

## Haagerup

One paragraph of the draft resolution therefore expresses the hope for a political structure leading to an equitable sharing of governmental responsibilities which would accommodate the identities of the two traditions. That would correspond better to the ideals and the tolerance *vis-à-vis* minorities practised in all EEC Member States. How it should be done must be left to the parties concerned and the authorities responsible, but we do call upon the governments of the United Kingdom and of the Republic of Ireland to assist actively in these efforts.

Among my positive findings as a rapporteur was the good will of the two governments to cooperate fully with each other. They do so already in the field of security — confirmation of which we have recently seen in the handing over of Dominic McGlinchey to the authorities in Northern Ireland — and they are willing to proceed beyond the present phase of mutual cooperation.

Another positive finding has been the constructive and often totally unselfish efforts to lower the barriers between the two communities carried out by private individuals, religious organizations, educational institutions and political groups. It is all too easy to inflame mutual distrust and dislike; but I have been encouraged to see how many people and institutions are determined to do just the opposite and to support moderation and cooperation and to discourage extremism and intolerance. Even if we do not and cannot interfere in the internal affairs of a Member State, let it be quite clear that this Parliament wants to associate itself with these forces of moderation, constructive goodwill and cooperation.

(Applause)

And when it comes to violence, this Parliament ceases to be neutral and impartial. We find no justification for terrorism in whatever form, and I can report to this House that in this condemnation of violence we are on the side, not only of the British and of the Irish Governments, but also of the very large majority of the people of Northern Ireland, who want nothing better than to go about their daily lives in peace.

(Applause)

Mr President, before concluding, I want to say that this report has benefited, to a very unusual degree, from the active cooperation and assistance of Members drawn from all six political groups. Without naming them all, I wish to mention the assistance of Mrs Baduel Glorioso and the support of Mr Segre, of the Communist Group. I want to acknowledge in full the valuable contributions made by John Hume, Brendan Halligan and Klaus Hänsch, of the Socialist Group. The same applies to Joe McCartin, Jean Penders, Jochen van Aerssen and Mrs Elise Boot, of the EPP Group. I also owe my thanks to Gérard Israël, a participant in our discussions, and in the latter

phases of the committee stage of the report Patrick Lalor, who also has been very helpful. Among the members of the European Democratic Group with whom I have been in touch on this, I want to single out the two active members of my small informal working party, Fred Catherwood and Robert Jackson, and also Lady Elles and Adam Fergusson, the former having stood up for me in my role as rapporteur both privately and publicly without necessarily agreeing with the decision to draw up a report on Northern Ireland in the first place.

Finally, Mr President, I must mention my own Irish group colleague, T.J. Maher, who in a way started it all when he raised the question more than four years ago in our group by saying, was it not appropriate to take a look at the conflict within our own Community and not only look at conflicts outside it. That, Mr President, brought me into the picture as chairing a small working party on Northern Ireland, in which position I benefited from the strong support of no less a European than the late Jean Rey, who was a Member of the Liberal Group until 1980.

If it had not been for the unfailing support of my own group chairman, Martin Bangemann, who launched the idea of a small informal working party, I should have been even less prepared for this task than I was when I was asked last year to write a report on Northern Ireland. With such help and the invaluable assistance I have had from my English associate, Richard Moore, and our Irish secretary, Valerie Tyrrell, I felt that I could not go totally wrong.

Here I conclude my speech. Mr President. I had planned simply to call for the support, both in words and in votes, of my colleagues. But I learned last night to my sorrow that the ED Group has decided to abstain. May I, therefore, towards the end address myself directly to the European Democratic Group.

I shall spare you all the arguments about the self-chosen isolation of the British, because I do not think these arguments are valid. I know from five years in this Parliament how sincerely European many of you think and act. I shall simply say that I know for certain that many of you want to vote for this report. Then do it! I have written it with much care to make it worthy of the support of all groups in this Parliament. It is very much a European report about a very intricate and difficult situation. Its positive impact will increase with your support, and I therefore urge you to give your active support by voting for it.

(Loud applause)

Mr Hume (S). — Mr President, I think the House, by its applause, has shown its appreciation of the work done by Mr Haagerup on this report. It is no easy task to come from outside into a place like Northern Ireland and a problem like Northern Ireland and to produce such a sensitive and finely-balanced docu-

## Hume

ment as Mr Haagerup has produced. I am sure I speak for all in the House in expressing our appreciation to him for the work he has done.

Mr President, the problem that we address in this debate today is one that is an affront to the ideals on which this European Community was founded. The very fact that this discussion is taking place — the first time ever that a major discussion in an international democratic assembly has taken place on the problems of Northern Ireland — is in itself an expression of powerful concern about the continuation of this conflict within the borders of the European Community — an expression of concern and urgency that is summed up in the tragedy itself, not alone in the deaths and injuries of thousands of people, and the serious economic crisis which interacts on the political crisis, particularly among young people. These Mr Haagerup has accurately identified, and his proposals, I have no doubt, will meet with unanimous support in this House in the economic sphere.

However, I suppose that for those of us in Northern Ireland, the tragedy and the urgency are really summed up symbolically by the fact that we have come to the stage where it has been necessary to build a brick wall to separate Catholics from Protestants on the streets of Belfast; and that that brick wall is called a 'peace line'. That wall is an indictment of everyone involved in the Irish problem, because the only message that comes from it is that all our past attitudes have brought us here and brought us to that wall. As well as an indictment, it is a challenge to all the parties to the conflict to recognize that past attitudes have brought us here and to rethink those attitudes with a view to reaching a lasting peace in Ireland.

Broadly speaking, there are three parties to that conflict. There is a Protestant tradition in Ireland, represented in this House by Unionist representatives. There is the Irish Nationalist, broadly Catholic tradition, also represented in virtually every group in this House. Then there is the British Government, which governs Northern Ireland. Each of these three groupings must recognize that a major rethink is necessary if we are to solve this tragedy.

*(Applause from the Socialist Group)*

The Protestant tradition — as I say, represented in this House — has an honourable history in the island of Ireland. It has always sought to maintain its distinctiveness and its difference within Ireland. That is an objective with which few could quarrel, because every society is the richer for diversity. My quarrel with the political leaders of that tradition is over the methods they have used to attain that objective: 'All power in our own hands. What we have, we hold. No surrender. Not an inch.' That exclusivist approach to power and the exclusion of whole sections of the community, discrimination against them, inherently constitutes a

violent attitude which in the end will always lead to conflict. It is an attitude that must be re-examined, because there are ways in which that same object of maintaining difference and diversity can be achieved without coming into conflict with the people with whom they share the island of Ireland.

The British Government would have us believe that they are the referees between the warring Irish factions. They are, of course, no such thing. They are part of the problem. The only identifiable policy that we can see and have seen over the years is a unilateral guarantee to one section of the community, a guarantee which reinforces the sectarian solidarity that runs right to the heart of the problem. There needs to be a much broader approach — an approach based on the need to bring the people of Ireland together in agreement and in a manner acceptable to both parts of it.

Then there is my own tradition, the Irish Nationalist tradition, represented, as I say, in almost every group in this House. We have had handed down to us a rather romantic vision of Ireland which bears little relation to the reality of life in Ireland today. The piece of earth called Ireland is already united. It is its people who are divided, and you cannot unite people at the point of a gun. You can only drive them further apart.

*(Applause)*

The spirit of Irish patriotism in 1984 must have a great deal more to do with the spilling of sweat than with the spilling of blood. Indeed, Mr President, it ought to have more to do with the real meaning of the Irish national flag. Violence is an affront to the meaning of that flag, which contains the white of peace between the orange and the green. It is that version of patriotism that will prevail in the end. That is the very same spirit that motivated the founding fathers of this Community of which this Parliament is the representative. Let us remember that the peoples represented in this Chamber, twice in this century alone, slaughtered one another by the million with a savagery that has been unparalleled in human history yet they had the vision and the strength to rise above the past and to create institutions that allow the peoples of Europe to grow together at their own speed.

Mr President, is it too much to ask that we can do the same for Ireland, to create institutions which will allow the people of Ireland to grow together at their own speed? The framework in which that can take place has been identified by Mr Haagerup in his report. It is the British-Irish framework. It is the coming together of the two governments to create the dialogue and the process that will bring that about. Let us hope that this debate today will act as a spur to them to get on with the job as a matter of urgency!

*(Applause)*