6. What gives the USA the authority to create the impression that it has a right of decision in relation to the accession of new Member States to the EU?

7. Does the Council intend to inform the USA that decisions on accepting new Member States lie exclusively, jointly, with the EU itself, its Member States and the candidate countries and are on no account a matter for non-European powers?


---

**Reply**

(21 July 2003)

1. The countries of the Western Balkans had their European prospects (‘potential candidates for membership’) confirmed at the Zagreb Summit in November 2000, based on the conclusions of the European Council meeting at Feira on 19 and 20 June 2000. The European Council meeting in Copenhagen on 12/13 December 2002 recently recalled the membership criteria defined at the Copenhagen European Council meeting in June 1993 and reaffirmed the European prospects of the countries of the Western Balkans.

2. The European Union attaches very great importance to the handing over of Radovan Karadžić, Ratko Mladić and General Gotovina to the ICTY. As regards the US position, the Honourable Member should address his request directly to the competent authorities.

3. The Council is aware that the US Congress included a special clause in its law on foreign assistance for 2003, whereby it has practically frozen until 15 June its aid for Serbia, amounting to USD 110 million. The suspension will be lifted if Secretary of State Colin Powell informs Congress that Serbia has complied with the conditions for cooperation with the ICTY.

4. The Council is not aware of any threats by Ambassador Prosper regarding these countries’ eventual membership of the EU, but is informed that the United States attaches great importance to the US and the EU sending the same message on full cooperation with the ICTY.

The Council reiterates that all countries and parties in the Western Balkans region must cooperate fully with the ICTY. Full cooperation with the ICTY is essential for further movement towards the EU.

Finally, the Council would like to stress to the Honourable Member that applications for membership of the European Union are dealt with solely in accordance with the conditions laid down in Article 49 of the Treaty on European Union, which upholds the principle of autonomy of decision making by the European Union.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-0220/03**

by Marco Cappato (NI) to the Council

(3 February 2003)

Subject: Drug-related escalation of violence in Bolivia

The situation in Bolivia vis-à-vis the demonstrations of indigenous groups that advocate the use of traditional produce such as coca leaf — currently strictly regulated by the Bolivian Government — should become of particular concern to the international community. In fact, over the last few days in Bolivia there has been a series of clashes between the police and army and the protesters, mainly farmers, who were demonstrating against the eradication of their traditional crop. According to Bolivian media outlets the situation is characterised by an escalation of violence that has led to at least 17 deaths, dozens wounded and hundreds arrested.

Is the Council aware of the nature of such an escalation in the confrontation between the Government and indigenous groups on the eradication of coca, and what measures is the Council enforcing or does it intend to enforce in its support to the Bolivian authorities in their crop eradication activities?
Does the Council not believe that the time has come to address the failures, and disastrous consequences, that prohibition is provoking in producer and consumer countries alike and initiate at the upcoming ministerial segment of the UN Commission on Narcotics, scheduled for 16 and 17 April 2003, a process of revision of the three international Conventions on Narcotic and Psychotropic Substances in order to promote a more effective pragmatic approach to the drug question?

Reply

(21 July 2003)

The situation in Bolivia to which the Honourable Member of Parliament refers has not been discussed in the framework of the Council. The theme of crop eradication and alternative development will be discussed at the forthcoming high level meeting on drugs of the European Union with the Andean Community on 26/27 May 2003 in Cartagena de las Indias as well as in a broader framework at the Fifth High Level meeting of the coordination/cooperation mechanism on drugs EU/Latin America/Caribbean on 29/30 May in the same city.

As regards a process of revision of the three international conventions so far no such an initiative has been discussed in the framework of the Council.

(2003/C 280 E/043) WRITTEN QUESTION E-0231/03

by Antonios Trakatellis (PPE-DE) to the Commission

(4 February 2003)

Subject: Input of Community resources into the Greek economy

Commission estimates and data relating to the Greek economy (updating of the stability programme for 2001 and 2002) show that the rate of growth of GDP in Greece was 4.10% in 2001. This is presented as evidence of the ‘good’ performance of the Greek economy compared to the EU average. However, according to the Commission report drawn up by the Budget Directorate-General in September 2002, the input of Community resources into Greece amounted to 3.50% of the GDP for 2001 and 3.65% for 2000. The corresponding figures relating to the contribution made by the input of Community resources to GDP for 2001 for other Member States of the European Union given in this report were as follows: Portugal: 1.53%, Ireland: 1.13% and Spain: 1.24% of GDP. This means that the growth of GDP in Greece derives essentially from a redistribution of EU budget resources, since, according to Commission statistics, Community input of all kinds — Structural Funds, Cohesion Fund, European Agricultural Guarantee and Guidance Fund and European Social Fund, etc. — amounted to 85.4% of the growth in the GDP of Greece in 2001.

1. Can the Commission confirm that the input of Community resources in Greece corresponded to 3.50% of GDP in 2001 and 3.65% in 2000 and that the 4.1% increase of Greek GDP in 2001 is due almost entirely to the input of Community resources?

2. What contribution has the Community budget made in the growth of Greek GDP in 2002 and what amounts of these funds entered Greece in the same year?

3. On the basis of the data available, what are the multiplier effects of such a significant transfer of Community funds to the Greek economy for 2000, 2001 and 2002?

4. On the basis of the data available, what is the potential for the Greek economy to continue growing under its own impetus after the expiry of the third CSF in 2006?