

*BIJLAGE IV*

*CAMPAIGN ANALYSIS REPORT: THE NETHERLANDS; the first direct elections to the European Parliament*

*by I. Lipschits and A.P.M. Lucardie*

*1. Electoral system: European and national*

Elections in the Netherlands take place on the basis of Proportional Representation. For elections to the Second Chamber<sup>1)</sup> the country is divided into 18 electoral districts. Political parties can submit a list of candidates in one or more of the 18 districts. Usually the parties participate in the elections in all 18 districts.

The act concerning the elections to the European Parliament passed the Second Chamber on 5th October 1978 and the First Chamber on 12th December 1978. In the Second Chamber the seven smallest parliamentary groups, who together have 12 of the 150 seats, voted against the bill. The four largest parliamentary groups (138 seats) voted in favour of it.

The most important differences in the electoral law for, on the one hand, the elections to the European Parliament and, on the other hand, the elections to the Second Chamber, are the following:

a. For the elections to the European Parliament the country was not divided into 18 electoral districts. This meant that the political parties could submit only one list of candidates. A list of candidates was not allowed to comprise more than 40 names.

b. Dutch citizens living in one of the member-states of the European Community were allowed to participate in the elections to the European Parliament.

c. Dutch citizens in the public service living outside the boundaries of the European Community (for instance, diplomats and their families) were allowed to participate in the elections to the European Parliament.

d. Nationals of other member-states of the European Community who were living in the Netherlands were allowed to participate in the Netherlands in the elections to the European Parliament if the state, of which they were nationals, did not give the vote to citizens living outside the national borders.

e. The election results were to remain secret as long as voting had not closed in all member-states of the European Community.

On 29th May 1978 the government introduced a bill to the Second Chamber concerning the elections to the European Parliament. The discussion in Parliament was not particularly heated. Only the small political parties, who on the basis of this bill stood no chance of winning a seat in the European Parliament, tried to bring about fundamental changes in the government proposals.

The most important objection on the part of the small parliamentary groups concerned the electoral quota. The quota is the number of validly cast votes divided by the number of seats. Seeing the number of seats in the Second Chamber is 150, the quota for the elections to the Second Chamber is 0.67% of the number of validly cast votes. The quota is at the same time the electoral threshold. A political party which does not get 0.67% of the valid votes does not participate in the distribution of the remaining seats and consequently cannot get a seat in the Second Chamber.

The Netherlands has 25 seats in the European Parliament and consequently the quota for the European elections was 4%, that is to say, 6 times as high as for the elections to the Second Chamber. With a quota of 4%, the seven small parties, which in the elections to the Second Chamber in 1977 won one or more seats, stood no chance of winning a seat in the European Parliament. The largest of these seven parties received only 2.1% of the valid votes in the 1977 elections.

In the parliamentary debate on the bill, the small parliamentary groups submitted a motion that the political parties which did not attain the quota in the elections would still be allowed to participate in the allocation of the remaining seats. The acceptance of this proposal would have given some of the small political parties a chance of winning a seat in the European Parliament. However, the large parliamentary groups voted against this proposal.

Other attempts on the part of the small parliamentary groups to increase their electoral chances (such as the proposal that 2 or more political parties could combine their lists of candidates for electoral ends but with the complete retention of their political identity) were also stopped by the large parliamentary groups.

These conflicts about the bill concerning the elections to the European

Parliament took place between the small parliamentary groups on the one side and the large groups on the other. There was more general opposition to the government proposals in the Second Chamber in connection with one other important point. This opposition concerned the proposal that the election results would not be allowed to be made public until the voting in all member-states of the European Community had closed.

In the Netherlands, elections normally take place on a Wednesday (schools are used for polling-booths and all schools have a half-holiday on Wednesday). On a European level, however, it was stipulated that the elections to the European Parliament would have to take place on one of the days from 7th up to and including 10th June 1979, that is to say, on a Thursday, Friday, Saturday or Sunday. Considering the religious composition of the population, it was out of the question to have the elections take place on a Sunday. With an eye to a good turn-out of voters, Saturday (the weekend) and Friday (leading up to the weekend) were not considered very suitable. The government therefore proposed to have the voting on Thursday 7th June.

According to the electoral law, counting the votes in the Netherlands is public. Because the results of the voting had to remain secret till Sunday evening 10th June, when the elections would be completed throughout the whole of the European Community, the government proposed that the ballot-boxes in the Netherlands should be sealed on Thursday evening 7th June and that the votes should be counted on Monday morning 11th June. There was a great deal of opposition to this proposal in Parliament. It would mean that within the European Community voting would take place in the Netherlands first and that the Netherlands would be the last to supply the election results (in other member-states the votes were to be counted on Sunday evening). The government stood firm: on a European level it was feared that an earlier revelation of the election results in the Netherlands would influence the elections in other member-states. Concerning this part of its proposal the government received the support of only a small majority (only the two governing parties, who have 77 of the 150 seats in the Second Chamber).

## *2. European elections and national elections*

### 2.1 Participating political parties

In 1977 no less than 24 political parties took part in the elections to the

Second Chamber. Of these 24 parties, eleven won one or more seats. Nine of these eleven parties took part in the elections to the European Parliament. In addition, a new political group, the Leschot List, tried to win a seat in the European Parliament. Table I comprises a list of the names of the political parties, arranged alphabetically according to the abbreviations of the Dutch names.

The three largest political parties are:

- the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA), which is a member of the Confederation of Socialist Parties of the European Community;
- the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA), which is a federation of the three large religious parties: Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), Christian Historical Party (CHU) and Catholic People's Party (KVP). Each of these three parties is a member of the European People's Party;
- the Dutch Liberal Party (VVD), which is a member of the Federation of European Liberals and Democrats.

The fourth largest party is Democrats '66 (D'66), which calls itself a progressive liberal party. The Pacifist Socialist Party (PSP) and the Political Party of Radicals (PPR) are progressive and radical parties. The Communist Party of the Netherlands (CPN) belongs to the smaller political parties. The National Reformed Political Association (GPV) and the Political Calvinist Party (SGP) are two small religious (Protestant) parties. The Democratic Socialists '70 (DS'70) - a right-wing democratic-socialist party - and the Free Tradespeople (BP) - a small party of small tradesmen and farmers - decided not to participate in the elections to the European Parliament. The Leschot List (LL) is the personal list of Mr. Winand Leschot, a person completely unknown in Dutch politics, who had a go at the European elections on the basis of a vague "green" platform.

The results of the elections to the European Parliament (1979), to the Provincial States (1978) and to the Second Chamber (1977) are set out in

- table II in numbers of votes cast;
- table III in percentages of votes cast;
- table IV in seats.

## 2.2 Turn-out and partisan distribution of votes and seats

The elections to the European Parliament took place in the Netherlands on

Thursday 7th June 1979. Not until the morning of Monday 10th June did the counting of votes begin. And yet on the evening of 7th June the election results were already known with a fair degree of accuracy in the Netherlands - and hence in the other countries of the European Community as well. This was due to an extensive election inquiry that Intomart (Hilversum) had carried out on the day of the elections on behalf of the press association ANP. In 40 polling-booths, 19091 voters filled in, in addition to their ballot-papers, an Intomart questionnaire, in which they were asked, among other things, their sex, age, the party they voted for in the European elections and the party voted for in 1977 in the elections to the Second Chamber.<sup>2)</sup>

The predictions based on this inquiry, which differed only very slightly from the official election results, were announced in a special television programme on the evening of the election day itself.

A number of striking points in the election results are:

- The turn-out for the Netherlands is very small.
- Two political parties gained most in these elections: CDA and D'66.
- The PvdA suffered a heavy defeat, while the VVD also sustained losses.
- Despite the fact that the small political parties stood no chance of winning a seat in the European Parliament because of the high quota, they did succeed in maintaining or even strengthening their electoral position.

The low turn-out for the elections to the European Parliament has attracted a lot of attention in the Netherlands. Until 1970 the law prescribed that those entitled to vote had to report to the polling-booths on the day of the elections. Until that time there was always a turn-out of more than 90%. Since 1970, the turn-out has been lower, as appears from the following table:

1970 Provincial States	68.1%
1970 City-councils	61.2%
1971 Second Chamber	78.5%
1972 Second Chamber	82.9%
1974 Provincial States	74.5%
1974 City-councils	65.4%
1977 Second Chamber	87.5%
1978 Provincial States	79.1%

1978 City-councils 73.3%

1979 European Parliament 57.8%

The turn-out in 1979 was by Dutch standards an all-time low. There were more than 2.5 million fewer votes cast than were cast in 1977 for the elections to the Second Chamber. In 1979 more than 4 million citizens did not exercise their right to vote. In the newspapers, articles appeared with headlines such as "Great Fiasco", "Euro-hangover" and "Unsuccessful Stunt". Only in a few newspapers was the view put forward that, given the circumstances in which these first European elections were held, the turn-out was reasonable: in any case, the majority of voters had gone to the polls. Vredeling, a member of the European Commission, said in a radio-broadcast about the turn-out: "It's a bit better than I'd feared, but much less than I'd hoped."

Many causes for the low turn-out were given in the press. These can be classified as follows:

- a. The work of the European politicians is unknown to the voters. The voters do not see themselves as European citizens. They are less involved in the European elections than in national elections and therefore the turn-out was lower. They do not feel responsible for European policy. They are not in touch with the activities of the European Parliament and it was the first time that direct elections to the European Parliament were held.
- b. There is criticism of European policy. European policy is formed in an atmosphere of specialization from which the citizens are excluded. Waste of time and money and very high tax-free salaries are often spoken about contemptuously.
- c. The idea of a united Europe has not caught on with the citizens. For many voters, Europe is only a collection of national states contrasting greatly among themselves. The differences are too big and nationalism too strong. The European house is no more than a stage-set.
- d. During the election campaign much critical attention was paid to the limited power of the European Parliament. As long as the European Parliament has limited authority it is not credible to the citizens and no mass turn-out for the European elections can be expected.

- e. The European propagandists and people giving information on the European Parliament tried in advertisements and on T.V. to sell it like a new washing-powder. This worked the wrong way. The idea of a united Europe disappeared under an avalanche of information.
- f. In the mass-media, much attention was paid to the activities of convinced opponents of the European elections. Although they were small in number, some of their actions attracted attention because of their specific character (such as the breaking of windows and the public burning of election call-up cards). In this respect it is also important that opponents of the European elections were active in a number of political parties (PvdA, PSP, PPR, SGP).
- g. The political parties failed in the election campaign. They did not succeed in making the differences among the parties clear to the voters. The election programmes were vague. The candidates for the European Parliament were often figures unknown on a national level.

The above are the most important of the causes given in the press for the low turn-out for the European elections.

An important result obtained in the Intomart inquiry is that especially the younger voters did not turn up for the European elections. For the European elections in 1979, 2.5 million fewer voters took part than for the elections to the Second Chamber in 1977; almost 1.5 million of these were younger than 35. In 1977, 42% of the voters was younger than 35 and in 1979 this was only 36%. This was especially to the disadvantage of the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA), which has a strong electoral following among the young voters.

The leaders of the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA) were disappointed with the election outcome. Compared with the 1977 elections, the PvdA suffered a loss of 3.4%, which by Dutch standards is considerable. Moreover, in 1979 the PvdA was no longer the largest party (see Table III). Den Uyl, the leader of the parliamentary group in the Second Chamber, regretted "that an important part of the PvdA following stayed home." For Vondeling, who headed the PvdA list, the election outcome for his party was very disappointing. He too blames the low turn-out for the bad results for the PvdA. In addition, an internal division within the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA) certainly played a role too in the matter

of the European elections. The Young Socialists, organized within the PvdA, opposed participation in the European elections; during the election campaign they agitated vigorously both inside and outside their own party.

The leaders of the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA) were pleased with the election outcome. Compared with the results of 1977, the CDA scored a very large gain (3.7%) in 1979 and that made it the largest party. Beumer, who headed the CDA list, declared himself "exceptionally satisfied". Beumer had conducted an active European campaign with a consistent European approach. Het saw the favourable election outcome as the reward for this campaign.

The leaders of the Dutch Liberal Party (VVD) were also satisfied with the election results. Compared with the 1977 elections, the VVD had, it is true, suffered a loss of 1.5%, but a heavier loss had been expected. In the regularly held opinion polls, the electoral following of the VVD had sunk to 14 to 15% and the VVD leaders publicly declared themselves satisfied with the 16.4% of the votes cast which they obtained in 1979.

The Democrats '66 (D'66) were generally considered to be the great winners of the European elections. The electoral following of D'66 rose from 5.4% in 1977 to 9.0% in 1979. D'66 had never before attained such a high percentage. De Goede, who headed the D'66 list, conducted a very active and strongly European-orientated election campaign.

The smaller political parties, none of which won a seat in the European Parliament, succeeded in maintaining their electoral positions in comparison with 1977 (see Table III). The Pacifist Socialist Party (PSP) even scored a gain which for that party was not inconsiderable. Haks, who headed the list of the Communist Party of the Netherlands (CPN), declared that the election outcome demonstrated that more than 42% of those entitled to vote (that is to say, the non-voters) had showed their condemnation of European politics as they now exist. Kalma, who headed the Pacifist Socialist Party (PSP) list, declared himself pleased at the low turn-out. According to him, this meant that a large part of the Dutch electorate could not feel happy with the European Community. Jansen, who headed the list of the Political Party of Radicals (PPR), was disappointed not to have won a seat in the European Parliament. Nevertheless, he felt that his activities in the election campaign had been important, because he had been able to draw attention to certain



points, in particular the protection of the environment. Blokland, who headed the National Reformed Political Association (GPV) list, was pleased that, through his propaganda against the formation of a European federation, he had scored a slight electoral gain for his party. Mr. Leschot, to conclude, said that he had not so much participated in the elections to win a seat in the European Parliament as to make a contribution to the furtherance of the quality of life and the protection of nature.

### 2.3 European elections as national test-elections?

In the Second Chamber elections in 1977, the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA) had a very large electoral victory. Compared with the elections to the Second Chamber in 1972, the PvdA scored a gain of 6.5% in the percentage of votes cast (from 27.3% to 33.8%). The PvdA got 10 more seats in the Second Chamber (a rise from 43 to 53 seats). After these election results, it was generally expected that a government would again be formed with Den Uyl, the political leader of the Dutch Labour Party, as prime minister.<sup>3)</sup> After no less than 170 days of negotiations between the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA), the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA) and the Democrats '66 (D'66), this attempt to form a government failed. The Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA) then began talks with the Dutch Liberal Party (VVD) with a view to forming a government. Within several weeks a government was formed with representatives of only these two parties: the Van Agt cabinet.<sup>4)</sup>

Under the leadership of the former prime minister, Den Uyl, the parliamentary group of the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA) violently opposed the policy of the Van Agt cabinet. During the general parliamentary debates in the Second Chamber in October 1978, Den Uyl stated:

"What we deal with here in the Chamber at the present time (...) is directly concerned with these European elections. The government cannot pursue a different policy in Brussels than what they put before us here. This indissoluble link between internal policy and European policy has as a consequence that next year we shall be opposing the governing parties on the policy that they are now pursuing here."

By "next year" Den Uyl was alluding to the elections to the European Parliament. With this statement he fixed the framework of the European election campaign for his party: it would be dominated by political considerations of a national

nature. This was one of the reasons why the five small political parties, who were as good as certain that they would not win a seat in the European Parliament, nevertheless took part in the European elections. After Den Uyl's statement it was likely that the European election campaign would at the same time become a struggle over national policies and under these circumstances the small political parties also felt obliged to enter the fray.

During the election campaign the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA) did indeed stress national controversial issues, particularly the replacement of the Van Agt cabinet by a new Den Uyl cabinet as the PvdA wished. On 6th June 1979, one day before the elections to the European Parliament, the PvdA placed a large advertisement in the daily papers. This advertisement included the following:

"Dutch problems can be solved best if there is a new government with the Dutch Labour Party. You cannot elect that new government. But your vote does lend force to the desire for it. That will not be misunderstood. That is why you really should go and vote. Vote for the PvdA. A vote for Vondeling (who heads the PvdA list) is also a vote of confidence for Den Uyl. For later."

The other political parties reacted with reserve to this attempt on the part of the Dutch Labour Party to put so much stress on the national political aspect. Especially the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA) and the Democrats '66 (D'66) - and to a lesser degree the Dutch Liberal Party (VVD) - emphasized the European aspect of the elections as much as possible.

When the election outcome showed that the PvdA, compared with the 1977 and 1978 elections (see Table III), had suffered a loss, leaders of the Dutch Labour Party called for the greatest possible caution in translating the results of the European elections to the national political situation. It was especially Rietkerk, the leader of the parliamentary group of the Dutch Liberal Party (VVD) in the Second Chamber, who repeatedly stressed that the poor results for the Dutch Labour Party demonstrated that opposition to the Van Agt cabinet among the voters was not running high.

### *3. Resources and mobilisation of party organisation*

The expenditure for the election campaign differed from party to party. In

discussions with party leaders and campaign leaders the following amounts were quoted:

a. Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA): Almost 1,000,000 Dutch guilders was spent on the European Parliament election campaign. About 1,500,000 Dutch guilders was spent on the 1977 Second Chamber election campaign. The expenditure for the European elections was two-thirds of that for national elections. The amount for the European election campaign was raised by the three political parties which form the federation of the Christian Democratic Appeal. The amount of 1,000,000 Dutch guilders includes a subsidy from the European Parliament. That subsidy was to be used exclusively for purely informative material.

b. Dutch Labour Party (PvdA): Apart from what was spent by regional branches, this party spent about 850,000 Dutch guilders on the European election campaign, including a subsidy from the European Parliament. The amount was collected among party members on a voluntary basis. The amount of 850,000 Dutch guilders spent on the European election campaign is about half what is spent on campaigns for the elections to the Second Chamber. Actually, it is even less than half, because the branches spent less on the European elections than is customary for national elections.

c. Dutch Liberal Party (VVD): Apart from what was spent by branches, this party spent 600,000 Dutch guilders from its own funds on the campaign for the elections to the European Parliament. In addition, there were also two subsidies: one from the European Parliament and one from the European Liberals and Democrats (ELD). The latter subsidy amounted to 75,000 Dutch guilders. In total, about as much was spent on the European elections as on national elections: in 1977, 750,000 Dutch guilders was spent on the Second Chamber election campaign, apart from what was spent by the branches. In addition to this sum, the party branches spent 100,000 Dutch guilders on election material.

d. Democrats '66 (D'66): In total, D'66 spent the sum of 170,000 Dutch guilders on the European Parliament election campaign. That is about equal to the sum that was spent in 1977 on the campaign for the national elections. Of the total amount, 50,000 Dutch guilders was derived from subscriptions and 120,000 Dutch guilders from voluntary contributions.

e. Political Calvinist Party (SGP): There are no details known about the amount spent on the election campaign by this party.

f. Communist Party of the Netherlands (CPN): The Communist Party spent in total about 150,000 Dutch guilders on the European Parliament election campaign. This does not differ much from the amount spent on national elections. The sum of 150,000 Dutch guilders came from a special fund which had been collected on a voluntary basis among party members.

g. Pacifist Socialist Party (PSP): It is not known what amount was spent by this party on the European election campaign. The only information given was that the money was obtained via an appeal to party members for voluntary contributions and that the members gave well.

h. Political Party of Radicals (PPR): The European election campaign was financed by this party with a sum of about 200,000 Dutch guilders, without the branches. According to the information given, this amount was definitely insufficient: it was half what is spent on national elections.

i. National Reformed Political Association (GPV): This political party has the rule that party members are required to give an obligatory contribution to the financing of election campaigns. Because there was disagreement within this party as to the desirability of taking part in the elections to the European Parliament, it was decided that for the European elections the branches would contribute, on a voluntary basis, 10 Dutch guilders per party member to the election campaign. This party spent about 85,000 Dutch guilders on the European election campaign, which was considerably less than for national elections.

j. Leschot List (LL): No details are known for this personal list of Mr. Leschot, concerning the expenditure for the European election campaign.

From the above information it is apparent that the three large political parties (Christian Democratic Appeal, Dutch Labour Party and Dutch Liberal Party) received money from the European Parliament for the conducting of the election campaign. Spokesmen from the smaller political parties expressed their condemnation of this in very forceful terms. They were of the opinion that in doing this the European Parliament made an unfair and reprehensible distinction between large and smaller political parties.

All participating political parties tried to mobilize the party-machinery at all existing levels for the election campaign. One exception in this respect was the Leschot List (LL) which did not have a national organization. Much use was made of advertisements in daily and weekly papers. Certainly at the beginning of the election campaign, advertisements were aimed at making the candidates heading the lists nationally well-known. During the campaign, many election meetings were organized, often in the form of a debate between two or more opponents. Those meetings were poorly to very poorly attended. There are cases known in which no-one at all turned up, apart from the speakers and the organizers. An election panel set up on a grand scale in Amsterdam on 26th May 1979 with candidates for the European Parliament and leaders of the parliamentary groups in the Second Chamber of the three largest political parties (Lubbers for the Christian Democratic Appeal, Den Uyl for the Dutch Labour Party and Rietkerk for the Dutch Liberal Party) was a failure. At the beginning of the day there was an audience of 18 and the maximum reached later was 500. This sort of rally for national elections draws thousands of people.

By law, political parties cannot buy time on radio and television. However, it is laid down by law that broadcasting time on radio and TV be regularly allotted free of charge to political parties who have seats in the Second Chamber. It is also prescribed by law that for elections to the Second Chamber all political parties taking part are allotted extra broadcasting time on radio and TV. This rule also applied to the elections to the European Parliament: in the 6 weeks preceding the European elections, all participating parties received free of charge two periods of 10 minutes each on the radio and two periods of 10 minutes each on TV.

For the European Parliament election campaign, the government did not give any direct financial aid to the political parties. The activities of the National Committee for the Direct Elections to the European Parliament are not dealt with here.

As for the exchange of top-level leaders for campaign rallies, Dutch leaders went abroad and foreign leaders came to the Netherlands, although on a modest scale in both cases. On 7th April 1979 Nord, the candidate for the European Parliament for the Dutch Liberal Party (VVD) spoke at the international election congress of the ELD in Luxemburg. Berkhouwer, the candidate heading

the Dutch Liberal Party (VVD) list for the European elections, led together with representatives of the German FDP, an election rally day on 21st May near the Dutch-German border. Den Uyl, the political leader of the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA), spoke at the socialist rally in Paris. Albeda, one of the leaders of the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA) and a minister in the Van Agt cabinet, represented his party on 26th May at the European Christian Democrats' festival in Ostende (Belgium). On the other hand, Tindemans (Belgium) addressed a rally of the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA) on 15th May, and Thorn (Luxemburg), Bangemann (Germany) and De Clercq (Belgium) were present at the Liberal Euro-congress in Maastricht (18th - 19th May).

<u>abbreviation</u> (in alphabetical order)	<u>name in Dutch</u>	<u>name in English</u> ')
BP	Boeren-Partij	Free Tradespeople
CDA	Christen Democratisch Appèl	Christian Democratic Appeal
CPN	Communistische Partij van Nederland	Communist Party of the Netherlands
D'66	Democraten '66	Democrats '66
DS'70	Democratisch Socialisten '70	Democratic Socialists '70
GPV	Gereformeerd Politiek Verbond	National Reformed Political Association
LL	Lijst Leschot	Leschot List
PSP	Pacifistisch Socialistische Partij	Pacifist Socialist Party
PvdA	Partij van de Arbeid	Dutch Labour Party
PPR	Politieke Partij Radikalen	Political Party of Radicals
SGP	Staatkundig Gereformeerde Partij	Political Calvinist Party
VVD	Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie	Dutch Liberal Party

) the name as provided by the political party in question

Table II. Results in numbers of votes cast in the election to:

- a) the European Parliament (1979)
- b) the Provincial States (1978)
- c) the Second Chamber (1977)

	European Parliament 1979	Provincial States 1978	Second Chamber 1977
CDA	2017692	2658001	2652278
PvdA	1721949	2562654	2813793
VVD	914661	1284287	1492689
D'66	511590	394105	452423
SGP	126397	169703	177010
CPN	97196	118082	143481
PSP	97137	100479	77972
PPR	92005	118601	140910
GPV	62639	72108	79421
LL	24956		
BP		34426	69914
DS'70		5974 <sup>a)</sup>	59487
others		60218	158234
total	<u>5666222</u>	<u>7578638</u>	<u>8317612</u>

a) DS'70 took part in the elections in only two provinces



Table III. Results in percentages of votes cast in the election to:

- a) the European Parliament
- b) the Provincial States
- c) the Second Chamber

	European Parliament 1979	Provincial States 1978	Second Chamber 1977
CDA	35.6	35.1	31.9
PvdA	30.4	33.8	33.8
VVD	16.4	16.9	17.9
D'66	9.0	5.2	5.4
SGP	2.2	2.2	2.1
CPN	1.7	1.6	1.7
PSP	1.7	1.3	0.9
PPR	1.6	1.6	1.7
GPV	1.1	1.0	1.0
LL	0.4		
BP		0.5	0.8
DS'70		0.1 <sup>a)</sup>	0.7
others		0.8	1.9
total	100.1	100.1	99.8

a) DS'70 took part in the elections in only two provinces

Table IV. Results in numbers of seats for the election to:

- a) the European Parliament (1979)
- b) the Provincial States (1978)
- c) the Second Chamber (1977)

	European Parliament 1979	Provincial States 1978	Second Chamber 1977
CDA	10	268	49
PvdA	9	254	53
VVD	4	118	28
D'66	2	31	8
SGP	-	13	3
CPN	-	5	2
PSP	-	4	1
PPR	-	6	3
GPV	-	4	1
LL	-		
BP		-	1
DS'70		-a)	1
others		2	
total	<u>25</u>	<u>705</u>	<u>150</u>

a) DS'70 took part in the elections in only two provinces

Footnotes

1. The Second Chamber is the part of the Dutch parliament which is elected directly. The First Chamber is elected indirectly by the members of the 11 Provincial States.
2. Intomart took a representative sample of 40 polling-booths. It covered 40241 people entitled to vote, of whom 23317 cast their vote. Of these voters, 19091 (81.1%) assisted in the inquiry.
3. The parties participating in the Den Uyl cabinet formed in 1973 were the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA), the Democrats '66 (D'66), the Political Party of Radicals (PPR) and two of the three parties which now form the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA), namely the Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP) and the Catholic People's Party (KVP).
4. Prime Minister Van Agt is the political leader of the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA). In the Second Chamber, the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA) and the Dutch Liberal Party (VVD) together have only 77 of the 150 seats; see Table IV.