

## Welcoming address

*Mr. Ivar Nørgaard*, Chairman of the Conference welcomed participants to the CEAC Conference and informed them of the draft agenda which the troika (constituted by the UK, Belgium, the European Parliament and Denmark) had suggested on the basis of the wishes which had been expressed regarding items.

## 2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda for the Conference was adopted. The Chairman had arranged for the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Prime Minister to make brief interventions so as to give the participants ample time for the ensuing dialogue. The Chairman allotted 5 minutes to speaking during the first round. This meant plenty of time for an open debate.

## 3. Intervention by the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Danish Prime Minister followed by a debate

### The Minister for Foreign Affairs

*Mr. Niels Helveg Petersen*, Minister for Foreign Affairs, in his capacity as President of the EC Council of Ministers concentrated on the current situation in Europe and also expounded the main themes of the meeting of the European Council to be held in June 1993.

By way of introduction, the Minister pointed out that he had himself contributed to laying down the rules for the activities of the Danish EC Committee in 1973 and had for many years since that time been a member of the Committee. In Denmark, we have always considered it important that the Government is intimately acquainted with the **points of view of Parliament** prior to important decisions in the Council of Ministers.

The Danish **referendum** to be held on May 18th 1993 concerns the Maastricht Treaty and the

Edinburgh Agreement which is the new basis for Denmark's attitude. The Minister for Foreign Affairs was optimistic because those voting for have the lead according to all opinion polls.

With regard to the situation in the former **Yugoslavia**, the Minister for Foreign Affairs was of the opinion that the signing of the Vance/Owen plan the previous day formed a new basis for the international society's contribution to creating peace - assuming that the Serbian Parliament approves the agreement. The reason why all parties have now signed is that the Council of Ministers has consistently been backing the sanctions against Serbia.

At the meeting of the European Council which is to be held in Copenhagen in June relations with **countries of Central and Eastern Europe as well as with Russia** are going to be a central theme on the agenda. The association agreements provide a framework for developing the co-operation. The aim is that a partnership agreement be signed with Russia in connection with the summit to be held in June. The Russians have expressed a strong wish that the perspective should be that a free trade zone be eventually established between the EC and Russia. In the opinion of the Presidency, the most important thing is to give the countries of Eastern Europe better access to markets where they can dispose of their goods.

The **expansion negotiations** with Austria, Finland, Sweden and Norway are, to the extent to which it is possible, conducted at the same time as there are numerous common problems e.g. with regard to the *acquis communautaire*. The Danish Presidency agrees with the coming Belgian Presidency to make every effort towards concluding the expansion negotiations by the end of 1993 with a view to going through with the ratification process and the referendums in the applying Member States during 1994 so that new countries will have become Members as from January 1st 1995. This sets an ambitious time-table which requires all parties to make a big effort.

The discussion on the European **growth initiative** will likewise be a central theme at the summit in Copenhagen.

Furthermore, the Presidency is preparing for a strengthening of the co-operation with **the USA**. And towards the end of the week Mr. Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, the Danish Prime Minister, and Mr.

Jacques Delors, President of the Commission, will be going to Washington to conduct negotiations with President Clinton on this.

During the debate which followed, contributions were made by nearly all delegations. On the whole, the discussions at the CEAC Conference were marked by a lively exchange of points of view in which many speakers made short interventions. Only Spain did not take part in the discussions as she was only represented by a civil servant.

*Mr. Peter Kittelmann* (Bundestag, Germany) pointed to the conflict between the wish for market access for goods from **Eastern and Central Europe**, and the recent demands for protectionism, which have surfaced in the EC due to the vast unemployment.

*Mr. Maurice Ligot* (Assemblée Nationale, France) stressed that many jobs within the EC may be at stake if the frontiers for trade with Eastern Europe are opened up just like that.

*Mr. Carlo Scognamiglio-Pasini* (Senato, Italy) advocated the principle of giving credits to the countries of Eastern Europe so as to enable them to buy machines etc. from the EC Member States. However, one has to pay attention to the fact that the economic situation differs from one EC Member State to another, and their possibilities of sharing in the financing is therefore rather different.

*Mr. Leonor Beliza* (Portugal) was worried that the countries of Eastern Europe are currently limiting their trade with one another while at the same time demanding freer access to the EC market.

*The Minister for Foreign Affairs* could not accept that it is a question of a new kind of protectionism on the part of the EC - not even when it is a question of bananas and steel. On the whole, the EC is still advocating the principles of free trade.

The Minister was of the opinion that it was possible to combat unemployment while at the same time opening up the frontiers of the EC to receive goods from Eastern Europe. Closing the frontiers has never been a way to meet the problems of unemployment. Experience drawn from the interwar period in Europe proves that. A liberal trade policy is not only profitable to others but also to ourselves. In that connection, the Minister for Foreign Affairs referred to the fact that the EC's

sales to Eastern Europe have increased more than Eastern Europe's sales to the EC since we started liberalizing the trade. This is not to be wondered at as the countries of Eastern Europe are in need of our technology and know-how when converting to market economy. The Minister for Foreign Affairs wished for a bit more balancing of the trade and therefore meant that the EC should make an effort to open up its markets within the areas in which the countries of Eastern Europe have a chance of competing. If we get the economies of Eastern Europe going, this will contribute to the economic growth in the whole of Europe.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs agreed that the countries of Eastern Europe also need credits but that the most important thing is market access.

We should, of course, prompt East-East trade.

*Mr. Panagiotis Skotiniotis* (Greece) was asking for a general **policy relating to the Balkans** on the part of the EC.

*The Minister for Foreign Affairs* agreed that Europe should formulate a coherent and sensible policy concerning the Balkans. He referred to the fact that from the very first the Council of Ministers has taken a very consistent line and supported the Vance/Owen plan. The plan is a precondition for having law and order in the Balkans. The very great work of implementing the plan now remains to be done. The UN Security Council will very soon be dealing with this question.

*Mr. Hugh Dykes* (House of Commons, UK) wished Denmark all the best with the coming **referendum** and asked how the Danes felt about the British "no" voters interfering in the Danish referendum.

*The Minister for Foreign Affairs* said that we do not care very much for foreign interference - irrespective of whether they advocate a "yes" or a "no". Therefore, the visit of the British "Euro-sceptics" has not been of any great importance to the attitude of the Danish population.

*Mr. René van Der Linden* (Tweede Kamer, Netherlands) put the question as to whether one can **expand** the Community by new Member States without the EC losing some of its influence and several other speakers also touched upon this question.

E.g. Mr. Carlo Francanzani (Camera dei Deputati, Italy), who spoke out for a consolidation of the present co-operation and a strengthening of the EC institutions in connection with the expansion - especially with regard to the democratic influence.

The French raised the question as to whether the neutrality policy of Austria and Sweden is compatible with the Political Union with its common foreign policy and eventually on a long view common defence policy. Shall the applying countries endorse the whole of the Maastricht Treaty or will they, like the United Kingdom and Denmark, have the possibility of introducing exceptions?

The Minister for Foreign Affairs referred to the fact that the Heads of State and of Government have decided that entering the four EFTA-countries mentioned does not necessitate changes in the EC institutions. He added that the EC needs participation of countries like Finland, Sweden and Austria who have a tradition for trade with Russia and Eastern Europe when we are going to extend the co-operation with these countries. Moreover, the Minister for Foreign Affairs was of the opinion that it seems to strengthen the EC institutions that the principle of subsidiarity is currently being given more substance and importance and that one has started practising a greater openness in the EC co-operation.

With regard to the hesitations of the French, the Minister for Foreign Affairs referred to the fact that the applying countries have applied on the basis of the Maastricht Treaty.

Mr. Carlo Francanzani (Camera dei Deputati, Italy) dealt with the situation in the former Yugoslavia. He referred to the Vance/Owen plan as important but not sufficient and would like to know how one intends to follow it up with regard to control and in a diplomatic and economic sense.

Mr. Hugo van Dienderen (Chambre des Représentants, Belgium) was critical of the Vance/Owen plan because it allows for ethnic expurgation and does not contain sufficient guarantees for a multi-cultural cohabitation.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs answered that Lord Owen, the EC peace mediator had been contacted in order to draw up the line of conduct which is to be decided on at the Council of Ministers' meeting next week. He thought, by the way, that

the EC had had a very consistent attitude with regard to the sanctions.

The central point in the Vance/Owen plan is that the Serbs shall withdraw from some areas of which they are in military control at the moment. This is the reason why the Serbs have been sceptical.

Mr. Leonor Beleza (Portugal) warned against the tendency that Europe is concentrating more and more on herself and urged the EC to deal more with the **developing countries**.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs referred to the meeting with the Rio-group in Copenhagen and to meetings with the countries of Latin America and Central America as well as to the dialogue which the EC is having with the countries of Eastern Europe.

Mr. Brian Lenihan (Ireland) saw an increased commercial intercourse based on principles of free trade and the entering into a new **GATT agreement** as the most important means in furthering economic growth.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs agreed that the conclusion of the GATT negotiations should be given the very highest priority. It will be included in the dialogue which the EC representatives are to conduct with the President of the USA later this week.

Mrs. Nicole Fontaine (European Parliament) asked what strategy the Community had adopted in order to live up to its responsibility to the **ACP countries** with their great social problems and problems of health.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs agreed to the importance of the EC increasing its contribution to the ACP countries.

## The Prime Minister

Mr. Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, the Danish Prime Minister, primarily dealt with the subject of **economic growth and employment** in Europe which has been given top priority during the Danish Presidency. If the EC is to have greater popular backing, the most important element is factual decisions in the Council of Ministers which will create more places of work in Europe. Therefore, a co-ordinated political contribution within the economic area is of vital importance.

of the decisions made at the summit in Edinburgh, the Commission has launched a growth initiative founded on a coordinated strategy. The Prime Minister gave a series of his visits to the capitals of Europe that among the Heads of state and of government, it is widely held that Europe needs a stronger, co-ordinated economic-political contribution. The process which has started will be strengthened during 1993 and 1994. During the meeting of the European Council, which will take place in Copenhagen in June, the Presidency will present a report which can form the basis of new decisions on factual Community initiatives and an increased co-ordination of the economic policy among the nations. Also the USA and Japan should take part in the common effort.

The single market should be used to mutual advantage, not only when it is a question of a co-ordinated economic policy. It will be much easier to accomplish greater investments in the environment, in education, in urban renewal etc. when the various countries do it together. The liberty to act will be greater for each country than if the contribution is not co-ordinated. If the interest rates continue to decrease in Europe, there are good possibilities for getting Europe on the move again by means of common political decisions.

When the Prime Minister is going to visit the USA from May 6th to 7th, the subjects which the Presidency will deal with will be:

- 1) A co-ordinated American-European contribution to attain economic growth and employment.
- 2) The conclusion of the Uruguay-round in the GATT negotiations.
- 3) The promotion of stability and co-operation in relation to Eastern Europe.
- 4) A strengthening of the UN including the combat of crime internationally.

The Presidency will do its utmost to ensure that a new co-operation and partnership agreement can be signed with Russia at the summit which is to be held in Copenhagen on June 21st. The aim of the agreement will, on a long view, be to establish a free trade area. Owing to the tense situation which is predominant in Russia, it is important that we keep up the speed.

With regard to the transatlantic dialogue conducted on **environmental questions**, the Prime Minister referred to the fact that the idea of a co-ordinated transatlantic contribution within the field of the environment expressed by the Danish Minister for the Environment during his recent visit to the Vice-President of the USA had been received positively.

Finally, the Danish Prime Minister made some comments on the coming **referendum** in Denmark. Prior to referendums, people have a tendency to "have something up their sleeves". An unfortunate example of this is the handwritten letter from a person working in the Legal Department of the Commission which was published recently. On that occasion, the Prime Minister underlined that the agreement made in Edinburgh on the Danish arrangement is an internationally binding agreement made between the 12 Member States. This is confirmed by the spokesman of the Commission.

Moreover, the Prime Minister looked confidently to the Danish referendum, which, in his opinion, would result in a big "yes".

Also the Prime Minister's intervention was followed by a long series of questions which especially dealt with the **growth initiative**. It was welcomed by all participants but several pointed out that in the light of the vast unemployment which characterizes Europe, the setting up of 450.000 places of work is not going to be of any great help. *Mrs. Renate Hellwig* (Bundestag, Germany), emphasized, however, that one does not generate economic growth by the incurring of debts and pointed to the fact that part of the unemployment is due to problems of structure.

Several delegations urged the conclusion of the **GATT negotiations** as soon as possible. Only France was against this saying that a GATT agreement would lead to greater unemployment in France say within the clothing industry and agriculture. That is why France is against such agreements and is also hesitant in allowing sensitive goods from the countries of Eastern Europe to enter France. Also Greece was hesitant referring to the increasing unemployment which many people look upon as a result of the single market, and also referring to concerns about the great number of economic refugees coming in from Eastern Europe.

...gians dealt with the principle of ... and asked whether the Prime Minister ... the Article on the environment in the ... Maastricht Treaty insufficient.

...dy Elles (House of Lords, UK) commented ... the remark made by the Prime Minister ... concerning the referendum to be held in Denmark. ... he referred to the British lawyer's interference in ... the Danish debate as a painful mistake. No one can ... doubt that the decisions of the European Council ... are really binding.

The Prime Minister first answered the many questions on **economic growth and employment**. The common European growth initiatives are sensible and well founded but they are not sufficient. What is needed is a further development of the initiatives at Community level and a stronger co-ordination of the economic policies of the countries. The Prime Minister pointed out that his intention was not that the EC shall dictate the substance of the financial policy of the individual countries. But one should make use of the common single market with its 380 million inhabitants in a dynamic way as a basis for a co-ordinated growth and make use of the fact that the multiplication effect is much bigger if say financial policy is modified at the same time.

All countries in Europe have a deficit on the balance of payment and are therefore afraid of taking new initiatives on their own. He mentioned as an example that if Denmark for instance increases public investments in works, it will immediately lead to an increased deficit on the balance of payment. But if we co-ordinate the contribution, the blocking effect, which is linked to the fact that part of the increased demand is aimed at imported goods, will become far less significant. Precisely in a period in which the private sector is in recession, it will be expedient to increase public investments in works. What the Prime Minister was envisaging was not one or two locomotives but twelve locomotives setting off at the same time. He had therefore asked the Commission to make out what the effect would be on the balance of payment, State budgets, inflation and employment if the Governments and Parliaments in all the countries decide to increase investments in works together. The calculations made hitherto show that each single country will profit more from co-ordinated growth activities than from efforts

which are not co-ordinated. This is the fundamental philosophy which shall set the economies of the European countries going again in a responsible way.

As a response to the hesitations which the Germans had, the Prime Minister added that when the private industry has got going, public investments can be slowed down again.

At present, there are 17 million unemployed in Europe. The immediate result of the growth initiative is 450.000 new jobs, of which the majority is due to common, European initiatives. The Prime Minister agreed that this is not sufficient. We have to think in a European way concerning our financial policy and we have to strengthen national initiatives. This will be a main theme at the meeting which the European Council is to hold in June.

In mentioning the **GATT negotiations**, the Prime Minister said that it was important that we keep up the fast track tempo, so that the Uruguay round can be concluded by the end of 1993. A successful conclusion of these negotiations will be an extra incentive to the economic growth. Therefore, solutions must be found to the French, Greek and other - isolated - problems. The Prime Minister quite understood the problems at hand but invited people not to regard the GATT negotiations as being of a static nature. This can lead to new repercussions in our relations with the USA and to disappointment in Eastern Europe. We shall not insist on maintaining old places of work, but on the contrary create new, advanced places of work in Europe. The EC should open up its markets to Eastern Europe if we are taking it seriously to make a solidary contribution to the Third World and to Eastern Europe, including a well planned industrial policy, agricultural policy and coal- and steel policy.

The Prime Minister said that the best chances of concluding the GATT negotiations would be to look upon all the separate elements in the agreement as an entirety. As in all agreements, it must be a question of "give and take" so that a balance which is acceptable both to Europe and to the USA is obtained.

It is important to extend the principle of subsidiarity but within **the field of the environment**, the new possibilities of making majority decisions inherent in the Maastricht Treaty should be used. The difficulties of the Ministers for the Environment in agreeing on a carbon dioxide tax because it is

possible for an individual country to intervene shows that it is important to make majority decisions in the future which will make it possible to conduct a more dynamic environmental policy at a European level.

With regard to the former **Yugoslavia**, the Prime Minister urged the Bosnian-Serbian Parliament to endorse the Vance/Owen plan, which their leader has signed. Because this is the only plan which has a chance of gaining wide acceptance. When the plan has been accepted, it will be up to the UN Security Council to have it implemented as soon as possible. This presupposes a considerable increase in the number of peace-keeping UN soldiers, something like 60.-70.000 over a longer period. Europe is to assume her part of the task together with the USA and Russia.

As one of the Greek participants in the debate had expressed the view that he had missed seeing Danish soldiers patrolling the streets of Denmark, the Prime Minister referred to the fact that those participating in the Conference during their visit to the Tivoli Gardens would get the chance to see a particularly, peaceful type of Danish soldier. The Prime Minister pointed to the fact that modern **foreign policy and security policy** to a still greater extent will amount to other things than military contributions. Modern security policy is more a question of financial assistance, of investments in the environment and in energy and of opening up of our markets. In that connection, the Prime Minister referred to the coming negotiations with Eastern Europe as one of the most important peace-keeping initiatives we can take.

In his reply to an intervention by *Mr. Carlo Scognamiglio-Pasini* (Senato, Italy), who had advocated export credits to Eastern Europe - adapted to the financial capacity of the individual EC Member States - the Prime Minister threw out the suggestion that a **common European investment guarantee** could be established which would give enterprises within the EC better possibilities of investing in the building up of a new production apparatus in Eastern Europe. One need not make do with soft loans from EC Member States but can in this way set the European private enterprises going.

#### 4. Political initiatives - at EC level and nationally - with a view to promoting economic growth and employment

The subject was illustrated by means of interventions from all countries as well as from the European Parliament. With regard to the **growth initiatives** at EC level, the Commission's growth initiative was welcomed, but the setting up of 450.000 new places of work is not enough; further initiatives must be taken. This is important also to restore people's confidence in the Community.

With regard to the growth initiatives taken by the individual Member States, several delegations went through what had been planned in their countries up till now. A major characteristic of the interventions was that a far greater contribution must be made if one is to break the unemployment rate. One pointed to increased public investments - in a period in which the private sector is passing through a trough of the waves - and to a co-ordinated policy with a view to stabilizing the foreign exchange market, and to returning to stable exchange rates in the EMS and to reducing the rate of interests so as to set private investments going.

As there was broad agreement that common initiatives aimed at creating growth and employment are of major importance, only main points of some of the individual interventions are given below.

*Mr. Yves Guena* (Sénat, France) and other French delegates referred to the fact that the election which had just been held, had proved that the population would not accept that the **importation** of cheap goods from **third world countries** leads to unemployment and misery among European workers. As an example was mentioned that the French clothing industry does not want to be restructured but does only wish to compete on equal and reasonable terms - not with textiles based on starvation wages and work done by children. Total, free trade ruins European places of work e.g. in agriculture. One should not become hypnotized by the principle of free trade, but attach importance

the Community preference which has been granted by the Treaty of Rome.

The points of view of the French were opposed by the Netherlands. Protectionism becomes equivalent to a spiral pointing downwards. The protection of industries is a short-sighted means and not valid on a long view. In that connection, the Netherlands' closing down of mines twenty years ago was referred to as was also the acceptance of the closing down of many textile enterprises.

Mr. Dimitrios Frangos (Greece) dealt with the big problem of the many economic refugees from Albania and the former Yugoslavia which Greece is facing. The immigration is by many Greeks looked upon as the reason for the increased unemployment. And the immigrants have also been seen to have committed crimes.

Mr. Eric Matthijs (Sénat, Belgium) of course agreed that one should try to create more places of work. But it shall not be done by artificial means, it shall be real places of work. When Belgium takes over the Presidency on July 1st, a high priority will be given to a **harmonization within the monetary field** so that the rate of interest can be reduced thereby increasing private investments.

He advocated a **carbon dioxide tax** at EC level in order to reduce the use of energy as part of the common energy policy. The money could be used for social improvements.

Mrs. Renate Hellwig (Bundestag, Germany) went through the various proposals aimed at **reducing public expenditure** which are currently being implemented in Germany, and mentioned e.g. a campaign in favour of limiting the issuing of prescriptions and measures taken against the misuse of social grants and unemployment benefit.

Mr. Carlo Francanzani (Camera dei Deputati, Italy) suggested a revision of the criteria for participating in the third phase of the EMU so that the rate of unemployment is included.

Mr. Brian Lenihan (Ireland) and other Irish parliamentarians dealt with the **monetary crisis**, and stressed monetary stability as a decisive factor for growth and employment.

A parliamentarian from the Netherlands advocated that a higher priority be given to the **cultural co-operation** in the EC.

Mr. Robert Hicks (House of Commons, UK), characterized the reducing of **unemployment** as an enormous task. Calculations have proved that economic growth has to reach 2,5 per cent before unemployment, which has reached 11 per cent in the UK, can be reduced. He urged that support be given not only to big projects but also to small and medium size enterprises.

Mrs. Helena Torres Marques (Portugal) urged that **employment** become the main point in the Presidency conclusions which sum up the CEAC Conference.

Mrs. Charlotte Antonsen (Denmark) underlined that the Danish non-socialist parties support the growth initiative even though it is not normal, liberal policy to favour a deficit on the State budget. However, an expansive financial policy is legitimate during a shorter period in order to set the economy going again. On a long view, it is important to finalize the single market as the entire EC improves its **competitive power** by this.

Currency stability is important to growth and employment. Denmark will contribute to this by voting "yes" on May 18th. It is important that the other European countries give a clear sign that they intend to carry through **programmes of convergence** and continue to work for a single currency and a common European central bank. Because in dealing with our own economic problems, we should not forget that Europe's most important task, at present, is to contribute to stabilizing the new democracies of Eastern and Central Europe.

Mrs. Marcelle Lentz-Cornette (Luxembourg) went through the **problems of unemployment** which have surfaced in Luxembourg, and mentioned i.a. that grants would be given via unemployment agencies to older employees, who have difficulty in finding jobs even though they have been professionally trained. She mentioned that half the places of work in Luxembourg are being occupied by persons who are not citizens of Luxembourg. Mr. Hugo van Dienderen (Belgium) spoke on behalf of the Greens and he was the only person to



associate himself from the final conclusions of the Presidency as he did not advocate economic growth. Growth is not synonymous with increased employment but it puts a strain on the environment. He mentioned that there had been a reduction in employment while at the same time the gross national product had been tripled. He advocated a sustainable development and a reduction of working hours as well as an improved **quality of life** and was against investing in more motor ways.

Also a *Greek Communist* was against investments which only serve big business and is of no help to the environment. As an example, he mentioned the construction of roads in Greece.

Moreover, the Greeks pointed to the fact that the Maastricht Treaty should be supplemented by an increased effort to help the **poorest areas** as the freer competition has widened the gap between the rich and the poor regions. Seen from an economic point of view, an unemployed person is better off in Northern Europe than an agricultural labourer in Southern Europe.

The delegates from *the Netherlands* looked upon these considerations as very defensive. It was pointed out that the Structure Funds have increased very much lately - but one should, of course, only support sensible projects which really create new places of work

*Mr. Gerald Thalheim* (Bundestag, Germany) from the former German Democratic Republic appreciated that the products which Eastern Europe can sell to the West are agricultural products, textiles and steel. Therefore, what is needed is not only support for investments but also **market access**.

*Mr. Jimmy Hood* (House of Commons, UK) pointed out that if an economic growth is to be attained, which really reduces unemployment, it is necessary to have lower **rates of interest** so that private investments get going. The great expenses which Germany has incurred because of the new constituent States have raised the German interest rate and has created problems in the other European countries.

## 5. Evaluation of the role of the CEAC

The item had been entered on the agenda at the request of the Netherlands' delegation, and *Mr. René van Der Linden* (Netherlands), as an introduction to the discussion, submitted the paper, which the Netherlands' delegation had elaborated prior to the Conference in Lisbon.

The Netherlands suggested that the Presidency in future forwards the annexes to the individual agenda items so that the participants can prepare for the discussions in advance. This should be seen as a request to the coming Belgian Presidency. The discussions at the CEAC Conferences can form the background for the discussions in the national Parliaments e.g. prior to the meetings of the European Council. The democratic control has only been considered to a lesser extent in the Maastricht Treaty. One must make sure that the national Parliaments will not be great losers when the Intergovernmental Conference is to be held in 1996.

During the discussion which followed, various quarters supported the Netherlands' proposal, as it was thought that it would render the work of the CEAC more efficient if annexes were sent out in advance concerning the individual agenda items.

A characteristic feature of the interventions was that the Presidency was praised for its hospitality and the way in which the Conference was held in Copenhagen. It was especially appreciated that ample time was allowed for putting questions to the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Presidency. The exchange of information was regarded as the culminating point of the Conference.

There was general agreement that the CEAC cannot make decisions but that the aim is to exchange points of view on topical subjects which have been entered on the European agenda as well as extending the co-operation between the national Parliaments and between these and the European Parliament. Not least personal contacts are important.

*Mr. Joao Cravinho* (European Parliament) suggested that as early as possible during each



Presidency a meeting be arranged in the troika (including the European Parliament) in order to prepare the CEAC Conference and decide on the subjects which are to be entered on the agenda. Then the Presidency and the individual delegations can forward written background notes prior to the CEAC Conferences. In that way, the debate will become better structured and its contents richer. As a possible agenda item for the CEAC Conference to be held in the autumn, he pointed to an evaluation of the legislative programme of the Commission, the Council and the European Parliament. If one wants to make the meetings more open and send out material to the press, one has to make sure that it is a question of a clear message in the form of some definite conclusions - otherwise one will be rendering oneself a questionable service.

*Mrs. Renate Hellwig* (Bundestag, Germany) suggested that in addition to inviting the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs for a discussion, one should also invite a minister in charge of a specific department in order to discuss a specific subject e.g. transport policy or finance policy.

*Mr. Ove Fich* (Denmark) regarded it as a positive element in the proposal of the Netherlands that one gets an opportunity to put questions to Ministers of the Presidency so that one can discuss the subjects which will be considered during the meetings of the European Council. He advocated stronger links between the national Parliaments and suggested that an exchange of opinions as to how we strengthen the national, parliamentary control of the legislative process in the EC be entered as an agenda item. Thus one might perhaps inspire one another to improve the parliamentary supervision of the Ministers' decisions in the Council. Finally, he pointed to the importance of including the population in the process to an increasing extent. If one does not obtain a fruitful interplay between the politicians and the population, one will experience what became apparent at the referendums in Denmark and France last year namely that a large part of the population feels isolated from the process which is going on in Europe.

*Mr. Leonor Beleza* (Portugal) agreed to the Netherlands' suggestion for a better preparation of the meetings. This may be combined with the German idea of inviting a Minister who is in charge

of a specific department. If an item on the agenda of the CEAC meeting is e.g. environmental policy, it would be natural to invite the Minister for the Environment of the country having the Presidency. Then one might perhaps at the same time invite representatives of the professional committees in question of the national Parliaments and of the European Parliament. In order to improve the image of the EC, he suggested that one considers holding the CEAC Conferences in cities which are not capitals. He advocated concentrating on a few items as a speaking time of five minutes is not enough for a delegation comprising six members.

*The Italian delegation* suggested that one makes a qualitative jump and in addition to the general exchange of points of view at each CEAC Conference discusses a special theme which has been prepared in advance by means of documents from the troika. The discussion of this theme should lead to a conclusion on the specific subject. Until the European Parliament is given more authority, the democratic deficit can be reduced by holding an annual conference like the one which was held in Rome between the national Parliaments and the European Parliament. The Italians referred to the exchange of views with the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs as being among the most interesting aspects of the Conference. But they suggested that this discussion be held at an earlier time during the period of the Presidency so that it will relate more to the programme of the Presidency. Thus the Belgian Presidency was asked to arrange for the Conference to be held at the beginning of the second half of 1993.

*Mr. Jimmy Hood* (House of Commons, UK) did not think that it would be a good idea if the troika at the beginning of the Presidency decides on the subjects which are to be considered at the CEAC Conference, because in that case one will not have the possibility of being flexible and of taking up subjects which are of topical interest to the European debate at the time at which the meeting is held. He meant that one should leave it to the Chairman to draw the conclusions from the meeting. Perhaps one should prolong the duration of the Conference programme to two and a half days in order to have more time for the discussions. It is difficult to speak in favour of greater openness in the EC without, at the same time, allowing the Press to attend the CEAC Conferences.

*Lord Boston of Faversham* (House of Lords, UK) replied that if the Press is to be admitted, a provision to this effect must be laid down in the Rules of Procedure, which apply to the CEAC Conferences.

*The Chairman* drew the attention to the fact that if one wishes the Press to attend (parts of) the next CEAC Conference or to hold a larger Press meeting with representatives of all the Member States, it is now that one should make a decision to amend the Rules of Procedure. At the present meeting, the procedure will be the same as last time i.e. the Chairman will inform the Press about the conclusions and the Press will then put questions to the Chairman.

*Mr. Jacques Genton* (Sénat, France) recalled that when the CEAC Conferences were first opened in 1989, the two Chambers of the French Parliament did not have very much control of the EC policy of the Government, but one has now learnt from Denmark and the Netherlands and is drawing in Parliament to a greater extent. He did not think that there was any rivalry between the national Parliaments and the European Parliament as the spheres of competence differ widely. A co-ordination can help to improve the democratic control or reduce the democratic deficit.

*Mr. Maurice Ligot* (Assemblée Nationale, France) agreed to the idea of inviting a Minister in charge of a specific department so as to discuss the subject chosen with the Minister before decisions are made in the Council. Maybe, it would be better not to invite the Press to the whole CEAC meeting - because then one risks that the MPs begin to make long speeches to the public - but the Press should have a summary of the debate so that citizens all over the Community become aware that a meeting has taken place between MPs from all EC Member States.

*Mrs. Helena Torres Marques* (Portugal) said that it would be useful for Portugal to learn how other EC Member States implement parliamentary control of the Ministers while an amendment to the Constitution is being made in connection with the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty. This means that EC questions will be dealt with by a Committee of the Portuguese Parliament. She suggested that a member of the Commission be invited in order to provide information on the Commission's legislative programme within the field which makes out

the main item of the CEAC Conference in question. *Mrs. Torres Marques* called for more openness to the Press and agreed that the duration of the meetings should be two days.

*Mr. Hugh Dykes* (House of Commons, UK) warned against making the level of the preparations for the CEAC Conferences too high. The most important thing is the exchange of points of view between representatives of the national Parliaments and the European Parliament - not the Press coverage. It would be alright to have longer meetings in order to have more time for the discussions. Perhaps, one might visit the Commission in Brussels once a year in order to discuss the programme of the Commission. Though it is costly, an Interparliamentary Conference like the one which was held in Rome should be planned as soon as possible.

*Mrs. Marcelle Lentz-Cornette* (Luxembourg) asked for the agenda to the CEAC Conference to be forwarded about six weeks prior to the Conference and that written interventions be included. She spoke in favour of elaborating a final communiqué which will be forwarded both to the national Parliaments and to the Press.

*Mr. Dimitrios Frangos* (Greece) found that two whole working days were needed for the CEAC Conferences and agreed to the idea of inviting the Commission Member, who is responsible for the policy within the field with which one chooses to deal in particular. In connection with the next elections to the European Parliament, an Interparliamentary Conference should be held along the lines of the one held in Rome. The CEAC Conferences should have a more formal character and should play a greater role in the conscience of the populations. *Mr. Frangos* said that a specialized European Affairs Committee had just been set up as a standing committee of the Greek Parliament. The Committee will discuss EC matters with the Minister in question and eventually change the course which Greece is to take.

*Mr. Nick Tummers* (Eerste Kamer, Netherlands) pointed to the fact that one of the aims of the Intergovernmental Conference in 1996 is to give greater authority to the European Parliament. But the EC is expected to be expanded before 1996. The European Parliament has previously made an increase in its authority a

condition for entering new Member States. Is this still the stand of the European Parliament?

*Mr. Joao Cravinho* (European Parliament) answered that the European Parliament has to endorse an expansion of the EC for it to take place. In the light of this, the European Parliament has passed a resolution guaranteeing that after the expansion the EC will function in a more democratic and efficient way. The European Parliament will use the instruments at hand to reduce the democratic deficit. How this can best be done in future must be settled at the moment when the individual matters are being dealt with.

*Mr. Brian Lenihan* (Ireland) spoke in favour of holding the CEAC Conference one month prior to the meeting of the European Council so that important questions, on which a decision has to be taken at the summit, can be dealt with. This was the case this year with the question of employment. He accepted the idea of more formalized meetings and suggested that the information material be improved between the meetings.

*Mr. Ivar Nørgaard* (Denmark) did not think it likely that one would profit very much from the big Interparliamentary Conferences ("Assises"). The Danes tend to believe more in meetings on factual subjects with few participants. In this way, one will get a dialogue on the subjects - not only a reading out of speeches prepared in advance.

*Mr. Charles Ferdinand Nothomb* (Chambre des Représentants, Belgium), who takes over the Presidency as from July 1st had been listening to the discussion of the Netherlands' proposal with great interest and had taken note of the many proposals as to how the CEAC Conferences could be made to have an even greater outcome.

Belgium will meet the wish for sending out background information prior to the meeting which is to be held during the second half of 1993.

In the light of the wish for more time for discussions, he said that in the countries from which the travelling time was especially long, one had had doubts about holding meetings for two whole days.

Due to the wishes to cut down the agenda so that one concentrates on say two subjects, one might perhaps start the preparations as early as July 1st - provided that during the troika meeting called for

the same afternoon one could agree on what themes to choose.

*Mr. Nothomb* mentioned the European Constitution, the working programmes of the Commission and of the European Parliament, the control of the Schengen co-operation, the expansion of the Community, employment, immigration policy, financing and transportation as possible themes. He suggested that one limits oneself to two subjects and takes a large, important subject which centres round EC policy within a specific area. And that one furthermore takes up another subject which is more concerned with method or control. Because one ought to attach most importance to the first subject and discuss the aspects which regard the contents of the policy as had been the case the day before with growth and employment.

At the troika meeting which was to be held the very same afternoon, one would discuss whether it was possible now to decide on the themes for the next meeting - and eventually to send out questionnaires so that one can have systematic, written interventions for the discussions.

There are good arguments for holding the CEAC Conferences at the beginning of the period of the Presidency, as this will be a better way of influencing the policy of the Presidency. But is is also a good idea to hold the meeting one month before the meeting of the European Council as one will then have a chance of influencing the decisions of the summit meeting. Belgium is prepared to plan a meeting at the beginning of July if there is a general wish for it. But one had already arranged with the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs that they can attend the CEAC Conference on November 22nd and 23rd 1993 - 20 days before the summit meeting in Brussels. One might eventually hold a meeting in July with fewer participants e.g. the Chairmen of the delegations i.e. about 20 persons in all as some countries have two Chambers. If there is a wish for a meeting of that kind, one will invite the Belgian Prime Minister to attend it. When a specific subject has been chosen e.g. employment, the Minister concerned in charge of a specific department i.e. the Minister for Labour as well as the relevant commissioner can be invited.

Mr. Nothomb invited the delegations to exchange information currently e.g. by forwarding a couple of pages every month.

It has been suggested by various quarters that one might split into groups on the first day. In that way, each delegate is given more speaking time. On the other hand, one will only hear the discussion in the group which one attends.

Mr. Nothomb found that it should be left to the Chairman to draw the conclusions of the meeting. Otherwise, one will just waste half a day discussing the individual formulations of the conclusions.

*Mrs. Renate Hellwig* (Bundestag, Germany) found that it would be overdoing it to hold a meeting of chairmen in July. She advocated a CEAC Conference one month before the summit meeting with one main theme and to which both the Minister concerned and the Commission member be invited. The choice of subject was to be left to the troika.

*Mr. René van Der Linden* (Tweede Kamer, Netherlands) spoke along the lines of Mrs. Hellwig and pointed to the fact that the CEAC Conferences provide a useful background for the national Parliaments preparations to the European Council's meeting. He mentioned the expansion of the EC and of the EMU as topical subjects for the Conference to be held in November. He suggested that spokesmen of the national Parliaments dealing with the specific subject be invited.

*The Chairman* said that the new troika (Belgium, Greece, the European Parliament and Denmark) would meet the very same afternoon and discuss the next CEAC Conference. He thought that it would be most practical to stick to one meeting namely on the dates one had already agreed on in Belgium. It would, of course, ease preparations if the main subject could be decided on now. The Chairman would suggest the expansion of the EC and immigration policy as likely subjects.

*Mr. Jimmy Hood* (House of Commons, UK) had nothing against entering the expansion of the EC on the agenda but was generally against making formal decisions on the subject of the next meeting six months before it takes place.

*Mr. Carlo Francanzani* (Camera dei Deputati, Italy) pointed to the fact that one has to begin the discussion of the theme of the EC constitution and

furthermore wished to follow up the subject of employment.

*Mr. Joao Cravinho* (European Parliament) did not quite like the idea of deciding on the subjects of the coming CEAC Conference already now. One should at least wait until after the coming summit meeting. Besides, he pointed to the fact that the CEAC is only a part of the interparliamentary co-operation and in that connection referred to the fact that the Speakers of Parliament will be meeting in Dublin at the end of the month.

In connection with the conclusions of the Presidency at the end of the Conference, Mr. Cravinho had certain reservations about the idea of inviting a member of the Commission to the CEAC Conferences.

## 6. Ensuring parliamentary control of Pillars 2 and 3

*Lord Boston of Faversham* (House of Lords, UK) said that the Maastricht Treaty as well as the Edinburgh Agreement prepare for involving the national Parliaments more in the activities of the Union. This is so much more important when it is a question of the co-operation on foreign policy and security policy within Pillar 2, and of the legal and internal co-operation within Pillar 3, as the European Parliament will only, in this respect, have a right to instituting hearings. Therefore, the two Houses of the Parliament of the UK have asked to enter an item on the agenda which makes it possible to discuss how Parliaments can effectuate the necessary, parliamentary control and also which documents are to be used.

Commission proposals are being discussed in the UK and one tries to exert an influence on the stand of the Government before a decision is taken on the proposals in the Council. But there is no previous control in fields like frontiers and expulsion. The discussion as to how Parliament can be involved is not finished yet. But the British Ministers, e.g. the Home Secretary, has already accepted that Parliament shall have more documents at its disposal so that it will be possible to have a good, systematic control. However, the Government will not submit documents which are

concerned with security or with exerting the authority which belongs to the Government.

Lord Boston spoke in favour of trying to reach an agreement as to which documents the Governments shall submit and which parliamentary control is required for the subjects belonging under Pillars 2 and 3. Maybe this can be taken up again when the Maastricht Treaty has been ratified.

The discussion which followed showed that there was broad agreement that parliamentary control of the interstate co-operation within Pillars 2 and 3 is of great importance irrespective of the fact that the co-operation has not been drawn into the institutional co-operation.

*Mr. David Martin* (European Parliament) characterized Pillars 2 and 3 as an odd hybrid. He called the attention to the fact that it was a compromise between the Member States who wished that all co-operation were Community co-operation, and also between the Member States who only wished for intergovernmental co-operation on foreign policy and legal conditions. It is a well known fact that the European Parliament has complained that the co-operation within Pillars 2 and 3 is primarily something which one deals with in the Council. *Mr. David Martin* concentrated on the co-operation within Pillar 3 and stressed that the European Parliament finds that it is important, particularly within the legal co-operation, to include democracy and transparency in the decision-making process as the proposals which are adopted will have a direct influence on the individual citizen. The European Parliament will try to make use of the limited authority which the Maastricht Treaty leaves it in order to exert as much control as possible and has therefore made an adjustment of its procedures. In that connection, it would be expedient to co-operate with the national Parliaments who can control the decisions of their Ministers in the Council.

*Mr. Jack Stewart-Clark* (European Parliament) complained that the European Parliament, the Commission and the Court of Justice do not have the same competences and the same influence on the foreign policy co-operation as is the case within the Community area. He suggested that one tries to find out, at an inter-institutional seminar, how the Council can be made to take the points of view into

consideration, which make themselves felt very much in the European Parliament and in the national Parliaments. And also how one best canalizes points of view to the Council and how one makes sure that the Council answers the questions put by Parliamentarians and take their points of view into consideration. He furthermore suggested that a subject dealing with foreign policy be taken up at a CEAC Conference which can be discussed with the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the country holding the Presidency and with commissioner *Mr. Van den Broek*.

*Mr. René van Der Linden* (Tweede Kamer, Netherlands) said that in the Netherlands one tries to make the Government submit the documents concerning e.g. the Schengen co-operation and the TREVI co-operation at an early date. Up to now, there has been almost no control with e.g. the Schengen co-operation which the Tweede Kamer has criticized. Also in connection with summit meetings, decisions are normally only submitted after they have been made. The Netherlands' European Affairs Committee has begun to take an interest in the decisions which are taken during the opening discussions at civil service level so as to draw in Parliament at the right moment. Moreover, the Netherlands' Members of the European Parliament have been asked to participate actively in the Committee work of the Netherlands' Parliament - and not only in that of the European Affairs Committee.

*Mrs. Renate Hellwig* (Bundestag, Germany) would not be able to say until after May 14th if Germany is "Europa fähig" at all, as it requires an amendment to the Constitution passed by a two thirds' majority to participate in the common European refugees policy and in the Schengen co-operation. Likewise, an amendment to the internal German provisions is required to participate in the co-operation on the combat of international crime, so that whitewashing of money can be punished more severely. An amendment to the Constitution of Germany is also required with a view to the common foreign policy and security policy so that Germany can take part not only in the peace-keeping forces but also in the peace-creating measures. Before that has been achieved, Germany cannot contribute to European defence policy. Bearing in mind the way in which the Maastricht Treaty is drawn up, the following words of criticism

are illogical, "The EC is no good for you cannot even solve the conflict in Yugoslavia". But nevertheless, they are often pronounced.

*Mr. Brian Lenihan* (Ireland) said that in Ireland one had recently reorganized the standing European Affairs Committee so that it controls the entire area comprised by the Maastricht Treaty thus also foreign policy. In a short while, it will also be possible to take part in the peace creating forces.

*The Netherlands* drew the attention to the fact that it is the Western European Union which deals with European security policy.

*Mr. Jacques Genton* (Sénat, France) pointed to the fact that it can be decided unanimously to transfer six of the areas which come under Pillar 3 to Pillar 1. Therefore, it has been necessary to insert a new provision into the French Constitution. The question of domestic security is a very sensitive one and therefore one must ensure domestic control before actually transferring it to Pillar 1. Also the Schengen Agreement which has not yet come into force causes problems.

*Mr. Maurice Ligot* (Assemblée Nationale, France) referred to the fact that the large number of persons who had voted "no" at the referendum in France was largely due to the citizens having felt that the civil servants in Brussels had far too much power. A result of this is that the French Constitution has been revised so as to give Parliament a better chance of controlling the Government's EC policy. All over Europe, there is a tendency for people to wish that Parliaments are drawn into the elaboration of the common policies to a greater extent. In this connection, Parliaments demand a knowledge of the documents at the time at which their Governments shall take a position on the matters in question in the Council of Ministers. The recent elections in France serve to underline the fact that the populations of the individual countries should be drawn into the European decision-making process via their elected politicians. As an example that the citizens also attach great importance to lesser matters, he mentioned that in France one does not want to give up the protection of the trade of goldsmith.

*Mr. Antonio Labo Xavier* (Portugal) said that in Portugal one is currently amending the Constitution as a result of the Maastricht Treaty. In that connection, one will take the Act seriously which gives Parliament the possibility of interfe-

ring with the EC policy of the Government - particularly when it is a question of the economic area. With regard to Pillars 2 and 3, Parliament would also like to keep up the pace but one is not so interested in interfering here. Many MPs find that when the Government has achieved something by means of a compromise after long-winded and difficult negotiations, Parliament shall not interfere. Against this stands Mr. Xavier's party - the Maximalists - who prefer everything to be checked beforehand.

*The Belgians* mentioned the risk that Europe would be run by top civil servants while the politicians of Europe lose their influence e.g. on how to combat narcotics crimes. Therefore, a standing committee is to be given the necessary competence to deal with the Schengen co-operation. One spoke in favour of co-operation between the national Parliaments and with the European Parliament in order to control the mutual agreements of the Governments within the fields which are comprised by Pillars 2 and 3 e.g. immigration policy. This might be achieved e.g. via the CEAC.

A Belgian representative of the Greens mentioned that the Belgian Government has now put itself under an obligation to brief both Chambers of the Belgian Parliament on EC proposals prior to the decisions but spoke of it as an emergency solution as the European Parliament should also have possibilities of controlling. The same should apply to Pillars 2 and 3. The Greens are in agreement with the UN Secretary General that instead of spending money on the arms race, the defence budget should be used for serious peace initiatives. And in the opinion of the Greens, this is only possible within the framework of the CSCE.

*Lord Slynn of Hadley* (House of Lords, UK) considered it a paradox that one of the fields which comes outside the competence of the EC Court of Justice, is the co-operation on legal questions. He mentioned that reports elaborated by the specialized European Affairs Committee of the House of Lords has been of great importance to the attitude taken by the Commission. Lord Slynn also underlined that regarding the questions which come outside the competence of the Court of Justice, it is even more important to have parliamentary control. Therefore, the Parliaments must know the proposals in detail before a final decision is taken on them.

The Greeks said that the European Parliament, on its own, take the initiative to setting up a committee of enquiry, and the citizens also have the possibility of applying to the European Parliament. The co-operation within Pillars 2 and 3 require unanimity but the national Parliaments are controlling the Ministers.

Mr. Ivar Nørgaard (Denmark) said that all matters concerning the Maastricht Treaty will be submitted to the EC Committee irrespective of whether it is a question of the Community area or of intergovernmental co-operation. This practice will be maintained when the Maastricht Treaty comes into force. In this way, it is possible to control the Ministers who are negotiating matters concerning Pillars 2 and 3. Denmark has, in particular, attached importance to the fact that it is a question of intergovernmental co-operation because this requires a consensus. This means that the EC Committee is in full control of matters which may be adopted as the Minister shall be given a mandate in order to enter into agreements. Furthermore, there is the possibility of discussing matters in a specialist committee e.g. the Legal Affairs Committee when it is a question of the legal co-operation and the Foreign Policy Committee when it is a question of foreign policy.

## 7. Appointing Members to the Committee of the Regions

The Chairman drew the attention to the fact that the reason for entering this item was merely that the delegates could provide one another with information as to how far the individual countries had come with regard to appointing Members to sit on the Committee of the Regions (cf. Article 198A in the Maastricht Treaty) and to account for the principles which underlie the appointment.

In Greece, there are no regional organs to take care of the appointment as there are only municipal organs. Therefore, it is up to the Government to undertake the appointment but the Opposition attaches importance to institutionalizing it.

In France, the former Government suggested that one third of the representatives shall come

from the twenty regions, one third from the departments and one third from the big cities, but the situation is not quite clear yet.

In Belgium, which is a federal state, both regions (defined by territories) and communities (defined by language) shall agree on the appointment. The tendency is pointing towards elected representatives.

In Germany, the constituent states make out the regions and it is laid down by statute that constituent states shall elect the representatives allowing, however, for the municipalities. One is aiming at appointing representatives at high level as it is believed that the Committee of the Regions will become very important and can be seen as the first step towards setting up a third Chamber in the EC.

In Italy, the question is not yet sufficiently clarified e.g. because the number of regions and autonomous provinces exceed the number of seats which Italy has on the Committee of the Regions. The Government is in favour of one third or half of the seats being taken by representatives of the provinces and of the big cities.

In Ireland, one has not reached a decision either but the regions are going to recommend representatives so that all regions will have elected representatives - and thus will not be represented by bureaucrats. Importance is attached to representing the poorer areas as one of the tasks of the Committee of the Regions is to ensure a better distribution of EC grants so that the average incomes of the poorest areas can be raised.

In the Netherlands, one has not yet discussed the appointment of representatives to sit on the Committee of the Regions. The municipalities and the twelve regions have not been able to agree and this is the reason why the Minister for the Interior has suggested that each group gets six representatives. In the Netherlands, the leaders of the municipalities as well as of the regions are appointed - not elected.

In the United Kingdom, the Government has just now accepted the only one of the many amendments to the ratification act to be adopted by the House of Commons i.e. no. 28, which is precisely about the appointment of Members to sit on the Committee of the Regions. Thus one makes sure that it will be a question of elected, local representatives.

In Portugal, the local, administrative councils,



authorized by the Constitution of 1976, have not been set up yet. But there are two autonomous regions, Madeira and the Azores. One has not decided yet how the twelve representatives of Portugal are to be appointed. The Portuguese Socialist Party is in favour of electing Members at local level.

In *Denmark*, we have not formally taken a stand on the question as the Maastricht Treaty has not been adopted yet, but when it happens it will hardly be a problem to allocate the seats regionally on the basis of our countries and municipalities.

In *Luxembourg*, the representatives shall be designated by the political groups. It is the Foreign Affairs Committee, who make the recommendations and the plenum of Parliament who make the formal decision on the appointment.

*Mr. David Martin* (European Parliament) pointed out that the point of view of the European Parliament is that the Committee of the Regions shall consist only of Members elected by the local authorities. They shall not be representatives of the Governments.

## Conclusions of the Presidency

*The Chairman* read out the conclusions which he had elaborated on his own. No real adoption took place at the meeting. After the reading out, some of the delegations did, however, comment. This led to one correction of a linguistic nature. The conclusions have been printed as **Annex 1**.

*Summary: Bjørn Einersen*

*Translation into English: Birgitte Wern*