

Community was also anxious that its position in the Western world should not hinder its relations with the East. Although on aid the difficulties were clear, the communiqué should give the impression that the Community was ready to increase its effort.

(c) MEETING AT 4.30 p.m. ON 20 OCTOBER, 1972

*Institutions*

64. *Mr. Biesheuvel* said that there could be no progress towards the second stage of EMU unless the Community's decision-making processes were improved and the Parliament played an appropriate role. The Dutch memorandum submitted to the *Ad Hoc* Group had proposed changes which would have required Treaty amendments. The new members were not however in favour of amending Treaty amendments. The new members were not pressing the Dutch proposals. But the Treaty at this stage and so he was not pressing the Dutch proposals. But the Treaty would provide two occasions for Council discussion of the future of the 1972 would provide two occasions for Council discussion of the future of the European Parliament. It would be considering the Commission proposals on the Vedel report and would be taking decisions on the second stage of EMU. This made it necessary for the Summit to issue a directive which might be that there should be during 1973 a decision on instituting direct elections (in accordance with national laws) and increasing the powers of the Parliament. Members of the Parliament from the new members must have their say. If no decision was taken during 1973, the Dutch could take the decision about direct elections in the Netherlands on their own. Finally, he proposed that Parliament should have a say in nominating the Commission from 1 January, 1973.

65. *Mr. Eyskens* quoted President Pompidou's remarks in his opening speech about forming a European Union in this decade. How should we do this? It must be a juridical union. Some people had suggested the use of a Wise Man or of Foreign Ministers. But he suggested that it would be best to put in the text of the Summit declaration or communiqué that it would be a major objective to transform relations between members into a European Union, while respecting the existing treaties, and ask the Foreign Ministers to produce a report by the end of 1973.

66. *Signor Andreotti* said that the aim was European unity. Italy was therefore, as far as the Parliament was concerned, in principle in favour of direct elections. But the entry of three new members justified a pause for thought. He would like to receive concrete proposals from the enlarged Parliament. This should be considered within a reasonable period. Meanwhile we should not denigrate the existing Parliament. He suggested that it should hold two major debates a year on the state of the Community with the Council President and other Foreign Ministers in attendance, perhaps even some Prime Ministers. As regards its powers, it should be made responsible for approving the EEC budget. Another idea which he suggested was that national Parliaments should each organise an annual debate on the state of the Community.

67. The *Prime Minister* said that we were a new member with no direct experience of the institutions of the Community, though we had met with some of them over a considerable period. In our view European Union was an admirable objective which should be achieved by pragmatic steps. If we spoke of federation or confederation this would cause all sorts of differences. The word union allowed us to make progress wherever we could. As regards the Parliament there was general agreement on the need for it to have responsibility and to be able to voice its criticisms of the other institutions. In our view some of those who put forward proposals for improvements should have experience

of government and we should naturally wish our parliamentarians to take part. We hoped to contribute to making the Council and the Commission as efficacious as possible. As regards Ministers for Europe, we thought it essential that Foreign Ministers should retain their overall control. We did not like the idea of Ministers being resident in Brussels. But we had a full member of the Cabinet in London, dealing with Europe, responsible to the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister. This arrangement happened to suit us. We thought therefore that we should be able to fall in with whatever was asked of us.

68. *Herr Scheel* agreed with the Prime Minister. There were two questions. Increasing the powers of the Parliament and direct elections. We should not concentrate our attention on the latter which was not practical at present. We should rather give the Parliament more competence, especially power to take decisions in regard to legislative developments. The Germans were in favour of State Secretaries for Europe and of the co-ordination of the dates of national cabinet meetings.

69. *Mr. Jorgensen* said that it would be wise to wait until the new members had some experience but the Danish Government was prepared to consider suggestions for changes including the creation of Ministers able to give more time to Europe. The Danish Government did not support direct elections to the Parliament for the time being.

70. *Mr. Lynch* agreed that it was best to wait before changes were proposed. He thought that Ministers of Foreign Affairs had too much to do and could be helped by junior Ministers who could deal with secondary European questions, subject to approval by Ministers of Foreign Affairs. One problem affecting the Parliament was the difficulty for national members to play their full part in the European Parliament. It was therefore inevitable that there should be direct elections.

71. *M. Werner* said that it was not the Summit's task to make revolutionary changes in the structure of the Community. European union would, however, be a political structure and would need an executive controlled by Parliament, and a judiciary. The problems of relations between these three should be resolved in the course of this decade. He was glad to see that there was general agreement on the need to hand over to the Community a number of new powers, particularly in the field of EMU. This would bring Article 235 into play. Closer control in the field of EMU. This would bring Article 235 into play. Closer control of the budget by the Parliament was necessary because so much of it was now voted out of *ressources propres*. The Parliament should also have two debates a year on general European affairs and there should be an improvement in relations between the Council, the Commission and the Parliament. The Parliament should be asked to give its own views on how it should be elected. It was up to each country to make its own arrangements to lighten the load of Ministers of Foreign Affairs. Any Ministers dealing with European Affairs should have real powers of co-ordination and there were advantages in countries being represented in the Council by a Minister who was in touch with the whole range of European problems. Junior Ministers would not be of much help.

72. *M. Schumann* said that there was no question of revising the Treaty and that the new members must gain some experience. None the less progress must be made. In the first place Article 235 should be used. Secondly nobody wanted an additional level of consultation between Ministers and permanent representatives. However, each country could have a Minister fully empowered to replace the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Thirdly, France was opposed to moving towards government of the Community by the Parliament but was in

favour of strengthening its supervisory powers within the limits of its present responsibilities. On direct elections, the Parliament of the enlarged Community should present its recommendations. On the broad question of institutions the Summit should ask Ministers of Foreign Affairs to produce a report by the end of 1973 even though this was going to be a particularly busy year. This report could be prepared by the institutions of the Community.

73. *Dr. Mansholt* reminded the Conference that the Commission had to make proposals by 1 May, 1973. It seemed to him that the Conference was concentrating on the creation of a European union which was an extremely vague term. However one should be clear that this body should be able to take decisions efficiently and should be responsible before a Parliament. The Community should lay down a programme of development for the creation of this union by a fixed date.

74. *President Pompidou* said that hitherto the methods of work of the Council of Ministers had not been sufficiently efficient. The institution of a group of junior Ministers as suggested by Germany risked complicating the work of the Council. His own idea of Ministers for Europe was something for the future. For the moment it was up to each Government to make its own arrangements. This did not necessitate any decision by the Conference. Turning to *Mr. Eyskens'* proposal that the institutions of the Community should produce a report in 1973 he thought that this might not be possible. On direct elections to the Parliament he drew from the discussion the conclusion that this was not at the moment possible. The creation of such a Parliament would pre-suppose in any case as a matter of principle the creation of a European Government. The President also feared that direct elections would tend to produce only those who had already failed to gain seats in their national Parliament and would be a disastrous outcome. France had in any case many reservations about the idea of a Parliament which had the power of decision without having a proper relationship with a real executive. None the less there should be closer relations between the institutions of the Community and the Parliament and the Parliament should have more supervisory powers. The Parliament should indeed debate the progress being made in the Community once or twice a year. France was not however abandoning the idea of direct elections which figured in the Treaty. *President Pompidou* then asked for the views of each delegation on *Mr. Eyskens'* proposal.

75. *Mr. Biesheuvel* repeated that certain decisions had to be taken before moving to the second stage of EMU. The Parliament of the enlarged Community should be asked to produce new proposals for direct elections.

76. *Mr. Eyskens* re-stated his proposal adding that the date of 31 December, 1973, was not sacred, that the Report would be prepared by the Council of Ministers and the Commission and that if Europe was now unable to produce a fuller idea of what European union might be by the end of the decade it would be better to drop the plan.

77. After it had been established that the discussion had turned to a specific part of the final communiqué there was a slightly confused debate as to whether a decision should be taken on it immediately or if it should wait until the whole of the communiqué was being considered. It was agreed that the reports already expected from the Commission should be presented as well as that called for in *Mr. Eyskens'* proposal. *M. Werner* said that he was in favour of the Belgian proposal. *The Prime Minister* suggested that it would not be possible to produce agreed views on these problems in 15 months and thought that it would be better to fix as the date for the report the end of 1975. *Sr. Andreotti* agreed with the

proposal and thought that 15 months was long enough. If it was not it would surely be better not to fix a date. *Mr. Eyskens* pointed out that a similar proposal had been made in 1961 without any date and nothing had happened. *Mr. Lynch* agreed with the proposal and that there should be a fixed date. *Herr Brandt* suggested that the report might be submitted to the next Summit Conference. *Mr. Eyskens* agreed that one could put off the date until the end of 1975. *President Pompidou* thought that both the date at the end of 1975 and the next Summit Conference could be included in the text. The meeting was then adjourned, at the Prime Minister's suggestion, so that delegations could look over the communiqué produced by the drafting group.