

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1185/85
by Mr Klaus Hänsch (S — D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(3 September 1985)
(87/C 54/01)

Subject: Legal proceedings against German tourists attempting to cross into the Netherlands with recently expired papers

A few weeks before the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands agreed to simplify formalities at their common frontier, a group of German tourists who were travelling by coach to the Netherlands on a short excursion were ordered, *ex post facto*, under international notice served by the Netherlands authorities to pay a fine of 35 Dutch guilder, on the grounds that the identity papers in their possession at the time had recently expired, and were threatened with prosecution in the event of non-payment.

1. Is the Commission aware of this practice, which is clearly also followed at the Netherlands frontier with Belgium (see Written Question No 625/85 ⁽¹⁾)? Does it believe it to be compatible with the attempts to create a 'people's Europe'?
2. Can and will the Commission take steps to ensure that this practice is ended?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 272, 23. 10. 1985.

Supplementary answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission
(29 October 1986)

Further to its answer of 10 October 1985 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission is now able to inform the Honourable Member that the Dutch authorities have confirmed that they fined a German tourist leaving the country 35 Dutch guilder following an identity check which revealed that her identity card had expired over two months previously.

Although it regrets the occurrence of such incidents, which are an unfortunate reminder to Community citizens of the continued existence of intra-Community borders and checks on persons, the Commission has to acknowledge that the action of the Dutch authorities does not contravene

Community law, as Articles 2 and 3 of Council Directive 73/148/EEC of 21 May 1973 on the abolition of restrictions on movement and residence within the Community with regard to establishment of services ⁽²⁾ stipulate that recipients of services (such as tourists) may enter and leave the territory of a Member State on production of a 'valid' identity card.

The Commission would remind the Honourable Member of the ruling by the Court of Justice that Community law does not prevent the Member States from providing appropriate sanctions for breaches of national provisions concerning the control of aliens ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 341, 31. 12. 1985.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 172, 28. 6. 1973, p. 14.

⁽³⁾ Judgement of 8 April 1976, Case 48/75 Royer /1976/ ECR 497.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2815/85
by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 February 1986)
(87/C 54/02)

Subject: Lung disease caused by atmospheric pollution

Last winter in the Limburg region and the eastern mining area, 20 to 25 % more people were admitted to hospital with bronchial disorders.

According to a lung specialist, bronchial complaints are increasing each year and, in his view, this is due to the rise in atmospheric pollution.

Depending on the wind direction, the area is exposed to pollution from the Ruhr or from the Liège industrial basin.

Can the Commission answer the following points:

— Is it aware of the serious increase in lung disease?

— Is research already being carried out at European level into the effects of atmospheric pollution and lung disease, particularly on the long-term implications?

Answer given by Mr Marín
on behalf of the Commission
(25 September 1986)

The long-term effects of air pollution on the respiratory system are well-known. The present situation with regard to air pollution by dust, and the oxides of nitrogen and sulphur has not fundamentally worsened, in the industrialized countries at least, in the last two decades. This state of affairs — which is not, however, optimum — is due to a large extent to the efforts of the European Community which has implemented a series of measures to reduce pollution at source and hence create a better environment for human beings, animals and plants.

The significant incidence of broncho-pulmonary diseases in the Meuse valley is due to a large extent to climatic phenomena ('rebound') and to particular geographical conditions which are in fact encountered in other places, in particular Ankara, Los Angeles and Nice. The major role played by tobacco in broncho-pulmonary diseases should not, however, be forgotten.

The Commission has a considerable amount of information about exposure-effect relationships. However, the information in question mainly concerns the exposure of workers who inhale large amounts of dust and various physico-chemical agents in the course of their work.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2948/85
by Mr Hemmo Muntingh (S — NL)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(7 March 1986)
(87/C 54/03)

Subject: Implementation of the Washington Convention

The Dutch authorities recently seized a consignment of 40 000 crocodile skins from Paraguay on their way to Italy.

The skins were of the Caiman crocodilus (spectacled caiman), a species which appears on List II of the Washington Convention (CITES) and in Annex C2 of Regulation (EEC) No 2384/85 ⁽¹⁾.

Paraguay has introduced a regulation governing exports of this species and the CITES Secretariat has informed all countries accordingly.

1. Will the Commission state whether there have been other incidents of this type since the EEC's accession to the CITES?
2. If so, which countries and which products were involved?
3. What steps has the Commission taken or will it take in response to such violations of the regulation, including the incident referred to above?
4. Does the Commission consider it acceptable that a full two years after entry into force of the Washington Convention trade is still permitted in the Community on the basis of documents submitted prior to the entry into force of the Convention?
5. What steps can the Commission take and what steps has it already taken in respect of carriers who transport goods covered by the Convention?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 231, 29. 8. 1985, p. 1.

Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis
on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 1986)

The Dutch authorities have not recently seized a shipment of 40 000 crocodile skins on its way from Paraguay to Italy.

The Honourable Member is therefore probably referring to a consignment of 15 000 Caiman crocodilus yacare skins (1 700 kg) which was detained at Schiphol airport while in transit from Paraguay to Italy back in April 1984.

Council Regulation (EEC) No 3626/82 on the implementation of CITES in the Community ⁽¹⁾ applies from 1 January 1984. The shipment concerned was therefore subject to the provision of Article 5, paragraph 4, of that Regulation which prescribes that, where specimens are brought into the Community and placed under a customs transit procedure, an export document has to have been issued by the exporting country and that Member States may require presentation of that export documentation or satisfactory proof of its existence. In the case concerned the Paraguayan export documents were not valid.

The fact that, in 1983, the Italian authorities had issued import permits for the consignment on the basis of these export documents is, in the opinion of the Commission irrelevant because Article 9, paragraph 1 and 2, of Regulation (EEC) No 3626/82 — on the recognition of decisions of other Member States and the validity of

permits and certificates throughout the Community — is not applicable to permits issued by a Member State before 1 January 1984.

Although Article 31, paragraph 1 of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3418/83 ⁽²⁾ provides that 'permits and certificates issued under national legislation concerning the implementation of the Convention before 1 January 1984 may continue to be used until their last day of validity' this does not affect the obligations of other Member States under Article 5, paragraph 4 of Regulation (EEC) No 3626/82 and the requirement of valid export documentation.

In reply to the specific questions raised by the Honourable Member of Parliament, the Commission

- 1 and 2. is not aware of any similar cases since the entry into force of Council Regulation (EEC) No 3626/82;
3. agrees to the steps taken by the Dutch authorities with regard to the consignment in question;
4. should like to note that the scope of Article 31, paragraph 1 of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3418/83 is limited to the period of validity of CITES documents, which never exceeds 6 months. Therefore no imports have taken place on the basis of documents issued prior to the entry into force of the Community CITES Regulations after 1 July 1984;
5. informs the Honourable Member that sanctions for illegal trade in CITES specimens are contained in the Member States' national implementation legislation. The Commission is, however, currently examining possibilities to arrive at a common level of the penalties concerned.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 384, 31. 12. 1982, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 344, 7. 12. 1983, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 3004/85

by Mr Gerhard Schmid (S — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 March 1986)

(87/C 54/04)

Subject: Lock-outs and the operation of the Common Market

The rules governing lock-outs vary from Member State to Member State.

1. What is the legal position in each Member State?
2. Is there a risk, in the Commission's view, that, as a result of the different rules, one country's undertakings and industries will be able to exert a greater influence over labour costs and hence gain competitive advantages?
3. The German Federal Government is planning to amend paragraph 116 of the German Employment Promotion Act in order to tighten up the rules governing lock-outs in the Federal Republic of Germany, a development

which may mean financial ruin for the German trade unions. Does the Commission take the view that Germany industry will gain such advantages, thereby distorting competition?

4. Does the Commission believe that this will jeopardize the operation of the Common Market?
5. In view of such problems, how important does the Commission consider its role, pursuant to Article 118 of the EEC Treaty, of promoting close cooperation between the Member States with regard *inter alia* to the right of association and collective bargaining between employers and workers?

**Answer given by Mr Marín
on behalf of the Commission**

(30 October 1986)

1. The legal situation regarding lock-outs in the Member States is as follows:

— In none of the Member States does the constitution recognize a lock-out as a fundamental right nor does it ban such lock-outs;

In Greece and in Portugal lock-outs are banned under common law;

— In Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Ireland with certain restrictions the law recognizes lock-outs as an instrument of industrial conflict;

— In Italy, France and Spain the law does not regard lock-outs as an instrument of industrial conflict.

In practice, lock-outs are only applied on any wide scale and only play an important role in the Federal Republic of Germany, and are rare or unknown in the other Member States. Indeed, in the Federal Republic of Germany a defensive lock-out against a strike which has already broken out is permitted by law and plays an important role in industrial conflicts.

2. The diversity of legislation and rules which can either encourage or hinder recourse to a lock-out is such as to influence the cost of labour and consequently effect the competitiveness between firms and sectors within the community.

3. The law concerning the neutrality of the Federal Labour Office in industrial conflicts which came into force on 24 May 1986, basically consists of no more than rules setting on record the existing legal situation. Accordingly it cannot be considered that these rules involve amendments relating to advantages or disadvantages as regards competition. In addition, this question cannot be assessed in practical terms except on the basis of the application of the rules in question.

4. See reply to 2 and 3.

5. As part of its responsibilities under Article 118 of the EEC Treaty and under the future Single Act the Commission is always prepared to discuss questions of trade union law and collective bargaining to the extent that they are of priority concern to the Community.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 3111/85
by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(21 March 1986)
(87/C 54/05)

Subject: Increasing incidence of bronchitis resulting from atmospheric pollution

In heavily polluted industrial areas children have 50 % more chance of catching bronchitis than in less polluted rural areas. This emerges from a survey carried out by the German Institute for Hygiene.

Is the Commission aware of these facts?

Are other foreign studies available that corroborate this data?

Does the Commission intend in the near future to map out those areas of Europe where environmental pollution is very severe and even hazardous for the inhabitants and at an early date to propose solutions?

Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis
on behalf of the Commission
(6 October 1986)

The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given by the Commission to his Written Question No 2815/85 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ See page 2 of this Official Journal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 161/86
by Mr Gérard Deprez (PPE — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(21 April 1986)
(87/C 54/06)

Subject: Restrictions imposed by Belgian Legislation on freedom of movement

Article 3 of the Belgian Royal Decree of 31 December 1953 on the registration of vehicles prohibits the regular use of a

vehicle registered in Belgium by any person, Belgian or foreign, not resident in Belgium.

While this restriction is perhaps understandable (for tax reasons) if the vehicle in question is intended for personal use or private business, it is aberrant in cases where the use of such a vehicle forms part of an employment contract.

For example, in the case of an institution for disabled adults situated on the Belgian side of the Franco-Belgian border, which employs staff from both sides of the border, only the Belgian staff resident in Belgium have the right to drive the vehicles belonging to the institution!

What is the Commission's reaction to this? Could it not submit proposals to the Council to ensure that such a situation, which runs counter to the objective of securing the free movement of persons, no longer arises?

Answer given by Mr Marin
on behalf of the Commission
(14 October 1986)

Article 3 of the Belgian Royal Decree of 31 December 1953 would appear to be incompatible with Community law, in particular with Articles 48 and 49 of the EEC Treaty. During the adoption procedure of Directive 80/1263/EEC ⁽¹⁾, moreover, it was noted that the case of a holder of a national driving licence issued by the Member State of residence was essentially the same as that of a visitor, if the holder of this driving licence, for professional reasons, drove a vehicle in another Member State, registered in that Member State.

The Commission will look into the matter, and if it should find that Community law has been infringed it will not fail to initiate the procedure provided for in Article 169 of the EEC Treaty.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 375, 31. 12. 1980.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 175/86
by Mr Ernest Mühlen (PPE — L)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(21 April 1986)
(87/C 54/07)

Subject: Consolidation and strengthening of the role of small and medium-sized undertakings in the Community

1. Since the Commission, through Mr Matutes, has expressed its intention of consolidating and strengthening the role played in the European Community by small and

medium-sized undertakings, can it indicate the measures by which it plans to achieve this objective?

2. Can the Commission state in particular by what means it plans to facilitate access to the capital markets for small and medium-sized undertakings, as it has expressed the intention of doing?

**Answer given by Mr Matutes
on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 1986)**

1. Community policy with regard to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) is one of the current priorities fixed by the Commission, and its aim is to lay down a coherent framework in which SMEs can be set up and develop harmoniously without discrimination vis-à-vis large firms and which takes account of their specific nature.

Within this framework, the policy, which is accompanied by the setting up of a more substantial administrative infrastructure (the Task Force), comprises both general improvement of the economic climate and a set of integrated programmes centred on the main problems experienced by SMEs.

Three campaigns are now envisaged:

- the first concerns the environment in which SMEs operate, through completion of the internal market (simplification of border controls, access to public contracts, adaptation of company law and the competition rules) and relaxation of legislative and administrative constraints at both national and Community level;
- the second campaign consists of action to improve the financing capacity of SMEs by encouraging them to make use of Community financial instruments (grants and loans) and by developing appropriate taxation arrangements;
- the third type of action aims to provide better assistance to SMEs in setting themselves up and in cooperation, staff training, research, dissemination of innovation and keeping informed.

2. In recent years the Commission has been at pains to promote the development of means of financing better suited to the special nature and needs of SMEs. The proposal for a European Innovation Loan and the success of the Venture Consort project which derives from it are illustrations of this.

The Commission intends to pursue its activities with a view, in particular, to better coordination of Community and private financing and to offer, or encourage the market to offer, new financing formulas better suited to small business projects.

The Commission is thus at present involved in four types of initiative:

- renewal of the New Community Instrument (NCI). In view of the success of the global loans made to SMEs through this instrument, in June 1985 the Commission made a proposal to the Council that a new tranche of loans should be made available, within a ceiling of 1 500 million ECU, exclusively for investment in SMEs, in particular for advanced technologies.

The lending arrangements proposed have innovative features such as extending the financing base to cover intangible assets and enabling financial intermediaries to convert the proceeds of a loan into a capital contribution;

- promotion of risk capital in parts of the Community where its use is not widespread. Thus under the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes the Commission may top up the capital endowment of both financial holding companies and guarantee funds for the acquisition of holdings in SMEs;
- improvements in the financing of projects which are at an intermediate stage between research and industrial production. To achieve these, the Commission is studying the possibility of setting up one or more investment corporations (Eurotech Capital), whose capital will be purely private, and a guarantee mechanism (Eurotech Insur) with both public and private resources. Eurotech Capital could in certain cases intervene to support projects carried out by SMEs;
- establishment of a corporation specializing in the injection of its own funds to SMEs (the EIFC), whose shareholders could be major private banks.

By means of these initiatives, the Commission intends, through both direct and indirect intervention, to encourage the market to provide SMEs with the type and quantity of capital they require.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 198/86**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE — IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(21 April 1986)**(87/C 54/08)*

Subject: Postage rates for printed matter within the Community

Will the Commission provide a detailed comparison of the postage rates for sending newspapers and other printed matter in the various Member States of the Community?

Is the Commission aware of the recent increases imposed by the Belgian postal authorities, whereby newspapers posted within Belgium are charged at 3,50 Belgian francs, whereas those sent to Benelux and other European Community destinations are charged at 15 and 20 Belgian francs respectively?

If so, would the Commission not agree that these rates are contrary to both the letter and the spirit of the Treaties and of the Single Act, in that they effectively partition the internal market?

If so, what action will the Commission take to rectify this situation and to make further progress towards the creation of a true European postage area?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield**on behalf of the Commission***(15 October 1986)*

In view of the volume of data involved, the Commission has sent direct to the Honourable Member and the Secretariat of Parliament details of the postage rates for newspapers and other printed matter sent within Member States and to other Member States of the Community.

With regard to the increase in Belgium in the rate for sending newspapers abroad, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question No 428/86 by Mr Glinne.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 270/86**by Mr Gerhard Schmid (S — D)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(12 May 1986)**(87/C 54/09)*

Subject: Action to combat forest fires

Between 1970 and 1981 the European Community lost a total of 2,1 million hectares of valuable forest as a result of forest fires. The scorched earth will be useless for any form of forestry for years, and the cost of the damage runs to some 2 000 million ECU.

1. What results were achieved by the FLORAC 1985 anti-forest fire campaign?
2. Has the Commission any proposals for increased cooperation by European States to meet emergencies?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen**on behalf of the Commission***(29 August 1986)*

The European firefighting exercise FLORAC 85 showed that if a fire should occur that could not be controlled using the Member State's own resources air and ground assistance could be given by other Member States provided that both those assisted and those giving assistance

- had harmonized their aerial techniques, equipment and certain essential products so as to achieve maximum compatibility, and
- had available both operational and backup personnel trained for such cooperation.

The proposal for a Regulation establishing a Community scheme to increase the protection of forests against fires and acid rain (Doc. COM(83) 375 final ⁽¹⁾) includes measures designed to meet these needs.

After three years of discussion on the basis of this proposal the Council, despite the changes made in it, is still unable to reach any positive decision.

The Commission has, however, noted with interest the unanimous commitments on the protection of forests against fire that the Member States made at the recent International Conference on Trees and Forests (SILVA). It considers that the latest compromise solution proposed by it and discussed in the Council is a satisfactory basis on which the Member States can implement their commitments without delay, and it will spare no effort to obtain a positive decision from the Council in the near future.

As far as cooperation by European states to meet emergencies is concerned the Commission, following an informal meeting of the ministers responsible for civil

defence held on 2 and 3 May 1985 in Rome, has begun a process of reflection on civil defence problems with the Member States with the aim of strengthening European cooperation in this area.

(¹) OJ No C 187, 13. 7. 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 275/86

by Mr Robert Battersby (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 May 1986)

(87/C 54/10)

Subject: Legality of prohibition of carriage of stowed nets inside coastal zones

Can the Commission confirm that all Community fishing vessels on passage through or seeking shelter within the twelve-mile coastal zone of any Member State or landing in any port of any Member State may legally carry any net in any material including monofilament material providing that the net concerned is properly stowed in conformity with EEC regulations?

Can the Commission further confirm that Community fishing vessels may land fish in any Community port irrespective of the type of gear or net material carried on board providing the gear or net is properly stowed in conformity with the regulations, and providing the gear and material used in catching was that legally authorized at the catching location?

Answer given by Mr Cardoso e Cunha

on behalf of the Commission

(6 October 1986)

With the exception of Article 14, paragraph 4, of Council Regulation (EEC) No 171/83 (¹) which provides that certain trawls may not be carried on board Member States' fishing vessels within the trawl prohibition areas referred to in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Article 14 'unless they are properly lashed and stowed in such a way that they may not be readily used', Community law contains no prohibition on the carriage on board of certain nets.

Landings in Community ports of catches taken by Member States' vessels and checks on such landings are covered by other legislation which carries no prohibition on the presence of certain types of gear on board a vessel and no limit on the rights of Community fishermen to land their catches in any part of the Community.

However, Articles 19 and 20 of the Regulation (EEC) No 171/83, provide that, in order to ensure more effectively the conservation of fish stocks available to national fishermen, each Member State may take certain national technical measures which overstep the Community requirements. Such measures must apply solely to national fishermen and must be compatible with Community law and consistent with the common fisheries policy.

Several Member States have taken advantage of this possibility to prohibit the presence of certain types of gear on the vessels of their own fishermen when such vessels are within their own coastal waters. Such measures must, as Articles 19 and 20 stipulate, be consistent with the Community rules, and notably those referred to in the first paragraph.

(¹) OJ No L 24, 27. 1. 1983, p. 14.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 335/86

by Mr Christian de la Malène (RDE — F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 May 1986)

(87/C 54/11)

Subject: Rules governing the marketing of 'soya milk' in the various Member States

The rules governing the product wrongly named 'soya milk' vary. In some Community countries it is sold freely, in some it may be sold only if certain rules on colouring are observed, so that the product may be identified, whilst in others its sale is prohibited.

There is no doubt that this product, whatever its dietary or other merits, is intended to compete with natural milk, especially cow's milk, although its composition is quite different. This emerges quite clearly from the fact that in most cases the producers refuse to give it an appearance which would clearly distinguish it from the natural product.

On the evidence of certain legal proceedings, it would seem that the Commission is in favour of completely free trading in this product, dispensing with any form of regulation or requirement as to presentation.

Can the Commission say:

1. why it is thus siding with the States which have the most liberal rules on the subject at the expense of others?

2. why it did not think fit to introduce a set of measures to ensure that this product is clearly distinguishable from other products?
3. why it is thus making an imported product more competitive in relation to cow's milk, the overproduction of which is creating so many difficulties for the Community authorities?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission**
(16 October 1986)

1. Action taken by a Member State to ban imports of 'soya milk' lawfully produced and marketed in another Member State is, in the Commission's view, in breach of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty. The Commission does not consider that there is any pressing need which could justify such a prohibition. A problem of public health does not arise. Consumers can be protected and fair trade safeguarded by applying strict rules on labelling, presentation and advertising, but a total ban on trade in the products in question is not necessary for that purpose and cannot therefore be justified.

Furthermore, the protection of a given economic sector cannot, in the Commission's opinion, constitute a pressing need that would justify hindering the free movement of goods.

To acknowledge such a justification would be tantamount to endorsing the underlying approach of protectionism at the expense of the fundamental principle of the free movement of goods and the free choice of consumers.

2. The Commission shares the Honourable Member's view of the need to distinguish unambiguously between milk and milk derivatives, on the one hand, and imitation products, on the other hand. Such a conviction led it to propose to the Council extremely strict rules on the subject: on 18 April 1986, the Commission sent the Council a report setting out an analysis of the market in milk substitutes and dairy products. The proposal follows on from that report ⁽¹⁾.

3. The Commission advocates a new approach to foodstuffs legislation in the context of the completion of the internal market ⁽²⁾. It takes the view that it is not desirable to propose an outright ban on the manufacture and marketing — and therefore also importing — of imitation products, provided that the latter satisfy a genuine consumer demand and do not jeopardize the interests of public health and consumer protection.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(86) 222 final.

⁽²⁾ Doc. COM(85) 603 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 403/85

by Mr Ernest Mühlen (PPE — L)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 May 1986)

(87/C 54/12)

Subject: Social aid for Community farmers

Since the agricultural prices for the 1986/1987 marketing year are not likely to ensure 'fair incomes' for small- and medium-scale farmers, national subsidies for social purposes — in the form of income support — have already been announced. In this connection, can the Commission say

1. whether it considers such aid compatible with the provisions of the EEC Treaty, and
2. whether it proposes to regulate, where appropriate, the granting of such aid, with the precise objective of preventing distortions and eliminating the risk of renationalization of agricultural policy?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(21 October 1986)

1. Public subsidies to income granted per farmer or by farm, even on the basis of considerations of social order, rank as State aids within the meaning of Article 92. For the assessment of such schemes, the Commission reviews them case by case in the light of a range of considerations of law and fact. These include the existence of provisions under Community derived law on agriculture (one of the main aims of which is to ensure a fair income for farmers), the specific objects of the schemes, and their relationship (if any) to larger-scale projects designed, for example, to enable the farmers concerned to take part in lasting arrangements for the development of agricultural structures or to allow the introduction of general provisions peculiar to the social security system.

2. Under Article 94 of the EEC Treaty, powers of decision in this field are vested in the Council. For its own part, the Commission is planning to establish a framework containing criteria governing the payment of aids linked to social security costs in agriculture. It has referred a preliminary draft framework document to the working group on conditions of competition in agriculture.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 437/86

by Lord O'Hagan (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 May 1986)

(87/C 54/13)

Subject: Transmitting frequencies

The Member States of the EEC all have different rules and laws which control the way in which amateur radio enthusiasts are allowed to transmit.

Does the Commission have any proposal for the harmonization or standardization of these rules?

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 1986)

The question of allocation of frequencies to be used by amateur radio licencees as well as the maximum transmitting power legally allowed for by their equipment has to be seen in the light of the scarcity of frequencies and the necessary measures which must be taken to protect against interference. At the World Administrative Radio Conferences the rules for the assignment and use of frequencies are laid down. The conferences are held approximately every 10 years, and the next will take place in 1987. The tele-administrations are aiming at achieving the very best frequency-economy for their services, due to the very tight allocations. As a result of this ever-growing utilization of the bands, it becomes still more important to prevent any harmful distortion of radio interference. The upper limit of allowable transmitter power is also a function of the saturation of the neighbouring bands. This differs from country to country. Thus a harmonization would imply alignment with the lowest of the upper limits.

The amateur radio frequencies are allocated and controlled by the individual tele-administrations. This takes place in a coordinated way through cooperation between the administrations, taking place in the European Conference on Post and Telecommunications (CEPT).

The Commission is cooperating with CEPT in the framework of its telecommunications policy, and is currently dealing with the priority issues of this policy, which covers a number of important harmonization and standardization issues. The allocations and the use of amateur radio frequencies are not among these priorities. Consequently, the Commission is not in a position where it intends to intervene in this matter.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 447/86

by Mr Willy Vernimmen (S — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 June 1986)

(87/C 54/14)

Subject: Community measures in the forestry sector

In the discussion document on Community measures in the forestry sector, the Commission gives details of an action programme for forestry.

This programme includes a number of measures to contribute to an expansion of the woodland area and better use of existing forests.

The Commission's document of 31 January 1986 limits discussion of forestry in the Community to the Community of Ten — this despite the fact that Spain and Portugal joined the Community on 1 January 1986.

1. Can the Commission tell us whether it has already realized this fact?
2. If so, what has the Commission done to date or what plans had it made to take full account of the accession of Spain and Portugal whereby the Community of Ten has become the Community of Twelve?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 1986)

1. Although the discussion paper on Community action in the forestry sector ⁽¹⁾ was prepared before Spain and Portugal joined the Community, the Commission included the two prospective Member States where data available so allowed.

2. In view of the enlargement and in accordance with the Act of Accession, the Commission proposed to the Council:

(a) as regards Portugal

— a Regulation on a specific programme for the development of Portuguese agriculture. This programme, which the Council adopted on 20 December 1985 ⁽²⁾, contains an important section on forestry (See Article 22 thereof);

— specific conditions for the application in Portugal of Regulation (EEC) No 797/85 on improving the efficiency of agricultural structures ⁽³⁾. The extension provided for therefore applies to the forestry provisions of the said Regulation. The Council adopted this Regulation on 22 April 1986 ⁽⁴⁾;

(b) as regards Spain:

- a Regulation adapting, on account of the accession of Spain, Regulation (EEC) No 797/85 including the forestry provisions thereof (in particular Article 20) ⁽⁵⁾.

The Commission has thus taken all the action required to enable forestry measures of a general nature in force in the Community to be applied as soon as possible.

The Commission also raised several issues directly related to the accession of Spain and Portugal, such as the cork industry, in its discussion paper on forestry, for which a large number of persons were consulted and which has been referred to Parliament. The conclusions to consultations in progress may enable the Commission to submit specific proposals for this product which is of particular importance for the two new Member States.

In addition, when extending the research sub-programme on wood as a renewable raw material for 1986 to 1990, which has just been approved by the Council, the Commission took particular care in selecting the title and contents of the said programme to take account of the forestry products of particular interest to the two new Member States, such as cork.

Lastly, the Commission has reminded the Council of its proposal relating to forest protection in particular against forest fires ⁽⁶⁾. This proposal is still before the Council pending a decision by the latter. The accession of the two new Member States, whose woodland area destroyed by fire each year is equivalent to twice the area destroyed in France, Italy and Greece provides added justification for this proposal and is an argument in favour of a speedy decision by the Council on the matter. In this respect the Commission welcomed the commitment by the Member States as a whole at the recent International Conference on Trees and Forests (the SILVA Conference), to international cooperation to protect forests against fires. It believes that the proposal referred to above gives the Council a suitable opportunity to put that commitment into effect in the very near future.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(85) 792 and Doc. COM(86) 26 final.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 372, 31. 12. 1985, Regulation (EEC) No 3828/85, 20 December 1985.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 93, 30. 3. 1985.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 115, 3. 5. 1986, Council Regulation (EEC) No 1316/86 of 22 April 1986.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 194, 17. 7. 1986, Council Regulation (EEC) No 2224/86 of 14 July 1986.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ No C 208, 8. 8. 1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 463/86

by Mrs Raymonde Dury (S — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 June 1986)

(87/C 54/15)

Subject: Harmonization of international postal rates

Can the Commission present a survey of the international postal rates applied within the European Community in respect of newspaper subscriptions?

Does it not believe that these rates should be harmonized?

Has it already referred this question to the Member States?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield

on behalf of the Commission

(4 November 1986)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions No 198/86 by Mr Raftery ⁽¹⁾ and No 428/86 by Mr Glinne.

⁽¹⁾ See page 6 of this Official Journal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 489/86

by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (LDR — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 June 1986)

(87/C 54/16)

Subject: Banning of 'soya milk' in France

Although 'soya milk', which is made from soya, sunflowers or colza seeds, is authorized in a number of European countries, it is banned in France.

This product contains more unsaturated fats than milk of animal origin. It has properties which are different from those of traditional milk.

The French State has been accused of erecting a barrier to the free movement of goods, and the case is now pending before the European Court of Justice.

Can the Commission state what particular specifications (labelling, composition of the product, etc.) it has proposed so that the consumer will know exactly the nature of the different products concerned ('plant-based milk' and 'milk of animal origin') and is able to make an informed choice?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission
(25 September 1986)**

The Commission would ask the Honourable Member to refer to Council Directive 79/112/EEC of 18 December 1978 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs for sale to the ultimate customer ⁽¹⁾.

Under Article 2 of that Directive, the labelling of a foodstuff and methods used must not be such as could mislead the purchaser, particularly as to its nature, identity and composition.

This regulation also covers the presentation and advertising of foodstuffs.

The name under which soya-based beverages are sold shall meet the requirements set out in Article 5 of the Directive. It must inform the purchaser of its true nature and enable it to be distinguished from products with which it could be confused.

Finally, the labelling of such beverages shall include an exhaustive list of its ingredients.

In the milk and milk-products sector the Commission has sent the Council a proposal for a strict regulation intended effectively to protect the designations traditionally used to distinguish between the products falling within this sector ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 33, 8. 2. 1979, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Doc. COM(84) 5 final, as amended by Doc. COM(86) 222 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 517/86

by Mr Louis Perinat Elio (ED — E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 June 1986)

(87/C 54/17)

Subject: Common environmental protection policy

With the imminent prospect of European Environment Year in 1987 and a fresh impetus to Community environment policy in the offing, the regions will have to participate and benefit from this common policy to protect the natural environment in the Community.

To achieve this there will be a need for a considerable effort through the Community action programmes to obtain evenly balanced funding between the ERDF, the EAGGF and the European Social Fund which promote Community regional development policy, so as to bring about the most efficient coordination possible, produce the optimal results

and, at the same time, reduce the costs involved in combating pollution at regional level.

Could the Commission therefore state whether it intends to take decisive and positive action to protect the environment as part of Community regional development.

**Answer given by Mr Varfis
on behalf of the Commission
(6 October 1986)**

A substantial portion of ERDF aid already goes to environmental protection and improvement projects.

The Commission is also determined to achieve greater consistency between the objectives of Community regional policy and environment policy. It will therefore prepare a study on the regional aspects of environment policy with a view to proposing a Community programme under the ERDF Regulation concerning support for investment and initiatives designed to protect and enhance the environment.

The Commission is currently studying the introduction of special internal procedures for integrating the environment dimension more effectively in the other Community policies and in the application of the corresponding financial instruments.

As far as the European Social Fund is concerned, the Commission would inform the Honourable Member that priority is given to vocational training schemes directly geared to specific jobs in undertakings with a staff of less than 500 and involving application of the new technologies sponsored by Community research and development programmes.

The following are the programmes in the environment field:

- environmental protection ⁽¹⁾,
- environmental protection and climatology ⁽²⁾,
- application of remote-sensing techniques ⁽¹⁾,
- industrial hazards ⁽¹⁾,
- clean technologies and measuring techniques ⁽³⁾,
- protection of the marine environment ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 3, 5. 1. 1984.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 71, 14. 3. 1984.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 176, 3. 7. 1984.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 75, 21. 3. 1985.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 549/86**by Mr Thomas Megahy (S — GB)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(6 June 1986)**(87/C 54/18)*

Subject: Special higher export restitutions on selected market products in selected markets

In February 1986 the Commission, departing from established policies and practices, began granting special higher export restitutions on selected products in selected markets. One of the first effects of this was to undercut a provisional New Zealand deal with Algeria. It is alleged that similar exercises are now being conducted against New Zealand in other key markets such as Mexico, North Africa and the Middle East. Can the Commission state why these policy changes have occurred and whether there are other countries adversely affected as well as New Zealand?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen

on behalf of the Commission

(29 September 1986)

The use of special differentiated refunds to assist Community exporters in particular markets is a well-established market instrument, but it had not been used in the dairy products sector for some years. It was introduced this year as a result of very keen price competition in an over-supplied market for the major dairy products. The normal system of refunds, which are rarely changed, gave competitors the advantage of being able to calculate the Community exporters' likely offer prices, and undercutting them. As a result, long-established markets, especially in North Africa and the Middle East, had been almost entirely lost to competitors, notably New Zealand. The new system has been successful in regaining some market share. It is not intended to continue with it indefinitely.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 577/86**by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(9 June 1986)**(87/C 54/19)*

Subject: Dairy superlevy

Is the Commission satisfied that the farmers and not the public authorities of Belgium (which exceeded its quota by 2 %), the Federal Republic of Germany (by 1,3 %), France (1 %), Luxembourg (1,4 %) and the Netherlands (2,0 %) are paying the dairy superlevy for having exceeded production quotas?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen

on behalf of the Commission

(11 September 1986)

The Community Regulations on the milk superlevy system provide that for all producers or purchasers where the level of milk deliveries during the 12-month period concerned exceeds the reference quantities allocated to them, the levy is payable on the excess deliveries by the liable producers or purchasers, account being taken of the reallocation of unused reference quantities where the provisions of Article 4a of Regulation (EEC) No 857/84 are applied.

The Commission can assure the Honourable Member that it will fulfil its responsibilities of ensuring that the Community Regulations on the levy system are implemented correctly in all Member States. In this context, the Commission carries out a permanent examination of the national regulations and other measures adopted by Member States for the application of the levy system in order to verify that these are in accordance with the Community Regulations concerned. The Commission has undertaken to take the appropriate action to deal with cases where the Community Regulations have not been complied with correctly and in full. In addition, the Commission Services are undertaking on-the-spot inspections in the Member States in order to ensure that the levy has been correctly assessed and accounted for by all those concerned with the application of the system.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 614/86

**by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(9 June 1986)

(87/C 54/20)

Subject: Waste paint

Could the Commission state:

1. What quantity of waste paint is produced each year in Europe?
2. Whether this waste should be classified as toxic or hazardous?
3. What is the current legal status of this waste in the various Member States of the European Community? Is it subject to certain regulatory provisions?
4. Whether there are collection centres for such waste, in particular in the Federal Republic of Germany? Whether it is reasonable to assume that these centres throughout the industrial Ruhr area number around ten, each one with a capacity of 50 to 200 000 tonnes per annum?
5. Why low price toxic fuels are not burned by local cement works in the vicinity of places producing this waste?
6. How waste paint is currently destroyed? In particular, what do Belgian paint manufacturers do at present with their waste?
7. What risks are involved in incinerating this waste?
8. If it is aware of any international movements of waste paint between Member States of the European Community? If so, what is the exact destination?
9. Whether it is current practice to burn waste paint in cement kilns? If so, what regulations are such plants required to observe?

**Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis
on behalf of the Commission
(12 September 1986)**

1. There are no exact figures on the quantity of waste paint produced each year in Europe. Overall, it is estimated at 1 million tonnes per year for the OECD. The figure for the Federal Republic of Germany is between 150 000 and 200 000 tonnes of paint sludge per annum. There is no Community definition of waste paint and it covers many different types of waste subject to different recording procedures in the various Member States.
2. Article 1(b) of Directive 78/319/EEC ⁽¹⁾ defines toxic and dangerous wastes.

Some waste paint may be considered toxic and dangerous because of the degree of contamination with the solvents and heavy metals listed in the Annex to this Directive. The term 'waste paint' is very imprecise and can cover a variety of products: liquid wastes from cleaning paint-spraying booths, wastes from paint and varnish manufacture, painting work wastes and paint residues from recycling paint solvents. In addition, the industry is producing increasingly complex paint formulations that result in wastes with very diverse properties.

3. The legal status of this waste may differ in the Member States for the above reasons.

For example, waste paint is considered as 'toxic waste' in Belgium (Royal Decree of 9 February 1976) and as 'special waste' in the Federal Republic of Germany (No 55503 if it contains organic solvents or heavy metals). In France, it is defined as 'pollutant waste' in Decree 77-974 of 19 August 1977. Because of its composition, waste paint is also considered toxic or dangerous in Italy and Denmark and it is treated as 'chemical waste' in the Netherlands. In all these cases treatment is subject to regulations that are at least as stringent as those of Directive 78/319/EEC.

4. According to information supplied to the Commission, there are about ten collection and pre-treatment centres for special wastes in the Land of North Rhine Westphalia capable of processing paint sludge. Details of the capacity of these centres have not been supplied.

5. Several cement works in the Federal Republic of Germany regularly burn old tyres and, in some cases, domestic refuse, i.e. solid wastes.

The reasons why German cement works do not burn waste paint are not known to the Commission. They may be of a technical, economic or social nature or the result of local regulations. In particular, most German cement works use the dry process, which restricts the use of special wastes as fuel under safe operating conditions. Generally, about 30 % of paint sludge is incinerated and the rest dumped or exported.

6. Some waste paint is treated to recover solvents if the solvent concentration is high enough to make this worthwhile. Non-recyclable wastes are used as substitute fuels if they have a sufficiently high calorific value.

Finally, highly dilute waste is subjected to separation treatment, the aqueous phase being discharged to the

aquatic environment and the sludge dumped or incinerated. The Commission does not have specific information regarding Belgian paint manufacturers.

7. The risks involved in incinerating waste paint depends on its composition. For this reason authorized disposal plants must have special incineration equipment to exclude risk to human health and the environment.

8. Council Directive 84/631/EEC on the supervision and control within the European Community of the trans-frontier shipment of hazardous waste ⁽²⁾ had not been properly implemented by any Member State by 1 June 1986, and the Commission has decided to institute the infringement proceedings provided for by Article 169 of the EEC Treaty. As a result, the Commission does not have information on international movements of dangerous waste and it is not possible at present to make a reliable estimate.

9. It is current practice in France to burn waste paint satisfying certain criteria. In 1983, 19 168 tonnes of spent non-chlorinated solvents and paint sludge were incinerated by five cement works in France. A further 19 953 tonnes of waste with a low net calorific value, including wash water from paint booths, were burned in the same year in three of these cement kilns.

The regulations that must be observed by such plants are at least as severe as the regulations laid down in the circular of 21 March 1983 (incineration of industrial wastes) (*Journal Officiel de la République française* NC 6281 of 2 July 1983). The gases emitted to the atmosphere must not contain more than 150 mg/Nm³ of dust, 5 mg/Nm³ of heavy metals and 100 mg/Nm³ of elemental chlorine.

At Community level, Directive 84/360/EEC ⁽³⁾ makes prior authorization obligatory for cement kilns and waste incineration plants.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 84, 31. 3. 1978.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 326, 13. 12. 1984.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 188, 16. 7. 1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 628/86

by Mr Pieter Dankert (S — NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(18 June 1986)

(87/C 54/21)

Subject: Failure to respect the deadlines for confiscation of guarantees

On page 274 of its 1985 report the Netherlands General Court of Auditors refers to the failure of the producers' association for meat and livestock to respect the deadlines

for confiscation of guarantees laid down in EEC regulations.

1. Does the Commission consider that the EEC legislation allows Member States to set their own deadlines for confiscation of guarantees?
2. Can the Commission say why the producers' association for meat and livestock did not respect the deadlines for confiscation of guarantees in the cases referred to on page 274 of the 1985 report of the General Court of Auditors?
3. What action has the Commission taken in this matter and what have the consequences been for the EEC budget?

Answer given by Mr Christophersen

on behalf of the Commission

(8 October 1986)

1. The Community legislation to which the Honourable Member seems to be referring, namely the Regulation laying down detailed rules for the application of special import arrangements for certain types of frozen beef intended for processing, includes rules for the provision of security and conditions governing its release (Article 2 paragraphs 2 and 3 of Regulation (EEC) No 1136/79) ⁽¹⁾. The purpose of this security is to ensure that the conditions governing the total or partial suspension of the levy due are respected under the specific conditions of the said Regulation. Although this Regulation imposes time-limits for the release of the security, no actual provisions are made regarding the date of a possible confiscation.

However, when the time-limit for furnishing the proof required under Regulation (EEC) No 1136/79 has not been observed, the security must be confiscated within a reasonable period.

2. The report of the Netherlands General Court of Auditors did not give details of the cases referred to by the Honourable Member.

3. As far as own resources are concerned, national inspection measures (with which Commission officials are associated under Article 18 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2891/77 ⁽²⁾) are conducted to ensure that the levies suspended in accordance with Regulation (EEC) No 1136/79 are established for payment to the Community budget in all cases where the conditions of the second of these Regulations, and particularly those in Article 2, have not been observed.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 141, 9. 6. 1979, p. 10.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 336, 27. 12. 1977, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 641/86
by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (LDR — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 June 1986)
(87/C 54/22)

Subject: Soil conservation in the EEC

It is estimated that an area of at least 25 million hectares (i.e. 8 times the area of Belgium) in the EEC is threatened by soil deterioration and erosion.

In certain countries like Spain, the growth in the area of uncultivated land is alarming.

It is therefore important that measures be taken to combat this deterioration.

What is the Commission's policy on the matter? Does it intend to take environmental conservation measures in alluvial regions, improving and stabilizing the composition of the arable stratum by providing aid to the farmers concerned? Does the Commission intend to carry out an overall study of the phenomenon and the remedies required throughout the Member States as a whole?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(24 September 1986)

The Commission is aware of the problems caused by soil erosion, both in the north and in the south of Europe. The erosion of agricultural land is receiving attention under the agricultural programme and the environment policy.

Under the socio-structural measures of the common agricultural policy the Council has adopted several specific regulations to promote the improvement and conservation of land in the Mediterranean areas of the Community.

In addition, Member States may apply aid schemes for farmers in environmentally-sensitive areas.

For more information the Honourable Member is referred to the Commission's answers to Written Questions No 1272/85 by Mr Roelants du Vivier ⁽¹⁾, No 1301/85 by Mr Kuijpers ⁽²⁾ and No 2688/85 by Lord O'Hagan ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 341, 31. 12. 1985, p. 40.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 48, 3. 3. 1986, p. 12.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 270, 27. 10. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 643/86
by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (LDR — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 June 1986)
(87/C 54/23)

Subject: Milk surplus

The figures for the 1985/1986 marketing year, which ended on 31 March 1986, indicate that, of all the Member States, only Italy and Greece did not exceed their quotas.

What is the Commission's policy as regards surpluses and the exceeding of quotas for the 1985/1986 marketing year?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(1 September 1986)

The latest available data indicate that for the second 12-month period of the milk superlevy system (April 1985 — March 1986), milk deliveries in most Member States exceeded the level of the guaranteed total quantities. This excess corresponds to about 0,9 % of the guaranteed quantities for the Community as a whole.

The Community Regulations concerned provide that the superlevy is payable on milk delivered by producers or to purchasers in excess of their reference quantities, including in the latter the additional unused quantities which may be temporarily made available where the provisions of Article 4(a) of Regulation (EEC) No 857/84 ⁽¹⁾ are applied. The levy on the excess is equivalent to 75 % of the target price where the levy system is applied according to formula A or to 100 % of the target price where formula B is applicable. The revenue from the levy accruing to the EAGGF will be used to finance expenditure in the milk and milk products sector and will thereby contribute to the financing of the storage and disposal costs of the milk delivered in excess of reference quantities.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 90, 1. 4. 1984, p. 13.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 652/86**by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(19 June 1986)**(87/C 54/24)**Subject: Killing of whales in the Azores*

Will the Commission confirm that sperm whales (*Physeter catodon*) are still being killed in the Azores to provide oil for industry and to provide teeth for the tourist trade? Will the Commission say how this killing is affected by Council Regulations (EEC) No 3626/82 ⁽¹⁾, which prohibits trade in sperm whale products, and Council Regulation (EEC) No 348/81 ⁽²⁾, which prohibits trade in whale products in the Community, now that Portugal has become a Member of the Community?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 384, 31. 12. 1982, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 39, 12. 2. 1981, p. 1.

Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis**on behalf of the Commission***(9 October 1986)*

No sperm whale were caught off the Faial and Pico Islands in 1985.

The sperm whale (*Physeter catodon*) is included in Appendix I to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), implemented in the Community under Council Regulation (EEC) No 3626/82. This implies that the export of parts and derivatives of the species concerned is not possible for primarily commercial purposes unless they were acquired before mid 1981 (entry into force of the inclusion of the sperm whale in Appendix I).

There is, therefore, no incentive to resume the fishery.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 656/86**by Mr Joaquim Miranda da Silva (COM — P)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(19 June 1986)**(87/C 54/25)**Subject: Community aid for olive oil production*

According to the Agreements governing Portugal's accession to the Community, Community aid for olive oil production is to be introduced with effect from the first marketing year following accession (Article 293(1)).

There is no evidence, however, that Portugal has yet received any funds from the EAGGF 'Guidance' Section for that purpose.

Will the Commission confirm that no funds have been transferred and, if so, will it state the reasons for this? Will it also provide details of the amounts already transferred to other countries for this purpose during the current year?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen**on behalf of the Commission***(29 September 1986)*

Under Article 293 of the Act of Accession Community aid for the production of olive oil, financed by the EAGGF Guarantee Section, is to be introduced in Portugal at the beginning of the first marketing year following accession, i.e. the beginning of the 1986/1987 marketing year.

The fact that Portugal has not yet received funds for this purpose is therefore a matter of the timetable laid down in the Act of Accession and not the result of any delay on the Commission's part.

In the first six months of 1986 the Commission paid advances of some 40 million ECU to countries that produce olive oil and were Member States before 1 January 1986. These payments related to marketing years earlier than 1986/1987.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 660/86**by Mr José Barros Moura (COM — P)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(19 June 1986)**(87/C 54/26)**Subject: Portuguese 'verde' wines*

Issue No 214 of *European Agriculture* published by the Commission, describes Portuguese 'verde' wines as 'wines obtained from unripe grapes' which is completely wrong, as these wines are produced in a specific area in the north of Portugal and are made from ripe grapes. Their special characteristics stem from the climate and the variety of grapes used.

Not only does this definition reflect total ignorance of the facts about wine-growing in Portugal, which is both incomprehensible and alarming but it could also adversely affect one of Portugal's major wine exports, given that 'verde' wines are popular throughout the world.

Will the Commission state:

1. Whether it intends to take any steps to correct the false information it published in respect of 'verde' wines and thereby prevent or make good the damage referred to above?
2. If so, what steps will it take?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
 (7 October 1986)

The text to which the Honourable Member refers was originally published in the 1985 annual report on 'The Agricultural Situation in the Community'. In view of the interest shown by the public generally in the main articles published in this document, the Commission had decided to reissue in its *Green Europe* series (No 214) the article quoted, 'Agricultural aspects of Community enlargement to include Portugal and Spain'. The Commission's intention was to outline briefly the main features of agriculture in the two countries before analysing in greater detail the impact of the enlargement and the solutions agreed by the twelve countries to ensure a smooth transition for the new countries to the EEC agricultural arrangements.

The description of Portuguese vineyards was confined to a list of the main quality wine production areas, without any discussion of wine growing itself.

With regard to 'Vinho Verde', the definition given is that included in most of the documents on Portuguese wine-growing; clearly there is here a general misconception, which had also been included in the article.

On the occasion of the forthcoming publication concerning wine in Europe, in particular where reference is made to Portuguese wine-growing, the Commission will ensure that the mistake consisting in ranking 'Vinhos Verdes' as wine obtained from unripe grapes is rectified.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 677/86

by Mr Louis Eyraud (S — F)
 to the Commission of the European Communities
 (1 July 1986)
 (87/C 54/27)

Subject: Determination of prices of lamb carcasses

The new Commission Regulation (EEC) No 1481/86 ⁽¹⁾ on the determination of prices of lamb carcasses specifically excludes imported lamb from the categories considered as representative for determining prices on the Rungis market.

What is the situation in the other Member States, notably in the United Kingdom, which absorbs 88 % of Community imports from New Zealand?

Why does the regulation not make provision for a single range of carcass weights to be used for determining prices in all Member States?

How will the Commission ensure that the carcasses used to determine prices are not selected from among the heaviest carcasses which, relatively, are also the least expensive. Would it not have been preferable to introduce sub-categories of carcass weights and assign them a representativeness coefficient thus ensuring an objective choice of reference carcasses?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 130, 16. 5. 1986, p. 12.

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
 (30 September 1986)

The new Regulation (EEC) No 1481/86 ⁽¹⁾ providing for harmonized recording of market prices for lamb carcasses in the various Community regions does not concern imported lamb.

This has involved a change for the Rungis market where imported lamb had always been included hitherto. In the other Member States, notably the United Kingdom, imported lamb was already excluded, so no change was necessary.

The Commission did not see fit to provide for a single weight range because allowance had to be made for significant differences in the average slaughter weight of lambs in the various Member States.

At the present stage, the Commission regards Community rules on weight sub-categories as unnecessary; but it is paying careful attention to the criteria used by Member States at national level for weighting the various weight sub-categories when the need arises, i.e. when the recorded price is not the weighted average of all the transactions carried out. Nonetheless, the Commission has noted the Honourable Member's suggestion and, in the light of the experience gained as the new Regulation (EEC) No 1481/86 — applicable since 2 June 1986 — takes full effect, it will examine whether there are grounds for harmonizing at Community level the question of the representativeness of weight sub-categories.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 130, 16. 5. 1986, p. 12.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 686/86**by Mr Carlos Robles Piquer (ED — E)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(1 July 1986)**(87/C 54/28)*

Subject: Regulation of the exploitation of and trade in charcoal in the European Community

There has recently been a sharp increase in the consumption of charcoal in the countries of the European Community, notably as a result of its use for open-air barbecues.

This increase has inevitably affected the production and distribution of charcoal, causing certain problems as regards supplies of the raw material, wood, and disparities in prices between producers and the middlemen responsible for marketing it.

The first of these problems is reflected in the unevenness of wood supplies which has in some cases led to the indiscriminate cutting down of woodland causing serious damage to the environment and disturbing its ecological balance. The second has led to an uneven distribution of profits from the exploitation of charcoal, largely to the disadvantage of producers as opposed to the marketing sector.

In view of this, can the Commission state its position on the matter and say whether it considers it necessary to introduce Community regulations in this field to rectify the aforementioned problems?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen

on behalf of the Commission

(16 October 1986)

The Commission is not aware of the specific difficulties to which the Honourable Member refers and thus cannot comment on any alleged indiscriminate cutting of timber.

However, in its recent forestry discussion paper ⁽¹⁾ and supporting memorandum the Commission refers to such issues as environmental damage through deforestation. In the 1986 programme it is also foreseen that forestry action proposals will be made which may include action in this field, if this is felt to be appropriate.

The Commission cannot comment on the relative profitability of the different sectors of the charcoal industry which operates in a free market situation.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(86) 26 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 703/86**by Mrs Barbara Castle (S — GB)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(1 July 1986)**(87/C 54/29)*

Subject: Disposal of wine distillates

In answer to my Question No 2810/85 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission referred to Articles 40(a) and 41(a) of Regulation (EEC) No 337/79 ⁽²⁾. Those provisions as subsequently amended, specifically provide that disposals of wine distillates obtained under Articles 39, 40 and 41 shall not cause any disturbance of the market in alcohol and spirituous beverages produced in the Community.

Would the Commission please state:

1. On what basis it considers that fixing the minimum price for sale by tender under Regulation (EEC) No 139/86 ⁽³⁾ at no less than the representative market prices for grain alcohol and the prices of wine alcohol obtained under Community distillation measures would satisfy the non-disturbance obligation referred to above, given that the cost of producing wine alcohol is approximately three times as high as the cost of producing cereal alcohol or cereal spirits and given that the reference to the prices of wine alcohol is a reference to prices which are subsidised and therefore artificial;
2. Whether it will take steps to discover what proportion of this heavily subsidised distillate is resold to consumers as eau-de-vie de vin or brandy or as an ingredient in products so described.
3. Whether it will propose further amendments to the wine regulations to ensure that the principle of non-disturbance also applies to disposal of wine distillates obtained under the voluntary and preventive measures (Articles 11, 12 and 15) and in particular to disposals of distillates by Member States' agencies;
4. Whether it will ensure that disposals of wine distillates by Member States' agencies do not lead to distortions of competition in non-EEC export markets to the detriment of producers of other competing Community spirits?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 221, 1. 9. 1986, p. 8.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 54, 5. 3. 1979, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 19, 25. 1. 1986, p. 1.

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(13 October 1986)**

1. For the first Community wine distillation operation, in 1971, distillation aids were fixed in the light of wine alcohol market prices recorded on the Italian market. The same basis has been used ever since.

It is fortunate that, whether or not by accident, wine alcohol prices, thus determined, are running at roughly the same level as the prices of grain alcohols produced in the Community. Thus, no wine alcohol, even subsidized, can prove harmful to trade in grain alcohols.

2. Distillation aids are paid whether the wine is processed into alcohol or into spirits distilled from wine.

3 and 4. The Council has decided that the clause relating to non-disturbance of the markets in alcohol and spirituous beverages produced in the Community would apply only to sales of alcohol from compulsory distillation operations and held by Community intervention agencies. In this connection, the Commission has just determined the details of application of the sales, the first of which will be held in the near future ⁽¹⁾. On the basis of the results of the first sales, it will be for the Commission and the Council to assess the case for altering existing rules, in particular in respect of sales made by national intervention agencies operating for alcohol and spirits distilled from wine, disposal of which is still a national responsibility.

The Commission and the Council will assess any disturbance which such national sales may cause in respect of Community sales, having due regard to additional costs arising and costs which would arise from alterations to current rules. They will also assess any impact of the sales on export markets, in particular with regard to other spirituous beverages normally exported.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 165, 21. 6. 1986, p. 14, Regulation (EEC) No 1915/86.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 745/86

**by Mr Lambert Croux (PPE — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 July 1986)
(87/C 54/30)**

Subject: Period for which Limburg (Belgium) should be recognized as a development area

On 31 July 1985 the Commission decided that the province of Limburg could receive the maximum amount of

government investment aid, but that this decision would apply only for three years, i.e. until 1988. The Commission based its decision on Limburg's economic activity and its industrial structure, which should enable it to benefit very quickly from a world economic recovery. The Commission also acknowledged the large-scale unemployment and the difficulties in the coal industry. It therefore stated that it would continue to follow developments in Limburg very closely.

In the light of recent economic development in Limburg, it can be seen that there has been a rise in investment and employment since 1984 but the situation in the coal industry has become more difficult. Unemployment remains high, partly as a result of the continuing increase, for demographic reasons, in the number of people coming into the labour market.

Does the Commission therefore not think that the period for maximum investment aid should be extended as from now, to encourage the climate for investment in the longer term?

The extension should be coordinated with the integrated programme for Limburg that is supported by the Commission, in order to help the restructuring and conversion in the coal industry?

**Answer given by Mr Sutherland
on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 1986)**

The Commission is aware of the problems confronting the province of Limburg. The analysis of the socio-economic situation in the province carried out in 1985 demonstrated that such problems were serious enough to justify the grant of aid up to the maximum level allowed for the Community's central regions. The Commission took the view, however, that the situation in the province could develop in such a way that the granting of aid of this intensity might in future no longer be justified. It accordingly provided that a new socio-economic analysis should be carried out in 1988. This three-year period is the same as that which the Commission set for re-examining problems in certain regions in other Member States.

Furthermore, the Commission does not wish to cut short the three-year period since the persistence of structural problems cannot be deduced from the trend of socio-economic indicators after only one year.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 770/86

by Mr Louis Eyraud (S — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(4 July 1986)
(87/C 54/31)

Subject: Training of quality control inspectors

In response to a question asked during a visit to a Danish bacon exporting company a quality control inspector told me that he had been trained 'on the job' and that originally he had been a butcher.

Does the Commission consider that under these circumstances the consumers' interests are being safeguarded?

Does it take the view that quality control inspectors can be both judges and judged?

What steps does it intend to take to harmonize the training of quality control inspectors in all the Member States of the Community?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(24 September 1986)**

The Commission considers that in this field more importance should be attached to the present competence of the quality inspectors than to any previous occupation or trade; in the case in point, anyway, the trade of butchery provides sound practical training. The Commission has no doubts as to the competence of bacon quality inspectors in Denmark.

It agrees that quality inspectors must not act both for the judges and the judged, but in this case the Honourable Member furnishes no evidence to this effect.

The Commission has begun work on the harmonization of products for which Community standards exist. For beef and veal there is a Community Inspection Committee composed of experts from the member countries and the Commission which monitors the correct and uniform application of the Community beef carcase classification grid by regular visits to slaughterhouses and intervention centres in all the Member States. For fruit and vegetables Council Regulation (EEC) No 1319/85 ⁽¹⁾ provides for quality inspection and price recording by Commission representatives.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 137, 27. 5. 1985, p. 39.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 773/86

by Mr Jean-Claude Pasty (RDE — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(4 July 1986)
(87/C 54/32)

Subject: Special intervention measures for common wheat of bread-making quality

Unlike the procedure adopted in previous years, the Commission's Regulation (EEC) No 400/86 ⁽¹⁾ laying down the terms and conditions for special intervention for common wheat of bread-making quality has fixed national ceilings in advance, including 1 million tonnes for the Federal Republic of Germany and only 200 000 tonnes for France.

In view of the ceilings, the percentage of production eligible for intervention has risen in the Federal Republic of Germany to 97,5 % of the quantity actually presented as against only 11,8 % in France.

In the light of these figures, does the Commission not consider that Regulation (EEC) No 400/86 has resulted in a real inequality in the treatment of producers of common wheat of bread-making quality within the Community, to the disadvantage of French producers?

Does it not consider that this procedure is contrary to Article 7 of the Treaty establishing the EEC which prohibits 'any discrimination on grounds of nationality'?

Whereas according to Article 40 of the Treaty, the common organization of the market 'shall exclude any discrimination between producers or consumers within the Community';

Whereas the Court of Justice of the European Communities has repeatedly ruled that the principle of non-discrimination demands that comparable situations should not be treated differently, unless such a differentiation is justified on objective grounds;

Whereas finally when Regulation (EEC) No 400/86 was adopted last February market prices for common wheat of bread-making quality, expressed as a percentage of the intervention price or the reference price, were more or less the same in all Member States and the representatives made no reference to any real analysis of market data pointing to differences in sales outlets from one country to another;

Can the Commission indicate the relevant data which led it to adopt such a procedure?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 45, 22. 2. 1986, p. 22.

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(3 October 1986)**

Regulation (EEC) No 400/86 laying down the terms and conditions for special intervention for common wheat of bread-making quality was adopted by the Commission following its statement made in July 1985 during the 1985/1986 price review of its intention to support the market in bread-making common wheat having certain features at the end of the 1985/1986 marketing year.

Having studied the situation of the market in bread-making common wheat in the various Member States, the stock situation and scope for disposal, the Commission decided in February 1986 to adopt the measure announced in the form of national quotas distributed as follows:

	(tonnes)
Federal Republic of Germany	1 000 000
France	200 000
United Kingdom	50 000
Italy	50 000
Denmark	50 000
Belgium	50 000
Netherlands	50 000
Greece	50 000
Luxembourg	2 000

With regard to the quotas allocated to the Federal Republic of Germany and to France, the Commission bore in mind, in particular, the scope for disposal of common wheat stocks existing in each of these Member States.

With regard to the quota allocated to France, in view of the volume of this country's exports, the Commission felt it right to restrict the quantities of bread-making common wheat that could be bought in, as it was felt that the scope for exports at the end of 1985/1986 would provide additional support for this type of cereals.

It should be noted that the establishment of national quotas under special intervention measures is not an innovation.

A special intervention measure in this form had already been adopted at the end of 1982/1983 in certain regions of the Federal Republic of Germany for a total of 300 000 tonnes, in certain regions of France for a total of 400 000 tonnes [Regulation (EEC) No 1428/83] ⁽¹⁾, and in Belgium [Regulation (EEC) No 1427/83] ⁽¹⁾, and the Netherlands [Regulation (EEC) No 1403/83] ⁽²⁾, for quantities of 50 000 tonnes each.

The quantities accepted as percentages of the offers to intervention made cannot be regarded as representative of a real market situation, since under a system of *pro rata*

acceptance, the offers are much greater than the quantities for which intervention is necessary, the purpose being to enable each operator to obtain the largest quantity possible.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 145, 3. 6. 1983.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 143, 2. 6. 1983.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 799/86
by Mr Joaquim Miranda da Silva (COM — P)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(4 July 1986)
(87/C 54/33)**

Subject: Tuna fishing by Spanish vessels in Portugal's EEZ

Portugal's tuna fishing fleet and tuna processing industry are facing severe difficulties.

Lengthy negotiations between Spain and Portugal on the use of Portuguese waters by Spanish fishing vessels have not been concluded because of the probable impact on Portuguese interests.

The substance of the Commission's proposal to the Council on tuna fishing by Spanish vessels in Portuguese waters is astonishing and outrageous, threatening, as it does, Portugal's most fundamental interests.

There is no evidence that *quid pro quos* of any kind have been agreed for Portugal in the form of either support for Portugal's fishing fleet and processing industry or effective controls to prevent the measures agreed on from being extended still further in practice.

The foundations of the Commission's proposal are unreasonable. Could the Commission explain the thinking behind the drawing up and submission to the Council of a proposal that will in effect allow up to four hundred Spanish vessels to fish tuna in Portuguese waters with no *quid pro quo* for Portugal and with unforeseeable damage to Portuguese interests?

**Answer given by Mr Cardoso e Cunha
on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 1986)**

Article 352 of the Act of Accession ⁽¹⁾ specifies the conditions for the access of vessels flying the flag of Spain and listed and/or registered in a port situated in the territory to which the common fisheries policy applies to

the waters falling under the sovereignty or within the jurisdiction of Portugal covered by ICES and CECAF for the period ending 31 December 1995.

Paragraph 2 provides that the number of vessels authorised to fish at the same time for albacore tuna is to be decided by the Council on a proposal from the Commission. No criteria by which this number was to be decided are specified in the Treaty. The number decided upon by the Council was based upon the relative importance of the fishing activities in the zones in question.

The control regime applying to Spanish vessels fishing for albacore tuna in Portuguese waters foreseen in Article 352 was significantly strengthened by a specific regulation of the Commission ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 302, 15. 11. 1985, p. 23.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 130, 16. 5. 1986, p. 23.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 803/86

by Mr Pol Marck (PPE — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 July 1986)

(87/C 54/34)

Subject: Imports of 'Hilton beef'

Does the Commission consider that the importation of Hilton beef complies with the recently adopted ban on hormones in imports from third countries?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen

on behalf of the Commission

(29 September 1986)

Council Directive 85/649/EEC prohibiting the use in Livestock farming of certain substances having a hormonal action ⁽¹⁾ applies to all farm animals and meat which are produced in the Community or imported into the Community from Third Countries. Member States must take the measures necessary to comply with this Directive by 1st January 1988 at the latest.

Before 1st January 1988 the Commission will contact the trading partners of the Community to request that guarantees no more favourable than those laid down by Community rules are provided in respect of exports of animals and meat to the Community. Until decisions are taken following these contacts national rules on substances with a hormonal action dealing with imports from third countries remain applicable, with due regard for the general provisions of the EEC Treaty.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 382, 31. 12. 1985, p. 228.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 815/86

by Mr Frank Schwalba-Hoth (ARC — D)

to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation

(4 July 1986)

(87/C 54/35)

Subject: Supply of technical components for the Chernobyl nuclear power station by undertakings in the EEC

The explosion in the fourth block of the Chernobyl nuclear power station has resulted, among other things, in statements by the European Parliament, the Commission and the Council of Ministers; the possibility of defective technical equipment in the Soviet reactor was among the issues discussed.

Can the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation say:

1. Which undertakings from EEC Member States were involved in supplying components for the Chernobyl nuclear power station;
2. Which other Soviet nuclear power stations have been provided with Western monitoring, testing and alarm equipment;
3. How they assess the effectiveness of the monitoring, testing and alarm equipment manufactured by Western firms in the explosion at Chernobyl on 26 April 1986;
4. What conclusions they draw for the safe running of Western nuclear power stations from the effectiveness of the Western monitoring, testing and alarm equipment employed at Chernobyl?

Answer

(19 January 1987)

The issues raised by the Honourable Member of Parliament have not been discussed in European Political Cooperation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 824/86

by Mr Richard Balfe (S — GB)

to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation

(10 July 1986)

(87/C 54/36)

Subject: Launch of recent South African attacks on neighbouring states from illegally occupied Namibian territory

Are the Ministers aware that recent South African attacks on Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe were launched from illegally occupied Namibian territory and have they made any representations, either jointly or singly, about this issue? If the answer is yes, can they give details?

Answer

(16 January 1987)

The Twelve have made clear their total opposition to South African attacks on neighbouring countries — specifically in the declarations issued on 22 May and 17 October. They condemn South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and regret the stalemate in efforts aimed at securing its independence within the framework of the United Nations independence plan for Namibia.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 828/86

by Mr Jean-Pierre Cot (S — F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 July 1986)

(87/C 54/37)

Subject: Adverse effect on the completion of the internal market on certain customs and transit activities

The Single Act finalized in Luxembourg provides for the completion of the internal market.

This undertaking which is essential to complete the construction of the Community will, at the same time, have an adverse effect on employment in certain areas which make their living mainly from transit activities.

A typical example of such a place is the town of Modane which is located at 1 000 metres and largely dependent for employment on police and customs controls on goods and

people. Eliminating these activities would lead to an absolutely disastrous situation in the present circumstances.

1. Will the Commission be taking parallel measures for the redeployment of the staff affected by introducing alternative forms of employment?
2. Does the Commission have any information on the preparation being made by national governments to deal with this situation?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission**

(3 October 1986)

1. The Commission recognizes that completion of the internal market will put an end to certain activities — whether carried out by Government departments or private firms — that stem from the fact that, at present, certain controls and formalities are carried out at the internal frontiers of the Community:

— As far as the customs authorities and other administrative departments with staff at such frontiers are concerned, the intensification of controls at the external frontiers will absorb some of the staff involved but it is clear that the problem raised by the Honourable Member will be resolved only by the gradual redeployment of the officials in question to other work unconnected with the crossing of the frontiers concerned. It is not for the Commission to take direct action to create new jobs for those affected but it considers that the removal of obstacles to free movement will have an overall beneficial effect on the economy of the Community; only completion of the internal market can ensure future prosperity with all the consequences that that implies for employment in general,

- As far as those in the private sector are concerned, the Commission is satisfied, through its discussions with the circles involved, that they are already aware of the need to examine without delay all possible means of diversifying and reorganizing their activities and it is to be hoped that the measures that are necessary will be taken in good time by those concerned.

2. The Commission has no information on the subject but it takes this opportunity to emphasize that the authorities in the Member States and the firms in question should not wait until 1992 before tackling this problem. A step-by-step reduction in the role played by the customs authorities and the other government departments with staff at the internal frontiers of the Community would be wholly in line with the step-by-step implementation of the measures set out in the *White Paper* published by the Commission in June

1985, the aims of which were approved by the European Council in Milan.

wild mushrooms, a semi-industrial undertaking has now begun to cultivate mushrooms.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 837/86

by Mr Luc Beyer de Rycke (LDR — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(10 July 1986)
(87/C 54/38)

Subject: Measures to promote the cultivation of mushrooms

At Barvaux-sur-Ourthe (Belgium), a region suitable for the development of substrate mycelium and the cultivation of

No less than 17 types of mushroom are regularly cultivated and almost 24 jobs have been created by this undertaking, which is now exporting some of its produce to France.

Has the Commission been informed of the techniques developed by this undertaking for the semi-industrial cultivation of wild mushrooms?

Can the Commission indicate the quantity of mushrooms from third countries imported annually into the Member States and say whether the development of such undertakings in the less-favoured regions of the Community might not help to overcome the problems of restructuring and meet regional policy objectives?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(19 September 1986)

The Commission has never received information on the existence of such a firm in the Barvaux sur Ourthe region or of processes this firm has developed for the semi-industrial cultivation of wild mushrooms.

With regard to imports of mushrooms, the table below gives detailed statistics of Community imports for 1985. This gives an approximation of quantitative imports each year and the relative share of each type of preservation.

Product	CCT heading	1985 quantities (tonnes)
— Fresh mushrooms		
— cultivated mushrooms	07.01 Q I	2 565
— chantarelles	07.01 Q II	2 819
— flap mushrooms	07.01 Q III	1 625
— Frozen mushrooms	ex 07.02 B	3 306
— Dehydrated mushrooms and truffles	ex 07.04 B	4 035
— Mushrooms preserved in vinegar	ex 20.01 C	318
— Mushrooms preserved temporarily in brine		
— cultivated	ex 07.03 E	5 730
— wild	ex 07.03 E	8 995
— Tinned mushrooms		
— cultivated	20.02 A I	21 797
— wild	20.02 A II	230

The Commission welcomes all initiatives in less-favoured areas with a view to the creation or development of productive operations, in particular those, like the example given, based on the development of local potential.

If the matter were referred to it by the Member State concerned, the Commission could, in accordance with the provisions of the ERDF Regulation, provide financial support for such initiatives.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 853/86
by Mr Amédée Turner (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
 (10 July 1986)
 (87/C 54/39)

Subject: Publication by the German authorities of a list of designations of origins of wine

Can the Commission state what it is doing to ensure that the German authorities produce a list of designations of origins of wine for publication by the Commission in conformity with Regulations (EEC) No 2247/73 ⁽¹⁾, (EEC) No 1608/76 ⁽²⁾, (EEC) No 997/81 ⁽³⁾ and (EEC) No 1224/83 ⁽⁴⁾ and the observations of the Commission in Case 56/80?

Can the Commission explain why no such list has yet been officially published by the Commission?

- ⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 230, 18. 8. 1973, p. 12.
⁽²⁾ OJ No L 183, 8. 7. 1976, p. 1.
⁽³⁾ OJ No L 106, 16. 4. 1981, p. 1.
⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 134, 21. 5. 1983, p. 1.

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
 (6 October 1986)

Pursuant to Article 3 paragraph 2, of Regulation (EEC) No 2247/73, the Commission published a list of quality wines *psr* in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* ⁽¹⁾. This list is based on reports from the Member States, including Germany.

Pursuant to Article 10 paragraph 1, of Regulation (EEC) No 1608/76, the Commission published, again on the basis of reports from the Member States, in *Official Journal of the European Communities* ⁽²⁾, a first list of table wines that are described as 'Landwein', 'vin de pays' or 'vino tipico'. This list was replaced by a list published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* ⁽³⁾ which includes the names of German 'Landweine'. It was published pursuant to Article 10 paragraph 1, of Regulation (EEC) No 997/81, which has since replaced Regulation (EEC) No 1608/76.

The list of imported wines described by reference to a geographical area referred to in Article 10 paragraph 2, of Regulation (EEC) No 1608/76 is contained in Annex 2 of this Regulation. After this Regulation was replaced by Regulation (EEC) No 997/81, reference is made to Article 10 paragraph 2, and Annex II of this last Regulation.

In its original version, Article 10 paragraph 1, of Regulation (EEC) No 997/81 contained a requirement for the producer Member States to forward within one year of the entry into force of this Commission Regulation a list of the names of the geographical units smaller than a given wine growing area and used for the designation of quality wines *psr*. This provision also stipulated that the Commission was to publish the lists sent in by the Member

States in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*. The new version of Article 10 paragraph 1, of Regulation (EEC) No 997/81 in Regulation (EEC) No 1224/83 omits the requirement incumbent on the producer Member States to send in lists to the Commission. Nor is the Commission now required to publish such lists. In the seventh recital of Regulation (EEC) No 1224/83, it is stated that the reporting obligation for the Member States has been dropped in order to ensure that the lists of quality wines *psr* to be published by the Commission are not lengthened unnecessarily by the names of geographical units which are seldom or never used.

- ⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 73, 29. 3. 1976.
⁽²⁾ OJ No C 68, 17. 3. 1978.
⁽³⁾ OJ No C 333, 9. 12. 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 856/86
by Mr Amédée Turner (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
 (10 July 1986)
 (87/C 54/40)

Subject: Articles 30-36 of the Treaty relating to the freedom of movement of wine

Does the Commission consider that the absence of a list of designations of origin of wine published by the Commission in conformity with Regulations (EEC) No 2247/73 ⁽¹⁾, (EEC) No 1608/76 ⁽²⁾, (EEC) No 997/81 ⁽³⁾ and (EEC) No 1224/83 ⁽⁴⁾, consistent with the observations of the Commission in Case 56/80, with regard to wines produced in the Federal Republic of Germany, constitutes a barrier to trade within the context of Articles 30-36 of the Treaty of Rome?

Can the Commission provide the legal reasoning for its conclusion?

- ⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 230, 18. 8. 1973, p. 12.
⁽²⁾ OJ No L 183, 8. 7. 1976, p. 1.
⁽³⁾ OJ No L 106, 16. 4. 1981, p. 1.
⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 134, 21. 5. 1983, p. 1.

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
 (6 October 1986)

In its answer to Written Question No 853/86 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission has already stated that the lists of the names of geographical units used for the designation of wine, publication of which is required by Regulations (EEC) No 2247/73, (EEC) No 1608/76 and (EEC) No 997/81, have in fact already been published. It is therefore not necessary for

the Commission to answer the question as to whether failure to publish these lists constitutes a barrier to trade.

(¹) See page 25 of this Official Journal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 858/86

by Mr Pol Marck (PPE — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 July 1986)

(87/C 54/41)

Subject: Imports of geese and ducks

Can the Commission state:

1. the quantities of geese and ducks imported into the EEC in 1984, 1985 and 1986;
2. the third countries of origin of these imports;
3. the percentage of goose liver accounted for by EEC goose production;
4. the measures being taken to monitor or prohibit imports from the countries of Eastern Europe following the Chernobyl accident?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen

on behalf of the Commission

(2 October 1986)

1 and 2. Imports of geese and countries of origin in 1984, 1985 and 1986 were as follows:

1984 (¹) 14 203 tonnes, of which 14 024 (99 %) from state-trading countries (³)

1985 (¹) 12 795 tonnes, of which 12 676 (99 %) from state-trading countries (³)

1986 (²) 404 tonnes, of which 396 (98 %) from state-trading countries (³)

— Imports of ducks and countries of origin in 1984, 1985 and 1986 were as follows:

1984 (¹) 9 942 tonnes, of which 9 563 (96 %) from state-trading countries (³)

1985 (¹) 9 476 tonnes, of which 9 409 (99 %) from state-trading countries (³)

1986 (²) 1 786 tonnes, of which 1 634 (92 %) from state-trading countries (³).

3. The Commission has no statistics concerning the Community production of goose liver. However, French production (France is the main Community producer) of foie gras of geese ranges around 650 tonnes per year.

4. Following the nuclear accident at Chernobyl, the Council and the Commission adopted the following regulations:

(a) Council Regulation (EEC) No 1388/86 of 12 May 1986 (⁴), which suspended until 31 May 1986 imports of live and slaughtered poultry, in particular.

(b) Council Regulation (EEC) No 1707/86 of 30 May 1986 (⁵), which, while repealing Regulation (EEC) No 1388/86, made imports of products listed in Annex II of the Treaty subject to verification with a view to establishing compliance with the maximum radio-activity tolerances fixed in that Regulation.

(c) Commission Regulation (EEC) No 1762/86 of 5 June 1986 (⁶), laying down detailed rules for the application of the Council Regulation referred to above under (b), in particular with regard to control and communication procedures between the Member State and the Commission.

(¹) 12 months.

(²) 5 months, provisional.

(³) Including Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania.

(⁴) OJ No L 127, 13. 5. 1986, p. 1.

(⁵) OJ No L 146, 31. 5. 1986, p. 88.

(⁶) OJ No L 152, 6. 6. 1986, p. 41.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 861/86

by Mr Lambert Croux (PPE — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 July 1986)

(87/C 54/42)

Subject: European bankruptcy laws

In the European Commission's *White Paper* on the completion of the internal market by 1992 no mention is made of plans to introduce a European bankruptcy law or to harmonize national legislation in this field.

Can the Commission say:

1. if it considers such rules to be desirable, and
2. if it will take an initiative in this field?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield

on behalf of the Commission

(1 October 1986)

1. As long ago as in 1970, the Commission sent the Member States a draft Convention, based on Article 220 of the EEC Treaty, on bankruptcy, winding-up, arrangements, compositions and similar proceedings. This draft was discussed by a working party of experts from the Member States and the Commission. As a result of these deliberations, and of the enlargement of the Community in 1973, the Commission sent the Council, on 23 June 1980, a 'new draft Bankruptcy Convention'. In view of recent developments in bankruptcy law, some Member States voiced objections with regard to this Convention, which, since it is based on Article 220 of the EEC Treaty, is being

negotiated in accordance with the conventional rules of public international law.

2. The Commission would draw the Honourable Member's attention to its Opinion of 10 December 1981 on the new draft Convention ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 391, 31. 12. 1981, p. 23.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 872/86

by Mr Ray MacSharry (RDE — IRL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 July 1986)

(87/C 54/43)

Subject: Milk consumption

Will the Commission provide details concerning the estimated milk consumption per person in each of the EEC Member States for the period 1975 to 1985 and, in addition, analyse the trend in the consumption away from full cream milk towards low fat milk over the same period?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen

on behalf of the Commission

(30 September 1986)

The development in *per capita* human consumption of drinking milk including buttermilk between 1975 and 1984, for each Member State and the Community as a whole, is given below. No figures are available for 1975 and 1985.

	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
EUR-10	—	—	—	—	91,2	94,0	94,7	94,0	93,4
EUR-9	97,5	95,4	94,9	95,0	94,6	95,4	95,9	95,2	94,6
D	77,8	73,3	73,5	73,6	71,8	74,3	74,7	76,0	74,1
F	81,1	82,0	79,1	82,9	83,8	82,7	84,0	84,7	87,4
I	74,5	77,3	80,1	79,9	80,2	84,2	86,3	81,4	79,7
NL	120,4	111,6	111,5	109,1	109,4	108,7	109,8	110,6	107,9
UEBL/ BLEU	77,4	75,5	74,5	74,5	77,2	77,0	75,7	76,3	75,9
UK	145,4	140,0	137,9	135,7	134,0	132,2	130,1	129,1	127,8
IRL	206,3	199,3	194,0	190,6	187,3	186,5	191,5	189,6	196,3
DK	136,4	137,0	139,5	138,2	139,6	141,5	144,4	145,5	144,2
GR	—	—	—	—	—	55,0	61,8	62,6	63,5

The Commission does not have detailed statistics for all drinking milk varieties and/or products in all Member States. However, statistics exist for the dairy production of liquid milk for consumption, either as whole milk (minimum fat content 3,5 %), semi-skimmed milk (fat content 1,5-1,8 %) and skimmed milk (maximum fat content 0,3 %). In EUR-9, total production of these liquid milk varieties increased by nearly 13 % over the period from 1973 to 1984. This global increase reflects a change over the period in question for whole milk or minus 10 %, for semi-skimmed milk of plus 160 % and for skimmed milk of plus 70 %. However, it is important to note that in global terms these products are stagnating, and the increase of the products with less fat has not been able to outweigh, in quantity terms, the decrease for whole milk. Important differences are registered as to the development in individual Member States. In the Federal Republic of Germany, the whole milk quantity fell from 1973 to 1977 by 20 % but has recovered by more than 29 % from 1977 to 1985 and thus is more important than before. During this latter eight-year period German production of semi-skimmed milk stagnated whereas skimmed milk fell by 60 %.

The tendency in France is very different from that of the Federal Republic of Germany as whole milk production has fallen by 36 % from 1973 to 1985, whereas semi-skimmed milk increased by 220 % and is now accounting for 66 % of the total whole, semi and skimmed milk production, against only 31 % in 1973. In France the skimmed milk production was relatively constant up to 1981 but has since then been on a slightly increasing trend.

In Italy, total production of these liquid products increased sharply throughout the seventies (nearly 50 %) but has been falling in the past three or four years. In 1983, whole milk accounted for 62 % of total production, while semi-skimmed and skimmed milk were 34 % and 4 % respectively. In 1984 whole milk had fallen to less than 55 % whereas semi-skimmed milk had increased to more than 40 %.

In the Netherlands, there has been a clear trend towards falling whole milk and increasing semi-skimmed milk, whereas skimmed milk, accounting for only 2 % of the total, has fallen by 60 % since 1973. Thus, in 1984 semi-skimmed milk amounted to 49 % of the total, against 18 % only in 1973.

Both in Belgium and in Luxembourg the total production of these liquid milk products has increased moderately over the period in question, on average about one per cent annually, and the reason has been increased production of semi-skimmed milk, a reduction of whole milk and relative stability for skimmed milk. The latter product is not important in Luxembourg but accounts for about 10 % of the total market in Belgium.

In the United Kingdom the overall development has been a decreasing production by less than one per cent annually, on average. Semi-skimmed milk has only been registered in the production statistics since 1984 and has produced a subsequent fall in the production of whole milk. Skimmed milk is not of any significant importance in the United Kingdom, according to the available statistics.

In Ireland, an increase is developing in the whole milk sector, whereas semi-skimmed milk is not produced, according to statistics. Skimmed milk amounts to about 3 % of the total.

In Denmark, the global production of the three products in question in 1985 was 12 % higher than in 1973. However, the relative importance of semi-skimmed milk had increased at the expense of whole milk. However, one could argue that the semi-skimmed milk had prevented an expansion of skimmed milk production.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 874/86

by Mr Ray MacSharry (RDE — IRL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 July 1986)

(87/C 54/44)

Subject: Butter surpluses

The EEC butter surplus is now 1 050 000 tonnes, ageing rapidly and deteriorating in quality.

The existence of these stocks is adding considerably to the budgetary costs of the CAP.

The most serious consequence of the presence of this surplus is that it is undermining butter market prices to a dangerous extent.

Will the Commission therefore give immediate and serious consideration to disposing of this butter surplus by selling it to the consumer at cheap rates and by converting older stocks not fit for human consumption into oil and selling it for animal-feed purposes?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen

on behalf of the Commission

(8 October 1986)

On 21 May 1986 the Commission submitted a proposal to the Council for a regulation amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 2990/82 on the sale of butter at reduced prices to persons receiving social assistance ⁽¹⁾ to the effect that the rate of aid for the purchase of butter should be raised from 25 % to 50 % and that certain other categories of persons should also be allowed to benefit from the scheme. The Council has begun examining the proposal.

More recently, on 30 July 1986, the Commission adopted Regulation (EEC) No 2409/86 ⁽²⁾ providing for intervention butter which had been in store for more than three years and was no longer fit for direct human consumption to be sold for incorporation in compound feedingstuffs.

Prior to these two measures the Commission had already successfully implemented schemes to sell concentrated butter at reduced prices for cooking [Regulation (EEC) No 3143/85 ⁽³⁾], to extend sales of reduced-price butter to small-scale manufacturers of pastry goods and ice cream [Regulations (EEC) No 3376/85 ⁽⁴⁾], and to authorize the sale of intervention butter for export [Regulation (EEC) No 765/86 ⁽⁵⁾]. Altogether, compared with the earlier schemes, these new measures have allowed more than 150 000 additional tonnes of butter to be disposed of.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(86) 218 final.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 208, 31. 7. 1986, p. 29.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 298, 12. 11. 1985, p. 9.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 321, 30. 11. 1985, p. 62.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 72, 15. 3. 1986, p. 11.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 880/86**by Mr Horst Seefeld (S — D)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(14 July 1986)**(87/C 54/45)**Subject: Transport talks with Austria*

I understand from the Council's press release of 14 November 1985 that the Council has approved the Commission's proposal for a framework for discussions with Austria aimed at improving cooperation in the railway sector and in combined transport through the Alps.

1. What talks has the Commission (or its departments) since held:
 - (a) with government representatives,
 - (b) with representatives of the railways and combined transport undertakings concerned?
2. What was the outcome of the talks in each case?
3. On what points was agreement reached? What points are outstanding? When will they be settled?
4. What arrangements has the Commission made so that it may co-finance infrastructure projects to improve Alpine transit through Austria? Which projects have already been agreed with Austria? What will these projects cost, and what will the Community's share be?
5. The Austrian press has accused the Commission of failure to understand Austria's specific problems in connection with transit traffic and of failure to act. What is the Commission's answer to these accusations?
6. Germany's Federal Transport Minister, Mr Dollinger, and his State Secretary, Mr Bayer, have commented in the German press that difficulties with Austria, e.g. the ban on night driving, etc., had been avoided by greater understanding and more financial support from the Community for Austria. What is the Commission's opinion of these comments?
7. What special steps will the Commission take to carry out the tasks conferred on it on 5 June 1986 by the President-in-Office of the Council at the joint meeting with the Transport Ministers of Austria, Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany?

Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis
on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 1986)

1, 2, 3 and 7. Since the Council approved the Commission's proposal for a Community framework for discussions with Austria on cooperation in the railway sector, combined transport and infrastructure, the Commission has held political talks to work out bilateral

framework with the Austrian authorities. The meeting in Bonn on 5 June 1986 between the Ministers of Transport of Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and the Netherlands, which at that time held the Presidency of the Council, and the Member of the Commission responsible for transport produced such a framework for cooperation. It can be briefly described as follows:

- Talks will be held shortly between the European Community, represented by the Commission, and Austria on cooperation on combined transport, rail transport and infrastructure development,
- These will take the form of six-monthly political talks between the Commission, the Presidency of the Council and the Austrian Minister of Transport. They will be prepared by experts,
- Regular progress reports on the technical and political discussions will be made to the Council,
- The Commission will take steps to ensure that the problems of transalpine transit traffic are included in Community discussions of its infrastructure programme,
- Wherever possible, the Commission will send observers to any talks in which the improvement of transalpine communications is discussed,
- The European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT) will provide a suitable wider forum for discussion of the problems of transalpine transit and traffic.

The Commission is preparing a timetable for talks with Austria and a list of topics to be discussed. It intends to hold a series of discussions between its experts and those of the Austrian authorities and authorities of the other countries concerned and with combined transport undertakings involved in transalpine transport. The first of these talks will be held in the autumn. They will pave the way for the political talks which will soon follow.

Talks will centre on the following aspects:

- the results of existing tripartite cooperation between Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy,

— all problems connected with transalpine rail communications and possible ways of promoting both them and combined transport.

4. In its Communication to the Council of 27 June 1986 on a medium-term transport infrastructure programme ⁽¹⁾ the Commission proposed, *inter alia*, improved access routes to transit infrastructures built by non-member countries, in particular Austria, Switzerland and Yugoslavia, which carry a large share of Community traffic. Such links include the Brenner and Tauern rail lines. A Council decision and proper arrangements to implement the programme are now required for alternative routes to be improved and ways to be found of easing transalpine traffic through financial support for infrastructure projects in these regions.

5 and 6. The Commission has no knowledge of the press articles referred to by the Honourable Member. He will, however, certainly know that the Commission sought to obtain negotiating directives to negotiate a cooperation agreement on transport with Austria but that the Council was unable to adopt directives acceptable to Austria as a basis for negotiation. A cooperation agreement of this kind would have provided a global approach to this question and obviated a number of problems.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(86) 340 final.

the appearance of being fresh, while actually at risk to infections such as the botulism spore which is not affected by the irradiation process.

What advice has the Commission to offer on this matter? Would it not prefer a moratorium on public consumption of irradiated food until the opportunity has been taken to undertake a full Community study? Does the Commission agree that problems could arise in a common market in food and food products if some countries accept irradiation of food and others do not?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission
(28 October 1986)

The Commission understands the concern felt by some of the public that food may be subjected to treatment by ionizing radiation. As was indicated in the *White Paper* on the Completion of the Internal Market ⁽¹⁾, the Commission intend to make appropriate proposals for legislation on irradiation by 1988 to resolve the problems referred to by the Honourable Member should some countries accept irradiated food whilst the process continues to remain prohibited in others. In order to be better informed on a scientific basis, the Commission has consulted the Scientific Committee for Food. The Committee has completed its work and its report is currently being prepared for publication.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(85) 310 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 885/86

by Mr Richard Cottrell (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 July 1986)

(87/C 54/46)

Subject: Irradiation of food

Various governments within the Community are considering proposals to permit the irradiation of food with Cobalt Gamma 60 rays. These include the United Kingdom, where there are plans for a pilot plant, and Belgium, where a plant is already operational. The object of irradiation appears to be to prolong the active shelf life of food, particularly vegetables, poultry and fish. Naturally, there is some public disquiet, since people fear they might be eating 'radioactive food'. It is a fact that scientific opinion is divided on the matter, not least because some food, like fish, may retain

WRITTEN QUESTION No 893/86

by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE — IRL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 July 1986)

(87/C 54/47)

Subject: Cuts of meat for human consumption

1. Is the Commission aware of the wide differences in the cuts of meat available in the different Member States, due principally to the different traditions of butchery?

2. If so, can the Commission suggest ways in which the resulting confusion among travellers might be overcome, while respecting the traditions of the profession in the various Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(19 September 1986)**

1. For many generations craftsmen butchers have developed and deployed their skills in carcase cutting and preparation to cope with variations in carcase weight and quality to suit national, regional and even local expressions of consumer preference. In consequence, the principal cuts of beef, lamb, pork and veal displayed and sold by retailers in the different Member States exhibit variations in composition, weight, size and appearance. The naming of retail cuts is an additional factor showing great differences not only between the Member States, but also within one and the same Member State. For example, about 30 names are known to be applied in the United Kingdom to the cut of beef which is most widely known as 'thick flank', 'top rump' or 'bed of beef'.
2. It is the Commission's view that due to the diversity of cutting practices and nomenclature throughout the Community it would be virtually impossible to introduce common marketing standards for meat at retail level.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 900/86

**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE — IRL)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(14 July 1986)
(87/C 54/48)**

Subject: Right to free movement

Will the Commission provide details as to the extent to which citizens or residents of the following territories enjoy rights to free movement within the Community:

- The Isle of Man,
- The Channel Islands,
- Gibraltar,
- Ceuta,
- Melilla,
- Andorra,
- Monaco,
- San Marino,
- The Vatican?

**Answer given by Mr Delors
on behalf of the Commission
(30 September 1986)**

The provisions of the EEC Treaty regarding the freedom of movement of workers, the right to establishment and to provide services apply to Gibraltar in conformity with Article 227 paragraph 4, of that Treaty.

The same provisions apply to Ceuta and Melilla pursuant to Article 25 of the Act of Accession to the same extent as these provisions apply to the Kingdom of Spain.

These provisions do not apply to Andorra, Monaco, San Marino and the Vatican City, which are not Member States of the Community.

Nor do these provisions apply to the Isle of Man or the Channel Islands, territories to which the EEC Treaty applies only, pursuant to Article 227 paragraph 5 of the Treaty, to the extent set out in Protocol No 3 attached to the Act of Accession of 1972. This protocol does not cover the matters in question; indeed Article 2 of the protocol specifies that nationals of these regions shall not benefit from the Community provisions regarding the free movement of persons or services.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 912/86

**by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck (S — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(14 July 1986)
(87/C 54/49)**

Subject: Bee-keeping subsidies

Can the Commission say how much is paid annually in EEC subsidies for the promotion of bee-keeping in Belgium and to whom these subsidies are paid?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(30 September 1986)**

There are two items in the Community budget which provide for Community expenditure in favour of bee-keeping.

First, in the context of agricultural structure, under the heading of general common measures to assist agriculture, there is provision for expenditure of about 375 000 ECU in 1986 to 1988 for financing research programmes on the eradication of varroaosis. One of the programmes involves Belgium and a research contract has been financed from this appropriation.

Second, there is a budget item 3 815 which was introduced by Parliament in 1986 for the specific purpose of financing various measures to combat varroaosis. This item is included in the budget recently approved by the budget authorities. The appropriation comprises 500 000 ECU for

1986 and the Commission departments are at present studying a number of measures which could be financed from it.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 918/86

by Mr Dominique Baudis (PPE — F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 July 1986)

(87/C 54/50)

Subject: Cultivation of sorghum

What role does the Commission expect sorghum cultivation to play in the future, now that it has decided to lower its price to that guaranteed for barley, bearing in mind that sorghum is a substitute cereal crop (for sunflower)?

Does it not fear that in failing to maintain the prices paid for substitute crops, it will discourage their cultivation in the future?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**

(16 October 1986)

The Council's decisions on prices and related measures in the cereals sector for 1986/1987 are designed to try and resolve the numerous problems caused by the structural surpluses.

Among other things, the Council decided to align the buying-in price for sorghum on the corresponding prices for common feed wheat, rye and barley in order to improve the competitiveness of feed grains on the Community market and to limit the cost of the cereals policy.

In adopting this global approach to the cereals problem, the Council hopes to improve supply and demand on the Community market for animal feed.

In fact, sorghum is not normally considered as an obvious substitute for sunflower because it belongs to the cereal family and therefore has very different protein and oil levels.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 938/86

by Mr José Barros Moura (COM — P)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 July 1986)

(87/C 54/51)

Subject: Appointment of Portuguese officials in the Community Institutions

With Portuguese accession to the Community a number of posts in the various Institutions will have to be filled by Portuguese officials.

The lack of such appointments is, now that some six months have passed since accession, very marked and highly detrimental in departments such as translation and interpretation and in administrative and technical functions.

There is widespread concern in Portugal at the slowness of appointments and questions are being asked as to the criteria for admission or rejection, as many of the great expectations which were aroused have been frustrated and accusations of political favouritism have been made in respect of candidates 'sponsored' by the Government.

1. How many competitions were organized, what was the number and type of posts competed for and how many candidates were actually recruited in these competitions?
2. What were the selection or rejection criteria applied?
3. What is the professional position (type and length of contract) of the officials recruited?
4. Which posts are still to be filled by Portuguese nationals in the various institutions and what timetable has been set for holding the relevant competitions and making the appointments?
5. Can the Commission supply a list of names of all Portuguese officials, with their respective category, type of contract and the duties they perform?

**Answer given by Mr Christophersen
on behalf of the Commission**

(22 October 1986)

1. During the nine months following the accession of Portugal and Spain the Commission published 24 notices of open competition to recruit Portuguese officials to the various career brackets to work in the main areas of Commission activity. Some of these competitions were in fact published as early as June 1985 prior to accession.

Other competitions are currently in progress or at the planning stage.

This confirms the importance attached by the Commission to meeting its recruitment objectives for nationals from the two new Member States within the time limits set.

2. Following the organization of these competitions the Commission now has the following reserve lists:

A7/6 (several areas): 59 successful candidates
A8 (several areas): 30 successful candidates
LA7/6: 26 successful candidates
LA8: 7 successful candidates
B5/4: 37 successful candidates
C5/4: 75 successful candidates.

Candidates are being appointed gradually, as required, once the administrative formalities required of new staff (notice, pre-recruitment medical examination, submission of documents, etc.) have been completed.

3. Selection of the Portuguese nationals has been carried out in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Staff Regulations, which state that the admission criteria and a detailed description of the compulsory tests must be published. The selection boards were also appointed in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Staff Regulations.

4. At the beginning of September 1986 the following Portuguese nationals were in the Commission's employment:

38 A officials and temporary staff
83 LA officials and temporary staff
28 B officials and temporary staff
47 C officials and temporary staff
5 D officials and temporary staff.

5. The Commission will be pleased to provide the Honourable Member with the names of the Portuguese staff already recruited.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 947/86

by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 July 1986)

(87/C 54/52)

Subject: Does decaffeinated coffee cause cancer?

Two of the most prominent consumer organizations in the United States have gone to court to oblige the Federal Government to ban a chemical substance used to decaffeinate coffee. According to the consumer organiza-

tions this substance causes cancer in animals. The substance in question is methyl chloride.

Can the Commission say:

1. whether it is aware of this information;
2. whether it can confirm or deny this information from its own research;
3. whether methyl chloride is used to decaffeinate coffee in Europe;
4. whether the United States exports decaffeinated coffee to the EEC Member States;
5. to which Member States;
6. what are the European rules on the production and composition of decaffeinated coffee?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield

on behalf of the Commission

(28 October 1986)

1. The Commission is aware that the United States Food and Drugs Administration has advised that residues of methylene chloride in decaffeinated coffee are not a health problem, and also that certain groups of persons in the United States are questioning this assumption.

The Commission assumes that this is the subject to which the Honourable Member refers.

2. The Commission consulted the Scientific Committee for Food in 1981 on extraction solvents and proposed Community measures based on this advice (see 6). The Commission has reconsulted the Committee specifically on the question of methylene chloride in decaffeinated coffee and was advised by the Committee in March 1986 that, at the levels of methylene chloride found in decaffeinated coffee (i.e. residues often less than 1 ppm; levels between 5 ppm and 10 ppm occurring infrequently), there is no reason to prohibit the decaffeination of coffee by this extraction solvent, but that the results of new research on the safe use of this substance should be reviewed as they become available.

3. Yes.

4 and 5. Yes. The United States is the largest third country supplier. The United States exported 16 tonnes to the European Community in 1985 of which 13 tonnes were destined for United Kingdom, 2 tonnes for Greece and 1 tonne for Belgium and Luxembourg.

6. Council Directive 77/436/EEC of 27 June 1977 ⁽¹⁾ on coffee extracts and chicory extracts (modified by Directive 85/573/EEC of 19 December 1985 ⁽²⁾) specifies compositional rules for decaffeinated coffee extracts.

On 28 October 1983 the Commission proposed a draft Council Directive on extraction solvent for food use ⁽³⁾, amended as a follow up to the opinion of the Parliament ⁽⁴⁾.

The Council is discussing the question of methylene chloride on the basis of the 1986 opinion of the Scientific Committee for Food and can be expected to agree a solution which respects the principal findings of the Committee.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 172, 12. 7. 1977, p. 20.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 372, 31. 12. 1985, p. 22.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 312, 17. 11. 1983, p. 3.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 77, 23. 3. 1985, p. 7.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 949/86

by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 July 1986)

(87/C 54/53)

Subject: Cartel established by insurance companies

Under Belgian legislation it is possible to sell a loan to another company and so obtain a new, cheaper loan.

This system is at present however being undermined, because certain insurance companies have agreed with one another that they will not take clients from other companies in order to maintain the cost of loans at a high level.

This, therefore, is a cartel.

Can the Commission say:

1. whether it is aware of this situation;
2. whether this practice is contrary to European legislation;
3. if not, what measures is the Commission planning to take to put an end to this practice?

Answer given by Mr Sutherland

on behalf of the Commission

(7 October 1986)

The Commission is aware from press reports that the Union Professionnelle des Entreprises d'Assurance (UPEA) indicated in a circular the attitude it advocates regarding mortgage loans in connection with the fall in interest rates in Belgium.

The information available to the Commission does not allow it to conclude that there are any agreements or concerted practices that may affect intra-Community trade within the meaning of Article 85 of the EEC Treaty.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 951/86

by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 July 1986)

(87/C 54/54)

Subject: Aspirin for children

In the United Kingdom children's medicines containing aspirin have been withdrawn from sale.

British parents are being asked not to give children under 12 any aspirin, or medicines that contain aspirin, without a doctor's prescription.

This is because there are indications that there is a connection between taking aspirin and Reye's syndrome (a disease that causes liver and brain damage and results in death).

Can the Commission say:

1. whether it is aware of these facts;
2. how many children in the EEC Member States have died from Reye's syndrome since 1970;
3. which EEC countries have taken the same measures as the United Kingdom?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield

on behalf of the Commission

(20 October 1986)

The question of the existence of a possible link between the ingestion of aspirin and the incidence of Reye's syndrome, and the various precautionary measures which had been taken or might be taken by Member States were discussed in detail by the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products at its meeting of 10-11 June 1986 and at a special meeting convened on 2 July. Reye's syndrome appears to have a multifactorial aetiology and no single cause has yet been identified. While the causes of Reye's syndrome are not clearly defined, aspirin may be a contributory factor to the causation of Reye's syndrome in some children.

Detailed statistics on the incidence of Reye's syndrome are not available. In all Member States, Reye's syndrome is a rare condition, which is primarily, but not exclusively, confined to children. However the information available suggests that the incidence of Reye's syndrome differs considerably between the Member States. In the United Kingdom, 229 cases of Reye's syndrome were reported between August 1981 and the end of July 1985, giving an annual incidence of between three and seven cases per million. In France, on the other hand, Reye's syndrome appears to be exceptionally rare and the authorities were aware of only four recent cases, which suggested an annual incidence of one case in 8-10 million.

At its meeting of 2 July, the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products was unanimously agreed that, having regard to the information available at present, there is no scientific or medical need for the regulatory authorities to withdraw paediatric forms of aspirin from the market. It should be noted that this point of view was shared by the United Kingdom authorities, where the industry itself had decided to withdraw paediatric forms rather than include an appropriate warning on the labelling.

The Committee considered that except in those countries where Reye's syndrome is exceptionally rare, the competent authorities should take appropriate steps to reduce the use of aspirin in children with febrile disease. Such measures might include:

- information to doctors, pharmacists and other health care professionals on the use of aspirin in children and the occurrence of Reye's syndrome,
- information to the general public on precautions to be taken when using aspirin in children, in particular advice not to give aspirin to children with fever without medical advice.

The Committee recommended that further studies be made into the possible relationship between aspirin and Reye's syndrome. It will compare further the product summaries, labelling, package inserts and legal status of medicinal products containing aspirin at its next meetings.

**Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis
on behalf of the Commission**

(7 October 1986)

The Commission — in view of the fact that the Community as such is not a party to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling — can only be represented at meetings of the International Whaling Commission by observers and has in fact attended meetings as such since 1981.

The Commission has clearly and repeatedly stated its position with regard to commercial whaling in reply to questions by a number of Honourable Members, a position which is in full support of the 1982 IWC decision to phase out commercial whaling.

The Commission should in particular like to refer the Honourable Member to the statement by its Vice-President Lord Cockfield of 10 May 1985 ⁽¹⁾ in response to report A2-22/85 by Mr Muntingh on the subject, which also addressed the issue of measures with regard to whaling nations.

⁽¹⁾ Verbatim report of proceedings p. 309-310.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 952/86

by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 July 1986)

(87/C 54/55)

Subject: Meeting of the International Whaling Commission in 1986 in Sweden

The World Wildlife Fund wants Japan, Norway, the Philippines, the Soviet Union, Iceland and South Korea to end whaling. It adopted this position in connection with the meeting of the International Whaling Commission held in Malmö (Sweden) from 9 to 13 June.

Can the Commission say:

1. whether it plays any part in the Whaling Commission;
2. if so, what is its position on whaling;
3. what measures it is planning to take towards whaling countries?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 955/86

by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 July 1986)

(87/C 54/56)

Subject: The disastrous situation in the Belgian and European hop industry

The Commission is fully aware of the disastrous situation in the Belgian and European hop industry. In this connection the Belgian and French hop farmers recently put forward a number of proposals to help the industry out of its difficulties.

The first proposal was that the unsold hops should be withdrawn from the market this year and that a premium should be granted for them. It was also proposed that the hop growing premium should be increased by 100 ECU. The growing premium would then be spent on the restructuring of the industry.

Can the Commission give its views on these two proposals?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(6 October 1986)**

The Common Organization of the Market in hops provides for the possibility of granting an annual aid to growers in respect of the area harvested in order to permit them to obtain a fair income. This aid is differentiated by variety group. In certain regions of the Community it is granted to recognized producer groups which may either distribute it to members in proportion to their area in production or retain part or all of the aid to undertake market stabilization measures or structural improvement programmes. In view of this the Commission does not feel that it would be appropriate for the Community to undertake intervention buying or to grant special aids for private buying-in schemes. The basis for the proposal for the income aid is an assessment, by variety group, of incomes and production costs. As a result of this analysis for the 1985 harvest the Commission proposed an increase of 50 ECU/hectare in the income aid for the variety groups 'Bitter' and 'Others', and a reduction of 25 ECU/hectare for the variety group 'Aromatic'. In the Commission's view there is no justification for an arbitrary increase of 100 ECU/hectare in the income aid for the type suggested in the second proposal mentioned by the Honourable Member.

However, although the basis for fixing the income aid remains unchanged, it is of course possible, as mentioned above, for recognized producer groups in receipt of the aid to use it to undertake purchasing programmes or restructuring plans.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 969/86

by Mr Reinhold Bocklet (PPE — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1986)

(87/C 54/57)

Subject: Abolition of the export refund on breeding stock exported to Spain

With the accession of Spain to the European Community, the export refund on breeding stock exported to Spain has been abolished since Spain is no longer a third country. Whereas in 1985, for example, 30 448 cattle for breeding were exported from the Federal Republic of Germany to Spain, since the refund was abolished on 1 March 1986, this trade has totally collapsed resulting in serious disruption of the market for breeding stock in the Federal Republic of Germany. At the same time Austria and Switzerland have

been able to take the place of German suppliers with highly subsidized exports of breeding stock within the framework of their Community supply quotas.

1. Is the Commission aware that the accession of Spain to the European Community has inflicted severe economic hardship on the German cattle breeders in view of the consequences outlined above which are hard to justify in terms of European policy?
2. What scope does the Treaty of Accession of Spain provide for transitional aid for German exporters of breeding stock?
3. Does the Commission intend to propose the introduction of such aids?
4. Which Member States are opposed to the introduction of such support?
5. Is the Commission prepared to ensure, within the framework of the treaties with Austria and Switzerland, that the latter do not take any action that is likely to disrupt traditional trade relations between the Community of the Ten and Spain?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 1986)**

1. The Commission is aware that the abolition of export refunds since 1 March 1986 and the fact that there is no accession compensatory amount for pure-bred breeding animals has made trade in such stock with Spain more difficult. However, the Commission believes that European stock-breeders and operators will quickly adapt to the new situation created by the accession of Spain; any temporary aid would delay this inevitable adjustment and the granting of a subsidy for trade between the Member States would be a retrograde step from the viewpoint of European integration.

In this connection, one may note that in January and February 1986 about 17 000 pure-bred breeding animals were exported from the Community of Ten to Spain, equalling approximately 38 % of total exports in 1985. Exporters were thus fully aware of the change in export arrangements applying from 1 March 1986 and carried out a major proportion of their annual deliveries in advance, collecting the export refund granted until the end of February.

2. Article 90 of the Act of Accession authorizes transitional measures where appreciable difficulties arise for an agricultural product. Such measures may be taken during the period up to 31 December 1987, but may not apply beyond that date.

3. In view of the reasons mentioned in paragraph 1 and the severe shortage of Community funds, the Commission

does not intend to propose transitional measures for trade in pure-bred breeding stock with Spain.

4. The Spanish authorities have expressed opposition to any such measures on several occasions.

5. The Commission is prepared to negotiate with Austria and Switzerland the discontinuation of the subsidies which those two countries now grant; negotiations with Austria have already started.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 984/86

by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1986)

(87/C 54/58)

Subject: Integrated action plan for Westhoek

The study carried out by the regional development company for West Flanders on an integrated action plan for Westhoek has been with the European Commission for some time.

Can the Commission say to what extent this study has already been discussed and whether any degree of approval has been given to the granting of European aid for an integrated programme for Westhoek?

**Answer given by Mr Varfis
on behalf of the Commission**

(23 October 1986)

The Commission would inform the Honourable Member that in December 1984 it decided to finance 75 % of the cost of a study in preparation for an integrated development operation in the Westhoek area.

The Commission recently approved the draft final report on the study and the final instalment under the contract is accordingly about to be paid.

A draft integrated programme for the Westhoek area, based on the study, was transmitted to the Commission by the Belgian authorities on 23 September 1986; Commission staff have now started examining this draft.

More generally, to give practical shape to the numerous studies preparatory to integrated development operations received from several Member States, the Commission recently adopted an information note for the Council and Parliament, which sets out the procedures and content for the implementation of an integrated approach⁽¹⁾. At a subsequent stage this note should open the way for the launching of integrated actions; their content and

objectives together with the related criteria and procedures will also be established then too.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(86) 401 final., 22 July 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1005/86

by Mr Geoffrey Hoon (S — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1986)

(87/C 54/59)

Subject: Sale of a reproduction of a Commission document in France

In the light of the reply given by Mr Christophersen on behalf of the Commission to my Question No 95/86⁽¹⁾ what action, if any, does the Commission propose to take in order to enforce its copyright in its publication?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 307, 1. 12. 1986, p. 6.

**Answer given by Mr Christophersen
on behalf of the Commission**

(26 September 1986)

Commission practice in the past was for publications to carry a copyright notice along the following lines: 'Reproduction authorized in whole or in part, provided the source is acknowledged'.

This was the case with the publication referred to by the Honourable Member in his Written Question.

Since then the Commission has adopted new rules whereby copyright is systematically reserved.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1012/86

by Mr Arturo Escuder Croft (ED — E)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1986)

(87/C 54/60)

Subject: Aid for silviculture in the peripheral maritime and island regions

Maintaining and extending forest areas in the peripheral maritime and island regions is of vital importance in order to prevent the desertification of certain of these regions.

In view of this, will the Commission say what measures it intends to take to develop silviculture and prevent gradual desertification in the peripheral maritime and island regions?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(16 October 1986)

The Commission recognises the importance of maintaining forests throughout the Community as a means of safeguarding the natural environment and is particularly aware of the dangers of neo-desertification associated with woodland removal in the zones referred to by the Honourable Member. Accordingly the Commission has given special consideration to these matters in its recent discussion paper on forestry ⁽¹⁾ and its accompanying Memorandum ⁽²⁾.

As a means of helping to promote forestry in arid zones associated with the Mediterranean basin and its islands, the Commission has since 1979 enacted forestry measures either specifically or as part of integrated regional measures. These have included Regulation (EEC) No 269/79 ⁽³⁾ in France and Italy extended by Regulation (EEC) No 2119/83 ⁽⁴⁾ and Regulation (EEE) No 1975/82 ⁽⁵⁾ and Regulation (EEC) No 619/84 ⁽⁶⁾ in Greece. These have included provisions for: —

- i) afforestation
- ii) rehabilitation of degraded woodland
- iii) fire protection
- iv) torrent control
- v) forest roading
- vi) pilot projects.

All in addition to the general forestry provisions of Regulation 797/85 ⁽⁷⁾.

More recently the extension to Spain and Portugal Regulation (EEC) No 3827/85 ⁽⁸⁾ of Regulation (EEC) No 797/85 has enabled those Member States to develop forestry schemes as part of their agricultural structures programmes under Regulation (EEC) No 2224/86 ⁽⁹⁾ and (EEC) No 3828/85 ⁽¹⁰⁾ respectively.

In general the potential exists for these Member States to develop further forestry measures within the framework of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes ⁽¹¹⁾. It is for Member States to propose such measures within their work programme.

The Commission's long-standing proposal to Council ⁽¹²⁾ on protection against fires and acid deposition would, if approved, provide further benefit to such regions.

- ⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(85) 792 final.
- ⁽²⁾ Doc. COM(86) 26 final.
- ⁽³⁾ OJ No L 38, 14. 2. 1979.
- ⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 205, 29. 7. 1983.
- ⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 214, 22. 7. 1982.
- ⁽⁶⁾ OJ No L 68, 10. 3. 1984.
- ⁽⁷⁾ OJ No L 93, 30. 3. 1985.
- ⁽⁸⁾ OJ No L 372, 31. 12. 1985.
- ⁽⁹⁾ OJ No L 194, 17. 7. 1986.
- ⁽¹⁰⁾ OJ No L 372, 31. 12. 1985.
- ⁽¹¹⁾ OJ No L 197, 27. 7. 1985.
- ⁽¹²⁾ Doc. COM(85) 375 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1015/86
by Mr Arturo Escuder Croft (ED — E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(23 July 1986)
(87/C 54/61)

Subject: Tomato imports in 1985

There is considerable concern in the Canary Islands about the future of fresh tomato exports to the European Community.

In order to assess the potential for exports to the EEC, will the Commission give details of imports of fresh tomatoes during 1985 by each of the countries of the EEC, specifying the quantities in tonnes, value of the products and their country of origin?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 1986)

The following table gives a breakdown, in quantity and value, of imports of fresh and chilled tomatoes into the various Member States in 1985.

On the question of origin, it is impossible to reply briefly so the Commission is sending the requested information directly to the Honourable Member and to the Parliament Secretariat.

The Honourable Member's attention is also drawn to the fact that discussions are at present under way in the Council with a view to the adoption of certain measures (quotas and tariffs) to facilitate exports of fresh and chilled tomatoes from the Canary Islands to the Member States.

Imports of fresh or chilled tomatoes — 1985

Member State	Quantity (tonnes)	Value (1 000 ECU)
Belgium/ Luxembourg	9 318	8 085
Denmark	12 801	11 872
Germany	378 954	291 694
Greece	—	—
France	253 059	204 211
Ireland	12 236	13 760
Italy	8 688	6 531
Netherlands	75 651	49 136
United Kingdom	253 524	196 514

Source: Eurostat — COMEXT, heading 05440 of the SITC.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1026/86

by Mr Jean-Pierre Abelin (PPE — F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1986)

(87/C 54/62)

Subject: Compensation for French industrialists in Zaire whose assets have been nationalized by Zaire

Article 9 of Zairan Law No 009/73 of January 1973, as amended by the Decree of 6 September 1974, CAB/EN No 043/74, provides for payment of compensation to foreign industrialists dispossessed of their assets as a result of Zairanization, over a period of ten years.

On 16 October 1981, the French Embassy in Kinshasa advised the French Association of repatriated persons and dispossessed industrialists and tradesmen that the Zaire Government was prepared to arrange compensation by a diplomatic transfer, the principle of which had been accepted by the OGEDEP.

However, on 27 February 1985 the Directorate for French Assets Abroad announced that Zaire proposed to pay compensation in five or six annual instalments in non-convertible currency, which appears somewhat unacceptable.

On 16 January 1986, the Secretary of State for Cooperation had a draft prepared for submission to the Zaire authorities and seeking a settlement amounting to some 6 million French francs payable over a period of about six years.

The negotiations have been long-drawn-out and Mr Abelin has informed the Commission that the aid granted by the last French Government under its cooperation programme amounted to 400 million French francs in 1985.

Can the Commission say whether there are plans to renegotiate Zaire's debt towards dispossessed industrialists and whether it envisages drawing up an acceptable

international protocol of agreement between the governments of the victims of Zairanization and the Zaire Government?

Answer given by Mr Natali

on behalf of the Commission

(20 November 1986)

The Commission recognises the role of private investment in the promotion of development cooperation. It is for this reason that the Commission, and the Community pressed for provisions to this effect in the Third Lomé Convention. Such a formal engagement was indeed achieved, and the contracting parties to the Third Lomé Convention formally undertook to accord equitable treatment to private investments (See Article 20 and title IV).

In the case referred to by the Honourable Member, the conflict, dating back to the early seventies, is between the ACP country concerned and nationals of a Member State and bears no relationship with the implementation of the Lomé III Convention. Therefore the Commission does not intend to intervene in an affair of this kind, which Member States actually consider as being their responsibility.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1027/86

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1986)

(87/C 54/63)

Subject: Education of the children of Europeans resident abroad

Expatriate Europeans living outside Europe experience problems in educating their children in third countries where they may be required to live for several years.

Certain Member States of the Community have set up a network of national schools to meet the needs of their own subjects but these are costly to run and perpetuate the cultural barriers between the children of the Community.

1. Does the Commission not consider that in certain large cities in third countries schools, modelled on the European Schools, could be set up to accommodate all European children, which would reduce the operating costs of the schools and would give a united Europe a real cultural presence?

2. If so, is the Commission prepared to take the matter up with the Council of Ministers and to submit proposals for the setting up of schools of this type?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1155/86

by Mr Michel Toussaint and
Mrs Anne André (LDR — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/64)

Subject: Education for Community nationals in non-Community countries

Expatriate Europeans in countries outside Europe find it difficult to educate their children in their country of residence, where they sometimes have to spend several years.

Hitherto, some Community countries have set up a network of national schools, to meet their nationals' needs, but these have the disadvantage of being expensive and of maintaining cultural barriers between children from the Community.

Does the Commission not think that schools along the lines of the European schools might be set up in certain cities in non-Community countries? These schools would take in European children under one roof, which would make it possible to cut down on running costs and give expression to the cultural presence of a united Europe.

If the Commission agrees, is it prepared to raise this matter with the Council of Ministers and propose that this type of school be set up?

Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1027/86 and 1155/86 given by Mr Christophersen

on behalf of the Commission

(31 October 1986)

The Commission believes that if schools along the lines of the European Schools were set up in certain cities in non-member countries they could offer the advantages referred to by the Honourable Members.

The Commission, however, believes that the expansion of European Schools in non-member countries might be premature until the objectives laid down for these schools are achieved in the Member States.

The Commission recalls that the European Schools are subject to intergovernmental authority: consequently, it is up to the Member States to adopt the measures proposed by the Honourable Members.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1061/86

by Mrs Yvonne van Rooy (PPE — NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1986)

(87/C 54/65)

Subject: List of ingredients for beverages containing more than 1,2 % by volume of alcohol

According to Article 6 paragraph 3 of the Council Directive 79/112/EEC ⁽¹⁾ on labelling of 18 December 1978, the Council, acting on a proposal from the Commission, was supposed by 18 December 1982 to determine the rules for labelling ingredients and, possibly, indicating the alcoholic strength in the case of beverages containing more than 1,2 % by volume of alcohol.

On 12 October 1982 the Commission submitted to the Council a proposal for a directive in the above sphere.

1. What is the present state of affairs with regard to the proposal for a directive of 12 October 1982?
2. Is it the Commission's view that, when the four-year deadline laid down in Article 6 paragraph 3 has expired, the general provisions of Directive 79/112/EEC on labelling governing the listing of ingredients (Articles 6 and 7) also apply to beverages containing more than 1,2 % by volume of alcohol?
3. What does the Commission propose doing, now that more than three years have elapsed since the deadline, so as to take some account, finally, of the desire for consumer protection where indication also of the contents of alcoholic beverages is concerned?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 33, 8. 2. 1979, p. 1.

Answer given by Lord Cockfield

on behalf of the Commission

(20 October 1986)

1 and 3. The Commission proposal ⁽¹⁾ covers two main points:

- indication of the alcoholic strength of beverages containing more than 1,2 % by volume of alcohol,
- listing of the ingredients of these beverages.

On 26 May 1986 the first point was approved with the adoption of Council Directive 86/197/EEC ⁽²⁾.

The second point is still under discussion and a decision should be taken before the end of the year. The Commission is maintaining its proposal in full on this point but has to admit that serious reservations have been expressed by a majority of the delegations.

2. No formal adoption of a legal act by the Council is necessary to make the listing of ingredients mandatory at

Community level for beverages containing more than 1,2 % of alcohol.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 281, 26. 10. 1982, p. 3.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 144, 29. 5. 1986, p. 38.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1069/86

by Mr Pol Marck (PPE — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1986)

(87/C 54/66)

Subject: African swine fever

Further to experience in Belgium and the Netherlands, can the Commission say what conclusions can be drawn as regards:

1. combating the disease itself;
2. treatment of products (private storage, destruction, etc.);
3. the cost of these operations;
4. combating the causes (kitchen waste);
5. the situation in Spain?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen

on behalf of the Commission

(27 October 1986)

1. Cases of African swine fever were reported in Belgium at the beginning of 1985 and in the Netherlands in the second half of 1986. Decisive measures by these two Member States rapidly stamped out the disease in the areas under threat.

This confirmed that it is essential to take precautionary measures in respect of all farms where the presence of swine fever is suspected. As soon as African swine fever is confirmed, steps must be taken to isolate an area sufficiently vast to encompass all the farms likely to have been contaminated. All pigs on infected farms must be rapidly slaughtered and destroyed in such a way that there is no risk of the virus spreading. In addition, as has been shown in Belgium and the Netherlands, it is advisable to carry out serological tests on a representative sample of the pig population in the area concerned in order to detect and eliminate possible carriers of the virus and to ensure that other farms are unaffected. In this way the situation can revert to normal as soon as possible.

2 and 3. In order to prevent any further spread of the disease when slaughterings had to be resumed on 24 March 1985 (housing space being insufficient to accommodate all the pigs) operators were required to keep pigmeat in store until decisions had been taken at national and Community level with regard to marketing. However, to forestall any financial risks engendered by such decisions, unknown to the operators at the time, it was decided to authorize them

to sell their private stocks to the Belgian intervention agency in the event that compulsory heat treatment or destruction should be imposed on the meat in question. Compulsory heat treatment was imposed by Commission Decision 85/403/EEC of 19 July 1985 ⁽¹⁾. The treatment involved special cooking of the meat under supervision to prevent any recontamination, the temperature and duration of the process being comparable to those of the normal cooking of similar products for the prevention of contamination.

However, the separation of meat liable to contain the ASF virus from other meat present in the processing plants and the psychological barriers against the acceptance of the resulting processed products in the retail trade made sales very difficult and slow. Most of the stored meat was therefore sold by operators to the Belgian intervention agency at a going market price and was then bought up by certain processors for use in prepared products or by manufacturers of meat meal. Prices for meat sold to processors were fixed by tender at just under one third of the prices obtaining for meat not subject to compulsory heat treatment, while prices for meat to be processed into meal were ridiculously low. And yet, by August 1986, eighteen months after the outbreak of African swine fever in Belgium, only 33 % of the stocks had been sold for human consumption, and processing will continue until the end of 1986.

In the light of this experience, when swine fever was reported in the Netherlands in April 1986, it was decided to proceed immediately with the slaughter of pigs ready for market, i.e. surplus piglets over 20 kg in weight and finished pigs over 105 kg. In this way, storage costs, bottlenecks in the marketing chain and any residual risk of subsequent contamination were avoided.

The gross cost of these measures may be estimated at 2 950 ECU/tonne of meat in Belgium and 1 480 ECU/tonne of carcase equivalent in the Netherlands. Net costs after deduction of revenue from sales are about 2 700 ECU and 1 450 ECU respectively.

4 and 5. The origin of the outbreaks reported in Belgium and the Netherlands is attributed either to accidental feeding with waste containing pigmeat-based products or to the use of kitchen waste not sterilized by appropriate heat treatment.

The introduction of African swine fever in a Community Member State is usually due to the use of contaminated meat or — above all — kitchen waste.

When kitchen waste or waste from meat-using industries is used for feeding pigs, it is essential to take maximum

precautions when collecting, sterilizing and distributing it. Heat treatment must be carried out in special installations subject to strict, centralized supervision.

However, in the interests of the development of the internal market and the expansion of tourism and trade, there is no doubt that the best prevention lies in the eradication of the disease.

In this respect, the persistently endemic nature of African swine fever in the Iberian peninsula gives cause for concern. Because of the constant risk presented by the disease, the Community helped to finance national eradication schemes in Portugal and Spain in 1980 to 1985. In the light of the results obtained, the Portuguese and Spanish authorities are now setting up more intensive programmes for which they have requested Community aid. This should ensure that, in the course of the next five years, it will be possible to establish, maintain and extend regions which are completely free of African swine fever.

(¹) OJ No L 228, 27. 8. 1985, p. 28.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1078/86

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1986)

(87/C 54/67)

Subject: Frontiers of mankind

It has been reported in the press that Japan has proposed to some of the states that took part in the last Tokyo Summit that they should join in a major civil research programme to be called 'frontiers of mankind'.

1. Has the Commission received information about such a programme?
2. Does the Commission think that participation in such a programme by certain Member States is compatible with their involvement in Community research programmes?

Answer given by Mr Narjes

on behalf of the Commission

(28 October 1986)

A tentative proposal had been prepared by the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) in view of a possible submission to the 1986 Tokyo Summit. MITI officials had made contact with the Services of all participants in the Summit including the Commission. The Japanese authorities finally did not submit such a proposal

to the Tokyo Summit. The Commission will follow this possible Japanese initiative with great attention.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1093/86

by Mr Richard Cottrell (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/68)

Subject: Alzheimer's Disease

Senile dementia, or Alzheimer's Disease, now poses a threat to the quality of life of an increasingly ageing population throughout the Community. The disease is now recognized as one which can condemn many thousands of elderly people to an institutionalized existence from which they will never be rescued unless and until a cure for the condition is found. In the short term, drastic improvement in treatment facilities is sought: but the best option for the Community is to coordinate the search for a cure, by assisting to monitor progress on research and provide appropriate stimulation in the research sector.

Will the Commission recognize that the elderly population within the Community should enjoy equal status with the young, and therefore provide budget appropriations at the earliest possible opportunity to combat Alzheimer's Disease?

Answer given by Mr Narjes

on behalf of the Commission

(31 October 1986)

The Commission fully recognizes that the elderly population within the Community should enjoy equal status with the young, and therefore be protected from diseases affecting its life quality such as senile dementia.

Within the Community's medical research programme (1982-1986) the Commission promoted the coordination of biological research on brain ageing, of which the work is totally executed and financed by the Member states. In 1985, the coordination was extended towards research on dementia including Alzheimer's Disease. New insights into its etiology were gained and allowed the setting-up of a concerted project aiming at the improvement of early diagnosis and treatment of Alzheimer's Disease. About 20 European institutes, in close collaboration with the Task Force of the National Institutes of Health (United States), will joint their research efforts to combat, as early as

possible, the degenerative processes of this disease which are leading to 'irreversible' brain damage.

Full operation and first results of this project are expected within the medical research coordination programme for the years 1987 to 1989.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1109/86

by Mr George Cryer (S — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/69)

Subject: Compensation for the effects of mining subsidence

Have any sums been paid by way of compensation to property owners as a result of damage by mining subsidence from EEC funds and if so can the states and monies paid be listed?

Answer given by Mr Varfis

on behalf of the Commission

(7 October 1986)

The Community does not pay compensation for damage to property caused by mining subsidence. Claims for such compensation are settled within the national legal framework of the Member States concerned.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1114/86

by Mr Carlos Robles Piquer (ED — E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/70)

Subject: Creation of an administrative court of first instance

In view of the accession of two new Member States the number of cases coming before the Court of Justice of the European Communities is bound to increase appreciably, and this will have an adverse effect on the speed of handling cases and the work of the professions involved, as a result of the marked rise in the volume of services required.

For this reason the need has arisen for an appropriate political agreement to create an administrative court of first

instance, leaving the Court of Justice free to deal with the legal problems of second instance.

Can the Commission state what stage preparations for a political agreement, if any, have reached in this regard, and whether it considers that there is a need to speed up the procedure for establishing such an administrative court, so as to facilitate the Court of Justice's activities?

Answer given by Mr Delors

on behalf of the Commission

(20 October 1986)

The Single European Act signed by the Member States of the Community, which will come into force once it has been ratified by all the Member States, provides for an amendment to the three Treaties to allow the Council to attach a court of first instance to the Court of Justice. Such a decision has to be taken unanimously by the Council at the request of the Court of Justice after consulting the Commission and Parliament (Articles 4, 11 and 26 of the Single Act). It will therefore be for the Court of Justice to take the first step in this direction after entry into force of the Single Act.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1116/86

by Mr Luis Perinat Elío (ED — E)

to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/71)

Subject: Indefinite closure of the *La Prensa de Nicaragua* newspaper

The Sandanista Government recently tightened its grip by ordering the closure on the Nicaraguan people in its continuing bid gradually to reduce their freedom by ordering the closure of the *La Prensa de Nicaragua* newspaper, the one remaining opposition newspaper in that country, for an indefinite period.

In view of this attack on the freedom of the press in Nicaragua, the pace at which the Sandanista Government is leading that country towards a hard-line left-wing dictatorship, with all the difficulties of a constant violation of human rights in which such dictatorships are known to engage, continues to give cause for concern.

Do the Ministers therefore consider it desirable to express their protest and concern, both at this undemocratic closure of *La Prensa* for an indefinite period and at the substantial restriction of the Nicaraguan people's freedoms by the Sandanista Government?

Answer*(16 January 1987)*

The Twelve have repeatedly made clear their view that lasting peace in Central America must be based on democracy and full respect for human rights throughout the region. Freedom of the press is clearly of great importance if genuine democracy is to flourish.

The Twelve see the Ministerial meeting with the Central American and Contadora Group countries due to be held in Guatemala in February 1987 as an opportunity to reaffirm the importance which the Twelve attach to the above principals being observed.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1123/86

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S — B)

to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation

*(2 September 1986)**(87/C 54/72)*

Subject: Europe's position on South Africa

Following the summit in The Hague, can the Council explain why its position on South Africa does not go as far as the recommendation of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons' Group which regarded sanctions as the only means of exerting pressure?

Does the Council not consider that the visit by Sir Geoffrey Howe, the British Foreign Secretary, is utterly pointless judging by the reactions of the black South African leaders and Bishop Desmond Tutu? Would it not be more appropriate to cancel this visit and immediately call a meeting of the European Foreign Ministers with a view to emergency measures?

Finally, is it not possible for Europe to take measures which would affect those sections of the South African population most opposed to the abolition of apartheid, e.g. in the agricultural sector?

Although agricultural exports may be of little significance in the economy of the country, it is, nevertheless, those sections of the population whose income is primarily dependent on agriculture who are in favour of maintaining the harshest form of apartheid?

Answer*(19 January 1987)*

The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given to Oral Question No 284 tabled by Mrs Castle.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1142/86

by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

*(2 September 1986)**(87/C 54/73)*

Subject: The market in maize

Is it true that:

1. in July 1985 the Commission authorized huge imports of American maize at an almost zero rate of customs duty;
2. these imports caused a drop in the price of maize in France and French producers found themselves in May 1986 with grain stocks of over 800 000 tonnes which they cannot sell except at the EEC intervention price;
3. the Community is therefore going to pay for stocking this 'French' maize for a great many months and then subsidize its exporting on to the world market?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen

on behalf of the Commission

(30 September 1986)

1. The 1984/1985 cereal year closed with drawings of maize import licences for about 1 million tonnes in July 1985. But the total volume (3,3 million tonnes) of licence drawings for the entire year was less than in previous years. In 1983/1984 licences were drawn for 5,1 million tonnes. In July 1985 most of the licences drawn were subject to a levy of 96 ECU/t; this is about half the Community intervention price. There is thus no question of any authorization of 'huge imports of American maize at an almost zero rate of duty'. It is relevant to recall that there are pre-established rules whereby the Commission fixes the import levies to cover the disparity between the threshold price and the cif price at Rotterdam. Given that cereal prices on the internal market are usually well below the threshold price, the system implies definite preferential disposal of Community

cereals. The levy obviously fluctuates with world prices and the rates of exchange of European currencies against the US dollar.

2. It is true that 400 000 tonnes of maize were taken into intervention in France in May 1986 and that a tendering procedure for exporting 200 000 tonnes of intervention maize was initiated in July 1986.

The main reason for these unusual events is the decline in the use of maize in animal feed since prices for other cereals have in some cases become more attractive.

3. The principles of temporary storage and subsidized exports form part of the common organization of the market in cereals as it is applied at the present time.

Under Article 36 of the EEC Treaty a Member State is permitted to prohibit or restrict imports on the grounds, *inter alia*, of the protection of health or life. It is understood that the United Kingdom Health and Safety Executive has in fact taken measures to safeguard the public in the case of imported Chinese fireworks.

While the number of injuries in the United Kingdom is a matter of concern, the Commission believes that the problem is on a much more limited scale in other Member States given the United Kingdom tradition of the use of fireworks in the period mentioned. The Community system of information on accidents involving consumer products ⁽¹⁾ should in due course provide more accurate information, enabling the Commission to assess the need for action at Community level.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 109, 26. 4. 1986, p. 27.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1152/86

by Mr Terence Pitt (S — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/74)

Subject: Sales of fireworks to children

Is the Commission aware that dangerous fireworks are being imported from China by Federal Republic of Germany companies, who relabel them and re-export them to their outlets in the United Kingdom?

Is the Commission also aware that H.M. Inspector of Explosives in the United Kingdom was unable to inspect samples of Chinese fireworks imported to West Germany last October, and re-exported to the United Kingdom, because of Article 30 of the Treaty of Rome, which prohibits fireworks from being inspected from Member State to Member State?

Finally, is the Commission aware that 4 000 youngsters were injured by fireworks in the United Kingdom for a four-week period until 5 November last year? 968 of them were hospitalized. Will the Commission now issue a Directive prohibiting shop sales of fireworks, except under licence, to over 18s, for properly organized displays only?

Answer given by Mr Varfis
on behalf of the Commission

(23 October 1986)

The Commission has no information about the situation described in the first paragraph of the question.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1160/86

by Mrs Raymonde Dury (S — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/75)

Subject: Administration of phenothiazine to young children

In its reply in the plenary sitting of 14 January 1986 to the oral question on phenothiazine (H-655/85) ⁽¹⁾, the Commission announced that a meeting of the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products would be held in January, when it would 'examine carefully the recommended precautions for use of these products'.

1. Could the Commission give details of the outcome of the meeting of the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products in January?
2. Can the Commission say whether the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products reached any conclusions on recommendations for the administration of phenothiazine to young children, whether it has informed the Member States and on what date?

⁽¹⁾ *Debates of the European Parliament*, No D2-334 (January 1986).

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 1986)**

1. The discussions of the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products in January 1986 on the possibility of a link between the administration of syrups containing phenothiazine derivatives and the incidence of sudden death in babies confirmed the provisional conclusions which the Committee had reached at its meeting of November 1985 and which were communicated to the Honourable Member in reply to her Written Question No 1945/85 ⁽¹⁾. According to the information available to the Committee, the hypotheses advanced on the possibility of a link between the sudden death of newly born babies and the administration of certain categories of medicinal products has been examined for several years by the national pharmacovigilance centres but the evidence available does not support them. It appears that the risk of apnea is common to all sedatives because of the depressing effect they have on the respiratory system. Moreover, the accidents which have been reported appear to result from a failure to respect the indications which appear on package inserts, and in particular the warnings relating to the risk of intoxication by overdosage.

2. In addition, the Committee undertook a detailed exchange of information on the various precautionary measures taken by Member States relating to the use of phenothiazine derivatives in babies. These measures include contra-indication in babies aged less than one or two years; special dosage forms for babies; warnings on the product information intended for doctors or patients; restrictions on the availability of these preparations (prescription only). The Committee did not, however, address any specific recommendation to the Member States on the use of the phenothiazine derivatives in babies or young children.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 130, 28. 5. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1168/86

**by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 September 1986)
(87/C 54/76)**

Subject: BICEP Programme and EEC

What is the current situation as regards the US 'BICEP' programme to subsidize agricultural exports from the United States? (Recipient countries, quantities sold, products concerned)

What is the parallel situation with regard to agricultural exports from the EEC?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(27 October 1986)**

The implementation of the United States Export Enhancement Programme (sometimes referred to as 'BICEP') comprises two distinct phases. One is the announcement of an initiative in terms of a given maximum quantity of a specified product available for export to a particular country. The other is the award under a given initiative to named exporters of specified quantities under favourable conditions. As of 1 August 1986 the situation concerning the implementation of the Programme is set out in the following table.

Exports of agricultural products from the Community since the introduction of the Export Enhancement Programme have remained buoyant. This remark is valid also for the main products which to date have featured prominently in this Programme, namely wheat and wheat flour. The European Community share of imports of wheat and wheat flour into the totality of countries targeted under the Programme, and which traditionally purchase from it, has not declined since the introduction of the Programme. In addition, European Community exports of wheat and wheat flour to all third countries in 1985/86, although somewhat smaller in absolute terms than in the previous year due to a considerable reduction in the overall size of international trade in these products, increased in relative terms.

Export destination	Quantity announced	Quantity awarded
<i>Wheat (tonnes)</i>		
Algeria	2 000 000	1 000 000
Benin	45 000	20 000
Egypt	1 564 500	1 264 500
Jordan	150 000	150 000
Morocco	1 500 000	890 000
Philippines	150 000	150 000
Senegal	100 000	0
Sri Lanka	125 000	50 000
Syria	700 000	0
Tunisia	300 000	175 000
Turkey	1 006 600	506 600
Yemen	100 000	50 000
Yugoslavia	400 000	320 000
Zaire	80 000	80 000
Total	8 221 100	4 656 100

Export destination	Quantity announced	Quantity awarded
--------------------	--------------------	------------------

Wheat flour (tonnes)

Algeria	100 000	0
Egypt	600 000	600 000
Iraq	150 000	75 000
Philippines	100 000	50 000
Yemen	150 000	31 500
Zaire	94 000	79 000
Total	1 194 000	835 500

Semolina (tonnes)

Algeria	250 000	0
---------	---------	---

Barley (tonnes)

Algeria	500 000	0
Israel	200 000	5 200
Jordan	60 000	0
Saudi Arabia	500 000	500 000
Total	1 260 000	505 200

Barley malt (tonnes)

Nigeria	100 000	4 400
---------	---------	-------

Rice (tonnes)

Jordan	40 000	22 700
--------	--------	--------

Mixed poultry feed (tonnes)

Yemen	150 000	0
-------	---------	---

Frozen poultry (tonnes)

Egypt	43 000	28 000
-------	--------	--------

Vegetable oil (tonnes)

India	25 000	0
-------	--------	---

Dairy cattle (head)

Algeria	5 000	0
Egypt	6 000	0
Indonesia	7 500	0
Iraq	6 500	0
Morocco	4 000	0
Tunisia	4 000	0
Turkey	5 000	0
Total	38 000	0

Eggs (cases)

Algeria	1 388 889	0
---------	-----------	---

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1175/86

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/77)

Subject: Double containment for PWRs

The Commission will know that the producers of electricity based their assertions of the safety of PWRs (in comparison with Chernobyl) on double containment.

Is the Commission planning a directive establishing effective standards for double containment?

Answer given by Mr Mosar**on behalf of the Commission**

(3 November 1986)

The safety of a PWR power station is not based solely on the presence of a single or double containment structure, although that structure certainly contributes to power-station safety; in particular, in the event of a serious internal accident, it forms a barrier between the radioactive products released from the primary circuit and the environment.

The overall safety of a power station depends on a wide range of factors, including the containment structures.

The activities conducted by the Commission in this field in response to the Council Resolution of 22 July 1975 on the Technological Problems of Nuclear Safety will shortly be the subject of a Communication from the Commission to the Council, as announced in the outline communication ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(86) 327, 13 June 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1176/86**by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S — B)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(2 September 1986)**(87/C 54/78)*

Subject: Checks on temporary workers in nuclear power stations

Is the Commission planning a specific instrument to define European health checks (protection against radiation) for temporary workers in nuclear power stations?

Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis**on behalf of the Commission***(30 October 1986)*

Temporary workers, as any other workers in nuclear power stations, fall within the ambit of the Basic Safety Standards laid down in the Council Directive of 15 July 1980 ⁽¹⁾ as last amended by the Council Directive of 3 September 1984 ⁽²⁾. The Commission is, however, aware of the fact that the application of the Basic Standards in the case of temporary workers in nuclear installations has sometimes proved difficult. In order to remedy the situation the Commission has therefore announced its intention in its Communication to the Council on 'The Development of Community Measures for the Application of Chapter III of the Euratom Treaty (Health and Safety)' ⁽³⁾ to make a specific proposal ensuring that temporary workers, especially those involved in transfrontier work, receive adequate protection.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 246, 17. 9. 1980, p. 1, Directive 80/836/Euratom.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 265, 5. 10. 1984, p. 4, Directive 84/467/Euratom.

⁽³⁾ Doc. COM(86) 434 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1185/86**by Mr Horst Seefeld and Mr Dieter Rogalla (S — D)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(2 September 1986)**(87/C 54/79)*

Subject: Community customs exemptions for goods carried in travellers' luggage

Does the Commission share our view that the Community provisions concerning customs exemption should be made more generous in that the concept of duty-free personal

luggage should be extended to include luggage sent on in advance or later by a different means of transport?

What steps does the Commission intend to take in this respect?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield**on behalf of the Commission***(15 October 1986)*

Pursuant to Article 45 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 918/83 ⁽¹⁾, a traveller's personal luggage is normally taken to be the luggage which that traveller is in a position to submit to the customs authorities on his arrival in the Community. It is at that moment that the customs authorities are best able to decide whether or not the traveller can claim exemption.

In view of the hazards involved in the transportation of travellers' luggage, particularly by air, Article 45 of Regulation (EEC) No 918/83 extends exemption to goods contained in luggage which, although registered at the time of the traveller's departure, could not, for some reason or other, accompany the traveller and did not arrive at his destination until later.

Implementation of this provision is not without its practical difficulties, since the customs authorities must be satisfied that the traveller has not benefited from exemption twice (for example, on arrival with his hand luggage and on the arrival of his registered luggage). Checks designed to prevent this are difficult to carry out and resented by travellers. These circumstances militate against extending exemption to luggage dispatched before or after the date on which the traveller actually undertakes his journey to the Community.

This position is fully consistent with the international provisions in force in this field, and particularly with those of Annex F3 to the Kyoto Convention concluded under the aegis of the Customs Cooperation Council and with those of the OECD Council's Decision-Recommendation of 27 November 1985 on international tourism policy.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 105, 23. 4. 1983, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1198/86
by Mr Arturo Escuder Croft (ED — E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 September 1986)
(87/C 54/80)

Subject: Improving the working environment

The Council has expressed its wish to bring about an improvement in the working environment.

What action has the Commission taken during 1986 to bring about an improvement in the working environment, and the health education and information of work people, and what practical measures does it propose to take during the remainder of this year?

Answer given by Mr Marín
on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 1986)

In 1984 the Council adopted a second five-year action programme of the European Communities on safety and health at work ⁽¹⁾. It covers the areas of:

- protection against dangerous substances,
- ergonomic measures, protection against accidents and dangerous situations,
- organization,
- training and information,
- statistics,
- research,
- international cooperation.

For the implementation of this programme, annual work plans are prepared with the assistance of the Advisory Committee for Safety, Hygiene and Health Protection at Work and following consultation with Member States. The plan for 1986 foresees 29 specific actions within these seven areas.

These annual work plans are not published but copies are forwarded to the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee in January of each year and copies are available on direct request. A copy of the 1986 work plan is being forwarded to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat general of the European Parliament.

The Commission intends also to propose action in other fields of working conditions more directly linked to the organisation of work in a Communication to be presented to the Council before the end of the year.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1207/86
by Mr Arturo Escuder Croft (ED — E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 September 1986)
(87/C 54/81)

Subject: Promoting olive oil consumption

The integration of Spain and Portugal into the EEC has significantly increased the economic contribution and the vote of Community countries within the International Olive Oil Agreement.

Would the Commission therefore state whether it intends to call for the promotional campaigns for the consumption of olive oil to be stepped up, in order to attempt to reduce EEC surpluses and increase its exports of this product, either through the International Olive Oil Agreement or directly?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 1986)

The accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community and the new International Olive Oil Agreement will mean a significant increase in the financial contribution of the Community, not of the Member States.

The Commission intends to step up promotion campaigns for the consumption of olive oil both directly and through the International Olive Oil Council (the body responsible for supervising the Agreement).

To that end, the Commission proposed:

- (a) on behalf of the EEC, during negotiations for the new Agreement, that the promotion fund be increased from 300 000 US dollars to 600 000 US dollars. That proposal was adopted.
- (b) for the 1985/1986 olive marketing year, that the percentage to be deducted from consumption aid for olive oil be increased from 4 % (1984/1985) to 7 %. That proposal was adopted by the Council. Sums deducted are intended to finance measures to encourage the consumption of olive oil in Community Member States and on the main world consumer markets.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 67, 8. 3. 1984, p. 2-4.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1216/86**by Mr José Happart (S — B)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(2 September 1986)**(87/C 54/82)**Subject: Use of nitrogenous fertilizers*

Can the Commission say what would be the effect on agricultural surpluses of a 50 % reduction in the quantity of nitrogenous fertilizers used in agriculture for all vegetable and animal production?

Is it possible to calculate the savings which would be made on the one hand by eliminating the cost of purchasing nitrogenous fertilizers and on the other hand as a result of the massive drop in agricultural surpluses following a reduction in the quantities of nitrogenous fertilizers used?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen**on behalf of the Commission***(16 October 1986)*

Increased use of nitrogenous fertilizers in farming is undoubtedly one of the factors which have contributed to increased production and hence to the build-up of surpluses, at least in some sectors. It is therefore probable that cutting nitrogenous fertilizer use by about 50 % would have profound repercussions, not only on the yield and volume of output of the various crops, but also on crop rotations and the types of farming practised in Europe as a whole.

But it is not easy to make a precise evaluation of the impact of such a measure on agricultural surpluses, and even less of the potential budget savings. One reason for this is that the correlation between the input of nitrogenous fertilizers and the output of farm produce is not uniform and unvarying throughout Europe. It depends not only on the product in question, but also on the nature of the soil, the variety of seed, the use of other fertilizers, and so on. A second reason is that such an evaluation would obviously have to take account not only of the direct impact of reduced fertilizer use on agricultural output but also of the indirect repercussions of such a change on the allocation of resources in European farming, a factor which is virtually impossible to quantify.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1217/86**by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S — B)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(2 September 1986)**(87/C 54/83)**Subject: Publication of the Commission's recruitment notices in Belgian newspapers (662/IX/84-FR)*

A general leaflet issued by the Directorate General for Personnel and Administration contains a list of Belgian newspapers in which recruitment notices are generally published. This list includes only one French-language newspaper from the capital and seven Dutch-language newspapers, several of which are provincial newspapers, but not one Walloon newspaper.

Can the Commission say what criteria were used in drawing up this list?

Does it not agree that the publication of recruitment notices is discriminatory?

What immediate steps will the Commission take to put a stop to this flagrant injustice and ensure a fair distribution of recruitment notices in national, Walloon, Flemish and Brussels newspapers?

Answer given by Mr Christophersen**on behalf of the Commission***(16 October 1986)*

The sole purpose of publishing Commission recruitment notices in the press of the twelve Member States is to reach the maximum number of potential candidates. In consultation with specialist agencies the announcements are placed in newspapers with a wide circulation (in the case of 'general' posts for administrative staff and secretaries), the specialist press (computer staff and agronomists) or the international press (interpreters).

In addition to these strictly functional considerations, there are budgetary constraints which prevent advertisements appearing simultaneously in several publications.

Operating from a position of complete neutrality the Commission accordingly does not claim to use all the press in any Member State.

But it naturally does all it can to ensure that its advertisements reach the whole of the Member State, particularly where no one paper is read throughout the country.

The Commission currently advertises in only two Belgian newspapers: *Le Soir* (circulation 250 000) and *De Standaard* (circulation 295 000).

Advertisements placed in these newspapers automatically appear in the other papers in the group: *La Lanterne*, *Handelsblad*, *Het Nieuwsblad* and *De Gentenaar*.

It is this list of newspapers which is relevant, not the one in the leaflet to which the Honourable Member refers, which is in fact in the process of being updated.

justified where an assisted investment has been implemented as planned and provided that all the conditions imposed by the ERDF Regulation are fulfilled.

(¹) OJ No C 348, 31. 12. 1984, p. 210, paragraphs 7.40 to 7.42.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1225/86

by Mr David Martin (S — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/84)

Subject: Court of Auditors' Report 1983

In Chapter 7.41 of its Audit Report for the Financial Year 1983, the Court of Auditors states that:

'During an audit visit in Scotland, it was found that, out of twenty-two firms in receipt of fund aid, totalling over 21 million Pounds sterling, only one had fulfilled the planned objectives regarding jobs'.

Will the Commission name the twenty-two firms visited and the one which achieved its job's target?

Answer given by Mr Pfeiffer

on behalf of the Commission

(28 October 1986)

As a general point, it must be stressed that the checks on operations financed by the ERDF in the Member States are confidential. Moreover, the Court of Auditors does not disclose to the Commission the detailed results of its inspection visits. The Commission cannot therefore name the firms referred to in paragraph 7.41 of the Court of Auditors' annual report concerning the financial year 1983.

In its answer to the Court of Auditors' observation on the Scottish firms' failure to achieve their job targets, the Commission pointed out (¹) that job forecasts in applications for ERDF assistance are no more than a rough guide and that penalties for divergence between forecasts and actual achievements in creating or maintaining jobs are not

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1240/86

by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/85)

Subject: Fire blight

Fire blight is again devastating fruit trees in Belgium this year.

This disease is now attacking apple trees whereas previously it affected hawthorn and pear trees more. It is estimated that 90 % of the orchards in the Liege province are currently contaminated; 60 000 pear trees have already been uprooted.

Could the Commission state:

1. if it has statistics available on the extent of this epidemic in the various regions of the Community,
2. what research findings it currently has available on combating fire blight,
3. what funds, if any, are available to tree growers for combating fire blight?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen

on behalf of the Commission

(3 October 1986)

1. The Commission has no recent figures on the extent of the disease in the Community, but it is clear that in most of the contaminated countries it must be regarded as endemic, despite the large sums spent on eradication.

2. Under the Agrimed research programme, a special effort was made, between 1978 and 1983, to combat fire blight, the main objectives being to study the effectiveness of new bactericidal molecules and to compare the sensitivities of commercial and hybrid varieties of apples and pears.

The trials were conducted in an experimental orchard at Dax-Labatut (France); the results obtained in 1983 can be summarized as follows:

— Chemical control: among the various products tested, only Bordeaux mixture at 1 gram U metal/litre proved

more effective than streptomycin (200 ppm). Autumn treatments in the nursery are apparently not satisfactory to control the disease,

- Varietal sensitivity: 31 apple varieties from European collections were inoculated by shoot injection and classified into five sensitivity groups. The assessment took account of the frequency of successful injections and the severity of the development of necroses.

31 other varieties grown to a significant extent in the Community Member States were inoculated for the first time in 1983.

Because of its slower vegetative development, inoculation of the European collection of pear varieties (80 varieties) began in 1983.

- Creation of hybrids: after preselection under glass at Wageningen (Netherlands) between 1980 and 1983, 1 857 pear hybrids having average to very good resistance levels were planted at Dax for definitive selection. 5 020 other hybrids were planted out directly at Dax; of these, 3 100 were retained in 1983.

Among the apple varieties, preliminary tests indicated resistance or low sensitivity in 10 varieties already improved for their resistance to scab and/or mildew.

Given the modest financial resources granted to the Commission under the Council's decision of 12 December 1983 ⁽¹⁾, it has been impossible to maintain a high level of research in this field. However, coordination of research continues and should allow of a further review of results in 1986.

3. There are no plans for financial aid to Community growers.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 358, 22. 12. 1983, p. 36.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1243/86

by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 September 1986)
(87/C 54/86)

Subject: Single-crop farming

It is generally agreed that European agriculture has tended in the direction of single-crop farming.

Does the Commission have statistics available to confirm this trend?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(29 October 1986)

Monoculture, in the strict sense of the term, is not among the characteristics covered by the agricultural structure surveys. These surveys do, however, provide figures concerning specialized holdings, i.e. holdings on which the principal enterprise plays a predominant role.

The Honourable Member will find below a table showing the trend for EUR-9 from 1975 to 1983 in specialized holdings as a percentage of agricultural holdings as a whole. The figures do indeed indicate a tendency towards greater specialization in European agriculture over the reference period and thus towards monocultures in the broad sense of the term.

Specialized holdings as a percentage of all agricultural holdings — EUR-9

Type of farming	Number of holdings		Utilized agricultural area		Total standard gross margin ⁽¹⁾	
	1975	1983	1975	1983	1975	1983
Cereals	7,0	9,1	8,8	10,6	6,0	7,4
Horticulture	2,2	2,2	0,5	0,4	6,3	7,2
Vineyards	8,4	10,4	2,3	2,3	5,2	5,4
Fruit and other permanent crops	10,6	14,6	3,0	3,2	6,4	7,1
Cattle, dairying	13,5	13,2	16,7	19,7	16,9	20,9
Cattle, rearing/fattening	4,2	4,9	6,7	7,5	3,0	3,5
Pigs	0,9	0,9	0,3	0,5	1,8	2,0
Pigs and poultry, other	0,6	0,5	0,2	0,2	1,2	1,2
Total specialized holdings	47,4	55,8	38,5	44,4	46,8	54,7
Total all holdings	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Sources: 1975 and 1983 structure surveys.

⁽¹⁾ Standard gross margin means the difference, established on the basis of standardized regional coefficients, between the monetary value of production (gross production) and the value of certain direct costs involved in that production. The standard gross margin is an indicator of the economic potential of holdings. It is expressed in terms of ESU (European size units): 1 ESU = 1 000 European units of account of standard gross margin.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1244/86

by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/87)

Subject: Prohibition of somatotropin

Although world milk production is still growing, the American Administration has granted federal funds to promote the use of somatotropin (or BST), a hormonal substance which, when injected daily into a dairy cow, may boost its production of milk by 20 to 40 %.

Does the Commission not think that the use of this hormone should be prohibited in the Community notwithstanding the fact that it is used for milk production and not fattening purposes? Could it state the economic and public health reasons which, in its view, exist for prohibiting such a product?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission

(29 October 1986)

The Commission has not had submitted to it details of products based on Somatotropine for increasing milk production.

In consequence it has not made a study of the public health or economic consequences that may be involved. If such products were authorised and entered into general use throughout the world, this would not be without considerable consequences for the equilibrium of the world market for milk products, and the Commission would take all considerations into account should this need arise.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1248/86

by Mr Jean-Pierre Abelin (PPE — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/88)

Subject: The mushroom crisis

Since 1985, the French mushroom market has been in deep crisis because of cutthroat and sometimes unfair competition from countries which are newly established mushroom

producers and exporters. The threat of collapse hangs over an entire economic sector which comprises more than 300 growers spread over more than half the Departments in France and provides a living for more than 6 000 persons on the land, more than 6 000 in the mushroom canning industry and more than 5 000 others working directly in this sector. In general, French producers abide by canning standards, which are more restrictive than those applied by their German or Dutch competitors, for example.

Consequently, the French canning industry would greatly welcome Community provisions — in the form of harmonized product standards and labelling rules — for the sale of high-quality tinned mushrooms in the European Community.

In view of the current difficulties on this market as a result of over-production world-wide, could not this matter be settled as soon as possible?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(25 September 1986)

Overproduction in the rest of the world is not a determining factor in the mushroom sector. For several years the Community mushroom canning industry has been effectively protected by frontier arrangements, adopted by the Council in June 1981, whereby imports are subject to quantitative limits.

On the question of Community quality standards, the Commission would point out that the Council is faced by the task of deciding on a very large number of standards and that, in the processed fruit and vegetables sector, it has given priority to products which are eligible for production aid; this is not the case for canned mushrooms. It is possible that other products, not eligible for aid, may be added to the list of products for which Community standards should be adopted, but any proposals to this effect must be discussed with representatives of the industry as a whole and all the Member States.

There is, however, a Community directive on labelling⁽¹⁾. Supervision of its implementation rests with the Member States. It should allow the matter to be resolved for the French mushroom industry, but it is for France to see that it is properly applied.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 33, 8. 2. 1979.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1252/86

by Mr Ernest Mühlen (PPE — L)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/89)

Subject: Deductions by the Belgian social security from pensions paid to recipients living abroad

1. Is the Commission aware that the National Institute for Health and Disability Insurance (INAMI), under Article 161 of the Belgian law of 8 August 1980, makes a deduction — currently of 2,55 % — from payments of pensions effected by bodies responsible for paying out social security benefits under Belgian law, regardless of whether the recipient is resident in Belgium or abroad.

2. Does it not consider that the INAMI's action in truncating Belgian pensions paid to recipients resident abroad is a breach of Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 of 14 June 1971 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons and their families moving within the Community, in that:

(a) a worker shall be subject to the social security legislation of a single Member State only (Article 13 paragraph 1);

(b) a worker employed in the territory of one Member State shall be subject to the social security legislation of that State even if the registered office of the undertaking employing him is situated in the territory of another Member State (Article 13 paragraph 2 (a));

(c) the institution responsible for payment of a pension and belonging to a Member State whose legislation provides for deduction from pensions in respect of contributions payable to a pensioner to cover benefits in kind, may do so only where the cost of such benefits is to be borne by an institution of the country which levies these contributions (Article 33)?

3. Does the Commission not consider that, in the case of the supplementary pensions referred to above, the judgement of the Court of Justice of the European Communities in Case 275/83, which states that:

'By deducting contributions from statutory pensions for old age, retirement and survivorship payable to Community nationals who reside in another Member State, the Kingdom of Belgium has failed to fulfil its obligations under the EEC Treaty',

also applies?

4. What does the Commission propose to do to enforce compliance with the letter and spirit of Community law?

Answer given by Mr Marin
on behalf of the Commission
 (23 October 1986)

The Commission is checking to ensure that the Belgian authorities comply with the decision by the Court of Justice in Case No 275/83, according to which Belgium failed to carry out its obligations under Article 33 of Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 ⁽¹⁾, 'by deducting contributions from statutory pensions for old age, retirement and survivorship payable to Community nationals who reside in another Member State'.

In January 1986, the Belgian authorities informed the Commission that the procedure for reimbursing deductions made since the law of 8 August 1980 became effective would start at the beginning of that year. The Commission's departments then asked the Belgian authorities to keep them informed of the full reimbursement of the amounts withheld. No such information has as yet been received by the Commission, which has duly repeated its request.

At all events, the Commission has received no complaints regarding deductions made on statutory pensions by the National Institute for Health and Disability Insurance (INAMI) since Decision 275/83. The question remains, however, as to whether such contributions may be levied, as provided under Article 161 of the Law of 1980, on non-statutory pensions, which are not covered specifically by Community legislation, bearing in mind that the legislation of only one Member State shall apply, as affirmed in the first paragraph of Article 13 of the Regulation, where these deductions are intended to finance a general social security scheme, covered by Community rules, and where no benefits under that scheme are to be borne by the state paying the non-statutory pension. In the Commission's view, these deductions comply neither with the letter nor the spirit of the provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71.

The Commission will contact the Belgian authorities and the authorities of other Member States who apply deductions in the same circumstances, and will judge whether, and if so, when, infringement procedures should be initiated.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 149 of 5. 7. 1971.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1254/86
by Mr Horst Seefeld (S — D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
 (2 September 1986)
 (87/C 54/90)

Subject: Bolting of train doors on crossing frontiers

Is the Commission aware of the fact that when a train on the Strasbourg-Mulhouse route was diverted via Kehl-Freiburg-Basel the passengers were subjected to unbelievable stress by the bolting of the train doors and that this deprivation of liberty is supposed to have occurred on the grounds of a customs regulation?

1. What was the customs regulation concerned?
2. When will it be abolished?
3. Are there any other regulations which restrict freedom of movement while travelling in the Community and, if so, what are they and what action is the Commission taking against them?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission
 (24 October 1986)

The practice described by the Honourable Member was hitherto unknown to the Commission, which is equally unaware of any similar practices in use elsewhere in the Community.

The locking of train doors in these circumstances is certainly not required by any Community provisions. The Commission will therefore ask the German authorities, who would appear to be principally concerned, to explain the facts reported by the Honourable Member, who will be informed in due course of the results of the enquiry.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1261/86
by Mr Kenneth Collins (S — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
 (2 September 1986)
 (87/C 54/91)

Subject: Council Directive defining non-life insurance services

Will the Commission indicate what progress to date has been made on the Commission's proposal for a Council Directive defining the conditions under which non-life insurance services may be exercised?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission
(16 October 1986)**

The Commission has made clear in the *White Paper* of June 1985 on 'Completing the Internal Market' ⁽¹⁾ the high priority it attaches to the establishment of a common market in services, including insurance.

As regards the progress of the proposal for a Council Directive on non-life insurance services, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions No 815/84 by Mr Mühlen ⁽²⁾ and No 2130/85 by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and others ⁽³⁾.

The judgements of the Court of Justice in the four insurance cases ⁽⁴⁾ referred to in the above answers are still awaited.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(85) 310 final.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 62, 11. 3. 1985, p. 17.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 175, 14. 7. 1986, p. 11.

⁽⁴⁾ Cases 220/83, 252/83, 205/84 and 206/84.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1267/86
by Mrs Sylvie Le Roux (COM — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 August 1986)
(87/C 54/92)**

Subject: Monetary compensatory amounts

It is laid down in Council Regulation (EEC) No 855/84 ⁽¹⁾ that the positive MCAs are to be abolished 'by the beginning of the 1987/1988 marketing year at the latest'. The Commission has not taken any initiative on the subject for the 1986/1987 marketing year and during the most recent fixing of farm prices the Council left the situation as it was, running the risk of not achieving an objective that it laid down itself.

Has the Commission decided to submit proposals for the complete abolition of positive MCAs, when farm prices are being fixed for the 1987/1988 marketing year?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 90, 1. 4. 1984, p. 1.

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(19 September 1986)**

The Commission's proposals for the elimination of the positive — as for the negative — MCAs must be seen in the light of the proposals relating to agricultural prices. From this angle, the Commission took the view that it would not be appropriate, for the 1986/1987 marketing year, to

submit proposals entailing reductions in prices as expressed in national currencies following revaluation of the agricultural conversion rates in order to eliminate MCAs still existing.

However, the Commission is well aware of the provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 855/84. It will bear these in mind when it prepares its proposals for the 1987/1988 prices.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1268/86
by Mr Emmanuel Maffre-Baugé (COM — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 September 1986)
(87/C 54/93)**

Subject: Restriction of the expansion of intensive farming

On 17 April 1986 and again on 10 July 1986, the European Parliament declared it necessary to restrict the development of intensive farming, which requires costly investment, uses intermediate consumer goods that are usually imported duty-free, without regard for Community preference, and have a harmful effect on the environment.

Has the Commission decided to follow this recommendation and propose adequate measures that would make it possible for EAGGF payments towards intensive farming to be reduced in gradual stages and by the introduction of ceilings?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 1986)**

For several years measures have been taken under the common agricultural policy to give more importance to family farms and to avoid encouraging further development of semi-industrial intensive farms.

For instance, no Community aid is available for poultry farming, and national aid is restricted to investments that are required in order to comply with rules and regulations imposed by public authorities to protect and improve the environment, provided such investments entail no increase in production.

In pig farming, Community aid for investment is restricted to farms able to produce at least 35 % of the feed required by the pigs being fattened; there is also a limit on the

number of pig places. Standards are being prepared at Community level to ensure the safeguard of the environment.

For beef and veal production, proposals were sent to the Council in February 1986 ⁽¹⁾ for adjustments to the market organization along similar lines. In particular, the proposals included the introduction of a premium scheme for specialist beef producers whereby single premiums would be granted in respect of the first 50 animals per holding.

In the dairy sector, the introduction of a production quota system combined with a super-levy on any milk produced in excess of the reference quantities should help to steer the sector towards more extensive farming methods. It is relevant to point out that the Commission's proposal for a special levy on intensive farms ⁽²⁾ was rejected by the Council.

On the specific subject of restrictions on intensive farming in mountain and hill areas and less-favoured areas, the compensatory allowance may not exceed 101 ECU per livestock unit and per hectare. The number of dairy cows must not exceed twenty per farmer. Furthermore, the Commission recently sent a proposal to the Council ⁽³⁾ for the allowance to be limited to 3 000 ECU per work unit.

Together with these measures to limit the development of intensive farming, the Commission proposed a series of measures to promote extensive farming which could be eligible for EAGGF aid ⁽³⁾. These include an annual premium per hectare for young farmers undertaking to use extensive methods, an increase in the compensatory allowance for farmers changing to extensive methods in less-favoured areas, an annual premium per hectare for farmers using methods consistent with the protection of environmentally-sensitive areas, and aid for 'organic' farming.

The Commission intends to pursue its efforts to take greater account of family farming and the need for environmental protection, and to achieve a more even balance between the growth of production and consumption, while also taking into account the outlets open to the Community on the world market.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1269/86

by Mr Dimitrios Amadou (COM — GR)
and 54 other Members

to the Council of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 54/94)

Subject: Visit by Mr Ozal to that part of the Republic of Cyprus under Turkish military occupation

Whereas the Republic of Cyprus has signed an association agreement with the EEC,

Whereas the foreign ministers as well as the European Parliament have condemned the unilateral declaration of the founding of the so-called 'Turkish Cypriot State', have stated their position in favour of the independence and integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and support the steps taken by the United Nations to find a solution to the Cyprus issue,

Noting that the procedures in the Council for the signing of the fourth financial protocol as well as the reconvening of the EEC-Turkey Association Committee are already in progress,

Will the Council state:

1. How it intends to react to the imminent visit by the Turkish Prime Minister, Mr Ozal, to the occupied territories of the Republic of Cyprus on 2 July 1986, just a few days after the Turkish army has carried out manoeuvres in the occupied territories of the Republic of Cyprus? This visit undermines the efforts of the UN, forms part of a dangerous policy of 'faits accomplis' to bolster the so-called 'Turkish Cypriot State' which has not received recognition from any member of the international community except Turkey, and is in utter conflict with the position of the European Community on the Cyprus issue.
2. The significance it will attribute to this unacceptable action by the Turkish Government when it conducts negotiations with Turkey, given that the thaw in EEC-Turkey relations seems to be interpreted by the Turkish authorities as allowing them to continue their provocation, ignoring the position of the international community?

Answer

(19 January 1987)

The Honourable Members of Parliament are referred to the reply given to Oral Question O-188/86 ⁽¹⁾ tabled by Mrs Veil on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(86) 31 final, 11 February 1986.

⁽²⁾ Doc. COM(81) 608 final, 23 October 1981.

⁽³⁾ Doc. COM(86) 199 final, 21 April 1986.

⁽¹⁾ *Debates of the European Parliament*, No D-346 (December 1986)

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1275/86

by Mrs Raymonde Dury (S — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 September 1986)
(87/C 54/95)

Subject: Definition of a 'cohabitant'

Can the Commission give the definition of a 'cohabitant' in each of the Member States and in the various social sectors?

Answer given by Mr Marín
on behalf of the Commission
(27 October 1986)

The concept of 'cohabitant', using a variety of terms, is current in the Member States as a definition of the situation of persons living together outside the bonds of marriage.

The term 'cohabitant' is used — improperly — by Belgian unemployment insurance legislation to designate workers who are members of households with more than one source of income.

The Commission is not aware that the term 'cohabitant', in the sense used by Belgian unemployment insurance legislation, is used in other national sectors or laws.

Answer given by Mr Mosar
on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 1986)

For the purposes of applying the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 1, of Decision No 2064/86/ECSC, it is not necessary to publish rules for methods of calculating costs and returns per tonne. Internationally comparable rules for methods of calculation were devised some years ago by the Association of the Coal Producers of the European Community (CEPCEO), in which all the Community's coal-producing Member States are represented.

Insofar as no specific problems arise, British Coal will be considered as one enterprise which has to submit to the Commission only one set of figures relating to all its coal-producing costs and returns.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1321/86

by Mrs Jeanette Oppenheim (ED — DK)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(3 September 1986)
(87/C 54/97)

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1292/86

by Mr Winston Griffiths, Mr David Morris and Mr Llewelyn Smith (S — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 September 1986)
(87/C 54/96)

Subject: Rules for state aid to the coal industry: deficit grant aid

Under Section II, Article 3, paragraph 1 of Commission Decision No 2064/86/ECSC ⁽¹⁾ will the Commission publish details for the calculation of costs and returns per tonne of coal?

With reference to the same paragraph will the Commission confirm that British Coal is one undertaking for the purpose of these calculations and could therefore submit one set of figures relating to all of its coal producing costs and returns?

Subject: Relations with third countries in connection with the liberalization of the Community market in transport services

Further to the Council's answer to my question (No H-204/86 ⁽¹⁾) on guidelines for the introduction of a free market in transport services, under which guidelines is the Council considering harmonizing the rules applicable in the transport sector — including the system of bilateral agreements on transit permits — to third countries, especially in eastern and western Europe?

I assume that the question of issuing permits to drive through other Member States to third countries no longer arises since the Council's objective is to liberalize the Community's own transport market, but feel that competition will be distorted if haulage contractors still have to base their goods transport to and from third countries on bilateral agreements that do not have a uniform basis.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 177, 1. 7. 1986, p. 1.

⁽¹⁾ *Debates of the European Parliament*, No D-341 (July 1986).

Answer*(20 January 1987)*

As emerges from the Council's previous reply, to which the Honourable Member refers, the guidelines adopted by the Council so far for the liberalization of the market in transport services are concerned with intra-Community road haulage. They deal with transport provisions applicable to third countries only as regards Community transit through such countries. It should be pointed out that in June 1986 the Council asked the Commission, with the completion of the internal market in view, to look into transit problems and submit to it appropriate proposals as swiftly as possible and by 1 January 1987 at the latest.

Pending receipt of the appropriate Commission proposals, the Council cannot at this point prejudge the transit arrangements to apply in relations between Member States and third countries.

Answer given by Lord Cockfield**on behalf of the Commission***(30 October 1986)*

As soon as the Commission's departments learnt of the measures to which the Honourable Member is referring, they approached the Greek authorities to request their immediate removal as they were incompatible with Articles 30 and 106 of the EEC Treaty. The measures were lifted at the end of August 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1342/86**by Mr James Provan (ED — UK)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(3 September 1986)**(87/C 54/98)**Subject: Greece — import ban*

The Commission will be aware that on 17 and 25 July 1986 respectively the Greek authorities announced (a) new restrictions on the issue of import licences for a number of products, including alcoholic beverages, which are now subject to price approval by the Bank of Greece and (b) a ban on applications for import licences for alcoholic beverages 'for one month'.

Can the Commission confirm

1. whether the Greek Government consulted the Commission prior to implementation of these measures;
2. whether the Commission considers these measures to be discriminatory and in breach of the EEC Treaty;
3. what steps it has taken to ensure the removal of (a) the new 'price approval' measures and (b) the ban on import licence applications?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1351/86**by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (LDR — B)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(3 September 1986)**(87/C 54/99)**Subject: Cultivation of lupins as a soya substitute*

The French National Lupin Growers' Union (UNAPEL), led by its President, Mr Desbrosses, recently explained the role that this legume, which is neglected by modern farmers, could play in reducing Europe's enormous protein deficit and as a partial replacement for soya in cattle fodder.

UNAPEL also drew attention to the role of the lupin in combating desertification in poor countries, owing to its capacity to fix atmospheric nitrogen and produce alkaloid substances which act as natural insecticides. According to UNAPEL, lupins improve soil quality and ensure high yields from the following crop.

Is the Commission familiar with the research and development being carried out in France by UNAPEL and National Agronomic Research Institute (INRA) on different varieties of lupins?

What aid has the Commission granted year by year to assist this research? What is the total volume of lupins grown for use as animal fodder in the EEC?

What are the prospects of the EEC taking steps to increase its production?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(6 October 1986)**

The Commission is aware of the research carried out by the UNAPEL and the INRA on the various types of lupin.

A contract was concluded with the INRA in Dijon for the 1979 to 1983 period for the breeding of new genotypes of lupins (*Lupinus albus* and *Lupinus mutabilis*) by mutagenesis. The sum granted was 27 500 ECU.

For 1984 to 1988, another contract for 60 000 ECU has been concluded with the same Centre, but it concerns legumes in general since the aim is the improvement in methods of analysis of antinutritional substances including alkaloids.

Lastly, a contract for 100 000 ECU, terminating on 6 January 1987, has been concluded with Dr Hussman of the Chimica e Tecnica Srl (CET) in Florence for the establishment of a pilot plant using a cold dehydration technique for the removal of the bitter substances from bitter lupins.

Community production of sweet lupins for animal feed, for which aid has been requested, totalled 820 tonnes for 1984/1985 and 1 014 tonnes for 1986/1987.

The Commission is planning to continue granting aid for sweet lupins used in animal feed and will consider what action should be taken on the basis of the results of research now being carried out.

**Answer given by Mr Natali
on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 1986)**

The Commission welcomes the agreement concluded in Geneva in July following more than two and a half years of difficult negotiations.

Its satisfaction is due, first, to the economic content of the agreement: the price range and adjustment mechanisms agreed will permit the real market situation to be reflected very closely and will enable speedy and effective adjustments to be made where required as a result of market developments. The participation of Côte d'Ivoire, the world's leading exporter, is a further factor in ensuring a satisfactory degree of participation in the agreement.

The Commission is also pleased at the positive implications of the conclusion of the agreement for future international cooperation with regard to commodities. As a result of the realism shown by the producers in accepting the economic clauses proposed by the consumers, future international discussions and negotiations in this field, particularly the preparations for UNCTAD VII, are likely to be conducted in a more pragmatic and positive spirit.

A further point worth stressing is that the agreement as concluded in Geneva incorporates much that was proposed by the Community and its Member States which, by virtue of the common position they were able to maintain and put over throughout the negotiations, most assuredly played a major role in the proceedings.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1353/86
by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (LDR — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(3 September 1986)
(87/C 54/100)**

Subject: Conference on cocoa — EEC position

Representatives of sixty countries met in Geneva recently for the Fifth Conference on cocoa to renegotiate the agreement which expires on 30 September 1986.

What is the Commission's position in these negotiations as regards the minimum guaranteed price for a pound of cocoa, the operation of buffer stocks and the market-damping mechanisms which are used to stabilize world prices?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1378/86
by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 September 1986)
(87/C 54/101)**

Subject: Commission decision on import licences for beef and veal

Commission Decision 86/376/EEC ⁽¹⁾ of 22 July 1986 calls upon the Member States to issue certain import licences for beef and veal products on 21 July 1986. What is the point of asking for something to be done before the decision that it should be done has been taken? Does this practice not make it very difficult for traders in the Member States to comply with, or take advantage of, the terms of such decisions?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 223, 9. 8. 1986, p. 47.

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(27 October 1986)**

Import certificates for beef/veal originating in Botswana, Kenya, Madagascar, Swaziland or Zimbabwe, covered by the Commission Decision of 86/376/EEC for July, are normally issued according to the following procedure:

- submission of import licence applications during the first ten days of each month to the responsible national agencies;
- on the second working day following that of the end of the period of submission of applications, the Member States notify the Commission of the overall quantities applied for (i.e. about between the 12th and 14th day of each month);
- the Commission examines the applications and adopts, between the 15th and the 20th day of each month, a decision establishing the quantities for which the Member States issue, on the 21st day of each month, the import licences;
- notification of the decision to the permanent representatives of the Member States and notification to the competent national agencies by telex;
- publication, for information, of the decision in the Official Journal after its notification.

The Commission's decision and its notification to the Member States therefore normally take place before the 21st day of the month. Regrettably, in July 1986, the decision was taken only after a delay because of late submission of the figures and because 21 July was a Belgian national holiday.

However, this delay entailed no disadvantage to the operators concerned, and should be regarded as an isolated case.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1390/86
by Mr Arturo Escuder Croft (ED — E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 September 1986)
(87/C 54/102)**

Subject: Trade delegations in Latin America

There has been a significant increase in the Commission's external offices in recent years and these have become an important factor in the Community's external relations.

However, its representation in Latin America is limited to the Regional Delegation in Caracas and two offices in Costa Rica and Chile.

1. Does the Commission think it is possible to pursue a Community policy with respect to Latin America without a significant increase in the number of Commission delegations in the countries of Latin America?
2. Does the Commission feel that a single delegation in Latin America is capable of implementing a full-scale policy of developing trade relations with Latin America?
3. In which countries does the Commission see an immediate need for a delegation?

**Answer given by Mr Cheysson
on behalf of the Commission
(28 October 1986)**

1. The Commission feels that a gradual strengthening of the Community's presence in Latin America is essential in order to develop stronger political and economic links with the countries of the American subcontinent.

The Community's relations with Latin America will, in the years ahead, continue to represent a challenge.

The multiplicity of the Cooperation Agreements and their reactivation bear witness to the revival of relations with the American subcontinent and to the political importance accorded to such developments by the Community.

The Community's enlargement is, in this context, providing an additional dimension in view of the traditional links between the Iberian Peninsula and Latin America.

2. The Commission is aware of the fact that with only one regional delegation for the whole subcontinent (based in Caracas, with two offices, in San José and Santiago), plus the bilateral delegation in Brazil, the political and economic potential of the Community's relations with Latin America cannot be fully developed.

3. In its Communication to the Council of April 11, 1986, 'Overseas Representation — Developing and Consolidating the Network', the Commission stresses the need to establish its presence in Latin America by setting up two additional external offices: one in the Southern Cone in order that the Community can foster its promising relations with Argentina and Uruguay and the other in Mexico, in order to provide additional support for economic and political cooperation based on the current Agreement.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1512/86

by Mr Konstantinos Filinis (COM — GR)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(1 October 1986)
(87/C 54/103)

Subject: Reactivation of the third financial protocol with Turkey

According to information received, by means of a letter sent to the Council of Ministers by Mr Christophersen, the Commissioner responsible for the budget, the Commission has decided to grant Turkey 13 million ECU under the third financial protocol between the EEC and Turkey.

Can the Commission say whether this is indeed the case and whether in fact it considers that the circumstances that required the suspension of the third financial protocol have now been removed?

**Answer given by Mr Christophersen
on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 1986)**

The information to which the Honourable Member refers in the introductory part of his question is only partly correct.

On 8 August 1986 the Commission decided to transfer 13 million ECU in payment appropriations within Chapter 96 of the 1986 general budget to Item 9 630 (Third Financial Protocol with Turkey), thereby increasing the allocation in payment appropriations from 30 to 43 million ECU. This was necessary to enable the Community to honour legal commitments towards Community firms working on contract in Turkey which it entered into before the events which led to the suspension of aid to that country.

The decision, which was taken in accordance with the Financial Regulation of 21 December 1977, was therefore based on purely budgetary considerations.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1516/86

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S — B),
Mrs Francesca Marinaro (COM — I)
and Mr Pancrazio De Pasquale (COM — I)
to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the
European Community meeting in political cooperation
(1 October 1986)
(87/C 54/104)

Subject: Appointment of a member of the P2 Lodge as spokesman of the Belgian Foreign Ministry

According to reports in the Belgian press, it has been established from documents currently available that the person who has been appointed Belgian Foreign Ministry spokesman has been a member of the P2 Lodge.

In view of the fact that Belgium will be holding the Community presidency in 1987 and in view of the Belgian Foreign Ministry spokesman's membership of P2 Lodge, do the Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to let this person act as spokesman on their behalf and in any other Community connection?

Answer

(19 January 1987)

The matter referred to by the Honourable Members falls outside the scope of European Political Cooperation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1591/86

by Mr Michael McGowan (S — GB)
to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the
European Community meeting in political cooperation
(17 October 1986)
(87/C 54/105)

Subject: Human rights and prisoners of conscience within the EEC

1. Has the Council conducted any research into the treatment of conscientious objectors within those Member States which have a system of compulsory military service?
2. In particular, has the Council considered the situation in Greece of Jehovah's Witnesses who refuse to do military service? Is the Council able to confirm that there is, as I understand from members of my Leeds constituency, no alternative to imprisonment for those Greek citizens who refuse to do military service?
3. Has the Council any information concerning two specific cases which have been brought to my attention by

Leeds members of Amnesty International, namely those of Timothy Naides (whom I understand to be imprisoned in Athens) and Sotiros Panos? I understand from my constituents that both Timothy Naides and Sotiros Panos are Jehovah's Witnesses who have been imprisoned by the Greek authorities for their refusal to do military service.

4. I also understand that Greek prisoners of conscience who have been imprisoned for such a refusal are, on their release, excluded from certain areas of employment and disenfranchised. (I appreciate that the latter point has no relevance to the particular case of Jehovah's Witnesses). Is the Council able to clarify this situation?

5. Has the Council considered the implications of such a situation for the human rights of the citizens of the EEC?

Answer

(19 January 1987)

The issues raised do not fall within the scope of European Political Cooperation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1707/86

by Mr Leen van der Waal (NI — NL)

to the Council of the European Communities

(29 October 1986)

(87/C 54/106)

Subject: Definitive organization of the market in road haulage

According to the statement issued by the Council of Transport Ministers on 30 June 1986, one of the features of the organization of the free market in road haulage by 1992 will be a Community licencing system based on qualitative criteria.

1. Does this imply that it is the Council's objective to have established a free transport market with no quantitative restrictions by the beginning of 1992?
2. During the transitional phase to 1992, a cumulative rise of 40 % in Community quotas is envisaged. Will this increase be sufficient to achieve the objective referred to above under 1, bearing in mind the annual growth in freight? If not, what measures will the Council take?
3. What are the practical implications of the requirement 'satisfactory experience of national transport operations' (one of the qualitative criteria applied in considering applications for a Community licence)?

Answer

(20 January 1987)

1. The Council's conclusions of 30 June 1986 on intra-Community road haulage do provide that a free market in this sector, without quantitative restrictions, should be created by 1992 at the latest.

2. The above conclusions provide that the annual increase in the Community quota should be brought up to 40 % (cumulative) during the transitional period starting in 1987. The Council has asked the Commission to examine whether this annual increase and the allocation of the Community quota amongst the Member States would have sufficient effect to allow easy transition to the final phase in 1992 at the latest and to submit an initial report on this point by 1 January 1988.

The Council will continue its discussion on the basis of this report.

3. The Council's conclusions of 30 June 1986 do not define the criterion of 'satisfactory experience of national transport operations'. The qualitative criteria which hauliers would have to meet in order to gain access to the international transport market will be determined on the basis of the proposal for a Regulation which the Commission has just submitted to the Council ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(86) 595 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1714/86

by Mr Spiridon Kolokotronis (S — GR)

to the Council of the European Communities

(30 October 1986)

(87/C 54/107)

Subject: Violation of human rights on the islands of Imvros and Tenedos

In their written reply concerning the regime imposed by Turkey on the Aegean islands of Imvros and Tenedos, the Foreign Ministers of the Community Member States stress that this subject has not been discussed in the context of European Political Cooperation.

On the islands of Imvros and Tenedos, which were ceded to Turkey under the Treaty of Lausanne (1922/1923) with an entirely Greek population, the Turkish state implemented a policy for a number of years, which it continues to pursue, in flagrant violation of the Convention (Declaration) on Human Rights and the Treaty of Lausanne (Articles 38-44), abolishing the teaching of Greek, seizing schools, destroying orthodox churches, forcibly expropriating and dispossessing the population of land and property, making unlawful arrests and committing rape with the result that the Greek inhabitants of the islands are in a state of subjugation.

What action will the Council take in view of the violation of human rights and basic principles of individual freedom on the territory of a country that wishes to be associated with the Community?

Answer

(19 January 1987)

The Twelve continue to monitor the Human Rights situation in Turkey. Member countries raise their concerns as appropriate. Further improvements on human rights are an essential part of the further normalisation of EC-Turkey relations.

The development of reciprocal trade is due in part to the strengthening of business ties between firms from the two partners and could certainly be further promoted by the setting up by industry of appropriate business and trade contact points in Taipei.

The question of visas for people from Taiwan desiring to enter Italy is one of national competence.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1728/86

by Mr Giorgio Almirante, Mr Antonio Tripodi
and Mr Pino Romualdi (DR — I)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 October 1986)

(87/C 54/108)

Subject: Relations between Italy and Taiwan

Does the Commission intend to call on the Member States of the European Community to give effect to the European Parliament's Resolution (Doc. 2-1765/84) on trade relations with the Republic of China in Taiwan? Is it aware of the difficulties which the Italian authorities make for Taiwanese nationals seeking a visa to visit Italy for tourist, study or business purposes and does it intend to request the Italian Government to act in the spirit of the above resolution and open its own commercial office in Taipei similar to those which other EEC Member States have maintained in Taiwan for a number of years?

Answer given by Mr De Clercq

on behalf of the Commission

(17 December 1986)

Although neither the European Community nor the Member States have diplomatic relations with Taiwan, the Commission has noticed the Community's interest in its enterprises and industries in expanding mutual trade with Taiwan and has kept in mind the suggestions made in the Parliamentary Resolution (Doc. 2-1765/84). In fact, trade between the European Communities and Taiwan has expanded rapidly over the last decade, Community exports passing from 412 million ECU in 1975 to 2 236 million ECU in 1985 and Community imports from Taiwan passing from 683,7 million ECU in 1975 to 3 903 million ECU in 1985.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1735/86

by Mr Ernest Glinne (S — B)

to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the
European Community meeting in political cooperation

(30 October 1986)

(87/C 54/109)

Subject: Maltese territorial waters

For a number of years, Colonel Gaddafi's regime courted Malta's socialist government, in particular by granting considerable economic aid. Malta 'reciprocated', without appreciably departing from its declared policy of non-alignment, by authorizing the installation of Libyan transmitter stations on its territory until an infuriated Colonel Gaddafi opposed the Maltese Government's plans to explore the continental shelf surrounding Malta with a view to exploiting any oil deposits. At the time, Prime Minister Dom Mintoff publicly censured the Libyan leader for his arrogance, suspended the radio broadcasting licences and petitioned the International Court of Justice in The Hague to confirm the limits of Maltese territorial waters.

Without anticipating the Court's judgment, what is the current position of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation and of the Member States, as regards observance of Maltese territorial waters?

Answer

(16 January 1987)

The issue referred to by the Honourable Member of Parliament has not been discussed within European Political Cooperation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1841/86

by Mr Bernard Antony (DR — F)

to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation

(7 November 1986)

(87/C 54/110)

Subject: EEC financial aid to Angola

Under Lomé III the EEC will provide Angola with 95 million ECU in aid from the 6th EDF to finance food self-sufficiency programmes.

Furthermore the EIB may offer loans of about 10 million ECU to finance productive investment programmes.

As the Soviet-Cuban troops are still occupying Angola, can the Foreign Ministers state whether this finance is not helping support an oppressive government?

Answer

(16 January 1987)

The Twelve believe that a final and lasting resolution of the problems of Southern Africa would be greatly facilitated by the withdrawal of foreign troops from the countries of the region. This does not, however, affect the EC's commitment to provide financial assistance to Angola under the terms of Lomé III.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1865/86

by Mr Jean-Marie Vanlerenberghe, Mr Jean-Pierre Abelin and Mrs Nicole Fontaine (PPE — F)

to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation

(13 November 1986)

(87/C 54/111)

Subject: Redundancies at *La Prensa* owing to lack of financial support

Violetta Chamorro, the manager of *La Prensa*, which is currently under suspension by the Sandinista authorities, has just announced that half the staff are to be made redundant owing to lack of subsidies.

Do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation not consider that the Twelve ought to help *La Prensa* in its

present difficulties, since otherwise the last voice of the free press in Nicaragua may very well be silenced?

Answer

(19 January 1987)

The Honourable Members are referred to the answer to Written Question No 1116/86 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ See page 44 of this Official Journal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1959/86

by Mrs Dorothee Piermont (ARC — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(21 November 1986)

(87/C 54/112)

Subject: Contamination by chemical weapons

NATO's 12 000 hectare Senne training area is situated not far from the town of Paderborn, Federal Republic of Germany. Notices indicate that most of this area is still affected by 'phosphorus contamination'.

Could the Commission answer the following questions or obtain the relevant information:

1. Is the area contaminated only by phosphorus or also by other substances used in chemical warfare? If other substances are involved, what are they?
2. Did the munitions factories that were on the site of the present-day training area during the second World War manufacture only conventional munitions or also chemical weapons and munitions?
3. If they did produce chemical weapons, what happened to the weapons and munitions of this type on the site at the end of the second World War? If they were stored, where?
4. Is the training area now used for chemical warfare and defense exercises?

Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis

on behalf of the Commission

(16 January 1987)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to his Written Question No 2787/85 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 175, 14. 7. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1982/86

by Mrs Emma Bonino, Mr Roberto CiccioMessere
and Mr Marco Pannella (NI — I)

to the Council of the European Communities

(24 November 1986)

(87/C 54/113)

Subject: Restoration of the Sistine Chapel

In view of the heated debate in art circles concerning the restoration work now in progress on the frescoes in the Sistine Chapel, which represent one of the pinnacles of European artistic expression and as such form part of the cultural heritage of all Europe; and in view of the fact that, despite the undoubted competence of the technical experts entrusted with the restoration, there appear to be grounds both for some of the criticisms of the procedures adopted on central aspects of the restoration work itself and for various doubts concerning the cultural framework which should govern the choice of such matters, including technical aspects, does the Council not consider that it would be appropriate for it to act as spokesman for the various international requests for work to be halted for a time to permit a thorough and objective assessment of what has been done so far?

Answer

(20 January 1987)

The question raised by the Honourable Members does not come within the Council's jurisdiction.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2056/86

by Mr Julian Grimaldos Grimaldos (S — E)

to the Council of the European Communities

(28 November 1986)

(87/C 54/114)

Subject: Economic agreements on integration between Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay

What political and economic measures does the Council intend to take in order to establish a constructive relationship with Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay in their efforts to integrate?

Answer

(20 January 1987)

The Community, itself an example of regional economic integration without precedent in history, encourages regional cooperation throughout the world and in Latin America in particular.

It has signed two major interregional cooperation agreements in Latin America with the Andean Pact and Central America.

It is following with considerable interest the experiment in economic integration currently under way between Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2068/86

by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck (S — B)

to the Council of the European Communities

(2 December 1986)

(87/C 54/115)

Subject: Enrolment campaigns in the Netherlands by Belgian kindergartens

1. Is the Council aware of the enrolment campaigns carried out by Belgian kindergartens in frontier areas of the Netherlands based on the fact that Belgian schools take infants from the age of two and a half whereas in the Netherlands they are not accepted until they reach the age of four?

2. In the context of a Europe without frontiers, does the Council intend to introduce uniform age limits for schools?

3. Does the Council consider that schools, like other social infrastructures, should be available to the general public across boundaries?

Answer

(20 January 1987)

The particular problem raised by the Honourable Member has not been referred to the Council, nor has the Council ever discussed it.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2089/86**by Mr Beyer de Ryke (LDR — B)****to the Council of the European Communities***(2 December 1986)**(87/C 54/116)*

Subject: Brussels — Extension of the Community buildings

Mr Jean-Louis Thys, Secretary of State for the Brussels Region, recently submitted a plan entitled 'Espace Bruxelles-Europe' which aims to be the blueprint for a harmonious complex containing the buildings and services of the Communities in Brussels.

This plan provides for wide consultation of all the authorities concerned as well as of the inhabitants of the district.

What is the attitude of the Council of Ministers towards the main points of the procedure set up?

What are the priorities for the buildings desired in this district?

Answer*(20 January 1987)*

The Honourable Member will recall that the plan entitled 'Espace Bruxelles-Europe' is an initiative within the framework of the town planning of Brussels, which is a matter for the Belgian authorities.

The Council Secretariat attends, as an observer, some of the meetings held within that framework in order to provide information on the buildings currently occupied by the Council and its new building which will group together all the Council's departments at the time of its completion, scheduled for 1992.
