community that must at least include Scandinavia, Austria, all the German people and the countries of East Central Europe: Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Because only a whole Germany, embedded in the heart of a whole Europe, will give the Russians the confidence to help heal the wounds of history.

But, Mr President, this broader Europe will only be stable if its roots go deeper. It must have a defence identity. Debates about neutrality in Europe are now as dated as the long-dead rhetoric of vanished empires. The Community of Twenty will threaten nobody, but it must have the means to defend itself. We will need, Mr President, political skill of the highest order as the structures of the last 40 years break up. Let us urge the leaders of Europe to be careful about the next steps, but let us also urge them to link care to a clear vision of the ultimate destination.

Mr President, we, the 150 children of peace in this Parliament, need to assert that the Community method that worked here on the Rhine will also work on the Oder and the Danube. We must stare history in the face and declare that only unity prevents war.

VAN DER WAAL (NI). — (NL) Mr President, a great deal that is worth considering has already been said about the political aspects of East-West relations. I will confine myself to a few reflections that are relevant in this context.

Recent events have again made it very clear to us how privileged we are to live in freedom and prosperity in the West. You cannot put a price on freedom, as the chairman of the Liberal, Democratic and Reformist Group very rightly said in this Parliament not long ago. And what we have prosperity to thank for in terms of education, health care and social services cannot easily be overestimated. But we must be careful about holding up western society to other countries as a model in every respect. That others are wrong does not mean that we are right. A review of the last 40 years, in which we have lived in freedom, is very instructive and humbling in this respect. Because not everything that can be said about western society is commendable. What we see is the gradual disappearance of a culture that for centuries has been stamped by Christianity. Marriage and the family have become largely discredited. The inviolability of life is no longer generally accepted. Sexual promiscuity is appallingly widespread. We are having to contend with various forms of addiction, isolation, increased crime and excessive concentration on material progress. All these phenomena indicate that the normative significance of the Ten Commandments has been lost to society.

We must say, sadly, that freedom in the West has been very much used as each country sees fit. People in Eastern Europe are badly off economically. The same is perhaps true of us culturally and intellectually. I think it will be a step in the right direction, Mr President, if the meeting between Eastern and Western Europe results in our reflecting on the spiritual foundations of western society as well as all the other things that need to be done.

DURY (S). — (FR) Mr President, what is so striking about this succession of demonstrations is their massive scale and peaceful nature. The Berlin Wall has been breached and will soon, I hope, collapse, and with it the entire political system produced by the Second World War.

In this state of elation at the renewal in Eastern Europe, it occurred to me that I had probably experienced similar feelings in May 1968. But then I realized that no, May 1968 was child's play by comparison with what is happening now. In the midst of all the current problems the Technical Group of the European Right must not think that they are the only ones to address themselves to the question of reunification. Whilst it is true that this is the slogan of the moment in Leipzig, the Socialist

DURY

Group, too, has carefully considered the issue. Last week in Brussels, in the presence of Willy Brandt, we had an animated debate in which the exchanges were frank, but also constructive.

For some among us the events of history are still fresh in our minds and fears have been expressed at the prospect of the re-emergence of a powerful Germany. They are understandable, as a number of speakers have pointed out. But we have also heard our friends, the German Social Democrats, say that the present is not the past, that democracy is a rock on which a secure and peaceful future can be built, and that the ghosts of the past should not paralyse us today.

For the Socialist Group it is the future that counts. The people must be free to decide under what political and economic system they wish to live. Moreover, with the possibility of a unified Germany taking shape, we insist that this would have to be as part of a united Europe.

We are not disturbed at the prospect of 17 million East Germans joining 320 million other Europeans in a Community based on solid institutions and policies. The situation would be different if 17 millions East Germans were to come together with 60 million West Germans to form a third world power. That is how the Socialist Group sees it. If there is to be unification, then it must be within the framework of a united Europe. But what kind of Europe? And what kind of a united Europe? That is what it is supposed to be, but has it always shown itself to be such?

What we Socialists — and no doubt others in this Parliament — want is a genuine political Europe, a social Europe, a Europe of the Environment.

The European Council will soon be meeting in Strasbourg, and Mr Giscard d'Estaing referred to two of the main items on the Summit's agenda: Economic and Monetary Union and the powers of the European Parliament. Unfortunately, he neglected to mention social Europe. For us a social Europe is a priority. And when I listen to some of the Heads of Government saying that they want a genuine Europe and a social Europe, I can only shake my head at the outcome of the meeting of 30 October on the Social Charter. The text produced is so watered down as to be unrecognizable. But what is important is that the Twelve adopt the Social Charter and show that social Europe can really come into being.

The European Community is more than merely a Community of businessmen, it is more than an internal market. It must have a human dimension. After the initial euphoria, for example, the East German refugees complained of a lack of child-minding facilities and about accommodation problems. A qualified engineer spoke of his difficulties in finding work.

I am not of course suggesting that this is a West German problem. It is, rather, a West European problem. Just what kind of Europe do we want to see? Is it a Europe of prosperity and social justice? If we are to serve as a model then that is surely the Europe we should create, a

Europe for people, a citizens' Europe, a workers' Europe, a children's Europe!

I hope that the European Council in Strasbourg will also hear this message and that, over and above the points made today by the two Heads of State and Government — which I endorse — we shall move on to produce truly European policies, ambitious policies that will present to the world the image of a social Europe, a political Europe and a Europe of the environment.

(Applause)

BERNARD-REYMOND (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, witnessing one of the most momentous events of this century we share the profound joy of all the nations now rediscovering what Sophocles in his 'Antigone' called the salubrious era of freedom.

For all the joy we feel, we do not of course close our eyes to the fact that in the present unstable situation there are many unknowns and that relapses are unfortunately still possible.

We must therefore show both determination and prudence in our approach. The prudence necessary to avoid doing anything that might render Mr Gorbachev's task more difficult, for on his success depends the favourable evolution of the present situation in Central Europe.

Prudence with regard to leaders who are only just embarking on their democratic reforms and who still have to provide evidence of their good faith. Prudence in the face of totalitarian regimes that have not yet yielded to the pressure from their people. Prudence in a military situation where disarmament is certainly on the agenda but where the balance remains all the more precarious because one of the camps retains a massive stock of weapons and is at the same time politically destabilized. Prudence, wisdom, but also determination. Determination to provide immediate and adequate assistance to Poland and Hungary, who courageously pioneered the road towards democracy. Determination, too, in regard to the speed and nature of our own political integration. The success of the European Community provided an example and an incentive which have played an important role in shaping attitudes and transforming the situation in Eastern Europe. But precisely because of this transformation the organizational forms of the Community are no longer adequate. We must therefore progress rapidly to a new stage in European politics and move towards an integrated European Union based on a constitution that will indissolubly bind the destiny of our nations in a federation.

The crucial question in the days and months ahead is this: Will the decline of imperialism leave the field free for the re-emergence of nationalism and fundamentalism and put us back a century, or shall we succeed in showing that the Community is the most democratic, the most modern and the most effective form of organization for nations that want to share the same destiny, a kind of federation for the traditional States?

BERNARD-REYMOND

Furthermore, a truly integrated Community organization is also the only possible framework within which the German people may, if it so wishes, resolve the problem of its unity. And it is clear that, at the moment, the degree of integration achieved is inadequate for that purpose also.

Everything, therefore, dictates that we speed up European integration. The forthcoming Summit in Strasbourg will show whether the governments of the Member States are ready to go beyond mere declarations of intent and seize this challenge.

ROMEOS (S). — (GR) Mr President, with good reason have we all celebrated the great changes that have recently taken place in Eastern European countries. Changes which were triggered, let us not forget, by the bold policies of Mr Gorbachev. And all the more reason was there to celebrate the toppling of the Berlin wall, because it was a symbol of Europe's division and of the cold war era, as President Mitterrand also stressed to the House this evening.

Today, however, we must give careful and serious consideration to the meaning of these changes, to where they are leading, and to what the Communities obligations might be. The presence in the European Parliament today, of President Mitterrand, the President of the Council, confirms that the Community appreciates the gravity of the changes taking place near us, of the important consequences they will have for Europe's future, and of the decisive part the Community is called on to play.

The presence of Chancellor Kohl confirms that the German problem, and let us not hesitate to say this — is the axle around which the Community's policy, but also that of the Soviet Union and even of the USA in Europe, will revolve.

The fact that they are both here together, President Mitterrand and Chancellor Kohl, together with their statements, must be interpreted as a definite and catholic decision that there will be a single Common policy in response to present and future developments in Central and Eastern Europe.

We should welcome President Mitterrand's initiative in convoking an extraordinary Summit Conference in Paris. We express our satisfaction with the Declaration by the Twelve that the Community's solidarity with the peoples of Eastern Europe progressing towards democracy, will be combined with more rapid steps towards European integration.

We did not expect that a Summit Conference lasting a few hours could consider in depth the future problems which may arise in Europe owing to these developments in Central and Eastern Europe. It was inevitable that the decisions made would be limited, and rightly so, to how the Community would respond to the economic problems faced by the new regimes in East Germany, Poland and Hungary. We agree with these views, but subject to two conditions: first, this aid must not assume the form, perhaps via the proposed new bank, of

a new Marshall plan. I think we would all wish to avoid imitating political interventions and practices reminiscent of that past.

Secondly, the basic conditions laid down by the Paris decisions for this aid are a return to democracy, respect for human rights, and the holding of free elections. We must agree with that, but also be careful about the implementation of such a policy, because in those countries there have been some social acquisitions which not only must we avoid destroying by our interventions, but might even do well to adopt ourselves for a social Europe that conforms with the vision we all entertain.

These decisions provide a first answer to the immediate problems. However, we must soon find answers to the problems connected with Europe's future and the Community's role. It is hardly difficult to agree that the Community now has a historic role, and to respond to that role it must first make its own progress towards economic, social and political integration and the building of its own identity, as President Mitterrand stressed.

The Intergovernmental Conference which it was initially decided to convene to discuss economic and monetary union, must now cover all the sectors in which institutional changes are needed to speed up European integration. But there is no need to achieve European integration to decide, from today, that the Community of Twelve, with the mechanisms available to it and with its institutional bodies, can and must undertake initiatives to create, in cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other Eastern European countries, a common European home founded on the principles of democracy and freedom, respect for human rights, the self-determination of peoples, solidarity, and the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement, so that all Europe's peoples can live securely within their present frontiers. If those principles are respected by everybody, they will surely lead to the completion of disarmament and to a guarantee of peace.

In conclusion, Mr President, the two leaders Bush and Gorbachev, who are due to meet in Malta next week, must also be given the message that Europe's future will be decided by the Europeans. What we expect from them, and would welcome, is a decision to limit still further their military presence in Europe, since as we hope, it will eventually come to be unnecessary.

PIRKL (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are all happy to be able to discuss at this time a new and, we hope, long positive period in European history. As a German Member I am, of course, particularly pleased that so many speeches in today's debate have shown our European friends to be willing to stand by the German people as it moves towards free national self-determination.

We are very grateful for this and assure you all that we have learnt the necessary lessons from the disasters of our recent history and will never forget them. You need

PIRKL

not worry about Germany's future development. It is firmly established in and with Europe, and we shall do all we can to cope with 'accidents' on the German party political scene, an example of which we have witnessed today, and to minimize the resulting damage to Germany and Europe.

But despite all the satisfaction at current developments in many parts of Eastern Central Europe and Eastern Europe, we must not overlook the negative aspects and dangers that remain. There have been tremendous developments, but we must nevertheless say that, although the Wall has some holes in it, it is still standing. Neither overcritical pessimism nor unconcerned gullibility is helpful at the moment. We must face up to the demands of the hour in a spirit of cool realism.

At this historic moment free Europe, and especially the Community and its Member States, must help by acting realistically. We must help even at a personal level if there is a danger of hunger and of lives being lost this winter. Towns and regions should find partners they can help. We must support the establishment of free and cultural associations wherever we are asked to do so. There must be no petty-minded discussions or decisions on effective economic aid, and that goes for the Community too.

But allow me to say in this context, in view of what has been said by several Members in this debate, that we certainly must not make this aid dependent on petty conditions being satisfied. But a minimum of freedom in the economic order is needed if this aid is to be prevented from seeping away.

Another thing we should always remember is that the developments that have been sparked off in the Eastern Bloc did not happen of their own accord. It was not a free decision taken by Gorbachev but the persistent solidarity of the Atlantic Alliance and the really magnetic force of the process of European unification that triggered these developments — besides the unrestrained striving after freedom that lives in everyone, including the people of Eastern Europe.

Let us urge on both the Atlantic Alliance and the process of European unification. That is what is needed at the moment, and that is the guarantee of the freedom that is still to come to much of Eastern Europe.

(Applause from the centre and right)

ROTH-BEHREND (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for me — and you will surely forgive me, a Berlin representative, for seeing it this way — the changes in Eastern Europe reached their high point in Berlin and the GDR on 9 November, when the people of the GDR patiently and reasonably set in motion a peaceful, an unstoppable and democratic revolution. With admirable tenacity and discipline, the peaceful power of the masses has achieved a degree of democracy and freedom of movement that no one, even in his wildest dreams, would have thought possible only six weeks ago.

The government and all the people of the GDR now face a difficult test. Everyone outside would do well to be sparing with advice but generous with willingness to help.

If this revolution is not to founder on the people's own impatience, it will need our solidarity, a solidarity of deeds, not a long list of conditions and requirements attached to aid that clearly cannot be met at present. Of course, we are all concerned about what happens in the GDR, but the people of the GDR certainly do not want to swap being told what to do by a party for being told what to do by outsiders.

Those who are sincere and do not just pretend to be happy about the new freedom of movement in the GDR know that what is needed now is rapid and unconditional aid, not some hesitant, petty, wait-and-see attitude.

The government and all the people of the GDR face difficult economic problems, to which solutions must be found very quickly if the sell-out that many people in the GDR fear is not to happen.

The GDR's economy must become internationally competitive so that it can earn hard, convertible currency and, with it, foreign exchange for its citizens. We should offer every support in this respect, but without repeating the mistakes that have been made in the past. This is not the time for *our* economic interests to take the forefront: the emphasis must be on what benefits the GDR. It should go without saying that we will not export our own mistakes in the environmental field, for example, as we have so often done in the past, and that we will recognize the strong ecological movement in the GDR. The GDR should be able to go its own way, and we must help it to do so. What is needed now is imagination, flexibility — a word we perhaps do not always know the true meaning of in the Community — and creativity applied to interim aid.

Whether temporary foreign exchange funds are provided or the exchange rate is supported up to a certain level, whatever is done, help will be needed from economic experts, but quickly and without lengthy and time-consuming analyses. Special situations call for special measures. We can show here how mobile and spontaneous we can be, and we of the European Parliament should insist that the European Community offer support as quickly as possible.

The frontier between the two Germanies was not only a national problem, not only a German problem. The whole of Europe was split by this frontier, and with the toppling of the Wall we have suddenly made so much more progress in our efforts to achieve a united Europe and a secure peaceful order for Europe.

Suddenly frontiers are actually losing their divisive power. For all those who are still in the Chamber at this late hour and stand up for peace and freedom in Europe and for the relaxation of tension between the two blocs the last few days have undoubtedly been very moving. For us in Berlin at least this has certainly been very true.

ROTH-BEHREND

The morning after the first night of open frontiers the Governing Mayor of Berlin, Walter Momper, said: 'The German people are now the happiest people in the world.' We of the Socialist Group in the European Parliament are convinced that everyone in Europe can join with all Germans in feeling happy at this time.

(Applause)

SISÓ CRUELLAS (PPE). — (ES) We have talked at great length about the recent events in Central and Eastern Europe and their possible implications for the Community. What is now needed is for the Community and its Member States to react with prompt and effective political action and economic aid, intelligently deployed so as to prepare the way for this greater democratic European which we all want to see.

As far as the economy is concerned, cooperation is urgently required to assist these countries in preparing themselves through training of manpower and creation of the necessary structures, so that public and private investment, whether domestic or foreign, produces the desired social and economic results. It would be quite wrong to think that it will be enough to arrange for loans to be made available to these countries, even if they are channelled through a development bank specially set up for this purpose. If this were to be our sole effort, these countries would end up in even greater debt and ruin than they are already. This is a problem with which Poland is only too well acquainted.

Furthermore, we must remember that cooperation is not a one-sided affair. Specifically, we must plan simultaneously for technical, training and financial aid. Firstly, in order rapidly to introduce professional training schemes, not just at the managerial level as referred to earlier, but at all levels. Trained manpower must be available if companies are to survive in a market economy. Secondly, in order to create the necessary economic and financial structures, which are at the moment either non-existent or inadequate. Thirdly, in order to carry out infrastructure projects which will enable these countries to catch up in an area where they are so far behind the West. And, fourthly, guarantees must be provided as the present arrangements are not attractive enough to encourage investment. The guarantees must be reciprocal, by arrangement with the countries concerned, and should be ratified by the national parliaments of the signatory states.

Unless we proceed in this way, loans will not solve the problems of these countries, nor will sufficient private investment be generated to create a market economy that can pull them out of their present predicament. If the programme for their economic recovery were to fail, so would their fragile democracies, and we should bear a heavy responsibility for that failure.

Let us not, therefore, be content with the sterile policy of empty gestures lest we put at risk the democratization process that has only just begun. Moreover, we should lose precious time, which our very alert competitors would not fail to exploit. For example, Japan and Korea

are already making investments in Hungary, to which we certainly have no objections — the more help and investment, the better — but we do prefer a European democratic Europe to a Japanese or Korean Europe.

(Applause)

COONEY (PPE). — Mr President, we have to see this debate in the context of European history over the last 50 years. The outstanding event in that time was the world war which has affected the history of our continent since. I come to this debate as a Member of a small island country physically, but only physically, divorced from the mainland of Europe — a country which was neutral and took no part in that conflict. The merits or demerits of that neutrality are something for academic debate though I have to say that the merits of neutrality in the contemporary sense are nil. However, that is for another day's work.

The fact of our neutrality enables me to have a different perspective from many of our colleagues who have spoken. My views on the recent developments and principally those in Germany are untrammelled by any residual considerations arising out of the alignments of that conflict. That conflict is lurking in the background unmentioned throughout this debate. And while the title of the debate is East Europe I do not think that we can deny that the event which sparked off this debate was the drama in Berlin some weeks ago. I think essentially this debate is about Germany.

I was in Berlin on that historic occasion when the Wall was breached. I witnessed the joy and indeed the euphoria with which the East and West-Berliners greeted each other. I was a recipient of greeting from East Berliners — they did not know I was a foreigner. I do not know German but it was quite clear to me that the one slogan that I was hearing loud and clear throughout that historic morning was One Fatherland. I have no doubt that there is a great wish among the German people for unity and it would be incredible in human terms if it were to be otherwise. The will of the people is for unity and we must not put any institutional impediment in the way of that will being achieved. It was the will of the people which brought freedom to Hungary and Poland, and it is the will of the people which will bring freedom to Czechoslovakia and, I hope, eventually to Romania.

What would those people have said to us if we had said you must go slow in realizing your will because of institutional difficulties. We would not have been thanked. We encourage that will and here in our own Community we must encourage that will. I have no fears about that will being realized because I am satisfied that the Community as presently structured is a sound edifice commanding the loyalty of all its constituent parts, not least the Federal Republic of Germany. I am satisfied that the Community will be able to absorb any movement towards unity among the German people. I am satisfied from the statement that have been made by German Statesmen, not least by

COONEY

Chancellor Kohl here this afternoon. I am satisfied from the views of my colleagues in this Parliament. We must not stand in the way of the will of the German people.

(Applause)

PESMAZOGLOU (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, during this extraordinary sitting the European Parliament has trustingly expressed its warm solidarity towards the peoples of East Germany and Central and Eastern Europe. The European Community now has the self-evident obligation to react without delay and in an effective way to these headlong developments, while remaining aware that reversals and retrogressions are not beyond the bounds of possibility. The work of reform and reconstruction in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe is much greater and more complicated than is often imagined. The European Commission must be helped to cope with the difficult task assigned to it.

My second comment is that the Community itself must be strengthened, as was stressed very correctly and responsibly by the President of the Commission. This means moving more rapidly towards monetary and political union, enhancing the powers of the European Parliament, and adopting the Social Charter. Those are the issues which the European Council in Strasbourg must decide upon. The groundwork and the specific proposals are mature and have already been put forward. It is of major importance that the President of France and of the Council, and the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, both confirmed this evening that the problems of Central and Eastern Europe, and the new equilibrium in Europe, can be dealt with only from within the European Community. That is a message of world-wide significance.

Mr President, I conclude with the comment that the nucleus and driving force of our Common European Home is the European Community of Twelve, with its institutions and its powerful political cohesion.

PRESIDENT. — Commissioner, do you wish to speak?

ANDRIESEN, Vice-President of the Commission. — Thank you, Mr President, but the debate was such that after the speech of President of the Commission, Mr Delors, I have nothing to add.

PRESIDENT. — Nonetheless, on behalf of the House, I would like to thank you for staying with us until the end of this long debate. Thank you, Mr Andriessen.

(Applause)

The debate is closed.

We shall now proceed to the vote on the request for an early vote on the five motions for resolutions to wind up the debate on Central Europe. I would like to point out that motion for a resolution Doc. B3-598/89 has been withdrawn.

COT (S). — (FR) Mr President, I endorse this request but would like the Bureau to consider a proposal supported by several of us, namely that the vote be taken at 3 p.m. so that a sufficiently large number of Members can give their backing to the views of this Parliament.

PRESIDENT. — You do not want to vote now or do you want the vote tomorrow at 3 p.m. instead of 6.30 p.m.?

COT (S). — (FR) That is correct. I should like the request for an early vote to be put to the vote now, with the vote itself being brought forward to 3 p.m. tomorrow to enable more Members to take part in this important vote at the conclusion of an important debate.

CHANTERIE (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, I approve Mr Cot's proposal, but perhaps the possibility of voting on all other important items at 3 p.m. might also be considered.

PRESIDENT. — Thank you, Mr Chanterie. I shall pass on the idea that we should let the House decide tomorrow morning whether to vote at 3 p.m. or at 6.30 p.m.

(Parliament agreed to the request for an early vote)

*(The sitting was closed at 9.35 p.m.)*¹

¹ Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.