

Official Journal

of the European Communities

ISSN 0378 – 6986

C 199

Volume 24

6 August 1981

English edition

Information and Notices

Contents

I *Information*

European Parliament

Written Questions with answer:

No 1821/80 by Mr Flanagan to the Commission Subject: Aircraft fuel conservation	1
No 1837/80 by Mr Faure to the Commission Subject: French confectionery in Italy (Supplementary answer)	2
No 1994/80 by Mr Moreland to the Foreign Affairs Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation Subject: Japanese Aid Programmes	2
No 2079/80 by Mr Moreland to the Foreign Ministers of the ten Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation Subject: Supply of minerals to the Community	3
No 2158/80 by Mr Cohen to the Commission Subject: Aid to Southern Africa	3
No 56/81 by Mr Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission Subject: Financial support from the Commission for research projects under the Euratom Treaty ...	4
No 61/81 by Mr Ansquer to the Commission Subject: New financial instrument for energy projects	4
No 70/81 by Mr Lomas to the Commission Subject: EEC food mountains in London North-East	5
No 126/81 by Mr Moreland to the Commission Subject: Lead-free petrol	6
No 139/81 by Lady Elles to the Commission Subject: Social aspects of the CAP	7

Contents (continued)

No 190/81 by Mrs Maij-Weggen to the Commission	
Subject: Dangerous slimming preparations	8
No 191/81 by Mr Vergeer to the Foreign Ministers of the ten Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation	
Subject: Respect by the GDR of its international human rights obligations (Joint answer)	8
No 192/81 by Mr Vergeer to the Council	
Subject: GDR-EEC relations (Joint answer)	9
No 207/81 by Mr Price to the Commission	
Subject: VAT and local authorities	9
No 212/81 by Mr Glinne to the Commission	
Subject: Humanitarian aid to El Salvador	10
No 221/81 by Mrs Lizin to the Commission	
Subject: Incidents at the Tihange nuclear power plant on 20 March 1981	10
No 229/81 by Mr Nord to the Foreign Ministers of the ten Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation	
Subject: Helsinki Final Act and the GDR – political prisoners in the GDR	11
No 233/81 by Mr Beyer de Ryke and Mr Habsburg to the Council	
Subject: Action taken on the resolution on protecting the site of Tyre (Lebanon)	11
No 239/81 by Mr Beyer de Ryke to the Foreign Affairs Ministers of the Ten meeting in political cooperation	
Subject: Belgian prisoners of war in the USSR	12
No 242/81 by Mr Beyer de Ryke to the Commission	
Subject: Air fares – improved access to intra-Community air transport	12
No 245/81 by Mrs van den Heuvel to the Foreign Ministers of the ten Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation	
Subject: Treatment of homosexuals in the United States	13
No 248/81 by Miss Quin to the Commission	
Subject: Cooperative housing schemes in Europe	13
No 249/81 by Miss Quin to the Commission	
Subject: Response of the Commission to Written Question No 1681/80 concerning the opinions of the European Parliament	14
No 250/81 by Miss Quin to the Commission	
Subject: Safety standards governing crews on ships	14
No 251/81 by Miss Quin to the Commission	
Subject: Ratification of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS 1974) ...	14
No 252/81 by Miss Quin to the Commission	
Subject: The 1978 IMCO Convention for the Training and Certification of Seafarers and Watch-keeping	15

No 253/81 by Miss Quin to the Commission	
Subject: ILO Convention No 147 concerning the minimum standards in merchant ships	15
No 254/81 by Mrs Pruvot to the Commission	
Subject: Shipment of toxic wastes to Africa	15
No 259/81 by Mr Seligman to the Commission	
Subject: Coking coal prices to the Community's iron and steel industries and to similar industries in Japan and USA	16
No 261/81 by Mr Seligman to the Commission	
Subject: Heavy fuel oil prices and taxes in the Community, USA and Japan	18
No 269/81 by Mr Seligman to the Commission	
Subject: Number of Community citizens of one Member State employed in the other nine Member States	18
No 274/81 by Mr Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission	
Subject: Reprocessing of nuclear waste	19
No 275/81 by Mr Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission	
Subject: Flow of information on incidents and accidents at nuclear installations	19
No 276/81 by Mr Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission	
Subject: Recruitment of unskilled and uninformed workers for the nuclear industry	20
No 278/81 by Mr Price to the Commission	
Subject: Public purchasing contracts	21
No 287/81 by Mr Curry to the Commission	
Subject: EAGGF	21
No 289/81 by Mr Pedini to the Commission	
Subject: Cooperation between Latin America and the European Community	22
No 294/81 by Mr Cousté to the Commission	
Subject: Extension of protective measures for the textile industry	23
No 295/81 by Mr Cousté to the Commission	
Subject: Proliferation of association agreements with countries outside the European Community and the problems of Mediterranean agriculture	23
No 297/81 by Mr De Clercq to the Commission	
Subject: Data on oil prices reproduced in the Commission Oil Bulletin (Press Information)	23
No 330/81 by Mr Pedini to the Commission	
Subject: Protection of copyright and rights to literary property	24
No 336/81 by Mr Calvez to the Commission	
Subject: Regulations governing courses of study for the PhD in engineering	25
No 339/81 by Mr Calvez to the Commission	
Subject: Control of pollution of the sea by hydrocarbons	25
No 342/81 by Mrs Desmond to the Commission	
Subject: Monies allocated to each Member State through the ERDF since 1973	26

Contents (continued)

No 351/81 by Mr Croux to the Commission	
Subject: Gross national product, inflation and unemployment in the EEC in 1981	26
No 352/81 by Mr Diana to the Commission	
Subject: Community stocks of butter and milk powder	27
No 354/81 by Mr Cecovini to the Commission	
Subject: Port of Trieste	28
No 361/81 by Mr Seal to the Commission	
Subject: Municipal housing for migrant workers in Italy	28
No 407/81 by Mr Adam to the Commission	
Subject: EEC grant applications	29
No 417/81 by Mr Moreland to the Commission	
Subject: Time required to process Written Questions	29

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1821/80

by Mr Flanagan

to the Commission of the European Communities

*(16 January 1981)**Subject:* Aircraft fuel conservation

The Commission has repeatedly stressed the need for energy conservation in the Community.

1. Does it not consider that the following practices are incompatible with its conservation objectives:

(a) in a typical flight over Europe, congestion and delays occur because planes are controlled by up to five different air control agencies which do not communicate with each other;

(b) IATA estimates that a plane flying over Europe is required to travel 15 % further than if it were able to take the most direct route;

(c) a flight between Frankfurt and Amsterdam means that a plane must fly 38 % further than the most direct route due to inadequate cooperation and coordination between the national aviation authorities?

2. Does not the Commission also agree that energy saving in this sector will also help to reduce air fares for the consumer?

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

(9 July 1981)

1. The Commission shares the view held by the Honourable Member as to the need to examine the

structure of the Community's air route network to reduce to a minimum the flying distances and delays involved, with a view to conserving energy.

With this in view, the Commission is watching with great interest the work of the Member States and by the international organizations, particularly Eurocontrol, ICAO and IATA.

However, the Commission realizes that if there was one single air traffic control system in Europe this would help resolve certain problems affecting air transport, in particular the question of energy saving. In the context of the renewal of the Eurocontrol Convention, Eurocontrol would play a significant role in developing and operating a European air traffic control system.

More especially, the Commission has recently put before the Council a proposal for a Regulation ⁽¹⁾ on the establishment of direct interregional services, one of the objects being to conserve energy.

2. Like the Honourable Member, the Commission considers that the energy savings which could be achieved in air travel could bring about a reduction in the costs to be borne by the passenger.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions No 504/80 by Mr Moreland ⁽²⁾, No 787/80 by Mr Remilly ⁽³⁾ and No 1095/80 by Mr Moreland and Mr Howell ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(80) 624 final, 27. 11. 1980: Proposal for a Council Regulation concerning the authorization of scheduled interregional air services for the transport of passengers, mail and cargo between Member States.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 217, 25. 8. 1980, p. 12.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 283, 3. 11. 1980, p. 30.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 302, 20. 11. 1980, p. 38.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1837/80**by Mr Faure****to the Commission of the European Communities***(16 January 1981)**Subject: French confectionery in Italy*

At present the import or manufacture of jellied sweets is forbidden by Italian law.

Since the gelatine used for this purpose does not appear in any way suspect and inasmuch as this legislation cannot be justified by the need to protect public health, would the Commission not consider that this legislation is contrary to the Treaty of Rome?

If so, what steps does the Commission intend to take to put an end to this infringement of the Treaty?

**Supplementary answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission***(30 July 1981)*

Further to its answer of 3 March 1981⁽¹⁾ the Commission is pleased to inform the Honourable Member that in reply to its request to the Italian Government for particulars of the regulations governing the manufacture and import of jellied sweets the responsible national authorities have stated that Article 2 of the Ministerial Decree of 29 October 1978 allows the use of gelatine in the production of sugar confectionery, up to a maximum of 1 %.

The Commission is continuing its enquiries with the Italian Government in order to obtain sufficient data to determine whether this limit is compatible with the rules of the EEC Treaty (Articles 30-36) and with judgments given by the Court of Justice in cases concerning the free movement of goods.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 78, 6. 4. 1981, p. 30.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1994/80**by Mr Moreland****to the Foreign Affairs Ministers of the Member States
of the European Community meeting in political
cooperation***(9 February 1981)**Subject: Japanese Aid Programmes*

Are the Foreign Ministers satisfied that the level of aid from Japan to the developing countries and the world refugee agencies is adequate in view of the increasing wealth of Japan?

Have the Foreign Ministers discussed this subject with the Japanese Government and encouraged it to increase the amount of aid given?

Answer*(13 July 1981)*

On 26 January 1981 the Japanese Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs expounded at length to their Parliament the long-term policy which the Tokyo Government propose to pursue with regard to development cooperation.

The Ministers noted that according to the Japanese Government the objective it had set itself, namely the doubling in terms of dollars of official aid between 1978 and 1980, was achieved. The credits used in 1977 amounted to US \$ 1.42 thousand million while they are estimated at US \$ 3.30 thousand million for 1980.

During the 1981/1985 period, the Japanese Government intends to double, compared with the previous five years, official development aid. It will also endeavour to improve the quality of the aid.

The attainment of this objective will enable Japan to increase its aid to a level more in line with its contributory capacity as indicated by the stage of development and the dynamism of its economy. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the European Communities would reiterate that official Japanese aid accounts in 1980 for 0.27% of the gross national product, i.e. less than the average of the Member States of the OECD Development Assistance Committee.

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the European Communities point out that exchanges of views on the policy to be pursued are regularly held with Japan in the framework of the international organizations responsible for development aid and assistance in another form to countries selected for that purpose.

The subject of mineral dependency has not been discussed in deliberations on the future of Namibia in the framework of the European political cooperation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2079/80

by Mr Moreland

to the Foreign Affairs Ministers of the ten Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation

(25 February 1981)

Subject: Supply of minerals to the Community

Although the Soviet Union can rely almost exclusively on domestic supplies of minerals, the Community has to rely to an extent on imports of such vital minerals as cobalt, chromium and manganese. Many of the mines supplying these minerals are in Southern Africa.

1. Are the foreign ministers concerned that the Community's supplies come from a potentially volatile part of the world? If so, have they contingency plans to deal with potential situations?
2. Have there been discussions on this subject with the United States which also has to import such minerals?
3. Are the foreign ministers bearing the subject of mineral dependency in mind when considering the future of Namibia?

Answer

(13 July 1981)

Decisions on whether certain minerals are imported, and if so, from which part of the world, are made by individual member countries and have not been a subject for discussion in the framework of the European political cooperation.

There have been no discussions between the ten on the one hand and the United States on the other, on the question of the supply of certain minerals.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2158/80

by Mr Cohen

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 March 1981)

Subject: Aid to Southern Africa

During the meeting of the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference at Maputo in November 1980 Mr Cheysson stated, on behalf of the Community, that as well as the financing available to the African members of SADCC who were also members of the Lomé Convention, a minimum of \$ 100 million would be available for financing regional projects provided for under the Lomé Convention in this region.

Can the Commission indicate:

- the provisions for distribution of regional financing under Lomé?
- to what extent additional funds could become available for Southern Africa if the situation so required?

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

(8 July 1981)

The overall amount which is reserved for financing regional and interregional projects is indicated in Article 133 (2) of the Lomé Convention. At present it stands at 600 million ECU and will have to be increased to 630 million ECU when Zimbabwe's accession has been ratified.

A breakdown of these funds is not given.

An approximate idea of the resources available to the Member States of SADCC (Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference) ⁽¹⁾ can however be obtained by taking into account the need for a

⁽¹⁾ SADCC is made up of seven ACP States (Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe), and two other countries (Angola and Mozambique). Zaire attended the Maputo Conference as an observer.

harmonious distribution of regional cooperation aid and Southern Africa's stated requirements. This explains the figure of \$ 100 million quoted as an indication by the Commission representative at the Maputo Conference in November 1980.

It is difficult to see how additional funds can be allocated under regional cooperation since this could be prejudicial to the desire for regional integration which has also been expressed in other regions ⁽¹⁾ of the ACP Group.

However, attention must be drawn to the catalytic role that the Commission can play in this region by undertaking co-financing together with the Member States' bilateral aid or with other providers of funds.

⁽¹⁾ West Africa, Central Africa, East Africa, the Caribbean, the Pacific and the Indian Ocean.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 56/81

by Mr Vandemeulebroucke

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 March 1981)

Subject: Financial support from the Commission for research projects under the Euratom Treaty

Can the Commission state what research projects it has financed or co-financed under the Euratom Treaty?

What private undertakings received contracts and what were the budget appropriations under the 1979 and 1980 budgets respectively, and what provision has been made under the 1981 budget?

Answer given by Mr Davignon
on behalf of the Commission

(6 July 1981)

The European Atomic Energy Community currently provides financial support for research projects in the following sectors:

- exploration for and extraction of uranium;
- decommissioning of nuclear power plants;
- safety of thermal water reactors;
- controlled thermonuclear fusion;
- biology – health protection (radiation protection);
- management and storage of radioactive waste.

The list of private firms with which the Community has concluded research contracts carried out in part or in whole during the years 1979 and 1980 is being sent directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat General of Parliament.

Since research contracts are concluded for periods of up to five years, these periods often coinciding with the calendar year, and financial support normally covers the entire duration of the contract, it is not possible to specify the Community's financial involvement in research projects carried out by one contractor or one group of contractors for a specific year, but only for the period and sector specified by each Council decision adopting a research programme.

As appropriate for research projects under contract are awarded on the basis of the merits of the project and not on the basis of the public or private nature of the applicant, the budget does not provide for funds specifically intended for certain types of organization.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 61/81

by Mr Ansquer

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 March 1981)

Subject: New financial instrument for energy projects

What are the Commission's views on the creation of a new instrument exclusively for financing energy projects in the European Economic Community?

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

(30 June 1981)

There would not appear to be any need to create a new instrument for financing energy projects in the European Community.

The ECSC can and does finance a large share of coal-mining investment and investment in coal-fired power stations.

Euratom can and does finance investment in nuclear power stations and the fuel cycle. Such investment is also financed by the EIB.

The New Community Instrument (NCI) can be used to finance all types of energy projects, since these are included amongst the priorities adopted for the current tranche.

The EIB can and does finance the various types of energy investment where they are to serve the purposes of regional development or are in the common interest.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 70/81

by Mr Lomas

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 March 1981)

Subject: EEC food mountains in London North-East

In a previous question to the Commission, I asked which cold stores were being used in the constituency of London North East and how much food was contained in these stores at the end of 1979.

In a completely unsatisfactory reply, the Commission refused to disclose which stores were being used and also what amounts of food were in these stores on the grounds that these were matters of 'commercial confidence'.

The surplus food in these stores is the property of the citizens of the EEC. What is the real reason for the Commission's refusal to say what stores are being used and how much food is in these stores?

Is it afraid to reveal the quantities of food being stored in an area where working people and old age pensioners find it difficult to buy food because of the high prices fixed by the EEC?

What will be the ultimate disposal of this surplus food?

Will any of it go to the citizens of London North East?

Does the Commission not accept any form of democratic accountability?

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

(7 July 1981)

In its reply to Written Question No 466/80 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission did not itself refuse to disclose which stores were being used or what food was stored in them. On the contrary, it stated that it did not have this detailed information and that the intervention agency in the United Kingdom had declined to provide this information as being a matter of commercial confidence. The responsibility for the storage of intervention products in the Community rests with the intervention agencies of the Member States themselves.

In the light of the Honourable Member's further question, however, the Commission services have obtained the information that the only product currently stored in North-East London is beef. In recent years intervention stocks of beef have been regularly released at reduced prices both on to the home and export markets. The Community has also put into effect a scheme of cheap beef sales ('social beef') for those in need; this scheme is operated elsewhere in the Community but the United Kingdom authorities are not taking advantage of it.

In general the Commission would like to emphasize that there are no food 'mountains' in public intervention stocks either in London North East or elsewhere in the Community. The level of such stocks is generally low. For beef and butter, for example, the current intervention stock in the whole Community is about 199 000 tonnes and 37 000 tonnes respectively. This is equivalent to about 11 day's and eight day's supply respectively.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 269, 16. 10. 1980, p. 6.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 126/81**by Mr Moreland****to the Commission of the European Communities***(13 April 1981)**Subject: Lead-free petrol*

Various studies have indicated that lead emissions can be detrimental to children.

1. Does the Commission accept the view that lead emissions can be detrimental to children?
2. Does the Commission plan to make a proposal on the lead petrol ratio in vehicles? Will the Commission consider proposing a level of 0.15 grammes or less in every litre of petrol?
3. Does the Commission accept the view of the car industry that a long period of notice is needed to make a full adjustment to a reduction in the lead petrol ratio?
4. Does the Commission believe that a reduction in the lead petrol ratio could be prohibitively costly and detrimental to the Community's energy saving objectives?

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

(26 June 1981)

1. The Commission is aware of many studies carried out during the last years with the aim of assessing the effects of lead exposure on human beings, and in particular on children. It is well established that the exposure to lead is attributable to several sources among which to lead emitted into the atmosphere from the tailpipe of automobiles and from industrial sources. The share of atmospheric lead in the total lead burden of human beings is only the minor part, the bigger one coming from food and from drinking water. By limiting the lead content in petrol ⁽¹⁾ and thus also the emission into the atmosphere from that source, the Commission has taken a first step to decrease the total burden of lead to which the population is exposed.

It is the total lead burden rather than the lead emission into the air which can eventually be detrimental to human health and children are considered to be among the sensitive fraction of the population. Therefore, the Commission has proposed already in 1975 a Directive on air quality standards for lead; this proposal is still under discussion at the Council.

2. The Council Directive of 29 June 1978 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States concerning the lead content in petrol ⁽¹⁾ is limiting the maximum lead content to 0.4 g of lead/l of petrol from 1 January 1981 in all the Member States. Member States may require also that the maximum lead content of petrol placed upon their own market be less than 0.4 g/l, without being less than 0.15 g/l. This possibility being already provided for by the Directive the Commission does not intend for the time being to make new proposals for lowering the lead content, without having the opportunity to judge the results on air quality from the application of this Directive.

3. Experience within the Federal Republic of Germany has shown that a considerable period of notice is required if such a measure of adjusting the permitted lead content of petrol to substantially lower values is to be carried out smoothly at the industrial level. Similar experience has been made in Switzerland and in Sweden. This delay was needed to allow the refining industry to adjust its production facilities to the required lower level, while maintaining the petrol quality in terms of octane rating at about the same level as before. The view of the car industry concerning the need for a longer period of notice for such measures seems justified, although such a view might have been raised rather by the refining industry.

4. In the framework of its Programme on the rational use of energy the Commission, in collaboration with the refining and the car industry, has examined the energetical repercussions of optimizing the quality requirements and the lead content of petrol. Further work is needed to assess the link of such measures with tighter requirements for control of car emissions, its economical and environmental consequences. For the time being it is not yet possible to conclude in one or the other direction on the ultimate costs which might be involved with a further decrease of the lead content in petrol. Such evaluation has not only to consider the economical side or the energy policy objectives but as well the industrial consequences and the environmental implications which the Commission is investigating at the moment.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 78/611/EEC, OJ No L 197, 22. 7. 1978, p. 19.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 139/81**by Lady Elles****to the Commission of the European Communities***(13 April 1981)**Subject: Social aspects of the CAP*

Will the Commission state what Community regulations or other instruments have been introduced for the distribution of agricultural products to disadvantaged groups in the Community, stating,

- (a) which products are covered,
- (b) to which specific sectors of the population, and
- (c) which Member States have benefited from these measures?

Have any Member States neglected to take advantage of these measures in relation to some if not all of the agricultural products covered?

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

(10 July 1981)

- (a) Regulations have been introduced for the distribution of agricultural products to disadvantaged groups in the Community in the sectors of fruit and vegetables (cauliflowers, tomatoes, peaches, pears, apples, table grapes, mandarines, oranges and lemons), beef and butter.
- (b) The specific sectors of the population benefitting from such regulations vary according to the particular agricultural product concerned

— for all fruit and vegetables mentioned above, Article 21 of Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 ⁽¹⁾ and Regulation (EEC) No 1315/80 ⁽²⁾ define the beneficiaries of free distribution as

- (i) charitable and social institutions together with those people recognized by national laws as those having the right to public assistance owing notably to the lack of sufficient means for their subsistence cost,
- (ii) children in schools, prisons and holiday camps as well as hospitals and old peoples' homes, Member States taking all the necessary precautions that quantities distributed in this context add to those purchased normally by school canteens or institutions;

— distribution for butter under Regulation (EEC) No 1717/72 ⁽³⁾ from intervention is done at reduced prices to those non profit-making institutions and organizations which are authorized by Member States to make such purchases. Similarly for beef under Regulation (EEC) No 2374/79 ⁽⁴⁾, bone-in beef is sold at reduced prices '... to those welfare institutions and bodies authorities by Member States'.

- (c) The table set out below indicates the quantities involved under these measures for the different products during 1979 and 1980. It illustrates a wide difference among Member States concerning appreciation of the provisions available.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 118, 20. 5. 1972, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 134, 31. 5. 1980, p. 20.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 181, 9. 8. 1972, p. 11.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 272, 23. 10. 1979, p. 16.

Total quantities of agricultural products distributed to disadvantaged groups in the Community during 1979 and 1980

(tonnes)

	Fruit and vegetables Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72								Beef Regulation (EEC) No 2374/79		Butter Regulation (EEC) No 1717/72	
	Cauli- flower	Tomatoes	Peaches	Pears	Apples	Manda- rines	Oranges	Lemons	1979	1980	1979	1980
Belgium	6.8	92.0	—	79.8	1 020.9	—	—	—	—	—	2 737	2 677
Denmark	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	865	850
Federal Republic of Germany	248.6	35.0	—	34.1	16210.2	—	—	—	—	—	11 500	12 541
France	39.8	47.0	139.8	90.1	896.8	—	—	—	—	—	3 306	3 916
Ireland	—	1.2	—	—	51.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	89
Italy	12.8	4 800.7	8 294.3	1 602.6	12604.6	11732.3	1 028.0	—	± 6 000	± 6 000	—	—
Luxembourg	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	162	187
Netherlands	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	605	648
United Kingdom	—	0.6	—	1.4	3 111.1	—	—	—	—	—	5 209	5 319
Greece	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total EEC	308.0	4 976.5	8 434.1	1 808.0	35894.6	11732.3	1 028.0	—	± 6 000	± 6 000	24 304	26 225

WRITTEN QUESTION No 190/81

by Mrs Maij-Weggen

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 April 1981)

Subject: Dangerous slimming preparations

The World Health Organization of the United Nations has recently put two slimming preparations, marzinol (brand name: Teronac) and fentermine (brand name: Mirapront) on the black list because they are dangerous to health.

Can the Commission state whether these preparations are on sale in the European Community and, if so, what measures it intends to take to follow the WHO's example?

The risks attached to their use, and in particular, their undesirable effects, are well known and appropriate measures have already been taken at national level. Thus, pursuant to Council of Europe resolution AP (77) 1, preparations containing these substances can be dispensed only on a doctor's prescription. Member States are responsible for the quality, safety and effectiveness of drugs, and the Commission does not contemplate proposing special measures in this field.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 191/81

by Mr Vergeer

to the Foreign Ministers of the ten Member States
of the European Community meeting in political
cooperation

(22 April 1981)

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission

(10 July 1981)

On the recommendation of the World Health Organization the UN Commission on Narcotic Drugs decided in February 1981 to list in Table IV of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances four anorectic agents including mazindol and phentermine, as referred to by the Honourable Member.

Both of these substances are used in the Member States for the treatment of obesity.

Subject: Respect by the GDR of its international human rights obligations

Last February Amnesty International began an international campaign in favour of political prisoners in the GDR at present estimated to be more than 3 000 in number.

Are the Foreign Ministers of the Ten aware of the GDR authorities' use of criminal law to suppress freedom of expression and of the existence of an arrangement between the GDR and the Federal Republic of Germany whereby the freedom of these political prisoners can be bought ('Freikauf')?

In view of the GDR's special relationship with the EEC as a consequence of inter-German trade, will the Foreign Ministers consider a joint and systematic approach to East Germany on behalf of their ten governments to have that country's authorities respect its international human rights obligations?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 192/81

by Mr Vergeer

to the Council of the European Communities

(22 April 1981)

Subject: GDR-EEC relations

The German Democratic Republic (GDR) is effectively the eleventh member of the European Community. East Germany exports to the EEC cross its frontiers practically without hindrance.

However, this country has a very high number of prisoners of conscience and each year GDR citizens are imprisoned for making use of their right to freedom of expression, their right to information and their right to emigrate. At the same time a certain number of political prisoners are allowed to leave the GDR against the payment of a sort of 'ransom' by the Federal German Government ('Freikauf').

Does the Council not consider that it should do its utmost to see that the development of trade between the GDR and the EEC is paralleled by a greater respect by East Germany of its international human rights obligations (the Final Helsinki Act and the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights)?

Joint answer ⁽¹⁾

(13 July 1981)

The subject-matter to which Written Question No 191/81 put by the Honourable Member primarily refers must be regarded as the exclusive competence of the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany.

As regards the more general aspect, in this case the attitude of the Ten towards the respect for human rights shown by the German Democratic Republic, the Presidency would refer to the reply given to previous questions relating to the respect for human rights in the Warsaw Pact member countries and in particular to Written Question No 1972/80 put by Mr André Damseaux (Liberal – Belgium) ⁽²⁾.

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

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 103, 6. 5. 1981, p. 16.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 207/81

by Mr Price

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 April 1981)

Subject: VAT and local authorities

Under what EEC derogation are local government authorities permitted to obtain goods and services without paying VAT on them?

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

(30 June 1981)

The common VAT system as defined by Directive 77/388/EEC ⁽¹⁾ does not lay down an exemption for goods and services supplied to local government

⁽¹⁾ Sixth Council Directive of 17 May 1977; OJ No L 145, 13. 6. 1977, p. 1.

authorities. However, some Member States choose to refund VAT paid by local authorities in the context of central government support for these bodies.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 212/81

by Mr Glinne

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 April 1981)

Subject: Humanitarian aid to El Salvador

Despite Washington's request that humanitarian aid for El Salvador be suspended, the Commission has released the funds earmarked in its aid programme for the Duarte regime. Guarantees have apparently been given by the International Red Cross that the opposition will not benefit from this Community aid.

Is it true that the opponents of the regime will not receive any of this aid?

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

(8 July 1981)

In deciding to grant food aid to El Salvador – to be distributed through the good offices of non-governmental organizations such as the International Red Cross – the Commission has, as is its custom, expressly made sure that there is every guarantee that the aid will effectively reach all sections of the population in El Salvador that need it, without exception.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 221/81

by Mrs Lizin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 April 1981)

Subject: Incidents at the Tihange nuclear power plant on 20 March 1981

1. Has the Commission been informed of the accident that occurred at Tihange nuclear power plant on 20 March 1981?

2. The communiqué issued by the Société Intercom asserts that neither the local population nor the workers were exposed to dangerous radiation. Can the Commission confirm this?

3. Does the Commission intend to ask for the necessary details so that this incident can be recorded in the data bank on nuclear accidents and incidents set up at Ispra?

4. Will the Commission supply the European Parliament with the information at its disposal?

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

(6 July 1981)

1 and 2. On 25 March 1981 the operator of the Tihange nuclear power station took the initiative of informing the Commission of the incident that had occurred on 20 March 1981. It was clear from this information that there had been no exposure of the local population.

In the absence of any communication from the Belgian authorities, the Commission has good grounds for believing that the incident in question does not come within the scope of Article 45 (5) of the Council Directive of 15 July 1980 amending the directives laying down the basic safety standards for protection of the health of workers and the general public against the dangers of ionizing radiation.

The Commission would draw attention, in this connection, to the answers it gave to Written Questions No 918/80 ⁽¹⁾ and No 2192/80 ⁽²⁾ by Mr Coppieters.

3. The Commission has begun the phase of initial operation of the reliability data bank set up under the Joint Research Centre programme. Information to be communicated periodically by the organizations and bodies concerned is gradually being fed into this bank. It covers, among other things, any incidents which may have occurred during the period under consideration.

4. Since at present the information procedures are exclusively the concern of the national authorities, the Commission is not in a position to provide the European Parliament systematically with information on nuclear accidents. The Honourable Member is also referred to the Commission's answer to Written Question No 1051/80 ⁽³⁾ by Mr Coppieters.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 295, 13. 11. 1980, p. 17.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 134, 4. 6. 1981, p. 29.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 288, 6. 11. 1980, p. 24.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 229/81**by Mr Nord****to the Foreign Ministers of the ten Member States
of the European Community meeting in political
cooperation***(22 April 1981)**Subject: Helsinki Final Act and the GDR – political
prisoners in the GDR*

1. In view of the special status of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in its relations with the Community, and its adherence to the Helsinki Final Act, what steps will the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation take to ensure that the GDR honours its obligations under the human rights provisions of the Final Act?

2. What steps did the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation take at the Madrid Conference to raise the question of the 7 000 political prisoners held by the GDR in flagrant violation of the Final Act and under a Constitution which is in itself an affront to all civilized standards of Government?

Answer*(13 July 1981)*

As regards the attitude of the Ten towards respect for human rights in the German Democratic Republic, the Presidency would refer to the reply given to previous questions concerning the respect for human rights in the Member States of the Warsaw Pact and in particular to Written Question 1972/80 put by the Honourable Member, Mr André Damseaux (Liberal – Belgium) ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 103, 6. 5. 1981, p. 16.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 233/81**by Mr Beyer de Ryke and Mr Habsburg****to the Council of the European Communities***(27 April 1981)**Subject: Action taken on the resolution on protecting
the site of Tyre (Lebanon)*

At its September 1980 part-session ⁽¹⁾, the European Parliament adopted a resolution calling for protection of the site of the historical remains of the city of Tyre (Sidon), in accordance with the UNESCO resolution on the same subject.

What diplomatic steps have been taken by the governments of the Community Member States to follow up this resolution?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 265, 13. 10. 1980, p. 104.

Answer ⁽¹⁾*(13 July 1981)*

The question raised by the Honourable Member was discussed recently during the 21st General Conference of UNESCO which was held in Belgrade from 23 September to 28 October 1980. At that Conference resolution No 4/13 on the preservation of the archaeological site of Tyre was adopted unanimously.

This resolution authorized the Director-General of UNESCO to appoint an adviser on the cultural heritage of the archaeological site of Tyre and the surrounding area, who will be entrusted with the task of reporting to the Director-General on the situation and of assisting all the parties involved in determining the emergency measures to be taken to protect and preserve the cultural heritage of all the civilizations concerned. The ten Member States of the Community consider that they should wait and support the efforts of the Director-General of UNESCO in this field.

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

WRITTEN QUESTION No 239/81**by Mr Beyer de Ryke****to the Foreign Affairs Ministers of the Ten meeting in political cooperation***(27 April 1981)**Subject: Belgian prisoners of war in the USSR*

On several occasions in recent months the Belgian press has claimed, on the basis of information received from American sources, that various Belgian prisoners of war held since the end of the Second World War are still imprisoned in camps in the USSR.

Mr Guido De Latte has written a book summarizing the various theories concerning these prisoners. What diplomatic steps have been taken by the different Member States to trace these Belgians and citizens of other Member States of the Community who have been imprisoned in the USSR and other eastern countries since the Second World War?

Answer*(13 July 1981)*

As a general rule, the search for prisoners of war who disappeared after the Second World War is primarily the responsibility of the individual States concerned. It has not, so far, been discussed within the context of European political cooperation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 242/81**by Mr Beyer de Ryke****to the Commission of the European Communities***(27 April 1981)**Subject: Air fares – improved access to intra-Community air transport*

The Treaty of Rome provides for the free movement of goods and persons.

This principle presumably also implies that public transport services will be as widely available as possible to European citizens who want to travel in the Member States at prices within the reach of most of them.

Although this principle is applied by the railways, it is applied to a lesser extent or not at all in air transport, the normal fare from Brussels to Marseilles being more expensive than the air fare from Brussels to New York.

How does the Commission propose to reduce the differences between national air transport markets on intra-European routes?

To what extent would it be possible to develop a European transport market by greater integration of the services of national and regional companies on intra-Community routes?

**Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis
on behalf of the Commission***(30 June 1981)*

The free movement of services in the transport field is not underpinned by Title III, Chapter 3, of the EEC Treaty. Indeed, Article 61 refers back to 'Transport' and, as regards air transport, Article 84 (2). Basing itself on the latter the Commission sent the Council in November 1980 a proposal for a Regulation ⁽¹⁾ conferring greater flexibility on the authorization of inter-regional air services between Member States. This proposal, which is currently under examination by the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee, follows on from the memorandum of the Commission of 6 July 1979 ⁽²⁾ entitled: 'Contribution of the European Communities to the Development of Air Transport Services'. In this memorandum the Commission put forward a Community approach to air transport whereby more vigorous competition and broader access to the market by airlines would be introduced gradually.

In collaboration with government experts from the Member States, the Commission has almost finished examining current tariff levels and will shortly be sending a report to the Council.

⁽¹⁾ Proposal for a Council Regulation concerning the authorization of scheduled interregional air services for passengers, mail and cargo between Member States, of 27. 11. 1980 – Doc. COM(80) 624 final, 27. 11. 1980.

⁽²⁾ Doc. COM(79) 311, final of 6. 7. 1979.

The Commission would also like to inform the Honourable Member that, from 1 April 1981, the tariffs in force between Brussels and Marseilles and between Brussels and New York are as follows:

Brussels – Marseilles:

Normal (return) fare (economy class) Bfrs 14 700 ⁽¹⁾

Brussels – New York:

Normal (return) fare (economy class) Bfrs 37 270 ⁽²⁾

Brussels – Marseilles:

APEX (return) fare Bfrs 6 260 ⁽¹⁾

Brussels – New York:

APEX (return) fare Bfrs 17 160 ⁽²⁾

⁽¹⁾ Valid throughout the year.

⁽²⁾ Average of high/off season.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 245/81

by Mrs van den Heuvel

to the Foreign Ministers of the ten Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation

(27 April 1981)

Subject: Treatment of homosexuals in the United States

1. Are the Ministers aware of the treatment received by the Dutch homosexuals Meyer Breed and Diana de Coninck on their visit to the United States ⁽¹⁾?

2. Do the Ministers consider that the application of special visa conditions for homosexuals is in conflict with the fundamental human rights as laid down by the United Nations?

3. Do the Ministers intend to protest to the US Government at this violations of human rights?

⁽¹⁾ See *Volkskrant* of 2 April 1981.

Answer

(13 July 1981)

The American immigration regulations and procedures regarding homosexuals have never been a point of

discussion between the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation, and these questions therefore cannot be answered.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 248/81

by Miss Quin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 April 1981)

Subject: Cooperative housing schemes in Europe

Can the Commission supply the following information about housing cooperative schemes in Europe?

1. The number of units and schemes of housing in cooperative ownership and management per country over the past ten years.
2. The above numbers as a proportion of the total housing stock per country.
3. Details of the financial provisions for schemes in each country (i.e. public or private sources) in particular as regards the degree of financial involvement of individual members of the cooperative.
4. Details of advice and information services organized or supported by central or local government for cooperatives and potential cooperatives.

**Answer given by Mr O'Kennedy
on behalf of the Commission**

(7 July 1981)

The information requested by the Honourable Member is not at present available to the Commission. A major difficulty in collecting the material required is the diversity of practice in this area in the different Member States. However, it is intended to extend the compilation of statistics related to housing and this should facilitate the availability of the type of information requested by the Honourable Member.

At present, also the Commission is conducting research on the employment potential of cooperatives in the Community. Although this research is concentrated on workers' cooperatives, its final results are expected to shed some light on financial provisions as well as advice

and information services available for all types of cooperatives and potential cooperatives. The relevant studies are scheduled for finalization at end-1981.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 249/81

by Miss Quin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 April 1981)

Subject: Response of the Commission to Written Question No 1681/80 concerning the opinions of the European Parliament

Further to my Written Question No 1681/80 and the Commission's response ⁽¹⁾ would the Commission please supply the following information?

- (a) Of the 351 draft regulations and directives which were not referred to the European Parliament between 1 December 1979 and 30 November 1980 how many were regulations and how many directives?
- (b) How many of the 351 were considered of a technical nature and how are these defined?
- (c) Of those described by the Commission in its response to Written Question No 1681/80 as being 'of minor importance', will the Commission please define its criteria for determining whether a regulation or directive is of 'minor' or 'major' importance?
- (d) At what level in the Commission is the decision taken on whether or not to refer a draft regulation or directive to the European Parliament?
- (e) Will the Commission please list the 13 proposals relating to fisheries that were not referred to the European Parliament?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 73, 2. 4. 1981, p. 20.

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

(9 July 1981)

- (a) Of the 351 proposals which were not referred to the European Parliament between 1 December 1979 and 30 November 1980, 336 were regulations and 15 directives.

(b) and (c) The terms 'technical nature' and 'of minor importance' are self explanatory. The 351 proposals referred to were all technical and of limited importance. A more detailed breakdown cannot be provided because of the time and effort which this would entail.

(d) The decision on whether or not to consult the European Parliament is taken by the Commission itself in the light of the political and economic content of the draft regulations and directives involved.

(e) The list of proposals relating to fisheries is being sent direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 250/81

by Miss Quin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 April 1981)

Subject: Safety standards governing crews on ships

Has the Commission made a study of the different standards governing crews on ships imposed by the different Member States on the vessels registered under their flags?

Can the Commission supply me with information about the differing standards of Member States?

What are the ways in which the legislative methods of the Member States differ concerning the establishment of minimum standards of safety and health for crews on ships?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 251/81

by Miss Quin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 April 1981)

Subject: Ratification of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS 1974)

Which Member States of the EEC, if any, have not ratified SOLAS 1974?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 252/81**by Miss Quin****to the Commission of the European Communities***(27 April 1981)*

Subject: The 1978 IMCO Convention for the Training and Certification of Seafarers and Watchkeeping

Which of the Community's ten Member States have not yet signed the above 1978 IMCO Convention?

standards for this sector. It is probable that all the Member States will eventually ratify these Conventions, thus acting on two Council recommendations along these lines ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ 78/584/EEC of 26 June 1978, OJ No L 194, 19. 7. 1978, p. 17; 79/114/EEC of 21 December 1978, OJ No L 33, 8. 2. 1979,

WRITTEN QUESTION No 253/81**by Miss Quin****to the Commission of the European Communities***(27 April 1981)*

Subject: ILO Convention No 147 concerning the minimum standards in merchant ships

Which of the European Community Member States, if any, have not adopted the abovementioned ILO Convention No 147?

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

(10 July 1981)

On 6 May 1981

- the IMCO 1974 International Convention for the safety of life at sea (SOLAS 74) had not been ratified by Ireland;
- the IMCO 1978 International Convention on standards of training, certification and watchkeeping for seafarers had not been ratified by Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands and Greece;
- ILO Convention No 147 concerning minimum standards in merchant ships had not been ratified by Belgium, Ireland and Italy.

The Commission has no information on the standards adopted by the Member States as regards the crew of vessels flying their flag. However, the abovementioned IMCO Convention of 1978 on the training of seafarers and ILO Convention No 147 lay down international

WRITTEN QUESTION No 254/81**by Mrs Pruvot****to the Commission of the European Communities***(27 April 1981)*

Subject: Shipment of toxic wastes to Africa

For reasons of economy some companies in the developed countries are apparently considering exporting toxic wastes to Third World countries.

1. Is the Commission aware that such plans exist in the Community?
2. If so, what Community measures could be taken to monitor and penalize those responsible?

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

(30 June 1981)

1. No.
2. Under Article 14 of Council Directive 78/319/EEC of 20 March 1978 on toxic and dangerous waste ⁽¹⁾, such waste must be accompanied by an identification form when transported in the course of disposal. Through these identification forms which have to be kept and, where necessary addressed to the relevant authorities of the Member States, it is possible to monitor toxic and dangerous waste from the time it is generated to the time of its final disposal.

The Commission is considering the introduction of an implementing directive extending the system of accompanying identification forms to cross-frontier

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 84, 31. 3. 1978, p. 43.

shipments of toxic and dangerous waste and thereby also providing a check on exports and imports of such waste. Under this Directive any exporter of the toxic or dangerous waste listed in the Annex to Directive 78/319/EEC would be required to notify cross-frontier shipments of such substances to the relevant authorities of both the exporting and the importing country.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 259/81

by Mr Seligman

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 April 1981)

Subject: Coking coal prices to the Community's iron and steel industries and to similar industries in Japan and USA

1. Will the Commission tabulate the latest prices per tonne for coking coal to the iron and steel industries in each Member State, Japan and USA?
2. Will the Commission indicate the date when the statistics were compiled and the national source of the statistics?
3. Will the Commission indicate, where appropriate, the amount of national subsidy and explain the national policy rationale for the subsidy?
4. Will the Commission state for each Member State, Japan and USA, the total value of national subsidies for coking coal in 1979 and 1980, and in each case the quantity of coking coal receiving the subsidy?
5. Will the Commission state for each Member State the quantity and value of coking coal imports in 1979 and 1980?
6. Will the Commission list the Community's external suppliers of coking coal, and for each supplying state the tonnage and value of their coking coal exports to the Community?
7. What was the average price per tonne for coking coal paid by the Japanese iron and steel industry during 1979 and 1980?
8. What was the average price per tonne for coking coal paid the US iron and steel industry during 1979 and 1980?

Please state prices in EUAs.

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

(10 July 1981)

1 and 2. Under the terms of Article 47, paragraph 2 of the ECSC Treaty, the Commission must not disclose the prices charged to iron and steel-making undertakings in the Member States for coking coal. It does not know the relevant prices for the steel industries of Japan and the USA. As far as it is aware, there are no national statistics on this subject.

In conformity with the dispositions of Article 5 of Commission Decision 73/287/ECSC concerning coal and coke for the iron and steel industry in the Community ⁽¹⁾, the Commission publishes regularly a guide price for coking coals imported into the Community from non-member countries. This price amounted to 58.85 ECU cif European ports per tonne on 1 January 1981 for a standard quality. Article 3 of the Decision authorizes the coal undertakings to align themselves on this price where necessary. At present, all the Community undertakings avail themselves of this facility to a greater or lesser degree.

According to information gathered by the Commission, the cif value at Japanese ports of imported coking coals was between 52 and 55 ECU per tonne for the first quarter of 1981.

It is not possible to carry out a comparison of quality with that of the standard quality to which the Community guide price corresponds; moreover, it is not certain that the average Japanese value takes into consideration the same freight elements as the Community guide price.

In the USA the steel undertakings themselves produce the major proportion of the coking coal that they use, and information about production costs, transport costs, etc. is not published.

3 and 4. The national aids for coking coal granted by the four coal-producing Member States in 1979 and 1980 have been authorized by the Commission within the framework of Decision 73/287/ECSC, taken on the basis of Article 95, paragraph 1 of the Treaty.

The preamble to this Decision ⁽²⁾ describes the motivation for this, which is essentially the maintenance in the Community of a sufficient capacity for the supply of coking coal.

The following tables gives the relevant tonnages and amounts:

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 36, 13. 2. 1980, p. 2.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 259, 15. 9. 1973, p. 36.

Tonnages of coking coal receiving subsidies, total value of national subsidies for coking coal in the Community

	Million tonnes		Million EUA	
	1979	1980 ⁽¹⁾	1979	1980 ⁽¹⁾
Belgium	4.3	4.0	141	167
Federal Republic of Germany	36.2	35.0	712	753
France	5.9	5.7	123	138
United Kingdom	4.7	4.8	13	58

⁽¹⁾ Estimations.

There are no data available about the subsidies for the Japanese coking coal production. As far as the Commission knows, no coking coal subsidies are given in the USA.

5. Quantity and value of coking coal imports from third countries

	Year 1979		January/September 1980	
	Million tonnes	Million UCE	Million tonnes	Million UCE
Federal Republic of Germany	1.0	48	0.9	41
France	5.5	266	5.1	247
Italy	6.8	305	5.9	277
Netherlands	2.9	127	2.0	88
Belgium	3.3	146	2.4	122
United Kingdom	2.2	103	1.9	93
EUR	21.7	995	18.2	869

6. List of the Community's external supplies of coking coal

	Year 1979		January/September 1980	
	Million tonnes	Million UCE	Million tonnes	Million UCE
USA	12.1	578	11.6	568
Australia	3.8	165	2.9	126
Poland	4.0	173	2.7	124
South Africa	0.6	27	0.4	21
USSR	0.7	29	0.4	19
Czechoslovakia	0.1	7	0.1	5
Canada	0.2	10	0.02	1
Other	0.1	6	0.1	5
Total imports	21.7	995	18.22	869

7 and 8. The only figure known approximately is the mean value of coking coal imported into Japan for 1980, which amounts to 51.60 EUA (see remarks 1 and 2 above).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 261/81**by Mr Seligman****to the Commission of the European Communities***(27 April 1981)*

Subject: Heavy fuel oil prices and taxes in the Community, USA and Japan

Will the Commission tabulate the latest selling prices and taxes on heavy fuel oil to industry in each Member State, USA and Japan?

Will the Commission indicate the date when these statistics were compiled and in each case the national source of this data?

Will the Commission explain the national policy considerations for differences in fuel oil taxes from one country to another?

Will the Commission indicate in each case whether national subsidies, commercial and fiscal rebates are granted and supply details?

Please state prices in EUAs.

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

(7 July 1981)

Edition No 96 of the Commission's Oil Bulletin, published on 28 May 1981, shows the price for each Member State of high sulphur heavy fuel oil. These prices are given in national currency, and show in each case, the pre-tax price, the amount of tax and the tax-paid price; prices are in respect of deliveries of less than 2 000 tonnes per month and/or 24 000 tonnes per year and hence relate to small users.

The price data are officially communicated on a monthly basis by Member State representatives in accordance with Community measures on price transparency.

Using the ECU exchange rate for 16 March 1981, the following are obtained:

Average ruling prices for high sulphur heavy fuel oil in ECU/tonne as at 15 March 1981 (deliveries of less than 2 000 tonnes per month and/or 24 000 tonnes per year):

	Price	Tax	Pre-tax price
Belgium	197·51	—	197·51
Denmark	210·67	0	210·67
Federal Republic of Germany	206·40	5·90	200·50
France	187·01	0·17	196·84
Ireland	228·53	22·84	205·69
Italy	182·17	0·81	181·36
Netherlands	191·18	5·35	185·83
United Kingdom	189·37	14·78	174·59

Similar information for the United States and Japan is not available to the Commission.

The Commission considers that it is the responsibility of individual Member States to explain the policy considerations underlying fiscal regimes applied to energy markets, and to relate them to Community objectives.

For its part the Commission observes that there are significant differences between Member States in the level of tax on heavy fuel oil and has on several occasions, called for efforts towards a progressive harmonization of fuel oil taxes.

The prices given are averages for a particular consumer category and as such are realistic. The Commission is none the less fully aware that commercial rebates are granted to large consumers and that given appropriate market conditions, such rebates can be substantial but regular and consistent information on this aspect of heavy fuel oil trade is not available.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 269/81**by Mr Seligman****to the Commission of the European Communities***(27 April 1981)*

Subject: Number of Community citizens of one Member State employed in the other nine Member States

Will the Commission tabulate the number of Community citizens of each Member State employed in each of the other nine Member States, listing the statistics according to nationality?

**Answer given by Mr O'Kennedy
on behalf of the Commission**

(9 July 1981)

Council Regulation EEC No 311/76 of 9 February 1976 ⁽¹⁾ provided that statistics on foreign employees were to be established on a regular basis. The Regulation, however, allowed for a transitional period until the end of 1980, during which Member States were to prepare the necessary statistics. The required figures are expected, therefore, to be available towards the end of this year.

At present, the only figures available are those submitted by Member States on their own initiative. Material related to these will be sent directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat General of the Parliament.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 39, 14. 2. 1976.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 274/81

by Mr Vandemeulebroucke

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 April 1981)

Subject: Reprocessing of nuclear waste

1. Is it true that the Commission has ordered an assessment of the state of reprocessing of nuclear waste?
2. If so:
 - (a) What persuaded the Commission to take this initiative? Is it linked with the appointment of a member responsible for all questions of nuclear safety?
 - (b) What are the names and functions of those carrying out the study? What criteria were used in selecting them? Did the Commission actively seek to ensure that the views of critical scientists are taken into account?
 - (c) What is the precise remit of the group?
 - (d) By when must the study be completed?
 - (e) What is the cost? Under what budget heading?
 - (f) Have the French authorities guaranteed full direct access to the La Hague reprocessing installations?

3. Will the report be made available to Parliament?

4. If the report should confirm that reprocessing as an industrial process is not working, will the Commission review its whole position on waste disposal reprocessing and the fast neutrons slow breeder option?

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

(8 July 1981)

The Commission has not requested the assessment referred to by the Honourable Member.

The *ad hoc* Advisory Committee on the Reprocessing of Irradiated Nuclear Fuels, set up by Council Decision on 18 February 1980, has been instructed by the Council to draw up an assessment of the status of reprocessing requirements and capacity in the Community. In its answer to Written Question No 24/81 ⁽¹⁾ by the Honourable Member the Commission presented some information on this Committee.

The Committee's report should be completed during the last quarter of 1981. It will contain the information supplied by the experts from the various Member States, in particular that relating to the La Hague plant to which reference is made at point 2 (f) of the Honourable Member's question.

The report will be sent to the Commission, which will pass it on to the Council, accompanied if appropriate by suitable proposals.

Obviously the conclusions of the Committee's report cannot be anticipated at this stage.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 140, 10. 6. 1981, p. 22.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 275/81

by Mr Vandemeulebroucke

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 April 1981)

Subject: Flow of information on incidents and accidents at nuclear installations

In its answer of 9 February 1981 to Written Question No 1523/80 ⁽¹⁾ from Mrs Lizin which refers specifically

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 63, 23. 3. 1981, p. 7.

to the collection of 'information on incidents (and/or accidents)' in the Community's nuclear power stations, the Commission states that as a result of contacts gradually established the Joint Research Centre 'regularly receives information from France and Italy'.

How long has this been happening?

Has the Joint Research Centre received in this way, from the French authorities, information about the incidents/accidents which took place at the La Hague nuclear waste reprocessing plant on April 15, 1980, in May 1980, in September 1980 and October 1980, and in particular on January 6, 1981?

If so, will it make that information publicly available, and in what way?

If not, does it know what criteria the French authorities are applying in selecting information to be transmitted?

The Commission in that answer refers to a 'research-oriented bank' and to 'computer storage' of information received.

What guarantees are there that information will be available to the citizens of the Community?

Information for the data bank is supplied voluntarily by the national authorities and organizations concerned; in particular, those of France and Italy – Member States to which the Honourable Members refers – have already provided information in the field in question. Contributions consist of data of a highly technical nature coded to enable them to be fed into a computer.

Interpretation of the data is thus a complex process, and access to the bank is at present limited to the authorities and organizations contributing to it. The results of the corresponding research will be disseminated in the Community in accordance with the usual rules for the dissemination of information acquired in the course of a research programme.

Nevertheless the Commission is also studying the possibility of a system of rapid information on events which occur in nuclear installations in general.

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

(30 June 1981)

The Council decided to set up a European reliability data bank to function as part of the reactor safety programme, on 13 March 1980 when it approved the programme for the Joint Research Centre for the period 1980–1983. With the reliability studies completed, the data bank has now begun its operations.

Its objective is to organize at European level a centralized system for the storage of information on nuclear power reactors and to analyze the stored data by computer, with the aim of providing information backup for research activities in the safety field.

In more precise terms, what is involved is the processing of data relating to the operation and reliability of light-water power stations and their components, for the purpose of constructing and refining mathematical models enabling risk analysis of these stations to be performed with still greater accuracy. It would not be possible on the basis of data relating to other nuclear power plants to carry out similar analyses based on statistical processing owing to the fact that they are so few in number and to the specific nature of their design.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 276/81

by Mr Vandemeulebroucke

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 April 1981)

Subject: Recruitment of unskilled and uninformed workers for the nuclear industry

1. Has the Commission, after due consideration, asked the Belgian authorities about the case referred to in Question No 1537/80 ⁽¹⁾ by Maurits Coppieters (recruiting of 'down-and-outs' for work at the Doel nuclear power station involving risk of high doses of radiation)?

2. If so, what has it discovered? Was there an infringement of the directive referred to in the Commission's answer to that question? If so, what action has the Commission taken, or does it intend to take?

3. If not, why not?

4. In view of the considerable sums set aside in the Commission's budget for press and information services, why was the Commission unaware of the press reports referred to in Mr Coppieters' question?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 350, 31. 12. 1980, p. 16.

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

(30 June 1981)

After it had answered Written Question No 1537/80 by Mr Coppeters ⁽¹⁾, the Commission contacted the competent Belgian governmental authorities. It would seem that, in this case, Belgian law is unequivocal as regards points 3 to 5 of the Commission's answer: i.e. the provisions of national law relating to the training and guidance of workers exposed to ionizing radiation in nuclear power stations conform strictly to the objectives defined in this regard in the Euratom Basic Standards. Moreover, pursuant to Article 33 of the EAEC Treaty, the Commission has on several occasions verified the existence of such conformity.

If an infringement has been committed at the Doel nuclear power station, it is the responsibility of the Belgian Government alone to impose the penalties provided for in order to ensure that the law is observed.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 67, 26. 3. 1981, p. 10.

European Communities in respect of specific products. Statistics on public contracts are based on the NIPRO Classification ⁽¹⁾ and include 25 categories, each of which covers a very broad range of products.

2. In any event, the absence of contract notices in respect of a particular product cannot in itself constitute presumptive evidence of an infringement of Community law, since the obligation under Community law to advertise contracts concerns only a limited proportion of the total expenditure by public authorities on purchases and services. This limitation derives from the scope of the directive on public supply contracts, which does not include contracts the value of which is below the prescribed threshold (1 40 000 ECU for central government contracts and 200 000 ECU for local government contracts), contracts concluded by bodies responsible for administering certain public services and contracts which may be concluded by private treaty.

3. The Commission departments are carrying out studies to determine the extent to which the directives concerned are being effectively and properly implemented in each Member State by all central and local contracting authorities and the transparency achieved. As soon as the data for 1980 are available, the Commission will, of course, forward them to the Council and Parliament, to enable those institutions in turn to make a precise assessment of the results of opening up public supply contracts to competitive bidding.

⁽¹⁾ Nomenclature of industrial products.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 278/81

by Mr Price

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 April 1981)

Subject: Public purchasing contracts

Will the Commission state which Member States have advertised public purchasing contracts for microscope slides in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* during the past three years, which have not and what action the Commission intends to take in respect of those countries which have failed to do so?

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

(30 June 1981)

1. The Commission is not able to provide statistics on contract notices published in the *Official Journal of the*

WRITTEN QUESTION No 287/81

by Mr Curry

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 May 1981)

Subject: EAGGF

What was the total amount spent in the first three months of 1981 by the EAGGF Guarantee Section and, specifically, by how much did that amount exceed or fall short of one-quarter of the total appropriation for the EAGGF Guarantee Section in 1981?

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

(8 July 1981)

EAGGF Guarantee expenditure in the first quarter of 1981 amounted to 2·814 million ECU which is 410 million ECU less than 25 % of the total EAGGF Guarantee appropriations in the 1981 budget as adopted.

The Commission would like to point out that expenditure in the first quarter of a year is usually less than 25 % of EAGGF Guarantee expenditure for that year. On 25 May 1981 the Commission adopted a preliminary draft rectifying budget for 1981 that, *inter alia*, reduced EAGGF Guarantee appropriations by 520 million ECU.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 289/81

by Mr Pedini

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 May 1981)

Subject: Cooperation between Latin America and the European Community

The Commission of the European Communities is no doubt aware of the outcome of the Fifth European Parliament/Latin American Parliament Interparliamentary Conference in Bogota from 25 to 28 January 1981 and of the recommendations adopted at the end of the meeting, particularly on the 'privileged cooperation' to be established between the Community and the countries of Latin America.

As science and technology are fundamental to the improvement of living conditions and the consolidation of freedom and the free institutions:

1. Does the Commission not agree that scientific and technological cooperation should not be regarded as secondary to improved trade but as a form of cooperation in its own right?

2. Does the Commission intend to consider a scientific and technological cooperation programme which, instead of merely resorting to occasional transfers of technology, provides for specific collaboration between European and Latin American universities and recognized research centres in order to consolidate cooperation between the two continents on problems of human health, housing and the rational use of natural resources?

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

(6 July 1981)

The Commission does not consider that scientific and technological cooperation should be regarded as secondary to the promotion of trade.

Scientific and technological cooperation is one of the objects of the cooperation agreement recently concluded between the Community and Brazil and of the proposed agreement with the Andean Pact. Such cooperation is also being sought with other Latin American countries, such as Mexico. Furthermore, mention should be made of the cooperation agreements concluded with Argentina and Brazil on the peaceful use of nuclear energy. In addition, the Community makes a substantial contribution to the financing of a number of Latin American research institutes whose activity extends beyond national boundaries.

However, there is no proper programme of scientific and technological cooperation covering the South American continent. The Latin American countries do not constitute a homogeneous group, moreover, and in this field as in others they have differing needs and are at varying stages of development.

The Commission is aware of the importance of science and technology for the economic and social development of the less developed countries and recently sent the Council a proposal for the establishment of a four year programme to support and boost the scientific activity of the Member States in the field of science and technology for development. Such a programme – which would however be complementary to the national policies of the Member States – will, if adopted by the Council, make it possible to undertake specific schemes which will also benefit Latin America.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 294/81**by Mr Cousté****to the Commission of the European Communities***(6 May 1981)*

Subject: Extension of protective measures for the textile industry

Is the Commission considering an extension of the protective measures for the Community's textile industry which is threatened by unrestricted imports from South-East Asia?

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

(7 July 1981)

The Commission will continue to take decisions on this matter – as in other areas where the common commercial policy is still not fully applicable – on the basis of requests lodged by the Member States and the criteria established by Decision 80/47/EEC of 20 December 1979 ⁽¹⁾.

This Decision specifies, moreover, the binding criteria of Article 115 EEC as construed by the Court of Justice.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 16, 22. 1. 1980, p. 14.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 295/81**by Mr Cousté****to the Commission of the European Communities***(6 May 1981)*

Subject: Proliferation of association agreements with countries outside the European Community and the problems of Mediterranean agriculture

Does the Commission not think that by permitting a proliferation of association agreements with countries outside the Community it is failing to take sufficient account of the problems of Mediterranean agriculture?

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

(8 July 1981)

In concluding agreements giving trade preference to third countries which have traditionally been suppliers of Mediterranean agricultural products, the Community has always had at heart both the interests of its partners, for whom the Community was generally the main client, and also those of its Mediterranean regions, so as to prevent the repercussions out of its outward-oriental policy from harming its own producers. To this end the Commission would point out that Community efforts in favour of the Mediterranean regions have been on two levels: in external relations, the Community had adjusted its concessions to its third country partners in the light of its own production (tariff quotas preferential import schedules, economic and non-commercial concessions, etc.) while adhering to the principles and machinery of the common agricultural policy; internally the Community has taken numerous measures concerning the Mediterranean regions with a view to strengthening structures and making their produce more competitive. The Community is following the situation closely so that it can adjust or add to its policy in this area as required.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 297/81**by Mr De Clercq****to the Commission of the European Communities***(6 May 1981)*

Subject: Data on oil prices reproduced in the Commission Oil Bulletin (Press Information)

The Bulletin referred to above is intended by the Commission to help to improve the transparency of the oil markets in the Community.

It appears from the experience of the past year that, while some countries report the average prices being charged (UK, Germany, Ireland, and for residual fuel oils, France and Italy), the countries which practice a system of price controls based, in particular, on programme contracts, report the maximum prices. Consequently, any discounts which might apply for certain products or in certain sections of the market are not taken into account in the data submitted to the Commission by these countries as they are in the data received from countries with no such system of maximum prices.

The Belgian oil industry has already drawn the Commission's attention to the need to remedy this anomaly by specifying the precise nature of the data collected and, in particular, the fact that the prices quoted are maximum prices.

On that occasion the Commission was explicitly asked to include an explanatory note in the Community's weekly bulletin.

How does the Commission intend to deal with this matter and why has it so far failed to comply with this request?

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

(30 June 1981)

As the Honourable Member indicates, in principle the Commission's weekly Oil Bulletin deals in actual prices, i.e. the level arrived at after deduction of the various discounts which might bring price levels down. For the purpose of the Bulletin, 'price level' is defined as 'the price most often applied and thus representative, according to the best estimates of the experts of the Member States, of the oil market in each Member State'.

Generally speaking the Member States' experts follow this definition and, without being obliged to do so (because the Oil Bulletin does not derive from any legal obligation), make every effort to communicate actual prices to the Commission once a week whilst at the same time taking into account the objective market situation.

In this context the Belgian situation is an exception as the prices at present communicated for that country are the maximum prices which may at times differ significantly from the actual prices. The Commission's departments are aware of the problem and have drawn the attention of the Belgian Administration to this anomaly. The Administration has indicated that it wishes to remedy the situation.

If the necessary changes are not introduced soon enough to be used in the slightly modified weekly Oil Bulletin which the Commission will begin issuing in the next few weeks, the Commission intends to take up the Honourable Member's suggestion and indicate where the prices given are maximum prices. Like other changes and explanations which will appear in the new Bulletin, the above point will be included, if necessary, to ensure greater transparency of the oil market by giving both the specific information and the method by which it is obtained.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 330/81

by Mr Pedini

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 May 1981)

Subject: Protection of copyright and rights to literary property

As is well known, the protection of copyright and rights to literary property is one area in which the harmonization of the national legislation of the various Community Member States is least advanced, not to say totally non-existent.

With regard to rights to literary property in particular, the disparities between the national provisions, especially concerning the duration of protection, result in inconsistencies and differences in the conditions under which publishers in the various Member States operates.

Does the Commission share this view, and if so, does it intend to propose in the near future appropriate measures designed to establish uniform provisions throughout the common market in this important field?

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

(30 June 1981)

The Commission is examining both the general problems of the harmonization of national laws on copyright within the framework of the EEC Treaty and a number of individual problems which have become urgent during recent years. The Commission expects to publish the results of its examination in the course of the year 1982, and in so doing, to identify certain areas in which legislative action appears to be needed.

One of the specific questions to be studied by the Commission in the course of this work is the duration of copyright protection. This was the subject of a hearing of interested bodies in October 1980. It was evident from the hearing that the legal problems were more complicated than had been supposed; hence, the need for further study and consultations.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 336/81**by Mr Calvez****to the Commission of the European Communities***(13 May 1981)*

Subject: Regulations governing courses of study for the PhD in engineering

At a symposium held at the Ecole Centrale in Lyons on 17 October 1980, the French Prime Minister affirmed the need for a review of the regulations governing courses of study leading to the qualification of PhD in engineering.

Does the Commission intend to submit to the Council proposals for harmonizing national legislation relating to studies for the PhD in engineering?

Can the Commission also say whether, to its knowledge, there have been cases in which disparities between the national legislations of the Member States on the training of engineers and doctors of engineering have resulted in restrictions on the principle of the free movement of workers (Article 48 of the EEC Treaty)?

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

(10 July 1981)

The Commission has no short or medium-term plans to submit fresh proposals to the Council on the harmonization of national laws relating to PhD courses in engineering or to engineering courses in general.

It would like to remind the Honourable Member that it presented proposals for directives in 1969 ⁽¹⁾ comprising measures designed to facilitate mobility of engineering graduates within the Community and that these proposals are still before the Council.

The considerable diversity of engineering diplomas conferred by the Member States makes comparison extremely difficult and this may present an obstacle to the mobility of engineers within the Community. However, these difficulties do not constitute barriers to the free movement of workers as defined in Article 48 of the EEC Treaty.

Within the context of the action programme in the field of education, adopted by the Council and the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council, of 9 February

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 99, 30. 7. 1969.

1976 ⁽²⁾, the Commission sent a communication to the Council on 5 May 1981 on the academic recognition of diplomas and of periods of study ⁽³⁾. The measures proposed in that communication would have the effect of facilitating the flow and exchange of information among the Member States on the comparability of diplomas and certificates in the Community, including those mentioned by the Honourable Member.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 38, 19. 2. 1976.

⁽³⁾ COM(81) 186 final of 29. 4. 1981.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 339/81**by Mr Calvez****to the Commission of the European Communities***(13 May 1981)*

Subject: Control of pollution of the sea by hydrocarbons

Of the 700 000 tonnes of crude oil transported daily off the coast of Brittany, only 150 000 tonnes are bound for French ports, the remainder being discharged in other European countries.

Should the EEC not consider making a financial contribution to a procurement programme for equipment to prevent and combat pollution of the sea by hydrocarbons?

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

(10 July 1981)

The Community does not have sufficient funds to support ambitious programmes of investment in equipment for preventing or cleaning-up pollution of the sea by oil.

However, the Commission has proposed – in its preliminary draft of the budget for 1982 – the entry of 600 000 ECU under Item 6221: 'Protection of the marine environment'. This sum would in particular enable the Community to share with the Member States in the financing of certain pilot measures in respect of anti-pollution equipment.

In addition, the Commission has entered 4 000 000 ECU under Article 661: 'Community operations concerning the environment'. Among these actions, the Commission

envisages participation in the financing of programmes aimed at conserving or managing certain maritime zones of special environmental interest to the Community.

The Community will moreover be taking part – with certain European countries – in a major research project within the framework of COST in respect of maritime navigation aids based in coastal areas. The Community's contribution will be some 1 700 000 ECU.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 342/81

by Mrs Desmond

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 May 1981)

Subject: Monies allocated to each Member State through the ERDF since 1973

Can the Commission state the amount of money allocated to each Member State through the Regional Development fund since 1973, and express that amount as a percentage of the Member States GNP and State capital expenditure?

Answer given by Mr Giolitti
on behalf of the Commission

(9 July 1981)

From 1975, the year in which the European Regional Development Fund was set up, to 1979, ERDF were equivalent to the following percentages of Member States' GDP over the same period:

Country	ERDF grants (million ECU)	GDP (million ECU)	%
B	39	330 000	0.01
DK	35	202 000	0.02
D	205	2 253 200	0.01
F	428	1 710 900	0.03
IRL	151	42 300	0.36
I	921	954 200	0.10
L	3	12 500	0.02
NL	48	452 600	0.01
UK	634	1 143 000	0.06
EUR 9	2 463	7 102 100	0.03

The most recent harmonized figures available on general government expenditure relate to 1977.

Accordingly, for the period 1975 – 1977, ERDF grants corresponded to the following percentages of general government capital expenditure:

Country	ERDF grants (millions of national currency)	General government expenditure (millions of national currency)	%
B	967	383 350	0.25
DK	126	32 883 ⁽¹⁾	0.38
D	264	202 480	0.13
F	1 074	215 336	0.49
IRL	35	801 ⁽¹⁾	4.35
I	325 000	25 374 000	1.28
L	64	22 480	0.29
NL	79	38 540	0.20
UK	150	19 902	0.76

⁽¹⁾ Estimates for 1977.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 351/81

by Mr Croux

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 May 1981)

Subject: Gross national product, inflation and unemployment in the EEC in 1981

Will the Commission give details of the estimated or anticipated trends in:

1. gross national product (in %);
2. inflation;
3. unemployment (in absolute figures and as a percentage of the working population);

in each of the ten Member States in 1981 on the basis of:

1. estimates of the relevant authorized bodies in each Member State;
2. where appropriate, the Commission's own estimates?

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

(9 July 1981)

The Honourable Member will find below the forecasts for economic growth, inflation and unemployment in the ten Community countries in 1981 as prepared by the

Commission's staff in May 1981. There would be serious drawbacks in comparing these forecasts with those produced at national level, since the time at which the latter are prepared differs appreciably from one Member State to another. In view of the ever-changing world economic situation, this would substantially reduce the significance of the comparison requested by the Honourable Member.

Growth, inflation and unemployment in the Member States in 1981

	GDP growth in volume terms ⁽¹⁾	Consumer prices (implicit index) ⁽¹⁾	Unemployment	
	% change		Number of unemployed ('000s)	Unemployment rate (number of unemployed as percentage of labour force)
DK	broadly 0	10	235	8.2
D	- 1/2	5 3/4	1 190	4.6
GR	1 1/2	23 1/4	(110)	(3.2)
F	1/2	13	1 750	7.7
IRL	2	17 1/2	106	9.7
I	- 1/4	21	1 780	8.4
NL	- 1/2	7 1/4	380	7.2
B	- 1/2	7 1/4	410	11.0
L	- 3	7 1/2	1.5	0.9
UK	- 2 1/4	11 1/4	2 737	10.5
EEC	- 1/2	11 1/2	8 700	7.7

⁽¹⁾ Rounded figures.

Source: Commission staff (forecasts prepared in May 1981).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 352/81

by Mr Diana

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 May 1981)

Subject: Community stocks of butter and milk powder

Can the Commission confirm that the Community industries concerned are experiencing difficulties as regards supplies of cut-price butter? In this connection, can the Commission indicate the level of butter and milk powder stocks in April 1981 as compared with April 1980?

Can the Commission also explain the considerable variations in stock levels and the relative financial burden?

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

(8 July 1981)

The Commission has proposed to the Council on 12 June 1981 that butter from the market should be made available to certain food manufacturing industries at reduced prices.

Comparative figures for stocks of butter and skimmed-milk powder are as follows:

(tonnes)

Situation at	Skimmed-milk powder	Butter	
	Public storage	Public storage	Private storage
30. 4. 1980	150 514	278 601	22 278
30. 4. 1981	151 295	36 088	42 343

Public stocks of skimmed-milk powder have been kept fairly low mainly as a result of measures taken by the Community to dispose of it on the internal market, particularly for animal feed.

Public stocks of butter – and hence storage costs – have been greatly reduced by the continuing implementation of measures to dispose of the products inside the Community and by the development of sales on the world market. At the same time, the Commission efforts to secure firmer prices for milk products on the world market has brought about a substantial drop in the unit cost of stock disposal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 354/81

by Mr Cecovini

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 May 1981)

Subject: Port of Trieste

The port of Trieste, the most northern Mediterranean harbour and therefore the one closest to the centre of the Community, is at a disadvantage compared with the competing ports of the Yugoslavian coast, which come under a different economic system, and does not receive ERDF aid which in Italy goes only to the Mezzogiorno. Because it cannot obtain ERDF aid it cannot cope adequately with the competition of the northern European ports. The EEC-Yugoslavia agreements, designed to create southward communication infrastructures in Yugoslavia, and the recent accession of Greece to the EEC may well also have an adverse effect on the port of Trieste, and this would be incompatible with the fundamental principles of Community policies.

Will the Commission not therefore advise the Italian Government to include the Friuli-Venezia Giulia region with its principal port of Trieste in the regional development programmes eligible for aid from the ERDF in order to counterbalance the possible adverse effects of enlargement and of competition from the non-Community Yugoslavian ports and assisted Community ports?

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

(7 July 1981)

The Commission would remind the Honourable Member that it is not for the Commission to approach Member States on the inclusion of regions in national systems of regional aid.

Under Articles 92 *et seq.* of the EEC Treaty, the Commission cannot examine the position of a region in a national system of aid until such time as the national authorities notify it that the relevant region has been included in such a system of aid.

Furthermore, Article 3 of the present ERDF Regulation states that 'regions and areas which may benefit from the Fund shall be limited to those aided areas established by Member States in applying their systems of regional aids and in which State aids are granted which qualify for Fund assistance'.

However, the Commission will not fail to take account of Parliament's comments during the forthcoming revision of the ERDF Regulation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 361/81

by Mr Seal

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 May 1981)

Subject: Municipal housing for migrant workers in Italy

Would the Commission confirm that in spite of membership of the EEC and heedless of the Articles of the Treaty of Rome governing the rights of migrant workers, the Italian Government refuse to provide any form of municipal housing for migrant workers in Italy?

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

(7 July 1981)

The Commission cannot confirm the allegation concerning the Italian Government's refusal to provide housing for migrant workers.

Nevertheless, Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 ⁽¹⁾, Article 9 provides that a worker who is a national of a Member State, employed in another Member State, shall enjoy all the rights and benefits accorded to national workers in matters of housing.

The Commission has not so far received any complaint in connection with the application of this particular provision in Italy.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 257, 19. 10. 1968, p. 2.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 407/81

by Mr Adam

to the Commission of the European Communities

(21 May 1981)

Subject: EEC grant applications

Is the Commission aware of the serious concern of local authorities in the north east of England at the long delays in processing grant applications?

Will the Commission please state what action it proposes to take to speed up the process?

Will the Commission also take steps to ensure that local authorities will be able to find out at what stage applications stand, after they have been submitted?

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

(30 June 1981)

The Commission does not possess the specific information which it would need in order to investigate the situation to which the Honourable Member refers, and regrets that it is therefore unable to answer his question at the moment.

It would be grateful if the Honourable Member would provide further details.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 417/81

by Mr Moreland

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 May 1981)

Subject: Time required to process Written Questions

In his answer to Written Question No 1750/80 ⁽¹⁾ by Mr Simpson, Mr Andriessen stated that 'the average length of time required to prepare a written answer is currently about 45 to 50 days. This period is required mainly because answers have to be sent to Parliament in all the official languages at the same time'.

1. As Members receive answers in their own languages some time before publication of the answers, does the Commission agree that it would be helpful and cut down on time if priority were given to translation into the Member's language and the answer sent directly to the Member once this translation had been undertaken?
2. Do all the Commissioners see written answers before they are sent to the Parliament?
3. Is the answer shown to any outside body (e.g. the Council) before being sent to the Member?
4. If the answer is affirmative to questions 2 and/or 3 above, how much delay is usually caused?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 78, 6. 4. 1981, p. 23.

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

(9 July 1981)

1. In sending answers to Written Questions to Parliament in all languages the Commission is complying entirely with the institutional rules governing the use of languages.

The answers are sent to the Secretary-General of Parliament in accordance with established practice whereby the Secretary-General of Parliament transmits Written Questions to the Secretary-General of the Commission.

The Commission would be prepared to review the procedure for the transmission of answers if Parliament so wished.

2. Yes.

3. Copies of answers to Written Questions are sent to the Council to verify the technical accuracy of information concerning the Member States.

In this connection the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Oral Question

No H 475/79 by Mr Sieglerschmidt ⁽¹⁾ and Written Questions No 1616/79 by Mr Cohen ⁽²⁾ and No 464/80 by Mr Schmid ⁽³⁾.

4. The procedure for approving answers allows Members of the Commission two working days to endorse the draft answer prepared by the departments; approval by the Commission as such must be given within five working days.

Under the procedure for notifying the Council of answers already approved by the Commission, comments must be received within two days.

⁽¹⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-252 (March 1980), p. 43.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 116, 12. 5. 1980, p. 25.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 206, 11. 8. 1980, p. 24.

