

Giolitti

and others must be regarded as an alternative or indeed opposite approach to the overall view of Mediterranean problems which Mr Pöttering mentioned. He it was who said we needed, also because of Community enlargement, a proper programme or plan for the Mediterranean area of the Community.

On the subject of the Mediterranean problems, Mr President, I must give an answer to the question which was tabled by Mr Muntingh and others. On 23 May 1979 the Commission recommended that the Member States should include in their regional development programmes measures stemming from other national or Community policies as well as those coming directly under regional policy. These other policies include Community environmental policy, which is in fact mentioned in the Muntingh question.

Community policy in the environmental field can, of course, lead to purification operations. We must remember, however, that the investments which Mr Muntingh links to the job problem which is particularly acute in the Mediterranean area is highly capital-intensive, and this means that relatively few jobs emerge. It is the Commission's view that other environmental measures, such as reafforestation or the prevention of coastal erosion or urban renewal, could be effective in providing new jobs.

As for the protection of the Mediterranean region from the pollution mentioned in the question, the Community has passed Community legislation on pollution and it also plays an active part in the UN plan for the Mediterranean. To be sure, the Commission can finance building and infrastructure projects for the treatment of waste water through the European Regional Development Fund and by way of loans, observing the conditions of use of these facilities, exclusively on projects submitted by the governments of the Member States. This means that the governments of the Member States have to take the initiative in this area, but the Commission will do its job to encourage and promote such initiative.

I have had to be brief, Mr President, but I think I have managed to convey the fundamental Commission view on the vast range of problems which was brought to our attention by Mrs Martin's report, by the questions and by the various speeches we have heard. Once again let me say how grateful I am for the contribution they bring to deeper consideration of the matter and to the formulation of solutions suited to the serious, acute and pressing problems we still have with Community regional policy.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

7. Community regional policy and Northern Ireland

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-177/81), drawn up by Mrs Martin on behalf of the

Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on Community regional policy and Northern Ireland.

I call the rapporteur.

Mrs Martin, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report I am presenting to you is the outcome of the motion for resolution tabled by Mr Hume and consort; in the light of the events of the past few months it is particularly appropriate for it must be said that the troubles which the Northern Ireland region has known, and indeed those which it is suffering today, are not unconnected with the socio-economic situation.

So that I could report to you properly on the problems which this region of our Community is suffering — and so that I could have a better appreciation of them myself — I visited the province and I would like to thank in this Assembly all those who helped me during my visit. I should make it plain that this is only a preliminary study, but I trust that this report will make you fully aware of the range of problems facing the people of Northern Ireland.

Northern Ireland is a small region of just under 11 000 km². It has a total population of 1.5 million and a working population of 600 000; its economic and social characteristics are summed up in a very high rate of employment and one of the lowest per capita incomes of the Community.

At the end of last year average unemployment was in excess of 16% of the working population and was over 32% in certain areas. This unemployment is the result of a sharp decline in vacancies resulting from the decline in the traditional industries such as shipbuilding and textiles. These two alone employed 89 500 people in 1950; today they employ only 25 400. At the same time, agriculture, which is a far larger employer than in the rest of the United Kingdom, accounting for 10% of employment in the region as opposed to 3% for the whole of the United Kingdom, has reduced its workforce by half since 1950. This decline in employment is made all the worse by one of the highest birth rates in Europe, which brings a high rate of job demand in its wake.

The troubles Northern Ireland has known for the last ten years or so have also harmed the region's economy, particularly tourism which seems to have potential for development, and the distributive trades. The troubles have also had their harmful effects on living conditions and the environment, particularly in the urban areas of Belfast and Londonderry, the more so in Belfast where it has not yet been possible to start reconstruction: I know because I have seen it during my visit to Belfast with Mr Taylor and Mr Paisley. And yet, when the public, particularly young people, no longer have enough room at home, when they have

Martin

nothing to do — for there is no work — they are open to any temptation . . . And when in addition they are living against a background of violence it is quite natural for them frequently to be attracted by it. This I say because I believe it: the desire for peace is closely linked to living conditions and employment. That is why we have a duty to do everything we can to help this region of our own Community find the way out of its present problems.

We must do it all the more urgently since the problems involved are so wide-ranging that there can be no doubt that many years will be needed to put things right.

This is why our Community felt that Mr Hume's motion for resolution was so appropriate and why we ask you to approve the conclusions of the motion: they can form the basis on which we can start to rebuild the region.

What we must do is ask the Commission to draw up a schedule of more Community intervention — not just ERDF — since the United Kingdom joined the Community, because what we must first do is measure what impact Community aid has on the economic and social development of Northern Ireland, on the creation of stable and productive jobs and raising the standard of living. Community aid has not been negligible, but all too often it has unfortunately been retained by the United Kingdom Government as reimbursement of its own proposed expenditure in the province, rather than being additional expenditure. That is a problem with which we are already familiar.

We must also invite the Commission to assess, on the basis of the new regional development programme which the British Government is to forward to the Commission, the economic outlook for Northern Ireland, together with the Community objectives and the measures and resources needed to achieve a certain parity of living standards and employment in relation to the Community average, and then check that this regional development programme covers the whole province of Northern Ireland, that it is comprehensive, coherent and independent, and above all that the local and regional authorities are involved in drawing it up. That, I feel, is the essential element if this region is to be helped to develop on its own, and without which little or no progress will be made.

We must also ensure that Northern Ireland receives an appropriate share of the special financial contribution paid to the United Kingdom, particularly to development infrastructures. The Committee hopes that the Commission will make a particular study of demographic projections and medium and long term job creation requirements; guidelines for land use and decisions on infrastructure; guidelines for industrial structure; development of agriculture and food industries, particularly to combat rural unemployment, which is no less serious for being less obvious; opening

the Community market to products from Northern Ireland and research into technologies with commercial potential; introduction of incentive measures for industrial development such as tax exemption for at least five years designed to encourage the creation of new industries and tax reductions on profits from exports; prospects for tourism; the role and coordination of local and regional development agencies — for, I would remind you, the Irish themselves must be given more and more responsibility for their own affairs; professional training and setting up a management training centre; special programmes for rural areas where unemployment is highest and the role of subsidies to counteract 'natural' disadvantages. As regards transport costs, the principle of 'territorial continuity' should be recognised by equating the cost of the crossing between Great Britain and Northern Ireland with the cost of the journey by rail. As regards the higher cost of energy, an 'integrated' system should be introduced for the whole of the United Kingdom, 'applying the same price everywhere, and above all, as a matter of urgency, the renewal of housing stock and renovation of accommodation in certain areas (particularly Belfast), since job creation must be linked with improved living conditions.

I am convinced, Mr President, — and I have now almost finished — that by making the situation clear, by identifying the goals to be achieved and the means to be used in their achievement we can, if it is the will of Europe, make a start on rebuilding Northern Ireland.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Hume. — Mr President, as a representative from Northern Ireland and as author of the resolution that led to Mrs Martin's report, I should like to begin by expressing my deep appreciation and gratitude to Mrs Martin for the excellent report she has produced, and not only for the report but for the extraordinary amount of work she put into it, including a three-day visit to Northern Ireland, where she met every interest there in a very gruelling schedule. I think she deserves the appreciation of everyone for the effort she has put into it.

(Applause)

Everybody knows, Mr President, that there is a political crisis in Northern Ireland, but not everyone is aware that there is an economic crisis of almost similar proportions. When I introduced this resolution to this Parliament in November 1979 on behalf of the Socialist Group, the level of unemployment in Northern Ireland was 12%. Today, as I speak, it is over 17%, and by all reliable estimates it is likely to reach over 20% by the end of this year. Already 1 in 5 adults is out of work in Northern Ireland, and in large pockets of Northern Ireland in both rural and urban areas unemployment has been well over 30% and close on 40% for the past decade. Nowhere in Europe can

Hume

match the figure for the town of Strabane — 34.6% unemployment, i.e. 1 out of 3 adults out of work. Can any other area of Europe claim to have such acute unemployment problems?

Related to those problems is an equally bleak picture of general social deprivation. In Belfast 1 out of 4 houses lacks basic amenities. Poverty is widespread, as reflected in the high level of payments of supplementary and welfare benefits. A report prepared by and for the European Commission indicates that 40% of all households in Northern Ireland are below the poverty line.

However, I do not want to waste the limited time I have in this debate on statistics of unemployment, poverty and deprivation. I think that my case has been fully endorsed by Mrs Martin's excellent and comprehensive report, which has been unanimously adopted by the Regional Affairs Committee, and also by the equally comprehensive report of Mrs Dekker, which has been endorsed by the Social Affairs Committee of this Parliament. In short, the dossier is there for all to see. Neither has the British Government, the authority responsible for Northern Ireland, challenged the case. On the contrary, in fact. When the resolution was first presented British MEPs were asked by the Government, through the Northern Ireland Office, to support this resolution, and I would like to express my appreciation of that action by the government.

However, what I want to get across to this Parliament this evening is the very difficult economic and social background which we, as politicians engaged in trying to find a political solution to the overall problem of Northern Ireland, must work against. It is an economic and social background which is heartbreaking, saps hope and deprives people, especially young people, of their rightful expectation of growing up in a society which will offer them the opportunity of fulfilment. I am personally convinced that the search for peace in Northern Ireland is intimately linked with the winning of better living and working conditions. Violence has cost us jobs as well as lives, but no one can be asked to build a peaceful political system on the ruins of a shattered economy. It is here, in the economic and social sphere, that the European institutions have a special role and a special responsibility given to them by the Treaties in the inspiring words

To create, by establishing an economic community, the basis for a broader and deeper community among peoples long divided by bloody conflicts.

If there is idealism in this Community and if there is a human face, then here is an area which is troubled today and which this Community can step in and assist.

The three Northern Ireland Members of this Parliament — and let us not disguise the fact that we have deep and indeed bitterly divided views on the political

situation in Northern Ireland — today make common cause in this Parliament. Today we speak with one voice on the issue of economic and social deprivation in Northern Ireland. We appeal to this Parliament and to the institutions of this Community for solidarity and for practical help. We appeal to you in the name of our common concern for the future of all our people in Northern Ireland.

What do we want you to do? We know and we appreciate that in many ways Northern Ireland benefits from priority treatment from the Community. Here I would like to pay a very warm tribute to Commissioner Giolitti and his colleagues in the Commission for their sensitivity to our problems and for their willingness to help. Commissioner Giolitti has not been slow to visit Northern Ireland and to see for himself and to express his willingness to help.

The Commission has supported the introduction of several programmes to benefit Northern Ireland. I think, for example, of the special measures to support agriculture and of the integrated operation proposed for Belfast. These actions are naturally welcome to us. Indeed we have lobbied hard and persistently for them.

However, the fact is that despite all these measures, despite the fact that of all the regions in the Community Northern Ireland receives the highest *per capita* aid, apart from Greenland, something is clearly going badly wrong and the aid is not having the effect it is intended to have. Since this resolution was introduced unemployment has risen from 12 to 17% — increased by 50%. Some of the things which have gone wrong are linked to our membership of the European Community. We have lost huge sections of our once prosperous man-made fibre industry, for example. The very day that Commissioner Giolitti announced the new proposals for the non-quota section in border areas a large textile plant in my own city closed down depriving 600 people of work, and that was only last week.

We are therefore asking, as a first step, that the Commission should carry out a rapid study of the impact of Community membership on Northern Ireland. We appreciate that no such study can be exhaustive, nor do we need it to be. It should be a first short step. More importantly, this study should review the prospects facing the Northern Ireland economy. We want to know what kind of future we have or whether we have any future at all. What can we offer to give hope to the young school-leaver in Northern Ireland today, to the shipyard worker who has been made redundant, to the health and community worker or the construction worker who have lost their jobs by the thousand because of the drastic cuts in public expenditure and because of economic collapse? The next step after such a study, of course, is logical — we have to plan and have a plan for our future. We must make an assessment of the potential of the Northern

Hume

Ireland economy, of what measures we must take, of what investment is needed, of what new patterns of life and work and pay are called for if we are to offer any hope to the people in that strife-torn area.

A number of detailed suggestions for economic development are made in the report. My two colleagues from Northern Ireland, Mr Taylor and Mr Paisley, have for their part made a number of extremely valid proposals and suggestions, and we together call on the Commission to consider these ideas and we intend to develop our thinking and proposals in the month ahead. The approach we are urging to regional policy in relation to Northern Ireland is, in fact, the approach urged by the Commission itself and fully supported by this Parliament in our advocacy of regional development programmes. We wanted, in other words, to be taken seriously for a change, because for us it is literally and factually a matter of life and death.

If a proper regional development programme is to be drawn up and if the contribution of the Community is to be clearly identified, then we will have to come to grips once and for all with the question of additionality. If the Community is to have a positive effect in Northern Ireland, then its aid must be channelled visibly and channelled directly. We realize, of course, and we openly state that financial resources and solidarity will at the end of the day be needed, but we see this as a question to be tackled at the appropriate time, not here and now. So I am calling today with confidence on this Parliament to endorse this resolution. I am hopeful that the broad basis of support which it has gained throughout the Northern Ireland community will be reflected by broad support in this Parliament. In my eyes this Parliament will fulfil its responsibilities and live up to its role by adopting this resolution.

Each institution of this Community complements the other, it will then be for the Commission to put practical shape and to inject its expertise and experience, especially in questions of regional development, into the framework presented to it today with vigour, concern and with deep seriousness by this Parliament. It is the Commission which has the power to reflect and to propose. We call on it to listen to the message of this resolution and grasp the opportunity offered by it. It should report to the Parliament on the results of its work and its reflections before the end of this year.

I earnestly urge the Council also to take note at this stage of the resolution and of this debate, since it is in the Council that the question of financial resources will ultimately have to be settled.

We are at the beginning, Mr President, of a process which, with the help, patience, solidarity and practical concern of everyone, may help to begin to lead the people of Northern Ireland out of the darkness in which they now find themselves.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, for the second time today I warmly congratulate Mrs Martin. Her report is one of considerable significance, and my group strongly supports it. Shortage of time, Mr President, enables me to concentrate only, I am afraid, on the amendment which I have moved myself; my colleague, Mr Taylor, will be the main speaker for our group for this debate.

The amendment I moved touches on that controversial issue of additionality, an issue which has been raised several times during today's proceedings. My group has always argued strongly for the principle of additionality, that is, that Community grants should be additional, and should be seen to be additional, to assistance given by the Member States. But I would hope that the House would make a modification to the wording of paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution without changing the substance of that motion. I am afraid that the present wording could be used by the uniformed or the mischievous in that it takes the United Kingdom Government to task without making the point that all other governments also follow the practice of using some of the grants to help finance the assistance, which they give, particularly to industry in the regions.

I want to kill stone dead any impression that somehow the United Kingdom Government could be lining its own pocket, as it were, with European money, or robbing Northern Ireland, or using funds improperly. I know that the three members for Northern Ireland are the first to acknowledge that the United Kingdom Government has put millions upon million of pounds into regional and social measures designed to help tackle the serious economic problems of Ulster; the problem which Mr Hume has spoken so eloquently about just now. Indeed, in 1979-80, Britain's expenditure in Northern Ireland was 944 million pounds out of a total public expenditure in the province of 2 483 million. 37% of that public expenditure — and I am not including the cost of security operations — was financed, and rightly so, from other parts of the United Kingdom, or the European Community. There is nothing to apologise for there.

Quite rightly, in recognition of Northern Ireland's social and economic problems, public expenditure per head is higher there than in England, Scotland and Wales. In 1980, the total allocation of Community funds to Northern Ireland came to 52 million pounds. In determining the level of public expenditure, the government says — and I believe it — that it takes these receipts into account and that the total is higher by these amounts than it otherwise would be, and that therefore the principle of additionality is kept. But what the report says and what we have always said is that we want to move to a situation in all Member States where it is clearly seen that help from the Community is additional. Mr President, I beg to move my amendment.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Maher. — Mr President, I too would like to compliment my colleague in the Liberal Group, Mrs Martin, for the excellence of her report, and particularly for the objectivity with which she presented it against a very difficult background.

Mr President, I want to make one point in particular. I don't think that we in the European Community or in this Parliament can continue indefinitely to avoid the political problem in the North of Ireland. I support fully and wholeheartedly every effort being made to relieve the economic distress in Northern Ireland. I fully support all those measures. Nevertheless it must be recognized that the resources which are badly needed there to create employment and develop agriculture and industry will continue to be wasted, at least to some extent, while the political problem of Northern Ireland remains and while the violence goes on. In that kind of society it is very difficult to make the best possible use of financial or other resources in order to bring about development.

It has struck me forcibly on a number of occasions that in this Parliament in particular we are always ready to discuss and interest ourselves in problems in Afghanistan, Zimbabwe or Vietnam or wherever. In fact, the further away these difficulties are or these problems arise — political problems or problems of violence or war — the more ready we seem to be to introduce motions of urgency and resolutions in order to discuss them. Here we have in our own Community as a whole not a very large one, but nevertheless an open wound, where there is suffering and distress and people are dying, soldiers and civilians. Yet we have stood back from this problem and not really interested ourselves as a Community in helping to resolve it. It is absolutely essential to provide as much economic aid and assistance as possible, but I still believe that that will have only a relatively small effect on the ground while we continue to avoid the main problem. Wouldn't it be reasonable to think that the other member countries of the European Community, who are joined with the UK and the Republic of Ireland in this family of nations, might help us and interest themselves more directly in trying to find a long-term solution to this age-old problem?

I make that suggestion in a constructive spirit and a spirit of friendship, because the last thing I want to do is to say anything that would make the difficulties worse than they are in the North of Ireland. I feel that somehow or other this problem that has existed since 1922 between the Republic and the UK is not going to be resolved unless there is intervention from an interested and concerned party who would have the influence to propose a solution and help us to achieve it. Only in this way can the other measures which we are so interested in introducing for the North of

Ireland begin to take effect in a situation where some return to normality can be brought about and where the investment we are making in agriculture and industry can, in fact, bear some fruit. The relationship between the Republic and Northern Ireland is extremely important from the economic point of view. We must live together, we must trade together. What happens in the South is important to the North, and vice versa. Therefore I would like to highlight this fact and appeal to the European Parliament to spearhead a move which will bear in on the political problem in order that these other measures can be made to be fruitful.

President. — I call the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Blaney. — Mr President, I too wish to congratulate the rapporteur on a very excellent report. I also congratulate the three movers of the motion that gave rise to this report and I only regret that the machinery of our Parliament is such that it has taken a rather long time to deal with the report on a matter that is so urgent, as has been pointed out by various speakers and by the rapporteur in the report itself.

The situation in Northern Ireland is no doubt a tragic one. It is without question the most troubled area in the entire Community, and this without doubt places a special responsibility on the Community to set about in the best way it can to help to implement the request and the invitation of the report and to get down to the in-depth study of the problems which are affecting our people in Ireland to such a degree and to come up with, as early as possible, new additional proposals that would, even for the time being, alleviate what is undoubtedly a most difficult situation — a situation of unemployment and deprivation that is probably unequalled in any part of the Community, and which did not just happen yesterday, and is not the result of the last ten years solely. The last ten years is more likely the result of what has been a growing situation, a growing cancer if you wish, over the last sixty years if not longer.

I fully support what is being proposed in the report and will fully support any proposals that may emanate from the Commission as a result of what we are talking about in this report at the moment, because help is needed there, is needed badly and is needed urgently, for all of the reasons already outlined by my colleague, John Hume. He and the other speakers who have a very full knowledge of the situation — our other two Members from the six counties of Ireland — will be able to outline in detail, if that were necessary the sad sorry situation. However the 34% unemployment level that you have heard about speaks eloquently enough of the sad and sorry plight our people are now in, and that it will undoubtedly, on

Blaney

present indications, worsen before it gets better. This is unfortunately and evidently true. So we do not only wish this report to be adopted, if possible, unanimously by this House, to underline our concern for the sad plight of our people in Northern Ireland, but also to give the Commission the sense of urgency that really surrounds this whole situation at the moment.

As I have said elsewhere, I will support any and all proposals that may come forward. The only plea that I would make is that we pass the report unanimously, if possible, and that we place the urgency of it above all other considerations particularly within our regional policy, I am sure the Commissioner who has shown his concern by his visitations there will be at the forefront of pressing forward any proposals that may emanate from the studies that are being requested. I can only, as I say, join the others in recommending to the House, that they give it their fullest support and in that way underline the urgency of the matter, in the hope that something can be done much more quickly than at our normal pace of getting things done through the EEC. I am not reflecting on anybody when I say that, it is just that the paraphernalia is difficult to get through. Let us try to see if we could cut through the paraphernalia and really do something worthwhile and spectacular and quick, to try and relieve this very sad and sorry situation.

President. — I call the non-attached Members.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, this is by far the most important debate held to date in this Assembly on Northern Ireland. We are all, and not least the Northern Ireland Members — Mr Hume, Mr Taylor and myself — deeply indebted to Mrs Martin for the diligent way in which she has prepared her report. She was widely welcomed in Northern Ireland, and though her stay was short, we hope she will come back again and see us in the province.

I am happy to say that I am able to give this report a general and generous welcome. Mrs Martin had the wisdom to keep her report in the main on strictly social and economic lines, and its cautious avoidance of party-political points is in my opinion its greatest strength. Of course that in itself is a welcome recognition of the fact that this Community has no jurisdiction whatever over the political or constitutional affairs of Northern Ireland, and a recent resolution of this Assembly underscored that important matter. We in Northern Ireland have suffered enough from foreign meddlers without the EEC also getting involved. Let me say explicitly that if political interference were ever to be the price of EEC economic assistance to Northern Ireland, then that is a price that neither I nor those whom I represent in this House would ever pay. Economic aid is not, and must not be, a licence or an excuse for constitutional or political meddling.

So I approach this debate solely on the basis of social and economic issues, and for that reason I have tabled Amendment No 2 so that the one potentially divisive political statement that is contained in the resolution may be removed. I refer to the suggestion in the eighth indent that full employment and a better standard of living in Northern Ireland would bring peace to my troubled province. I wish, Sir, that were true. I wish it were only an economic problem that we had to deal with. As is evident in this House, there is agreement between the three representatives from Northern Ireland on this economic problem. It is naive in the extreme to suggest that it is lack of jobs or a low standard of living that cause the Irish Republican Army to deny us the peace we all seek and callously to murder the people of Northern Ireland. The fallacy of that contention, Sir, is seen in the fact that the worst year of violence that we have had in Northern Ireland in the last 10 years was 1974, when our unemployment was at the lowest percentage: it was only 5% — less than one-third of what it is today. It is not a lack of jobs that causes the IRA to blow up factories which are providing employment for their own community. Let me illustrate this point. The British Government has spent millions of pounds on the De Lorean car plant, on the edge of West Belfast, where there is very high unemployment. What happened recently? That factory was bombed — bombed by the IRA, who gloried in the fact they had bombed — and as a result another seven million pounds had to be brought out of the British exchequer to keep that car plant in production.

I urge this Assembly to accept my amendment and therefore remove from this resolution the one section which could deny it cross-community support in Northern Ireland. By removal of the words I referred to, this resolution loses nothing but gains much.

What I have said does not in any way mean that I am unconcerned about unemployment and social conditions in Northern Ireland. Far from it. These great issues concern me greatly, and I have continually raised them in this House. With over 100 000 people officially unemployed — although the figure is more like 125 000 unemployed in reality — and with the fact that our textile industry, which in 1960 employed 58 000, now only employs 20 900, the sad state that we are in becomes evident. The needs of Northern Ireland are as great as they are obvious, and as such they demand urgent attention by this Community, which, let it be said, has to date received more from Northern Ireland than it has given to it. As a member of the British House of Commons, I have sought by parliamentary questions to probe this matter to the full, and these figures that I give this House are not my figures. They are the figures of the Government of the United Kingdom. Since Northern Ireland entered this Community to the end of 1980, it is credited with having paid into the EEC budget 166.7 million but received a gross figure of only 141 million. Of this 141 million given for Northern Ireland by the various

Paisley

Community funds, the United Kingdom Government admits in parliamentary replies that I have that it has retained 83.44 million to offset its own spending in Northern Ireland and passed on, as additional expenditure, a mere 57.66 million. That, I suggest to this House, is a public scandal which needs to be urgently examined by this Community, because not only is this a fraud by the United Kingdom Government on the people of Northern Ireland, it is equally a fraud on this Community, for the funds given for Northern Ireland by the EEC are intended to be additional to the national government's contribution to the problems of Northern Ireland. It is therefore imperative that following this resolution there is a special investigation by the Commission on this crucial point. I believe the question of additionality is the key to giving real economic aid to Northern Ireland. If the United Kingdom Government is allowed to continue to pocket 60% of all monies given by the EEC for Northern Ireland while that province sinks deeper and deeper into an economic quagmire, then surely this Community is almost as guilty as the United Kingdom Government.

In my opinion, the recognition of additionality as fundamental is one of the most positive things said in the whole of Mrs Martin's report. But for all this fine and wise words, this resolution will come to nothing if it is not acted on with expedition and concern by the Commission and Council. The Community has shown itself able and willing to act decisively in other areas, as for example, in response to the terrible earthquake in Italy a few months ago. Rightly so, of course, but it should be realized by all that we in Northern Ireland have suffered an economic earthquake which has thrown almost 1 in 5 of our workers out of their jobs and which has wrought havoc with many families and left a great gaping gulf between our province and economic prosperity. In terms of unemployment, Northern Ireland cries out for aid from this Community, and as this EEC has already designated Northern Ireland as one of its five areas of priority, I think then that it should be able through the Commission and Council of Ministers to see to it that the swallowing of funds at Whitehall is removed and that the funds from this Community are channelled to Northern Ireland.

I trust that this Assembly will give its wholehearted support to this resolution and that the Commission and Council will apply themselves to the tasks underscored in this report with a keenness and spirit that is capable of meeting at least some of the economic dilemmas which are facing us today in Northern Ireland. I would like to add that the resolution tabled by Mr Hume today is coming forward and is taking some effect and that I would identify myself with all the efforts that have been made both outside and inside this House in order that something may be done along the lines of Mrs Martin's resolution.

President. — The time obliges us to suspend this debate. It will continue tomorrow, after the first voting time.

(The sitting was suspended at 8.05 p.m. and resumed at 9.05 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

Vice-President

8. *Common organization of the market in sugar*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Markozanis and others, on the proposal for a Council regulation (EEC) on the common organization of the market in sugar with particular reference to the 'masse de manoeuvre' or margin (Doc. 1-221/81).

In the absence of Mr Markozanis, I call Mr Vardakas.

Mr Vardakas. — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, during the negotiations on Greek accession to the European Community, the question was raised as to what sugar quota should be fixed for Greece under the system applying in the Community. But Greece, unlike the other Member States of the Community, produced only sugar and no isoglucose, and so the A quota for Greece was fixed at 290 000 tonnes for sugar only.

Since then the question has been raised concerning isoglucose production by Greek industries. As you are aware, the raw material from which isoglucose is produced is maize, of which there is a shortfall in the Community.

The proposal in Article 25 of the new regulation involving the reciprocal transfer of sugar and isoglucose production quotas means for Greece the compulsory reduction of its sugar quota, which in turn means that Greece is not even self-sufficient in sugar. If it is retained, this measure will adversely affect Greek sugar-beet production.

In these circumstances the fixing of the isoglucose quota independently of the already fixed sugar quota is perfectly reasonable and fair.

President. — I call Mr Dimopoulos.

Mr Dimopoulos. — (GR) Mr President, I have asked to speak both because Mr Godikas is absent and