

Official Journal

of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6986

C 295

Volume 23

13 November 1980

English edition

Information and Notices

Contents

I Information

European Parliament

Written Questions with answer:

- No 1279/79 by Miss Quin to the Commission
Subject: Changes in employment of fishermen and fish landings (Supplementary answer) 1
- No 1620/79 by Mr Glinne to the Council
Subject: Planned construction of a nuclear power station at Cattenom (France) 2
- No 352/80 by Mr Michel to the Commission
Subject: Isoglucose (Supplementary answer) 3
- No 518/80 by Mr Curry to the Commission
Subject: Economics of Community Preference 4
- No 611/80 by Mrs Herklotz to the Council
Subject: Cleaning up of the Rhine 4
- No 674/80 by Mr Provan to the Commission
Subject: Textile industry 5
- No 682/80 by Mr Van Miert to the Commission
Subject: Financing of pilot schemes for the housing of the physically and mentally handicapped and foreign workers 5
- No 726/80 by Mr Ansquer to the Council
Subject: Channel Tunnel scheme 6
- No 745/80 by Mr Wurtz to the Council
Subject: Refusal of access to certain occupations for candidates in the European elections 6
- No 798/80 by Mr Habsburg to the Council
Subject: International Labour Organization Convention on the employment of minors 6
- No 801/80 by Mrs Lizin to the Commission
Subject: Nuclear power stations: dates and cost of decommissioning 7

Contents (continued)

No 820/80 by Mr Price to the Commission Subject: Community income and applicant countries	7
No 824/80 by Mr Del Duca to the Commission Subject: Jobs in the Community glass industry	8
No 835/80 by Mr Diligent to the Commission Subject: The Commission's answers to written questions	9
No 869/80 by Mr Moreland to the Council Subject: Decision-making at the Council of Transport Ministers	9
No 874/80 by Mr Verhaegen to the Commission Subject: Afforestation policy	10
No 878/80 by Mr Albers to the Commission Subject: Pilot projects to improve the quality of the education given to the children of migrant workers	11
No 883/80 by Mr Irmer to the Commission Subject: Differences in road traffic regulations in the Community	13
No 885/80 by Mr McCartin to the Commission Subject: Adaptation of the western drainage scheme to include individuals as well as cooperatives	13
No 904/80 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission Subject: EEC finance for institutions of further education of university status	14
No 906/80 by Mr van Aerssen to the Commission Subject: Insurance problems affecting external trade	15
No 908/80 by Mrs Hoffmann to the Council Subject: Situation of the European car industry	16
No 913/80 by Mr Bocklet to the Commission Subject: Skimmed-milk powder	16
No 918/80 by Mr Coppieters to the Commission Subject: Accident at the nuclear waste re-processing plant at The Hague	17
No 919/80 by Mr Coppieters to the Commission Subject: Accidents at nuclear plants in the Community	17
No 928/80 by Mr John Mark Taylor to the Commission Subject: Transport	18
No 933/80 by Mr Provan to the Commission Subject: Taxation of alcoholic beverages in Greece	18
No 948/80 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission Subject: Fuel subsidy for fishermen	19
No 959/80 by Mr Lalor to the Commission Subject: Origin markings	19
No 960/80 by Mr Calvez to the Commission Subject: Community investment in the coal sector	19

(Continued on inside back cover)

Contents (continued)

No 965/80 by Mr Battersby to the Commission Subject: Relations between the Community and Comecon	20
No 969/80 by Mr Battersby to the Commission Subject: Relations between the Community and Member States of Comecon	21
No 974/80 by Mr Seefeld to the Commission Subject: Change of registration of private cars in the Community	21
No 975/80 by Mr Schwencke to the Commission Subject: Community subsidies from the Regional and Social Funds for measures in the German Land of Lower Saxony	22
No 976/80 by Mr Flanagan to the Commission Subject: Generating electricity in the Shannon estuary	22
No 977/80 by Mr Flanagan to the Commission Subject: Harmonization of energy prices and taxes	23
No 1003/80 by Mr Provan to the Commission Subject: ECU grant and hill farmers	23
No 1007/80 by Mr Seefeld to the Commission Subject: Issue of Dutch driving licences on presentation of Egyptian licences	24
No 1022/80 by Mr Provan to the Commission Subject: Imports of rabbit meat from non-EEC countries	24
No 1054/80 by Mr Müller-Hermann to the Commission Subject: Discrimination against shipping companies in the Algiers-Marseilles trade	25
No 1064/80 by Mr Diana to the Commission Subject: Italy's debit balance	25
No 1066/80 by Mr Glinne to the Commission Subject: Accidents in the home	26
No 1072/80 by Mr van Aerssen to the Commission Subject: Interpretation of GATT rules in Community Member States	26
No 1075/80 by Mr Früh to the Commission Subject: Trends in the number of nurse cows in the Community	27
No 1079/80 by Mr Pininfarina to the Commission Subject: Sale of pasta products in some Member States	28
No 1080/80 by Mr Kavanagh to the Commission Subject: Draft Directive on free movement and right of establishment of pharmacists	28
No 1088/80 by Mr Lomas to the Commission Subject: School visit to Belgium – racial discrimination	29
No 1097/80 by Lord O'Hagan to the Commission Subject: Harmonization of excise duty and the tax on alcoholic beverages	29
No 1183/80 by Mr Seeler to the Commission Subject: Financial assistance for basic research	29

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1279/79

by Miss Quin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 December 1979)

Subject: Changes in employment of fishermen and fish landings

Will the Commission supply figures for the number of fishermen, and the volume of fish landed, in 1972 in each of the present Member States and supply similar figures for the most recent year for which figures are available?

**Supplementary answer given by Mr Ortoli
on behalf of the Commission ⁽¹⁾**

The number of fishermen in each Member State in 1972 and 1978 and the volume of catches are given in the table below:

	No of fishermen ⁽²⁾			Landings (1 000 tonnes) ⁽³⁾
	Full-time	Part-time	Total	
	1972			
Germany	5 373	3 800	9 173	312·0
France	:	:	34 609	671·6
Italy	:	:	65 000 (est)	369·0 (est)
Netherlands	:	:	4 947	289·3
Belgium	1 607	—	1 607	51·6
United Kingdom	18 413	4 290	22 703	954·8
Ireland	2 174	3 968	6 142	86·4
Denmark	10 988	3 703	14 691	1 418·6
EUR 9	:	:	158 872	4 153·3

⁽¹⁾ Up-to-date version of the reply already published in OJ No C 150, 18. 6. 1980, p. 6.

⁽²⁾ Great care should be taken when comparing the data on the number of fishermen for the different Member States and for the two years because definitions may be different or may have changed.

⁽³⁾ Landed weight.

	No of fishermen ⁽¹⁾			Landings (1 000 tonnes ⁽²⁾)
	Full-time	Part-time	Total	
	1978			
Germany	4 476	268	4 844	270·1
France	:	:	22 456	715·3
Italy	:	:	45 000 (est)	361·5
Netherlands	:	:	3 604	285·3
Belgium	914	—	914	42·8
United Kingdom	16 467	5 719	22 168	956·5
Ireland	2 815	5 805	8 620	100·4
Denmark	10 938 ⁽³⁾	3 971 ⁽³⁾	14 909 ⁽³⁾	1 715·2
EUR 9	:	:	122 515	4 447·1

⁽¹⁾ Great care should be taken when comparing the data on the number of fishermen for the different Member States and for the two years because definitions may be different or may have changed.

⁽²⁾ Landed weight.

⁽³⁾ Data for 1977.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1620/79

by Mr Glinne

to the Council of the European Communities

(5 January 1980)

Subject: Planned construction of a nuclear power station at Cattenom (France)

The plans, recently announced by France, to increase the capacity of a nuclear power station to be sited in the Moselle area, are causing concern in Germany and Luxembourg. These neighbouring countries fear that the planned increase in the generating capacity of the Cattenom power station – to 5 200 megawatts – will cause a temperature rise and, at the same time, the increased pollution of the Moselle.

According to Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty 'each Member State shall provide the Commission with such general data relating to any plan for the disposal of radioactive waste in whatever form as will make it possible to determine whether the implementation of the plan is liable to result in the radioactive contamination of the water, soil or airspace of another Member State'.

Moreover, on 17 May 1979, the Commission presented to the Council a proposal for a Regulation on the introduction of a Community consultation procedure for power stations likely to affect the territory of another Member State.

What action has been taken by the Council with regard to this proposal for a Regulation?

Does the Council ensure that Member States observe Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty? Have the necessary guarantees been given by France to Germany and Luxembourg as regards the non-pollution of the Moselle? Why has the regional government of Rhineland-Palatinate reaffirmed its categorical opposition to the siting of a power station of such a capacity at this location, fearing, in particular, that a rise in the temperature of the Moselle will alter the climate and cause harm to the vineyards of the region?

Answer

(21 October 1980)

Article 37 of the Treaty lays down that 'each Member State shall provide the Commission with such general data relating to any plan for the disposal of radioactive waste in whatever form as will make it possible to determine whether the implementation of such plan is liable to result in the radioactive contamination of the water, soil or airspace of another Member State. The Commission shall deliver its opinion within six months after consulting the group of experts referred to in Article 31'.

Under the terms of paragraph 6 of the Commission recommendation on the application of Article 37, plans for the disposal of radioactive waste must be forwarded to the Commission at least six months before the scheduled date of disposal.

It is for the Commission, and not the Council, to ensure that the Member States comply with the Articles of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community.

Apart from this, the Council is in the process of examining a proposal for a Council Regulation on the introduction of a Community consultation procedure for power stations likely to affect the territory of another Member State.

Although a different procedure is involved, the Council was aware in the case of the Cattenom power station that the Act of Communication laid down in Article 41 of the Treaty was carried out in February 1979 and that the Commission expressed its point of view in September 1979.

As regards the guarantees referred to by the Honourable Member; it is not for the Council to comment on them.

However, from information given by Member States the Council has reason to believe that, under the thermal load plan, the International Commission for the Protection of the Moselle against Pollution is examining the question of the effect of the establishment of the Cattenom nuclear power station on the waters of the Moselle and that of the preventive measures which will need to be taken. The Council expects that the discussions of the International Commission will result in Regulations for the protection of the Moselle which will take into account the interests of all the parties concerned.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 352/80

by Mr Michel

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 May 1980)

Subject: Isoglucose

1. Since 5 June 1979 France has authorized the use of gluco-isomerase (or D-gluco-cetol-isomerase) preparations obtained by the controlled fermentation of a strain of streptomyces violaceoniger to manufacture high-fructose glucose syrups.

Is the true that this strain is not commercially available and is used only in France, so that this authorization constitutes discrimination between national and imported products?

2. If so, what is the Commission's attitude? Does it intend to propose common standards and forbid any discriminatory measures?

3. Isoglucose complying with the national definition may be incorporated in foods and drinks intended for human consumption provided current regulations and practices do not conflict with their use in these foods and drinks.

That is an important proviso.

Can the Commission specify the foods and drinks in which isoglucose is forbidden but in which other liquid sugars are permitted?

Supplementary answer given by Mr Davignon on behalf of the Commission

(17 October 1980)

Further to its answer of 11 June 1980⁽¹⁾, the Commission is now able to supply the information obtained from the French authorities.

1. The Order of 5 June 1979, published in the *Journal Officiel de la République française* C 6845 of 9 August 1979, was issued in implementation of the Decree of 15 April 1912 (amended) which stipulates that only chemical products (permanent or temporary) whose use has been declared lawful by an Order can be used in food for human consumption. Before authorizing decrees can be issued they need the opinion of the French Higher Council of Public Health and the National Academy of Medicine. Basing their pronouncements on the toxicological dossiers submitted, these bodies have come out in favour of gluco-isomerase obtained from streptomyces violaceoniger. If there are other gluco-isomerases marketed on the basis of other micro-organisms, there is nothing to stop producers submitting a request for authorization in conformity with the abovementioned Decree to the French Ministry of Agriculture.

2. The Commission is following this question closely and will take any measures that might prove necessary.

3. The Order of 5 June 1979 is designed to authorize the use of a particular enzyme process and not to regulate the use of isoglucose in foodstuffs. Thus, Article 4 covers the regulations which define the composition of foodstuffs.

In general, high-fructose glucose syrups may be used in all food and drink where the use of glucose is admitted.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 178, 16. 7. 1980, p. 66.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 518/80

by Mr Curry

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 June 1980)

Subject: Economics of Community Preference

Does the Commission believe that it makes economic sense to subsidize the expansion of the peach growing sector in Italy when, even with the benefit of extensive producer aids and protected by a 22% tariff, Italian canned peaches are unable to compete in quality and price with those shipped 6 000 miles from South Africa or 12 000 miles from Australia?

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

(8 October 1980)

Contrary to the Honourable Member's impression, since the production aid was granted canned peaches produced in the Community have been sold at prices competitive with those of similar products from non-member countries.

With regard to the expansion of peach growing, the Honourable Member is referred to the answer to his Written Question No 521/80 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 288, 6. 11. 1980, p. 2.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 611/80

by Mrs Herklotz

to the Council of the European Communities

(16 June 1980)

Subject: Cleaning up of the Rhine

In the statement by the Council of the European Communities before the European Parliament in Strasbourg on 21 May 1980 ⁽¹⁾, the Italian Foreign Minister Mr Colombo, in his capacity as President-in-Office of the Council, stressed the need to clean up the Rhine.

⁽¹⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-256 (21 May 1980) p. 113.

What steps does the Council intend to take to find a solution to the increasing problem of pollution in the Rhine.

What sums of money will the Council make available and what time-scale does it envisage for tackling the question of cleaning up the Rhine?

Answer

(21 October 1980)

1. The Council has on several occasions demonstrated its wish to protect and improve the quality of the aquatic environment of the Community, the Rhine included. To this end it has already adopted, as part of its first and second action programmes on the environment, a whole range of Directives such as:

- the Directive concerning the quality required of surface water intended for the abstraction of drinking water in the Member States ⁽¹⁾;
- the Directive concerning the quality of bathing water ⁽²⁾;
- the Directive on pollution caused by certain dangerous substances discharged into the aquatic environment of the Community ⁽³⁾;
- the Directive on the quality of fresh waters needing protection or improvement in order to support fish life ⁽⁴⁾;
- the Directive concerning the methods of measurement and frequencies of sampling and analysis of surface water intended for the abstraction of drinking water ⁽⁵⁾;
- the Directive on the quality required of shellfish waters ⁽⁶⁾;
- the Directive on the protection of groundwater against pollution caused by certain dangerous substances ⁽⁷⁾.

Finally, at its meeting on 15 July 1980 the Council approved a Directive on the quality of water for human consumption.

2. With regard to the protection of the Rhine, it should be noted that since the Community is not a

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 194, 25. 7. 1975, p. 26.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 31, 5. 2. 1976, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 129, 18. 5. 1976, p. 23.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 222, 14. 8. 1978, p. 1.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 271, 29. 10. 1979, p. 44.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ No L 281, 10. 11. 1979, p. 41.

⁽⁷⁾ OJ No L 20, 26. 1. 1980, p. 43.

contracting party to the Bonn Convention of 3 December 1976 against pollution by chlorides but only to the Convention on the Protection of the Rhine against Chemical Pollution, also signed in Bonn on 3 December 1976, this is not a matter for the Council.

3. However, the Commission has observer status, under the International Commission for the Protection of the Rhine against Pollution, on the working bodies responsible for chloride pollution questions.

Commission will be having consultations with a view to extending the existing arrangements until accession. After accession the provisions of the respective Treaties would apply.

The decline in job opportunities in textiles and clothing is due to a number of factors and it is not feasible to say precisely what weight should be given to any one of them. It is also necessary to bear in mind that in the Community's trade in manufactured products with the applicant countries the overall trade balance is largely in the Community's favour.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 674/80

by Mr Provan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 June 1980)

Subject: Textile industry

What measures does the Commission propose to protect the Textile Industry within the Community from imports produced at below equivalent cost from countries applying for admission to the Community?

Does the Commission realize that if this continues, many jobs within the existing Community will be at stake?

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

(8 October 1980)

Imports of textile and clothing products from Greece, Portugal and Spain are covered by the Preferential Agreements at present in force between the Community and these countries. These Agreements give unrestricted access for industrial products from the countries concerned and contain a safeguard mechanism except with respect to Greece. Nevertheless, the Community has secured voluntary restraint arrangements for imports of textile and clothing from these countries.

For Greece the present arrangement will continue until accession after which the relevant provisions of the Treaty of Accession will apply. For Portugal and Spain the

WRITTEN QUESTION No 682/80

by Mr Van Miert

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 June 1980)

Subject: Financing of pilot schemes for the housing of the physically and mentally handicapped and foreign workers

The 1979 Report on Social Developments states, in Section C – Social developments in 1979, Chapter VI – Housing (p. 125), that 'the Commission once again contributed to the cost of studies and pilot schemes concerned with housing for the physically or mentally handicapped and for foreign workers'.

Can the Commission state:

1. Which schemes and studies have been given finance to date and how much?
2. What conditions schemes must comply with, particularly as regards their 'pilot' nature?
3. What the results of the studies carried out have been and what provision has been made for their publication?
4. What information has been published so that all the groups concerned will be in an equal position when submitting project proposals?
5. To what extent the applications for finance in 1980 have been met and what opportunities still exist for the submission of further projects?

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

(10 October 1980)

1. In the period 1976 to 1980, 35 studies and pilot schemes in the housing field to promote the social integration of handicapped persons have been supported by the Commission. (1976: 450 000 u. a.; 1977: 500 000 u. a.; 1978: 560 000 u. a.; 1979: 600 000 EUA). A detailed report on each of the projects is under preparation and will be presented before the end of this year.

2. The national schemes supported by the EEC should be seen as projects promoting the mobility of handicapped persons through special housing as well as providing the necessary social services.

3. As stated under point 1, a report on the programme is being prepared.

The Commission is also preparing a Video-programme illustrating some of the results.

4. The relevant national handicapped organizations concerned with the housing problem are aware of the EEC pilot-schemes. The pilot projects concerned have been referred to at the informative Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation of Handicapped Persons (Luxembourg, 21 to 23 March 1979) organized by the Commission's Directorate-General Employment and Social Affairs, and at the Conference on Urban Problems in the European Community (Liverpool, 6 to 9 November 1979), organized by the Commission's Environment and Consumer Protection Service.

5. Only a small part of the 1980 budget has definitively been earmarked for new pilot actions. The final selection will take place in October or November of this year.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 726/80

by Mr Ansquer

to the Council of the European Communities

(4 July 1980)

Subject: Channel Tunnel scheme

Will the Council comment on the recent plans announced by French and British railways, together with

a consortium of four European companies, which envisage the construction of a single-track rail tunnel with electric locomotion, thereby reviving the Channel Tunnel scheme?

At what stage is this project and when should it be completed?

Answer

(21 October 1980)

The Council has no information on the scheme referred to by the Honourable Member.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 745/80

by Mr Wurtz

to the Council of the European Communities

(4 July 1980)

Subject: Refusal of access to certain occupations for candidates in the European elections

Is it true that in one of the nine Member States of the Community one or more persons have been refused access to certain occupations because they stood as candidates in the European elections held on 10 June 1979?

Answer

(21 October 1980)

The Council has no knowledge of any facts of the type mentioned by the Honourable Member.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 798/80

by Mr Habsburg

to the Council of the European Communities

(10 July 1980)

Subject: International Labour Organization Convention on the employment of minors

A number of recent successful European films are in clear breach of Article 3 of ILO Convention No 138 on the

employment of minors, which provides that minors below the age of 18 may not be employed in work which may corrupt their moral values.

In view of the increasing number of films in which minors act in pornographic scenes, will the Council state whether it is prepared to call upon those States of the Community which have not yet ratified International Labour Organization Convention No 138 to do so forthwith and to invite those countries which have already done so forthwith to apply the provisions of the Convention and in particular Article 3 thereof?

Answer

(21 October 1980)

The Council shares the concern behind the Honourable Member's question. However, the question relates to a matter which is the responsibility of the Member States.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 801/80

by Mrs Lizin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 July 1980)

Subject: Nuclear power stations: dates and cost of decommissioning

Can the Commission state:

1. On what dates will the oldest nuclear power stations operating in the Community be decommissioned?
2. Will the costs of such operations be borne by the electricity generating companies? Under what headings will they appear in the balance sheet?

**Answer given by Mr Brunner
of behalf of the Commission**

(8 October 1980)

1. Seven nuclear power stations in the Community have already been closed down for good. These closures

were spread over the years 1968 to 1977 and relate to low and medium-capacity stations (4 to 237 MW(e)).

As regards stations at present in operation, the decommissioning dates have not yet been fixed. However, 10 units of small or medium size in the Community can be expected to close down over the next ten years.

2. The cost incurred in the decommissioning of a nuclear power station is borne by the operator and is usually defrayed from cash reserves.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 820/80

by Mr Price

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 July 1980)

Subject: Community income and applicant countries

If Greece, Spain and Portugal had been Members of the European Community in 1978, 1979 and 1980 and assuming that there were no resulting changes in their respective patterns of trade or domestic consumption, what does the Commission estimate would have been the figures for Community income from each of these countries for each of those years (showing agricultural levies, customs duties and VAT revenue separately)?

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

(8 October 1980)

In the 'Fresco' ⁽¹⁾ which it presented in 1978, the Commission made an estimate of the own resources which would have been paid in full into the Community budget in 1978 by Spain, Greece and Portugal, had they been full members at that time.

These estimates, which, in view of the inadequacy of the statistics available, must be considered as orders of magnitude serving merely as a guide, were as follows:

⁽¹⁾ 'Enlargement of the Community - Economic and sectoral aspects' - Commission Memorandum to the Council submitted on 20 April 1978 - Bulletin EEC Supplement 3/78.

	(million EUA)		
	Greece	Spain	Portugal
1. Customs duties	100 ± 20	350 ± 50	30 ± 10
2. Agricultural levies and sugar levies	100 ± 20	275 ± 50	75 ± 15
3. 1 % of the VAT assessment basis (a)	170	610	110
4. VAT own resources on the basis of the rate which would have been applied for a twelve-member Community	130	470	85
5. Total own resources at the maximum VAT rate of 1 %	370	1 235	215

(a) Since VAT is not applied by any of the three countries, the assessment bases were estimated from national accounts aggregates

These estimates have not been updated for 1979 and 1980. However, a more recent assessment of agricultural levies has been made on the basis of 1979 imports in the case of Greece and Spain and 1978 imports in the case of Portugal. The result is an appreciable increase in agricultural resources which would be paid by the three countries, assuming they were full members. The increase on the 'Fresco' estimates is some 40 % and stems largely from the Spanish and Portuguese payments. In the case of Portugal, customs duties would also be higher because of a substantial rise in imports in terms of value in 1978 and 1979.

The forecasts for Greece for 1981 ⁽¹⁾ show a fair degree of comparability with the 1978 estimates.

⁽¹⁾ See preliminary draft budget for 1981, volume 7/B, pp. 974 *et seq.*

WRITTEN QUESTION No 824/80

by Mr Del Duca

to the Commission of the European Communities

(11 July 1980)

Subject: Jobs in the Community glass industry

The United States company Vernante-Pennitalia is proposing to build a massive float-glass factory in Italy with a capacity three times greater than that of the same company's drawn glass plant and of the production programme of the Cuneo float glass factory. Moreover, there are apparently plans to build similar plants in Turkey, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

The survey carried out for the EEC by the Brussels Institute Sobemap shows that more than a thousand jobs would be threatened by the implementation of these proposals, since they will reduce the production of existing float glass plant. These cut-backs might have particularly adverse effects on factories in Abruzzo, which is one of the economically depressed regions of Italy.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Whether it is aware of these projects and what measures does it intend to take to prevent a situation arising where their implementation (which would appear injudicious at this time in view of the crisis in the car industry and the stagnation of the construction industry), instead of making a positive contribution to employment problems, would ultimately have an adverse effect on employment in existing glass companies by leading to serious overproduction?
2. Does it intend to make use of the results of the study recently carried out for the EEC by the Brussels Institute Sobemap, which concludes that the installation of new float glass plant in Europe should be rejected, since it is estimated that they will lead to a reduction in the activities of existing float glass plant, with the loss of 1 500 jobs?
3. Does it not consider that there is a need for an industrial policy in the clear glass sector which is based on large continuous-cycle plant and substantial fixed investments to prevent adverse effects of the type referred to above and does it not feel that the redevelopment and reorganization of old drawn glass plant should make use of the labour force in sectors other than float glass to prevent a serious crisis in this sector too?

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

(8 October 1980)

1. The Commission is indeed aware of the projects to which the Honourable Member refers. This was one of the reasons why the Sobemap study was ordered. For the moment, only one of the projects is being carried out within the Community in Luxembourg, in fact.

The report's conclusions should not be considered as final, however, for this is a sector where the technological changeover is still incomplete and which, over the past twelve months has experienced a considerable and sustained increase in demand, although it is not absolutely clear why.

2. The Commission has sent a copy of the Sobemap report to all interested parties, namely the Governments of the Member States, directors of Community glass-making companies, the Standing Committee of the Glass Industry in the EEC and the trade unions. For their part, those responsible for the glass-making industries in the Community have agreed to update the information in the Sobemap report on a regular basis, so they can provide all the interested parties with an overall view of the situation facing this sector, which will help those parties in all aspects of their decision-making.

3. Responsibility for industrial strategy is primarily a matter for the firms concerned.

However, the Commission will continue to supplement and analyse the information at its disposal so as to be able to put forward any proposals which may be needed to ensure that the firms and the market, remain competitive, and that employment in the industry is maintained.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 835/80

by Mr Diligent

to the Commission of the European Communities

(11 July 1980)

Subject: The Commission's answers to written questions

Can the Commission give the proportion of written questions put to it by members of the European Parliament which it has not answered within the

appropriate time-limit and which are published unanswered in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*?

Is the Commission resolved to take steps to enable European parliamentarians to exercise their supervisory power to better effect?

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

(8 October 1980)

The publication of questions without reply in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* is an initiative of the Parliament, under Article 45, paragraph 3 of its Regulations. The Commission is therefore not in a position to provide the Honourable Member with the statistics requested.

However, the Commission can inform the Honourable Member that between 17 July 1979 and 30 June 1980 it has received 2 036 written questions, compared to 778 written questions in the course of the same period in 1978 to 1979. As at 1 September the Commission had replied to 86 % of these questions, approximately 7 % of questions receiving a reply within one month and 55 % within two months.

As the Commission has stated on several occasions, it wishes to reply as quickly as possible to written questions ⁽¹⁾, and it makes every effort to do so. To this effect, it has introduced new internal procedures in an attempt to speed up the process of replying to questions. However, certain administrative constraints – in particular the need to meet the requirement that all replies are submitted to Parliament in the six official languages of the Community – have imposed limitations on the Commission's ability to respect the delay envisaged in the Parliamentary Regulations. The Commission will nevertheless keep the system under review and will make every attempt to reduce the time taken in replying to written questions.

⁽¹⁾ Cf, in particular, reply to Written Question No 327/79 by Lord O'Hagan, OJ No C 260, 15. 10. 1979, p. 14.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 869/80

by Mr Moreland

to the Council of the European Communities

(14 July 1980)

Subject: Decision-making at the Council of Transport Ministers

Decisions relating to transport in the Community affect and are affected by decisions taken in other European

countries such as Switzerland, Austria and Yugoslavia. These countries are not represented at Council, but Council members do discuss transport issues with these countries at the Conference of European Transport Ministers (ECMT).

1. How does the Council take account of the views of these countries when considering transport issues that will affect other European countries?
2. Has any consideration been given to allowing other European countries to be present at Council meetings when items directly affecting them are considered?
3. Is the Council concerned that the ECMT could become a virtual replacement of the Council and that in practice decisions relating to transport in the Community will result as much from discussion at the Conference as discussion at the Council?
4. Does the Council support the reported view of one Minister from a Member State that the Conference is more valuable than the Council because, *inter alia*, of the involvement of non-member States?

Answer

(21 October 1980)

The European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT) is a consultative body consisting of the Ministers of Transport of 19 European countries and is mainly concerned with the preparation of reports and the adoption of resolutions on transport problems in western Europe. The Community as such takes part in ECMT proceedings under an arrangement between the Council and the ECMT Council of Ministers. Collaboration between the two organizations is arranged in such a way as to ensure reciprocal information and to avoid duplication as far as possible.

Accordingly, the Council does not feel that there can be any competition between the Community and the ECMT as regards Community transport policy.

As regards the effect on non-member countries of provisions adopted by the Council in the field of transport the Community usually takes account of the Agreements and resolutions negotiated in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and, where appropriate, holds bilateral consultations with the countries concerned.

The Council has always carried on its deliberations in accordance with the Treaty and has never considered inviting non-member countries to attend its meetings. It feels that the procedures described above enable it to take sufficient account of the views of other European countries.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 874/80

by Mr Verhaegen

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 July 1980)

Subject: Afforestation policy

In the 1979 Commission report on the state of agriculture in the Community, attention was drawn to the production of wood from forestry and other forms of afforestation.

Can the Commission say:

- what is the level of production and demand for wood in the various Member States?
- how far the CAP also applies to forestry and what the main aspects of this policy are?
- how far the Member States have adapted to this or are pursuing their own policies and what the features of these policies are?

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

(17 October 1980)

1. The average figures for output of forest products by Member States (1974 to 1978) are shown below (in thousands of m³ of wood in the rough).

Each year the Community has to import wood and wood products equivalent to more than 120 million m³ of wood in the rough, for a value of 8 000 to 9 000 million EUA.

2. As wood is not listed in Annex II to the Treaty it is not covered by any market organization or aid.

At present, limited aid can be given only through structural aid to farming (for instance, control of erosion, pest control, flood control measures, etc.).

Such aid is being envisaged under Council Regulation No 269/79 ⁽¹⁾ establishing a common measure for forestry in certain Mediterranean zones of the Community (Italy, France) and is provided for in Council Regulation No 1820/80 ⁽²⁾ for the stimulation of agricultural development in the less favoured areas of the west of Ireland.

3. The draft Council recommendation on the principles and objectives of the forestry policy, presented by the Commission on 6 December 1978, has since been under discussion in the Council.

In view of the growing shortage of wood in the Community and its increasing importance as a renewable energy source in the present world crisis, the Community has a duty to try and reduce its dependence on the world market for wood. The forestry policy applied by the Member States is outlined in Supplement 3/79 to the Bulletin of the European Communities and described in more detail in 'Forests and Forestry in the Member States of the European Communities'.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 38, 12. 2. 1979, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 180, 14. 7. 1980, p. 1.

	Round wood production ⁽¹⁾	Trade deficit quantities ⁽²⁾
Belgium/Luxembourg	2 674 800	569 000
Denmark	1 705 400	631 500
France	30 575 600	1 105 500
Federal Republic of Germany ⁽³⁾	28 288 000	1 452 000
Ireland	357 800	210 300
Italy	6 719 600	1 487 700
Netherlands	948 400	1 442 100
United Kingdom	3 516 600	3 778 500
EEC	74 786 200	9 224 600

⁽¹⁾ Average 1974 to 1978 inclusive.

⁽²⁾ Imports less exports (in US\$ in 1978).

⁽³⁾ The estimates of apparent consumption in each Member State are in course of revision by the FAO.

Total consumption for the nine Member States appears to exceed 220 million m³ in rough wood equivalent.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 878/80

by Mr Albers

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 July 1980)

Subject: Pilot projects to improve the quality of the education given to the children of migrant workers

1. Can the Commission say what results have been achieved with the pilot projects to improve the education given to the children of migrant workers?
2. Which projects have been introduced, given financial support and already concluded?
3. Are the results such that, once aid from the Social Fund ceases after three years, there is a possibility of permanent improvement in the quality of instruction which these children receive?

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

(10 October 1980)

1. The pilot schemes on the education of the children of migrant workers conducted under the auspices of the Commission are of value in three ways:

- they represent a substantial effort on the part of the participating educational institutions to improve their educational methods and bring them up to date;
- they have repercussions at both regional and national level, since the objectives are determined in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and since a national evaluation makes it possible to identify and disseminate up-dated teaching methods;
- at Community level, they provide a testing ground on account of the variety of situations and educational structures, the comparative evaluation of which is likely to be extremely profitable.

Starting next November, a group of experts will examine the action taken in response to the comparative evaluation report drawn up by the ALFA research team for the period 1976 to 1979. Each pilot scheme is followed by a European colloquium at which representatives of the Ministries of Education and experts from the other Member States take note of the methods used and the results obtained. The Commission will publish a description of each of the schemes in the Studies series.

It should also be pointed out that the themes of the pilot schemes are in keeping with the objectives of Directive 77/486/EEC and that these schemes contribute greatly to the preparations for implementing the Directive.

To the results indicated in the answer to Written Question No 1069/78 by the Honourable Member ⁽¹⁾, the following comments may be added:

1. In schools where there is a high percentage of immigrant children, intercultural education contributes greatly to the socialization of the foreign and native children;

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 145, 11. 6. 1979, p. 7.

2. The teaching of the language and culture of origin is much more effective when given within the framework and timetable of ordinary education than when arranged outside school;
3. There is an urgent need to devise suitable teaching material, appropriate to the situation and linguistic knowledge of immigrant children;
4. Pre-school education has a decisive influence on immigrant children's success at school.

2. The table below lists the pilot schemes, completed and in progress, launched as part of the action programme on education (resolution of 9 February 1976):

Theme	Place	School years	Date of colloquium
Teacher training	Nordrhein-Westfalen	1976-1978	1979
	Crédif/Minist. éduc. Paris	1976-1978	1979
	Brussels	1979-	
Reception methodology	Waterschei/Winterslag	1976-1979	1978
	Leiden	1976-1980	1979
	Luxembourg	1978	
	Odense	1978	1980
	Enschede	1979	
Language and culture of origin	Paris	1976-1979	1978
	Bedford	1976-1980	1980
	Limbourg, Belgium	1979	
	Marseille	1979	

Two years after the completion of each project, the Commission will ask the Ministries of Education what subsequent action has been taken at both local and national level.

The Paris project revealed the importance of intercultural education in schools where immigrant children receive integrated tuition in their language and culture.

The Marseille scheme explores in greater detail the methodology and effects of intercultural education. The Winterslag/Waterschei scheme on the reception of children between the ages of 6 and 8 proved that it was perfectly possible to educate young immigrants bilingually in the first three years of primary school. By extending the experiment other schools and pursuing it with the first group of children up to the sixth year of primary, the Limbourg authorities hope to develop a complete model for the integrated tuition of the language and culture of origin.

The teacher training schemes in the Federal Republic of Germany and in France already provide useful models.

The European Social Fund also helps to finance a number of demonstration projects on special teaching for migrants' children. These schemes are listed in the annexes to the reports on the activities of the European Social Fund ⁽¹⁾.

In laying down the guidelines of the management of the European Social Fund during the years 1981 to 1983, the Commission confined intervention from the Fund to a period not exceeding three years ⁽²⁾. This period is considered adequate to devise pedagogic principles and teaching material to be used to improve the quality of special teaching for migrants' children.

⁽¹⁾ Report for the 1979 financial year published on 4 July 1980, Doc. COM(80) 365 final.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 119, 14. 5. 1980, p. 4.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 883/80

by Mr Irmer

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 July 1980)

Subject: Differences in road traffic regulations in the Community

As the motor car is the most popular means of holiday transport, each year many millions of Community citizens discover, particularly during holiday periods, that road traffic rules are not the same in every country, not even in the European Community. Not only speed limits, maximum blood alcohol limits and emergency telephone numbers, but also regulations on such matters as the use of horns in built-up areas, priority, parking, etc., differ. A holidaymaker who crosses several countries with his car is liable to be rather bewildered by this variety of regulations and in some cases this may lead to fines, accidents, etc.

1. Does the Commission agree that further standardization of road traffic regulations would be desirable?
2. What practical steps has the Commission taken to further standardize road traffic rules in the interests of drivers and what steps does it propose to take in future?
3. Is provision made at each of the Communities' internal frontiers for holidaymakers to find out in their own language and in an uncomplicated way the relevant road traffic regulations and, if not, what possibilities does the Commission see for providing this kind of information?
4. If the answer to question No 3 is in the affirmative, is such information also provided at frontier crossing points to countries adjacent to the Community and, if not, does the Commission think it would be possible to provide similar information in such cases?

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

(17 October 1980)

1. The Commission shares the Honourable Member's view of the difficulties caused by the existence of some differences in road traffic regulations within the Community and the advantages to be gained by eliminating these differences. It is true, however, that considerable harmonization of the regulations governing road traffic and road signs has already been carried out.
2. Nevertheless, the Commission must point out that the standardization of road traffic regulations has been

dealt with efficiently for a long time now by other international bodies covering a larger geographical area such as the ECMT, the OECD and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. It appears desirable that the standardization of road traffic regulations should take place not only in the countries of the Community but over as large an area of Europe as possible.

In view of the limited means at its disposal, the Commission wishes to avoid duplicating work being done elsewhere and intends to take only those steps in this field which prove to be indispensable. It was in this context that it prepared a proposal allowing for the introduction of a Community driving licence to which the Council agreed in principle at its 647th meeting on 24 June.

As far as the other points raised by the Honourable Member are concerned, the Commission's action has consisted of coordinating the positions of the Member States in the international bodies where these matters are discussed.

3 and 4. The relevant national authorities and national and international touring organizations supply information for road users on a large scale. In view of the priority which must be given to the development of the common transport policy, the Commission does not intend to act in this area at the moment.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 885/80

by Mr McCartin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 July 1980)

Subject: Adaptation of the western drainage scheme to include individuals as well as cooperatives

Is the Commission aware that the western drainage scheme could be considerably more effective if the grant aid towards the purchase of drainage equipment were extended to include individuals as well as cooperatives? The present position means there are long delays in getting schemes off the ground and there are many private contractors whose livelihood depends on this work and they have invested heavily in purchasing equipment.

Is there any likelihood that the scheme could be adapted to include individual contractors?

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

(7 October 1980)

The programme to accelerate drainage operations in the less favoured areas of the west of Ireland was initiated by the Irish Government on 1 January 1979. In accordance with Article 2 of the Commission Decision of 23 November 1978 ⁽¹⁾, on the approval of this programme, the Irish Government shall report to the Commission on the progress of this scheme before 1 May each year. The first such report has recently been received and is being examined by the Commission.

The Commission wishes to state that, as yet, a sufficient time period has not elapsed to permit an effective evaluation of the scheme. In the circumstances it does not consider it opportune to amend the scheme at this point in time. The progress of the scheme will, however, be continuously monitored by the Commission in liaison with the Irish authorities with a view to taking all appropriate steps to ensure that its implementation will have the maximum possible impact on the improvement of drainage conditions in the areas concerned.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 344, 8. 12. 1978, p. 32.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 904/80

by Mrs Ewing

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 July 1980)

Subject: EEC finance for institutions of further education of university status

1. Will the Commission list all possible headings under which institutions of further education of university status – including technical colleges and colleges of art, music and drama – may apply for grants and finance from the EEC?

2. Will the Commission state how much Community finance has been expended to date on institutions of further education of university status – including technical colleges and colleges of art, music and drama – and break down this figure per Member State?

3. Will the Commission state how much of the UK allocation has gone to institutions of this kind in Scotland?

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

(17 October 1980)

1. The headings under which institutions of further education of university status – including technical colleges and colleges of art, music and drama – which may apply for grants and finance are:

— ‘grants for the development of joint programmes of study between institutions of higher education in Member States of the European Community’.

In the first action programme in the field of education, adopted by the Council and the Ministers of Education in 1976, particular emphasis was given to the promotion of cooperation in the field of higher education within the European Community by stimulating the development of joint programmes of study between institutions of higher education in the Member States. At the present time, 121 different joint programmes, involving 212 institutions of higher education, have been or are being supported under the Community grant scheme.

— ‘Article 290: subsidies to institutions of higher education’.

This Article is to enable aid to be granted to higher education institutions and residential education centres for adults setting up a programme of value to European integration.

— The European Social Fund may, in the course of its support for vocational training programmes, contribute to the costs of such programmes for eligible groups of people in institutions of further education.

2.

Year	Budget	Number of grants awarded
1976/77	100 000 u.a.	32
1977/78	100 000 u.a.	28
1978/79	300 000 EUA ⁽¹⁾	57
1979/80	300 000 EUA ⁽¹⁾	74

⁽¹⁾ Including administrative costs.

A list of all institutions participating in the scheme to date will be sent to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of the European Parliament. Grants are normally administered on behalf of the two or more cooperating institutions by one of the bodies concerned; it would therefore be misleading to present the breakdown in the form requested.

In 1978 and 1979, the Commission subsidized 33 institutions of higher education, both university and non-university. The total amounts of these grants was 147 000 EUA in 1978 and 161 000 EUA in 1979. The Commission takes a formal decision on the utilization of these subsidies on an case-by-case basis. It is therefore not appropriate to break down these figures by Member State.

3. Universities from Scotland have participated in sever of these schemes. No other institutions from Scotland have participated in the scheme to date.

Two subsidies were made to Scottish institutions in 1978/79; University of Edinburgh, Centre of European Governmental Studies and the Nevis Institute, Edinburgh.

Figures for the type of institutions in question are not available.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 906/80

by Mr van Aerssen

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1980)

Subject: Insurance problems affecting external trade

A large number of countries, principally developing countries and eastern European countries, have taken steps or enacted laws to protect their economy, in particular their insurance industry, which seriously affect world trade. These countries raise various obstacles which prevent Community exporters from making a free choice when arranging insurance cover in respect of exports to those countries. Such measures prevent the Community exporter from seeking the most appropriate form of insurance protection, despite the fact that this is also in the recipient's interests. It is particularly the suppliers of high-technology export goods who are frequently obliged to take serious financial risks since they are liable for respecting delivery dates laid down by contract until the equipment exported has been accepted in full, but at the same time they may not freely choose their insurer or the type of cover they require. In the final analysis, this forces them to take out two insurance policies, a procedure which is unnecessarily costly.

1. Is the Commission aware that these restrictive measures are causing serious problems for the Community's exporters and insurance companies and in the long run result in an increase in the price of the goods exported?

2. What steps has it taken or is it planning to take to overcome these problems, so that the trading partners may enjoy complete freedom to choose their insurer and the type of cover they require?
3. Does it take the view that when agreements with the countries involved are being negotiated or implemented, attempts should be made, as part of the Community's economic policy, to ensure the partial or total abolition of the barriers referred to, so that eventually the companies involved may be free to choose their insurer?
4. Is it prepared to amend the conditions it lays down for tenders to supply goods under the food aid programme, to enable the Community's insurance industry to share in the insurance of such supplies?

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

(8 October 1980)

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern regarding obstacles to trade, particularly in the matter of the free choice of an insurer for such operations.

The Commission is aware that some countries have taken measures aimed at restricting the choice of insurer to cover export operations to them, and of the fact that such restrictions are liable to increase the cost of the contracts covered.

As regards the steps to be taken to deal with this situation, the Commission is endeavouring to remedy the problem raised by the Honourable Member by seeing to it that the principle of free choice of insurer is observed in the terms and implementation of trade agreements with certain non-member countries for all export operations between those countries and the Community.

In the administration of Community food aid, and in particular in organizing tenders for the supply of such aid, the Commission allows Community tenderers complete freedom in the choice of insurer where cif deliveries are specified.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 908/80

by Mrs Hoffmann

to the Council of the European Communities

(23 July 1980)

Subject: Situation of the European car industry

On 11 June 1980 the Industry Ministers of the Nine held a meeting in Venice which was chaired by Mr Bisaglia.

At that meeting the current situation of the European car industry and its future prospects were among the topics discussed.

This meeting followed various meetings between Viscount Davignon and the heads of certain large car manufacturers, such as Alfa Romeo's Mr Ettore Massacesi on 27 February 1980 and Fiat's Mr Umberto Agnelli on 7 March 1980.

Could the Council now tell us what conclusions have been drawn from the various meetings and will he spell out how they will affect the future of those employed in the industry?

Answer

(21 October 1980)

At their strictly informal meeting in Venice on 11 June 1980, the Industry Ministers dealt with very broad topics of industrial strategy.

Various industrial sectors using traditional or advanced technologies were discussed, and in particular the car industry. However, no specific debate was held on the situation in any given sector such as the car industry, as this was not the aim of this informal meeting, which was devoted entirely to general topics and was not intended to produce any immediate conclusions. The discussions nevertheless highlighted the importance attached by the relevant national authorities and the Commission to the situation in the car industry, especially as regards employment. For its part the Council will not fail, immediately upon receipt, to examine with the greatest attention any communications which may be forwarded to it by the Commission on developments in this sector.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 913/80

by Mr Bocklet

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1980)

Subject: Skimmed-milk powder

Regulation (EEC) No 1624/76 ⁽¹⁾ prescribes that for skimmed-milk powder imported into Italy for feedingstuffs aid will be paid in the consignor Member State when it has been established that the powder has been imported under customs control. The exporters must also pay a security equivalent to 110% of the aid, which is only released on presentation of proof that the powder has been denatured or processed into compound feedingstuffs.

There are indications that this reduced-price powder is not all being supplied to its official destination but that Italian middlemen are channelling it into the market for human consumption, bypassing customs controls, and that it is being sold in made-up form as drinking milk. This has considerably disrupted the Italian market in drinking milk, fresh milk products and ices.

1. Is the Commission prepared to do everything in its power to prevent further abuse of Regulation (EEC) No 1624/76 in Italian territory?
2. What measures does the Commission intend to take to achieve this?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 180, 6. 7. 1976, p. 9.

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

(13 October 1980)

1. Regulation (EEC) No 1624/76 ⁽¹⁾ provides that a security equal to the amount of the aid, plus 10%, shall be provided by the importer established in the Member State of destination.

This security may only be released on production of proof that the quantities of skimmed-milk powder have been denatured or processed in accordance with the provisions of Articles 1 to 8 of Regulation (EEC) No 1725/79 ⁽²⁾ and with regard to control the denaturing or processing, the provisions of Article 10 (2) and (3) of that Regulation.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 180, 6. 7. 1976, p. 9.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 199, 7. 8. 1979, p. 1.

These provisions lead to the result that the price level for skimmed-milk powder exported under Regulation (EEC) No 1624/76 will reach that of normal skimmed-milk powder on the Italian market unless it is denatured or processed into animal feed. Distortions of the Italian market can only occur if the importer's security is unjustifiably released, or the denatured or processed skimmed milk is used for a purpose other than animal feed.

Under Regulation (EEC) No 283/72 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission has received information about one case only where the skimmed-milk powder was diverted to other uses. This occurred in 1978; the security has not been released. The Commission's services are not aware of any information which might suggest that securities have been released without justification, or might indicate that animal feed is being used for a purpose other than animal feed.

Denatured skimmed-milk powder is no longer fit for human consumption when the denaturing has been properly carried out.

2. As the Commission has not been informed of any cases where the provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 1624/76 have not been applied, the introduction of additional measures is not contemplated. However, if the Commission were to be informed of violations which could be remedied by new provisions it would not hesitate in taking the appropriate action.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 36, 10. 2. 1972, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 918/80

by Mr Coppieters

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1980)

Subject: Accident at the nuclear waste re-processing plant at The Hague

1. In the light of the reports about an accident at the nuclear installations in The Hague on 15 April, does the Commission feel that the arrangements for ensuring the safety of workers and of the surrounding population at the The Hague plant proved to be adequate? If not, what action does it propose to take to make them adequate?

2. What is the Commission's assessment of the seriousness of the accident which might have occurred had there been a critical situation in the re-processing workshop, or had the cooling tanks reached boiling point?

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

(17 October 1980)

As regards the protection of the health of workers and the general public against the dangers arising from ionizing radiation, the Member States are obliged, under Article 33 of the Euratom Treaty, to comply with the basic standards laid down in the Council Directive of 1 June 1976 ⁽¹⁾, of which Article 39 (5) stipulates that:

'Any accident involving exposure of the population to radiation must be notified as a matter of urgency, when the circumstances so require, to neighbouring Member States and to the Commission of the European Communities.'

Not having been so notified, the Commission has every reason for believing that the specific case mentioned by the Honourable Member does not fall within the scope of the abovementioned provisions.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 187, 12. 7. 1976, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 919/80

by Mr Coppieters

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1980)

Subject: Accidents at nuclear plants in the Community

Is the Commission prepared to make a regular report to Parliament on all accidents occurring at nuclear plants of all kinds within the Community?

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

(17 October 1980)

Although plant operators systematically notify the competent authorities in the Member States of the accidents referred to by the Honourable Member, they are required to inform the Commission only if an accident involves the exposure of the public to radiation or if circumstances warrant such notification.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 928/80

by Mr John Mark Taylor

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1980)

Subject: Transport

Can the Commission give any optimistic indicators as to whether 'transport infrastructure' monies for the United Kingdom will be used to facilitate the completion of the A1/M1 link and the road option known as the 'trade route to Europe' bearing in mind that this will be of help to Britain and also to Britain's Community partners too?

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

(8 October 1980)

Any Commission decision about the allocation of Community funds to help finance specific infrastructure projects must be taken in accordance with the rules governing the use of financing instruments to provide Community support for projects of Community interest.

The United Kingdom Government has not yet approached the Commission for aid for the projects to which the Honourable Member refers. The Commission cannot therefore express any opinion on this matter since it knows nothing about the projects.

The Commission would point out that the proposed Council Regulation on support for projects of Community interest in transport infrastructure ⁽¹⁾ aims specifically at improving trade routes between Member States. This proposal has not yet been adopted by the Council.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 207, 2. 9. 1976, p. 9.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 933/80

by Mr Provan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1980)

Subject: Taxation of alcoholic beverages in Greece

In its reply to Written Question No 806/78 ⁽¹⁾ the Commission stated that its attitude towards the arrangements for taxing spirituous beverages in Greece would have to be determined in the light of the case law arising from the decisions of the Court of Justice of the European Communities in regard to the taxation of spirituous beverages in Denmark, France, Ireland and Italy. Now that the Court of Justice has condemned the discriminatory application of the tax systems in these countries, will the Commission please state whether the application of the following taxation measures, at present applied to spirituous beverages in Greece, are compatible with the EEC Treaty and the Court of Justice judgements:

- (a) luxury tax;
- (b) agricultural insurance tax;
- (c) turnover tax;
- (d) stamp duty;
- (e) farmer's social insurance levy;
- (f) banderole tax;
- (g) exchange control/contribution/bank fee.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 33, 6. 2. 1979, p. 11.

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

(8 October 1980)

As the Commission anticipated in its reply to Written Question No 806/78, the decisions of the Court in the cases to which the Honourable Member refers were helpful in clarifying a number of issues involved in the application of Article 95 of the EEC Treaty to the taxation of alcoholic beverages. The Commission has taken care to bring those decisions to the particular attention of the Greek authorities, requesting that they be borne in mind in a review of Greek fiscal legislation.

It must therefore be expected that, prior to accession, the Greek authorities will endeavour to make such changes in their country's fiscal legislation as are necessary to bring it into line with Community law.

In these circumstances the Commission does not consider that it would be proper at this juncture to set out in detail

its views on the hypothetical question of whether the taxation measures in question would contravene the terms of the Treaty, should those measures remain unamended on the date when the Treaty becomes applicable to them.

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

(10 October 1980)

The Commission plans to submit to the Council in the coming weeks a proposal of a Directive in the indication of origin for textile products being offered for sale by retailers.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 948/80

by Mrs Ewing

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1980)

Subject: Fuel subsidy for fishermen

In view of the fact that in France a fuel subsidy is paid to fishermen, will the Commission recommend that a similar subsidy be paid to all fishermen?

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

(17 October 1980)

The Commission has initiated the procedure provided for in Article 93 (2) of the EEC Treaty in respect of the French fuel subsidy and a similar Italian subsidy. Having completed a preliminary examination of this type of aid, the Commission had found that its effect on competition was incompatible with the proper operation of the Common Market and that it was not an appropriate way of solving the structural problems now facing the fisheries sector.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 960/80

by Mr Calvez

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1980)

Subject: Community investment in the coal sector

In all its proposals the Commission has always stressed the need for greater utilization of Community coal. Given that investment is needed to stimulate the coal industry and that Articles 54, 55, 56 and 57 of the ECSC Treaty allow the Community to take certain measures in this area:

1. Can the Commission say whether these provisions of the Treaty have been applied more often since the energy crisis in 1973?
2. Could the Commission list the specific cases in which measures have been taken in application of these Articles?
3. Does the Commission consider that the provisions of the ECSC Treaty are sufficient for the development of the Community coal industry? If not, does it not think it would be desirable to adapt the ECSC Treaty to the needs of the Community in order to endow it with more effective means of action?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 959/80

by Mr Lalor

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1980)

Subject: Origin markings

Does the Commission intend to present proposals which would lead to the introduction of 'origin markings' for all textile products, which would clearly benefit the consumer?

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

(15 October 1980)

1. (a) *Article 54*

The volume of loans granted by the Commission to finance investment in coal production and marketing rose from 54 million EUA in 1973 to 1 221 million EUA in 1979.

The money borrowed is usually on-lent at cost rate, but in some priority cases is passed on at reduced interest rates, its cost in budgetary terms being 3.2 million EUA in 1979 against 0.1 million EUA in 1973. This year the Commission introduced an additional system of interest relief grants totalling 3 million EUA. Loans to finance subsidized housing for miners doubled between 1973 and 1979.

(b) *Article 55*

Financial aid to promote technical coal research amounted to 17 million EUA in 1979 compared with 5.8 million EUA in 1973. A total of 3.5 million EUA has also been lent each year to finance research into industrial health and safety, industrial medicine, ergonomics and pollution control.

(c) *Article 56*

This Article concerns social measures to alleviate the effects of redundancies due to mine closure. Since 1973, however, mine closures have been considered a necessary rationalization measure to transfer production to new more productive mines which will guarantee stable long-term production. The corresponding expenditure in the ECSC Budget was therefore reduced from 36.1 million EUA in 1973 to 13.1 million EUA in 1979.

(d) *Article 57*

As regards indirect production measures covered by this Article, the Commission holds regular discussions with national governments on measures to increase coal consumption and improve commercial policy.

2. The Honourable Member will find a number of practical examples below:

— *Article 54 (first paragraph)*

New mine at Selby (UK) with an estimated annual production capacity of 10 million tonnes; total loans granted by the Commission up to this year: 405 million EUA.

— *Article 54 (second paragraph)*

Steag power station (Ruhr) with a capacity of 700 MW; Commission loans total 113 million EUA.

— *Article 55*

Mining engineering research has been concentrated in the following areas:

- equipment reliability;
- monitoring of mining operations;
- product upgrading;
- coal conversion.

— *Article 56*

The number of pits working in the Community fell from 345 at the end of 1973 to 295 at the end of 1979. In virtually all cases of mine closure the Commission has provided aid for the retraining of miners.

— *Article 57*

The Commission has made various proposals to the Council, including one on financial measures by the Community to promote intra-Community trade in power station coal and another on financial measures by the Community to promote investment in coal-fired power stations.

3. The Commission considers the provisions of the ECSC Treaty are adequate for the development of the Community coal industry. The resources of the ECSC Budget are, however, limited.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 965/80

by Mr Battersby

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1980)

Subject: Relations between the Community and Comecon

With regard to the meeting between the Commission and Comecon on 16 July 1980, will the Commission state:

1. the points covered by the agenda;
2. the composition of the two delegations, indicating the rank and nationality of the interlocutors;
3. whether a representative of the Afghan Government will be present in the Comecon delegation as an observer;
4. the results of the meeting?

Answer given by Mr Haferkamp
on behalf of the Commission

(17 October 1980)

1. At the meeting of the drafting group of experts of the Community and the CMEA which took place in

Geneva from 16 to 18 July 1980, there was no formal agenda, but it had been agreed beforehand in an exchange of messages between Vice-President Haferkamp and Mr Faddeev, Secretary of the CMEA, that the group could discuss all aspects of the draft EEC-CMEA Agreement.

2. The delegations were led respectively by M. L. Kawan, Chief Adviser at the Commission of the European Communities, and by M. J. Nyerges, Director General at the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Trade.

3. No representative of the Afghan Government was present, and it has not been the practice in the past for countries which have sent delegations as observers to CMEA meetings, but are not members of the CMEA, to take part in the negotiations with the Community.

4. The meeting of the drafting group continued the detailed drafting work on the text of an EEC-CMEA Agreement which it had begun at its previous meeting on 4 and 5 March 1980. In particular, while the previous meeting had confined itself to drafting texts on matters where there was already a broad measure of agreement between the two sides, the July meeting began the detailed examination of certain points of divergence. As it was not possible to finish this examination during the meeting, it has been agreed in principle that a further meeting at expert level should be held in the autumn.

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

(17 October 1980)

As the Honourable Member will be aware, the Commission, acting on behalf of the Community, sent in November 1974 to all State-trading countries, whether members of the CMEA or not, a proposal for the negotiation of new trade agreements with the Community to replace those of the Member States with those countries which were on the point of expiry. Unfortunately, there was very little response to that offer from the member countries of the CMEA.

Since then, however, the Commission has had frequent contacts with the individual CMEA countries of Europe both in multilateral fora – for example in the GATT, in the EEC, in the CSCE and in the negotiations with the CMEA itself – and bilaterally. It would be too lengthy a task to list all bilateral contacts the Commission has had with these countries, but the Commission would recall in this context the contacts leading up to the conclusion of bilateral agreements on textiles with Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Romania; on iron and steel products with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Romania; on industrial products and the creation of a joint committee with Romania; and the negotiations on fisheries, unfortunately unsuccessful, with the GDR, Poland and the USSR.

Of the CMEA countries outside Europe, the Commission has had contacts with Cuba, in the context of the application to that country of the provisions of the Community's Generalized Scheme of Preferences; and with Vietnam in connection with the provision of food aid to that country. There has been no contact since 1974 with the authorities of Mongolia.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 969/80

by Mr Battersby

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1980)

Subject: Relations between the Community and Member States of Comecon

With which Member States of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance has the Commission had contact in order to develop cooperation between individual States and the Community and when, in each case, was the démarche made?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 974/80

by Mr Seefeld

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1980)

Subject: Change of registration of private cars in the Community

The following report on the procedure involved in transferring the registration of a 'Golf' car from the

Federal Republic of Germany to France was carried by 'Wirtschaftswoche' on 27 June 1980:

'Had I known at the outset that changing the registration of my car was to involve not only the Paris registration office, but also the German embassy, the French customs administration, the Paris prefecture of police, the Volkswagen company, the French Mines Administration (which is responsible for traffic safety), the Ministry for Industry and the French Minister for Transport, I would gladly have spared myself the whole exercise, sold the 'Golf' in Germany and bought the same model in France, where the dealer would have been able to register it in less than an hour.'

1. Is this an accurate reflection of the situation?
2. If so, what steps will the Commission take to abolish this kind of red tape in the Community?
3. Does the Commission share my view that this is an instance of non-tariff barriers to trade being erected, which are incompatible with the free movement of goods and of persons in the European Community?

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

(17 October 1980)

The information which the Commission has at its disposal about the reported facts is not sufficiently complete or detailed.

The Commission is making the necessary inquiries and – depending on the results of these inquiries – will take appropriate action in accordance with the EEC Treaty.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 975/80

by Mr Schwencke

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1980)

Subject: Community subsidies from the Regional and Social Funds for measures in the German Land of Lower Saxony

1. How much was Lower Saxony allocated from the Regional and Social Funds in 1979?
2. What firms benefited and how much did they receive?
3. What longer-term projects are being or will be supported in Lower Saxony?

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

(20 October 1980)

1. In the year 1979, an amount of DM 33·1 million was granted by the Regional Fund in favour of projects located in Lower Saxony. It is not possible to quantify the amount of aid given by the Social Fund to Lower Saxony as the German Government has always presented applications by field of intervention but covering all German Länder. The commitment for the Federal Republic of Germany as a whole was DM 132·5 million in 1979.

2. For the Regional Fund, a description of individual projects is published, with a certain time-lag, in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*. The list of projects aided in 1979 is likely to appear at the end of 1980. For reasons of confidentiality, it is not possible to name the firms which have received Community aid.

For the Social Fund, a description of assisted operations is published each year in the financial reports.

3. At present, the Commission does not know of any multiannual projects.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 976/80

by Mr Flanagan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1980)

Subject: Generating electricity in the Shannon estuary

Has the Commission given any serious consideration to the possibility of generating electricity in Europe's estuaries by means of a tidal barrage, in particular in the Shannon estuary on Ireland's west coast?

Will the Commission comment on the feasibility of this type of project?

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

(8 October 1980)

Any source of energy capable of reducing the Community's dependence on oil and holding out the

prospect of being economic to operate should be of interest to the Community, as is in fact the case with tidal energy.

However, the economic viability of a tidal power station depends very much on local conditions and the extent to which the installation is integrated into the regional infrastructure. Only a detailed study of each project will establish whether it is likely to be economic to operate and the Commission has not made any studies of this type. It is therefore not in a position to comment on the feasibility of a tidal power station in Ireland's Shannon estuary.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 977/80

by Mr Flanagan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1980)

Subject: Harmonization of energy prices and taxes

According to the text of the Commission's statement to the European Council on 'Energy: Community initiative' ⁽¹⁾ progressive harmonization of energy prices and taxes within the Community is an essential, albeit long-term measure. Can the Commission elaborate further on the implications of such harmonization and the time-scale involved?

⁽¹⁾ Bull. EC 3 - 1980, p. 9, paragraph 12.

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

(8 October 1980)

The implications of harmonization of energy prices and taxes within the Community, together with a consideration of some of the obstacles to such harmonization, and the energy and economic policy issues that will arise are reviewed in the Commission's communication to the Council on 'Energy Price and Tax Harmonization in the Community' ⁽¹⁾. This paper will be updated later this year.

At its meeting in Brussels on 9 June 1980 the Energy Council adopted a resolution on new lines of action in

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(80) 152, 20. 3. 1980.

the field of energy saving, including acceptance of the need for consumer prices to reflect world market conditions and long term cost ⁽²⁾.

The Commission has recently transmitted to the Council a draft Council recommendation on electricity tariff structures in the Community ⁽³⁾.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 149, 18. 6. 1980, p. 3.

⁽³⁾ Doc. COM(80) 356, 26. 6. 1980.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1003/80

by Mr Provan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1980)

Subject: ECU grant and hill farmers

Will the Commission reconsider the position of hill farmers who are now ineligible for the 20 ECU grant as they may have a dairy farm 200 miles away in partnership with another member of their family?

Do the Commission not consider that it would be fairer to apply this grant on a land classification basis rather than on the proposed discriminatory basis?

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

(17 October 1980)

Council Regulation (EEC) No 1357/80 of 5 June 1980 ⁽¹⁾ and Commission Regulation (EEC) No 1885/80 of 15 July 1980 ⁽²⁾ lay down the conditions on which premiums are granted for maintaining suckler herds.

One very important condition for receiving the premium is that a producer should not sell milk or milk products originating on his holding or holdings, regardless of where these are situated.

The Commission does not intend amending the criteria for granting the premium.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 140, 5. 6. 1980, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 184, 17. 7. 1980, p. 29.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1007/80

by Mr Seefeld

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1980)

Subject: Issue of Dutch driving licences on presentation of Egyptian licences

1. Is the Commission aware that at travel agencies Dutch tourists can book trips to Egypt which include not only the flight and hotel accommodation but also an Egyptian driving licence?
2. How does the Commission view the fact that Dutch driving licences can be obtained from provincial authorities in the Netherlands on presentation of driving licences acquired in this way?
3. Is this practice compatible with the criteria laid down for the introduction of a uniform Community driving licence?
4. Will the Commission ask the Dutch Government to remedy this situation?

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

(10 October 1980)

1. The Commission is not aware of the facts reported by the Honourable Member.

2 and 3. The proposal for a first Directive on the introduction of a Community driving licence, approved by the Council at its meeting of 24 June 1980, stipulates:

- that a Community driving licence will be issued only to those persons who have passed a practical and theoretical examination and satisfy the medical criteria contained in Annexes II and III to the Directive (Article 6 (1));
- that, when a Member State exchanges a licence issued by a non-Community country for a Community driving licence, this fact is to be mentioned on the licence and that, if this licence is to be exchanged at a later date, the Member States are not obliged to exchange it for their licences (Article 8 (3)).

4. The Commission will not fail to ask the Netherlands Government for further details about the case referred to.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1022/80

by Mr Provan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 August 1980)

Subject: Imports of rabbit meat from non-EEC countries

Does the Commission realize that massive imports of rabbit meat from Hungary, Romania and China in the summer months are causing severe disruption in the European price when we should be encouraging even pricing throughout the year. The rabbit is a potentially significant source of meat, a very efficient converter of vegetable protein into high quality meat and does it more efficiently than in any other quadruped. It could significantly assist the supply of animal protein in the worsening energy situation and should be encouraged.

Will the Commission assist the industry in our Community?

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

(13 October 1980)

1. Imports of rabbit meat from non-EEC countries are subject to Council Regulation (EEC) No 827/68 ⁽¹⁾ on the common organization of the market in certain products listed in Annex II to the Treaty. The customs duties applicable to rabbit meat imports are set down in the Common Customs Tariff under heading No 02.04 A and at present stand at 10.9% *ad valorem* in the case of conventional duties.

Except for such Common Customs Tariff duties, the levying of any charge having equivalent effect to a customs duty and the application of any quantitative restriction or measure having equivalent effect are prohibited in trade with non-Community countries.

The Regulation does, however, allow the use of protective measures if by reason of imports the Community market experiences or is threatened with serious disturbances. In that eventuality the Commission, at the request of a Member State or on its own initiative, decides upon the necessary measures.

2. The Commission notes that imports of rabbit meat from non-Community countries have been increasing

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 151, 30. 6. 1968, p. 14.

over the last few years (1977: 39 000 tonnes; 1978: 41 000 tonnes; 1979: 48 000 tonnes). The external trade figures for summer 1980 are not yet available to cast more light on the situation described by the Honourable Member.

The Commission is monitoring the trend of the rabbit market in the Community and imports of rabbit meat from non-Community countries. It does not consider at the moment that these imports are such as to cause serious disturbances justifying protective measures.

However, the Council has taken no general decision to introduce into shipping the principle of the freedom to provide services. In the case in question the Commission has not ascertained that refusing to allow shipping companies which are not established in France, in accordance with the EEC Treaty to participate in Franco-Algerian liner conference traffic, constitutes discrimination beyond that resulting from the fact that the principle of the freedom to provide services in the sector is not applied.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1054/80

by Mr Müller-Hermann

to the Commission of the European Communities

(18 August 1980)

Subject: Discrimination against shipping companies in the Algiers-Marseilles trade

The Commission's answer to my Written Question No 1634/79 ⁽¹⁾ of 17 May 1980 on shipping between Algiers and Marseilles is, in my opinion, unsatisfactory.

In fact, the central issue is the respect for the principle that shipping companies of other Community Member States should be allowed to carry some of the French cargo quota, and not the position of Algeria, which is neither a member of the Community nor a signatory to the OECD Code of Liberalization.

I would therefore request that the Commission's answer be reconsidered from the following point of view:

Is it the case that a shipping company established in a Community Member State is subject to a form of discrimination that is contrary to Community principles?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 137, 9. 6. 1980, p. 30.

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

(17 October 1980)

As it stated in its answer to the Honourable Member's Written Question No 1634/79 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission takes the view that the relationships between Member States' and other OECD countries' shipping companies should be conducted as far as possible on a commercial basis.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 137 of 9. 6. 1980, p. 30.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1064/80

by Mr Diana

to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 August 1980)

Subject: Italy's debit balance

In various articles from the Brussels correspondents published in the Italian daily papers of 11 July 1980, much was made of the fact that Italy's debit balance with the Community amounted to some 2 702 000 million lire. The details given suggest that the information came from a semi-official, if not an official, source.

Among other things, no reference was made to the current situation as regards individual projects and the application of the socio-structural directives. Moreover, the Italian Minister of Agriculture has challenged the accuracy of the largest amount involved, namely the 1 208 000 million lire for price support for olive oil.

Can the Commission indicate the source of this information, which described in somewhat sensational terms delays in payment – obviously with reference to the situation at 31 December 1979 – that were nonetheless altogether expected as, for example, in the case of reforestation and irrigation measures?

Would the Commission not agree that, in assessing these delays in payment, it would be appropriate to distinguish between notional liabilities and actual debts?

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

(20 October 1980)

The Commission is unable to state the exact source of the reports mentioned by the Honourable Member.

This information refers to a situation which is now well known. Nevertheless, the figures quoted, in particular with regard to olive oil, are at the very least exaggerated.

In this sector and also in particular with regard to price support for durum wheat, significant progress has been made in recent years due also to the re-definition of Community standards. Other decisive progress still has to be made to speed up the scrutiny and liquidation of claims, even if due caution is necessary to prevent payments against irregular, incomplete or doubtful applications.

As regards structural measures, it is true that execution of the various projects and the application of the Directives on structures have so far not kept up to schedule in Italy, and this has prevented full use of the appropriations intended for these measures.

But figures for the first half of 1980 do point to an increase in the number of applications for settlement.

There are no delays at Commission level.

The Commission agrees that when the question of delays in payments from appropriations is being considered, a distinction should be made between appropriations committed and unexpended appropriations. These terms do not cover, however, all aspects of the situation criticized in the articles.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1066/80

by Mr Glinne

to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 August 1980)

Subject: Accidents in the home

The Community has expressed great concern at the high number of accidents in the home, resulting in 25 000 to 30 000 fatalities per year.

Last year the Commission therefore proposed to initiate a Community system of information on accidents occurring in houses and flats and in the immediate vicinity (gardens, garages, etc.).

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What has been the response of the Member States to this proposal?
2. Which Member States have responded favourably?
3. What results have been obtained? Has the number of accidents diminished?

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

(8 October 1980)

1. The proposal is being considered by the Council.
2. All Member States but one received the proposal favourably.
3. Since the proposal has not been adopted, no result can be reported in respect of the number of accidents; even if the proposal should be adopted, an appreciable time would pass before usable results were obtained, the intention being to stage a pilot scheme before launching the system in its definitive form.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1072/80

by Mr van Aerssen

to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 August 1980)

Subject: Interpretation of GATT rules in Community Member States

The Tokyo Round of negotiations lays great emphasis on full application of the GATT rules in the interests of liberalization of the international economic situation.

1. Can the Commission say what steps it has taken to introduce GATT rules in the Member States and what expectations it attaches to these rules?
2. Can the Commission give a general idea of the views of the individual Member States on the GATT rules?
3. Is the Commission aware of any opposition in individual Member States to the introduction of these rules, and if so, what form does it take?
4. How does the GATT affect national and European development programmes or other Community preference arrangements?
5. Can the Commission state how industry will be represented in (future) GATT committees; for example, will representatives of national associations of industry sit on these committees, in accordance with Article VII(1) of the GATT code of conduct (Government Purchasers)?

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

(17 October 1980)

The Commission shares the view that the full implementation of the GATT rules as they result from the Tokyo Round of trade negotiations will be a vital contribution to the maintenance and improvement of the multilateral open trading system.

1. By virtue of their conclusion by the Community ⁽¹⁾ the agreements and arrangements adopted in the course of the multilateral trade negotiations are binding on the Community institutions and the Member States. Many of their provisions do not, however, entail any special internal implementing measures. In other cases where changes in Community law were required, these have been made on the basis of proposals put forward to the Council by the Commission ⁽²⁾. The Commission itself has also taken implementing measures where it has the power to do so. In addition, the Commission maintains close and frequent contact with relevant national officials on all aspects of implementation of the MTN codes, both by Member States and the Community's trading partners. It can, of course, only fully comply with its responsibilities in this connection if it has the necessary extra staff and resources at its disposal. The Honourable Member will recall the requests made by the Commission in the context of its 1980 Budget proposals.

The Commission has the highest expectations of the Tokyo Round results, to which it remains firmly committed. They have a most important role to play, and at a difficult time, if progress made towards trade liberalization since the coming into force of the GATT is to be maintained. The pattern of trade for the coming decade and beyond will to a large extent be determined by the codes. And, in this connection, the committees set up within the GATT to monitor their implementation will be of special significance. It is the Commission's policy to advocate and encourage the widest possible acceptance of the codes among our trading partners.

2 and 3. All the Member States share the views of the Commission on the need to ensure that the MTN results are fully and fairly implemented, not only by the Community and its Member States, but also by as many other countries as possible.

⁽¹⁾ See Council Decision of 10 December 1979 concerning the conclusion of the Multilateral Agreements resulting from the 1973-1979 trade negotiations, OJ No L 71, 17. 3. 1980, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ See for example Council Regulation (EEC) No 3017/79 of 20 December 1979 on protection against dumped or subsidized imports. OJ No L 339, 31. 12. 1979, p. 1. Council Regulation (EEC) No 1224/80 on the valuation of goods for customs purposes, OJ No L 134, 31. 5. 1980, p. 1.

4. It is the Community's view that the GATT provides an invaluable forum for the multilateral discussion of the trade aspects of its relations with the developing countries. Part IV of the General Agreement is devoted exclusively to trade and development. It incorporates a set of principles and objectives, lays down commitments which the developed contracting parties are required to meet and provides a basis for joint action. Also, one of the most noteworthy results of the Tokyo Round was the adoption of the so-called 'enabling clause', which provides a clear basis, and therefore greater legal certainty for preferences granted under GSP systems; preferences which the developing countries grant to each other, and any special preferences for the least developed countries. The Community's development policies and other preferential arrangements are consistent with the relevant provisions of the General Agreement.

5. Participation in GATT meetings is, as a rule, limited to government representatives. Community representation at the committees established under the new codes in GATT is assured by Commission officials, assisted by officials of the national governments. A comprehensive machinery exists at Community and national level for ensuring that the interests of industry and other sectors of the economy are taken into account in the work of these committees.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1075/80

by Mr Früh

to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 August 1980)

Subject: Trends in the number of nurse cows in the Community

Recent statistics indicate that there was a decline in the number of nurse cows in the United Kingdom in 1978/79.

1. What, in the Commission's view, are the reasons for this decline?
2. What is the trend in the number of nurse cows in the other Member States?
3. In the light of this trend, does the Commission consider it sensible to continue the premium system for nurse cows?

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

(17 October 1980)

1. The number of suckling cows in the United Kingdom has declined over the past few years mainly because other farming ventures, especially dairy farming, have been more profitable.

2. Following a rapid expansion of suckling cow numbers up to 1974/75, the last few years have seen a slight drop in numbers in the Community, as is apparent from the table below.

Numbers of suckling cows

Country	Year			
	1973	1975	1977	1979
Community of nine	6 056	6 136	5 871	5 854
France	2 478	2 681	2 640	2 750
Ireland	684	563	512	453
Italy	796	744	758	753
UK	1 824	1 834	1 641	1 528

'000

3. Yes. The Commission considers that premiums for suckling cows should be continued, because they serve two purposes: that of maintaining and developing a specialized system of quality production and that strengthening support for beef production without exacerbating milk production problems.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1079/80

by Mr Pininfarina

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 August 1980)

Subject: Sale of pasta products in some Member States

Can the Commission of the European Communities say whether and, if so why, the Legal Service considers the ban on the consumption in one Community country of foodstuffs produced on a free and authorized basis in another Community country is compatible with the Treaty provisions on the free movement of goods.

This question refers in particular to pasta products, as in some countries these can be sold if produced from common wheat flour which, however, is totally banned from consumption in those Member States where it is laid down that pasta must be manufactured exclusively from durum wheat flour.

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

(10 October 1980)

The Commission has already stated its position on the matter raised by the Honourable Member in its answer to Written Question No 1502/79 by Mr Ligios ⁽¹⁾.

To supplement this answer, it would point out that the Court of Justice of the European Communities reaffirmed the principles laid down in its Judgment No 120/78 of 20 February 1979 ⁽²⁾, in a new Judgment No 788/79 of 26 June 1980.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 110, 5. 5. 1980, p. 53.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 87, 3. 4. 1979, p. 6.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1080/80

by Mr Kavanagh

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 August 1980)

Subject: Draft Directive on free movement and right of establishment of pharmacists

Is the Commission aware of the disquiet among Irish pharmacists concerning the danger of discrimination against them, if the above draft Directive includes measures harmonizing practices concerning localization or licensing of pharmacies, in view of the fact that there is as yet no such system in Ireland or in some of the other Member States, and will it ensure that no measures are proposed which are of a discriminatory nature?

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

(17 October 1980)

The Commission does not intend to include in the draft Directives to facilitate the free movement of pharmacists within the Community, which it will submit to the Council shortly, measures aimed at introducing in each Member State a system involving the localization or prior authorization of pharmacies.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1088/80

by Mr Lomas

to the Commission of the European Communities

*(26 August 1980)***Subject:** School visit to Belgium – racial discrimination

In July 1980 a party of 45 school children, aged 14 to 19, and five teachers from a London school visited Blankenberge, Belgium. On 7 July two teachers and some of the pupils visited the King Beach disco. There seemed to be problems at the door because some of the children were black but after discussion they were allowed in.

On 8 July the teachers and school children again visited this disco. Each time a black pupil sought to gain entrance the doorman became more and more reluctant to admit them. Until, finally, he refused to admit a black pupil, saying 'First we let a few in, then it is five or six, then 10, then 20 or 30. I have instructions from the owner'.

A request to see the owner was refused and when it was pointed out to the doorman that what he had done was to practise racial discrimination and that this was illegal in the UK, he said it was quite legal in Belgium. At this point all the teachers and school children left the disco.

Will the Commission state whether it is legal to practise racialism in Belgium and will it impress upon the Belgian Government that acts such as these are not helpful in developing good relations between different peoples, both Belgian and British and black and white?

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

(20 October 1980)

The Commission has no information about the incident to which the Honourable Member refers, which falls within the jurisdiction of the Member State concerned. The Commission could only intervene if there was evidence that the Member State had failed to respect its obligations under the Treaty. The Commission is however firmly opposed to discrimination on racial ground and would agree with the Honourable Member that events of the kind described can only do harm to relations between individual citizens in the different Member States.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1097/80

by Lord O'Hagan

to the Commission of the European Communities

*(26 August 1980)***Subject:** Harmonization of excise duty and the tax on alcoholic beverages

It is said that the Commission is prepared to exempt cider with less than 8.5 % alcoholic content from its new Regulations on harmonization of excise duty and the tax on alcoholic beverages.

1. Is this true?
2. Will the Commission do its best to ensure that this proposal is maintained in the Regulations?
3. When are the proposals to be published?

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

(8 October 1980)

As stated in the reply to Written Question No 554/79 by Mr Cottrell ⁽¹⁾, the Commission, in the context of the harmonization of excise duties on alcoholic beverages, would not oppose a solution for cider which, while complying with the relevant rules of the Treaty, was also likely to meet with general agreement. However, as it is still the case that the Council has not yet examined the Commission's compromise proposal ⁽²⁾ in detail, it would be premature to advance alternative solutions for cider before the Council discussions have begun.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 66, 17. 3. 1980, p. 4.

⁽²⁾ Doc. COM(79) 261.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1183/80

by Mr Seeler

to the Commission of the European Communities

*(22 September 1980)***Subject:** Financial assistance for basic research

Until now the Commission, on behalf of the European Communities, has refused to grant financial support to projects for pure research. Such projects have had to be funded by Member States acting alone or jointly.

There are now major basic research projects which are beyond even the larger Member States, such as projects in the field of the structure of matter.

One centre for research of this kind is the Deutsche Elektronen Synchronoton (DESY) in Hamburg, which is planning to construct a new proton and electron storage ring facility (HERA) to provide fresh insights into the structure of matter.

This project is expected to cost over DM 1 000 million.

1. Is the Commission prepared to review its policy of not providing financial assistance for basic research projects?
2. Would the Commission be prepared to fund this new research project jointly with one or more Member States?

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

(17 October 1980)

As it recently had occasion to point out in its answer to Written Question No 973/80 ⁽¹⁾ by Mr Linkohr, the

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 288, 6. 11. 1980, p. 17.

Commission does not intend to conduct directly or to initiate basic research activities in the Community. Coordination of basic research and support for major projects moreover constitutes one of the objectives and *raison d'être* of the European Science Foundation (ESF).

In view of the importance of this type of research for the Community and of its considerable repercussions on scientific and technical progress, however, the Commission cannot dissociate itself from this activity. It is therefore keeping the work of the European Science Foundation under constant review and, whenever justified, is supporting basic research activities in the context of its programmes on energy, the environment, raw materials, radiobiology, etc.

Lastly, with a view to reassessing its role and scope for action in research, the Commission held a symposium in Strasbourg from 20 to 22 October 1980 with the particular aim of discussing, with prominent figures from the European Parliament and from government, scientific, administrative and industrial circles, the topic: 'Present options for and new dimensions of a common research policy'. The results of this symposium should help to inform the Commission about the possibility of extending its field of activity in research and development.

