

Official Journal

of the European Communities

ISSN 0378 - 6986

C 47

Volume 25

22 February 1982

English edition

Information and Notices

Contents

I Information

European Parliament

Written Question with answer:

No 472/81 by Mr Diana to the Commission Subject: Register of olive cultivation (Supplementary answer)	1
No 525/81 by Mr Capanna to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation Subject: Assassination of the PLO representative in Brussels	1
No 555/81 by Mr Adonnino to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation Subject: Respect for the universal Declaration of Human Rights and the measures contained in the third basket of the Helsinki Final Act	2
No 757/81 by Mr Bonde to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation Subject: Report on ways of improving political cooperation	2
No 988/81 by Mr Battersby to the Commission Subject: Overfishing of the herring	3
No 1062/81 by Mr Welsh, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Sir John Stewart-Clark and Sir Brandon Rhys-Williams to the Commission Subject: Imports of numerically controlled machine tools	3
No 1071/81 by Mr Simpson to the Commission Subject: Service charge levied by the Belgian Post Office for presenting packages to the customs authorities	4
No 1081/81 by Mr Damseaux to the Commission Subject: Advertising on television	5
No 1084/81 by Mr Cottrell to the Commission Subject: Grants and loans to Greenland	5

Contents (continued)

No 1094/81 by Mr Woltjer to the Commission	
Subject: Problems of marketing Scottish herring	7
No 1124/81 by Mr Muntingh to the Commission	
Subject: Ecology and development – forest clearance and reafforestation in the Solomon Islands	7
No 1142/81 by Mr Curry to the Commission	
Subject: Processing of Community grown rape seed (colza) to obtain oil	9
No 1147/81 by Lord O'Hagan to the Commission	
Subject: Benefits of membership of the European Community	9
No 1192/81 by Mr Costanzo and Mr Ligios to the Commission	
Subject: Papers required for the customs clearance of wine in France	10
No 1207/81 by Mr Galland to the Commission	
Subject: Incompatibility of French nationalization measures with the Treaty of Rome	11
No 1218/81 by Mr Galland to the Commission	
Subject: Incompatibility of French nationalization measures with the Treaty of Rome	11
Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1207/81 and 1218/81	11
No 1211/81 by Mr Galland to the Commission	
Subject: Incompatibility of French nationalization measures with the Treaty of Rome	11
No 1216/81 by Mr Galland to the Commission	
Subject: Incompatibility of French nationalization measures with the Treaty of Rome	12
Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1211/81 and 1216/81	12
No 1250/81 by Mr Purvis to the Commission	
Subject: Centre for industrial development	12
No 1251/81 by Mr Curry to the Commission	
Subject: Intervention agencies	13
No 1259/81 by Mr Damseaux to the Commission	
Subject: Community aid to Belgian iron and steel companies	15
No 1260/81 by Mr Seeler and Mr Rogalla to the Commission	
Subject: Public debate on net contributions and whether they should be subject to an upper limit	15
No 1266/81 by Mr Simmonds to the Commission	
Subject: Co-responsibility	16
No 1267/81 by Mr Simmonds to the Commission	
Subject: Co-responsibility	17
No 1277/81 by Mr Provan to the Commission	
Subject: Farmed salmon	17
No 1289/81 by Mr Fernandez to the Commission	
Subject: Job losses in certain industries	18
No 1323/81 by Ms Clwyd to the Commission	
Subject: Section 2 of the European Communities Act 1972	19
No 1324/81 by Ms Clwyd to the Commission	
Subject: Legal cock fighting	19
No 1334/81 by Mr Cariglia to the Commission	
Subject: Invitation to tender in connection with the measures envisaged to promote the consumption of olive oil in the Community in application of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1970/80 and Commission Regulation (EEC) No 1348/81	19

Contents (continued)

No 1340/81 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission	
Subject: Cheap textile imports	20
No 1341/81 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission	
Subject: Proceedings against pulp producers	20
No 1343/81 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission	
Subject: Lime subsidy	20
No 1345/81 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission	
Subject: Risk of anthrax poisoning	21
No 1346/81 by Mr Moreland to the Commission	
Subject: Supply of malting barley	21
No 1352/81 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission	
Subject: Glasshouse products – intervention	22
No 1354/81 by Mrs Poirier to the Commission	
Subject: Importation of maize for the manufacture of isoglucose	22
No 1358/81 by Mrs Walz to the Commission	
Subject: Restrictive purchasing arrangements for spare parts	23
No 1359/81 by Mrs Walz to the Commission	
Subject: Competition policy in the mineral oil sector	23
No 1360/81 by Mrs Charzat to the Commission	
Subject: Questionable activities of Europ-Assistance	24
No 1363/81 by Mr Pearce to the Commission	
Subject: Turkeys	25
No 1366/81 by Mr Battersby to the Commission	
Subject: EAGFF grants to the potato sector – 1981	25
No 1368/81 by Mr Patterson to the Commission	
Subject: Fishing with dynamite off the Greek Islands	26
No 1372/81 by Mr Habsburg to the Commission	
Subject: Role of the 'Interagra' company in the supply of foodstuffs by the Community	26
No 1398/81 by Mr Schmid to the Commission	
Subject: Irradiation of food products for the purpose of preservation	27
No 1401/81 by Mrs Pruvot to the Commission	
Subject: Recognition of qualification by the Community and the ACP countries	27
No 1406/81 by Mr Battersby to the Commission	
Subject: Fines imposed on the consumer electronics manufacturer 'Pioneer' and several of its distributors	28
No 1412/81 by Mrs Pruvot to the Commission	
Subject: Protection of the environment under the Second Convention of Lomé	28
No 1422/81 by Miss Quin to the Commission	
Subject: European Regional Development Fund Non-Quota Regulation – assistance for areas affected by the decline in steel and shipbuilding	29
No 1425/81 by Mrs Lizin to the Commission	
Subject: Contracts signed with Walloon experts	30

(Continued overleaf)

Contents (continued)

No 1433/81 by Mr Damseaux to the Commission	
Subject: Creation of a uniform customs procedure in all the Member States	30
No 1443/81 by Mr Enright to the Commission	
Subject: British sewers	31
No 1454/81 by Mr Gérard Fuchs to the Commission	
Subject: Telecommunications satellite planned by the African Postal and Telecommunications Union	31
No 1455/81 by Mr Patterson to the Commission	
Subject: Commonwealth citizens passing through frontiers within the EEC	32
No 1456/81 by Mr Ansquer to the Commission	
Subject: Use of alginates as foodstuff additives	32
No 1462/81 by Mr Bucchini to the Commission	
Subject: Regional Fund	32
No 1476/81 by Mr Provan to the Commission	
Subject: Brazil	33
No 1480/81 by Mr Schmid to the Commission	
Subject: Notification of the arrest of foreigners	33

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

WRITTEN QUESTION No 472/81

by Mr Diana

to the Commission of the European Communities

*(19 June 1981)**Subject: Register of olive cultivation*

In the light of the fact that the establishment of a register of olive cultivation was provided for as long ago as 1975 ⁽¹⁾ in order to obtain the information necessary to establish the olive and olive oil production potential of the Community and to ensure more effective operation of the Community system of aid.

Given that the relevant detailed rules for implementation were issued in 1979 ⁽²⁾ and that deductions have been made from the price of olive oil in respect of the producers' contribution to the cost of maintaining the register since the 1974 – 1975 marketing year.

Given that the Italian Intervention Agency for Agricultural Markets (AIMA) has already selected a technical body to which the work is to be entrusted and has defined powers of the association of olive growers.

Can the Commission state what obstacles still prevent a start being made on drawing up the olive register and what steps the Community intends to take to remove these?

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EEC) No 154/75 of the Council of 21 January 1975: OJ No L 19, 24. 1. 1975, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Regulation (EEC) No 2276/79 of the Commission of 16 October 1979: OJ No L 262, 18. 10. 1979, p. 11.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Dalsager
on behalf of the Commission*(26 January 1982)*

Following its answer of 3 August 1981 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission examined the information received from the Italian authorities. It concluded that amendments should be made to the agreement between the Italian intervention agency (AIMA) and the body responsible for drawing up the register of olive cultivation in Italy.

As the Italian authorities have agreed to make these changes, the Commission has no further comments on the commencement of work on the register.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 222, 2. 9. 1981, p. 20.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 525/81

by Mr Capanna

to the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the
European Community meeting in political cooperation*(29 June 1981)**Subject: Assassination of the PLO representative in
Brussels*

Whereas:

1. Naim Khader, the PLO representative to the Council of Ministers and executive bodies of the European Communities was barbarously assassinated in Brussels on 1 June 1981;

2. the PLO office in Brussels of which Naim Khader was the director, had been officially recognized since 1977 by the Belgian Government as the PLO information and liaison office;
3. the diplomatic and political activities of the assassinated Palestinian representative formed an integral and important part under the aegis of the Arab League of the Euro-Arab dialogue;
4. the choice of the victim and place of the attack obviously constitutes an extremely serious act of terrorism directed against the governments of the Ten EC Member States aimed at preventing them from granting official recognition to the PLO and from pursuing the Euro-Arab dialogue;

will the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation state whether, in their view, it is appropriate and necessary to put on record an official condemnation of the base assassination of Naim Khader not only as an act of terrorism but also as a dangerous attack on the Euro-Arab dialogue which is vitally important to the European and Arab peoples?

Answer

(1 February 1982)

The Ten have not discussed the assassination of Mr Khader. However, the Ten's condemnation of all acts of terrorism, from wherever they come, is a matter of record.

The Ten remain firmly committed to continuing the Euro-Arab dialogue.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 555/81

by Mr Adonnino

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

(29 June 1981)

Subject: Respect for the universal Declaration of Human Rights and the measures contained in the third basket of the Helsinki Final Act

Can the Ministers state what the present situation is as regards the case of the French citizen, Mr Guy Torrent?

He intends to marry a Soviet citizen and, according to recent information circulated by the Commission on Human Rights based in Geneva, at the beginning of this year he had still not received permission to go to Moscow to get married after previously being denied permission on the eve of the wedding day which had been fixed by the Soviet authorities themselves.

Answer

(1 February 1982)

The Ten have not discussed the case of Mr Torrent. However, they have made clear on many occasions, notably at the CSCE meeting in Madrid, their belief that all signatories of the Helsinki Final Act should implement the provisions thereof, specifically that the 'participating States will examine favourably and on the basis of humanitarian considerations requests for exit or entry permits from persons who have decided to marry a citizen from another participating State'.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 757/81

by Mr Bonde

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

(27 July 1981)

Subject: Report on ways of improving political cooperation

Can the Foreign Ministers give a detailed account of the Political Committee's preparation of a report on 'various ways of improving political cooperation' (see my Written Question No 1706/80 ⁽¹⁾), indicating in particular:

1. How many meetings have been held in connection with the elaboration of the report?
2. The agenda for these meetings.
3. Have there been proposals for the setting-up of a secretariat for external affairs?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 49, 9. 3. 1981, p. 34.

4. Has the Commission taken part in the discussions?
5. Have the discussions covered security and/or defence policy aspects?
6. When is the committee expected to conclude its work and produce the report?

Answer

(1 February 1982)

The London report on European Political Cooperation was agreed by Foreign Ministers on 13 October 1981. The full text has been published.

by its declaration of 27 July 1981, it declared 'its determination to use all the means in its power to ensure the respect by Member States of these proposals'.

In order to protect stocks of juvenile herring, the Commission has proposed maximum limits to the percentages which herring may form of the catches of sprats.

The Commission has had consultations with the Norwegian authorities at which it was agreed that the Kingdom of Norway should have no catch possibilities for herring in the North Sea in 1981. The proposal for a Council Decision implementing the result of these consultations by the conclusion of an agreement with Norway ⁽²⁾ has been approved by the Council on 15 December 1981.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 221, 2. 9. 1981.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 988/81

by Mr Battersby

to the Commission of the European Communities

(21 September 1981)

Subject: Overfishing of the herring

Will the Commission state what measures it is taking to prevent overfishing of the herring in the northern and central zones of the North Sea bordering on the Skaggerak fishery?

Could it also state whether it has initiated consultations with the Norwegian authorities to prevent overfishing of herring stocks in contiguous Norwegian-EEC waters?

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

(21 January 1982)

To prevent overfishing of the herring in the northern and central zones of the North Sea, the Commission has proposed zero total allowable catches for the herring for these two areas (divisions IVa and IVb of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea) ⁽¹⁾. In the absence of an agreement by the Council, the Commission has approved national measures by Member States which give effect to these proposals. Furthermore,

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1062/81

by Mr Welsh, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Sir John

Stewart-Clark and Sir Brandon Rhys-Williams

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 October 1981)

Subject: Imports of numerically controlled machine tools

1. Would the Commission publish details of the monthly imports of numerically controlled machine tools and computer numerically controlled machines tools by volume and value in respect of each Member State, since the commencement of surveillance monitoring in February this year? Could they also indicate the degree of penetration achieved of each domestic market?

2. Does the Commission consider that there is a possibility of invoking Article XIX of GATT in respect of these imports and if so would it act in respect of the entire customs territory of the Member States?

3. Has the issue of NC machine tool imports been raised in the high-level consultations with the Japanese authorities and have they given any indication that they would be prepared to exercise voluntary restraint?

4. Does the Commission consider that the development of NC machine tool technology has important implications for the development of the Community's industrial base, comparable in importance with telematics? If so, does it plan to make any proposals to the Council to support the development of this sector?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 224, 3. 9. 1981.

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

(26 January 1982)

1 and 3. The body of data requested by the Honourable Members concerning the monthly imports under the eight tariff headings in this sector amount to a fairly large collection of statistics. The Commission will therefore send the detailed information it has received from the Member States since the monitoring system was introduced direct to the Honourable Members and to Parliament's Secretariat. The Commission does not have full information regarding the penetration rates in each of the Member States' markets.

Although the information received by the Commission is incomplete – it having proved difficult to collect sufficient data in some Member States – the results at present available do show a tendency for Japanese exports in this sector to be slowing down. There are still large discrepancies, however, in the import figures by Member State and by type of machine tool concerned. Sales of Japanese 'machining centres', in particular, are still increasing very considerably in some Member States.

The subject was discussed at the latest high-level consultations with the Japanese authorities (May – June 1981). On that occasion, as at previous meetings, the Japanese authorities declared themselves willing to moderate their exports in this sector. The figures show that Japan has been exercising greater restraint with regard to its exports since the Community monitoring system was introduced.

2. Any decision on the possibility of invoking Article XIX of GATT on a Community or regional basis must comply with the requirements of that Article. To date, no Member State has broached this matter with the Commission.

4. The machine-tool industry occupies a strategic position in the whole productive economy, affecting the competitiveness of a great many other industries by the technical advances incorporated in its products.

It is currently faced with major technological change resulting from the inclusion of electronics in its products. In this sense, the spread of electronics in this industry is part of the telematics revolution.

The Commission is closely following developments in the machine-tool industry and has found that, throughout the Community, it is reacting swiftly to today's challenges. If necessary, however, the Commission will not fail to put forward any special measures which the circumstances require.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1071/81

by Mr Simpson

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 October 1981)

Subject: Service charge levied by the Belgian Post Office for presenting packages to the customs authorities

A United Kingdom citizen resident in Belgium was recently sent a book by post from the United Kingdom to her Belgian address. Before she could receive it, however, she was required to pay Bfrs 173, being a charge for the service provided by the Belgian Post Office in presenting the package to the customs authorities. I am informed that such charges are frequently made by the Belgian authorities on parcels received from other Member States.

Will the Commission confirm that such a charge is illegal because:

- (a) in breach of Article 12 of the EEC Treaty, it constitutes a charge having equivalent effect to a customs duty in trade with another Member State, and/or
- (b) in breach of Article 36 thereof, it constitutes a means of arbitrary discrimination or a disguised restriction on trade between Member States, and/or
- (c) in breach of the International Postal Convention, it constitutes a charge greater than the agreed postal rate?

Will the Commission take all necessary steps to ensure that the Belgian Government ceases to apply the charge forthwith?

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

(19 January 1982)

Since no breakdown is given of the Bfrs 173, this amount is presumably made up of a customs presentation charge and VAT.

The charge is justified on the grounds that collection of VAT on the importation of goods involves a 'clearance' procedure and that the postal administration completes the relevant customs formalities on behalf of the person to whom the goods are being sent.

The Commission has for many years been striving to do away with this charge, which is difficult to reconcile with the idea of a genuine common market.

As the Commission stated in its answer to Written Question No 192/71 put by Mr Vredeling on 25 June 1971 ⁽¹⁾, no conclusion as to whether the customs presentation charge is compatible with the EEC Treaty can be reached on the basis of an examination of Articles 12 *et seq.* and 30 *et seq.* of the Treaty made in the light of the rulings given by the Court of Justice.

On a proposal from the Commission, the representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council on 18 December 1978, decided ⁽²⁾ that customs presentation charges would no longer be levied where goods sent from one Member State to another were exempt from taxes. Small consignments of a non-commercial character sent by private individuals are thus covered by this Decision. The consignment referred to by the Honourable Member was probably regarded as a commercial consignment.

In its 1972 proposal for a Council Directive on the tax reliefs to be allowed on the importation of goods in small consignments intended for private individuals ⁽³⁾, the Commission had proposed (Article 2) that newspapers, reviews and other periodicals, brochures and books of a value not exceeding 25 u.a. sent from one Member State as small consignments be exempt from taxes. This provision was not, however, incorporated in the Directive approved by the Council ⁽⁴⁾.

As far as the Commission is aware, the amounts of the customs presentation charge as laid down in the Belgian regulations do not exceed the rates agreed under the Universal Postal Convention.

The Commission will continue to work for the abolition of the customs presentation charge, which is still levied in a number of Member States.

Further, as stated recently in the Programme for the simplification of VAT procedures and formalities in intra-Community trade ⁽⁵⁾, the Commission considers that tax relief should be introduced in such trade in respect of the importation of small commercial consignments of books, reviews and newspapers.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 97, 2. 10. 1971.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 6, 10. 1. 1979.

⁽³⁾ Doc. COM(72) 1030 final; OJ No C 113, 28. 10. 1972.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 354, 30. 12. 1974, p. 57.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No C 244, 24. 9. 1981, p. 4.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1081/81

by Mr Damseaux

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 October 1981)

Subject: Advertising on television

What is the status of each of the television networks in the Member States? Are they authorized to accept commercial advertising and, if so, under what conditions and subject to what constraints?

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission

(19 January 1982)

As stated in the answer to Written Question No 856/81 by Mrs Martin ⁽¹⁾ the Commission is currently looking into the question of whether, and if so how, cross-frontier television services (including commercial television) could be facilitated by coordinating national legislation through Council Directives under Articles 66 and 57 (2) of the EEC Treaty. During this operation the Commission will be obtaining particulars of the legal position in the various Member States. It will make this information available to the Honourable Member in due course.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 38, 15. 2. 1982, p. 2.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1084/81

by Mr Cottrell

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 October 1981)

Subject: Grants and loans to Greenland

Will the Commission:

- list the total amount of grants and loans made for development in Greenland since Danish accession to the Community,
- list the number of Community-assisted projects that these grants and loans cover,

- estimate the value per head of population in Greenland, compared to the average Community investment per head in Member States other than Denmark,
- state the number of applications for grants and loans concerning Greenland currently in the pipeline?

**Answer given by Mr Giolitti
on behalf of the Commission**
(25 January 1982)

1 and 2. The totals to date for grants and loans to Greenland are as follows.

- (i) Grants from the European Social Fund for vocational training projects amounted to Dkr 168 530 289 between 1978 and 1981.

The projects covered training for the unemployed and the underemployed, and advanced training for workers in employment ⁽¹⁾.

- (ii) Total grants from the EAGGF Guidance Section to the fisheries sector since 1973 have amounted to Dkr 16 367 115.

Eighteen projects for the purchase or construction of 42 fishing boats were assisted.

- (iii) Assistance from the European Regional Development Fund from its inception in 1975 until September 1981 amounted to Dkr 361 840 000 for 304 projects.

- (iv) Under the specific energy measures, aid amounting to Dkr 31 870 000 has been granted for five projects under Regulation (EEC) No 3056/73 on the support of Community projects in the hydrocarbons sector ⁽²⁾ and Regulation (Euratom) No 2014/76 on the support of projects concerning uranium prospecting programmes ⁽³⁾.

- (v) By 30 September 1981, the EIB had granted loans of Dkr 383·4 million towards the financing of nine projects.

3. The following table shows the estimated annual average amounts per head of population granted to Greenland and the other four priority regions in the form of aid from the major Community funds and in the form of loans.

Grants and loans for primarily structural purposes to the five priority regions from 1978 to 1980 ⁽¹⁾

Grants (EAGGF Guidance Section: direct measures, ERDF, ESF, EMS interest subsidies)	ECU per capita 1978 - 1980
Mezzogiorno	33·3
Ireland	52·2
Northern Ireland	45·2
Greenland	263·4
French overseas departments	28·5
Total	35·6

Loans (EIB, NCI, ECSC, Euratom)	
Mezzogiorno	37·4
Ireland	84·9
Northern Ireland	34·4
Greenland	177·0
French overseas departments	0
Total	41·2

⁽¹⁾ The only period for which there is a regional breakdown for grants from the Social Fund.

The figures illustrate the major effort made by the Community to assist Greenland. But for a fair assessment of their significance, it should be borne in mind that Greenland is a sparsely populated region and that, as it covers an area of 2 175 600 square kilometres, investments required to aid development are predominantly large infrastructure projects and energy projects.

4. At 30 October 1981, Denmark had submitted 13 applications for aid from the EAGGF Guidance Section for the purchase or construction of fishing boats based in Greenland in the framework of interim common measures for restructuring the inshore fishing industry; the applications are being considered and the Commission will be taking a decision before 31 May 1982.

For the moment applications concerning electricity and water supply and a study into the use of hydroelectric energy are under consideration for aid from the Regional Fund.

Applications for about Dkr 64 million in Social Fund aid to vocational training projects in Greenland have been

⁽¹⁾ Full information on aid from the Social Fund is published in the Fund's Annual Report.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 312, 13. 11. 1973.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 221, 14. 8. 1976.

received in the first batch for 1982; the projects involve about 4 000 workers.

The Commission would point out that the negotiations for EIB loans are confidential: decisions are published only when the contracts have been signed.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1094/81

by Mr Woltjer

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 October 1981)

Subject: Problems of marketing Scottish herring

Is the Commission aware that the large landings of herring in Scotland, which are directly related to the Scottish fishing quota and the fishing methods used, are leading to serious problems regarding the marketing of the herring?

Does not the Commission believe that, in future, the allocation of catch quotas should be more closely linked to fishing patterns, the processing capacity on board the vessels and the market situation on shore, in order to prevent disturbance of the market and herring being consigned to the fishmeal industry, something that was never intended?

Would not the introduction of a phased system of quota allocation that took due account of demand on the market concerned be a possible way of preventing food fish from being processed for fishmeal?

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

(19 January 1982)

The Commission is aware that in some Community ports there have been difficulties with regard to the marketing of herring.

The Commission would stress that in the absence of any Council decision and given the most recent scientific advice from the ICES, a continued ban on herring fishing would have been legally questionable. The fixing of TACs is to be seen mainly as a conservation measure and not as a measure to regulate markets.

The Commission would point out that it is for the Member States to take appropriate measures, either directly or through producer organizations, to ensure that landings follow an orderly pattern and correspond to the needs of the market.

Article 19a of the Commission's proposal of 23 January 1981 amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 2527/80 of 30 September 1980 laying down technical measures for the conservation of fishery resources ⁽¹⁾ also makes provision for Member States to adopt national technical measures going beyond the minimum requirements, applicable only to fishermen of the Member State concerned and designed to ensure better management or better use of quotas, provided that such measures comply with Community law are in conformity with the common fisheries policy.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 29, 10. 2. 1981, p. 3.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1124/81

by Mr Muntingh

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 October 1981)

Subject: Ecology and development – forest clearance and reafforestation in the Solomon Islands

According to the Solomon Islands National Development plan for 1980-81, there are 170 000 hectares of exploitable forest on these islands, with a possible yield of 10.4 million cubic metres of timber. The aim is to produce 400 000 cubic metres of raw timber in 1982 and to reafforest 4 710 hectares the same year. These figures show that the gap between production and replanting will steadily increase, resulting within the foreseeable future in the destruction of the local tropical rain forests.

Moreover, according to the above document, the timber will be exported mainly in its raw state, which is unprofitable for the Solomon Islands and therefore ecologically unsatisfactory. For, owing to the small profit on raw timber, more forest will have to be exploited.

Livers Pacific Timbers Ltd, a subsidiary of UAC International, which in turn is a subsidiary of Unilever, is the company exploiting and exporting most of the timber resources of the Solomon Islands. According to the Solomon Island Dossier drawn up by the ESACI (Ecumenical Study and Action Centre for Investments), the activities of LPT are meeting with resistance from the local people.

1. Is it true that the local population derives only very little benefit from the activities of LPT (royalties being only 3 % of the export price of raw timber and exports consisting mainly of raw timber rather than of finished or semi-finished products)?
2. Is it true that ecologically irresponsible exploitation methods are used (an average of 20 trees felled per hectare and roads built over agricultural land)?

3. Is it true that in the Solomon Islands reforestation is planned and carried out mainly with the support of foreign aid and that those who exploit the forests contribute nothing?
4. Does the European Community provide aid for reforestation?
5. If so, to what extent and under what conditions?
6. Does the European Community provide finance through the Stabex system to promote the Solomon Islands' timber exports?
7. If so, to what extent and under what conditions?

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

(21 January 1982)

1. The major logging companies operate on the basis of logging concessions from the government or from 'customary' landowners. Royalties paid by the major logging companies are of two types. On government lands, it is assessed at 3 % of the FOB value. On customary land, the royalties are determined in the agreement between the company involved and the people concerned, and varies from 1.5 Solomon dollars to 3 Solomon dollars per cubic metre of exported timber. There is a special agreement between LPT and the cooperative of landowners in New Georgia, under which royalties, based on the value of the export price, should not be less than 7.5 % and not more than 12.5 %. New Georgia cooperatives are meant to invest these royalties into reforestation.

In the Solomons, only about 10 % of the total timber production is processed. The major problem in developing export saw-milling industries is the differential pricing and tariff policies in the export markets, which favour unprocessed logs over sawn timber.

2. The area of forests considered accessible and exploitable under present conditions represent only 7 % (about 180 000 hectares) of the total forest cover of the country. Commercial log volumes are only a small proportion of total standing volume of wood because of the narrow specifications, in both size and species, of what constitute a commercial sawlog. A reasonable estimate is that an average of 15 to 20 trees per hectare are selected for logging.

There is considerable evidence of unnecessary damage resulting from the current logging operations that could be greatly reduced by more careful planning and operation of felling and extraction. The most severe effect is soil compaction by the caterpillar tractors. The Commission services will draw the attention of the Solomons Government to the necessity of ensuring that ecological safeguards are built into future intensive logging operations, and that a follow-up land use should be planned and ready for implementation before this type of operation begins.

3. There has been only a limited area of forest plantations established through individual or community involvement. The explanation for this low level of involvement lies in the joint effects of several factors including the lack of social or cultural traditions for large scale tree planting, the ready availability of forest products, customary land tenure, a lack of government resources and trained staff and poor communications on each island as well as within the archipelagic context of the country. Moreover, as licences for harvesting the forest do not bear any provision relating to replanting or subsequent forest management, the problems of replacing the resource for the moment are still left to the government.

The government has, however, recently become conscious of its responsibility in the protection of its forests. As a first step in 1976, aid projects to the Solomons were agreed to with the UK and New Zealand, covering 20 000 hectares of replanting, 45 % on Kolombangara. The reforestation programme up to the end of 1980 covers some 18 256 hectares or about 26 % of the area logged.

Private companies, will from 1983 onwards, be obliged to invest in reforestation, though no definite proposals are yet made. The export duty on lumber has been increased from 1 January 1982 from 10 to 15 % of FOB price. The current government plan envisages that one-third of this duty will go into the reforestation fund. Should the private companies invest in a regeneration programme, they become entitled to a refund of the 5 % of the export duty. This plan, however, is not yet official, and is part of the new policy now being discussed.

4 and 5. The Community's first aid programme to the Solomons, drawn up in June 1977, and amended in July 1978 includes a reforestation project at an estimated cost of 625 000 ECU, financed in the form of grant.

The project involves the establishment of 1 800 hectares (about 8 % of the 1980-1984 programme) of tree plantations (mainly mahogany) in the Shortlands and Santa Cruz group of islands. The reforestation operations started early 1981 and is likely to be completed by 1984. In addition, the Solomons Government intends to request under the current fifth EDF programme, the financing of the costs of replanting 875 hectares of logged land, at Viru on New Georgia, at an estimated cost of 1 million ECU.

6 and 7. The Solomon Islands received Stabex transfers for an amount of 761 245 ECU, for short falls in the earnings of its exports of wood in the rough. These transfers were granted under the provisions governing Stabex, of Title II of Council Decision of 29 June 1976 on the Association of the Overseas Countries and Territories.

The receipt of the timber Stabex from the Community enabled the Solomons Government to create in 1979 a stabilization fund for the timber industry.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1142/81**by Mr Curry****to the Commission of the European Communities***(16 October 1981)*

Subject: Processing of Community grown rape seed (colza) to obtain oil

Is the Commission satisfied with the working of the scheme to subsidize the processing of Community grown rape seed (colza) to obtain oil? Does the Commission believe it is logical to have both a scheme for pre-fixation of aid and a scheme for day aid? Does the Commission believe that Canadian seed price is the best basis for the establishment of the levels of pre-fixed aid given the relative decline in the importance of Canadian raw materials to the EEC processing sector? Does the Commission believe that if pre-fixed aid were at a high level it would encourage greater uptake of aid in this form and make day aid relatively less attractive? Does it believe that budgetary savings could be made by improving the terms of pre-fixed aid rather than setting a level of subsidy which encourages companies to opt for the more costly day aid? What calculation of the relative uptake of day aid and pre-fixed aid did the Commission make when estimating the cost of the regime for the 1982 preliminary draft budget?

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

(22 January 1982)

1. The Commission would like to point out that this system has been in operation since 1967 and has enabled a volume of production which has increased from 450 000 to 2 million tonnes to be disposed of without any major difficulties. The Commission would stress that, in view of the characteristics of the market in question and the international commitments entered into by the Community, the existing aid system is the most appropriate means of achieving two primary objectives of the common agricultural policy simultaneously: ensuring both fair producer prices and reasonable consumer prices. On that basis the Commission is inclined to take the view that the support system for colza seed operates satisfactorily.

2. When production of colza seed rose sharply in 1980 and 1981, the system known as day aid, together with the system of aid fixed in advance, helped to ensure that production was disposed of normally. Whereas the purpose of the day aid system is to improve marketing of

Community seed and at the same time make maximum use of crushing capacities, the method of fixing aid in advance permits better planning of crushing. The two schemes can therefore exist side by side as they meet different requirements.

3. The Commission when fixing the amounts of aid in advance does not take Canadian seed prices as the sole basis but also refers – when these are available – to prices of seeds from other countries, e.g. Sweden. Although imports of Canadian seed into the Community are decreasing, they still totalled 325 340 tonnes in 1980, and the Commission considers that the prices of Canadian seed can be regarded as representative.

4 and 5. Raising the level of aid fixed in advance does of course increase interest on the part of operators. However, it is doubtful whether advance fixing of aid at a higher level would result in savings for the Community budget, since it is not certain that aid fixed in advance, at a level likely to interest operators, would be less than the day aid amounts.

6. When drafting the relevant proposal for a Regulation at the end of May 1981, the Commission estimated that 700 000 tonnes of colza seed might be covered by the day aid system. The remainder of Community production, not covered by day aid, should thus amount to between 1 200 000 and 1 300 000 tonnes.

The estimates for the 1982 budget had already been established on the basis of aid averaging 190 ECU/tonne and have not been adjusted, in view of the marginal financial impact of the proposal compared with the total appropriation of 407 million ECU.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1147/81**by Lord O'Hagan****to the Commission of the European Communities***(16 October 1981)*

Subject: Benefits of membership of the European Community

The Commission will have studied the statement of the National Executive Committee of the British Labour Party called 'Withdrawal from the EEC'.

Does the Commission agree that membership of the EEC 'has brought little or no benefit to Britain; it has made inflation worse, weakened our economy, and undermined our industry and jobs'?

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

(12 January 1982)

The Commission has expressed its opinion on this and related issues on various occasions, in particular, in recent years, through answers given to Written Questions Nos 1489/80, 1490/80, 1492/80, 1494/80 by the Honourable Member and No 243/81 by Mr Lomas ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 49, 9. 3. 1981, p. 26; OJ No C 78, 6. 4. 1981, p. 7; OJ No C 165, 6. 7. 1981, p. 1; OJ No C 73, 2. 4. 1981, p. 6; OJ No C 216, 20. 7. 1981, p. 4.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1192/81

**by Mr Costanzo and Mr Ligios
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(3 November 1981)

Subject: Papers required for the customs clearance of wine in France

Is the Commission aware that the customs authorities of the French Republic are requiring additional papers for the customs clearance of wine of Italian origin held up at the border and have introduced special procedures and practices for the presentation of such papers?

Does the Commission consider that these papers can be presented directly by the exporters or importers to the competent customs authorities without waiting for the relevant applications to be sent through the French Government or the Italian Government?

Does it think it right that the Italian Government should receive these applications from the French Government over one month after the date of the wine's arrival at the border?

Does the Commission not consider that the French authorities, by now requiring a certificate of origin for consignments of Italian wine exported to France between January and April 1980 which were cleared by the customs in the normal way at that time and have perhaps

already been consumed, are hindering the application for and presentation of the relevant papers for the wine held up at the border between July and August 1981?

What action has the Commission taken to prevent the request for additional customs papers delaying the customs clearance of goods and causing a financial loss to the agents concerned?

Finally, does the Commission consider it correct that the French customs should suddenly decide that these papers are inaccurate and incomplete when the same papers have been considered complete and accurate by these authorities for more than ten years?

What conclusions should European and world public opinion draw about the state of intra-Community trade?

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

(26 January 1982)

The French authorities held that certain accompanying papers did not comply with Community rules and requested additional information from the Italian authorities under the system of administrative cooperation provided for in Regulation (EEC) No 359/79 ⁽¹⁾. This procedure is consistent with the relevant provisions.

But in some cases the French authorities asked their Italian counterparts to supply the original supporting documents as well as the information itself. Such a request is contrary to the provisions of Regulations (EEC) Nos 1153/75 ⁽²⁾ and 359/79 and the Commission initiated a procedure for infringement against the French Republic.

2. Accompanying papers are always presented by the operators to the competent bodies of the importing country at the time of customs clearance. If these papers have to be validated the provisions on administrative cooperation become applicable, although the authorities of a Member State are free to accept as valid evidence any of the papers supplied directly by the operators.

3 and 5. The Commission considers, that France delayed initiating the procedure of validation in respect of several consignments and then delayed customs clearance of several validated consignments. It therefore initiated two procedures for infringement, under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, and sent reasoned opinions to the French Government on 2 and 12 October 1981.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 54, 5. 3. 1979, p. 136.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 113, 1. 5. 1975, p. 1.

4. The Community rules provide that accompanying papers must be kept for at least five years, during which any investigations may be conducted.

6. Honest and diligent cooperation between Member States is essential for correct implementation of the relevant Community rules and Member States must apply Community law with unfailing diligence.

7. Problems may always arise in the Community. Solutions must be sought within the framework of the Treaty and the Community institutions.

obligations arising out of this Treaty or resulting from action taken by the institutions of the Community.

They shall abstain from any measure which could jeopardize the attainment of the objectives of this Treaty.'?

**Joint answer given by Mr Thorn
on behalf of the Commission**

(22 January 1982)

The Commission would ask the Honourable Member to refer to the explanations given by Mr Andriessen on behalf of the Commission during the debate in the European Parliament on 14 and 15 October 1981, concerning the Commission's attitude to the extension of the public sector in France, in reply to the oral questions asked on this subject by other Members of Parliament ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Oral questions O-38 by Mr Cousté, O-47 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins, H-392 by Mr d'Ormesson and H-412 by Mr Rossi, Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-275 (October 1981).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1207/81

by Mr Galland

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 November 1981)

Subject: Incompatibility of French nationalization measures with the Treaty of Rome

The fourth paragraph of the preamble of the Treaty of Rome states that 'the removal of existing obstacles calls for concerted action in order to guarantee steady expansion, balanced trade and fair competition'.

Is the decision by the French Government to nationalize all credit institutions, eight industrial groups and the whole of the iron and steel industry compatible with the preamble of the Treaty of Rome?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1211/81

by Mr Galland

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 November 1981)

Subject: Incompatibility of French nationalization measures with the Treaty of Rome

Article 2 of the Treaty of Rome states that 'the Community shall have as its task, by establishing a common market and progressively approximating the economic policies of Member States, to promote throughout the Community a harmonious development of economic activities, a continuous and balanced expansion, an increase in stability . . . '.

The French nationalization measures run counter to the direction being taken by all the governments of the Member States in the economic field.

As a result, the economic policy of one Member State is taking a course radically different from those of the other nine Member States.

In the light of this, what measures does the Commission intend to take to safeguard the approximation of the policies of the Member States and to ensure that Article 2 of the Treaty of Rome is respected?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1218/81

by Mr Galland

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 November 1981)

Subject: Incompatibility of French nationalization measures with the Treaty of Rome

Does the Commission consider that the French Government's nationalization bill constitutes a 'measure which could jeopardize the attainment of the objectives of the Treaty of Rome' within the meaning of Article 5 of the Treaty, which states that:

'Member States shall take all appropriate measures, whether general or particular, to ensure fulfilment of the

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1216/81**by Mr Galland****to the Commission of the European Communities***(3 November 1981)*

Subject: Incompatibility of French nationalization measures with the Treaty of Rome

Can the Commission say whether, in drawing up the nationalization bill, the French Government complied with Article 6 (1) of the Treaty, which states that:

'Member States shall, in close cooperation with the institutions of the Community, coordinate their respective economic policies'?

**Joint answer given by Mr Thorn
on behalf of the Commission**

(20 January 1982)

There is a public sector to a greater or lesser extent in all the Member States. Moreover, nationalization measures or measures to reduce the size of the public sector have already been taken by Member States during the lifetime of the Communities.

Such variations in the scale and composition of the public sector do not in themselves constitute an obstacle to the progressive approximation of economic policies.

Nevertheless, if difficulties were encountered as a result of the methods of managing the public sector in the Member States, the coordination at Community level provided for in Article 6 (1) of the EEC Treaty would enable an appropriate solution to be found.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1250/81**by Mr Purvis****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 November 1981)*

Subject: Centre for industrial development

1. In view of the fact that

(a) during its first four years 97 of the CID's envisaged projects were abandoned and 98 were carried out by promoters without CID participation and

(b) in 1980 it succeeded in co-financing only 11 feasibility studies for new enterprises, as against 26 in 1979

is the Commission satisfied with the performance to date of the CID in promoting industrial development in the ACP States?

2. What progress has been made towards implementing the recommendations of the resolution on a Community Foundation for International Technological and Scientific Cooperation, adopted by Parliament in May 1981? When does it intend to submit the report on its future plans and organization as requested in that report and agreed to by the Commission in the debate (OJ, Annex No 1-271 - Debates of the European Parliament - May 1981)?

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

(19 January 1982)

1. The figures quoted by the Honourable Member must be placed in the context of the CID's overall activities, which are set out in its annual report.

(a) The Centre for Industrial Development, which was created by the Lomé Convention, is a promotional body and it is not surprising that a number of projects come to nothing. The abandonment of 97 projects out of a total of 500 is a normal proportion.

For the 98 other projects carried out by promoters without CID participation, the CID acted as a go-between in the initial stages, which is also one of its functions.

(b) The reduction in the number of feasibility studies in 1980 is mainly due to budgetary restrictions in the year of transition between the two Conventions, which meant that the CID had to concentrate on following up projects for which studies had already been made rather than on financing new studies.

The Commission considers that the effectiveness of the CID will be increased as a result of the setting up of the new structure, the stepping up of resources and the implementation of new policies.

2. In accordance with the desire expressed by Parliament in the Resolution referred to by the Honourable Member, the Commission has made every

effort to follow the courses of action defined by the Programme of Action adopted on 23 January 1980 in Vienna by the United Nations' Conference on Science and Technology for Development (UNCSTD) in at least three ways:

- (i) by developing the agreements between universities and research institutes in Europe and in the associated developing countries with a view to enhancing the latter's R and D potential and improving the training of their scientific and technical personnel;
- (ii) by pushing ahead with the preparatory work for the establishment of the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (TCA) provided for in the Second Lomé Convention to give the ACP States easier access to scientific and technical information on agricultural and rural development, the results of research and agricultural experiments, and managerial staff training opportunities;
- (iii) by drawing up a research and development programme, currently before the Council, aimed at stepping up research in industrialized countries aimed at solving scientific problems that are priorities for developing countries, primarily in connection with tropical agriculture, and medicine, health and nutrition in tropical areas.

On 15 October 1981 the Commission transmitted to the Council a communication on 'Scientific and Technical Research and the European Community' ⁽¹⁾ concerning an overall research strategy, of which one of the priority themes is aid for developing countries. On the basis of this communication the Council asked the Commission on 9 November to submit concrete proposals in connection with 'the concept of a general outline programme with a view to a global strategy'.

Hence, within the next few months the Commission will submit the report requested by Parliament on the objectives and tasks of scientific and technical cooperation in the development sphere and on the reorganization that is planned to strengthen cooperation, not only within the Community but more particularly with the developing countries.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(81) 574.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1251/81

by Mr Curry

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 November 1981)

Subject: Intervention agencies

How much expenditure by intervention agencies has the Commission disallowed per country, and in each case what was the total allowed, for each of the last five years for which the Commission has figures?

Does the Commission consider it satisfactory that disallowed expenditure can be recovered from the national government but not from the person/agency/company which has benefited from the improper expenditure?

Answer given by Mr Dalsager
on behalf of the Commission

(20 January 1982)

The accompanying table shows the expenditure of Member States' intervention agencies during the period 1971 to 1975 – the last years for which the clearance of accounts has been the subject of a Commission Decision – broken down by payments disallowed and payments allowed for EAGGF financing.

The Commission's view is that Member States should normally recover from the beneficiaries amounts paid in error and disallowed as chargeable to the EAGGF.

However, since the recovery procedures are dictated by the countries' own regulation – which differ from one country to another – it is possible that the amounts disallowed when the accounts are cleared can be and indeed are recovered in some Member States whereas they have to be written off in others.

The Commission considers it desirable to harmonize national provisions governing the recovery of amounts paid in error on the EAGGF's account in order to eliminate discrimination between producers in the various Member States.

The Commission hopes to be able to carry out the necessary work in the near future.

Expenditure declared by intervention agencies, broken down by payments disallowed and payments allowed as chargeable to the EAGGF
Guarantee Section

(in national currency)

Country	Financial years					
	1971		1972		1973	
	Disallowed	Allowed	Disallowed	Allowed	Disallowed	Allowed
Belgium	- 6 761	4 976 726 330	- 2 148 241	6 397 812 406	- 63 952 869	9 617 084 437
Denmark	—	—	—	—	- 213 229 ·61	2 213 602 674 ·69
Federal Republic of Germany	- 10 816 960 ·07	1 411 976 619 ·28	- 4 505 286 ·12	1 798 764 879 ·87	- 9 192 762 ·41	2 470 986 346 ·80
France	- 10 322 697 ·58	3 326 922 715 ·77	- 84 317 418 ·21	4 992 738 940 ·16	- 129 327 122 ·10	6 032 587 162 ·25
Ireland	—	—	—	—	- 806 ·88	37 027 656 ·28
Italy	- 6 094 531 460	106 615 809 225	- 7 568 368 137	334 783 371 018	- 1 452 206 248	364 069 285 898
Luxembourg	—	71 134 396	—	94 852 293 ·20	- 48 009 ·90	273 157 129
Netherlands	- 1 615 308	951 043 115 ·48	- 93 732 ·15	1 227 698 473 ·75	- 24 519 398 ·66	1 886 436 768 ·93
United Kingdom	—	—	—	—	- 396 368 ·33	62 982 080 ·40

Expenditure declared by intervention agencies, broken down by payments disallowed and payments allowed as chargeable to the EAGGF Guarantee Section

(in national currency)

Country	Financial years			
	1974		1975	
	Disallowed	Allowed	Disallowed	Allowed
Belgium	- 310 486 060	7 112 791 259	- 40 037 299·50	8 789 084 723·50
Denmark	- 1 599 974·85	2 150 697 122·15	13 147 527·31	2 334 379 676·73
Federal Republic of Germany	17 681 510·94	2 101 350 638·89	- 32 894 745·37	2 160 164 617·69
France	90 162 814·11	3 793 004 893·73	- 633 761 320·43	5 877 407 433·44
Ireland	429 007·10	75 621 237·59	1 627 665·69	98 577 414·86
Italy	- 14 843 911 637	320 154 647 151	- 12 928 563 923	569 794 296 041
Luxembourg	- 1 124·10	98 804 374·40	—	271 799 272
Netherlands	- 22 131 015·82	1 606 852 382·86	1 777 173·32	1 713 598 994·56
United Kingdom	- 935 861·00	110 635 044·80	- 432 316·39	338 970 557·28

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1259/81

by Mr Damseaux

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 November 1981)

Subject: Community aid to Belgian iron and steel companies

The iron and steel industry is currently going through an unprecedented period of crisis which was also the reason for the fall of the Eyskens government.

Does the Commission not feel that Community aid to Belgian iron and steel companies should form part of a genuine restructuring plan drawn up by the competent Community authorities?

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

(22 January 1982)

Under Commission Decision No 2320/81/ECSC of 7 August 1981 establishing Community rules for aids to the steel industry ⁽¹⁾, aid may be granted to the steel industry only if the recipient undertaking or group of undertakings is engaged in the implementation of a systematic and specific restructuring programme which is capable of restoring its competitiveness and of making it financially viable without aid under normal market conditions and which results in an overall reduction in the production capacity of the recipient undertaking or group of undertakings.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 288, 13. 8. 1981, p. 14.

It is for the national authorities and for firms to draw up restructuring plans. The Commission's function is simply to check that they comply with the rules laid down by the Community.

It goes without saying that when it assesses whether Community assistance should be granted the Commission does not apply criteria different from those which the steel aids Decision establishes for national aid.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1260/81

by Mr Seeler and Mr Rogalla

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 November 1981)

Subject: Public debate on net contributions and whether they should be subject to an upper limit

In the Commission's view, what impact has the public debate on net contributions by individual Member States and their subjection to an upper limit had on the attitude of the public towards and its feelings of belonging to Europe?

What contribution is the Commission making through its public relations work to this debate?

What is the Commission's own assessment of the measurable advantages and disadvantages for the Member States, individually and collectively, of membership in the European Community?

Does the Commission consider it appropriate to work out criteria by means of which the contribution to

Community revenue made by the individual Member States can be broken down and compared with the many measurable advantages they enjoy and, if so, is it prepared to do so?

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

(20 January 1982)

The Commission is concerned about the importance that has been attached to net budget contributions in the public debate about the Community in certain Member States.

The Commission has often pointed out that budgetary aspects alone are not a true reflection of the benefits derived from Community membership by each Member State. The approach taken by the Commission in its May mandate report of 24 June 1981 makes it quite clear that it sees budgetary problems in the wider context of political development. The Commission's information services have been instructed to explain this point of view at every opportunity.

In the Commission's view all Member States reap economic, social and political benefits from membership of the Community. Unlike budgetary phenomena, most other aspects of Community life are not easily quantified. The elimination of customs duties, for instance, and the abolition of quantitative restrictions between Member States, together with the establishment of common rules on competition, have produced a single market. The consequent increase in trade has led to economies of scale, and the European consumer has benefited either by a relative reduction in prices or by a wider choice of goods. To undermine the Community's achievements in this field would obviously have serious repercussions on employment, but it is difficult to measure the effect of the Community's existence on standards of living and employment. This difficulty, however, is no reason for ignoring in public debate the indisputable advantages in those areas.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1266/81

by Mr Simmonds

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 November 1981)

Subject: Co-responsibility

Will the Commission state what amounts of money have been raised by the co-responsibility levy in 1979, 1980 and (estimate) 1981, and indicate the amounts spent on

- (a) advertising and similar purposes,
- (b) direct consumer subsidies, and
- (c) other purposes

in those years?

What amount of revenue from the levy is still awaiting allocation?

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

(21 January 1982)

Co-responsibility levy receipts for the period 16 September 1977 to 31 December 1981 were:

	<i>million ECU</i>
1977	24.1
1978	156.1
1979	94.2
1980	222.9
1981 ⁽¹⁾	503.0
Total	1 000.3

Expenditure of these receipts during the same period was as follows:

A. Specific programmes

(million ECU)

Year	Measure					
	Market development	School milk	Disposal of fats		Improvement of milk quality	Total
			Concentrated butter	Ice cream		
1977	—	—	—	7.5	—	7.5
1978	10.1	10.3	4.5	28.5	—	53.4
1979	37.4	30.0	3.6	23.8	15.5	110.3
1980	26.6	45.7	5.1	24.0	8.0	109.4
1981 (1)	49.0	69.0	5.0	32.0	15.0	170.0
Total	123.1	155.0	18.2	115.8	38.5	450.6

As market development and improvement of milk quality are covered by contracts paid for as they are executed, the total cost of these contracts is in fact higher.

B. Priority actions

Receipts not used for specific programmes are used to cover expenditure on disposal of milk sector surpluses in accordance with certain priorities established by the co-responsibility group.

It should be remembered in this connection that total milk sector expenditure, ignoring co-responsibility levy receipts, has been as follows:

	<i>million ECU</i>
1977	2 948·2
1978	4 170·8
1979	4 621·7
1980	4 974·9
1981 ⁽¹⁾	4 178·0

⁽¹⁾ According to the 1981 Budget, including draft amending budget No 2/1981.

expenditure by EAGGF in the dairy sector remains heavy and the situation could deteriorate quickly if, as seems likely, EEC milk production once again resumes its upward path or if major changes occur in an uncertain world market for dairy products. In effect, the underlying problems of increasing surplus in the dairy sector remain and suppression of the levy for reasons of short-term expediency could do lasting damage to the long-term strategy of the Commission expressed in its document 'Guidelines for European Agriculture' ⁽¹⁾ Which aims at providing fair incomes for dairy farmers based on a healthy balanced market for dairy products. The levy is still required to discourage, and to help dispose of, surplus production and to enlarge the market for dairy products and together with other measures should ensure a healthy market closely linked to the needs of consumers.

⁽¹⁾ COM(81) 608 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1267/81

by Mr Simmonds

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 November 1981)

Subject: Co-responsibility

In view of the fact that the Community no longer has significant stocks of dairy produce, and that dairy farmers are hard-pressed by the current financial situation in the Community, will the Commission propose that the rate of the dairy co-responsibility levy be reduced to zero until the next farm price review?

Answer given by Mr Dalsager
on behalf of the Commission

(25 January 1982)

The Commission will not propose a reduction in the level of the co-responsibility levy to be applicable during the current dairy season. This is because the Community stocks of dairy products are at a low level owing to a temporary reduction in the expansion of milk supplies, a policy of good market management, and a high level of demand for dairy products on world markets. Even so,

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1277/81

by Mr Provan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 November 1981)

Subject: Farmed salmon

Would the Commission explain how it proposes to support salmon-producing fish farms, now that the agreement on certain fisheries measures will give support to both wild salmon and trout producers, which are highly competitive with farmed salmon?

Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis
on behalf of the Commission

(20 January 1982)

It is not yet possible to specify in detail the considerations which will be taken into account in the context of any future practical application of Articles 18 and 22 of the new markets Regulation establishing, if necessary, a deficiency payments scheme for wild salmon and providing the possibility of fixing a reference price for trout. Nor can the Commission as yet reach specific conclusions about the possible implications for salmon farming of any such measures.

The Commission would point out, however, that the Community already makes investment grants to salmon-producing fish farms under its interim common measure for restructuring the inshore fishing industry (Regulation (EEC) No 1852/78); since 1978, 11 fish farming projects concerning salmon rearing have been

granted two million ECU in Community aid under this measure. A Commission proposal for a definitive restructuring measure for the fishing industry ⁽¹⁾ now before the Council, also provides for aid of this kind.

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

(19 January 1982)

⁽¹⁾ COM(80) 420 final, 18. 7. 1980.

As a general rule the figures for job losses in industry are not available to the Commission.

The only available data concerns net job losses, in other words the difference between two levels of employment.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1289/81
by Mr Fernandez
to the Commission of the European Communities
(16 November 1981)

Subject: Job losses in certain industries

Can the Commission provide a statistical table of job losses in the steel, shipbuilding-and-repair, textile, clothing, and footwear industry over the last ten years (since 1970)? Can it show the total number of jobs in each industry in 1970?

In respect of the textile industry, the Honourable Member is referred to the answer given by the Commission to Written Question No 497/80 by Mrs Hoffmann ⁽¹⁾.

The attached table shows the net job losses between 1970 and 1980, 1975 and 1980, 1979 and 1980 and employment levels in 1975 for all the Member States except Greece. These figures are estimates and will no doubt be amended as definitive information reaches the Statistical Office of the European Communities.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 283, 3. 11. 1980, p. 4.

Firms employing 20 workers or more

NACE	Net job losses			Employment
	1970/1980	1975/1980	1979/1980	1975
221 (ECSC iron and steel industry)	(¹)	- 145	- 44	781.1
361 (Shipbuilding)	(¹)	- 108	- 17.5	408.5
— new civil shipbuilding	(¹)	- 85	- 10.7	205.2
— repairs	- 15.4	- 12.3	(¹)	69.6
43 (Textiles)	(- 766)	- 326.5	- 71	1 633
451 (Footwear)	(- 89)	- 20	- 14.6	313.8
453/5 (Clothing)	(- 276)	- 182	- 48	1 110

Losses are indicated by a minus sign.

Sources:

- 221 — Quarterly Iron and Steel Bulletin. ECSC Statistics.
- 361 — Coordinated annual survey of activity in industry. Firms employing 20 workers or more.
 - New civil shipbuilding: Report on the state of the shipbuilding industry in the Community (Situation as at 1 January 1981 COM(81) 432 final.
 - Repairs: national official services.
- 43 — 451-453/5: Coordinated annual survey of activity in industry and Eurostat estimates based on short-term surveys or professional sources. Firms employing 20 workers or more.

(¹) Data not available.

() Unreliable estimates.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1323/81**by Ms Clwyd****to the Commission of the European Communities***(19 November 1981)*

Subject: Section 2 of the European Communities Act 1972

What would be the implications of the United Kingdom repealing Section 2 of the European Communities Act 1972?

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

(26 January 1982)

The Commission cannot imagine that the United Kingdom would repeal Section 2 of the European Communities Act 1972 as it contains essential rules concerning the position of Community law in the United Kingdom.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1324/81**by Ms Clwyd****to the Commission of the European Communities***(16 November 1981)*

Subject: Legal cock fighting

Legal cock fighting has been banned in most Community countries; in which countries or regions is it still permitted and what plans has the Commission to outlaw this barbarous practice?

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

(20 January 1982)

The Commission has no information on which regions within the Community continue to authorize cock fighting.

The Commission does not intend to make any proposals in this matter and feels that such an emotive and sensitive area is best left to the public policy of individual Member States.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1334/81**by Mr Cariglia****to the Commission of the European Communities***(19 November 1981)*

Subject: Invitation to tender in connection with the measures envisaged to promote the consumption of olive oil in the Community in application of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1970/80 ⁽¹⁾ and Commission Regulation (EEC) No 1348/81 ⁽²⁾

With reference to the invitation to tender for advertising contracts to promote the consumption of olive oil in the Community (OJ No C 183, 25. 7. 1981, p. 2), would the Commission state whether the firms to be entrusted with the promotional work in question are to be chosen on the basis of long practical experience in the field, or will preference be given to advertising firms set up in connection with the scheme envisaged by the Community and therefore having direct or indirect links with interest groups in the sector concerned?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 192, 26. 7. 1980, p. 5.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 134, 21. 5. 1981, p. 17.

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

(26 January 1982)

Article 2 of Regulation (EEC) No 1348/81 on detailed rules for applying Council Regulation (EEC) No 1970/80 laying down general implementing rule for campaigns aimed at promoting the consumption of olive oil in the Community provides that for the purposes of assessing the proposals put forward, the Commission is to take account, *inter alia*, of the quality and cost of the proposed measures and the tenderer's degree of specialization and experience in the field covered by the measure envisaged.

The Commission assures the Honourable Member that it intends to adhere strictly to these criteria when selecting the agencies to carry out the measures provided for in that Regulation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1340/81

by Mrs Ewing
to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 November 1981)

Subject: Cheap textile imports

Will the Commission state their estimate of the quantity of cheap textile imports from Third World countries which are not Lomé members?

Answer given by Mr Davignon
on behalf of the Commission
(20 January 1982)

It is not possible to define with any precision the meaning of 'cheap' textile products, and consequently it is not possible to estimate the quantity of cheap textile imports from Third World countries. Not all the products imported from these countries are necessarily cheap.

Total imports from developing countries in 1980 amounted to:

	<i>million EUA</i>
SITC 65 Textiles	2·258
SITC 84 Clothing	4·116
TOTAL	6·374

Excluding the Lomé countries the figures are:

SITC 65 Textiles	2·201
SITC 84 Clothing	4·043
TOTAL	6·244

The definition of the Third World used for the purpose of this answer is that of the economic zone designated as Class 2, developing countries in the Community Statistical Office publication 'Geonomenclature'. It corresponds very closely, but not exactly, with the definition of developing countries in the GATT and in UNCTAD. Essentially Class 2 includes all the developing countries of Africa, Asia and South America, including the ACP countries.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1341/81

by Mrs Ewing
to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 November 1981)

Subject: Proceedings against pulp producers

Will the Commission list the names of the pulp producers against whom proceedings have been launched on the ground that such producers have been manipulating prices to the detriment of EEC Companies?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(20 January 1982)

The Commission regrets that it cannot disclose any details of the case to which the Honourable Member refers, since proceedings in this case pursuant to Article 85 of the EEC Treaty are currently pending.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1343/81

by Mrs Ewing
to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 November 1981)

Subject: Lime subsidy

Will the Commission list the EEC Member States who have introduced a lime subsidy and give details of the extent of the subsidy and the factors determining receipt.

Answer given by Mr Dalsager
on behalf of the Commission
(26 January 1982)

In order to alleviate the difficulties of cattle producers in Ireland and Northern Ireland in recent years the Council introduced Council Regulation (EEC) No 1054/81 of 21 April 1981 establishing a common measure for the

development of beef cattle production in Ireland and Northern Ireland ⁽¹⁾. This measure, which has a duration of two years from the date of approval of the detailed application rules, includes aid for the improvement of pastures and meadows through the increased use of lime. The measure is being implemented by Ireland and the United Kingdom. Aid may not be greater than 4.0 ECU per tonne of lime and a maximum of 18 million ECU is eligible for EAGGF reimbursement.

Apart from this, the Commission is not aware of any specific aids being granted by Member States for the purchase or use of lime. It may be that such aids are granted as part of general measures for land improvement or for bringing large areas under cultivation, but the lists of existing aids are not sufficiently detailed to allow them to be identified.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 111, 23. 4. 1981, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1346/81

by Mr Moreland

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 November 1981)

Subject: Supply of malting barley

1. What has been the proportion of malting barley (produced for brewing) of the total Community cereal production for each of the last six years?

2. Does the Commission agree that the effect of intervention pricing for cereals in recent years has been to encourage production of high-yielding cereals to the detriment of production of malting barley? If so what action does the Commission propose to take to rectify this situation?

Answer given by Mr Dalsager
on behalf of the Commission

(21 January 1982)

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1345/81

by Mrs Ewing

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 November 1981)

Subject: Risk of anthrax poisoning

Will the Commission look into the danger constituted by the anthrax poisoned island of Gruinard in Wester Ross in Scotland and consider what steps should be taken to ensure that the recent removal of samples of the soil cannot happen again as certain of these samples were posted or delivered, e.g. to Porton Down, thereby creating the risk of an outbreak of anthrax to citizens of the UK and of the Community.

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission

(20 January 1982)

The Commission has no jurisdiction to deal with the question asked by the Honourable Member, which is a matter solely for the national authorities concerned.

1. The distinction between malting barley and barley for other purposes is not as clear as it may appear. Malt can be produced with different barley qualities and even winter barley is used sometimes. The malting quality of barley also varies from year to year depending on climatic conditions. It therefore happens often that barley which had not been initially planted for malting becomes acceptable for this purpose and vice versa. The total production of barley and the usage of barley for the production of whisky and beer since 1976 was as follows.

(in millions of tonnes)

	Barley production total	Usage of barley for EEC beer and whisky production	Usage of barley for EEC malt export
1976/77	30.1	5.3	1.13
1977/78	37.7	5.2	1.45
1978/79	39.6	5.5	1.34
1979/80	38.9	5.4	1.44
1980/81	40.1	not available	not available
1981/82	39.7	not available	not available

2. The lack of easy distinction between barley types makes it difficult to assess the effect of intervention pricing on production of barley specifically for malting. It

is nevertheless evident that intervention pricing has had no detrimental effect on production of malt as such. However, the Commission would agree, for a number of reasons, that the common intervention price for feed cereals including barley should increase less than agricultural prices generally, thus reinforcing the possibility for better qualities to attract higher prices on the market. This approach was adopted in 1981/82 price proposals and it is the Commission's intention to make further annual proposals to the same effect.

The uses to which products withdrawn from the market may be put are listed in Article 21 of Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 ⁽¹⁾ (free distribution in the fresh state or after processing, use for animal feed in the fresh state or after processing, industrial use etc.) and remain the same irrespective of the method of cultivation.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 118, 20. 5. 1972.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1352/81

by Mrs Ewing

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 November 1981)

Subject: Glasshouse products – intervention

Will the Commission

1. quantify the amount of greenhouse products bought into intervention in each of the past five years in the various Member States, giving precise details in the case of greenhouse tomatoes, and

2. state what became of these products after they had been bought into intervention?

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

(22 January 1982)

The Commission does not have any information on the proportion of glasshouse products in intervention buying.

It is worth pointing out, however, that the cost to the EAGGF of intervention is identical whether the product withdrawn was grown in the open or under glass even when, as in the case of glasshouse tomatoes, producer groups or associations of such groups can set withdrawal prices higher than those for open-grown tomatoes. In such cases the difference is met by these groups and associations.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1354/81

by Mrs Poirier

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1981)

Subject: Importation of maize for the manufacture of isoglucose

Will the Commission state whether the maize used for the manufacture of isoglucose is imported at a reduced rate of duty?

What are the quantities imported for that purpose?

What is the amount of the import levy?

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

(26 January 1982)

No reduction is made in the levy charged on maize imported into the Community for the manufacture of isoglucose. The import levy on maize is variable and is fixed daily. Since the beginning of November 1981 it has ranged between 91 ECU/tonne and 99 ECU/tonne.

As to the quantities of maize imported, the trade statistics available do not enable the Commission to state precisely how much is used for isoglucose production.

However, based on a total production of isoglucose in the 1980/81 marketing year of 184 000 tonnes, it would be reasonable to estimate a total usage of maize of around 295 000 tonnes of which about 80% would be imported.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1358/81**by Mrs Walz****to the Commission of the European Communities***(24 November 1981)*

Subject: Restrictive purchasing arrangements for spare parts

1. What is the Commission's view from the standpoint of European competition policy on the recent decision by the German Bundesgerichtshof (Federal High Court) on the admissibility of restrictive purchasing arrangements for spare parts within the Volkswagen group?
2. What stage has the Commission reached in its deliberations on measures concerning restrictive agreements between motor car manufacturers and their authorized repairers?

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

(19 January 1982)

1. The Commission sees no reason to suppose that in its judgment of 22 September 1981 ('original VW spare parts II') the German Bundesgerichtshof sought to deny the applicability of Community law to exclusive purchasing obligations for spare parts where these might affect trade between Member States (cf. page 32 of the judgment).
2. In its Decision of 13 December 1974 in 'Bayerische Motoren Werke AG' ⁽¹⁾ the Commission established the following principles, which it has since applied in its administrative practice ⁽²⁾:
 - (a) Within the distribution and servicing network established in the common market by a motor vehicle manufacturer and his importers, the selected dealers and workshops authorized to sell the manufacturer's vehicles must be able to buy spare parts supplied by the manufacturer (goods covered by the agreement) wherever they wish, and consequently must also be able to import from other Community countries (Decision, recitals 27 and 29).
 - (b) The selected dealers and workshops must be able to use and to sell parts which compete with the goods covered by the agreement and supplied by the motor vehicle manufacturer, provided they reach the same standard of quality (Decision, recitals 3 (IV), 9, 18,

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 29, 3. 2. 1975, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Fourth Report on Competition Policy, points 86 to 92; Fifth Report, points 13 and 61.

and 28 to 30). Whether competing parts do reach that standard and can thus be used by the selected dealers and workshops, is a question to be decided on the merits of each individual case.

Following on from its practice hitherto, the Commission will shortly be submitting a preliminary draft Regulation on the application of Article 85 of the EEC Treaty to certain categories of motor vehicle distribution and servicing agreements. The draft will include provisions specifying how far dealers and workshops within the distribution network established by a motor vehicle manufacturer and his importers can be banned from obtaining supplies of parts from sources outside the distribution network (wholesalers or representatives of the motor vehicle manufacturer's own suppliers for example). Member States, interest groups, and the European Parliament will be given the opportunity to put forward their views on the draft.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1359/81**by Mrs Walz****to the Commission of the European Communities***(24 November 1981)*

Subject: Competition policy in the mineral oil sector

The German Bundeskartellamt (Federal Cartels Office) recently announced a new practice with regard to the authorization of amalgamations in the mineral oil industry. The 16 companies which in the opinion of the Federal Cartels Office together constitute an oligopoly are to be treated differently in that the smaller companies among them will be allowed to take over small and medium-sized concerns whereas the seven larger undertakings will not.

1. What figures does the Commission have in its possession on vertical concentration in the mineral oil market in the Member States of the European Community?
2. What is the Commission's assessment of the idea of stimulating competition between the members of an oligopoly by means of a discriminatory method of authorizing amalgamations?
3. What are the implications for the European market of the new positive authorization system for the (relatively) small oil companies in the Federal Republic of Germany?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(26 January 1982)

1. The Commission has no systematic figures on the development of vertical integration in the petroleum industry. From the information in its possession, however, it would not appear that the process of vertical integration in the industry has accelerated at common marked level.

2 and 3. The Commission has no grounds for commenting on a statement by the competent authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany announcing an administrative practice to be applied in merger control under domestic law. It would point out that at Community level, following the reasoning of the Court of Justice in its judgment in the Continental Can case of 1973, Article 86 of the EEC Treaty applies to a merger only where it would strengthen a dominant position held by an undertaking so as to enable it to prevent the maintenance of effective competition in a substantial part of the common market. When considering individual cases the Commission may find it proper to consider, along with other factors, the sizes of the undertakings in question and the closing of the market which may result where independent dealers are bought up in a distribution structure already marked by a high degree of concentration.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1360/81
by Mrs Charzat
to the Commission of the European Communities
(24 November 1981)

Subject: Questionable activities of Europ-Assistance

Europ-Assistance is a multinational insurance company which provides travellers with a number of services such as repatriation in the event of illness or road accident. However, within the Community, the 'services' provided by this company are unnecessary to the extent that the citizens of the Community are entitled under Community law to social security cover and hospital treatment or care in any country of the European Community. Regrettably, the Community's citizens are ill-informed as to their rights and Europ-Assistance makes them sign a clause in the 'insurance contract' by which Europ-Assistance is subrogated to their rights. In other words, Europ-

Assistance collects from the national social security funds the benefits which a Community citizen treated in another Member State would automatically be entitled to, while naturally also collecting the amount of the subscription to the 'contract'.

1. What is the Commission's view of this practice?
2. Does the Commission have information on the amount of sums paid in this way to Europ-Assistance by mistaken Community citizens?
3. Does the Commission not think that having regard to the Treaty of Rome it should institute an urgent enquiry into such practices and possibly take whatever measures are necessary to deal with them?
4. Will the Commission kindly report to the European Parliament on the results of its enquiry?

Answer given by Mr Richard
on behalf of the Commission
(19 January 1982)

1. The Commission is aware of the provisions binding the contracting parties to Europ-Assistance, in particular the clause which refers to the reimbursement of medical costs abroad – E 111, and the clause concerning the legal framework-delegation. Clearly, the reference to form E 111 which can only be used by persons covered by Council Regulations (EEC) No 1408/71 and No 574/72 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons and their families moving within the Community ⁽¹⁾, that is solely where they need benefits in kind when present in one of the Member countries, might mislead persons ignorant of the provisions thus referred to.

2. It is impossible for the Commission to obtain details of the sums paid under assistance agreements of this kind in the various Member States since the firms concerned are mainly private. In any case there is no obligation on nationals of Member States to sign such contracts, the conditions of which are generally clearly set out in the contract itself.

3. It is not for the Commission to impose penalties in cases where such agreements give rise to abuse but a matter for the various Member States where such abuse takes place. The Commission will, however, draw the

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 149, 5. 7. 1971, p. 2 and OJ No L 74, 27. 3. 1972, p. 1.

attention of the competent authorities in the Member States to the need for more complete information in the areas in question. It should also be noted that on 13 January 1981 the Commission forwarded to the Council a proposal for a Directive on tourist assistance ⁽¹⁾, its main aim being to submit the various activities of assistance insurance firms to coordinated rules governing insurance as provided in Council Directive 73/239/EEC of 24 July 1973 (coordination of direct insurance claims other than life insurance ⁽²⁾).

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 51, 10. 3. 1981.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 228, 16. 8. 1973, as amended by Directive No 76/580/EEC of June 1976 (OJ No L 189, 13. 7. 1976).

In 1979, an investment project in France for the processing, storage and marketing of turkeys was covered by an ERDF grant decision. Since it was one of several projects under a grouped application, the Commission is unable to state the amount allocated to this particular project.

Under the European Social Fund, a few applications were received in years gone by for the vocational retraining of unemployed workers to fill new jobs in the agri-food industry, primarily the cutting and boning of poultrymeat and pigmeat. In the case of France, these applications for the most concerned Brittany, but they have not been renewed in recent years.

For the United Kingdom, a three-year financing operation costing around UK £ 40 000 was authorized in 1981 for a programme for training some 230 persons for jobs in the poultry industry in Yorkshire.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1363/81

by Mr Pearce

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1981)

Subject: Turkeys

In answer to my Written Question No 626/81 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission states that Community aid for turkey production is not provided for under Directive 75/159/EEC ⁽²⁾ on the modernization of farms. It concluded therefore that 'no French project has received aid from the Community'.

My Written Question 626/81 requested information on 'public money' spent on turkey production, not merely EAGGF grants.

Would the Commission therefore state how much money has been spent from non-agricultural funds, particularly the Regional and Social Funds, on projects involving turkey production in France and Britain in each of the last two years?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 264, 15. 10. 81, p. 30.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 96, 23. 4. 72, p. 1.

Answer given by Mr Giolitti
on behalf of the Commission

(22 January 1982)

In the last two years, the Commission has not made any ERDF grant to undertakings concerned with turkey production in France or the United Kingdom.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1366/81

by Mr Battersby

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1981)

Subject: EAGGF grants to the potato sector – 1981

In view of the statement by the Commission in Official Journal C 156 of 25 June 1981, that any type of investment in the potato sector may qualify for assistance, and that priority is granted to the storage, sorting, and packing of potatoes, could the Commission state how many applications for EAGGF aid under Regulation (EEC) No 355/77 ⁽¹⁾ were received in 1981 prior to the closing date for applications from the potato sector, sub-divided into storage, sorting, packing and processing, by Member State, how many projects were approved for assistance in each sub-division in each Member State, and what percentage of the total financial aid allocation went separately to the potato, horticulture, and sheep meat sectors?

Could the Commission also give the percentage of total aid granted to the milk and milk product sector, meat, wine, feeding stuff, olives, cereals, fats, sugar and fishing product sectors?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 51, 23. 2. 1977, p. 1 and OJ No L 53, 25. 2. 1977, p. 30 (corrigendum).

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

(26 January 1982)

The Commission is sending three tables, showing the information requested, directly to the Honourable Member and to the Parliament Secretariat. These cover only the first instalment for 1981 of applications under Regulation (EEC) No 355/77. Full information for 1981 is not yet available but will be published in the Eleventh Report of the EAGGF Guidance Section, available in August 1982.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1368/81

by Mr Patterson

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1981)

Subject: Fishing with dynamite off the Greek Islands

In view of reports that fishermen on certain Greek Islands are using sticks of dynamite, detonated underwater, to catch fish, would the Commission:

1. investigate whether these reports are true; and if they are true,
2. take steps to end this method of fishing in view of its indiscriminate nature and its damaging effect on the marine environment?

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

(19 January 1982)

Until the Council approves the establishment of a Community based system of inspection, as described in the Commission's communication to the Council of 16 December 1980 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission is unable to make the investigations requested.

Article 10 of Decree No 2244/1940 of the Code of Fisheries embodied in Greek law provides for the

prohibition of the use of explosives for fishing throughout Greece.

Enforcement of this law is a matter for the appropriate national authority.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1372/81

by Mr Habsburg

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 November 1981)

Subject: Role of the 'Interagra' company in the supply of foodstuffs by the Community

In his answer to my question of 14 September Commissioner Davignon indicated that if it felt that there were serious doubts among members of Parliament and the general public concerning 'Interagra's' role in the delivery of foodstuffs to Poland, the Commission would be willing to conduct an investigation.

Is the Commission aware that large sections of public opinion in the Community are concerned that 'Interagra' and its chairman Mr Doumengue have been accorded preferential treatment contrary to the public interest by certain Community agencies and that this has not been confined to sales of butter to the Soviet Union but also concerns food aid to Poland? Is this not sufficient justification for conducting a serious and comprehensive investigation of 'Interagra's' relations with the Community and for informing Parliament and the public at large of the results so as to throw light at long last on a situation which is unfortunately far from clear at the present time?

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

(26 January 1982)

The Commission is aware from previous questions by the Honourable Member of his interest in the role of Interagra in food exports. The Commission does not give any preferential treatment whatever to Interagra. It emphasizes that Regulations establishing refunds or opening tenders for particular products are open to all Community operators on an equal basis. The Commission does not consider, therefore, that any special investigation of this company is called for. The Commission believes it would be contrary to all democratic rules to discriminate in favour of or against individual operators.

⁽¹⁾ COM(80) 882 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1398/81**by Mr Schmid****to the Commission of the European Communities***(24 November 1981)*

Subject: Irradiation of food products for the purpose of preservation

1. What are the regulations governing the permissibility of irradiation to preserve food products in the individual Member States?
2. Is it compulsory to label goods treated in this way as such?
3. Does the Commission consider that a uniform Regulation on the marketing and labelling of these goods at Community level is necessary?
4. Does the Commission share the view of the Federal German Health Office that irradiation can lead to the formation of highly toxic substances and that the possibility of congenital deformities cannot be excluded?

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

(22 January 1982)

1. The Commission is making enquiries about regulations in the Member States governing the use of irradiation for the purpose of food preservation and will inform the Honourable Member in due course. There are a number of regulations relating in particular to the granting of authorizations for the installation of fixed or movable irradiators, which are in fact powerful sources of cobalt-40 or caesium-137. As regards such irradiators, regulations that comply with the provisions of the Euratom Directive laying down the basic safety standards for the protection of the health of workers and the general public against the dangers arising from ionizing radiation ⁽¹⁾ are in force in all the Member States.
2. The Commission is of the opinion that irradiated foods should be labelled as having been so treated, pursuant to Article 5 (3) of Council Directive 79/112/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling presentation and advertising of foodstuffs for sale to the ultimate consumer ⁽²⁾.
3. Independently of the results of the enquiries mentioned in 1 above, the Commission can already say

that a detailed reply to question 3 would require extensive studies. The Commission is unable to devote the necessary resources to such an exercise at the present time.

4. The Commission has been informed that the Federal German Health Office has not stated that irradiation of food products for the purpose of preservation, using appropriate technology, causes the effects suggested by the Honourable Member.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1401/81**by Mrs Pruvot****to the Commission of the European Communities***(24 November 1981)*

Subject: Recognition of qualifications by the Community and the ACP countries

Can the Commission inform us how much progress has been made towards the mutual recognition of qualifications by universities in the ACP countries and the Community countries?

Can the Commission say, firstly in which countries, and secondly in which disciplines, mutual recognition of qualifications actually exists?

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

(19 January 1982)

Under the Lomé Convention, which governs relations between the Community and the ACP States, there is no provision for mutual recognition of qualifications by ACP States and Member States of the Community.

It is up to the ACP or Community countries themselves to decide what qualifications they will recognize, and mutual recognition is covered by bilateral agreements between particular countries.

An updated list of existing bilateral agreements, broken down by country and field of discipline, will be sent to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat-General as soon as possible.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 246, 17. 9. 1980.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 33, 8. 2. 1979.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1406/81**by Mr Battersby****to the Commission of the European Communities***(1 December 1981)*

Subject: Fines imposed on the consumer electronics manufacturer 'Pioneer' and several of its distributors

Approximately two years ago, fines totalling 6.95 million units of account (ECU) were imposed on the consumer electronics manufacturer 'Pioneer' and several of its distributors for anti-competitive practices.

Can the Commission state if all the fines imposed have been recovered, and if any have not been recovered, the reasons for such non-recovery?

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

(22 January 1982)

The fines imposed by the Commission in its Decision of 14 December 1979 ⁽¹⁾ on

- Pioneer Electronic Europe NV, Antwerp (Belgium),
- C. Melchers & Co., Bremen (Federal Republic of Germany),
- Musique Diffusion Française, Velizy-Villacoublay (France), and
- Pioneer High Fidelity (GB) Ltd, Iver, Buckinghamshire (United Kingdom)

have not yet been paid. Since all of the abovementioned undertakings have challenged the Decision before the Court of Justice, the Commission, in accordance with its then applicable rules, has refrained from enforcement of the fines until such time as the Court of Justice gives its judgment in this case.

As indicated in its answer to Written Question No 796/79 by Mrs Cresson ⁽²⁾, the Commission has been re-examining its internal procedure provisions concerning the collection of fines, penalties and certain other debts and is now able to announce that these provisions have been amended. In future the Commission will proceed to enforcement of the fine even in cases which are under appeal but may agree to defer enforcement subject to the undertaking agreeing to pay interest and providing a bank guarantee covering both the sum due and the interest thereon.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 60, 5. 3. 1980, p. 21.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 19, 24. 1. 1980, p. 15.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1412/81**by Mrs Pruvot****to the Commission of the European Communities***(1 December 1981)*

Subject: Protection of the environment under the Second Convention of Lomé

The Second Convention of Lomé, unlike Lomé I, refers to the protection of the environment in national and regional development projects.

Article 112 of the Convention states that project appraisal should take into consideration the non-quantifiable effects on the environment. No procedure has yet been established, however, for the appraisal of such effects or for the creation of development models geared to the protection of the environment.

Could the Commission state what it intends to do in this area?

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

(25 January 1982)

Even before Lomé II the protection of the environment was always one of the factors taken into consideration in the preparation and appraisal of development projects. From the first EDF onwards the Community has financed specifically environmental projects, on soil conservation for instance, or included an environmental component in more general projects, such as reafforestation schemes in integrated rural development projects.

The main procedural guide to appraisal of environmental impact is contained in the Manual used by Commission staff responsible for the administration of Community aid for preparing and appraising project dossiers, which explicitly deals with environmental issues. When preparing agricultural projects, for instance, the environmental impact (particularly as regards soil conservation and local fauna) must be considered, while in the case of water engineering or drainage projects it must be shown 'whether the project will have a positive impact (for example: treatment of waste water, refuse collection, protection of ground cover, control of erosion and deterioration of the soil, improvement of living conditions and so on) or a negative impact (for example: overgrazing around watering points, increase in effluent, etc.)'.

Every financing proposal which is submitted to the EDF Committee must contain a section dealing with the expected environmental effects of the project.

In the Commission the term 'environment' is used to cover the man-made features of a locality as well as the natural surroundings, and a Community project, the Mopti Health Centre in Mali, has been awarded the Aga Khan Prize for architecture ⁽¹⁾.

However, the Commission is keen to do more and its recent communication to the Council entitled 'Towards a plan of action to combat world hunger' ⁽²⁾ includes proposals for action on a broader front, naming the fight against erosion and desertification, the more rational utilization of wood as a source of energy and the reconstitution of wooded areas among the essential priorities. As a matter of general policy the Commission is endeavouring to work out, in cooperation with the countries concerned, ways and means of integrating environmental considerations more closely at the design stage of programmes and projects carried out in the framework of relations between the Community and the developing countries.

⁽¹⁾ Awarded for designs which combine awareness of local traditions with relevance to contemporary needs.

⁽²⁾ COM(81) 560 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1422/81

by Miss Quin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 December 1981)

Subject: European Regional Development Fund
Non-Quota Regulation – assistance for areas affected by the decline in steel and shipbuilding

1. Can the Commission confirm that it had still not received the applications and programmes for quota free ERDF assistance for the United Kingdom shipbuilding areas by 1 November 1981?

2. Will the Commission state when the shipbuilding and steel area ERDF proposals were agreed in the Council of Ministers and on what dates it received the programmes it has been given by the United Kingdom Government?

3. Can the Commission indicate when it expects to be able to tell the United Kingdom Government what it thinks of the proposals for the areas affected by the decline of the steel and shipbuilding industries?

4. Is the Commission aware that local authorities in the United Kingdom were asked for their suggested

schemes to be funded under the ERDF quota free section more than a year ago and many of them believe that the Commission is holding up the applications?

5. Is the Commission also aware that this is having a damaging effect upon local authorities with respect to other funds under which resources are available and the view is growing that (i) it is impossible to get quick action when and where it is needed from Brussels and (ii) that if the response is as slow as this appears to be there is no point in local authorities – working within the framework of annual budgets – becoming involved in protracted and apparently fruitless negotiations of this kind?

6. Does the Commission have any suggestions as to how this deteriorating situation might be improved and how similar situations might be prevented in the future?

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

(25 January 1982)

1. The Commission has not received the special programme which concerns zones adversely affected by restructuring of the shipbuilding industry in the United Kingdom.

2. Both Council Regulations (EEC) No 2616/80, which concerns zones adversely affected by restructuring of the steel industry, and No 2617/80, which similarly concerns shipbuilding zones, were adopted on 7 October 1980 ⁽¹⁾. The special programme concerning the steel zones was received by the Commission on 14 October 1981.

3. The Commission will shortly be giving the United Kingdom its observations on the steel zones programme: those on the shipbuilding zones programme will similarly follow shortly after its presentation by the United Kingdom.

4. The Commission has been informed that the United Kingdom Government consulted with a large number of local and regional authorities in preparing the steel zones programme, and is aware that some misunderstanding of the situation on the part of local authorities is possible until formal approval and publication of special programmes takes place.

5. The Commission recognizes that in the early stages of implementing the programme certain difficulties and delays may well occur in coordinating the endeavours of

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 271, 15. 10. 1980.

the local and regional authorities with those of central government(s) and the Commissions. However, given that the current programmes are to be implemented over five years during which there will be annual reports of progress, the Commission is confident that any delays in getting them underway will be readily recouped in the life of the programmes.

6. As this is the first series of quota-free operations, the preparation involved may require lengthy consultation. This procedure, should, with experience, be shorter in the future.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1425/81

by Mrs Lizin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 December 1981)

Subject: Contracts signed with Walloon experts

1. In reply to my Written Question No 790/81 ⁽¹⁾ the Commission expressed its satisfaction that the implementation of these contracts has led to specific reconversion measures. Can the Commission refer me to the appropriate files?

2. The Commission indicates in this connection that the SRIW was unable to accept the global loan offered by the ECSC. Can the Commission give its opinion concerning the reasons for this refusal?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 323, 10. 12. 1981, p. 4.

Answer given by Mr Giolitti on behalf of the Commission

(26 January 1982)

1. The following files for conversion loans under Article 56 of the ECSC Treaty have been prepared by the Commission with the assistance of the Belgian consultants:

(million ECU)

— SRIW	Global loan for small and medium-sized undertakings	12·5
— Belgian Mechanical Fabrication	Direct loan	7·22
— Titech Europe	Direct loan	5·83

— Caisse Nationale de Cr�dit Professionnel	Global loan	12·00
— Usines � Tubes de la Meuse	Direct loan	12·034
— Travhydro	Direct loan	2·18

These are the first applications for conversion loans to be submitted by the Belgian Government for some ten years. Other projects are still in the process of being prepared.

2. During negotiations on the clauses of the contract with the SRIW, the problem of guaranteeing the loan was raised and was the subject of discussions between the Belgian authorities and the Commission's staff.

These discussions have now been completed and have removed all remaining doubts as to this particular precondition of the loan.

There should therefore be no further major obstacles preventing this conversion loan operation from actually being carried out in the near future.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1433/81

by Mr Damseaux

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 December 1981)

Subject: Creation of a uniform customs procedure in all the Member States

In its answer to my Written Question No 519/79 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission told me that it had drawn up a proposal for a Council Regulation establishing a single Community procedure based on customs control in the Member State of departure, which would provide the person concerned with a kind of *laissez-passer* valid throughout the Community.

The Commission did not, however, feel it necessary to refer this proposal for a Regulation to the Council.

Can the Commission state whether this proposal for a Regulation, which would greatly facilitate the movement of goods within the Member States, has now been submitted to the Council for its consideration?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 275, 31. 10. 1979, p. 17.

**Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission**
(21 January 1982)

The proposal for a Regulation introducing arrangements for movement within the Community of goods sent from one Member State for temporary use in one or more other Member States to which the Honourable Member refers was transmitted by the Commission to the Council on 28 July 1981 ⁽¹⁾.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs of the European Parliament discussed the proposal on 24 and 25 November 1981, and unanimously adopted the report submitted by its rapporteur, Mr Carossino.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 227, 8. 9. 1981, p. 3.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1443/81
by Mr Enright
to the Commission of the European Communities
(3 December 1981)

Subject: British sewers

In view of the Commission's proposals to increase lorry weights, what supplementary measures does it propose to take in order to finance the replacement of British sewers which would be incapable of sustaining such weights?

**Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis
on behalf of the Commission**
(20 January 1982)

The types of commercial vehicles proposed by the Commission will not create additional problems for the road network or underground services in the Community.

For example, in the United Kingdom, the total axle loading – which is the critical factor for the underground pipes – from the reduced number of heavy vehicles on the

roads is expected to be slightly less than it would be if the regulations were unchanged. Thus the proposed increase in lorry weights should have no significant effects on British sewers.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1454/81
by Mr Gérard Fuchs
to the Commission of the European Communities
(3 December 1981)

Subject: Telecommunications satellite planned by the African Postal and Telecommunications Union

In view of its repeated expressions of interest in regional development projects (report by Mr Wawrzik 559/80) and the various decisions by the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly favouring the introduction of a cultural dimension into cooperation and development (Chasle Report, ACP/EEC 27/81), would the Commission state how much aid it intends to provide from the European Development Fund to enable the telecommunications satellite planned by the African Postal and Telecommunications Union to move on to the next stage of development? Will it indicate the time limits within which this aid may be used?

**Answer given by Mr Pisani
on behalf of the Commission**
(26 January 1982)

The Commission takes a keen interest in the studies being undertaken to assess the prospects for a satellite telecommunications network in Africa and regards such a system, with its economic and technical advantages, as more promising in the medium and long term than conventional land-based links.

It accordingly intends to continue in 1982 to provide funds under the regional cooperation section of the fifth EDF for complementary studies in support of those already financed for the APTU, which will make it possible to extend the scope of the venture to all the African countries which have recently expressed interest in the system, and assess its feasibility.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1455/81**by Mr Patterson****to the Commission of the European Communities***(3 December 1981)*

Subject: Commonwealth citizens passing through frontiers within the EEC

Several cases of maltreatment of Commonwealth citizens by immigration officers at the frontiers of EEC countries have been reported recently. The most recent involves two Commonwealth citizens and the Ostende immigration authorities in Belgium; the immigration officers concerned held the two female tourists from the United Kingdom in uncomfortable and quite unwarranted conditions and stamped their passports with a cross before they were sent back to the United Kingdom because their entry visa to Belgium was not valid.

In view of this apparent discrimination against Commonwealth citizens, can the Commission take any action to prevent recurrences of this sort of incident specifically involving nationals of Commonwealth countries?

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

(26 January 1982)

The provisions concerning freedom of movement within the Community apply solely with respect to nationals of Member States. As described by the Honourable Member, however, the case in question evidently does not involve a refusal on the part of the Belgian immigration authorities to admit nationals of the United Kingdom.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1456/81**by Mr Ansquer****to the Commission of the European Communities***(3 December 1981)*

Subject: Use of alginates as foodstuff additives

Many marine alginates are used as thickening or emulsifying agents in foodstuffs requiring a certain

amount of preparation. Is the Commission prepared, for instance by means of an information campaign, to encourage the use of these additives, which provide economic benefit to farmers and consumers and hence to the Community?

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

(21 January 1982)

In the Commission's view, the best people to promote the sale of products containing marine alginates are their manufacturers. The Commission does not intend to launch a campaign; in any case, it does not have the means to do so.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1462/81**by Mr Bucchini****to the Commission of the European Communities***(3 December 1981)*

Subject: Regional Fund

Can the Commission list the various projects in Corsica financed by the Regional Fund in 1979 and 1980, specifying in each case the sum involved, the precise location and the state of progress?

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

(26 January 1982)

In 1979 and 1980 the ERDF helped to finance 28 infrastructure investment projects in Corsica to an amount of FF 11 706 600 in 1979 and FF 7 907 400 in 1980.

The list of projects financed in 1979 was published in OJ No C 354 of 31 December 1980; the list for 1980 is in the process of being published.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1476/81**by Mr Provan****to the Commission of the European Communities***(3 December 1981)**Subject: Brazil*

The amount of, *inter alia*, EEC produced spirituous beverages entering Brazil is restricted due to the application of a quota system based on value.

Is the Commission aware of this restrictive measure? Has it made representations on this matter to the Brazilian authorities? If not, will it please do so?

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

(21 January 1982)

The Commission is aware through its contacts with representatives of European industries of the quota system applied by Brazil with regard to a wide range of imported products, including spirits.

This quota system which forms part of a series of measures justified by Brazil on grounds of balance of payments difficulties, was recently examined within the GATT framework.

The Commission took an active part in this examination, requesting firm indications from Brazil of a timetable for the progressive improvement in the import regime. The Commission will continue to monitor the situation closely.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1480/81**by Mr Schmid****to the Commission of the European Communities***(3 December 1981)**Subject: Notification of the arrest of foreigners*

1. If a foreigner is arrested in one of the Member States of the EC, does the arrest have to be notified to the authorities in the country of which the person concerned is a citizen?

2. What provision is there for the relatives of persons arrested abroad to visit or telephone detainees in the different Member States?

3. Does the Commission intend to submit proposals for the harmonization of these provisions?

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

(25 January 1982)

The Commission has no need of information of the kind requested by the Honourable Member to perform its duties under the Treaties and is therefore unable to answer his question.
