

Considerable progress has been made in improving and harmonizing environmental policy and legislation in the Community, but it is inevitable that Member States have sought to go even further by imposing stricter environmental standards for their most vulnerable areas.

Where this is the case, the yeast manufacturers are in a similar position to the other manufacturers located in the areas concerned and the Commission cannot see any justification for an exception to be granted.

2. When the Council decided in April 1995, with Regulation (EEC) No 1101/95 amending Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81 on the common organization of the market in the sugar sector and Regulation (EEC) No 1010/86 laying down general rules for the production refund on certain sugar products used in the chemical industry <sup>(1)</sup>, after consulting the Parliament, to extend the common market organization in the sugar sector for a further six years until 30 June 2001, it also examined the possibility of including yeast as an eligible product for receiving the production refund which is granted for the manufacture of certain chemical industry products in accordance with Regulation (EEC) No 1010/86 of 25 March 1986 laying down general rules for the production refund on certain sugar products used in the chemical industry <sup>(2)</sup>.

In view of the important effects, both positive and negative, that inclusion would have on the functioning of the common market organization in the sugar sector directly concerned by any change to the production refund rules, the Council felt that no decision should be taken without first consulting the competent experts meeting in the management committee for sugar.

3. The consultation took place in February 1996 and the management committee for sugar concluded that the best course of action, in view of concerns over possible market distortions in the sales of glucose, molasses and sugar, would be to postpone any decision for a further two marketing years, after which the situation will once again be reviewed. The production refund arrangements applicable in the cereals sector have similarly continued to exclude yeast as an eligible product.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 94, 9.4.1986.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 110, 17.5.1995.

(98/C 174/73)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-3283/97**

**by Leonie van Bladel (UPE) to the Council**

*(21 October 1997)*

*Subject:* Lack of hospital care for elderly people following cardiac catheterization operations

1. Does the Council agree that after a cardiac catheterization operation on a middle-aged person the hospital should keep the patient in for observation for at least two days, as recommended by the Nederlandse Hartstichting (Dutch heart foundation)? A hospital in Amsterdam recently failed to observe this, with the result that the patient died.
2. Can the Council indicate where this rule is set out?
3. Can the Council guarantee that this rule is strictly observed in all the Member States?
4. Can the Council confirm that the growing number of elderly persons, whose efforts brought about the economic rise of Europe, do not become the victims of the purely economic policy of hospitals and are allowed to stay in hospital, under expert nursing supervision, for two days after a cardiac catheterization operation?

**Answer**

*(26 February 1998)*

The issue raised by the Honourable Member is not the subject of provisions adopted pursuant to the Treaties.