most strongly, without in any way wishing to make a statement which is anti-Greek, to have a large vote of abstention to show that we do not want this kind of divisive politics any more. I hope Members will abstain. I will vote against.

Mr Spencer (ED) — My group will vote in favour because we have considered the Wedekind amendments in great detail; we have actually gone through the report itself in great detail. In some ways both the debate and some of the speeches made, now exist in a separate plane from that of the report itself, which is technically accurate and commands our support. Therefore I encourage my colleagues to vote for it.

* * *

TURNER REPORT (DOC. 1-611/83 — TRADE MARKS AND COMMUNITY TRADE MARKS): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke:

— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 11, 13 to 37, 39 to 53, 55 to 64, 66 to 68 (last part), 70, 72 (last part), 82, 84/rev. and 95;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 12, 69, 71, 75, 76, 78 to 81, 86 and 93.

Explanations of vote

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (FR) The importance of the resolution passed today deserves to be emphasized, and it is for this reason that I take this opportunity on behalf of our Group to congratulate the Commission on the initiative that it has taken under Articles 100 and 235 of the Treaty of Rome to establish a Community trade mark and to approximate the laws of the Member States relating to trade marks.

In so doing, the Commission — and I should like to pay tribute to all Members of the Commission and in particular to Mr Narjes whom we heard this morning — undertook a difficult task which is now on the point of reaching a successful outcome, a task which is worthwhile purely on the basis of the enlargement of the market in branded products. This point of view is shared not only by manufacturers, which is important in itself, but also by consumers, who have the right, when buying a product bearing a trade mark, to put their reliance in the quality of that product and the after-sales service.

This is why we are satisfied with the explanations given this morning by Mr Narjes. One point remains outstanding, however, and, although voting for these proposals for a directive and a regulation, my Group is anxious that the importance of the World Intellectual Property Office and the need for a proper relationship between the Madrid arrangement on international registration of trade marks and the proposed regulation for Community trade marks should not be overlooked. I refer in particular to the use of international registration as a basis for Community registration and, vice versa, the use of registration of the Community trade mark as a basis for its international registration.

It is important, therefore, that the Madrid arrangement should not be overlooked. In addition, it is essential for the Commission and, in due course, the Council to take account of the various preparations currently in progress for the establishment of a code on infringements under GATT auspices. The importance to be attached to an early outcome to these worldwide negotiations cannot be overemphasized. We are the European Economic Community, but there is a worldwide community, and the measures that we adopt must be coherent and conducive to development of the internal market that we wish to establish, so that we may also be secure in better protection vis-à-vis the rest of the world.
There remains a problem in this respect, and here I address my remarks to the Council: it is the problem of the eventual choice of legal instrument. We believe in regulation Community, but some States would prefer a convention. It is important for the Council to state its position on this point clearly, and in the near future. I would add that there is also the problem of the seat, which will be the subject of another debate. We support the French Government's position and hold that the seat should be in Strasbourg.

President. — Mr Couste, you have exceeded your speaking time.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Ladies and gentlemen, The Socialist Group would have been only too happy to vote for the Commission's proposal in the form in which it was submitted, albeit with the reservations I expressed this morning. I deeply regret the amendments the proposals have undergone here. The trade marks lobby will doubtless be pleased. I am not surprised that a conservative majority in this House has made concessions to these interests. I expressly deplore the fact, Mr Narjes, that the Commission too, as was apparent in your statements this morning, has been conciliatory towards the interests of this lobby and has given in to pressure from a whole number of Member States — although I appreciate the difficulty of your position.

We could also have supported a whole series of amendments against which we voted, but as we intimated this morning, we cannot agree to a number of points in a situation in which the internal market will experience difficulties as a result of what has been adopted here — a situation in which, and I shall say it again, even if Mr von Bismarck does not like it, the way is now open for holders of trade marks in a number of countries to manipulate them and consumer rights will no longer be adequately safeguarded.

The Socialist Group must, therefore, vote against the resolution and consequently — indeed it has already done so — against the proposal for a regulation in its present form, and against the proposal for a directive.

(Applause)

* * *

BROK REPORT (DOC. 1-758/83 — EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN ASSET FORMATION): ADOPTED

Explanation of vote

Mr Estgen (PPE), in writing. — (FR) I am delighted that our Parliament should be addressing itself to the task of fostering employee participation in asset formation, following the very happy example of initiatives in a number of Member States. I look upon the effects of the motion for a resolution on which we are going to vote as a development of economic democracy and citizenship in industry. It is not that I have any wish to echo the cry of the Russian Revolution of 1917: 'the factory for the workers!'.

I leave any such ambitions to our Communist colleagues, from whom such a cry would be more becoming.

It is our good fortune to live in a society in which the economic and the social command each other's respect, if only because they are mutually dependent and therefore condition each other.

The idea of rising above confrontation between the two factors of production in industry — capital and labour — and bringing them together is not a new idea.

The Catholic Church set forth its social doctrine in this area in a series of encyclicals, from Rerum Novarum in 1980 to Laborem Exercens in 1981, stressing the primacy of the labour factor over the capital factor.