

Official Journal

of the European Communities

Volume 19 No C 49

3 March 1976

English Edition

Information and Notices

Contents

I *Information*

European Parliament

Written Questions:

No 376/75 by Mr Broeks to the Commission Subject: Procurement of computers by the British Government and nationalized British industry	1
No 460/75 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission Subject: Regional Funds allotted to the UK Government	2
No 467/75 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission Subject: Minority languages in the Community	2
No 489/75 by Mr Della Briotta to the Commission Subject: Currency regulations adversely affecting migrant workers	3
No 499/75 by Mr Willi Müller to the Commission Subject: Disposal of radioactive waste	4
No 502/75 by Mr Gibbons to the Commission Subject: Classification of carcase beef	5
No 510/75 by Mr Bordu to the Commission Subject: Unemployment and industrial 'redeployment'	6
No 512/75 by Mr Ansart to the Commission Subject: Crisis in the iron and steel industry	7
No 513/75 by Mr Lemoine to the Commission Subject: Armaments production in the Federal Republic of Germany	9
No 519/75 by Mr Laban to the Commission Subject: The suspension of compliance with international obligations with particular reference to the European Communities	9

Contents (continued)

No 531/75 by Mr Laban to the Commission	
Subject: Prices of beef and veal and pigmeat	11
No 554/75 by Mr Glinne and Mr Dondelinger to the Commission	
Subject: The European Community and Venice	11
No 558/75 by Mr Cousté to the Commission	
Subject: Loans issued by the EEC or its specialized bodies	12
No 559/75 by Mr Cousté to the Commission	
Subject: Harmonization of the rules governing the extraction and marketing of mineral waters	13
No 568/75 by Mr Osborn to the Commission	
Subject: Employment in the public sector	14
No 573/75 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission	
Subject: Help to raspberry producers	15
No 587/75 by Mr Gibbons to the Commission	
Subject: National aids for agricultural production	16
No 591/75 by Mr Seefeld to the Commission	
Subject: Drinking and driving	17
No 599/75 by Mr Calewaert to the Commission	
Subject: Protection of Belgian birdlife	17
No 604/75 by Mr Seefeld to the Commission	
Subject: Delays in African and Asian ports	18
No 610/75 by Mr Jahn to the Commission	
Subject: Construction of nuclear reactors in the USA and USSR	20
No 624/75 by Mr Seefeld to the Commission	
Subject: Thefts of motor vehicles	21
No 627/75 by Mr Nolan to the Commission	
Subject: Economic planning in the Community	22
No 629/75 by Mr Howell to the Commission	
Subject: Average producer's selling price for wheat	22
No 634/75 by Mr Lenihan to the Commission	
Subject: Deportation for crime	23
No 646/75 by Miss Boothroyd to the Commission	
Subject: New European Social Fund	24

II *Preparatory Acts*

Commission

Proposal for a Directive amending Council Directive 75/271/EEC of 28 April 1975 concerning the Community list of less-favoured farming areas within the meaning of Directive 75/268/EEC (France)	26
--	----

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTION No 376/75

by Mr Broeks

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 September 1975)

Subject: Procurement of computers by the British Government and nationalized British industry

According to press reports, in particular in the 'Economist' of 31 May 1975 (p. 66), the British Department of Industry has been trying to prevent a computer requirement for the British Export Credit Guarantee Department from going to open tender. Instead, the contract was to be given to the British computer firm ICL. The same report also stated that the British Government was expected to put great pressure on the nationalized industries to order ICL equipment.

The Commission is therefore asked to answer the following questions:

1. Does it share the view of the author of this question that the use of such pressure by the British Government must be regarded as conflicting with the principles of the common market? If not, why not?
2. Is the Commission prepared to keep a close watch to ensure that the British Government does not give preferential treatment to the British computer firm ICL *vis-à-vis* other Community manufacturers, and to take the necessary steps to ensure that such preferential treatment is stopped? If not, why not?

Answer

(2 February 1976)

1. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to Directive 70/50/EEC ⁽¹⁾ which makes it quite clear that the Commission regards measures which 'encourage . . . the purchase of domestic products only' as incompatible with Article 30 of the EEC Treaty.
2. The Commission has approached the British Government in this matter and asked it for its comments.

⁽¹⁾ Cf. Article 2 (3) (k) read in conjunction with the second recital of Commission Directive 70/50/EEC of 22 December 1969 (OJ No L 13, 19. 1. 1970, p. 29).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 460/75

by Mrs Ewing

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 October 1975)

Subject: Regional Funds allotted to the UK Government

In view of the evidence that the UK Government has regarded and used allotted Regional Funds as a payment for its own responsibilities and not as an addition, what measures will the Commission take to bring pressure on the UK Government to use the funds allotted to the UK Government by the Regional Fund for the purposes, for which they were intended?

Answer

(23 January 1976)

In the preamble of Council Regulation (EEC) No 724/75 of 18 March 1975 establishing a European Regional Development Fund ⁽¹⁾, all Member States have subscribed to the principle that the Fund's assistance should not lead the Member States to reduce their own regional development efforts but should complement those efforts. Since then all Member States, including the United Kingdom, have reaffirmed their adherence to this principle. The ways of putting this into effect are currently under discussion within the Regional Policy Committee. As far as the United Kingdom is concerned, the British Government announced on 24 September 1975 a set of measures designed to deal with the problem of

underemployment, including an extra allocation of £ 20 million to the advance factory programme; in deciding the size of this programme the government took account of its expected receipts from the Regional Development Fund.

Furthermore, in accordance with Article 6 (6) of the abovementioned Regulation, Member States must provide the Commission at the beginning of each year with all useful information concerning the resources which they have decided to allocate, or which they propose to allocate, to the development of their regions. This information should assist the Commission to assess the use that has been made of the money granted from the Fund.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 73, 21. 3. 1975, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 467/75

by Mrs Ewing

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 October 1975)

Subject: Minority languages in the Community

What is the policy of the Commission to minority languages in the EEC Member States, such as Scots Gaelic, Welsh, Irish, Basque and Breton? Is any research being done into ways of fostering such languages and cultures in view of the damaging effect of modern mass media usually conducted in majority languages?

Answer*(27 January 1976)*

The Commission is bound by the Treaties which limit the official languages of the Community institutions to six. Acts of the Community are therefore issued in these languages. The Treaties themselves were also translated into Irish.

The Commission does of course take account of the contribution which the wealth of inter-related popular traditions and cultures makes the quality of life of the European Community and research is now being carried out into those aspects of local heritage which unite the Community's regions despite the distances which divide them.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 489/75**by Mr Della Briotta****to the Commission of the European Communities***(29 October 1975)*

Subject: Currency regulations adversely affecting migrant workers

1. Is the Commission aware that before finally leaving the country, an Italian married couple in their sixties who had worked all their lives in the United Kingdom were made to give up about £ 8 000, which represented the entire savings of two migrant workers after many years of hard work?

2. Does the Commission not feel that a currency regulation which bears so harshly on simple workers is unjust and unnecessarily persecutory?

3. Can the Commission indicate whether the currency provisions on which this abuse is based are applied with similar strictness against representatives of multinational firms with plants in the United Kingdom?

4. What does the Commission feel it can do to put an end to such deplorable cases?

Answer*(23 January 1976)*

1. The Commission read reports of the case referred to by the Honourable Member in the British press on 8 October 1975.

2, 3 and 4. Under Community rules there are no restrictions on 'transfers of capital belonging to

emigrants returning to their country of origin' (cf. Article 1 of the first Directive of 11 May 1960 ⁽¹⁾).

The United Kingdom agreed to liberalize these transactions when it became a member of the

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 43, 12. 7. 1960, p. 921/60.

Community but it, like other Member States, has exchange controls which limit the amount of capital which can be exported in the form of banknotes. The limit imposed in the United Kingdom is £ 25 per person. The Italian couple contravened these regulations by attempting to take £ 8 500 in banknotes with them and were therefore liable to the penalties specified in the regulations.

There would have been no problem whatsoever if the money had been transferred through an approved bank.

It would appear that the couple were unaware of the fact that they were quite free to transfer their savings to Italy. The incident underlines the need for an information service along the lines advocated by the Commission in its Action Programme. This would not only provide migrant workers with continuous information on living and working conditions in the host country but would also make them aware of their rights and obligations.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 499/75

by Mr Willi Müller

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 November 1975)

Subject: Disposal of radioactive waste

1. What is the Commission's reaction to the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority's intention as announced in its annual report, to begin solidifying radioactive wastes into glass and dumping them on the sea bed or underground, departing from previous procedure?
2. Is the Commission familiar with this method of radioactive waste disposal being developed in Britain?
3. What is the Commission's opinion of the process in terms of environmental safety, and is it intended, if the process proves workable, to get other Member States of the Community to store radioactive wastes on the same principle?

Answer

(23 January 1976)

1. Most countries with a nuclear industry are considering underground storage of vitrified waste as a possible solution to the disposal problem.
2. The Commission would agree with the experts that storage of high-activity waste in solid form, and particularly in vitrified form, should prove safer in the long run than the method used hitherto. Storage of radioactive waste in liquid form in reservoirs can be regarded as no more than an interim solution.

It is for this reason that the Community's programme on the management and storage of radioactive waste, now in course of implementation, makes provision for collaboration with the appropriate agencies on a joint study of the disposal of solidified waste in geological formations ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 178, 9. 7. 1975, p. 28.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 502/75

by Mr Gibbons

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 November 1975)

Subject: Classification of carcase beef

1. Does the Commission have any proposals for a system of classifying carcase beef for intra-Community trade and trade with third countries?
2. What Member States operate such a system of classification for internal trade and export trade?
3. Who is responsible for operating and supervising such schemes and who bears the costs?
4. What benefits would result from the introduction of a standard system of beef carcase classification in the Community?
5. What problems does the Commission foresee in establishing such a Community system?

Answer

(27 January 1976)

The Commission has not drafted a proposal for a carcase classification scheme.

Development work at national level is going on in all Member States and in some notably in France, Germany, United Kingdom and Ireland work is at a very advanced stage.

The administration, control and costs are all the responsibility of the Member States concerned.

The principal benefits of a Community scheme are:

— the broad range of carcasses could be described using common terminology and grouped into classes with the obvious advantages to importers, exporters, wholesalers, retailers and eventually farmers who would be guided as to their breeding programme and the products they should supply,

— the improvement of market information so that price could be interpreted in relation to quality and like compared with like. This would decrease uncertainty and increase competition,

- the intervention price could be fixed for a specific class of carcase and the same price could be paid for the same product in each Member State.

Because of the traditional trading patterns, the number of and variation in breeds, the variety of products and the structure of the industry the Commission recognizes serious difficulties in drafting a Community carcase classification scheme.

There are further difficulties which hinder the Commission presenting a proposal:

- defining the products to be classified,
- presentation of the products to be classified,
- further experience with national systems of classification.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 510/75

by Mr Bordu

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 November 1975)

Subject: Unemployment and industrial 'redeployment'

The textile industry, like other important sectors of the Community, is at present experiencing a serious crisis characterized in particular by a dramatic rate of unemployment, numerous mass redundancies and frequent factory closures in Europe. The fundamental cause of this crisis is well illustrated by the behaviour of the French multinational group 'Rhône-Poulenc'. This group, which achieved a turnover of FF 5·6 thousand million in 1974, has delegated 50 % of its textile production to foreign subsidiaries. In 1973 and 1974 it invested directly in Argentina, Thailand, Japan and Brazil and built a second factory in Spain. It is now the leading Brazilian textile producer. At the same time, it announced in September 1975 that its 90 000 French employees would be laid off.

1. What measures does the Commission intend to take to prevent multinational companies from continuing to shut down production units, thereby enormously increasing unemployment in the EEC?

2. Does it not consider it essential and urgent to encourage the Member States to review their policy of direct aid and massive support to industry, a policy which helps to accentuate this redeployment, leads in turn to a worsening of the recession, to further unemployment and to the increasingly rapid abandonment of entire industrial sectors in the EEC, without regard to the independence of the Community and its Member States?
3. The Commission has strongly asserted its desire for the 'anti-crisis' plans of its Member States to be better coordinated. However, as the main feature of these plans consists in direct support for private investment, can the Commission explain how, in its opinion, a coordinated policy to reinforce public financing of capitalist wealth will make it possible to combat unemployment and inflation, when this same policy, faithfully followed by the Member States, over the past few years, is very largely the cause of the crisis now affecting the EEC?

Answer

(28 January 1976)

The Commission's views on problems associated with multinational undertakings in the Community are set out in its communication of 8 November 1973 to the Council.

When it approved Mr Leenhardt's report on 12 December 1974 Parliament congratulated the Commission on its initiative and urged the Council to discuss the Commission's communication as soon as possible. However the matter has still to be placed on the Council's agenda.

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern about the social consequences of factory closures. This is why the Directive of 17 February 1975 ⁽¹⁾, adopted by the Council on a proposal from the Commission, requires an employer contemplating collective redundancies:

1. to consult workers' representatives;
2. to notify the competent public authority which can then intervene to seek solutions to the problems raised by the projected redundancies if the situation on the labour market makes this necessary.

In this way the effects of redundancies resulting from factory closures or cut-backs in production can be mitigated.

The Commission is keeping a close watch to ensure that state aids to sectors in difficulty, notably the textile industry:

1. do not lead to an overall increase in production capacity;
2. provide priority support for companies which, despite adaptation problems, have economic potential and are in a position to change over to modern production methods.

This approach should encourage the reorganization and development of sectors in difficulty.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 75/129/EEC of 17 February 1975 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies (OJ No L 48, 22. 2. 1975, p. 29).

It is true that better coordination within the Community is essential if the 'anti-crisis' plans of Member States are to be as effective as possible.

But the Commission's recommendations were in no way limited to urging direct support for private investment. The need to revive public investment was emphasized in most of the Commission's communications to the Council since 1974 and in its recommendation of 23 July 1975 ⁽²⁾ to Member States which also advocated the 'encouragement of private consumption, notably by the improvement of the financial situation of the poorest groups, the easing of credit for consumption ...'.

With regard to programmes to support private investment, the Commission considers that aid in the past tended to favour investments which did little to help the employment situation since aid was related to capital invested rather than jobs created. In view of employment prospects in the years ahead, the Commission believes that arrangements to support private investment should be re-examined and the emphasis on capital-intensive investment reduced.

The Honourable Member is of course entitled to his views on the reasons for the crisis now affecting the Community. The Commission itself believes that the crisis was sparked off by the combined effects of a number of cyclical and structural factors, including the energy crisis and the uncertainty and unease engendered by persistent worldwide inflation and monetary instability.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 209, 7. 8. 1975, p. 30.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 512/75

by Mr Ansart

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 November 1975)

Subject: Crisis in the iron and steel industry

On 26 September 1975 the Commission recognized the gravity of the decline in production in the iron

and steel industry. Besides the Community measures in the field of employment, which are no more than a palliative, it was also indicated that 'the instruments available, particularly that of industrial financing, were inadequate'.

1. Rather than 'inadequate', should not this type of financing, whether at national or Community level, be described as 'ineffectual' in the field of employment?
2. By way of example, can the Commission analyse the situation of the two major French groups, USINOR and SACILOR? These two groups are threatening to sack 20 000 employees if they do not receive further aid of FF 12 000 million from the French Government, this despite the fact that over a period of five years — from 1970 to 1975 — they have received, in various forms, FF 10 800 million in public funds, invested FF 8 600 million, amassed FF 7 100 million in gross profits and reduced their work force by 6 400 persons. In 1974, which was already a period of serious decline, USINOR earned gross profits of FF 2 250 million (67 % higher than the 1973 figure) while SACILOR's gross profits totalled FF 1 500 million (170 % up).
3. Can the Commission give an overall picture of the latest situation in each Member State: production, exports, imports, and public aid of various kinds?
4. In view of the strategy of 'redeployment', based on the export of means of production which intensifies the growing dominance of the multinational — especially American — companies and at the same time eliminates a part of the EEC's iron and steel production potential, does not the Commission consider it necessary to commend to the Member States the path of nationalization as the only sound means of safeguarding in the long term a sector essential to Europe's economic development and independence?

Answer

(2 February 1976)

1. Steel prices have now fallen to such a level that most firms in the Community iron and steel industry are temporarily unable to cover depreciation out of income and have to finance investment by borrowing. Articles 54 and 56 of the ECSC Treaty empower the Commission to facilitate such investment and loans totalling 498 million units of account were made available to the industry under these Articles between 1 January and 30 November 1975. So far there is no reason to believe that investment activity has been so seriously affected by the shortage of funds that long-term development of capacity has been jeopardized.

2. The Commission is not in a position to answer this question since Article 47 of the ECSC Treaty forbids the disclosure of information about the business relations of undertakings.

3. The Honourable Member should refer to the latest edition of the Iron and Steel Statistical Bulletin published by the Statistical Office of the European Communities which gives production, import and export figures for each Member State.

As far as public aid is concerned the Honourable Member will appreciate that since Article 4 (c) of the ECSC Treaty prohibits specific aids to ECSC

industries, the iron and steel industry can only benefit from general or regional aid schemes. The Commission is informed of assistance granted to the iron and steel industry in Member States to assess its compatibility with Articles 4 (c) and 67 of the ECSC Treaty but regrets that it cannot give any details in view of the confidential nature of this information.

4. Member States are free under their political and legal systems to nationalize undertakings. Article 83 of the ECSC Treaty takes a neutral position in this respect stating simply that 'the establishment of the Community shall in no way prejudice the system of ownership of the undertakings to which this Treaty applies'.

It is not therefore for the Commission to weigh up the advantages and disadvantages of nationalization. It would merely point out that the vagaries of the market affect undertakings irrespective of ownership.

It is improbable in any case that a significant proportion of the Community's steel requirements will be produced abroad within the next five or 10 years. This question is treated in the memorandum setting out general objectives for the Community's iron and steel industry to be published shortly.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 513/75

by Mr Lemoine

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 November 1975)

Subject: Armaments production in the Federal Republic of Germany

The Federal Republic of Germany recently announced its intention of developing the intensive manufacture and export of armaments ('Leopard' tanks, submarines, fast patrol boats, minesweepers, missiles, helicopters, anti-tank guns, etc). The principal firms concerned (Krupp, VFW-Fokker, MBB, MTU, Rheinstahl, Aral, Dynamit Nobel, Dornier, Telefunken, Daimler-Benz, Siemens) played an important role in arming the Nazis.

1. Without any anti-German feeling and without defending arms merchants of whatever

nationality, does the Commission not feel it has an important role to play in seeing that the Potsdam agreements, which forbid Germany from manufacturing (and thus from exporting) war material, are observed by the signatory parties and that the long-standing violation of this international agreement is ended?

2. Does the Commission feel that cooperation between the Federal Republic and South Africa in the nuclear field is compatible with these agreements, the manufacture of nuclear weapons being forbidden in the territory of the Federal Republic?

Answer

(30 January 1976)

1. The Commission is unable to answer the Honourable Member's question since it has no competence whatsoever in relation to the interpretation and application of decisions taken at the Potsdam Conference.

2. The Commission knows nothing of any form of cooperation between Germany and South Africa in the nuclear weapons field.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 519/75

by Mr Laban

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 November 1975)

Subject: The suspension of compliance with international obligations with particular reference to the European Communities

Mr H. A. Audretsch, research assistant at the Europa Institute Utrecht, recently obtained his doctorate of law with a thesis on the supervision of compliance with international obligations, with particular

reference to the European Communities. Although Mr Audretsch considers such supervision to be reasonably well organized in general, he criticises amongst other things the slowness of the procedure and the lack of openness about infringements of the Treaty and the Regulations. The Commission is therefore requested to answer the following questions:

1. Is it true that the supervision procedure takes from one to four years and if so, why is it so slow?
2. Is the Commission prepared to give detailed information on the extent of the supervision machinery?
3. Is it also true that only those cases are investigated which are brought to the Commission's notice in one way or another and that the machinery is inadequate for a large-scale investigation on the Commission's own initiative into infringements by the Member States of Treaty provisions and Regulations?
4. If the answer to the last question is in the affirmative, is the Commission prepared to take measures to expand control facilities in order to increase the effectiveness of the necessary supervision?
5. To what extent does the Commission avail itself of the possibility of contracting investigation work out to research institutes, as in the case of the Europa Institute at Leiden?
6. Is the Commission prepared to be more open in the future about real or suspected infringements by Member States and to:
 - (a) publish opinions, and
 - (b) provide information about infringements which have been rectified without the matter coming before the Court of Justiceboth as a preventive measure and to encourage Member States to provide the information requested as rapidly as possible?

Answer

(21 January 1976)

1. The procedures for pursuing infringement cases require different periods of time depending on the nature of the individual case. The average length of time for dealing with cases is between one and two years. A number of cases have been settled within a few months. Some cases, however, are particularly complex and require lengthy exchanges between the Commission and a Member State before regularization and have occasionally lasted four years or more (e.g., case 45/64 where the totality of internal taxation for several hundred products had to be examined).

The Commission has always taken the view that, when it has evidence that a Member State fully intends modifying its legislation to comply with Community law, it is preferable to accept delay rather than pursuing procedures which would lead to recourse to the Court of Justice.

2. Yes. The Commission is prepared to give this information to the competent Committee of the European Parliament.

3. The Commission regularly examines *ex officio* national legislation and administrative practices. To the extent that violations of the Treaties or derived Community law are established in the context of

these examinations, the Commission pursues infringements of this nature in the same way as matters which are brought to its attention by way of complaints received from official or non-official sources.

4. The Commission has well established and detailed procedures for checking the implementation of Community law in Member States. Improvements are regularly introduced, most recently in the case of Directives where special problems occur. Greater supervisory capacity might necessitate increased staff resources which the Honourable Member will know presents severe difficulties at present.

5. The Commission has for many years — within the limits of budgetary constraint — availed itself of the possibilities suggested by the Honourable Member, not only with respect to the Netherlands but to other Member States. A number of infringement procedures originate from the extensive material which has been provided for the Commission by academic sources.

6. The Commission has not hitherto usually stimulated publicity about suspected infringements. It has been able to deal effectively with a wide range of cases by means of discussions with Member States which have remained confidential.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 531/75**by Mr Laban****to the Commission of the European Communities***(20 November 1975)**Subject:* Prices of beef and veal and pigmeat

1. Can the Commission state the average producer and consumer prices of beef and veal and pigmeat (expressed in units of account per 100 kg) in the various Member States from 1970 to 1974 inclusive?
2. Will the Commission also indicate the gross difference between the average wholesale price and the consumer price, expressed as a percentage of the consumer price for meat in these categories?

Answer*(28 January 1976)*

The Commission is sending information on producer and consumer prices for beef and veal and for pigmeat direct to the Honourable Member ⁽¹⁾.

It would warn him however that it is extremely difficult to compare absolute prices at the different marketing stages, and in particular to use them as a basis for assessing trading margins, since producer prices are quoted per 100 kg live weight, wholesale prices per 100 kg carcase weight and consumer prices per 100 kg cut weight.

⁽¹⁾ The information is also being sent to Parliament's Committee on Agriculture which may find it of interest.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 554/75**by Mr Glinne and Mr Dondelinger****to the Commission of the European Communities***(20 November 1975)**Subject:* The European Community and Venice

In his famous book 'La Paille et le Grain' Mr François Mitterrand criticizes Italian governments for their lack of policy on Venice, which is in danger of

destruction if another flood occurs on the same scale as in 1966. He accuses the Italian authorities of allowing the funds donated by international organizations, both public and private, in order to save Venice to be squandered and even misappropriated:

'The Italian Government passed a special law allocating Lit 300 000 million for the financing of a five-year plan to complete the necessary work, and borrowed this money from two English banks ... Lit 2 000 million were provided by Germany, Britain and the United States. And was Venice saved? In actual fact, no. The Italian Government has yet to decree the enactment of the special law. The Lit 300 000 million loan has been used for other purposes and squandered. No one knows what has happened to the Lit 2 000 million donated by other countries (which was not exempted from Italian VAT). The reasons for this negligence are hardly surprising. It appears that Italian leaders are only interested in clinging at all costs to the most despicable power of all — that of granting favours to their backers and filling posts. They would rather Venice was destroyed than risk offending those who pay their electoral expenses. The Marghera and Mestre factories belong to powerful groups. Two of them depend on multinational companies. No one would dare refuse them their permits, exemptions, and abuses of rights. There is no more appalling example of the

contradiction inherent in capitalism which is unable to resist the attraction of immediate profit, even at the risk of destroying a treasure.' ⁽¹⁾.

1. How much aid has the Community granted to save Venice?
2. Is the Commission satisfied with the use to which this aid has been put?
3. Was the Commission able, and is it still able, to supervise the use of these funds?
4. In the Commission's view, would Venice be better protected now than it was in 1966 in the event of another flood on a similar scale?

⁽¹⁾ 'La Paille et le Grain' published by Flammarion, Paris 1975, pp. 230—232.

Answer

(2 February 1976)

1, 2 and 3. The Commission would inform the Honourable Members that the Community has never been asked to help save Venice and that in any event there is no budgetary appropriation from which aid could have been made available for an operation of this kind.

4. The Commission is not in a position to say how Venice would fare in the circumstances described by the Honourable Members. It would refer them on this point to specialized Italian agencies in Venice itself.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 558/75

by Mr Cousté

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 November 1975)

Subject: Loans issued by the EEC or its specialized bodies

The Commission is requested to furnish a statement of the amount of the loans granted to date by the EEC or its specialized bodies, such as the EIB or others.

Could the Commission also state which Community loans — either for Euratom, or for individual countries such as Portugal — have or have not been subject to direct or indirect parliamentary control.

Answer*(30 January 1976)*

1. Between its inception and 10 December 1975, the ECSC granted loans totalling 2 593 million units of account ⁽¹⁾. Of this 2 094 million units of account were made available to the coal and steel industries as such, 327 million units of account were granted to undertakings for conversion programmes re-employing redundant coal and steel workers, and the remaining 172 million units of account were lent to finance workers' housing.

The ECSC's financial activities are examined and discussed within the relevant Parliamentary Committees, notably in connection with the fixing of the ECSC levy, and are monitored by Parliament each year on the basis of the Audit Board's report.

2. To date Euratom has availed of its financial powers on one occasion only. In 1963 loans totalling 40.4 million dollars were made available to two nuclear power station construction companies under a 1959 agreement with the Washington Import-Export Bank.

These loans are shown in the Communities' General Budget and as such are subject to parliamentary control.

3. By 10 December 1975, the European Investment Bank had made a total of 4 856.7 million units of account available for investment projects of Community interest in the Member States. These

⁽¹⁾ ECSC units of account at 31 December 1974 parities.

loans were financed in full from the bank's own resources.

Within the same period, financing agreements signed under protocols concluded between the EEC and a number of associated countries amounted to 719.2 million units of account, broken down as follows:

Turkey:

366.9 million units of account (of which 25 million from the bank's own resources and 341.9 million from the Member States);

AASM/OCT:

242.4 million units of account (of which 135.3 million from the bank's own resources and 107.1 million from the European Development Fund);

Greece:

109.9 million units of account from the bank's own resources.

The bank has also been authorized by its Board of Governors to grant loans of up to 150 million units of account to Portugal in 1976 and 1977 under the emergency aid programme approved by the Council on 7 October 1975.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 559/75**by Mr Cousté****to the Commission of the European Communities***(20 November 1975)*

Subject: Harmonization of the rules governing the extraction and marketing of mineral waters

The Commission, at present pursuing an active policy within the European Economic Community, in the field of health and the environment, is asked if it is able to state

whether there is any harmonization of the rules for extracting and marketing table mineral waters or whether it plans to take any measures — and, if so, what measures — to protect European consumers.

Answer

(28 January 1976)

On 11 May 1970 the Commission presented a proposal to the Council for a Directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the abstraction and marketing of natural mineral waters ⁽¹⁾.

Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee delivered favourable opinions on 19 April and 18 March 1971 respectively.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 69, 11. 6. 1970, p. 14.

The conditions for abstraction and marketing laid down in the proposal are sufficiently stringent to protect the consumer. Particularly worthy of note are the bacteriological criteria applicable at source and the specifications to be met by water catchment and bottling plants to prevent contamination and ensure that natural mineral waters retain their original properties. The proposal is still being examined by the relevant Council bodies.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 568/75

by Mr Osborn

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 November 1975)

Subject: Employment in the public sector

For each Community country and for the Community as a whole, what is now:

1. the numbers employed by the public sector, in total and expressed as a percentage of total employment;
2. the numbers employed by the Community, in total and expressed as a percentage of total employment,

comparing the position with 1970 and 1965 respectively?

Answer

(21 January 1976)

The Commission would inform the Honourable Member that such information as it has is set out in the table below.

Total employment and employment in public administrations ⁽¹⁾

Member State	1965			1970			1971—74			
	Total	Public administra- tions	‰	Total	Public administra- tions	‰	Total	Public administra- tions	‰	Reference year
	'000			'000			'000			
Germany	27 153	2 639	9.7	26 571	2 975	11.2	26 152	3 430	13.1	1974
France	20 086	2 208	11.0	20 905	2 464	12.3	21 452	•	•	1973
Italy	19 680	1 820	9.3	19 745	2 091	10.6	19 831	2 334	11.8	1974
Netherlands	4 502	516	11.5	4 696	567	12.1	4 673	607	13.0	1973
Belgium	3 717	459	12.5	3 774	510	13.5	3 828	•	•	1974
Luxembourg	134	•	•	137	13	9.5	151	14	9.3	1974
United Kingdom	•	•	•	24 777	4 257	17.3	24 427	4 398	18.0	1971
Ireland	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Denmark	•	•	•	2 380	475	20.0	2 395	564	23.6	1974
Permanent posts authorized by the Council	8 511			9 110			12 335			
As ‰ of total employment (figures partly based on estimates)	0.0083			0.0088			0.0120			

⁽¹⁾ As defined by the SOEC.

• Figures not available.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 573/75

by Mrs Ewing

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 November 1975)

Subject: Help to raspberry producers

Will the Commission explain what help is available to raspberry producers at present facing a situation of insecurity following a surplus crop from last year overhanging the market, and state whether they have any plans to arrange for further help.

Answer

(22 January 1976)

As far as fresh fruit is concerned, raspberry growers, like other fruit and vegetable producers, qualify for Community assistance under Regulation (EEC) No

1035/72 ⁽¹⁾. This takes the form of grants towards the formation of producers' organizations and the creation of intervention funds.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 118, 20. 5. 1972, p. 1.

As far as products processed from raspberries are concerned, imports into the Community from non-member countries are currently subject to a system of import licences. This allows the Commission to estimate imports over a 75-day period following the issue of a licence and hence ensure good market management.

National assistance may also be granted in accordance with Articles 92 to 94 of the EEC Treaty.

Article 93 of the Treaty requires Member States to notify the Commission, in sufficient time to enable it to submit its comments, of any plans to grant or alter aid.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 587/75

by Mr Gibbons

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 November 1975)

Subject: National aids for agricultural production

The Commission has, on several occasions and particularly in its stocktaking of the common agricultural policy, pointed out the major problems in relation to competition, intra-Community trade and the development of Community farm structures which national aids can cause. The Commission has also stated that a full inventory of all existing aid measures is indispensable. The Member States, in addition, gave an undertaking on 2 October 1974, to submit such an inventory by 1 January 1975.

1. What Member States have already submitted such an inventory?

2. Are there any reasons, apparent or otherwise, for delays in the submission of these inventories by the other Member States?

3. What is the Commission doing and what measures can it resort to in speeding up the submission of these inventories?

4. It is true to say that some Member States would prefer that the Commission do not investigate their national aids?

5. Has there been any recent change in the Commission's policy on national aids?

Answer

(21 January 1976)

1, 2 and 3. All Member States have submitted inventories of aids existing in 1974 though no Member State met the deadline of 1 January 1975 fixed by the resolution of 2 October 1974. In fact the last inventory received by the Commission was 10 months late.

Because a number of inventories omitted certain categories of aid the Commission had to ask the Member States concerned to make the necessary additions.

4. The Commission cannot comment on the alleged preferences of the Member States. The Honourable Member will appreciate however that even partial failure on their part to comply with Article 93 (3) complicates the task entrusted to it in this area by the EEC Treaty.

5. The Commission is now defining the framework referred to in Section 127 of the stocktaking of the common agricultural policy ⁽¹⁾ on the basis of these inventories.

⁽¹⁾ Bulletin of the European Communities: Supplement 2/75.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 591/75**by Mr Seefeld****to the Commission of the European Communities***(26 November 1975)**Subject: Drinking and driving*

I assume the Commission is aware that the maximum legal alcohol level for drivers of motor vehicles and the methods of analysis used differ in the Member States of the Community.

1. Does the Commission share my view that this is confusing for drivers and a danger to road safety?
2. Does the Commission intend to take measures to achieve harmonization at Community level?

Answer*(28 January 1976)*

The Commission is aware of the problem raised by the Honourable Member and would like to draw attention to its memorandum on guidelines for Community action to improve road safety presented to the Transport Committee of the European Parliament on 21 March 1971 which include as one of seven priorities the adoption of stronger measures against driving under the influence of alcohol.

However, no direct action on drinking and driving is foreseen at present. As drinking and driving can lead

to the withdrawal of driving licences, this problem must be regarded in the light of the proposal submitted to the Council on the harmonization of the laws relating to motor vehicle driving licences. Subsequent adoption of uniform rules for the objective assessment of offences and for the determination of the circumstances in which driving licences may be suspended, withdrawn or restored is foreseen in this proposal. The Commission is therefore of the opinion that the adoption of the proposal on driving licences must precede Community action on drinking and driving.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 599/75**by Mr Calewaert****to the Commission of the European Communities***(28 November 1975)**Subject: Protection of Belgian birdlife*

According to recent press reports ⁽¹⁾ and statements by certain animal protection organizations ⁽²⁾, one of

⁽¹⁾ Volksgazet, 17 October 1975.

⁽²⁾ Coordinating Committee on the Protection of Birds (CCBV) Durentijdelei 8, 2130 Brasschaat.

the Member States of the European Communities, namely Belgium, has allowed a new open season on birds running from 16 October to 16 November 1975. Although the use of nets has been banned in Belgium since 1972, Mr A. Lavens, Minister of Agriculture of the Member State concerned, has nevertheless again allowed the catching of 80 000

birds this year. Flemish birdcatchers are to be allowed to catch 28 370 chaffinches, while in Wallonia the catching of missel thrushes and cranes has been allowed.

During the period mentioned, the catching of 15 different bird species is permitted in Belgium, including a number of typical migrants and nesters, whose numbers are falling discernibly. Moreover, in the same Member State, 602 700 birds that are part of the European bird heritage are kept in captivity. Nor are there any plans to introduce strict control measures in Belgium.

1. Is the Commission aware of these facts? If so, does it envisage approaching the Member State concerned, with a view to remedying or alleviating this situation?
2. Are other cases of deliberate threats to European birdlife known to the Commission? If so, what?

3. To what extent is the Commission considering the development of a general policy to protect the environment and animals, so as to put a definite stop once and for all to the systematic extermination of wild life in the European Communities?

If such a policy is envisaged, can the Commission indicate the main lines it would take?

If no such policy is envisaged, can the Commission state what the major obstacles to it are, and how it will attempt to overcome them in the future?

4. Can the Commission give a comparative survey of the measures taken, or lack of them, in the various Member States against hunting traditions that are survivals from the past and have now become a menace, so as to avoid the complete disappearance of countless animal species in the Community?

Answer

(23 January 1976)

1 and 2. The Commission is aware that the hunting and snaring of birds, permitted in a number of Member States, could endanger birdlife in general and migrants in particular. It would remind the Honourable Member that its Answers to Written Question Nos 401/74 by Lord O'Hagan ⁽¹⁾, 412/74 by Mr Jahn ⁽²⁾, 634/74 by Lord O'Hagan ⁽³⁾ and 29/75 by Mr Jahn ⁽⁴⁾ outlined work being done by the Commission in this field.

3 and 4. A proposal for a Directive which the Commission will be submitting to the Council in the first quarter of 1976 should lead to a decisive improvement in legislation on birdlife protection in the Member States.

This proposal will summarize measures currently in force in Member States.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 156, 10. 12. 1974, p. 19.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 156, 10. 12. 1974, p. 22.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 56, 8. 3. 1975, p. 15.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 151, 7. 7. 1975, p. 14.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 604/75

by Mr Seefeld

to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 November 1975)

Subject: Delays in African and Asian ports

1. Is the Commission aware that European

Community foreign trade and shipping is at present severely handicapped by docking delays in a considerable number of African and Asian ports?

2. Can the Commission confirm that, in the following ports in particular, unloading delays of several months must be expected:

- Lagos/Apapa,
- Warri,
- Port Harcourt,
- Calabar,
- Tripoli,
- Bengasi,
- Basrah,
- Korramshar,
- Damman,
- Karachi,
- Bombay.

3. Can the Commission confirm that attempts to reroute traffic to Asia overland have already resulted in congestion and other difficulties for rail and road traffic on these routes?

4. How does the Commission view the attempts at transporting goods to West Africa by means of

protected trans-Sahara convoys of roll-on/roll-off vehicles?

5. What will be the consequences of the growing backlog of goods in European ports?

6. Does the Commission see any connection between these problems and the lack of a Community sea transport policy?

7. Will the Commission, in the framework of the Association or cooperation agreements, offer to help the African and Asian countries concerned to solve the problems connected with their port facilities and inland transport infrastructures?

8. Does the Commission believe that the present delays have given rise to an apparent shortage of ship capacity, which could well turn into overcapacity should it prove possible to eliminate port congestion?

9. What effects do these delays have on freight rates and export prices?

10. Will the Commission raise this matter at the World Economic Conference?

Answer

(30 January 1976)

1. The Commission knows of the problem raised by the Honourable Member.

2. The Commission cannot confirm that the waiting time is several months in each of the ports mentioned although it knows that the situation is particularly serious in the Nigerian and Arabian Gulf ports. In the former country there has been a considerable reduction in waiting time recently.

3. The Commission knows of the problem.

4. The Commission knows that the question of trans-Saharan convoys has been examined, as well as air transport for more urgent goods. The question of the use of roll-on/roll-off transport being landed at more primitive port installations is also under examination in Nigeria.

5. Owing to the present down-turn in international trade the backlog is unlikely to be reflected in lower receipts and reduced employment

opportunities. The effect of overseas port congestion is minor compared with the overall effects of the down-turn in trade.

6. No.

7. The Commission regards the development of port facilities and transport systems in the developing countries in general and the ACP States in particular as being of the utmost importance. Indeed a considerable proportion of Community aid to Africa has been for this purpose. The Honourable Member will appreciate that there can be no question of the Commission suggesting a course of action to countries linked with the Community by cooperation agreements; it believes that the developing countries themselves must decide on their own development priorities.

8. No. Even with the present congestion there is currently overcapacity in nearly every shipping sector.

9. There is no effect on freight charges as such. However, the present congestion does mean that surcharges are levied on goods shipped to these ports and contracts are such that it is usually the developing countries themselves who pay the extra costs rather than the shipping lines.

10. Port congestion and associated freight problems were not raised at the International Economic Cooperation Conference held in Paris on 16 December 1975. The Commission felt that this essentially technical problem had no place on the agenda of a high-level meeting of this kind.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 610/75

by Mr Jahn

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 December 1975)

Subject: Construction of nuclear reactors in the USA and USSR

1. Can the Commission state the number and location of nuclear reactors in the USA and the USSR, as well as any known future plans in this area?
2. In the Commission's view, are the safety regulations for the construction and operation of nuclear power stations in those countries more or less stringent than in the Community?

Answer

(28 January 1976)

By mid-1975, some 55 nuclear power reactors with a total installed capacity of 37 000 MWe were in use in the United States. Some 63 others (64 000 MWe) were under construction, with a further 100 (120 000 MWe) on order or under negotiation. A large proportion were sited in the eastern half of the country or were due to be built there.

At the same time, 18 reactors with a total capacity of 5 500 MWe were in use in the Soviet Union for electricity-generating purposes. According to the information available, 10 reactors (8 500 MWe) were under construction and roughly the same number in the design stage. These nuclear power stations are spread widely throughout the Soviet Union.

It should be remembered that different factors govern the siting of nuclear power stations in the United States, the Soviet Union and Europe. In the United States, and particularly in the Soviet Union,

they are built in thinly populated areas; this is not generally the case in Europe.

The Commission has little information about standards for the construction of nuclear reactors in the Soviet Union. Design standards for containment, for instance, are apparently much less stringent than in Europe. The Commission has no information about Soviet safety standards governing reactor operation.

European experts are familiar with US safety standards for the construction of nuclear power stations. Some European countries have used or are using US standards as the basis for their own national standards for the construction of light-water reactors (where American experience is greatest). Others have taken over the American standards directly, but with some modifications stemming from siting peculiarities which have often led to stricter

regulations designed, for instance, to protect power stations against external forces such as aircraft crashes, earthquakes and deliberate acts of destruction.

The safety standards applied to the operation of nuclear power stations are also similar in the United States and Europe, the problem of quality assurance being similarly treated. European design and operating standards are generally comparable to those imposed in the United States.

On a more specifically European level, the Commission is actively engaged in an extensive Community programme aimed at the coordination and harmonization of safety standards. This programme is particularly designed to implement:

— the Council resolution of 7 March 1975 on energy and the environment ⁽¹⁾,

— the Council resolution of 17 December 1974 concerning Community energy policy objectives and the nuclear action programme ⁽²⁾, presented by the Commission to the Council in February 1974 in implementation of this resolution ⁽³⁾,

— the Council resolution of 22 July 1975 on the technological problems of nuclear safety ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 168, 25. 7. 1975, p. 2.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 153, 9. 7. 1975, p. 2.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 44, 19. 4. 1974, p. 12.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 185, 14. 8. 1975, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 624/75

by Mr Seefeld

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 December 1975)

Subject: Thefts of motor vehicles

Is the Commission aware that recognized specialist publications such as the 'Deutsche Verkehrs-Zeitung' (German Transport Journal) of 15 November 1975, are reporting an 'increase of gangsterism on the roads of Europe'? For example, about 200 lorries are supposed to have been stolen. The thefts are most common in northern Italy.

In what ways does the Commission feel able to induce Member States to take stronger measures against this form of highway robbery, and can the Commission propose on its own initiative measure to protect commercial transport?

Answer

(27 January 1976)

The Commission shares the concern expressed by the Honourable Member, but must point out that the taking of measures to repress lorry thefts does not fall within the competence of the Commission. It is a question for national police and judicial authorities, cooperating internationally where necessary through the appropriate channels.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 627/75

by Mr Nolan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 December 1975)

Subject: Economic planning in the Community

What progress has the Commission made in coordinating economic planning in the member countries?

Answer

(28 January 1976)

In all the Commission has prepared three medium-term economic policy programmes ⁽¹⁾ for transmission to the Council. The last of these covered the period up to the end of December 1975.

The first two programmes introduced arrangements for the mutual exchange of information between Member States. The third programme, which was more ambitious, attempted to define compatible objectives.

The relevant Commission departments are currently working with the Economic Policy Committee on the

preparation of a fourth programme for the period 1976 to 1980. The Commission hopes to transmit this to the Council before the summer.

Work on this programme has revealed a growing awareness on the part of the Member States of the need to take the longer-term view when solutions to the Community's economic and social difficulties are being sought. The Commission is convinced however that political will is the key to effective coordination of economic policies. It intends to make this view quite clear to the Council when it presents the fourth programme.

⁽¹⁾ Published in: OJ No 79, 25. 4. 1967; OJ No L 129, 30. 5. 1969; OJ No L 49, 1. 3. 1971; respectively.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 629/75

by Mr Howell

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 December 1975)

Subject: Average producer's selling price for wheat

What is the average producer's selling price for wheat in each of the nine member countries for September and October 1975 respectively?

Answer*(21 January 1976)*

The information requested by the Honourable Member is not available, except in respect of a full marketing year. As regards the months of September and October 1975 however, the Commission is able to supply the average wholesale market prices for common wheat; these do not take into account the charges arising between the producer and the wholesale marketing stage or any payments (e.g., deficiency payments) made direct to the producer.

(u.a./metric ton)

Member State	Average of following centres	September 1975	October 1975
Belgique/België	Bruxelles/Brussel, Kortrijk, Liège	126.85	128.46
Danmark	København	120.08	119.92
Deutschland	Hamburg, Hannover, Dortmund, Köln, Mannheim, Würzburg	129.46	130.79
France	Rouen, Chartres, la Pallice, Corbeil	129.76	130.33
Ireland	Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Monaghan, Enniscorthy	— ⁽¹⁾	— ⁽¹⁾
Italia	Alessandria, Milano, Bologna, Padova, Grosseto	128.63	129.30
Nederland	Rotterdam	129.14	131.04
United Kingdom	London, Bristol, Hull, Liverpool, Cambridge	118.72	121.12

⁽¹⁾ No quotation received.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 634/75**by Mr Lenihan****to the Commission of the European Communities***(11 December 1975)**Subject: Deportation for crime*

Recent press reports have suggested that a worker convicted of criminal offences in a Member State cannot be deported as such deportation would infringe EEC rules.

Furthermore recent judgments of the Court of Justice would suggest that an EEC citizen setting up business in a member country could not be deported as a result of a mere conviction. Would the Commission clarify the situation with regard to deportation of an EEC citizen by a member country on the grounds of criminal offences?

Answer

(22 January 1976)

Right of entry or right of residence as guaranteed by Community law ⁽¹⁾ may be limited by Member States solely on grounds of public order, public security or public health. Council Directive 64/221/EEC ⁽²⁾ coordinated the special measures justified on these grounds.

⁽¹⁾ The circumstances in which this right is guaranteed by Community law were outlined in the Commission's Answer to Written Question No 394/75 by Mr Broeks (OJ No C 19, 28. 1. 1976, p. 9).

⁽²⁾ OJ No 56, 4. 4. 1964, p. 850/64.

Article 3 (2) of this Directive ('previous criminal convictions shall not in themselves constitute grounds for the taking of such measures') read in conjunction with other provisions of the Directive and notably Article 3 (1) ('measures taken on grounds of public order or of public security shall be based exclusively on the personal conduct of the individual concerned') would exclude deportation of an EEC citizen for crime except where his conduct as such represented a threat to public order or public security.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 646/75

by Miss Boothroyd

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 December 1975)

Subject: New European Social Fund

The Council Decision of 1 February 1971 ⁽¹⁾ on reform of the European Social Fund stated in Article 5 that assistance from the Social Fund should be granted 'for measures for the absorption and reabsorption into active employment of the disabled'.

On 27 June 1974 ⁽²⁾ the Council adopted a resolution establishing the first Community Action

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 28, 4. 2. 1971, p. 15.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 80, 9. 7. 1974, p. 30.

Programme for the vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons.

1. Could the Commission define the terms 'handicapped' and 'disabled' and state whether assistance from the Social Fund is available for programmes to help the mentally as well as physically handicapped?
2. Could the Commission further say how much money in the last financial year went to projects for retraining the disabled, what proportion it is of total Social Fund allocations and how much money, if any, went for the retraining of the mentally handicapped?

Answer*(22 January 1976)*

1. The resolution referred to by the Honourable Member defines the term 'handicap' as 'any limitation, congenital or acquired, of a person's physical or mental ability which affects his daily activity and his work by reducing his social contribution, his employment prospects, his ability to use public services'.

The European Social Fund makes no distinction between physical and mental handicaps when assessing an individual's prospects of resuming work

following a period of vocational rehabilitation, training or retraining.

2. In 1975 45.11 million units of account, or 13.50 % of total aid from the European Social Fund, went to the handicapped.

This included assistance to the mentally handicapped but precisely because no distinction is made between physical and mental handicaps the Commission is not in a position to give the Honourable Member an exact figure.

II

(Preparatory Acts)

COMMISSION

Proposal for a Directive amending Council Directive 75/271/EEC of 28 April 1975 concerning the Community list of less-favoured farming areas within the meaning of Directive 75/268/EEC (France)

(Submitted by the Commission to the Council on 23 January 1976)

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community,

Having regard to Council Directive 75/268/EEC of 28 April 1975 on mountain and hill farming and farming in certain less-favoured areas ⁽¹⁾, and in particular Article 2 (2) thereof,

Having regard to the proposal from the Commission,

Having regard to the opinion of the European Parliament,

Having regard to the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee,

Whereas the Government of the French Republic has communicated to the Commission, in accordance with Article 2 (1) of the said Directive, a proposal to extend the mountain areas listed in the Annex to Council Directive 75/271/EEC, together with the relevant information concerning the characteristics of the communes or parts of communes involved therein;

Whereas the said government has used to determine the very difficult climate conditions referred to in the first indent of Article 3 (3) of Directive 75/268/EEC an average minimum altitude in each commune of 600 metres in the Vosges, 700 metres in the other mountain regions and 800 metres on regions facing the Mediterranean;

Whereas steep slopes as referred to in the second indent of the said Article 3 (3) are defined as those greater than 20 %;

Whereas where there is a combination of the above two factors, the criteria used are a minimum altitude of 500 metres and an average slope of 15 %; whereas only a very few of the communes in the proposal do not fully satisfy the conditions required but nevertheless fully satisfy those of Article 3 (4) of the said Directive; whereas since their economies are closely linked with those of their neighbouring communes and, in most cases, their areas are enclosed within those communes and clearly smaller, they can nevertheless be classified within the mountain areas;

Whereas, under these circumstances, the nature and amount of the said criteria, which the Government of the French Republic have used to define the areas communicated to the Commission, satisfy the characteristics of mountain areas referred to in the said Article 3 (3);

Whereas the communication of the said Member State fails to include details of the present situation in these areas with regard to the infrastructure referred to in Article 3 (2) of the said Directive; whereas it appears that the infrastructure is not always adequate; whereas moreover the absence of information about current or proposed programmes prevents an assessment of the time within which will occur a substantial improvement in this situation; whereas, nevertheless the areas in question should be included in the Community list of less-favoured farming areas, on the understanding that the Government of the French Republic will present at an early date a detailed communication to the Commission on this subject,

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 128, 19. 5. 1975, p. 1.

HAD ADOPTED THE PRESENT DIRECTIVE:

Article 1

The Annex to Directive 75/271/EEC is hereby amended by the addition of the areas listed in the Annex to this Directive.

Article 2

The Member State concerned shall forward to the Commission by the end of 1976 at the latest, a

detailed communication indicating the period of time within which measures for the substantial improvement of infrastructure will be taken in the areas listed in the Annex to this Directive.

Article 3

The present Directive is addressed to the French Republic.

ANHANG — BILAG — ANNEX — ANNEXE — ALLEGATO — BIJLAGE

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	01 — Département de l'Ain
	<i>Arrondissement de Belley</i>
Ambérieu-en-Bugey	l'Abergement-de-Varey
Champagne-en-Valromey	Champagne-en-Valromey, Chavornay, Vieu
Saint-Rambert-en-Bugey	Torcieu
Virieu-le-Grand	Cheignieu-la-Balme, Contrevoz, Virieu-le-Grand
	<i>Arrondissement de Nantua</i>
Bellegarde-sur-Valserine	Bellegarde-sur-Valserine (reste du territoire non classé par arrêté du 20. 2. 1974), Surjoux
Izernore	Izernore, Matafelon-Granges (reste du territoire non classé par arrêté du 20. 2. 1974), Samognat; Serrières-sur-Ain
Nantua	Brion, Géovreissiat
Poncin	Challes-la-Montagne, Mérignat, Saint-Alban
Oyonnax	Dortan
	03 — Département de l'Allier
	<i>Arrondissement de Vichy</i>
Cusset	Busset
	04 — Département des Alpes-de-Haute-Provence
	<i>Arrondissement de Forcalquier</i>
Sisteron	Mison, Sisteron
Volonne	Aubignosc, Château-Arnoux, l'Escale, Peipin, Volonne
	06 — Département des Alpes-Maritimes
	<i>Arrondissement de Grasse</i>
Bar-sur-Loup	Bar-sur-Loup, Tourettes-sur-Loup
Saint-Vallier-de-Thiery	Cabris, Saint-Cézaire-sur-Siagne, Spéracédès, Le Tignet
Vence	Le Broc, Gattières, Saint-Jeannet
	<i>Arrondissement de Nice</i>
Contes	Cantaron, Châteauneuf-de-Contes, Contes
L'Escarène	Blausasc, Peillon
Levens	Aspremont, La Roquette-sur-Var, Saint-Blaise, Tourette-Levens
Roquesteron	Gilette
	07 — Département de l'Ardèche
	<i>Arrondissement de Largentière</i>
Joyeuse	Faugères, Planzollès, Ribes, Vernon
Largentière	Chazeaux, Largentière (fraction ancienne commune de Tauriers)
Thueyts	Fabras, Lalevade-d'Ardèche, Meyras, Pont-de-Labeaume

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	<i>Arrondissement de Privas</i>
Vals-les-Bains	Vals-les-Bains
Chomérac	Saint-Bauzile
Privas	Dunières-sur-Eyrieux, les Ollières-sur-Eyrieux, Veyras
Viviers	Aubignas
La Voulte-sur-Rhône	Saint-Fortunat-sur-Eyrieux, Saint-Laurent-du-Pape
	<i>Arrondissement de Tournon</i>
Annonay	Annonay
Saint-Félicien	Colombier-le-Vieux
Saint-Peray	Champis, Saint-Sylvestre
Tournon	Boucieu-le-Roi, Colombier-le-Jeune, Plats, Saint-Barthélémy-le-Plein
	09 — Département de l'Ariège
	<i>Arrondissement de Foix</i>
La Bastide-de-Sérou	Aigues-Juntes, Allières, La Bastide-de-Sérou, Cadarcet, Durban-sur-Arize, Larbont, Montels, Montséron, Nescus, Suzan
Foix	Arabaux, Baulou, Cos, Foix, l'Herm, Loubières, Montgailard, Pradières, Saint-Jean-de-Verges, Saint-Martin-de-Caralp, Saint-Pierre-de-Rivière, Vernajoul
Lavelanet	L'Aiguillon, Carla-de-Roquefort, Dreuilhe, Illat, Lavelanet, Lesparrou, Lieurac, Raissac, Roquefort-les-Cascades, Saint-Jean-d'Aigues-Vives, Sautel, Ventenac, Villeneuve-d'Olmes
	<i>Arrondissement de Pamiers</i>
Le Mas-d'Azil	Camarade, Gabre, Le Mas-d'Azil, Montfa
Mirepoix	Dun, Pradettes
Varilhès	Calzan, Cazaux, Dalou, Gudas, Loubens, Malléon, Ségura, Vira
	<i>Arrondissement de Saint-Girons</i>
Sainte-Croix-Volvestre	Bagert, Barjac, Bedeille, Contrazy, Lasserre, Mauvezin-de-Sainte-Croix, Mérigon, Montardit
Saint-Girons	Clermont, Encourtiech, Eycheil, Lescure, Montégut-en-Couserans, Saint-Girons
Saint-Lizier	Betchat, Gajan, Montesquieu-Avantes, Montgauch, Montjoie-en-Couserans, Taurignan-Castet, Taurignan-Vieux
	11 — Département de l'Aude
	<i>Arrondissement de Carcassonne</i>
Alzonne	Montolieu
Conques-sur-Orbiel	Limousis, Sallèles-Cabardès
Mas-Cabardès	Lastours, Salsigne, Villardonnel
Mouthoumet	Félines-Termenès, Termes, Vignevieille
Peyriac-Minervois	Caunes-Minervois, Villeneuve-Minervois
Saissac	Fraisse-Cabardès

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	<i>Arrondissement de Limoux</i>
Alaigne	Escueillens — Saint-Juste-de-Bellengard, Monthaut, Pomy
Chalabre	Caudeval, Chalabre, Corbières, Courtauly, Gueytes-et-Labastide, Peyrefitte-du-Razes, Sainte-Colombe-sur-l'Hers, Sonnac-sur-l'Hers, Tréziers
Couiza	Coustaussa, Serres
Limoux	La Bezole, Bourigeole, Castelreng, Saint-Couat-du-Razès
Quillan	Ginols, Granès, Quillan, Saint-Ferriol
Saint-Hilaire	Clermont-sur-Lauquet, Greffeil
	<i>Arrondissement de Narbonne</i>
Tuchan	Cucugnan, Duilhac, Maisons, Montgaillard, Padern, Rouffiac-des-Corbières
	12 — Département de l'Aveyron
	<i>Arrondissement de Millau</i>
Belmont-sur-Rance	Montlaur, Rebourguil
Camarès	Camarès
Cornus	Saint-Jean-et-Saint-Paul (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)
Millau-Ouest	Comprégnac
Saint-Affrique	Roquefort-sur-Soulzon, Saint-Affrique, Saint-Jean-d'Alcapiès, Saint-Rome-de-Cernon, Tournemire (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974), Vabres-l'Abbaye
Saint-Rome-de-Tarn	Saint-Rome-de-Tarn
	<i>Arrondissement de Rodez</i>
Cassagnes-Bégonhès	Cassagnes-Bégonhès
Conques	Noailhac, Saint-Cyprien-sur-Dourdou (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974), Saint-Félix-de-Lunel
Espalion	Bessuéjols, Espalion (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)
Estaing	Sébazac, Villecomtal
Marcillac-Vallon	Clairveaux, Marcillac-Vallon, Mouret, Nauviale, Saint-Christophe, Valady
Naucelle	Camboulazet
Réquista	Réquista, La Selve
Rignac	Auzits, Ecandolières, Mayran, Goutrens, Belcastel
La-Salvetat-Peyralès	Lescure-Jaoul
	<i>Arrondissement de Villefranche-de-Rouergue</i>
Aubin	Aubin, Cransac, Firmi
Capdenac-Gare	Bouillac
Decazeville	Almon-les-Junies, Boisse-Penchot, Flagnac, Livinhac-le-Haut
Najac	Najac, Saint-André-de-Najac, Bor-et-Bar
Rieupeyroux	La-Bastide-l'Évêque, Prévinières (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	19 — Département de la Corrèze
	<i>Arrondissement de Brive-la-Gaillarde</i>
Beynat	Albignac, Aubazine, Beynat, Lanteuil, Palazinges, Sérilhac, Le-Pescher
Beaulieu	Brivezac, Chenailers-Mascheix, Tudeils
Brive-Nord	Dampniat
Meyssac	Lostanges, Lagleygeolle, Noailhac
	<i>Arrondissement de Tulle</i>
Argentat	Albussac, Argentet, Forges, Mémoire, Monceaux-sur-Dordogne, Neuville, Saint-Bonnet-Elvert, Saint-Chamant, Saint-Hilaire-Taurieux, Saint-Martial-Entraygues, Saint-Sylvain
La Roche-Canillac	Champagnac-la-Prune, Clergoux, Espagnac, Gros-Chastang, Gumond, Marcillac-la-Croisille, La Roche-Canillac, Saint-Bazile-de-Laroche, Saint-Martin-la-Meanne, Saint-Pardoux-la-Croisille, Saint-Paul
Seilhac	Beaumont, Saint-Salvador
Tulle-Nord	Naves
Tulle-Sud	Les Angles-sur-Corrèze, Chanac-les-Mines, Le Chastang, Cornil, Gimel, Ladignac-sur-Rondelles, Lagarde-Enval, Laguenne, Marc-la-Tour, Pandrignes, Saint-Bonnet-Avalouze, Sainte-For-tunade, Saint-Martial-de-Gimel, Saint-Priest-de-Gimel, Tulle
Uzerche	Meilhards
	20 — Département de la Corse
	<i>Arrondissement d'Ajaccio</i>
Ajaccio	Afa, Alata, Appietto, Bastelicaccia, Villanova
Bastelica	Cauro, Eccica-Suarella, Ocana
Celavo-Mezzana	Cuttoli-Corticchiato, Peri, Sarrola-Carcopino, Tavaco, Valle-di-Mezzana
Cruzzini-Cinarca	Ambiegna, Arro, Calcatoggio, Cannelle-d'Orcino, Casaglione, Lopigna, Sari-d'Orcino, Sant'Andréa-d'Orcino
Deux-Sevi	Osani, Partinello, Serriera, Cargèse, Ota, Piana
Deux-Sorru	Arbori, Coggia
Sainte-Marie-Sicché	Cognocoli-Monticchi, Coti-Chiavari, Forciolo, Grosseto-Prugna, Guargualé, Pietrosella, Pila-Canale, Serra-di-Ferro, Urbalacone, Zigliara
	<i>Arrondissement de Bastia</i>
Alto-di-Casacconi	Prunelli-di-Casacconi, Scolca, Volpajola
Borgo	Vignale
Campoloro-di-Moriani	San-Giovani, Sant'Andréa-di-Cotone
Capo-Bianco	Barrettali, Cagnano, Luri, Meria, Pino, Centuri, Ersa, Mor-siglia, Rogliano, Tomino
Conca-d'Oro	Barbaggio, Oletta, Olmeta-di-Tuda, Poggio-d'Oletta, Vallecalle
Fiumalto-d'Ampugnani	Pero-Casevecchie, Velone-Orneto, Casalta, Prunò, Scata, San-Gavino-d'Ampugnani
Haut-Nebbio	Lame Urtaca, Sorio, San-Gavino-de-Tenda, Santo-Pietro-di-Tenda
Saglio-di-Santa-Culia	Brando, Pietra-Corbara, Sisco, Canari, Nonza, Ogliastro, Olcani, Olmeta-di-Capocorso
San-Martino-di-Lota	San-Martino-di-Lota, Santa-Maria-di-Lota, Ville-di-Pietra-bugna
Vescovato	Porri

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	<i>Arrondissement de Calvi</i>
Belgodère	Belgodère, Costa, Novella, Occhiatana, Palasca, Ville-di-Paraso, Algajola, Aregno, Avapessa, Cateri, Feliceto, Lavatoggio, Muro, Nessa, Speloncato
Calenzana	Calenzana, Galeria, Moncale, Montegrosso (Montemaggiore)
Calvi	Lumio
Île-Rousse	Corbara, Monticello, Pigna, Sant'Antonio, Santa-Reparata-di-Balagna
	<i>Arrondissement de Corte</i>
Moita-Verde	Tallone, Tox
Prunelli-di-Fiumorobo	Prunelli-di-Fiumorobo, Solaro, Ventiseri
	<i>Arrondissement de Sartène</i>
Bonifacio	Bonifacio
Figari	Figari
Olmeto	Arbellara, Olmeto, Propriano, Viggianello
Petreto-Ricchisano	Sollacaro
Porto-Vecchio	Conca, Lecci, Porto-Vecchio, Sari-di-Porto-Vecchio
Sartène	Belvédère, Campo-Moro, Billia, Giuncheto, Grossa, Sartène
	23 — Département de la Creuse
	<i>Arrondissement d'Aubusson</i>
Bellegarde-en-Marche	Bosroger
	<i>Arrondissement de Guéret</i>
Bénévent-l'Abbaye	Saint-Goussaud
	25 — Département du Doubs
	<i>Arrondissement de Besançon</i>
Amancey	Nans-sur-Sainte-Anne
	<i>Arrondissement de Montbéliard</i>
Clerval	Anteuil (fraction Ferme du Château de Bermont) Belvoir Sancey-le-Grand (fractions Petit-Teigne, La Combe-Georgeot, Grand-Teigne, Le Fonteny, Juvillers, Les Pleines, En-Étard) Vellevans (fraction Ferme du Creusot) Vyt-les-Belvoir (fraction Ferme du Lomont)
Hérimoncourt	Abbévillers (fractions Marche, La Villers, La Chefferie) Dannemarie (fraction Ferme de la Lave) Glav (fractions Le Pré-du-Prince, les Buissons, la Combe) Pierrefontaine-les-Blamont (fractions Brise-Poutot, le Tilleul) Villars-les-Blamont

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
Pont-de-Roide	Feule Péseux Pont-de-Roide (fractions Fermes de Brulefer, Chatay, la Derrière) Rosières-sur-Barbèche Solemont Villars-sous-Dampjoux (fraction Ferme de Rochedanne)
Saint-Hippolyte	Bief Fleurey Liebvillers Saint-Hippolyte
30 — Département du Gard	
<i>Arrondissement d'Alès</i>	
Alès-Ouest	Cendras, Saint-Jean-du-Pin
Anduze	Généralgues, Saint-Sébastien
Bessèges	Bessèges, Robiac, Gagnières
La Grand'Combe	La Grand'Combe, Les Salles-du-Gardon, Laval-Pradel
Saint-Ambroix	Le Martinet, Meyrannes, Molières-sur-Cèze, Saint-Florent-sur-Auzonnet, Saint-Jean-de-Valérisclé
<i>Arrondissement du Vigan</i>	
Lasalle	Monoblet, Saint-Bonnet-de-Salendrinque, Saint-Félix-de-Pallières, Thoiras, Vabres
Sumène	Saint-Laurent-le-Minier, Saint-Julien-de-la-Nef
31 — Département de Haute-Garonne	
<i>Arrondissement de Saint-Gaudens</i>	
Aspet	Izaut-de-l'Hôtel
Barbazan	Bagiry, Frontignan-de-Comminges, Galié, Luscan, Ore, Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges
Saint-Béat	Chaum, Esténos, Fronsac
34 — Département de l'Hérault	
<i>Arrondissement de Béziers</i>	
Bédarieux	Bédarieux, Carlencas-et-Levas, Pradal (le), Saint-Étienne-Estrechoux, Tour-sur-Orb (la)
Saint-Gervais-sur-Mave	Aires (les), Hérépain, Lamalou-les-Bains, Poujol-sur-Orb (le), Villemagne
<i>Arrondissement de Lodève</i>	
Lodève	Fozières, Lodève, Olmet-et-Villecun, Soumont, Usclas-du-Bosc
Lunas	Bousquet-d'Orb (le), Octon (territoire de l'ancienne commune de Saint-Martin-des-Combes)
<i>Arrondissement de Montpellier</i>	
Aniane	Saint-Guilhem-de-Désert
Ganges	Agonès, Brissac, Cazilhac, Ganges, Laroque, Montoulieu, Moulès-et-Baucels, Saint-Bauzille-de-Putois

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	38 — Département de l'Isère
	<i>Arrondissement de Grenoble</i>
Domène	Domène (hameau Molinières) Murianette (hameaux Combaloux, les Combes, le Japin, la Péréree, les Perrets) Le Versoud (hameau Roussillon) Villard-Bonnot (hameau Bouteillères)
Goncelin	Champ-près-Froges (hameaux Bourdhuire, le Feylet) Le Cheylas (hameaux le Trouillet, le Villard) Froges (hameaux Le Bocard, Mazaretiers, Rouare, Langenet) Goncelin (hameaux le Mollard, Fontcouvert, Pelane, le Champet, Montgalmand) Pontcharra (hameaux Papillard, Maupas, le Berruer) Saint-Maximin (hameaux les Rojons, les Bruns, le Crêt, les Ripelets, les Bretonnières, le Mouret) Tencin (hameau Vautravers)
Meylan	Biviers (hameaux Grivelières, les Chevalières) Corenc (hameaux le Mollard, Saint-Germain) Saint-Ismier (hameaux Manival, Larguit, Le Millet, Crêt-de-la-Chaume, le Gueydan) La Tronche (hameau Bouqueron)
Pont-en-Royans	Beauvoir-en-Royans (hameaux Yselière, Petit-Bois) Pont-en-Royans (hameaux Courtevous, Paradis) Saint-André-en-Royans (hameaux les Courroix, la Roche, Odier, les Nouviaux) Saint-Romans (hameau Monteux) Saint-Pierre-de-Chérennes (hameau la Combe)
Saint-Etienne-de-Saint-Geoirs	Brion La Fortesse Plan Saint-Geoirs (hameaux Molezin, la Bâtie, Bramafan, les Arêtes) Saint-Michel-de-Saint-Geoirs
Saint-Laurent-du-Pont	Entre-deux-Guiers (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)
Saint-Marcellin	Murinais
Sassenage	Veurey-Voroize (hameaux Saint-Oûrs, Eygalens)
Saint-Martin-d'Hères	Saint-Martin-d'Hères (hameau le Mûrier)
Touvet	Chapareillan (hameaux Bellecombette, la Palud)
Tullins	Cras (hameaux la Rivoire, Combe-du-Moulin, le Faix, les Ferrières) Morette (hameaux les Feugères, la Combe, Charavinières, la Guitardière, Chechamain, le Village) Quincieu La Rivière (hameaux les Travers, le Rivet, les Monts) Saint-Paul d'Izeaux Tullins (hameaux la Méarie, l'Eslinard, les Ramais) Vatilleu
Vif	Le Gua (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974) Vif (hameaux Grirardière, la Merlière, le Poyet, le Sert)

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
Vinay	Chasselay Cognin-les-Gorges (hameaux Mante, Grandes Côtes, Montchardon) Notre-Dame-de-l'Osier Rovon (hameau les Combes) Saint-Gervais (hameaux le Souillet, Freyssinet, le Moléron, la Chatagnaire, le Puy) Nerpol-et-Serres Varacieux
Vizille	Notre-Dame-de-Commiers Saint-Georges-de-Commiers Vizille (hameau Montjean)
Voiron	Chirens Coublevie (hameau le Bret) Saint-Étienne-de-Crossey (hameaux Tolvon, le Sex) Voiron (hameaux Souillet-le-Grand, Souillet-le-Petit, le Rousset, la Pensière, le Molard, Grattonnières)
Voreppe	Voreppe (hameau Chalais)
Saint-Geoire-en-Valdaine	<i>Arrondissement de la Tour-du-Pin</i> Massieu Montferrat Saint-Bueil Saint-Geoire-en-Valdaine Saint-Sulpice-des-Rivoires Velanne Voissant
Virieu	Bilieu Charavines
Clairvaux-les-Lacs	39 — Département du Jura <i>Arrondissement de Lons-le-Saunier</i> La Frasnée
Salins-les-Bains	Bracon Ivrey Pretin Saint-Thiébaud Saizenay Salins-les-Bains Pont-d'Héry (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)
Moirans-en-Montagne	<i>Arrondissement de Saint-Claude</i> Chancia Jeurre Lect
Saint-Claude	Chassal Lavancia-Épercy Molinges
Saint-Laurent-en-Grandvaux	Vaux-lès-Saint-Claude Saint-Pierre-en-Grandvaux (classée par l'arrêté du 26. 6. 1961, omise dans l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	42 — Département de la Loire
	<i>Arrondissement de Montbrison</i>
Boën-sur-Lignon	Débats-Rivière-d'Orpra, l'Hôpital-sous-Rochefort, Leigneux, Saint-Sixte Marcoux (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8) Trelins (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8) Pralong (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8) Marcilly-le-Châtel (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8) Boën (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8)
Chazelles-sur-Lyon	Maringes, Virigneux, Viricelles, Chazelles-sur-Lyon
Feurs	Cottance, Essertines-en-Donzy, Jas, Panissières, Saint-Barthélemy-Lestra, Saint-Martin-Lestra, Salvizinet (partie située à l'est du CD 10)
Saint-Georges-en-Couzan	Sail-sous-Couzan
	<i>Arrondissement de Roanne</i>
Roanne	Saint-Jean-le-Puy-Saint-Maurice-sur-Loire, Villemontais (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8)
Saint-Haon-le-Châtel	Saint-Haon-le-Châtel Renaion (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8) Saint-Alban-les-Eaux (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8) Saint-André-d'Apchon (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8) Saint-Haon-le-Vieux (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8) Ambierle (partie située à l'ouest du CD 8)
Saint-Symphorien-de-Lay	Saint-Victor-sur-Rhins
	<i>Arrondissement de Saint-Étienne</i>
Firminy	Caloire, Saint-Paul-en-Cornillon
Pélussin	La Chapelle-Villars, Chuyer
Rive-de-Gier	Cellieu (hameaux de la Chironnière et Peyreux) Chagnon (hameaux de la Trène, Bourchanin et Cruziot) Châteauneuf (hameaux de Grangelet, Vaugelas, et section de Granay) Farnay Genilac (ex-commune de la Cula) Saint-Martin-la-Plaine (partie située au nord des CD 77 et 37) Saint-Paul-en-Jarez Saint-Chamond (ex-commune de Saint-Martin-en-Coailleux, et partie située au sud de la voie ferrée pour l'ex-commune d'Izieux)
Saint-Héand	Sorbiers (sections A1 et A2, D1 et D2)
	43 — Département de la Haute-Loire
	<i>Arrondissement de Brioude</i>
Auzon	Auzon, Vézézoux
Blesle	Chambozon, Léotoing, Lorlanges
Brioude	Saint-Géron

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	46 — Département du Lot
	<i>Arrondissement de Figeac</i>
Bretenoux	Cahus, Laval-de-Cère
Figeac-Est	Linac, Predeignes, Saint-Perdoux, Viazac
Lacapelle-Marival	Labathude, Saint-Bressou, Sainte-Colombe
Saint-Cère	Bannes, Frayssinhes, Latouille-Lentillac, Saint-Paul-de-Vern, Saint-Vincent-du-Pendit
	57 — Département de la Moselle
	<i>Arrondissement de Sarrebourg</i>
Lorquin	Abreschviller, Saint-Quirin, Turquestein-Blancrupt
Phalsbourg	Dabo, Garrebourg, Haselbourg, Hultehouse, Lutzelbourg
Sarrebourg	Harreberg, Hommert, Walscheid
	63 — Département du Puy-de-Dôme
	<i>Arrondissement de Clermont-Ferrand</i>
Clermont-Sud	Romagnat: — sections G et AL (village de Opme) — sections I et AM (village de Saulzet-le-Chaud) — section H (villages de Redon, Pradet)
Clermont-Est	Sayat: — section A (villages d'Argnat)
	<i>Arrondissement de Riom</i>
Combronde	Combronde: — section G (villages des Ballages, Borots) — section A (villages des Jouffrets)
Menat	Saint-Gal-sur-Sioule
Riom-Est	Châtel-Guyon: — section AR (village du Bournet)
Riom-Ouest	Enval: — section ZD (village de Beauvaleix)
	64 — Département des Pyrénées-Atlantiques
	<i>Arrondissement de Bayonne</i>
Espelette	Ainhua, Sare
Iholdy	Hosta, Saint-Just-Ibarre
Saint-Étienne-de-Baigorry	Ascarat
	<i>Arrondissement d'Oloron-Sainte-Marie</i>
Aramits	Ance, Arimats, Féas
Arudy	Arudy (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974), Sainte-Colome
Mauléon-Licharre	Barcus, Musculdy, Ordiarp, Roquiague
Oloron-Sainte-Marie	Asasp (quartier Lagnos), Esquiule, Lurbe-Saint-Christau, Oloron-Sainte-Marie (quartier Bager Sud)
Tardets-Sorholus	Laguinge-Restoue, Tardets-Sorholus, Lichans-Sunhar

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	65 — Département des Hautes-Pyrénées
	<i>Arrondissement d'Argelès-Gazost</i>
Argelès-Gazost	Adast, Agos-Vidalos, Argelès-Gazost, Ayros-Arbouix, Ayzac-Ost, Boô-Silhen, Lau-Balagnas, Préchac, Pierrefitte-Nestalas
Lourdes	Les Angles, Arcizac-es-Angles, Aspin-en-Lavedan, Bourréac, Escoubès-Pouts, Ger, Geu, Julos, Lézignan, Lourdes, Luga-gnan, Paréac, Poueyferre
Luz-Saint-Sauveur	Viscos (classé par l'arrêté du 26. 6. 1961, omise dans l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)
Saint-Pé-de-Bigorre	Peyrouse
	<i>Arrondissement de Bagnères-de-Bigorre</i>
Bagnères-de-Bigorre	Argelès, Bettès, Cieutat, Hauban, Mérilheu, Orignac, Pouzac, Trébons, Uzer
La Barthe-de-Neste	Avezac-Prat-Lahitte, Bazus-Neste, Gazave, Lortet, Mazouau, Saint-Arroman
Lannemezan	Artiguemy, Benque, Bonnemazon, Bourg-de-Bigorre, Castil-lon, Chelle-Spou, Gourgue, Lutilhous, Mauvezin, Molère, Péré, Sarlabous, Tilhouse
Mauléon-Barousse	Bertren, Izaourt, Loures-Barousse, Sainte-Marie, Saléchan, Sarp, Siradan
Saint-Laurent-de-Neste	Aventignan, Hautaget, Lombres, Montégut, Montsérié, Nestier, Tibiran-Jaunac
	<i>Arrondissement de Tarbes</i>
Ossun	Averan, Barry, Layrisse, Orincles
Tournay	Bégole, Barbazan-Dessus, Caharet, Castéra-Lanusse, Hitte, Lanespède, Luc, Oléac-Dessus, Ozon, Poumarous, Ricaud
Galan	Castelbajac
	66 — Département des Pyrénées-Orientales
	<i>Arrondissement de Céret</i>
Argelès-sur-Mer	Argelès-sur-Mer (sections cadastrales CD, CE, CH, CI et CK) Laroque-des-Albères (sections cadastrales B3 et C2), Sorède (sections cadastrales C1, C2, C3, D unique et E unique)
Arles-sur-Tech	Amélie-les-Bains (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)
Céret	Calmeilles, Céret, l'Écluse, Oms, Le Perthus, Reynès, Taillet
Côte-Vermeille	Banyuls-sur-Mer, Cerbère, Collioure, Port-Vendres
	<i>Arrondissement de Perpignan</i>
Latour-de-France	Caramany
Saint-Paul-de-Fenouillet	Ansignan, Prugnanes, Saint-Martin
Thuir	Caixas, Passa-Llauro-Tordères (fraction Llauro)
	<i>Arrondissement de Prades</i>
Prades	Catllar, Eus
Sournia	Feilluns, Pézilla-de-Conflent, Tarerach, Trévillach, Trilla
Vinça	Casefabre, Estoher

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	67 — Département du Bas-Rhin
	<i>Arrondissement de Molsheim</i>
Rosheim	Mollkirch
Schirmeck	Le Ban-de-la-Roche (territoire de l'ancienne commune de Fouday), Barembach, La Broque, Rothau, Schirmeck
	<i>Arrondissement de Sélestat</i>
Villé	Albé, Bassemberg, Breitenau, Saint-Martin
	68 — Département du Haut-Rhin
	<i>Arrondissement de Colmar</i>
Munster	Griesbach-au-Val, Gunsbach, Soultzbach-les-Bains, Wihr-au-Val
Wintzenheim	Walbach, Zimmerbach
	<i>Arrondissement de Guebwiller</i>
Guebwiller	Rimbachzell
Rouffach	Osenbach Rouffach (fraction forêt reculée) Soultzmatt (fraction forêt reculée) et hameau Wintzfelden (sections D et E du cadastre)
Soultz	Soultz (fraction forêt reculée)
	<i>Arrondissement de Thann</i>
Cernay	Wattwiller (fraction ferme du Molkenrain)
Thann	Bourbach-le-Bas, Rammersmatt
	69 — Département du Rhône
	<i>Arrondissement de Lyon</i>
L'Arbresle	Bessenay: sections F1, F2 et E en partie (lieux-dits le Moulin à vent, le Vernay) Bibost: sections A2, A3, A4 et A5 en partie (lieu-dit: le Trève) Savigny: sections E1, E2 et E3 Sourcieux-les-Mines: sections C2 et D1 Saint-Pierre-la-Palud: sections AE, AH, AD en partie (lieux-dits: le Petit-Saint-Bonnet et les Grandes-Vignes), AC en partie (lieu-dit: les Bornes)
Mornant	Chaussan: sections C, D et B en partie (sauf hameau Brunzieux) Rontalon: en totalité, sauf les sections AH et AI Saint-Didier-sous-Riverie: sections A, F1, F2 et G Saint-Sorlin: sections D1, D2, D3, C1, C2, C3 et B2
Vaugneray	Pol lionnay: sections AL, AM et AN Saint-Laurent-de-Vaux: en totalité Thurins: sections AR et AT en totalité, AP en partie, AS en partie, AH en partie, AE en partie, AD en partie section AP en partie, lieux-dits La Martinière-d'en-Haut, Roche-Saint-Martin, Bois Renard, le Combard; section AS en partie, lieux-dits les Bruyères, les Pins;

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
	<p>section AH en partie, lieux-dits le Rat, le Jaricot, Plat-de-Saint-Romain</p> <p>section AD en partie, lieux-dits les Granges-Ouest, les Bochets</p> <p>section AE en partie, lieux-dits les Granges-Est, la Picolette, les Côtes</p> <p>Vaugneray: sections E, G2, I, K, F1 en partie et H en partie (F1 en partie, lieux-dits: Laïs, Bel-Air, Taconant, l'Évêque); (H en partie, lieux-dits: au-dessus de la Chana, les Roches, Rochetrouille, Clavigny, Combe-Fusil-en-Pellerou, Croix-de-la-Fausse, Vergnant-Sud)</p> <p><i>Arrondissement de Villefranche-sur-Saône</i></p> <p>Beaujeu: sections A, B, E1, E2, F</p> <p>Chiroubles: section D</p> <p>Jullie: sections A, B1 et B2</p> <p>Marchamp: sections A, C1, D, E1 et E2</p> <p>Saint-Didier-sur-Beaujeu: sections A, C, D, B1, B2 en partie (lieux-dits La Ronze, Jorson et Longchamp: parcelles 260 à 280) et B3 en partie (lieu-dit les Loys: parcelles 563 à 567; lieu-dit les Guérins: parcelles 551 à 553 et 556 à 562)</p> <p>Vauxrenard: sections A, AD, AC, AO, AP, AR, AS et G</p> <p>Bois-d'Oingt: Chamelet: en totalité</p> <p>Létra: en totalité</p> <p>Saint-Paule: en totalité</p> <p>Tarare: Dareize: sections A1, A2 en partie: le Creux</p> <p>Saint-Loup: section A1 et lieu-dit le Crêt-du-Pay sur les sections A2 et B1</p> <p>Saint-Romain-de-Popey: section C3 en partie (lieux-dits Teilloux, Bois de Teilloux, Bois de Varenne, le Bois de la Combe, Bois Simon, le Crêt)</p> <p>Tarare: en totalité</p> <p>Thizy: Thizy: en totalité, Bourg-de-Thizy: en totalité</p> <p>Villefranche-sur-Saône: Rivolet: section A, section B</p> <p>70 — Département de la Haute-Saône</p> <p><i>Arrondissement de Lure</i></p> <p>Faucogney-et-la-Mer: Esmoulières, Faucogney-et-la-Mer, Saint-Bresson</p> <p>Mélissey: Ternuay-Melay et Saint-Hilaire</p> <p>71 — Département de la Saône-et-Loire</p> <p><i>Arrondissement de Mâcon</i></p> <p>Tramayes: Pierreclos, Serrières</p> <p>73 — Département de la Savoie</p> <p><i>Arrondissement d'Albertville</i></p> <p>Albertville-Nord: Pallud (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p><i>Arrondissement de Chambéry</i></p> <p>La Ravoire: Montagnole (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Saint-Cassin (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p>

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
Les Échelles	<p>Attignat-Oncin (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>La Bauche (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Saint-Christophe-la-Grotte (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Saint-Franc (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Les Échelles</p>
Montmélian	Villaroux (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)
La Motte-Servolex	<p>Saint-Sulpice (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Vimines (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p>
Pont-de-Beauvoisin	<p>Aiguebellette-le-Lac (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Ayn (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Dullin (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Lépin-le-Lac (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Nances (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Saint-Béron (hameaux de: La Londagne-Nord, La Londagne-Sud, le Bajat)</p> <p>Saint-Alban-de-Montbel</p> <p>La Bridoire (hameau de: les Roches)</p>
Grésy-sur-Aix	Brison-Saint-Innocent (hameau de: Les Granges)
Saint-Genix-sur-Guiers	<p>Gerbaix (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Marcieux (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Novalaise (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Saint-Maurice-de-Rotherens (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Sainte-Marie-d'Alvey</p>
Saint-Pierre-d'Albigny	<p>Saint-Jean-de-la-Porte (hameau de: le Féal)</p> <p>Saint-Pierre-d'Albigny (hameaux de: les Garniers, les Granges)</p>
Yenne	<p>Loisieux (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Saint-Pierre-d'Alvey (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>La Chapelle-Saint-Martin</p> <p>Traize</p> <p>Meyrieux-Trouet (hameaux de: Trouet, Villaret, Kreiner)</p>
74 — Département de la Haute-Savoie	
<i>Arrondissement d'Annecy</i>	
Alby-sur-Chéran	Cusy (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)
Annecy-le-Vieux	Annecy-le-Vieux (hameaux de Sur-les-Bois, Chez le Roy, chez Chappet, chez Rosset), Menthon-Saint-Bernard, Veyrier-du-Lac
Annecy-Ouest	Choisy
Faverges	<p>Doussard</p> <p>Faverges (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)</p> <p>Giez</p>

CANTONS	COMMUNES OU PARTIES DE COMMUNES
Rumilly	Lathuille (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)
Seynod	Crempigny-Bonneguête
	Duingt, Saint-Jorioz, Sévrier
	<i>Arrondissement de Saint-Julien-en-Genevois</i>
Cruseilles	Cercier
Frangy	Chaumont (reste du territoire non classé par l'arrêté du 20. 2. 1974)
	Clarafond-Arcine
	Vanzey
Saint-Julien-en-Genevois	Chevrier
	Savigny
	81 — Département du Tarn
	<i>Arrondissement d'Albi</i>
Alban	Teillet
Monesties	Montirat
	Saint-Christophe-Narthoux
Pampelonne	Jouqueviel
Réalmon	Saint-Antonin-de-Lacalm
	Le Travet
Valence-d'Albigeois	Assac
	Cadix
	Courris
	Le Dourn
	Fraissines
	Saint-Michel-Labadié
	Trébas
Villefranche-d'Albigeois	Ambialet
	Le Fraysse
	87 — Département de la Haute-Vienne
	<i>Arrondissement de Limoges</i>
Châteauneuf-la-Forêt	La Croisille-sur-Briance
Laurière	Jabreilles-les-Bordes, la Jonchère-Saint-Maurice, Saint-Léger-la-Montagne
	88 — Département des Vosges
	<i>Arrondissement d'Épinal</i>
Bruyères	Xamontarupt
	<i>Arrondissement de Saint-Dié</i>
Brouvelieures	Biffontaine
Corcieux	Herpelmont, la Houssière, Vienville
Fraize	Entre-deux-Eaux
Saint-Dié	Lesseux
Senones	Belval, Châtas, Grandrupt, Le Puid, le Vermont, Vieux-Moulin
	90 — Département du territoire de Belfort
	<i>Arrondissement de Belfort</i>
Giromagny	Auxelles-Bas, Giromagny