

English edition

Information and Notices.

Notice No	Contents	Page
	I Information	
	European Parliament	
	<i>Written Questions with answer</i>	
84/C 84/01	No 670/83 by Mr Robert Battersby to the Commission Subject: Mackerel, 1981	1
84/C 84/02	No 785/83 by Mr Karl von Wogau to the Commission Subject: Import of overseas apples and pears into Italy	1
84/C 84/03	No 1145/83 by Mr Mihail Protopapadakis to the Commission Subject: Anti-Community propaganda in a pamphlet published by the Athens press office of the Commission of the European Communities	2
84/C 84/04	No 1197/83 by Mr Rudolf Wedekind to the Commission Subject: Damage to forests by bark beetles	3
84/C 84/05	No 1236/83 by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté to the Commission Subject: Trade compensations obtained under the GATT	3
84/C 84/06	No 1275/83 by Mr Richard Cottrell to the Commission Subject: Functions of the Commission office in Cardiff, Wales	4
84/C 84/07	No 1332/83 by Mr Thomas Megahy to the Commission Subject: Environmental policies for the coal industry	4
84/C 84/08	No 1335/83 by Mr Dieter Rogalla to the Commission Subject: Indentification stickers on motor vehicles	5
84/C 84/09	No 1340/83 by Mr Jens-Peter Bonde to the Commission Subject: Payments to South Schleswig and North Schleswig	6
84/C 84/10	No 1352/83 by Mr Karl von Wogau to the Commission Subject: Exclusion of university students from school milk concession	6
84/C 84/11	No 1355/83 by Mr John Hume to the Commission Subject: Assistance for Northern Ireland from EEC Funds	7
1		(Continued overleaf)

<u>Notice No</u>	<u>Contents (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
84/C 84/12	No 1368/83 by Mr Karel Van Miert to the Commission Subject: Newspaper advertising of staff vacancies	7
84/C 84/13	No 1379/83 by Mr Horst Seefeld to the Commission Subject: Unacceptable practices in the technical inspection of imported used vehicles (further to Written Question No 1105/83	8
84/C 84/14	No 1406/83 by Mr Roland Boyes to the Council Subject: Review of the Social Fund	9
84/C 84/15	No 1407/83 by Mr Karl von Wogau to the Commission Subject: Technical barriers to trade in the importation of goods into France	9
84/C 84/16	No 1425/83 by Mr Brendan Halligan to the Council Subject: Raising public awareness of the European Community	10
84/C 84/17	No 1446/83 by Mr Horst Seefeld to the Commission Subject: Conditions affecting the visibility of motor-cycle crash helmet wearers	11
84/C 84/18	No 1462/83 by Mrs Mechthild von Aleman to the Commission Subject: Cultural exchanges between the People's Republic of China and the European Community	11
84/C 84/19	No 1464/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Double taxation conventions	12
84/C 84/20	No 1465/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Double taxation conventions	12
84/C 84/21	No 1467/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Double taxation conventions	13
84/C 84/22	No 1468/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Double taxation conventions	13
84/C 84/23	No 1469/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Double taxation conventions	14
84/C 84/24	No 1470/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Double taxation conventions	15
84/C 84/25	No 1471/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Double taxation conventions	15
84/C 84/26	No 1472/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Double taxation conventions	16
84/C 84/27	No 1473/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Double taxation conventions	16
84/C 84/28	No 1482/83 by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté to the Commission Subject: Use of European Social Fund appropriations by different Member States	17
84/C 84/29	No 1494/83 by Mrs Ien van de Heuvel to the Foreign Ministers of the 10 Member States of the European Communities meeting in political cooperation Subject: Working party on non-proliferation	18
84/C 84/30	No 1501/83 by Mr Robert Moreland to the Commission Subject: Harmonization of social provisions relating to inland waterways	18
84/C 84/31	No 1512/83 by Mr Willy Vernimmen to the Council Subject: Trade balance between the EEC and Japan	19
84/C 84/32	No 1513/83 by Mr Willy Vernimmen to the Council Subject: Science and technology	19

(Continued on inside back cover)

<u>Notice No</u>	<u>Contents (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
84/C 84/33	No 1515/83 by Mr Roberto Costonzo to the Commission Subject: Dutch exports of citrus fruit juices onto the Community market	20
84/C 84/34	No 1529/83 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Council Subject: Case of Oleg Radzinsky, the militant pacifist sentenced in the USSR	20
84/C 84/35	No 1550/83 by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté to the Council Subject: Resumption of talks between the Community and GRULA (Group of Latin American Ambassadors)	21
84/C 84/36	No 1561/83 by Mr Brian Hord to the Commission Subject: Failure by Italy to comply with the Directive on cosmetics	21
84/C 84/37	No 1566/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Protectionist measures taken by the US against steel imports	22
84/C 84/38	No 1570/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Inspection assignments under Euratom and the IAEA	22
84/C 84/39	No 1573/83 by Mr André Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Damage to forests from acid rain	23
84/C 84/40	No 1578/83 by Mr Leonidas Kyrkos to the Commission Subject: Programmes for restructuring the citrus fruit sector	23
84/C 84/41	No 1580/83 by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin to the Commission Subject: Effect of the Liège earthquake on the Tihange nuclear power station	25
84/C 84/42	No 1595/83 by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté to the Commission Subject: Use of resolutions by the Council	25
84/C 84/43	No 1604/83 by Mr James Moorhouse to the Commission Subject: Cheap flights from Berlin	25
84/C 84/44	No 1608/83 by Mr James Moorhouse to the Commission Subject: Flight data recorders	26
84/C 84/45	No 1612/83 by Mr Jacques Denis to the Commission Subject: European Development Fund projects	26
84/C 84/46	No 1614/83 by Mrs Marlene Lenz to the Commission Subject: List of research projects commissioned	27
84/C 84/47	No 1618/83 by Mrs Hanna Walz to the Commission Subject: Food preservation by radioactive irradiation	27
84/C 84/48	No 1632/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Sprat fishing	28
84/C 84/49	No 1659/83 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins to the Commission Subject: Community pressure on South African Government	28
84/C 84/50	No 1670/83 by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck to the Council Subject: The International Convention on the Law of the Sea	29
84/C 84/51	No 1672/83 by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck to the Council Subject: Lung cancer in women	29
84/C 84/52	No 1675/83 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: Minimum wages in particular industries	30
84/C 84/53	No 1736/83 by Mr Robert Battersby to the Commission Subject: Council Directive on the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances	30
84/C 84/54	No 1790/83 by Mr Thomas Megahy to the Commission Subject: New textile industry area scheme	31

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTION WITH ANSWER

WRITTEN QUESTION No 670/83**by Mr Robert Battersby (ED — GB)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(4 July 1983)**(84/C 84/01)**Subject: Mackerel, 1981*

What legal action does the Commission intend to take to recover excess amounts paid out to the Netherlands authorities for mackerel in 1981 which were exported in excess of the mackerel available to the Netherlands, i.e. quota plus net imports?

**Answer given by Mr Dalsager
on behalf of the Commission***(10 February 1984)*

As the Commission has already had occasion to point out in its answer to Written Question No 718/82 ⁽¹⁾ and No 1100/82 ⁽²⁾ by the Honourable Member, final settlement of expenditure on refunds is not made until the Commission is satisfied that proper procedures have been followed and Community rules complied with.

The Commission has carried out on-the-spot inspection and has informed the Netherlands authorities of the consequences which it considers should be drawn as regards the export refunds for frozen mackerel in 1981. A decision on this expenditure will be taken by the Commission when the 1981 accounts are cleared.

It should also be mentioned that the export refunds were suspended as from 1 November 1983.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 225, 30. 8. 1982, p. 18.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 339, 27. 12. 1982, p. 11.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 785/83**by Mr Karl von Wogau (PPE — D)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(21 July 1983)**(84/C 84/02)**Subject: Import of overseas apples and pears into Italy*

Is the Commission aware that imports of apples and pears from non-European countries into Italy are prohibited for phytosanitary reasons except in the period from 1 March to 31 May, when these products may be imported from the following countries of origin:

- Argentina,
- Chile,
- Paraguay,
- Brazil,
- South Africa,
- Uruguay?

1. Can the Commission state why no imports are allowed into Italy from New Zealand and Australia during the period of exception, which thus amounts to discrimination against these two countries *vis-à-vis* the other main suppliers to the Community (South Africa, Chile, Argentina)?

The representatives of New Zealand and Australia have for a long time been applying, without success, to the Italian Government for inclusion in the list of exceptions. Does Italy consider the products from New Zealand and Australia to be particularly dangerous to the health of its consumers?

2. Does the Commission think it reasonable that importers in other Member States, once the products have been released for free circulation, can supply customers in all the Member States with apples and pears from third countries, though not Italian cus-

tomers outside the period from 1 March to 31 May and even then not with Australian or New Zealand products, hence amounting to a substantial impairment of free intra-Community trade?

3. Is the Commission aware that Italy is the only Member State to have issued such regulations to protect the health of its consumers? Is this not rather an example of a protectionist measure designed to bar third country apples from general access to the Italian market under the pretext of protecting the health of consumers, thus constituting a disguised restriction on trade pursuant to Articles 30 to 36 of the EEC Treaty and the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice?

4. Does not the Commission also think that uniform arrangements should hold in all the Member States?

5. Is there not the risk that future new Members of the Community will adopt similar phytosanitary regulations to protect their markets following the Italian example?

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

(6 February 1984)

1. Council Directive 77/93/EEC of 21 December 1976 on protective measures against the introduction into the Member States of harmful organisms of plant or plant products ⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Directive 81/7/EEC ⁽²⁾, provides for closer harmonization of plant protection regulations in the Member States in order to make common protection arrangements against the introduction of harmful organisms into the Member States and to remove gradually the obstacles to intra-Community trade, including frontier inspections.

The Community health plant protection system established by Directive 77/93/EEC includes, in addition to general protective measures, a number of special arrangements for designated areas in the Community to take account of the fact that the dangers to plant health vary according to the environmental context.

For this reason, the system does allow Member States to impose certain plant health protection restrictions in intra-Community trade. The Directive does not, however, at the present time, make provision for total or seasonal bans on imports of apples and pears.

2. The Commission is currently examining the regulations introduced by the Member States in implementation of the Directive in order to establish whether they are consistent with its provisions. This examination is still in progress. The Commission intends, as part of this programme. To request the Italian authorities to explain the reasons for the

measures taken in respect of apples and pears originating in certain non-Community countries.

3. There are other Member States which apply protective measures against products originating in non-Community countries, which are not provided for in Directive 77/93/EEC. The status of these measures is also subject to closer examination.

4. The Commission takes the view that the harmonization of plant protection regulations should eventually serve to create a common system of protection, except in cases where geographically conditioned variations in the threat to plant health call for other arrangements to be made.

5. Community law will be binding on future members of the Community in the same way as it is binding on the present Member States.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 26, 31. 1. 1977, p. 20.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 14, 16. 1. 1981, p. 23.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1145/83

**by Mr Mihail Protopapadakis (PPE — GR)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(13 October 1983)

(84/C 84/03)

Subject: Anti-Community propaganda in a pamphlet published by the Athens press office of the Commission of the European Communities

The Athens press office of the Commission of the European Communities recently published a pamphlet entitled 'Adjustments and Repercussions in Greek Agriculture' written by a Mr Chadziadiou.

In view of the fact that the abovementioned pamphlet:

- (a) deliberately distorts the picture of trade relations between Greece and the EEC;
- (b) 'snipes' at the former President of the Greek Government and current President of the Hellenic Republic for allegedly mismanaging the negotiations on Greek accession to the EEC; and
- (c) expresses both covertly and overtly anti-Community sentiments,

would the Commission state whether it is aware of the existence of the pamphlet in question and what measures it intends to take to discipline the officials responsible for employing Community funds and resources for anti-Community propaganda and the

propagation of the political views of one political party of a Member State to the detriment of others?

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

(16 February 1984)

The text to which the Honourable Member refers was not drafted by a Commission official; nor was it signed. It was included by the Athens Information Office in one of its series of publications.

Information material published by the Commission does not necessarily reflect the official opinions of the Community institutions. However, the Commission can assure the Honourable Member that instructions have been issued to ensure that texts which could provoke justified negative reactions are not published.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1197/83

by Mr Rudolf Wedekind (PPE — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 October 1983)

(84/C 84/04)

Subject: Damage to forests by bark beetles

Is the Commission aware that damage to forests by bark beetles has increased owing to the hot summer?

Can the Commission state which regions of the EEC have been most affected and what counter-measures are being taken?

Does the Commission intend taking financial steps to enable private owners of forests to take the appropriate counter-measures which they could not otherwise afford?

Can the Commission state whether there is a direct link between the increased incidence of bark beetles and the death of forests?

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

(13 February 1984)

The Commission is aware of a number of attacks by bostrychid on weakened stands in the Federal

Republic of Germany, and the matter will be considered by the directors of forestry research of the Member States.

The Commission regrets that it does not have detailed information available at the moment on the scale of these attacks.

As long as the resources made available to it for forestry research remain inadequate the Commission cannot envisage any specific Community measure in this area.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1236/83

by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté (DEP — F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 October 1984)

(84/C 84/05)

Subject: Trade compensations obtained under the GATT

Can the Commission give an update on the talks held in GATT by Community authorities with the United States, in order to obtain trade compensations for the damage arising from the US decision to limit imports of special steels?

What results have been achieved and is the Commission satisfied with them? If not, what further steps does it intend to take, and when?

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

(15 February 1984)

Since the imposition by the US authorities of import restrictions upon specialty steels last July in the form of additional customs duties and quantitative restrictions, Commission and US officials have held consultations within the framework of GATT Article XIX on the Issue of compensation for injury caused by these measures.

The Council of General Affairs decided on 29 November 1983 that the Community should, before 15 January 1984, send a list to GATT of compensatory withdrawals equivalent to the trade loss caused by the US import restrictions, provided the consultations referred to had not led to an adequate compensation offer by the US side.

In accordance with Council conclusions, the Commission submitted a list of compensatory withdrawals to the GATT on 13 January 1984.

The Community measures, taking the form of increases in customs duties as well as the imposition of import quotas, will be valid for one year, after which they can be extended.

The Community will either amend or withdraw these measures in the light of any decision which the US Government may take regarding its own measures restricting specialty steel imports.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1275/83

by Mr Richard Cottrell (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 November 1983)

(84/C 84/06)

Subject: Functions of the Commission office in Cardiff, Wales

Will the Commission describe the functions of the Commission office, located in Cardiff, Wales, with particular regard to:

- (a) the activities of this office in helping industrial enterprises in the area to obtain Community grants and loans;
- (b) the number of staff on the establishment;
- (c) the grade and salary of the senior Commission representative appointed to the Office;
- (d) the operating costs of the office in the last complete year for which figures are available, including expenses claimed by staff in the performance of their duties;
- (e) the system by which appointments are made to this office, in particular that of the senior official there;
- (f) whether it is a requirement that the senior official and other staff should be Welsh by birth;
- (g) what responsibilities this office discharges with regard to other parts of the United Kingdom, including the region south of the River Severn which embraces Bristol and the County of Avon.

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

(17 February 1984)

- (a) The Cardiff office has no direct role in assisting enterprises in Wales to obtain grants and loans from EEC sources. As a press and information office its role is to provide general information on Community assistance for business and agriculture. Actual negotiations are carried out between the ap-

propriate Government departments and the Commission's operational directorates.

- (b) The number of staff on the establishment is three.

- (c) The grade of the senior Commission representative at the Cardiff office is A 5. The salary is fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Staff Regulations of officials of the European Communities.

- (d) In 1982, the operating costs were 124 242,26 ECU.

- (e) The Appointing Authority takes decisions on appointments within the Commission according to the provisions of Article 29 of the Staff Regulations.

- (f) No. The Community Staff Regulations are opposed to specific jobs being set aside for nationals of a given Member State, or indeed a specific region of a given Member State.

- (g) The Cardiff office has no responsibilities with regard to parts of the United Kingdom other than Wales.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1332/83

by Mr Thomas Megahy (S — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(18 November 1983)

(84/C 84/07)

Subject: Environmental policies for the coal industry

Would the Commission please say whether they have drawn up a programme relating the EEC environmental policies specifically to the coal industry and indicate what recent steps they have taken to follow up the suggestions put forward in the report of the European Conference on Coal and the Environment organized by the Yorkshire and Humberside County Councils Association in September 1982, for example, with special reference to the coal industry:

- the placing of environmental conditions on ECSC loans to coal producers,
- the use of environmental impact analysis,
- the acceptance of Community-wide environmental standards,
- proposals for research into, for example, the practicalities of backstowage, re-use of colliery spoil, and alternative methods of spoil disposal,

- as well as the introduction of a Community Environment Fund, and a tax on coal or energy to be used for environmental improvements?

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

(8 February 1984)

The Commission has continued its work which, in the various spheres of Community policy, relates to the suggestions put forward in the report of the European Conference on Coal and the Environment organized by the Yorkshire and Humberside County Councils Association in September 1982:

- the Commission decided in 1974 that it would grant reduced-interest loans under Article 54 of the ECSC Treaty for purposes relating to health and safety, notably nuisance abatement ⁽¹⁾. Loans of this kind have indeed been made, particularly in conjunction with loans for productive investment;
- in July 1980 the Commission sent to the Council a proposal for a Directive concerning the assessment of the environmental effects of certain public and private projects ⁽²⁾, which is relevant to extractive industries as well; the Commission hopes that the Council will reach a favourable decision on this proposal in the near future;
- on 15 July 1980 the Council adopted a Directive on air quality limit values and guide values for sulphur dioxide and suspended particulates ⁽³⁾;
- the Commission has sent the Council three proposals for Directives: one on air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide ⁽⁴⁾; one on the combating of air pollution from industrial plants ⁽⁵⁾; and one on the limitation of emissions of pollutants into the air from large combustion plants ⁽⁶⁾;
- under its Research and Development programme on the environment the Community has supported several research projects on the rehabilitation of sites left derelict by the coal industry;
- in January 1983 the Commission sent the Council a proposal for a Regulation on action by the Community relating to the environment ⁽⁷⁾; this is still being discussed by the Council.

(1) OJ No C 146, 25. 11. 1974.

(2) OJ No C 169, 9. 7. 1980.

(3) OJ No L 229, 30. 8. 1980.

(4) OJ No C 258, 27. 9. 1983.

(5) OJ No C 139, 27. 5. 1983.

(6) COM(83) 704 final.

(7) OJ No C 30, 4. 2. 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1335/83

by Mr Dieter Rogalla (S — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(18 November 1983)

(84/C 84/08)

Subject: Identification stickers on motor vehicles

1. What is the purpose of stickers on motor vehicles indicating their nationality?
2. On what international agreement are they based and is the Community party to any such international agreement?
Were the Member States involved in the drawing up of any such agreement before or since the establishment of the European Community?
3. What steps has the Commission taken to devise a Community identification sticker for vehicles travelling in third countries and to urge that existing national identifications are phased out?
4. If such steps have not yet been taken, does the Commission agree that they are necessary and when does it intend to take actions on this matter?

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

(26 January 1984)

1 and 2. Motor vehicles in international traffic are required to display a distinguishing sign on the State of registration as one of the conditions of admission to other States. This obligation, laid down in Article 20 of the 1949 Geneva Convention on International Road Traffic, was confirmed in Article 37 of the 1968 Vienna Convention on Road Traffic which superseded the former. The Commission participated as an observer in the preparatory work for the Vienna Convention which was signed by seven Member States and subsequently ratified by three of them.

The Community is not a party to this Convention, but the desirability and usefulness of its becoming a party to this and other Conventions concluded under United Nations auspices is constantly under review.

3 and 4. The interesting idea suggested by the Honourable Member would require a modification of one part of the above Convention which deals with many other aspects of road traffic. It would also require changes to other international agreements relating to the designation of distinguishing signs and might have effects on the principles and methods of registering vehicles in Member States,

and to the provisions of both the First and the Second Council Directive on motor vehicle insurance (72/166/EEC (1); 84/5/EEC (2)) which specifically refer to national registration plates. In these circumstances the Commission, bearing in mind its priority programmes in the field of transport, has no plans to take any initiative in this matter to which it would have to devote substantial resources.

(1) OJ No L 103, 2. 5. 1972.

(2) OJ No L 8, 11. 1. 1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1340/83
by Mr Jens-Peter Bonde (CDI — DK)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 November 1983)

(84/C 84/09)

Subject: Payments to South Schleswig and North Schleswig

Would the Commission provide a table of the total appropriations paid from the Community budget to, respectively, South Schleswig and North Schleswig in each year since 1975?

Answer given by Mr Giolitti
on behalf the Commission

(16 February 1984)

The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) is the only one of the financial instruments financed from the general budget in respect of which the Commission can give a regional breakdown of commitment appropriations.

The commitment appropriations for ERDF grants to the Landesteil Schleswig and to Sonderjylland are the following:

Year	Landesteil Schleswig		Sonderjylland	
	DM	ECU	Dkr	ECU
1975	—	—	—	—
1976	1 174 042	454 866	—	—
1977	4 271 222	1 654 828	—	—
1978	1 676 185	661 243	—	—
1979	107 998	43 062	319 400	45 776
1980	1 252 409	504 572	1 983 400	256 777
1981	775 859	301 916	—	—
1982	688 556	281 596	2 098 049	262 948
1983	300 000	130 263	972 726	119 705
Total	10 246 271	4 032 346	5 373 575	685 206

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1352/83
by Mr Karl von Wogau (PPE — D)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 November 1983)

(84/C 84/10)

Subject: Exclusion of university students from school milk concession

Under Article 1 of Regulation (EEC) No 2167/83 (1) of 28 July 1983 university students will no longer be entitled to milk subsidized by the Community.

1. Why do all schoolchildren and students regularly attending a school of any grade or category

benefit from milk subsidized by the Community when university students are excluded?

2. If abuses have led to the exclusion of university students from this concession, would it not be possible — on the basis of stricter supervisory measures applied by the appropriate student bodies — to ensure that, as in the case of schools, the milk is used for its intended purpose?
3. What makes the Commission think that subsidized milk distributed by student bodies which have undertaken to apply proper supervisory measures is less likely to be used for its intended purpose, than milk distributed at reduced prices in holiday camps for schools of all grades and categories?

4. What objections are there to student organizations distributing milk at reduced prices with lunchtime meals?

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

(24 February 1984)

(¹) OJ No L 206, 30. 7. 1983, p. 75.

In view of the length of its answer, which includes a number of tables, the Commission is sending it direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

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

(6 February 1984)

The decision not to grant Community aid for the supply of milk to students at universities and other higher education establishments of similar status is based on the following factors.

The school milk programme has an educational and a nutritional aim, and should prove more effective among primary and secondary school pupils.

In many Member States, students do not attend university for a specific period each day, which makes it extremely difficult to organize and supervise the distribution of milk to them.

For these reasons, the Commission restricted school milk aid to primary and secondary education establishments. It considered it normal that pupils at these establishments should be able to go on receiving school milk while staying at holiday camps for schools.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1368/83

by Mr Karel Van Miert (S — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 November 1983)

(84/C 84/12)

Subject: Newspaper advertising of staff vacancies

Can the Commission indicate:

1. What policy it pursues when advertising staff vacancies in the daily or weekly newspapers of the various Member States?
2. What its views are as regards putting advertisements for staff vacancies into the hands of the Universal Media Agency?
3. Whether it is aware that, for the Dutch-speaking area of Belgium this agency has a contract with 'Het Laatste Nieuws' and the 'Standaard' group, which are of Liberal and Catholic tendencies respectively, and that, as a result, the notices of vacancy do not appear in newspapers (such as 'De Morgen') which are of a different tendency, so that readers of these newspapers cannot easily learn of the open competitions being organized by the Community?
4. Does the Commission find this acceptable?
5. What steps does it propose to take to remedy this?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1355/83

by Mr John Hume (S — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 November 1983)

(84/C 84/11)

Subject: Assistance for Northern Ireland from EEC Funds

Will the Commission state how much money has been paid in the period from January 1979 to the latest available date, in respect of each of the 28 district council areas in Northern Ireland, from:

1. the Regional Fund;
2. the Social Fund;
3. FEOGA (a) guarantee,
(b) guidance;
4. EIB loans,
5. NCI loans?

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

(29 February 1984)

1. The aim of Commission policy in advertising its competitions is to reach the greatest possible number of potential applicants.
2. To do this, the Commission avails itself of the services of Universal Communication, an advertising agency which advises on the most effective media.

In addition, for a number of highly specialized posts, the Commission at times contacts organiza-

tions with proven skill in researching specific sectors of the labour market.

3. Whether Universal Communication has contracts with the newspapers referred to by the Honourable Member is immaterial to the services the firm provides for the Commission. Universal Communication is given data on the target population groups and the type of advertisement required, and the only criteria used in selecting particular publications are their circulation figures, reader profile and penetration of each target group.

For the Honourable Member's information, vacancy notices for the last set of competitions were published in the following newspapers.

Belgium

De Standaard, Le Soir

Luxembourg

Luxemburger Wort

Federal Republic

of Germany

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung

Italy

Corriere della Sera

France

Le Monde

Denmark

Berlingske Tidende

Netherlands

Intermediair

Ireland

Irish Times

United Kingdom

The Times

Greece

Ta Nea

4 and 5. Budget constraints being what they are, the Commission is unable to envisage extending its advertising of competitions to a larger number of publications.

However, in implementing its new recruitment policy, the Commission will, with the assistance of government departments and universities in the Member States, do its utmost to broaden the range of information and publicity provided in connection with open competitions.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1379/83

by Mr Horst Seefeld (S — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 November 1983)

(84/C 84/13)

Subject: Unacceptable practices in the technical inspection of imported used vehicles (further to Written Question No 1105/83 ⁽¹⁾)

As the background documents relating to an individual case and accompanying this question clearly show, time after time there are delays in the technical inspection of imported used vehicles not simply because of tardy preparation of accompanying documents by the agents of the manufacturers in question, but principally as a result of procrastination in the official bodies responsible for technical inspection, which make intra-Community trade in such vehicles economically practically impossible.

1. What is the Commission doing to help speed up the completion of documents by the agents of such manufacturers in future?
2. In which Member States is the Commission aware of practices by the bodies responsible for technical inspection which amount to discrimination against the purchasers of used imported vehicles?
3. What is the Commission doing to eliminate such practices.
4. Is the Commission prepared to intervene in favour of the persons affected in individual cases like the one mentioned above?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 24, 30. I. 1984, p. 22.

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

(8 January 1984)

1. Two types of proceedings under the EEC Treaty may result from the refusal by manufacturers or their representatives to furnish documents required for the importation of second-hand vehicles or indeed from inordinate delays in the supply of these documents.

On the one hand, the appropriate national authorities may not have adequately supervised the private undertakings which were authorized to carry out the official procedures. In such a case it may be appropriate for the Commission to take steps to investigate the matter in the context of Article 30 EEC. Such action would take the form of infringement proceedings seeking the removal of obstacles to trade between Member States in the form of technical checks for which the Member States are responsible (cf. the answer to question 2, *infra*). On the other hand, the action of the private undertakings or their representatives may in certain circumstances amount to an abuse of a dominant position affecting trade between Member States prohibited by Article 86 of the EEC Treaty (see case 26/75 General Motors Continental NV v. Commission (1975) ECR 1367). In cases in which such an abuse is clearly shown, the Commission will not hesitate to act to ensure that the abuse is terminated. At the moment a case concerning the importation of new vehicles is being examined by the Commission and

may possibly result in a Decision being adopted under Article 86 of the EEC Treaty.

2. Certain complaints alleging infringements of the Treaty provisions for the free movement of goods have been received concerning problems in this area. The Commission is still examining these complaints. In any event, the Commission intends shortly to address a communication to the Member States on approval and registration formalities for imported vehicles.

3 and 4. In cases in which a complaint is made to the Commission and is justified, the Commission will not hesitate to take appropriate action to ensure that Community law is observed. This includes taking up cases on behalf of individuals provided that the necessary information is furnished.

Individuals should, however, also be aware of the possibility of bringing actions based on the Treaty articles mentioned above before national courts. Recourse to national courts may have certain advantages over a complaint to the Commission. For example, the injured party may be awarded damages, something which the Commission cannot do.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1406/83

by Mr Roland Boyes (S — GB)

to the Council of the European Communities

(9 December 1983)

(84/C 84/14)

Subject: Review of the Social Fund

Further to the reply to my Written Question No 848/83 ⁽¹⁾:

1. Has the Council agreed to the 'Black Spot' proposals of the Commission?
2. If so, what criteria will be used to identify each Black Spot?
3. Which areas in Britain qualify for support under such criteria?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 308, 14. 11. 1983, p. 21.

Answer

(29 February 1984)

Under the terms of the new provisions governing the European Social Fund which it adopted on 17 October 1983 after conciliation with the European Par-

liament, the Council laid down a more general formula than that proposed by the Commission, which contained no specific details on the arrangements for allocating assistance from the Fund in the way referred to by the Honourable Member.

Article 7 (3) of the Decision on the tasks of the European Social Fund states that, in addition to the appropriations for projects in regions which are eligible for a higher rate,

'The remaining appropriations shall be concentrated on operations in respect of employment in other areas of high and long-term unemployment and/or industrial and sectoral restructuring.' ⁽¹⁾

It is hence for the Commission, in the framework of the guidelines referred to in Article 6 of the above Decision, to determine the detailed arrangements for implementing this provision.

In this connection, as the European Parliament is aware following conciliation with the Council on this subject, the Council and the Commission stated that 'special attention should be given to projects to promote employment in areas in which the unemployment rate is exceptionally high compared with the national average' ⁽²⁾. It is for the Commission to determine such areas under the procedure laid down in Article 6 of the Decision.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 289, 22. 10. 1983, p. 40.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 289, 22. 10. 1983, p. 41 (Statement at Article 6).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1407/83

by Mr Karl von Wogau (PPE — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 December 1983)

(84/C 84/15)

Subject: Technical barriers to trade in the importation of goods into France

1. Is the Commission aware of the temporary provisions issued by the French Ministry of Research and Industry (Commissaire à la normalisation — standards officer) on 25 August 1983 in implementation of the decree of 10 June 1983 concerning mandatory standard NF 38—320 for freezers?

2. Is it correct that, under these rules, transitional provisions will apply only until the end of this year and that, as from 1 January 1984, the new mandatory inspection procedures and markings for freezers will be introduced definitively and without exception?

3. Does the Commission consider the imposition of these new mandatory inspection procedures and markings to be compatible with Articles 30 and 36 of the EEC Treaty?

4. If not, what action does it propose to take against this violation of the Treaty?

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

(2 February 1984)

After the adoption by the French Government of the Order of 10 June 1983 making it compulsory to apply standard NF 38—320 in respect of domestic freezers, the Commission initiated, in pursuance of Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, proceedings for the infringement of Article 30 of that Treaty.

Following these proceedings, the French authorities adopted transitional measures for the implementation of the Order; these measures, which were described in a memorandum dated 25 August 1983, in no way changed the commission's assessment of the substance of the case.

The measures were recently revoked and replaced by provisions set out in a new memorandum issued by the Ministry of Research and Industry.

This memorandum provides that, by way of derogation from Article 6 of the Order, importers are not required to produce the approval certificate referred to in Article 4 (2) in respect of:

- Community products;
- products for which an application was made by 1 August 1983 for the right to use the national mark of conformity to standards and for which a valid derogation issued by the Commissioner for Standardization (Commissaire à la normalisation) can be produced.

The Commission takes the view that, since these derogations apply to products which, under Community law, must qualify for free movement, the French Government has fulfilled its obligations.

The Commission will be in a position to terminate the infringement proceedings as soon as the French authorities have given it certain clarifications concerning the interpretation of the abovementioned memorandum.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1425/83
by Mr Brendan Halligan (S — IRL)
to the Council of the European Communities**

(9 December 1983)

(84/C 84/16)

Subject: Raising public awareness of the European Community

The European Community is still regarded by many people as a vague and irrelevant institution to their everyday lives. Market research in all the Member States confirms this to be so. Will the Council prepare a practical programme of action which would make the European Community relevant and meaningful to all its citizens?

For example, will the Council agree to finance a scheme whereby senior citizens could travel free throughout this Community at will, using public transport? This would substantially increase communications between the Member States, have enormous social benefits for the elderly, many of whom have never visited another Community country and, finally, would gain great good will for the institutions of Europe.

Answer

(29 February 1984)

The Council welcomes any measures which might be taken by the Community itself or by the Member States individually to bring more home to the people of the Member States the fact that it is those States' aim to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe.

The Council believes that the various information campaigns which will precede the actual campaign for election of the Members of the European Parliament could be a suitable framework in which to draw attention to these measures.

As regards the Honourable Member's suggestion, the Council points out that fares are fixed by the competent authorities.

As far as the Community's powers are concerned, the Council would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that it has almost completed discussions which should lead in the near future to adoption of a resolution on a Community policy on tourism in which it intends to ask the Commission to submit proposals in the field of tourism in the Community. In addition, the field of assisted tourism was

discussed at the informal meeting of Ministers responsible for tourism held in Athens on 20 November 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1446/83

by Mr Horst Seefeld (S — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 December 1984)

(84/C 84/17)

Subject: Conditions affecting the visibility of motor-cycle crash helmet wearers

Issue No 43 of the magazine *Stern* of 20 October 1983 reports that many of the almost 2000 riders of motor cycles, mopeds and motor-assisted bicycles killed in road accidents last year were 'as good as blind'. Tests carried out by the Cologne research establishment for driver visibility and road safety have shown that the plastic surface of the crash helmet visor soon becomes scratched and every headlight and streetlight is diffused through these scratches into a bright and dazzling star. *Stern* reports that 'in the case of 10 % of the visors examined, wearer visibility was reduced by half and sometimes by more than half. That is criminal'.

1. Is the Commission aware of these findings?
2. What can be done at Community level to improve the visibility of motor-cycle crash helmet wearers?
3. Could the Commission make an appropriate contribution to research into scratch-proof protective coatings?

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

(7 February 1984)

1. The Commission is aware that plastic visors on motor-cycle crash helmets can become worn in use and thereby impair the wearer's vision.
2. If vision is impaired the best remedy is to replace the visor. A new visor is relatively inexpensive and replacement is usually quick and easy.

Some years ago the Commission itself had begun preparing Community Regulations for motor-cycle crash helmets, but since the International Organiza-

tion for Standardization (ISO) and the UN's Economic Commission for Europe in Geneva are also doing some fairly broad-based work on standards or regulations for crash helmets the Commission discontinued its own work in order to avoid a duplication of effort, and joined in the work of the other organizations. The result was UN/EEC Regulation No 22. There are, however, no provisions in this regarding the quality of vision and scratch-resistance of visors, and the problem is currently being discussed in the Economic Commission for Europe. Depending on the outcome the Commission will not fail, after consultation with the Member States, to make an appropriate proposal to the Council for improving visibility through motor cycle crash helmet visors.

3. The Commission is currently prevented by lack of funds from making a financial contribution to research into scratch-proof protective coatings.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1462/83

by Mrs Mechthild von Aleman (L — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 December 1983)

(84/C 84/18)

Subject: Cultural exchanges between the People's Republic of China and the European Community

Can the Commission indicate whether plans exist to promote an exchange of academics and students between the People's Republic of China and the European Community?

Is it true that a German graduate who had obtained a school-leaving certificate from the European School and completed Chinese studies at a Belgian university was refused a grant to participate in an exchange programme with the People's Republic of China by:

- (a) the Belgian authorities, on the grounds that the applicant was not of Belgian nationality; and
- (b) the German authorities also, on the grounds that the applicant, a German citizen, had completed his studies outside Germany?

Does the Commission not agree that this is a typical case of totally outdated cultural chauvinism which has no place in the 20th century?

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

(8 February 1984)

There are currently no plans for Community support to encourage exchanges of academics and students between the People's Republic of China and the European Community.

The Commission has no knowledge of the case referred to by the Honourable Member, where a German graduate was refused a grant to visit the People's Republic.

Without knowing the institutions and procedures of the Member States involved, the Commission is unable to comment on the case in question.

The Commission does however intend, in the context of its activities pursuant to the action programme in the field of education approved on 9 February 1976, to organize a first meeting of the heads of the bodies responsible for student welfare and related matter in the Member States at some point during 1984. This will lead to the establishment of contacts which should help to prevent similar cases occurring in the future.

Finally, the Commission would draw the Honourable Member's attention to conclusions to the meeting of the Council and the Ministers of Education held on June 1983, which include a statement to the effect that the Member States should, in the recognition of certificates and diplomas obtained in other Member States, be guided by the principle of greatest possible generosity and flexibility.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1464/83

by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 December 1983)

(84/C 84/19)

Subject: Double taxation conventions

Can the Commission provide a list of all double taxation conventions currently in force between Italy, on the one hand, and

1. other Community Member States;
 2. third countries,
- on the other?

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

(9 February 1984)

Italy has concluded double taxation conventions with the following countries which came into force in the years shown:

Member States:

France: 1967
Federal Republic of Germany: 1926
United Kingdom: 1962
Belgium: 1973
Netherlands: 1960
Ireland: 1975
Denmark: 1967
Greece: 1968
Luxembourg: 1983.

Non-Community countries:

Austria: 1925
Canada: 1980
Cyprus: 1983
Egypt: 1982
Finland: 1974
Japan: 1973
Israel: 1973
Hungary: 1980
Morocco: 1983
Norway: 1963
Romania: 1979
Singapore: 1979
Spain: 1980
United States: 1956
Sweden: 1958
Switzerland: 1979
Thailand: 1980
Trinidad and Tobago: 1974
Tunisia: 1981.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1465/83

by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 December 1983)

(84/C 84/20)

Subject: Double taxation conventions

Can the Commission provide a list of all double taxation conventions currently in force between the Federal Republic of Germany on the one hand, and

1. other Community Member States;
 2. third countries,
- on the other?

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

(9 February 1984)

The Federal Republic of Germany has concluded double taxation conventions with the following

countries which came into force in the years shown:

Member States

Belgium: 1969
Denmark: 1964
France: 1961
Greece: 1968
United Kingdom: 1967
Ireland: 1964
Italy: 1952
Luxembourg: 1960
Netherlands: 1960.

Non-Community countries

Egypt: 1961
Argentina: 1979
Australia: 1975
Brazil: 1976
Ivory Coast: 1982
Finland: 1982
India: 1960
Indonesia: 1979
Iran: 1969
Iceland: 1973
Israel: 1966
Jamaica: 1976
Japan: 1967
Canada: 1957
Kenya: 1980
Korea: 1978
Liberia: 1975
Malaysia: 1979
Malta: 1976
Morocco: 1974
Maritius: 1981
New Zealand: 1980
Norway: 1960
Austria: 1955
Pakistan: 1960
Poland: 1975
Portugal: 1982
Romania: 1975
Zambia: 1975
Sweden: 1960
Switzerland: 1973
Singapore: 1973
Spain: 1968
Sri Lanka: 1982
South Africa: 1975
Thailand: 1968
Trinidad and Tobago: 1977
Tunisia: 1976
Hungary: 1979
United States: 1955
Cyprus: 1977.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1467/83

by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 December 1983)

(84/C 84/21)

Subject: Double taxation conventions

Can the Commission provide a list of all double taxation conventions currently in force between Greece on the one hand, and

1. other Community Member States;
 2. third countries,
- on the other?

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

(10 February 1984)

Greece has concluded double taxation conventions with the following countries which came into force in the years shown.

Member States

Federal Republic of Germany: 1964
Italy: 1968
France: 1964
Belgium: 1970
United Kingdom: 1953.

Non-Community countries

Austria: 1972
Cyprus: 1960
Finland: 1981
India: 1964
Sweden: 1963
United States: 1953.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1468/83

by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 December 1983)

(84/C 84/22)

Subject: Double taxation conventions

Can the Commission provide a list of all double taxation conventions currently in force between the Netherlands on the one hand, and

1. other Community Member States;
 2. third countries,
- on the other?

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

(9 February 1984)

The Netherlands has concluded double taxation conventions with the following countries which came into force in the years shown.

Member States

Federal Republic of Germany: 1960
Belgium: 1971
Denmark: 1958
France: 1974
Ireland: 1970
Italy: 1960
Luxembourg: 1969
United Kingdom: 1981.

Non-Community Countries

Austria: 1971
Australia: 1976
Canada: 1957
Czechoslovakia: 1974
Finland: 1971
Hungary: 1940
Indonesia: 1974
Israel: 1974
Japan: 1970
Yugoslavia: 1983
South Korea: 1981
Malawi: 1969
Malta: 1977
Netherlands Antilles: 1965
Norway: 1967
New Zealand: 1981
Pakistan: 1982
Poland: 1981
Romania: 1980
Singapore: 1971
South Africa: 1972
Spain: 1972
Suriname: 1977
Sweden: 1968
Switzerland: 1952
Thailand: 1976
United States: 1947
Zambia: 1982.

ation conventions currently in force between the United Kingdom on the one hand, and

1. other Community Member States;
 2. third countries,
- on the other?

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

(9 February 1984)

The United Kingdom has concluded double taxation conventions with the following countries which came into force in the years shown.

Member States

Belgium: 1970
Denmark: 1973
France: 1973
Federal Republic of Germany: 1971
Greece: 1954
Ireland: 1976
Italy: 1973
Luxembourg: 1968
Netherlands: 1977.

Non-Community countries:

Antigua: 1947
Netherlands Antilles: 1970
Australia: 1968
Austria: 1970
Barbados: 1970
Belize: 1947
Botswana: 1978
Brunei: 1950
Burma: 1952
Canada: 1967
Cyprus: 1975
Dominica: 1949
Falkland Islands: 1949
Faeroe Islands: 1961
Fiji: 1976
Finland: 1970
Gambia: 1947
Ghana: 1978
Grenada: 1949
Guernsey: 1952
Hungary: 1978
Indonesia: 1975
Isle of Man: 1955
Israel: 1963
Jamaica: 1973
Japan: 1970
Jersey: 1952
Kenya: 1977
Lesotho: 1949
Malawi: 1956
Malta: 1962
Mauritius: 1947
Montserrat: 1947

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1469/83

**by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(19 December 1983)
(84/C 84/23)

Subject: Double taxation conventions

Can the Commission provide a list of all double tax-

Namibia (SW Africa): 1962
 New Zealand: 1966
 Norway: 1970
 Pakistan: 1961
 Philippines: 1978
 Poland: 1978
 Portugal: 1969
 Zimbabwe: 1956
 Romania: 1977
 St Christopher and Nevis: 1947
 St Lucia: 1949
 St Vincent: 1949
 Seychelles: 1947
 Sierra Leone: 1947
 Singapore: 1967
 Solomon Islands: 1950
 South Africa: 1969
 South Korea: 1978
 Spain: 1976
 Sudan: 1977
 Swaziland: 1969
 Sweden: 1961
 Switzerland: 1978
 Trinidad and Tobago: 1967
 Tanzania { Tanganyika: 1952
 { Zanzibar: 1952.

France: 1966
 Federal Republic of Germany: 1959
 Italy: 1967
 Luxembourg: 1968
 Netherlands: 1965
 United Kingdom: 1976.

Non-Community countries

Australia: 1984
 Austria: 1964
 Canada: 1968
 Cyprus: 1962
 Finland: 1969
 Japan: 1974
 Norway: 1967
 Pakistan: 1968
 Sweden: 1960
 Switzerland: 1965
 United States: 1951
 Zambia: 1967.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1470/83

by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 December 1983)

(84/C 84/24)

Subject: Double taxation conventions

Can the Commission provide a list of all double taxation conventions currently in force between Ireland on the one hand, and

1. other Community Member States;
2. third countries,

on the other?

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

(16 February 1984)

Ireland has concluded double taxation conventions with the following countries which came into force in the years shown.

Member States

Belgium: 1973
 Denmark: 1961

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1471/83

by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 December 1983)

(84/C 84/25)

Subject: Double taxation conventions

Can the Commission provide a list of all double taxation conventions currently in force between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg on the one hand, and

1. other Community Member States;
 2. third countries,
- on the other?

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

(7 February 1984)

Luxembourg has concluded double taxation conventions with the following countries which came into force on the dates shown.

Member States

Federal Republic of Germany: 1960
 Belgium: 1972
 France: 1960
 United Kingdom: 1968
 Ireland: 1975
 Netherlands: 1969
 Denmark: 1982
 Italy: 1983

Non-Community countries

Austria: 1964
 United States: 1964
 Iceland: 1976
 Brazil: 1980
 Finland: 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1472/83

by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 December 1983)

(84/C 84/26)

Subject: Double taxation conventions

Can the Commission provide a list of all double taxation conventions currently in force between France on the one hand, and

1. other Community Member States;
 2. third countries,
- on the other?

Answer given By Mr Tugendhat
on behalf of the Commission

(20 February 1984)

France has concluded double taxation conventions with the following countries which came into force in the years shown.

Member States

Belgium: 1965
 Denmark: 1958
 Federal Republic of Germany: 1981
 Greece: 1964
 Ireland: 1964
 Italy: 1971
 Luxembourg: 1967
 Netherlands: 1974
 United Kingdom: 1969.

Non-Community countries

Algeria: 1970
 Argentina: 1981
 Australia: 1977
 Austria: 1961
 Benin: 1977
 Brazil: 1972
 Cameroon: 1978
 Canada: 1976
 Central African Republic: 1971
 Comoros: 1971
 Congo: 1969
 Czechoslovakia: 1975
 Egypt: 1983

Finland: 1959
 Gabon: 1969
 Hungary: 1981
 India: 1970
 Indonesia: 1981
 Iran: 1975
 Israel: 1964
 Ivory Coast: 1969
 Japan: 1981
 South Korea: 1981
 Lebanon: 1963
 Madagascar: 1965
 Malaysia: 1976
 Mali: 1975
 Malta: 1978
 Mauritania: 1969
 Mauritius: 1982
 Morocco: 1971
 New Zealand: 1981
 Niger: 1966
 Norway: 1981.
 Pakistan: 1969
 Philippines: 1978
 Poland: 1976
 Portugal: 1972
 Romania: 1975
 Senegal: 1976
 Singapore: 1975
 Spain: 1975
 Sri Lanka: 1982
 Sweden: 1972
 Switzerland: 1970
 Thailand: 1975
 Togo: 1975
 Tunisia: 1975
 United States: 1968
 Upper Volta: 1967
 Yugoslavia: 1975
 Zambia: 1964.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1473/83

by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 December 1983)

(84/C 84/27)

Subject: Double taxation conventions

Can the Commission provide a list of all double taxation conventions currently in force between Belgium on the one hand, and

1. other Community Member States;
 2. third countries,
- on the other?

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

(20 February 1984)

Belgium has concluded double taxation conventions with the following countries which came into force in the years shown.

Member States

Denmark: 1971
Federal Republic of Germany: 1969
France: 1973
Greece: 1970
Ireland: 1974
Italy: 1973
Luxembourg: 1973
Netherlands: 1970
United Kingdom: 1970

Non-Community countries

Austria: 1973
Brazil: 1973
Canada: 1976
Czechoslovakia: 1977
Finland: 1971
India: 1975
Indonesia: 1975
Israel: 1975
Japan: 1970
Malaysia: 1975
Malta: 1975
Morocco: 1975
Norway: 1969

Portugal: 1971
Singapore: 1973
Spain: 1972
Sweden: 1968
Tunisia: 1976
United States: 1972.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1482/83

**by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté (DEP — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(19 December 1983)

(84/C 84/28)

Subject: Use of European Social Fund appropriations by different Member States

Can the Commission say how each State has used the Social Fund resources it has received over the last five years specifying the amounts involved in each case).

Has each State informed its nationals of the projects carried out under the Social Fund? Can the Commission state which Member States have not done so? Does it intend to take measures to force States to make this information public and if so what form would these measures take?

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

(16 February 1984)

The following table shows the trend in appropriations committed for each of the Member States over the last five years under the European Social Fund.

(million ECU)

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
Belgium	11,50	15,94	29,30	23,19	23,57
Denmark	14,28	14,70	19,43	24,48	27,26
Federal Republic of Germany	62,26	52,88	107,96	74,64	91,17
France	103,14	134,82	194,96	141,78	264,54
Greece	—	—	—	30,57	52,39
Ireland	46,94	58,13	79,69	105,72	143,09
Italy	256,22	281,23	327,15	341,01	439,86
Luxembourg	0,36	1,00	0,93	0,56	0,47
Netherlands	9,81	19,32	18,30	12,67	15,88
United Kingdom	115,71	196,43	236,50	249,05	442,58
	620,22	774,45	1 014,22	1 003,67	1 500,81

A table showing a detailed breakdown of the appropriations allocated by the European Social Fund in 1982 for each Member State and field of intervention has been sent to the Honourable Member and the Parliament Secretariat direct. It should be noted that the annual reports list all the data, showing, from different aspects, how ESF assistance is used.

The information offices of the Community in the Member States also play a part in supplying information on the subsidies granted by the Fund.

Each Member State has its own method of informing its nationals of Funds intervention. The Commission has no reason to believe that any Member State is deliberately withholding information on this subject and does not see the need for a binding instrument in this area. However, the Commission would obviously welcome any additional effort to increase public awareness with regard to the practical help the European Community is giving the Member States through the Fund in matters of training and employment.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1494/83

by Mrs Ien van de Heuvel (S — NL)

to the Foreign Ministers of the 10 Member States of the European Communities meeting in political cooperation

(19 December 1983)

(84/C 84/29)

Subject: Working party on non-proliferation

1. In the 1984 budget statement for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the Netherlands, the Dutch Minister in question referred to a working party on non-proliferation set up following a Dutch initiative.

2. Can the Foreign Ministers state what the work of this working party consists of?

3. Are the Ministers prepared to keep Parliament regularly informed of the progress of this work?

Answer

(29 February 1984)

The working party on non-proliferation, set up within the framework of European political cooperation, met for the first time on 9 December 1981. Since its inception it has met 10 times.

The working party meets at the request of the Political Directors with a specific agenda and, like the other working parties in European political cooperation, reports to the Political Committee.

Anxious to ensure that civil use of nuclear energy do not contribute to the proliferation of nuclear arms and explosives, the Ten thought it necessary to have discussions, consultations and exchanges of information on questions involving aspects of nonproliferation which could be discussed in political cooperation, while naturally keeping in mind the responsibilities of the European Commission and topics already discussed in other working parties.

Such is the objective of the working party on non-proliferation. In pursuance of this aim it has discussions on the non-proliferation policies of the Member States, on the policies pursued by certain third countries, and on various questions dealt with by specialist international organizations, mainly the IAEA.

The Political Committee has agreed that the work of the working party on non-proliferation has proved useful and that the working party should continue its activities on the basis of precise directives from the Political Committee.

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs will reply under the normal procedures to any questions of substance which members of the European Parliament might put to them on this matter.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1501/83

**by Mr Robert Moreland (ED — GB)
and Mr George Patterson**

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 December 1983)

(84/C 84/30)

Subject: Harmonization of social provisions relating to inland waterways

1. Will the Commission state if it is pursuing its Directive on this subject with the Council and if so does it hope for adoption soon?

2. What revisions have been made (or does the Commission intend to make) to the Directive? In particular what provisions now exist to deal with the problems of estuarial waters and narrow inland waterways?

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

(3 February 1984)

1. The Council has suspended work, for the time being, on the proposal for a Regulation on the harmonization of certain social provisions relating to goods transport by inland waterway ⁽¹⁾. In view of the fact that the Central Commission for Navigation on the Rhine (CCNR) in Strasbourg, in whose work the Commission participates, is currently drawing up new rules governing the composition of crews and working conditions on Rhine vessels, the responsible Council departments considered that an attempt should be made to reach agreement on the basic problems within that forum. When this somewhat complex work has been completed, the Commission, which had to follow the Council's approach, will examine whether amendments should be made to the present proposal.

2. In view of progress and the need to consult the parties involved, it would be premature to state at this stage what amendments the Commission will subsequently propose.

At present, vessels navigating narrow waterways are subject to national rules. Working conditions on vessels navigating estuaries are governed, unless otherwise provided, by the Paris Agreement of 27 July 1950, as amended in Geneva on 21 May 1954 and 23 May 1963. As regards crews, Rhine vessels are subject to Chapter 14 of the Regulation on Inspection of Shipping on the Rhine (CCNR — 1976) which, on the stretches of the Rhine passing through the Netherlands, applies only to vessels crossing the German-Dutch border; other inland waterways vessels are governed by collective agreements.

⁽¹⁾ COM(75) 465 final of 10.9. 1975, as amended by COM(78) 363 final of 11. 7. 1979.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1512/83

by Mr Willy Vernimmen (S — B)

to the Council of the European Communities

(4 January 1984)

(84/C 84/31)

Subject: Trade balance between the EEC and Japan

At its meeting of 17 and 18 October 1983 the Council once more 'noted' that the balance of trade between the EEC and Japan was particularly unfavourable to Western Europe.

Once more, the substance of the message was simply that Japan was continuing to disregard the principles embodied in GATT and was keeping its mar-

kets closed to European products. The response by Europe is remarkable for its persistent naivety. Instead of taking action the Council is continuing to express pious hopes.

Can the Council indicate when it ultimately intends to bring the economic weight of Western Europe, the largest trading bloc in the world, to bear on this issue?

Answer

(29 February 1984)

The Council does not share the Honourable Member's view that the Council's strategy towards Japan has produced no results. The Japanese Government has just in particular announced new measures to stimulate domestic demand and to make it easier for foreign goods to be imported into Japan. It has also renewed for 1984 its assurances of moderation concerning Japanese exports of certain sensitive products to the Community.

The Council nevertheless considers that these measures are not sufficient to eliminate the persistent imbalance in trade between the Community and Japan. It considers in particular that substantial changes must be made in Japanese policy on buying foreign manufactured and processed products. The Council intends to continue its activities on the basis of the conclusions it worked out at its meetings in October and November 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1513/83

by Mr Willy Vernimmen (S — B)

to the Council of the European Communities

(4 January 1984)

(84/C 84/32)

Subject: Science and technology

On 17 and 18 October 1983, the Council adopted a decision establishing a research programme of the European Economic Community on forecasting and assessment in science and technology (FAST) 1983 to 1987.

The three central themes of the FAST II programme are as follows:

1. New forms of growth for Europe (in particular, the possible contributions of the new technologies to solving work and employment problems and the integrated development of renewable natural resource systems);
2. The transformation of service activities and technological change (the problems and opportunities in this area are of decisive long-term significance to Europe);
3. New strategic industrial systems; analysis of the significance for the future of Europe of the com-

munications sector (audiovisual equipment, cable networks and telecommunications) and the agri-foodstuffs sector in particular.

Can the Council explain its interpretation of the concept of 'new forms of growth' and indicate who, in its opinion, should help to determine what course this growth should take and what should be the function of the agri-foodstuffs sector?

Answer

(29 February 1984)

The FAST programme is a research programme whose main task is to analyse scientific and technological changes in order to bring out their long-term implications and consequences for research and development policy and for other Community policies.

As regards the 'Europe and new growth' research field which is of particular interest to the Honourable Member, the studies are concerned with the growth resulting from the use of new technologies and particularly the technology of communications and telecommunications, the services sector, the relations between technology, labour and employment and the integrated development of renewable natural resources, including the agri-foodstuffs industry.

On the basis of the results of these studies, in which both sides of industry are involved, political options relating to the development of Community activities can be examined in due course.

home production without this irregular practice coming to the attention of the appropriate Community bodies?

Does it not feel that this type of commercial operation infringes the rules on free competition and Community preference and moreover adversely affects a typical product of the least-favoured Mediterranean regions?

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

(13 February 1984)

It is true that the Netherlands is a major exporter of citrus fruit juice prepared for retail sale.

The Commission realizes that this can only be juice processed from imported fruit.

However, there is no legal objection to the market preparation and sale of imported raw materials as this does not interfere with freedom of competition.

With regard to Community preference, this would seem to be generally ensured: thanks to the aids paid, the quantity of fresh citrus fruit sent for processing to juice has increased sharply in recent years. In Italy it rose:

- (a) for oranges of the 'Biondo comune' and pigmented varieties, from 299 242 tonnes in 1978/79 to 583 986 tonnes in 1981/82,
- (b) for lemons, from 163 877 tonnes in 1977/78 to 414 802 tonnes in 1981/82.

EAGGF expenditure on aids for citrus fruit processing rose, for Italy only, during the corresponding periods, from 20,9 to 60,8 million ECU for oranges and from 10,1 to 31,0 million ECU for lemons.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1515/83

by Mr Roberto Costanzo (PPE — I)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 January 1984)

(84/C 84/33)

Subject: Dutch exports of citrus fruit juices onto the Community market

Is the Commission aware that Holland has become one of the principal exporters of citrus fruit juices, despite the fact that it does not grow such fruit on its own territory and that exports of citrus fruit from other EEC Member States onto the Dutch market are minimal?

Does the Commission not believe that citrus fruit juices marketed by certain Dutch firms originate from outside the Community and that these products are perhaps being re-exported in the guise of

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1529/83

by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L — B)

to the Council of the European Communities

(4 January 1984)

(84/C 84/34)

Subject: Case of Oleg Radzinsky, the militant pacifist sentenced in the USSR

Without wishing to interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign State which is a signatory to the Helsinki Agreements, it should be pointed out that the sentencing in Moscow of the militant pacifist Oleg Radzinsky to one year's imprisonment and five years' exile (in a Gulag) for defending his views casts doubt on the way in which the USSR complies with the Helsinki Agreements.

The Council of Ministers has undoubtedly made diplomatic representations to the Soviet authorities with regard to the defence of human and civic rights in this particular case. What form have these representations taken?

Answer (1)

(27 February 1984)

No representations have been made to date to the Soviet authorities on behalf of the Ten concerning Mr Oleg Radzinsky.

The representatives of the Ten in the course of representations made on numerous occasions to the Soviet authorities have reminded the latter of the commitments concerning respect for human rights and fundamental liberties entered into in the Final Act of Helsinki (1975) and reiterated in greater detail in the final document of the Madrid meeting (1983). Although, in the interests of effectiveness, these representations have for the most part been made discreetly, the Ten have also — in the framework of the CSCE procedure — stressed publicly the need to implement all aspects of the Helsinki and Madrid provisions in order to give full effect to the results of both Conferences and thus promote the process of improving security and cooperation in Europe. The Ten intend to continue their action in this regard and will certainly follow in this spirit the case of Mr Radzinsky.

(1) This reply has been provided by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, within whose province the question came.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1550/83
by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté (DEP — F)
to the Council of the European Communities

(4 January 1984)
(84/C 84/35)

Subject: Resumption of talks between the Community and GRULA (Group of Latin American Ambassadors)

Could the Council state whether talks between the Community and GRULA are to be resumed soon, and if so, when and on whose initiative?

Answer

(29 February 1984)

The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given by the Council to Written Question No 1399/83 put by Mr Pedini (1).

(1) OJ No C 52, 23. 2. 1984, p. 30.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1561/83
by Mr Brian Hord (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 January 1984)
(84/C 84/36)

Subject: Failure by Italy to comply with the Directive on cosmetics

In a reply to Mrs Squarcialupi's Written Question No 2030/82(1) to the Commission, dated 24 January 1983, an answer was given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission, dated 14 March 1983, to the effect that the Commission had been informed that a draft law is being debated in the Italian Parliament.

Would the Commission now indicate formally that the relevant legislation has been completed in the Italian Parliament and that in such circumstances all Member States of the Community have now fully complied with the relevant Directive on cosmetics?

(1) OJ No C 118, 3. 5. 1983, p. 24.

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission

(6 February 1984)

The Commission has noted that Italy has still not incorporated Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products (1) into Italian law, and it has therefore decided to initiate infringement proceedings against that Member State for failure to comply with the Judgment of the Court of Justice of 2 March 1982.

All the other Member States have incorporated the Directive into their law.

(1) OJ No L 262, 27. 9. 1976.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1566/83**by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(4 January 1984)**(84/C 84/37)*

Subject: Protectionist measures taken by the US against steel imports

Last July the US, disregarding the anti-protectionist stance adopted at the Williamsburg summit, decided to take protectionist measures against imports of special steels.

- Which Belgian undertakings have been affected by these measures, and what are the quantities involved?
- Has the Community succeeded in persuading the United States to accept the proposals for compensation drawn up within GATT?

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

(10 February 1984)

The Belgian firms affected by the US measures against imports of special steels are Alz and Henricot. Concerning the quantities delivered to the United States, the Commission regrets that, since these data relate to individual firms, it cannot give a reply to the Honourable Member.

As the US Government introduced its restrictive measures under Article XIX of GATT (safeguard clause), the Community entered into consultations with it to obtain compensation in the form of tariff

reductions on similar products. The result of these consultations was unsatisfactory. In consequence, and in conformity with the Council Decision of 29 November 1983, the Commission notified GATT, on 14 January 1983, of the list of counter-measures (increased customs duties and import quotas for certain products originating in the United States), which will enter into force within the 30-day period provided for in Article XIX. These counter-measures involve volumes of trade substantially equivalent to those affected by the US measures.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1570/83**by Mr André Damseaux (L — B)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(4 January 1984)**(84/C 84/38)*

Subject: Inspection assignments under Euratom and the IAEA

Could the Commission state the number and frequency of inspection assignments carried out by Euratom and the IAEA in Belgium in the course of the last five years?

Since the officials of the Nuclear Safeguards service who take part in these inspections encounter increasingly complex problems, would it not be appropriate to permit these officials to attend whenever the opportunity arises, courses, conferences or seminars organized by these European and international bodies concerned with nuclear matters?

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

(16 February 1984)

The number and the frequency of the inspections carried out by Euratom and the IAEA over the last five years in Belgium are set out in the following table:

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
— Number of inspections					
EUR	65	92	115	124	115
IAEA	47	65	98	111	110
— Average frequency ⁽¹⁾					
EUR	5,9	5,8	7,2	6,9	6,1
IAEA	4,7	8,1	7,5	7,4	6,1

In the Commission's view, there is nothing to prevent the Nuclear Safeguards officials from participating in courses, conferences or seminars held by Euratom and the IAEA. The Euratom Safeguards Service is continuing to develop its specific training programme for its inspectors, at its headquarters, as part of courses held by the Joint Research Centre at Ispra or as part of other courses held by Community institutions or institutions outside the Community (IAEA, Vienna, or the United States). The Belgian authorities, should they so desire, may get in touch in this connection with the Directorate for Euratom Safeguards of the Directorate-General for Energy in Luxembourg, which is responsible for organizing this training.

(1) Number of inspections divided by the number of installations inspected.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1573/83
by **Mr André Damseaux (L — B)**
to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 January 1984)
(84/C 84/39)

Subject: Damage to forests from acid rain

The increasingly extensive damage caused to forests by acid rain is posing serious economic, as well as environmental, problems.

Could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Has the EEC adopted urgent measures and taken suitable steps to limit the damage caused by acid rain?
2. Is any information available concerning those areas of Belgium where damage from acid rain has been officially recorded and, if so, what is the area of forest affected?

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission

(7 February 1984)

1. It is widely recognized that atmospheric pollution, notably by sulphur dioxide and oxides of nitrogen, contributes substantially to acid depositions which are thought to be responsible for serious damage to forests in several European countries.

In an effort to tackle this damage at its roots, the Commission has consolidated its campaign against air pollution by introducing measures designed to curb emissions of these pollutants and subject them to tighter controls.

In April 1983 the Commission presented a proposal for a Directive to the Council on the requirements that should be met prior to the authorization of new industrial plant, which would have to be equipped with the best technology available to minimize air pollution (1). The Council has yet to give its approval to this proposal.

A second proposal — aimed at controlling and reducing emissions from large combustion installations — has just been submitted to the Council (2). It calls for the application of Community emission standards to any new installation above a certain rating. This proposal for a Directive also provides for a reduction — by 1995 — in total emissions of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and particulates stemming from this category of plant by percentages specified in the Directive.

Other urgent measures planned by the Commission to tackle these emissions at source include a review of the Directive on the sulphur content of gas-oil, a re-examination of the old proposal on the sulphur content of fuel oils and the use thereof, a Directive on the burning of waste oils and proposals on the lead content of petrol and new emission standards for motor vehicles.

2. A study carried out by the Administration Belge des Eaux et Forêts in the spring of 1983 did not provide evidence of widespread damage to Belgian forests as a result of acid rain, although limited damage has been observed in the Hertogenwald.

However, since ground observers have as yet had scant experience of this type of damage to forests, the existence of more serious damage cannot be ruled out.

As matters stand, however, no precise estimate of the area of forest actually affected by acid rain has been made.

(1) OJ No C 139, 27. 5. 1983.

(2) COM(83) 721 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1578/83
by **Mr Leonidas Kyrkos (KOM — GR)**
to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 January 1984)
(84/C 84/40)

Subject: Programmes for restructuring the citrus fruit sector

In three Member States, Italy, Greece and France, citrus fruit producers, acting in accordance with the

provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 1204/82 ⁽¹⁾, submitted to the Commission programmes for converting and restructuring their citrus fruit sector.

The cost of implementing these programmes greatly exceeds the amount of 280 million ECU provided for by the Commission.

The special Committee on Agriculture which considered these programmes sent them back to the Member States to be adjusted to the amount provided for by the Commission, which is valid for the five-year period from 1983 to 1988.

Does the Commission consider that this move contributes to finding a solution to the problems of the citrus fruit sector in each country?

Is not the stipulation that the programmes should be adjusted to the amount provided for by the Commission, instead of increasing the amount to cover the requirements of the programmes, to be viewed as a half-measure which makes it impossible to find a genuine solution to the problems of the citrus fruit sector?

When will the Commission ever realize that the Community consists not only of the northern countries but of the Mediterranean countries as well?

What purpose is served by actions such as these or the recent statements by the relevant Commissioner to the effect that subsidies to citrus fruit and tomato producers are to be reduced this year?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 140, 20. 5. 1982, p. 38.

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

(10 February 1984)

On 21 November 1983 the Commission approved the citrus sector restructuring programmes drawn up by Italy, Greece and France (for Corsica). Under Article 2 of Regulation (EEC) No 2511/69 ⁽¹⁾, as amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1204/82 ⁽²⁾, the work involved in drawing up these plans was to be done in conjunction with the Commission, which might forward any recommendation to the Member State concerned.

In order to concentrate these Member States' efforts and hence make them more effective, they were

recommended to reduce the areas envisaged in their draft plans for conversion and restructuring. This made it possible to bring the estimated expenditure on the measures envisaged more into line with the 288,5 million ECU laid down in Article 3 of Regulation (EEC) No 1204/82 as the estimated cost of the EAGGF.

The Commission's attitude is also to be seen in the light of the very small degree of progress made by Italy and France on the plans approved by the Commission in 1973 under the initial version of Regulation (EEC) No 2511/69. It was thus the Commission's duty to ensure that greater success would attend the new provisions introduced by Regulation (EEC) No 1204/82 when new plans were drawn up.

The Commission therefore cannot agree that it has not undertaken the action necessary for effectively improving structures in the citrus sector.

It should also be pointed out that, under the new version of Article 1 (2) of Regulation (EEC) No 2511/69, the Council reserved the right to decide, before 31 December 1988 and on a proposal from the Commission, to extend the time limit for the measures concerned beyond that date.

As regards the 'recent statements by the relevant Commissioner', the Commission supposes that the Honourable Member is referring to its communication to the Council on the common agricultural policy, included in COM(83) 500 final of 28 July 1983.

The Commission would point out that this communication did not envisage reducing aid to tomato producers. It simply made the point that a guarantee threshold had already been fixed for tomato processing aid, at the equivalent of 4,5 million tonnes of fresh tomatoes.

The aid in the citrus sector too is for processing and not an aid to producers. The intention is to prevent the aids concerned leading to undue processing of products which could equally well be consumed fresh.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 318, 18. 12. 1969, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 140, 20. 5. 1982, p. 38.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1580/83**by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S — B)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(4 January 1984)**(84/C 84/41)*

Subject: Effect of the Liège earthquake on the Tihange nuclear power station

The unusually violent earthquake which shook the Liège region seems not to have had any effect so far on the Tihange power station. Nevertheless, the people of the Huy area cannot fail to be alarmed at the closeness of the critical zone.

If such a violent earthquake had taken place at Huy, what would the effects have been?

In the light of the progress made in its research at Ispra, could the Commission carry out a simulation of such an incident and draw up a detailed report with safety recommendations in this respect?

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

(10 February 1984)

As part of the licensing procedure for nuclear power stations, the Belgian authorities request the Commission to participate in the safety analysis in an advisory capacity; under this arrangement the Commission transmitted to the Belgian safety authorities in 1981 a safety assessment report on Tihange nuclear power station unit 2, which was drawn up by a committee of experts brought together by the Commission.

This report deals in particular with the protection of the power station against earthquakes, seismic protection being covered in Belgium by regulations based on the relevant US rules. The problem of the Tihange site was examined by highly-qualified experts who recommended specific values for the intensity of the maximum potential earthquakes to be taken into consideration in the design of the plant and, consequently, for the maximum acceleration its structures should be able to withstand. These values were based on a thorough geological and seismo-tectonic examination of the site and on the earthquake history of the Tihange and adjacent areas.

Our conclusion of the experts' report, however, is that the earthquake which recently shook the city of Liège cannot be directly transposed to the Tihange power station, which is situated in an different seismic-tectonic zone. Any nuclear power station sited in the same seismic zone as Liège would have to satisfy more stringent requirements than those adopted for the Tihange area.

Using the maximum earthquake intensity values adopted for the site, constructors have to ensure that buildings and systems which are important for safety effectively withstand such conditions. Under its research programme the JRC has conducted, and is continuing to conduct, studies on the behaviour of structures in dynamic conditions; it could therefore make a contribution to any mathematic analyses of the behaviour of buildings during earthquakes. With the facilities currently at its disposal, however, it is not able to simulate the effects of an earthquake on existing buildings or structures.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1595/83**by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté (DEP — F)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(4 January 1984)**(84/C 84/42)*

Subject: Use of resolutions by the Council

Following its reply to Written Question No 451/83⁽¹⁾ by Mr Dieter Rogalla, can the Commission say how many resolutions have been adopted by the Council since 1958 (year by year)?

Does it consider this form of action to be effective and, if so, does it intend to promote it, and how?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 246, 14. 9. 1983, p. 12.

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

(17 February 1984)

The Honourable Member is asked to address his question on Council resolutions to the institution concerned.

The Commission considers that Council resolutions which define broad Council policy in a given field can make a useful contribution to the decision-making process. A number of Commission communications to the Council are designed to encourage the adoption of such policy guidelines.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1604/83**by Mr James Moorhouse (ED — GB)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(4 January 1984)**(84/C 84/43)*

Subject: Cheap flights from Berlin

As a result of a misunderstanding between the Commission and myself, Written Question No 416/83 ⁽¹⁾ was answered in the same manner as Oral Question H-146/83 ⁽²⁾, whereas I thought the Written Question would receive a full answer. I would therefore put the same question to the Commission:

1. In response to Written Questions No 1546/80 ⁽³⁾ and No 1543/82 ⁽⁴⁾ (supplementary answer), the Commission states that Community legislation on dumping does not apply to services and that it therefore cannot take action concerning the predatory nature of Interflug's encroachment on the Berlin-to-Greece charter market. In an earlier reply to Written Question No 1546/80 the Commission stated that it was 'collecting the information needed to answer the Honourable Member's questions'.
2. Would the Commission explain why it has taken over two years to furnish a simple reply on the existence or not of Community rules on the subject?
3. What was the nature of the information being sought, and what information has the Commission already collected?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 216, 11. 8. 1983, p. 26.

⁽²⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, Annex to the Official Journal, No 1-300, 8. 6. 1983, p. 179.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 345, 31. 12. 1980, p. 32.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 118, 3. 5. 1983, p. 1.

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

(17 February 1984)

As the Commission stated in its reply to Oral Question No H-146/83 by the Honourable Member, the Commission had understood, following contacts with the author of Written Question No 1546/80, that no further reaction on its part was necessary. It is not therefore the case that the Commission took over two years to furnish a reply.

The Commission is in a position to add the following elements to its replies to previous questions on this subject.

The Commission was approached again on this matter in July 1982 by the Association of the European Independent Airlines. Informal contacts were then taken up with United Kingdom officials because the airlines affected by the practices of the Eastern bloc airlines were British.

As a result of this exchange of views, it was agreed, in consideration of the Commission's lack of possibilities for action, as described in the answer to

Written Question No 1543/82, that the United Kingdom authorities would deal with the matter themselves.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1608/83
by Mr James Moorhouse (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(9 January 1984)

(84/C 84/44)

Subject: Flight data recorders

A recent editorial in *Flight International* magazine ⁽¹⁾ pointed out the failure of the US Government to require all aircraft over 12 500 lb to carry digital flight data recorders with at least 10 parameters as is the case in the United Kingdom.

Will the Commission propose legislation to harmonize the requirements as to flight data recorders within the Community, and will it extend such legislation to include all aircraft operating within the Community from 1990?

⁽¹⁾ Week ending 15 October 1983, Volume 124, Number 3884.

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

(16 February 1984)

The Commission does not contemplate action in this area.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1612/83
by Mr Jacques Denis (COM — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(9 January 1984)

(84/C 84/45)

Subject: European Development Fund projects

Can the Commission state how contracts are allocated to undertakings in the various Member States, third countries and ACP States, and give details of the sums involved for each project?

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

(21 February 1984)

The Commission is transmitting directly to the Honourable Member and to the Parliament Secretariat statistical tables showing the breakdown between Member States, ACP States and third countries, as at 30 September 1983, of purchasing and other contracts financed respectively from the currently operational fourth and fifth European Development Funds.

With regard to a detailed statement of the sums involved for each project, the Commission would request the Honourable Member to refer to the invitation to tender results published in the *Supplement to the Official Journal of the European Communities*, for example for the last three years for which such results have been compiled:

- for 1980, in OJ No S 161 of 24 August 1981,
- for 1981, in OJ No S 191 of 4 October 1982,
- for 1982, in OJ No S 91 of 16 May 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1614/83

by Mrs Marlene Lenz (PPE — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 January 1984)
(84/C 84/46)

Subject: List of research projects commissioned

Can the Commission supply a detailed list of all research projects into women's issues commissioned since 1979, giving the titles, contents, initiators and costs of the research projects?

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

(16 February 1984)

The Commission is not in a position to supply an exact and exhaustive list of all research projects and studies directly or indirectly concerning the situation of women which have been carried out with its financial assistance since 1979. In addition to the studies initiated by the Commission, certain limited financial contributions are made towards other research projects which the Commission wishes to encourage.

Most of the studies begun since 1982 have been financed in the framework of the Action Programme

on the Promotion of Equal Opportunities for Women (1982 to 1985) ⁽¹⁾. The Progress Report on the implementation of this programme ⁽²⁾, which has already been transmitted to the Parliament, indicates the studies and research projects which are finalized or under way — some of which have already been transmitted to the European Parliament.

⁽¹⁾ COM(81) 758 final.

⁽²⁾ COM(83) 781 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1618/83

by Mrs Hanna Walz (PPE — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 January 1984)
(84/C 84/47)

Subject: Food preservation by radioactive irradiation

1. In which Community Member States is food preservation by radioactive ray treatment:

- (a) expressly allowed;
- (b) prohibited or subject to licence;
- (c) not regulated?

2. Does the Commission know in which States, and for which products, this preservation technique is mainly used?

3. Is it the Commission's view that the ban on sales of irradiated food applying in the Federal Republic of Germany puts the agricultural and food-stuffs industries exporting to the Federal Republic from other Community States at a competitive disadvantage?

4. Does the Commission consider it necessary to formulate rules at Community level to provide health protection for consumers and/or ensure competitive equality?

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

(7 February 1984)

1 and 2. The Honourable Member should refer to the answer given by the Commission to Written Question No 1398/83 by Mr Schmid ⁽¹⁾, ⁽²⁾.

3 and 4. At present, some Member States prohibit the use of irradiation for food-processing purposes, whereas others allow it to be used only for certain products. The Commission considers that trading problems will inevitably increase as irradiation is used more and more frequently to preserve food-

stuffs, particularly where national authorities permit its use for different products. It is, therefore, of the opinion that some form of Community action is essential, not only to facilitate free trade in food-stuffs, but also to protect the health of the consumer.

(1) OJ No C 47, 22. 1. 1982, p. 27.

(2) OJ No C 339, 27. 12. 1982, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1632/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 January 1984)

(84/C 84/48)

Subject: Sprat fishing

Under the terms of Regulation (EEC) No 2817/83⁽¹⁾ the Norwegians have been allocated 40 000 tonnes of sprats as part of the agreed fishing quota in area ICES IV. As sprat fishing in parts of the ICES IV area is banned during the winter months, and the Regulation covers 1983 fishing, can the Commission explain whether or not the Norwegians are constrained by the same rules, or if there has been no discussion of this with the Norwegians?

If the Norwegians are constrained by the measures intended to restrict fishing access for EEC fishermen, can the Commission indicate why such restrictions do not form a part of the Regulation agreed on 4 October 1983?

(1) OJ No L 278, 11. 10. 1983, p. 1.

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

(20 February 1984)

Regulations on technical measures relating to fishing in the Community's fishery zone are applied on a non-discriminatory basis and thus are equally applicable to Community and third country fishermen. Therefore the restrictions on sprat fishing referred to by the Honourable Member and contained in Article 9 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 172/83 ⁽¹⁾ were in force in 1983 for Norwegian as well as Community fishermen.

As is the customary practice, the Council's adoption of this Regulation was notified to the Norwegian authorities in conformity with the Framework Agreement on Fisheries between the Community and Norway, which provides that each party shall inform the other of the introduction of fishery

regulations in its fishery zone. This notification procedure has operated to date to the mutual satisfaction of both parties.

Consequently, both parties consider it unnecessary to repeat all the fishery regulations in force in each other's zone in the texts of, for instance, the Council Regulations authorizing Norwegian vessels to fish agreed quotas in the Community's fishery zone.

(1) OJ No L 24, 27. 1. 1983, p. 30.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1659/83

by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 January 1984)

(84/C 84/49)

Subject: Community pressure on South African Government

What progress has the Commission made with the detailed study of the methods by which the Community could exert peaceful pressure on the Government of South Africa by political or economic means, including the effects of specific and limited sanctions, which was called for in paragraphs 16 and 17 of the resolution on southern Africa adopted by Parliament on 9 February 1983⁽¹⁾?

(1) OJ No C 68, 14. 3. 1983, p. 43.

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

(15 February 1984)

The Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the Commission's answer to Written Question No 41/83 by Mr Lezzi ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission continues to attach special importance to the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference's regional programmes, which are designed to encourage economic cooperation between members of the Conference and reduce their economic dependence on South Africa.

In this context, the Commission plans, under the auspices of the SADCC, to hold talks with the southern African States most directly concerned.

(1) OJ No C 212, 8. 8. 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1670/83

**by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck (S — B)
to the Council of the European Communities**

(17 January 1984)
(84/C 84/50)

Subject: The International Convention on the Law of the Sea

At its meeting of 21 and 22 February 1983 the Council fixed the working programme for the group of senior officials examining the 'Law of the Sea'. Can the Council supply a detailed list of the representatives from the Member States and the European Commission sitting in this group?

What problems related to the Convention on the Law of the Sea has this group already examined in connection with the task of achieving coordination at Community level? What have been the results? When, and on what subjects, is this group going to submit proposals to the Council?

Answer

(29 February 1984)

The working party of senior officials on the law of the sea consists of a representative of each Member State and Commission and Council officials. The latter act as the working party's secretariat.

The working party's terms of reference as adopted by the Council at its meeting on 21 and 22 February 1983 cover in particular the following points:

1. Development of the law of the sea and its effects on common policies;
2. Participation by the Community and its Member States in the Convention on the Law of the Sea;
3. Proceedings of the preparatory commission;
4. Declarations and statements provided for under Article 310 of the Convention;
5. Other matters.

The working party held a number of meetings during 1983 particularly concerning point 3 above.

It prepared for the proceedings of both sides at the first session of the preparatory commission of the International Seabed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, coordinated Member States' positions on the spot and assessed the situation at the end of each half-session.

The working party's meetings enabled joint positions to be worked out on the questions examined by the preparatory commission, namely on the structure of that body. The Member States, which had shown considerable unity during the negotiations with the other participants at the session, were able to see the candidate of the WEOG (Western European and Others Group) elected to the post of chair-

man of the third committee and to have their ideas accepted on many points concerning the rules of procedure of the preparatory commission, particularly as regards the status of observers and the status, after signing, of bodies (including the EEC) other than States which were entitled to sign the Convention.

At its second session from 19 March to 13 April 1984, the preparatory commission will begin examining the questions of substance referred to it, including the protection of preparatory investments. The working party will examine these questions and that of the mining code before the beginning of the second session on the basis of the conclusions worked out by the seabed experts.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1672/83

**by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck (S — B)
to the Council of the European Communities**

(17 January 1984)
(84/C 84/51)

Subject: Lung cancer in women

The number of women dying of lung cancer in the Member States of the European Community is increasing enormously. For example, according to recent studies, the number of cases of lung cancer in women in Belgium went up eight fold between 1955 and 1978. The main reason given is the continual rise in the number of women smokers.

Is the Council aware of this disturbing development? Does the Council not take the view that action against smoking must be based on health education? If so, what steps has the Council already taken to coordinate and improve the existing national information campaigns? What have the results of such action been? What further moves is the Council going to make to counter the meteoric rise in lung cancer which is the result of changing smoking habits? Does the Council propose to ban tobacco advertising? If so, what form of advertising, where and when?

Answer

(29 February 1984)

As the Council stated in its reply to Written Question No 375/83, at the meeting of the Council and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting within the Council on 16

November 1978, the Ministers of Health discussed the policies to be implemented in the field of health education, *inter alia* as regards smoking.

On that occasion they adopted a number of conclusions as regards introducing common methods to compare results and assess the efficiency of health education campaigns, the elaboration of a common position on advertising, exchanges of information on the measures taken, etc., and asked the Commission to help organize these activities.

Since the Commission is responsible for providing such assistance and since no proposals have yet been forwarded to the Council, the Council does not have the information requested by the Honourable Member and has been unable to discuss what measures should be taken.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1675/83

by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 January 1984)

(84/C 84/52)

Subject: Minimum wages in particular industries

Will the Commission list those bodies in Member States which are empowered to fix minimum wages in particular industries (like the Wages Councils in the United Kingdom), indicating their areas of competence?

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

(17 February 1984)

The only Member State (besides the United Kingdom) where statutory bodies, similar to the United Kingdom's Wages Councils ⁽¹⁾, are empowered to fix minimum wages in particular industries is Ireland where such bodies are called Joint Labour Committees ⁽²⁾. In both Member States such bodies are competent not only to fix statutory minimum remuneration to be paid by employers, but also other terms and conditions of employment for workers in industries where effective regulation of pay for the workers concerned does not exist, or is likely to cease to exist or be adequate.

It must also be noted that five Member States, viz. Belgium, France, Greece, Luxembourg and the

Netherlands, currently operate a legal national minimum wage.

(1) Aerated Waters Wages Council; Boot and Shoe Repairing Wages Council; Button Manufacturing Wages Council; Clothing Manufacturing Wages Council; Coffin Furniture and Cerement Making Wages Council; Cotton Waste Reclamation Wages Council; Flax and Hemp Wages Council; Fur Wages Council; General Waste Material Reclamation Wages Council; Hairdressing Undertakings Wages Council; Hat, Cap and Millinery Wages Council; Lace Finishing Wages Council; Laundry Wages Council; Licensed Non-residential Establishment Wages Council; Licensed Residential Establishment and Licensed Restaurant Wages Council; Linen and Cotton Handkerchief and Household Goods and Linen Piece Goods Wages Council; Made-up Textiles Wages Council; Ostrich and Fancy Feather and Artificial Flower Wages Council; Perambulator and Invalid Carriage Wages Council; Retail Bespoke Tailoring Wages Council; Retail Food and Allied Trades Wages Council; Retail Trades (Non-Food) Wages Council; Rope, Twine and Net Wages Council; Sack and Bag Wages Council; Toy Manufacturing Wages Council; Unlicensed Place of Refreshment Wages Council.

(2) Aerated Waters and Wholesale Bottling Joint Labour Committee; Agricultural Workers Joint Labour Committee; Boot and Shoe Repairing Joint Labour Committee; Brush and Broom Joint Labour Committee; Button Making Joint Labour Committee; Catering Joint Labour Committee; General Waste Materials Reclamation Joint Labour Committee; Hairdressing Joint Labour Committee; Hairdressing (Cork Co. Borough) Joint Labour Committee; Handkerchief and Household Piece Goods Joint Labour Committee; Hotels Joint Labour Committee; Law Clerks Joint Labour Committee; Messengers (Cork City Area) Joint Labour Committee; Messengers (Dublin City and Dun Laoghaire) Joint Labour Committee; Messengers (Limerick City) Joint Labour Committee; Messengers (Waterford City) Joint Labour Committee; Provender Milling Joint Labour Committee; Shirtmaking Joint Labour Committee; Tailoring Joint Labour Committee; Women's Clothing and Millinery Joint Labour Committee.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1736/83

by Mr Robert Battersby (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 January 1984)

(84/C 84/53)

Subject: Council Directive on the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances

Will the Commission confirm that a proper interpretation of Article 7 (3) prohibits the publication of the list of substances kept by the Commission under Article 13 (2) of the Sixth Amendment, all of which have in any case undergone a full hazard assessment?

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

(13 February 1984)

Article 7 (3) of Directive 79/831/EEC ⁽¹⁾ requires Member States and the Commission to keep secret certain information concerning the manufacturing and marketing of chemical substances. This article does not prohibit publication of the list of chemical substances as envisaged by the Commission.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 259, 15. 10. 1979.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1790/83

by Mr Thomas Megahy (S — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 January 1984)

(84/C 84/54)

Subject: New textile industry area scheme

Would the Commission please report on the progress that has been made towards implementation of the new regional development measure contributing to overcoming constraints on the development of new economic activities in certain zones adversely

affected by restructuring of the textile and clothing industry?

Would it also please state when it expects to be able to make the first allocation of funds to hard-hit areas like the West Yorkshire textile industry area?

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

(15 February 1984)

On 18 January 1984, the Council adopted Regulation (EEC) No 219/84 instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to overcoming constraints on the development of new economic activities in certain zones adversely affected by the restructuring of the textile and clothing industry ⁽¹⁾.

In order to implement this measure, according to Article 3 of this Regulation, Member States concerned are required to present the Commission with special programmes which must be approved by the Commission.

Allocations of the Fund in respect of this measure can be made as soon as the conditions laid down in Article 6 of the Regulation are fulfilled.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 27, 31. 1. 1984, p. 22.

THE FINANCES OF EUROPE

Daniel STRASSER

Preface by Christopher TUGENDHAT

The finances of Europe are one of the Community's major concerns since they largely determine the activities in which the Community can engage.

The general budget of the European Communities has steadily grown in political importance over the years.

The European Parliament, which has now acquired greater budget powers, has given the budget pride of place in its business and preoccupations.

In this book, Daniel Strasser, the Director-General for Budgets in the Commission of the European Communities, paints a very comprehensive picture of how the Community budgets are prepared and implemented and explains their significance. The total amount of funds involved now stands at 10 billion pounds sterling — 11 billion Irish pounds.

Daniel Strasser holds a doctorate in economics and degrees in the law of public administration and political studies from the University of Paris. He also holds an honorary doctorate from the University of Oviedo and is a lauréat of the Institut de France (Académie des sciences morales et politiques). After a period from 1953 to 1958 in which he was assigned to the Office of the French Council of Ministers (Office of the Secretary-General of the French Government), Mr Strasser joined the Commission of the European Economic Community as Principal Administrator in the Executive Secretariat (1958), and graduated to Assistant to the Director-General for Administration (1959—1963) and Director for Internal Affairs (1963-1968). After the merger of the Executives, he was Director for Administration (1968-1969), Director for Personnel (1970-1972) and Director for Budgets (1973-1977). He has been Director-General for Budgets since 1977. Since 1978, Mr Strasser has been Vice-Chairman of the Executive Bureau of the College of Europe in Bruges.

Published in: Danish, Dutch, English, German, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish.

ISBN 92-825-2072-2

Catalogue number: CB-30-80-980-EN-C

Price (excluding VAT and postage) in Luxembourg: 12.50 ECU; UKL 7; IRL 8.75; USD 17; BFR 525.

OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg