

(98/C 158/63)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-3184/97****by Riitta Myller (PSE) to the Commission***(16 October 1997)*

*Subject:* Public health effects of the new school milk subsidy

The Council has urged the Commission to add soured milk (Sw. filmjöljk, Fin. viili) to the list of products eligible for the school milk subsidy. Under the Commission's proposal for an amendment to the regulation, only villi made from whole milk would receive the subsidy. However, in Finland, for example, villi is never made from whole milk, because consumers want lower-fat and thus healthier products.

How does the Commission justify its proposal to subsidise the use of fat? How does the Commission's proposal for an amendment to the school milk subsidy promote public health in the EU's Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Fischler on behalf of the Commission***(4 December 1997)*

In proposing the inclusion of the products 'viili/fil' in the list of products eligible for the school milk subsidy under Council Regulation (EEC) No 1842/83 of 30 June 1983 laying down general rules for the supply of milk and certain milk products at reduced prices to schoolchildren<sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission wished to ensure a position similar to that of yoghurt, in view of the similarities of these products. Moreover, since the school milk scheme was reformed in 1993, the programme has been centred on drinking milk, so as to improve the effectiveness of the scheme and safeguard the position of this basic product. Schoolchildren wishing to reduce their consumption of butterfat can therefore opt for semi-skimmed milk, which is also subsidised under the scheme.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 183, 7.7.1983.

(98/C 158/64)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-3189/97****by Magda Aelvoet (V) to the Commission***(16 October 1997)*

*Subject:* Building of a cafeteria in the Habitat area of 'De Demervallei' (Flanders)

In view of the fact that:

1. the Flemish wetlands area of 'De Demervallei' is a nature conservation area according to the Flemish Government's Decision of January 17, 1988, within the meaning of European Directive 79/409/EEC of April 2, 1979, concerning the protection of birds<sup>(1)</sup>;
2. Directive 92/43/EEC<sup>(2)</sup> incorporating Directive 79/409/EEC states that an environmental impact assessment study must be carried out for development plans affecting nature conservation areas;
3. the organization Intercommunale Schulens Meer (ISM), which has a concession on the use of the water surface of the nature conservation area mentioned above) for leisure and sport activities has planned the construction of a cafeteria costing about 40 million BEF in Lummen, at the water's edge;
4. for that purpose, ISM has obtained from the Flemish Government a building permit, which does not even mention that the building would be situated in the nature conservation area, and ignores the strongly negative opinion given by the Department of Nature Conservation of the Flemish Government itself;
5. ISM has applied for European funding to carry out this project, and has presented it as a 'nature education centre', although it is not in fact any kind of 'education centre' (the only infrastructure which could be described as an 'education centre' is an exhibition room even smaller than the lavatories!),

does the Commission intend to allow this project to be financed?