EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999 *2004*

Session document

FINAL
A5-0063/1999

16 November 1999

REPORT

on the communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a European Union Action Plan to Combat Drugs (2000-2004) (COM(1999)239)

Committee on Citizens' Freedoms and Rights, Justice and Home Affairs

Rapporteur: Marietta Giannakou-Koutsikou

Symbols for procedures	
*	Consultation procedure *majority of the votes cast*
**I	Cooperation procedure (first reading) *majority of the votes cast*
**II	Cooperation procedure (second reading) *majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position* *majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend the common position*
***	Assent procedure *majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
***I	Codecision procedure (first reading) *majority of the votes cast*
***II	Codecision procedure (second reading) *majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position* *majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend the common position*
***III	Codecision procedure (third reading) *majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text*

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission)

Abbreviations for committees		
I.	AFET	Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy
II.	BUDG	Committee on Budgets
III.	CONT	Committee on Budgetary Control
IV.	LIBE	Committee on Citizens' Freedoms and Rights, Justice and Home Affairs
V.	ECON	Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs
VI.	JURI	Committee on Legal Affairs and the Internal Market
VII.	INDU	Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy
VIII.	EMPL	Committee on Employment and Social Affairs
IX.	ENVI	Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy
X.	AGRI	Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development
XI.	PECH	Committee on Fisheries
XII.	REGI	Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism
XIII.	CULT	Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport
XIV.	DEVE	Committee on Development and Cooperation
XV.	AFCO	Committee on Constitutional Affairs
XVI.	FEMM	Committee on Women's Rights and Equal Opportunities
XVII.	PETI	Committee on Petitions

CONTENTS

Page

Procedural page 4

A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION 5

B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT 17

Opinion of the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy 23

By letter of 28 May 1999 the Commission forwarded its communication to the Council and the European Parliament on a European Union Action Plan to Combat Drugs (2000-2004) to Parliament (COM(1999)0239).

At the sitting of 13 September 1999 the President of Parliament announced that she had referred the communication to the Committee on Citizens' Freedoms and Rights, Justice and Home Affairs as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy, the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy, the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs and the Committee on Development and Cooperation for their opinions (C5-0093/1999).

The Committee on Citizens' Freedoms and Rights, Justice and Home Affairs had appointed Marietta Giannakou-Koutsikou rapporteur at its meeting of 28 July 1999.

It considered the Commission communication and the draft report at its meetings of 27 September, 19 October, 25 October, 8 November and 15 November 1999.

At the last meeting it adopted the motion for a resolution by 31 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

The following were present for the vote: Watson, chairman; Evans and Posselt, vice-chairmen; Giannakou-Koutsikou, rapporteur; Andersson (for Cashman), Angelilli, Berger (for Karamanou), Blokland (for Krarup, pursuant to Rule 153(2)), von Blötticher, Bourmediene-Thiery, Camre, Cappato, Cederschiöld, Ceyhun, Coelho, Dell'Utri, Deprez, Di Lello Finuoli, Di Pietro, Duhamel, Frahm, Gebhardt (for Schmid), Gemelli (for Buttiglione, pursuant to Rule 153(2)), Hernandez Mollar, Kessler, Kirkhope, Klamt, Krivine (for Sylla), La Perrière (for Pasqua, pursuant to Rule 153(2)), Manders (for Ludford, pursuant to Rule 153(2)), Musotto (for Ferri, pursuant to Rule 153(2)), Newton Dunn (for Hannan), Paciotti, Palacio Vallelersundi (for Cornillet), Pinker, Roure (for Sousa Pinto), Schulz, Sörensen, Swiebel, Terrón I Cusí, Turco (for Vanhecke) and Vattimo.

The opinion of the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Industry is attached.

On 22 September, 23 September, 21 September and 14 October 1999 respectively the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy, the Committee on Development and Cooperation and the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs decided not to deliver opinions.

The report was tabled on 16 November 1999.

The deadline for tabling amendments is 10 a.m. on 17 November 1999.

A

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

European Parliametn resolution on the communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a European Union Action Plan to Combat Drugs (2000-2004) (COM(1999)239 – C5-0093/1999 – 1999/2095(COS))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the communication from the Commission of 28 May 1999 on a European Union Action Plan to Combat Drugs (2000-2004) (COM(1999)239 – C5-0093/1999 – 1999/2095 (COS)), hereafter referred to as the 'Action Plan',

- having regard to Article 152 of the EC Treaty,

- having regard to Title VI of the EU Treaty,

- having regard in particular to Article 34 of the aforementioned Treaty, under which the Commission and the Member States share the right of initiative in the field of police and judicial cooperation, and in this instance in combating drugs, thereby broadening the scope of action and the responsibilities of the Commission and, by extension, the supervisory power of the European Parliament in this field,

- having regard to Article 39 of the EU Treaty, which strengthens the role of Parliament in the legislative process governing the adoption of framework decisions, decisions and conventions relating, *inter alia*, to organised crime and drug trafficking,

- having regard to the incorporation of the Schengen *acquis* into the Treaties,

- having regard to the report of 2 June 1998, including key elements of a post-1999 EU drugs strategy, to the European Council on activities on drugs and drugs-related issues under the UK Presidency (7930/2/1998 – C4-0409/1998),

- having regard to the plan of action of the Council and Commission on how best to implement the provisions of the Treaty of Amsterdam on an area of freedom, security and justice[1], endorsed by the Vienna European Council in December 1998,

- having regard to the relevant conclusions reached at the European Council meetings in Dublin in December 1996, in Cardiff in June 1998, in Vienna in December 1998 and in Tampere in October 1999,

- having regard to the United Nations Conventions of 1961, 1971 and 1988 on combating drugs, as well as the Political Declaration and resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly special session (Ungass) of 8 to 10 June 1998,

- having regard to Council Directive 1992/109/EEC of 14 December 1992 on the manufacture and the placing on the market of certain substances used in the illicit manufacture of narcotic

[1] 0692/98 – C4-0692/98 – 98/0923 (CNS)

drugs and psychotropic substances, amended by Commission Directive 1993/46/EEC and completed by Commission Regulation No 1485/1996, and to Council Regulation (EEC) No 3677/90 laying down measures to be taken to discourage the diversion of certain substances to the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, amended by Regulation (EEC) No 900/1992[2],

- having regard to the European Union action plan to combat drugs (1995-1999) (COM(1994)234),

- having regard to Decision No 102/1997/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council adopting a programme of Community action on the prevention of drug dependence within the framework for action in the field of public health (1996-2000)[3],

- having regard to the Council Joint Actions of 17 December 1996 concerning the approximation of the laws and practices of the Member States of the European Union to combat drug addition and to prevent and combat illegal drug trafficking, of 16 June 1997 concerning the information exchange, risk assessment and the control of new synthetic drugs, and of 3 December 1998 on money laundering and the identification, tracing, freezing, seizing and confiscation of the proceeds from crime[4],

- having regard to the other instruments of judicial, police and customs cooperation[5], and in particular to the OISIN, Falcone and Grotius programmes[6],

- having regard to the proposal amending Council Directive 1991/308/EEC on prevention of the use of the financial system for the purpose of money laundering (COM(1999)352) of 8 July 1999[7],

- having regard to the proposal for a Council regulation (EC) completing Regulation (EEC) No 302/1993 establishing a European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) (COM(1999)430) of 9 September 1999[8],

- having regard to its resolutions of 15 June 1995 on the communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a European Union plan of action to combat drugs (1995-1999) and of 12 May 1998 on the communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the control of new synthetic drugs (designer drugs), its recommendation to the Council of 6 October 1998 on European cooperation in the framework of the UN General Assembly special session (Ungass) on drugs, and its resolution of 13 April 1999 on a post-1999 EU drugs strategy on activities on drugs and drugs-related issues under the UK Presidency[9],

---

[2] OJ L 370, 19.12.1992, p. 76; OJ L 159, 1.7.1993, p. 134; OJ L 188, 27.7.1996, p.28; OJ L 357, 2.12.1990, p. 1; and OJ L 96, 10.4.1992, p. 1 respectively

[3] OJ L 19, 22.1.1997, p. 25

[4] OJ L 342, 31.12.1996, p. 6; OJ L 167, 25.6.1997, p. 1; and OJ L 333, 9.12.1998 respectively

[5] as cited in the communication, pp. 47-49

[6] OJ L 7, 10.1.1997; OJ L 99, 31.3.1998; and OJ L 287, 8.11.1996 respectively

[7] OJ C

[8] OJ C

[9] OJ C 166, 3.7.1995, p. 116; OJ C 167, 1.6. 1998, p. 29; OJ C 328, 26.10.1998, p. 43; and OJ C 219, 30.7.1999, p. 109 respectively

- having regard to the EMCDDA annual reports on the state of the drugs problem in the European Union,

- having regard to the report of the Committee on Citizens' Freedoms and Rights, Justice and Home Affairs and the opinions ... (A5-0063/1999),

A. whereas this Action Plan sets out five objectives: (1) maintaining the fight against drugs as a 'major priority' for EU internal and external action; (2) an integrated and balanced approach to demand and supply reduction; (3) procuring comparable data; (4) international cooperation and support for the United Nations; and (5) finding 'appropriate' resources, 'while not bidding for new resources',

B. whereas, however, the 'major priority' status which is supposedly worth maintaining does not feature in the legislation of the Union or in its budgetary commitment; whereas it is doubtful that that 'appropriate' resources can be found unless provision is made for additional resources; whereas, the Action Plan thus paints an overly optimistic picture of the commitment and real capacity of the Union and its Member States to combat drugs,

C. whereas it is not instruments, programmes or structures which are most lacking, but rather strong and overtly unambiguous political resolve in areas such as external policy, the coordination and strict monitoring of agreed efforts and a sizeable budgetary commitment; whereas, *inter alia*, the resources earmarked in the Community budget for the fight against drugs - some ECU 31 million for social measures and barely ECU 24 million for all cooperation measures in the 1998 budget, according to the data presented in this Action Plan - are woefully inadequate in comparison with the challenges faced,

D. whereas the forthcoming Portuguese Presidency ought to convene an extraordinary 'inter-pillar' Council meeting to address the fight against drugs and invite the applicant countries to attend; whereas that Council should meet once a year in order to adopt an ambitious political anti-drugs project subject to a precise timetable; whereas the said Council ought to convene on a yearly basis to assess and adapt the Plan,

E. whereas without prejudice to the invitation to the Council given by the Tampere European Council 'to adopt the 2000-2004 European Strategy against Drugs before the European Council meeting in Helsinki', the European Council should decide in principle to convene the extraordinary 'inter-pillar' Council meeting referred to above; whereas an interinstitutional conference should be responsible for preparing it,

F. whereas the need to convene the 'inter-pillar' Council can be deduced from conclusion 59 of the Tampere European Council, which is particularly relevant to action to combat drugs, and states that 'justice and home affairs concerns must be integrated in the definition and implementation of other Union policies and activities' and that 'all competencies and instruments at the disposal of the Union, and in particular, in external relations must be used in an integrated and consistent way to build up the area of freedom, security and justice',

G. whereas the coordinating role in anti-drugs operations entrusted to the Horizontal Drugs Group (HDG) should be strengthened further; whereas the HDG could become a 'high-level

working group'; whereas it would prove beneficial to establish regular, direct contact between the HDG and the competent bodies of the European Parliament in order to further informal interinstitutional coordination on the issues relating to drug addiction addressed under this Action Plan,

H. whereas policies for demand reduction, care and social rehabilitation of drug addicts and supply reduction are not three alternative or contradictory policies, but, rather, inseparable strands within the same mainstreaming policy whose ultimate aim is always social and individual wellbeing,

I. whereas this policy can only be devised to cover the long term and can only deliver results gradually, provided that it makes full use of educational, health and social resources and that the necessary means and funds are made available to it,

J. whereas an essential element of the drugs policy within the EU consists in improving cooperation between EU institutions, Member States, regions and cities,

K. whereas the *raison d'être* of the fight against drugs lies in helping drug addicts rid themselves of their dependence; whereas achieving this aim will involve coordination amongst decision-makers in the relentless clampdown on drug traffickers, whose activities currently account for 8% of world trade, according to United Nations figures,

L. whereas 80% of organised crime worldwide is linked to drug trafficking; whereas the links between drug trafficking and arms dealing, dealing in nuclear material, terrorism, the 'mafia', corruption and a number of armed groups and official circles are common knowledge,

M. whereas the abuse of drugs leads to biological, psychological and social problems, illnesses, problems in the home and at work, criminal acts, traffic accidents, etc. ; whereas young people are being exposed to the risk of drugs at an increasingly early age; whereas all available means should be employed to protect the under-18s as a matter of priority and to reduce the number of drug-related deaths; whereas the fight against addiction to one or more drugs must go hand in hand with the fight against alcoholism, whose impact on families and society is also particularly devastating,

N. whereas action must be taken to combat the marked increase now visible in some EU Member States in the consumption of alcoholic beverages by young people; whereas this, combined with the use of drugs (especially synthetic drugs), is leading to increased juvenile delinquency, more traffic accidents, more examination failures, greater family tensions, etc.,

O. whereas the clampdown should not be conducted against drug addicts themselves, who should, on the contrary, receive help from society, but rather against the drug traffickers and criminal organisations responsible for drug production, trafficking and dealing,

P. whereas there can be no anti-drugs policy in the European Union without cooperation with third countries; whereas international agreements on combating drugs and anti-drugs clauses in agreements concluded between the Union and third countries are, therefore, an absolute priority; whereas, furthermore, development cooperation policy must be revised, so as to bring it into line with the principles enshrined in the Political Declaration issued by the United Nations General Assembly special session in June 1998; whereas engaging in

'constructive dialogue' under the guise of *Realpolitik* would not suffice as a pretext for a laissez-faire policy,

Q. whereas Article 152 of the EC Treaty (public health) in its newly worded form now makes it possible to conduct varying national programmes to reduce health risks by stipulating that 'the Community shall complement the Member States' action in reducing drug-related health damage, including information and prevention'; whereas ultimate responsibility for practical measures in regard to treatment and rehabilitation must lie with the Member State, which also finances the treatment programme,

R. whereas, however, to avoid conveying a confused and counterproductive message, it would be advisable for such programmes to be underpinned by an approach overtly aimed at freeing drug addicts from their dependence and improving their quality of life,

S. whereas drug use is a threat to public health, including that of the drug addicts themselves; whereas if the number of deaths is to be reduced it is desirable to promote and develop programmes involving aid, information, rehabilitation and damage limitation, while not debarring Member States from adopting ad hoc measures or pilot schemes,

T. whereas large numbers of drug addicts are currently imprisoned in the EU for drug-related offences (trafficking, dealing, theft, etc); whereas it is desirable to promote and develop similar programmes to those proposed in the previous paragraph in the prison context,

U. whereas the EU must encourage medical scientific research which is focussed on improving the chances of breaking addiction patterns so as to help reduce demand,

V. drawing attention to the need to link the fight against poverty and unemployment to the problems of drug addiction and urban delinquency, while the subsidiarity principle is observed and respected in regard to matters concerning juvenile and urban delinquency; taking the view that a project of this kind could form part of action to combat urban delinquency, which Parliament ought to include in the 2000 budget (line B5-820N),

W. whereas the projects under the programme of Community action on the prevention of drug dependence (1996-2000) and those to be funded under the forthcoming action programme should be properly targeted, rigorously assessed and devised to work in synergy with national programmes, in line with the aims of the action plan,

X. sharing the particular alarm expressed by the Commission at the 'major reduction of financial commitment by Member States to social sector activities' (p. 55),

Y. whereas the confiscation of proceeds from drug-related crime should be backed up by the necessary decisions for those proceeds to be allocated to programmes on prevention and the rehabilitation of drug addicts and support programmes for their families,

Z. whereas there is good reason to exploit every possibility afforded by Article 30 of the EU Treaty governing police cooperation, especially by involving Europol, and by Article 31 of the same, which deals with common action on judicial cooperation in criminal matters, including the establishment of minimum rules relating to drug trafficking; whereas the plan

of action to establish an area of freedom, security and justice endorsed by the Vienna European Council refers to the establishment of such rules,

AA. whereas, likewise, the money laundering directive which, on the Commission's own admission, has enjoyed only limited success in confiscating assets, must be made tougher and its strict implementation assured; whereas the fight against money laundering will fail to deliver credible results unless conducted on an international scale, which does not, however, preclude vigorous action within the EU,

BB. whereas the new synthetic drugs constitute a potential danger and a new problem, particularly given the diversion of their precursors, many of them licit, for illicit ends, the ease with which they can be manufactured and the frequently unusual behavioural patterns of their users; whereas if the effectiveness of the early warning system at EU level seems satisfactory, the results of the action to which it leads in the Member States should be evaluated,

CC. whereas the means must be found to combat the use of the Internet in facilitating drug trafficking and production; whereas crimes such as drug trafficking should be prosecuted in accordance with applicable law even if it occurs via services over the Internet,

DD. whereas Internet providers who remove from the Net information which gives rise to crime should be awarded a quality symbol to strengthen their competitive position; whereas information which combats drug sales and drug abuse is of common interest and should be increased; whereas the Member States should use health information to highlight the health hazards involved in drug abuse,

EE. drawing attention to the impact of new technologies, and especially the Internet, on drug abuse through the diffusion of information on chemical precursors and the manufacturing of drugs which is sometimes a direct incitement to drug-taking,

FF. whereas the growing problem of doping in sport, which, besides constituting a health matter, raises legal, judicial and police issues, must be included in the European Union's strategy and Action Plan to Combat Drugs; whereas the Action Plan has paid scant attention to the problem of the harmonisation of laws and judicial and police cooperation in this field, goals which a number of sports ministers from the Member States hope to see attained; whereas the willingness of the Member States and the Commission 'to help in setting up an international agency to deal with this problem in cooperation with sports organisations', as mentioned in the Commission's conclusions, does not go far enough,

GG. whereas the link between drug taking and road accidents should lead to a policy initiative at Union level,

HH. whereas there is good cause to cooperate fully with the United Nations and the UNDCP (United Nations Drug Control Programme), to subscribe to the principles established in the June 1998 Ungass Political Declaration – namely joint responsibility, inclusion of drug control in development policies, a balanced approach to demand reduction and supply reduction, respect for human rights and multilateral approaches – and to enforce the resolutions adopted on that occasion,

II. whereas it is necessary to ensure that, in line with Parliament's request, the handling of European Union funding of the UNDCP should not be entrusted to those governments of third countries which fail to offer guarantees with regard to the sound management of the said funding and respect for human rights,

JJ. whereas one of the most important prerequisites for combating drugs is the reduction of poverty in the southern developing countries; whereas all possible efforts should be undertaken to remove the social and economic causes that favour continuing drug production; whereas the special preferences granted by the European Union in the Andean Pact countries and the countries of central America under the GPS scheme should be extended further, at least to the level granted by the EU to other developing countries; whereas the GPS scheme alone, however, is not sufficient to encourage farmers to shift to other products; whereas communities that have decided to stop the production of drugs and raw materials should be granted special support to develop alternatives,

KK. whereas the necessary resources should be allocated for the implementation of the EU/Latin America/Caribbean coordination and cooperation mechanism in the field of drugs adopted at the first summit of heads of state and government of the three regions in Rio de Janeiro on 28 June 1999,

LL. whereas, where external policy is concerned, it is vital that resolute and coherent action be devised and implemented at EU level to combat drug production and trafficking, first and foremost through money laundering agreements and tougher anti-drugs clauses comprising suspension and penalty arrangements,

MM. whereas the European Union must maintain close contact with the Dublin Group (the Member States and the Commission, the US, Canada, Japan, Australia and Norway) and its 'mini-groups',

NN. whereas, in the context of the pre-accession strategy, it would be advisable to give high priority to the *acquis* in the area of freedom, security and justice, and in this case to the *acquis* on combating drugs; having regard to the need to re-evaluate the measures under the Phare and Tacis programmes devoted to combating drugs and strengthen all aspects of cooperation in the fight against drug trafficking and transit with the applicant countries of central and eastern Europe and all countries concerned, especially the Balkan states, Russia and the NISs, Turkey and the Maghreb countries; whereas, as the Commission has proposed, the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) should see its remit extended as soon as possible to include the implementation of drug awareness projects funded under the Phare programme,

OO. whereas the admission of a shortage of resources for programmes targeting developing nations contrasts with the unfounded assertion that Community efforts have met with considerable success,

PP. whereas, failing a drastic improvement in the monitoring of the instruments and programmes under the Action Plan, the indispensable condition for a policy to be effective will not be met; whereas, for evaluation at EU level to be feasible, the Member States must present an exhaustive appraisal of their policies, employing transparency equal to that applied in the economic field,

QQ. whereas the persistent lack of comparable data on the drugs problem in the various Member States, as highlighted once again in the analysis of public spending undertaken in chapter VII of the EMCDDA 1998 Annual Report is alarming,

RR. whereas the EMCDDA has an essential role to play in gathering data and statistics and analysing policies, legislation and penal practice both in the European Union and in the applicant countries; whereas without comparable data, based on common definitions and concepts, and a budget commensurate with the tasks entrusted to it, the Monitoring Centre will be unable to perform its task optimally,

SS. whereas at the special meeting on the creation of an area of freedom, security and justice in the European Union held in Tampere on 15 and 16 October 1999 the European Council:

- underlined the importance of addressing the drugs problem in a comprehensive manner and called on the Council 'to adopt the 2000-2004 European Strategy against Drugs before the European Council meeting in Helsinki' (conclusion 50),
- called for priority to be given to cooperation in preventing drug-related crime (conclusion 42),
- called for joint investigative teams to be set up without delay, as a first step to combat in particular trafficking in drugs, on the initiative and with the participation of representatives of Europol, thus encouraging the proper implementation of the provisions of Article 30(2), TEU (conclusions 43 and 45),
- agreed to set up Eurojust – which should act in the matter of judicial cooperation as Europol acts in police cooperation (conclusion 46),
- designated drugs trafficking as one of the areas in which priority should be given to efforts to harmonise national criminal law, thus calling for the start of joint action provided for under Article 31(e) TEU (conclusion 48),
- with regard to money laundering, called for common standards to be developed to prevent the use of corporations and entities registered outside the territory of the Union and for arrangements to be concluded with third country offshore-centres (conclusion 57),
- stressed the need to define clear priorities, policy objectives and measures for the Union's external action in justice and home affairs (conclusion 61),

on performance and overall aims

1. Shares the objectives of the Action Plan; congratulates the Commission on its honesty in acknowledging shortcomings; considers, however, that it paints an overly optimistic picture of the commitment and performance of the Union and its Member States in combating drugs;

On political resolve and the decision-making process

2. Notes that, at present, the overall budgetary resources implemented by the European Union appear woefully inadequate and the monitoring of action weak; considers that the European Union should be allocated further resources to strengthen its measures to prevent drug addiction and help drug addicts and to combat crime ; believes that every Member State should set aside resources for treatment programmes to enable every addict to obtain help

to get off drugs in accordance with national conditions; calls on the Commission to make suitable financial proposals with a view to facilitating the proposed actions;

3. Calls on the Member States and the Union to show greater political resolve and, if it appears that the need for more effective measures to combat drug abuse and drug trafficking cannot be met with existing resources, to commit higher resources on the one hand for internal action, notably in the educational, social, health and medical scientific field, particularly as regards the effects of drugs on health and life expectancy, and, on the other, for international action; condemns, in the light of Article 6(4) of the TEU which requires the Union to provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies, the persistent lack of comparable data provided by the Member States on drugs and drug addiction and calls on them to remedy this situation forthwith;

4. Considers that urban and regional policy experiments on reducing harmful (health) effects, reducing demand for drugs and crime prevention and investigating the adverse effects on health of various drugs are important as regards finding new ways of dealing with drug-related problems;

5. Welcomes the Commission's objectives of reducing drug abuse among young people and the number of deaths among addicts but lacks clarification of the measures, timetables and follow-up strategies needed to achieve those objectives; calls therefore on the Commission to elaborate on its objectives in this respect;

6. Calls on the Commission to involve non-governmental organisations in implementing the action plan in order to maintain an integrated and balanced anti-drug strategy in which reductions of supply and demand are regarded as mutually reinforcing factors;

7. Calls on those Member States which, according to UN statistics, are transit countries for drug trafficking to clamp down on such activity as soon as possible;

8. Calls on the forthcoming Portuguese Presidency to convene an extraordinary 'inter-pillar' Council meeting devoted to combating drugs and to invite the applicant countries to attend; calls on the European Council meeting in Helsinki to decide in principle on this convocation; calls for an interinstitutional conference to be responsible specifically for preparing this 'inter-pillar' Council meeting;

9. Calls on the said Council, which should meet once a year, to signal clearly its refusal to consider the drug problem as inevitable by adopting an ambitious political anti-drugs project subject to a precise timetable;

10. Calls on the 'inter-pillar' Council to examine each year, on the basis of an EMCDDA report, the progress in implementation by the Monitoring Centre of a global information system on drugs and to develop the methodological tools needed for implementation;

on the specific objectives; on international action

11. Emphasises the need to use all available means to protect the under-18s as a matter of priority through preventive work and focusing on rehabilitative measures for addicted parents of minors, to consider increasing Community and national budgets alike, and pursue measures

targeting new synthetic drugs; asks for early prevention measures to be taken in schools as part of coordinated action amongst the Member States; calls for the Comenius programme to make a greater contribution in this vein;

12. Calls on the Commission, in implementing the action plan, to emphasise the need to intensify efforts in the Member States to combat drug-abuse in prisons, in which care, measures to promote reintegration into society and working life, access to drug-free units and the possibility of converting a prison sentence into treatment should be seen as important elements;

13. Calls on the Commission to evaluate the various approaches to treatment and to introduce a range of different treatment programmes with individualised criteria for admission and the objective of non-dependence on drugs;

14. Calls on the Member States to implement programmes to protect public and individual health, and measures to treat drug addicts in prison;

15. Supports the research priorities outlined for drugs under the fifth framework programme and wishes also to include the social aspects of production, the reduction of health risks of drug use and the evaluation of a multilateral approach designed to restrict trade and production;

16. Urges the European Union to apply a coherent policy to combat drug production and trafficking in a consistent manner, using its capacity for bringing political influence to bear and providing effective help to the countries concerned; insists to this end on the urgent need for broader coordination in the fields of justice and home affairs and of external policy, in particular development and trade policy;

17. Calls on the EU and its Member States to encourage and develop damage limitation policies, without debarring individual Member States from adopting measures and pilot schemes in this area;

18. Favours the strengthening and rigorous evaluation of action on money laundering; stresses the role which Europol and, in due course, Eurojust should play to this end in conjunction with the European Judicial Network; calls on the European Union to work towards making this action a priority at international level and towards concluding bilateral and multilateral money laundering agreements; reiterates its request that the funds confiscated from criminals be allocated to programmes to combat drug addiction;

19. Considers that FATF plays an essential part in combatting money laundering and that its mandate should be extended for a further five years;

20. Calls on the Union and Member States to cooperate constructively with the United Nations and the UNDCP and in particular to apply the principles contained in the Political Declaration and resolutions of the June 1998 United Nations General Assembly special session (Ungass) on combating drugs; hopes, in this respect, to see the respective responsibilities of the European Union and the Member States in enforcing those resolutions made clear;

21. Reiterates its request that the handling of European Union funding of the UNDCP should not be entrusted to those governments of third countries which fail to offer guarantees with regard to the sound management of the said funding and respect for human rights;

22. Calls for meticulous checks on compliance with the anti-drugs clause in international agreements; asks to that effect that it be accorded the same 'essential clause' status as the 'human rights' clause;

23. Expects that the control on the external trade of chemicals based on Council Regulation 3677/90 and Commission Regulation 3769/92 and on a number of precursor control agreements concluded with eight countries of the organisation of America States will be extended to other countries;

24. Calls for the inclusion within the Action Plan of an 'inter-pillar' initiative on doping in sport, which should also address the harmonisation of laws, the involvement of sports organisations and judicial and police cooperation as well as comprising preventive measures and public health initiatives, also for amateur sport;

25. Calls for use to be made of Article 71(1)(c) of the EC Treaty so as to harmonise provisions in the Member States' highway codes relating to road accidents caused by drug taking;

on the pre-accession strategy

26. Deplores the rise of new drugs markets and trafficking syndicates in the countries of central and eastern Europe encouraged by the economic and political difficulties in some of these countries and insists on the importance of the PHARE multibeneficiary drugs programmes;

27. Emphasises that the pre-accession strategy must give high priority to the fight against drugs; stresses, however, that the evaluation made hitherto of the success of the projects funded from the measures under the Phare and Tacis programmes devoted to combating drugs, which received ECU 11 and 4 million in 1998, has by and large proven inadequate; calls for a fundamental review of these measures; approves the Commission proposal regarding the broad involvement of the applicant countries and Turkey in the EMCDDA;

on evaluation

28. Demands that the Commission begins the systematic and rigorous monitoring and evaluation of all action pursued in the fight against drugs, including action taken at international level, drawing in particular on the expertise of the EMCDDA; urges the Member States to present an exhaustive annual appraisal of their policies; urges the Commission to submit an annual report on this basis, setting out a comprehensive review of action to combat drugs, so that the policies pursued in this field can be compared;

29. Calls on the Commission to fund programmes to evaluate the practices used in the fields of prevention, treatment and reintegration as well as the social and health implications and, on the basis of its conclusions, to help the Member States frame their national policies;

on the role and resources of the EMCDDA

30. Calls on the EMCDDA fully to contribute towards the systematic monitoring of the above-mentioned anti-drug actions, to expand its assistance to the Member States in evaluating their activities to reduce demand, to implement the five harmonised epidemiological indicators, to strengthen its system for evaluating the risks posed by the new synthetic drugs and broaden its scope to cover the risks linked to performance-enhancing drugs; calls therefore for the EMCDDA to be equipped with the harmonised statistics and resources it needs to carry out its task;

*
* *

31. Calls on the European Council to consider this resolution as recommendations for its meeting in Helsinki; reserves the right to react, before the meeting of the 'inter-pillar' Council which if demands should be convened, to the general guidelines which the European Council will have laid down in the fight against drugs;

32. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the European Council, the Commission and Council, and the parliaments and governments of the Member States and applicant countries.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Despite the ongoing differences of opinion on the sensitive matter of combating drugs both within and outside the Union, a definite trend towards stepping up cooperation and international coordination is apparent, above all at the United Nations. Mention of this is made in the 1998 report by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction. Your rapporteur would like to take as the starting point for her considerations a further observation made in the report[10], namely that, in order to pursue the analysis, Member States will have to provide more comparable data. the report goes on to state that this will provide for a better understanding of the means of improving the effectiveness of public spending on drugs and assessing the social costs incurred by the drugs problem.

For an extraordinary 'inter-pillar' Council

Paradoxically, whilst international – and intra-Community – cooperation is structured around several bodies, and whilst action to combat drugs in the European Union cuts across the three pillars of the Union, it is not always possible to obtain comparable data from the Member States, the very countries which seek to speak to the international community with one voice. (The less-than-abundant statistical data in the communication is notable in itself.)

None of the reasons which might be put forward to explain this shortcoming will serve to detract from the impression that the commitment by the Member States to finding solutions to stamp out this scourge and curb criminal trafficking, which accounts for 8% of world trade, constitutes an inadequate response to the problem.

This impression is reinforced by the revelation in the Commission communication that the allocation for Community programmes of an internal and external nature alike in the 1998 budget amounted to ECU 31 million for the internal measures and ECU 24 million for external measures, or 1/1500th of the EU budget. The Commission also alludes to the 'major reduction of financial commitment by Member States to social sector activities' (p. 55).

Therefore, before reviewing the various aspects of the Commission communication, it would be worthwhile looking at the issue of action on the part of the Member States. We propose that, during the forthcoming Portuguese Presidency, an extraordinary 'inter-pillar' Council meeting be convened to address the drugs problem. The applicant countries would be invited to the meeting, which the health, justice, home affairs and foreign ministers would definitely attend. On the basis of the Commission communication and Parliament's opinion, that extraordinary Council would adopt an ambitious political anti-drugs project subject to a precise timetable. It would meet on a yearly basis, in order to ensure monitoring and constant updating of the Plan at the highest level and to establish a climate of cooperation and action.

The Commission communication

- **Principles and objectives**

As regards principles, we hold to the concept of the fight against drugs as a mainstreaming policy whose ultimate aim is always prevention and whose demand reduction and supply reduction aspects

[10] EMCDDA 1998 Annual Report, Summary and Highlights, chapter VII, p. 24

are inseparable. This therefore entails simultaneous action on three fronts: prevention and social measures, judicial and police cooperation and external policy. This concept is contained in the communication.

This being the case, let us now examine the 'main aims and objectives' established by the Commission as part of an integrated strategy (chapter II, section E):

1) to ensure that the fight against drugs is kept as a major priority for EU internal and external action;
2) to continue the integrated and balanced approach between supply and demand reduction, seen as mutually reinforcing elements;
3) to ensure collection, analysis and dissemination of objective, reliable and comparable data on the drugs phenomenon with the support of the EMCDDA and Europol;
4) to promote international cooperation and the integration of drug control into development cooperation, and to support the efforts of the United Nations and of the UNDCP, in line with the principles adopted at Ungass;
5) to emphasise that, 'while not bidding for new resources', the successful implementation of the strategy and actions mentioned in this Action Plan will necessitate 'appropriate resources'.

Whilst voicing support for objectives 2 and 4, the following points should be raised, taking into account the softer tone often employed in this type of communication:

- With regard to objective 1, it would be preferable to refer to *establishing* rather than *keeping* the fight against drugs as a major priority, given that the modest current budget commitment, insufficient statistical data, the lack of systematic evaluation of programmes and legislative instruments, and the shortcomings in coordination between the field of justice and home affairs and international action do not actually suggest that it enjoys such status.
- The wording of objective 3 provides another instance of an exercise in wishful thinking, given the all-too-familiar difficulties encountered in this area, above all by the EMCDDA.
- The wording of objective 5 would appear to reflect above all the Commission's concern at the narrow room for manoeuvre which the financial perspective leaves for items 3 and 4. One cannot but be surprised to read in the same sentence that the success of the Plan necessitates 'appropriate resources', but that the Commission will not bid for additional resources. Annex IV demonstrates repeatedly the extent to which the budgetary resources in general, be they for internal or external action, for demand reduction or supply reduction, are low, or at any rate woefully inadequate in comparison with the challenges faced. The data supplied in this Action Plan refers to some ECU 31 million for social measures and barely ECU 24 million for all cooperation measures in the 1998 budget.

To illustrate this point further we might mention the ECU 5 million earmarked for the action programme to prevent drug addiction in 1998, the 0.74 million for cooperation projects between police or customs authorities in the fight against drugs, or the 4 million or so for the Tacis programme.

Your rapporteur believes, therefore, that the Commission paints an overly optimistic picture of the situation and of the commitment and real current capacity of the Union and its Member States to combat drugs. The forthcoming Action Plan must, of course, represent continuity, yet it should also

mark a departure from a certain sense of fatalism, a lack of resolve, a rigid separation of the pillars and international action which, on occasion, owes more to the dictates of *Realpolitik* than to the resolve to clamp down on traffickers and those who collude with them.

- **Evaluation of instruments and programmes**

The Commission should be congratulated for its frankness on this crucial issue. It acknowledges the fact that neither legislative instruments nor programmes have undergone sufficient evaluation (chapter III, section B) and undertakes to have greater recourse to independent experts.

Given that there is no systematic monitoring, it is impossible to know the extent to which the established objectives have been met. Annex I takes a more detailed look at this issue. A political interpretation of the indications given therein, based on the information provided by the Commission itself, enables the observations set out below to be made.

Programmes aimed at reducing demand (prevention, social measures, education and research)

- The EDDRA database developed by the EMCDDA in collaboration with the REITOX National Focal Points to provide information on national demand reduction projects, is delivered pleasing results.
- The early warning system for new synthetic drugs run by the EMCDDA is working well, as demonstrated by the recent Council Decision on the amphetamine derivative 4-MTA[11].
- The ongoing mid-term assessment of the action programme (1996-2000) on the prevention of drug dependence has yielded contrasting and, indeed alarming, results. As the Commission states, 'the project reports of the networks [funded under the programme] quite often fail in giving a convincing picture of their actual capacity to gather expertise and experience from all the Member States and from all the relevant agencies in the Member States, as well as to disseminate information when provided through these networks. (...) The projects funded seem to emphasise approaches targeted directly to individuals, contrasted with a lack of projects with a broader public policy approach towards public health problems' (pp. 38-9).
- Twenty per cent of projects funded by Integra - one of the four Employment Initiatives under the European Social Fund and the main initiative on drug dependence in terms of financial resources, having received ECU 15-20 million from the 1998 budget – deal with rehabilitating drug addicts. Whilst referring to the success of one project in Athens, the communication makes no mention of a global evaluation of the Integra initiative.
- The references to the education and youth programmes (Socrates and Youth for Europe) and the vocational training programme (Leonardo) are made by and large for form's sake. Although they would qualify for drug-related measures, the relevant amounts allocated to them in 1998, estimated at approximately ECU 0.5 million, are small. No allusion is made to any evaluation of the projects concerned.
- Trumpeted as a matter for particular attention in the fifth research framework programme, research on drug-related issues was covered by some projects under the fourth programme (1994-1998), above all in the Biomed 2 programme and the socioeconomic research programme (total appropriation for 1998: ECU 5 million). Here again, no mention is made of an evaluation.

[11] OJ L 244, 16.9.1999, p. 1

Instruments to reduce trafficking

- According to the Commission, Directive 92/109/EEC and Regulations No 3677/90 and No 3769/92 concerning the diversion of precursors and the manufacture of narcotic drugs are proving effective. (They have not, however, undergone external evaluation.)
- The Commission Implementation Report of 1 July 1998 concerning the transposition of the money laundering directive makes a fairly positive assessment of the impact of the directive. However, the directive's preventive nature rules out the possibility of assessing how many money laundering operations may have been prevented. The results in terms of prosecutions, convictions and asset seizures, in the Commission's words, 'remain relatively modest so far' (p. 23).
- The Joint Action of 29 June 1998 on the creation of a European Judicial Network[12] has led to the establishment of the said network which, in turn, has set up contact centres in each Member State. The Commission does not elaborate further on the specific results of this cooperation.
- By contrast, an external evaluation of the judicial and police cooperation programmes and, by extension, of OISIN (cooperation between police and customs authorities), within which most projects address the fight against drugs, has been announced for this year.
- Several instruments adopted by the Council since 1995 have sought to improve police and customs cooperation in combating drugs, to approximate laws and practices in the Member States in this field, to exchange information on the chemical profiling of drugs, and to control new synthetic drugs (see above). However, given their recent implementation, no evaluation has been undertaken of the impact of these legal instruments, adopted pursuant to Title VI of the EU Treaty.
- Naturally, any evaluation of the effectiveness of Europol would be premature.

International action

- The Commission conducts a concise and rather superficial assessment of international action, perhaps because of a lack of coordination within the Commission between external action and justice and home affairs. That said, after a brief overview, the Commission feels entitled to conclude, in its global assessment of external action, that 'with regard to international drugs control cooperation, the EU has made significant progress. Coordination of drugs control at policy level, as well as coordination of activities, has improved but should be further enhanced' (p. 55). Either the Commission has good reasons, which is does not disclose, to be so optimistic, or its optimism is affected: whatever the case, we are left none the wiser.
- The evaluation of action in the field of North-South relations is particularly surprising. The admission of a shortage of resources contrasts with the unfounded assertion that 'EC efforts have met with considerable success' (p. 52). A number of contacts, forums and initiatives are listed, yet their specific usefulness and effectiveness are not mentioned.

[12] OJ L 191, 7.7.1998

- The one external evaluation, critical overall, of one pilot demand reduction project under the Phare programme is fuelling concern about the outcome of the external evaluation of the 1996/1997 programmes expected in late 1999.

❑ Specific objectives

➢ Demand reduction

As regards action on demand reduction, besides placing strong emphasis on the reduction in financial commitment on the part of the Member States in this area, the Commission sees future preventive action as requiring first and foremost systematic impact evaluation, well-targeted information campaigns, a comprehensive preventive approach in schools which targets children from an early stage, the development of the inter-city network, projects geared towards peer groups, and linkage with prevention strategies to combat alcoholism and smoking.

Your rapporteur shares the Commission's objectives entirely. She calls on the Member States to devote the necessary budgetary effort to action on steady demand reduction and thereby signal its refusal to ignore a social phenomenon. She proposes stepping up initiatives to combat drug addiction amongst the poor and those at risk of becoming marginalised. Moreover, she suggests seeing to it that Comenius, a strand of the Socrates programme devoted to secondary education, contributes to teacher training and educational projects on drugs.

➢ Supply reduction – judicial and police cooperation

As regards supply reduction measures, the Commission intends to begin by consolidating the *acquis* by means of Community legislation and international agreements to combat the diversion of precursors, an updated money laundering directive, the implementation of the action plan on promoting 'safer use of the Internet'[13] and, if need be, the creation of new instruments to complement the early warning system introduced for new synthetic drugs.

In addition, the Commission addresses the implementation of Title VI of the EU Treaty, referring to the plan of action 'on an area of freedom, security and justice' endorsed by the Vienna European Council. It is worth pointing out in particular the establishment of minimum rules relating to the constituent elements of criminal acts and penalties in the field of drug trafficking as a measure to be taken within two years (see Article 34 of the EU Treaty). Moreover, the justice and home affairs *acquis* and its priorities are highlighted in the context of the pre-accession strategy.

Whilst approving of the Commission's specific objectives in this regard as well, your rapporteur would like to emphasise the role that Europol should play in combating money laundering and calls for further consideration to be given to setting up a structure whose role vis-à-vis judicial cooperation and the judicial system mirrors the role expected of Europol vis-à-vis police cooperation and the police system.

➢ International action

[13] Decision No 276/1999/EC, OJ 33, 6.2.1999

Whilst voicing our reservations with regard to the evaluation of external action conducted hitherto, here again we can agree with the guidelines governing international action.

Nonetheless, taking account above all of the importance of the problems relating to enlargement and the concerns over the transit of drugs through the Balkans, a particularly weighty chapter on the improvements to be made to the anti-drug measures under the Phare and Tacis programmes might have been expected. Your rapporteur remains unsatisfied and puzzled in this regard.

In short, much is said in this chapter – except, perhaps, that the European Union must devise, in unambiguous terms, resolute and coherent action to combat drug production and trafficking, and implement that action in a consistent manner. In addition, the sphere of international action must work in closer coordination with the field of justice and home affairs and, beyond that, with the area of freedom, security and justice, which should be given a comprehensive external dimension.

Greater responsibility

To sum up, whilst taking what we consider to be too cautious an approach, the Commission communication sets out excellent guidelines, despite its overly optimistic picture of the commitment and performance of the Union and its Member States in the fight against drugs. Commitment, action and a genuine project are required from the Member States now. Since Amsterdam, the Treaties have conferred greater responsibility on the institutions of the Union in terms of the legislative and budgetary means available to combat drugs. It is now up to them to assume that responsibility in practice.

26 October 1999

OPINION
(Rule 162)

for the Committee on Citizens' Freedoms and Rights, Justice and Home Affairs

on the proposal for a Council Directive on a European Union Action Plan to Combat drugs (2000-2004) (COM(1999) 239) (report by Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou)

Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy

Draftsman: Mrs Dorette Corbey

PROCEDURE

At its meeting of 4 October 1999 the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy appointed Mrs Corbey draftsman.

It considered the draft opinion at its meetings of 13 October and 26 October 1999.

At the latter it adopted the following conclusions by 26 votes to and 1 abstention.

The following were present for the vote: Westendorp y Cabeza, chairman; Brunetta and Mombaur, vice-chairmen; Corbey, draftsman; Baltas, Bodrato, Carlsson (for Wijckman), Carraro, Chichester, Damião (for Caudron), Foster (for Harbour), Lamassoure, Liese (for Langen), Linkohr, McAvan, Montfort, Murphy, O'Toole (for Read), Paasilinna, Piétrasanta, Plooij-Van Gorsel, Pohjamo (for Thors), Purvis, Quisthoudt-Rowohl, Schwaiger, Valdivielso de Cué and Vidal-Quadras Roca (for Ferrer i Casals).

BACKGROUND/GENERAL COMMENTS

The European Action Plan to Combat drug stresses the need for a global, multidisciplinary and integrated response based on five key actions:

- information
- demand reduction
- supply reduction and the fight against illicit trafficking
- international co-operation
- co-ordination at national and European Union level.

The Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy considers the prevention of drug addiction and strategies to avoid the social situations that pave the way for use and abuse of drugs of utmost importance. Therefore, it welcomes the integrated and multidisciplinary approach putted forward in the action programme. However, the present opinion only deals with aspects of the problem falling under the competencies of the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy. These concern production, trade, international co-operation and research.

Production

It is wellknown that most heroin seized in the European Union originates from South-west Asia. Turkish chemical groups and Albanian-Yugoslav criminal groups play an important role in the heroin trade. Colombian heroin is partly destinated for European markets. Morocco is a major supplier of cannabis resin to the Member States. Pakistan is another source country. Colombia, South Africa, Nigeria and Thailand are suppliers of herbal cannabis (marihuana).

The countries producing drugs generally are poor countries. Strategies to reduce production should address the social and economic circumstances of producers.

The European Union is a major production region for synthetic drugs. Precursors serve to produce legal and useful products in the fields of pharmaceutics but are also elements of dangerous drugs. The improper use of precursors should be banned.

Trade

Central and Eastern Europe is a transit region for cannabis. But a substantial reduction in illicit coca and opium poppy cultivation is observed and is the result of the mobilisation of the international Community. The preaccession strategy includes the possibility for the candidate countries to become Members of countries Agencies such as the EMCDDA (European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and drug addiction) even before full Membership of the Union. The Multi-Beneficiary Drugs Programme aims at developing the institutional capacity of the ten candidate countries of Central and Eastern Europe to develop and co-ordinate drug policies in line with the European Union drugs strategy. It also provides for the integration of non-candidate countries namely Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The programme is focusing on support for institution building in order to establish the required legislation and standards and to reinforce the operational capacities of the drug control structures.

Trade in precursors must be controlled. The agreements to control trade do function well but should be extended to more countries.

Illegal trade in precursors or in drugs is highly profitable. The Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy welcomes the efforts to fight money laundering.

Research

The fifth framework provides – although limited - opportunities to study drugs related problem. The committee on industry supports the priorities that are outlined in the action programme. The programme focuses on reduction of the demand, social and economic aspect use/abuse of drugs, detection and monitoring, fraud related to doping in sports. The social aspects of production and trade are only marginally included. The same goes for factors that could reduce the risks of drug use.

International co-operation:

The committee reminds the following: "Whereas the beginning of the 1990s international co-operation was dominated by a divide between producer and consumer countries as well as by a heavy emphasis on law enforcement, the emphasis has now shifted to a broad consensus between the developing world and the developed world, between so called "producer" and "consumer" countries, drug control is to-day recognized as part of overall efforts to foster social and economic development

in a broader sense. The concepts of "shared responsibility" and "partnerships" have become the basis for co-operation in this field. The drug problem is being viewed from a broader set of human welfare issues addressing the social and economic dimensions of sustainable development in both producing and consuming countries".[14]

The Amsterdam Treaty does not provide new instruments other than those already existing under the previous treaty: common positions and joint actions mentioned respectively under articles 14 and 15 of the TEU. There are two broad categories: 1) multilateral action under the framework of European Union institutions 2) bilateral and regional actions through three types of instruments for co-operation with third countries:

- drug clauses in European Union Agreements
- political dialogue
- trade policy and financial technical support (for more details, see COM(1999) 239, P. 27 to 34)

Let us remind that in the Community budget we find some specific drug related items in the field of External Actions:

- B7-6210 North South co-operation in the field of drugs and drug addiction (8,9 MECU in 1998)
- B7-500 PHARE Multicountry Programme for the fight against drugs (11 MECU in 1999)
- B7-520 TACIS (3MECU concerning drugs in 1998)

CONCLUSIONS

The Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy:

1. considers that one of the most important prerequisites in the fight against drugs is the reduction of poverty in Southern countries; emphasises that the social and economic circumstances that facilitate the continuation of production should be eliminated.Emphasises in this context the importance of the special preferences which the European Union grants to the Andean Pact and Central American countries under the GSP and calls for their further expansion at least to the level which the EU grants to other developing countries, e.g. ACP countries;

2. considers that the GSP alone is not sufficient to motivate farmers to shift towards other products; a special support should be granted to communities which have decided to give up the production of drugs or precursors, in the form of help with the development of alternatives;

3. supports the research priorities outlined on drug within the 5th framework programme and wishes to add social aspects of production, reduction of health risks of drug use and evaluation of multilateral approach to restrict trade and production;

4. deplores the rise of new drugs markets and trafficking syndicates in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe encouraged by the economic and political difficulties in some of these countries and insists on the importance of the PHARE Multibeneficiary Drugs Programmes.

[14] COM(1999) 239, P. 6

5. draws the attention on the impact of new technologies and especially Internet on drug misuses through the diffusion of information on the chemical precursors and the manufacturing of drugs and is sometimes a direct incitation to drugs;

6. supports the commission in its fight against money laundering, which is possible only if all countries and regions of the world share the same objective and considers that FATF plays an essential part against money laundering and that its mandate should be extended for a further five years;

7. draws the attention of the Commission and of the Council on the special problem of doping in sport and the development of every more sophisticated doping methods which call for closer international co-operation;

8. expects that the control on the external trade of chemicals relying on Council Regulation 3677/90 and Commission Regulation 3769/92 and on a number of precursor control agreements concluded with eight countries of the organisation of America States will be extended to other countries;

9. recalls the importance of the principles tabled in the Political Declaration of UNGASS (United Nations General Assembly Special Session on Drugs): shared responsibility, integrating drug control into mainstream development, balanced approach between demand and supply reduction; respect for human rights, support for multilateral approaches but stresses the need for a thorough evaluation of current policies and the conventions that guide these policies;

10. Regrets that available budget available is extremely limited and suggests to increase it substantially;

11. Supports and appreciates the work of the Observatory and suggest to extend the observations to items related to production and trade of drugs and expects that the findings of Observatory will provide the basis for a European approach in drugs.