

# Official Journal

## of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6986

C 210

Volume 25

12 August 1982

English edition

## Information and Notices

---

Contents

### I *Information*

#### **European Parliament**

##### *Written Questions with answer*

No 1625/81 by Mr Pranchère to the Commission Subject: UK contribution to the Community budget .....	1
No 1829/81 by Mr Prout to the Commission Subject: Free movement of pharmacists .....	1
No 47/82 by Mr Van Miert to the Commission Subject: Aids to the Belgian fishing industry .....	2
No 54/82 by Mr Cousté to the Commission Subject: Art market in the Community .....	2
No 127/82 by Mr Herman to the Council Subject: Proposal for a Regulation relating to Community transit .....	3
No 157/82 by Mr Jonker to the Commission Subject: Effect of import restrictions on foreign debts of developing countries .....	3
No 170/82 by Mr Cohen to the Council Subject: Global North-South negotiations .....	4
No 192/82 by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin to the Commission Subject: Implementation in Belgium of Directive 79/7/EEC — equal treatment in social security .....	4
No 198/82 by Mr Antoniozzi to the Commission Subject: Excise duty on wine in the United Kingdom .....	5
No 271/82 by Mr Diana to the Commission Subject: Period allowed for the payment of excise duties on the consumption of beer and wine .....	5
Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 198/82 and 271/82 given by Mr Tugendhat on behalf of the Commission .....	5

**Contents (continued)**

<b>No 232/82 by Mr Penders to the Council</b> Subject: Attendance by the President of the Council at the world economic summit in Versailles .....	5
<b>No 235/82 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission</b> Subject: Petrol cost variations within the Member States .....	6
<b>No 262/82 by Mr Welsh to the Commission</b> Subject: Greek requirements for certificates of origin .....	6
<b>No 272/82 by Mrs Théobald-Paoli to the Commission</b> Subject: Development of robotics .....	7
<b>No 282/82 by Mr Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission</b> Subject: Pilot plants for energy from biomass .....	7
<b>No 283/82 by Mr Notenboom, Mr Malangré and Mr Croux to the Commission</b> Subject: Problems of trans-frontier workers in the European region of Maas-Rhine .....	8
<b>No 288/82 by Mrs Lizin to the Commission</b> Subject: Anti-dumping procedure against Romania .....	8
<b>No 300/82 by Mr Irmer to the Commission</b> Subject: Danger to health from cadmium .....	9
<b>No 308/82 by Mr Pearce to the Commission</b> Subject: Britain and the EMS .....	10
<b>No 324/82 by Mr Beyer de Ryke to the Commission</b> Subject: Despoilment of the property of European nationals resident overseas — ACP-EEC Convention .....	10
<b>No 341/82 by Mr Albers to the Commission</b> Subject: Rear fog lights and brake lights .....	10
<b>No 353/82 by Mr Pearce to the Commission</b> Subject: Dialogue with the Arab OPEC countries .....	11
<b>No 355/82 by Mr De Gucht to the Commission</b> Subject: Division of Belgium .....	11
<b>No 356/82 by Mr De Gucht to the Commission</b> Subject: Monetary union .....	11
<b>No 357/82 by Mr De Gucht to the Commission</b> Subject: Division of Belgium .....	12
<b>No 358/82 by Mr De Gucht to the Commission</b> Subject: Division of Belgium .....	12
<b>No 359/82 by Mr De Gucht to the Commission</b> Subject: State aid to the coal mines of Campine .....	12
<b>No 360/82 by Mr De Gucht to the Commission</b> Subject: Regionalization .....	12
<b>Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 355/82, 356/82, 357/82, 358/82, 359/82 and 360/82 given by Mr Thorn on behalf of the Commission .....</b>	12
<b>No 364/82 by Mr Rogalla to the Commission</b> Subject: Answers to Written Questions .....	12
<b>No 368/82 by Mr Normanton to the Council</b> Subject: Membership of the Council .....	13

Contents (continued)	No 369/82 by Mr Normanton to the Council Subject: Membership of the Council and the Parliament .....	13
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 368/82 and 369/82 .....	13
	No 372/82 by Ms Quin to the Commission Subject: The indebtedness of farmers, and measures to alleviate it .....	13
	No 376/82 by Ms Quin to the Commission Subject: Regional and social statistics .....	14
	No 379/82 by Ms Quin to the Commission Subject: Mediterranean agriculture and structural policy .....	14
	No 395/82 by Mr Beyer de Ryke to the Commission Subject: EEC-Japan relations .....	15
	No 407/82 by Mrs Dury to the Council Subject: Possible withdrawal of Greenland from the Community .....	16
	No 414/82 by Mr Brok to the Commission Subject: Construction of the Point Salines/Grenada Airport .....	16
	No 423/82 by Mr Costanzo to the Commission Subject: Special aid to young farmers .....	17
	No 444/82 by Mr Moreland to the Commission Subject: US corporate taxation .....	17
	No 447/82 by Mr Moreland to the Council Subject: Rear-view mirrors on three-wheeled vehicles .....	18
	No 452/82 by Mr Schwartzberg to the Council Subject: Unfair Japanese competition .....	18
	No 460/82 by Mr Prout to the Commission Subject: German law on the promotion of employment .....	19
	No 461/82 by Mr Prout to the Commission Subject: Employment agency work .....	19
	No 467/82 by Mr Capanna to the Commission Subject: Safety of workers in nuclear power stations .....	20
	No 470/82 by Mr Radoux to the Commission Subject: Relations between the EEC and the East European countries .....	21
	No 471/82 by Mrs Théobald-Paoli to the Commission Subject: Mediterranean horticulture .....	21
	No 479/82 by Mr Habsburg to the Commission Subject: Gradual amalgamation of airlines in the Community .....	22
	No 482/82 by Mrs Dury to the Council Subject: Use by the Member States of the 'Luxembourg compromise' (right of veto) .....	22
	No 493/82 by Mr Davern to the Commission Subject: Waterford bridge .....	22
	No 495/82 by Mr Davern to the Commission Subject: Voting rights for merchant seamen .....	23

(Continued overleaf)

<b>Contents (continued)</b>	<b>No 496/82 by Mr Flanagan to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Expenditure per head of population .....	23
	<b>No 501/82 by Mr Alber and Mr von Wogau to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Currency exchange fees in the European Community .....	24
	<b>No 515/82 by Mr Patterson to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Commission staff .....	24
	<b>No 516/82 by Mr Patterson to the Council</b>	
	Subject: Council staff .....	25
	<b>No 523/82 by Mr Seefeld to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Use of side-lights in France .....	25
	<b>No 526/82 by Mr Normanton to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Citizens' Band radio .....	26
	<b>No 535/82 by Mr Pearce to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Aid to developing countries .....	26
	<b>No 563/82 by Mrs Dury to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: NCI .....	26
	<b>No 600/82 by Mrs Squarcialupi to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Dangers of NCR copying paper .....	26
	<b>No 612/82 by Mr Price to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Presence of Commissioners .....	27
	<b>No 621/82 by Mr Pedini and Mr Filippi to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Isolation of the elderly in modern society .....	27
	<b>No 624/82 by Mrs Fullet to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Distribution of replies to Written Questions by Members of Parliament .....	28
	<b>No 651/82 by Mr de Courcy Ling to the Commission</b>	
	Subject: Eligibility of Coventry for ESF funds .....	28

## I

*(Information)*

## EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

## WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1625/82****by Mr Pranchère****to the Commission of the European Communities***(18 January 1982)**Subject:* UK contribution to the Community budget

It is now quite clear that the United Kingdom received excessive compensation in respect of the 1980 and 1981 budgets.

1. Can the Commission confirm that this excessive compensation totalled more than 5 million francs?
2. What measures does it intend to propose to remedy this situation?
3. Has it considered, say, an amendment to the 1982 budget?

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

*(9 July 1982)*

The conclusions of the Council of 30 May 1980 were based on the assumption that the United Kingdom's net contribution would be 1 784 million ECU in 1980 and 2 140 million ECU in 1981. For the reasons given in the answer to Written Question No 1427/81 by Mr Schieler <sup>(1)</sup>, latest estimates suggest that the United Kingdom's net contributions in 1980 and 1981 will probably be on aggregate about 1 000 million ECU lower than the figures on which the Council based its discussions.

The text adopted by the Council on 30 May 1980 sets out what should happen if the United Kingdom's contribution increases. It does not deal with a fall in that contribution.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 138, 1. 6. 1982, p. 2.

On 25 May 1981, Ministers for Foreign Affairs agreed that corrections to be made for 1980 and 1981 in the light of the actual figures will be taken into account when negotiating the subsequent solution.

The Commission cannot prejudge the result of these negotiations.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1829/81****by Mr Prout****to the Commission of the European Communities***(22 February 1982)**Subject:* Free movement of pharmacists

Will the Commission confirm that the draft directives providing for the free movement of pharmacists have been examined at least once by a Council of Ministers working group?

If so, does the Commission agree that it is improper for the Council of Ministers to consider a Commission proposal until Parliament has submitted its opinion on it?

If so, would the Commission not agree that it is improper to send its officials to such a working group?

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

*(9 July 1982)*

The technical review of the Commission's three proposals concerning pharmacists began in the Council

at the end of last October, eight months after Parliament and the Council had received them.

The Commission feels there would be no justification for declining to take part in such technical proceedings. The Council accepts that political questions will not be reviewed until Parliament has expressed an opinion.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 47/82**

**by Mr Van Miert**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(19 March 1982)*

*Subject:* Aids to the Belgian fishing industry

Recently the Commission instituted legal proceedings against a number of Member States for granting national aids to the fishing sector. More particularly, in the case of Belgium, which in 1981 granted Bfrs 60 million in national aid to promote fuel-saving in the fishing sector, it considered invoking Articles 92 *et seq.* of the EEC Treaty. The limited support involved amounted to Bfrs 5 per litre of fuel saved per hour spent at sea in 1981.

In view of its own efforts to promote energy-saving and given the difficulties faced by the fishing sector, why does the Commission consider that such a scheme gives rise to unfair competition?

What practical measures designed to save energy and safeguard employment in the fishing industry has the Commission taken, if any?

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

*(9 July 1982)*

The Commission has no fundamental objection to aids to encourage and stimulate energy saving in the fishing sector (guidance, training, investment, etc.). This position is in line with the Council resolution of 9 June 1980 concerning new lines of action by the Community in the field of energy saving<sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission does attach particular importance to schemes for saving energy and safeguarding

employment in the fishing industry, and this is reflected both in its proposals on structural policy and in the selection of projects submitted for EAGGF Guidance aid.

The premium in question, not being linked to any financial commitment on the part of the recipient, having no long-term effect on his energy consumption and having the effect in practice merely of reducing his fuel costs in 1981, the Commission came to the conclusion that the Belgian scheme referred to by the Honourable Member did not constitute an energy-saving aid but was in fact an operating aid.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 54/82**

**by Mr Cousté**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(25 March 1982)*

*Subject:* Art market in the Community

How does the Commission view the state of the art market in the Community?

Can it outline the problems raised by the diversity of regulations governing trade in works of art by means of a comparison between the Member States?

Is the Commission planning to propose harmonization of tax legislation or simplification of customs formalities in this field?

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

*(7 July 1982)*

The Commission is very well informed, particularly by way of Community action in the cultural sector<sup>(1)</sup>, on the situation of the art market in the Community.

Member States' regulations governing trade in works of art display at least two common features. In accordance with Article 36 of the EEC Treaty, they aim to preserve the essential elements of the national heritage in the country concerned and they

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 149, 18. 6. 1980, p. 3.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Supplement 6/77 — Bull. EC.

also strive to prevent and curb traffic in stolen works of art.

As regards harmonization of tax legislation concerning works of art the Commission would remind the Honourable Member that on 11 January 1979 it laid before the Council a proposal<sup>(1)</sup> for a seventh Directive on the harmonization of Member States' laws relating to turnover taxes. This proposal, which would establish a common VAT system applicable to works of art, collectors' items, antiques and used goods, was amended on 16 May 1979 following Parliament's opinion<sup>(2)</sup>. The Council has not yet reached agreement on the new text. By harmonizing the rules for determining the basis for taxation Community regulations would help to secure complete fluidity in intra-Community trade in works of art, both within the Member States and upon importation.

As regards simplification of customs formalities the Commission, on 28 July 1981, sent the Council a proposal<sup>(3)</sup> 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. When adopted this proposal will do much to facilitate the movement of works of art.

The Commission also intends in the very near future to send the Council a proposal for a Regulation on simplifying customs formalities in intra-Community trade, which will cover all Community goods, including works of art.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 26, 1. 2. 1978, p. 2.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 136, 31. 5. 1979, p. 8.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No C 227, 8. 9. 1981, p. 3.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 127/82

by Mr Herman

to the Council of the European Communities

(31 March 1982)

*Subject:* Proposal for a Regulation relating to Community transit<sup>(1)</sup>

On 30 June 1980, the Commission forwarded to the Council a proposal for a Regulation relating to Community transit<sup>(1)</sup> containing recommendations intended in particular to contribute to the improvement of intra-Community trade. Does the Council intend to approve this proposal in the near future?

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(80) 354 final.

If not, what amendments should the Commission make to the proposal to ensure that it is approved by the Council?

**Answer**

(6 July 1982)

On 15 December 1981 the Council adopted Regulation (EEC) No 3813/81 amending Regulation (EEC) No 222/77 on Community transit<sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 383, 31. 12. 1981, p. 28.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 157/82

by Mr Jonker

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 April 1982)

*Subject:* Effect of import restrictions on foreign debts of developing countries

How does the Commission assess the possible effect of import restrictions such as import quotas in the textile sector on the enormous foreign debts of some developing countries, bearing in mind that they rely largely on their exports to finance these debts and how do such measures indirectly affect those banks in the West with which the developing countries have contracted a large proportion of their debts?

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

(5 July 1982)

Import restrictions can increase the indebtedness of developing countries by driving them to further borrowing both in order to pay for their own imports and to service their existing debt. The end result may be financial difficulties which would affect their public- and private-sector creditors, including the banks.

However, it is impossible to quantify the effect of such restrictions on developing countries' debts because of the wide differences in their individual situations and the host of domestic and external factors which can affect both exports and foreign indebtedness.

The Commission is in any event watching the increasing level of the developing countries' debts and the rising cost of debt servicing with concern, and is endeavouring to allow as much freedom of access to the Community market as possible for these countries' exports. In this connection it would point out that the Community is far and away the largest importer of textiles and clothing from the third World.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 170/82**

**by Mr Cohen**

**to the Council of the European Communities**

*(1 April 1982)*

*Subject:* Global North-South negotiations

What steps does the Council intend to take, following the Cancun Conference, in order to re-launch the global North-South negotiations?

**Answer**

*(6 July 1982)*

The Council notes with regret that, despite the impetus given in October 1981 by the North-South summit at Cancun, the talks which have taken place in recent months at the General Assembly in New York — and which are still going on — have so far failed to produce a consensus that would enable global negotiations actually to be started.

As the European Council reiterated at its meeting in Brussels on 29 and 30 March 1982, the Community remains committed to an early revival of the North-South dialogue and is endeavouring to help find a compromise solution in New York. The matter of strengthening North-South relations was, moreover, raised at the Western summit at Versailles.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 192/82**

**by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 April 1982)*

*Subject:* Implementation in Belgium of Directive 79/7/EEC — equal treatment in social security

In reply to one of my questions, the Commission gave a definition of indirect discrimination based on marital and family status.

Subsequently, in reply to a complaint from the Women's Liaison and Solidarity Committee, the Commission stated that in Belgium the royal decree of 24 December 1980 on employment and unemployment and the ministerial implementing regulation which provided for higher unemployment benefits for married or cohabiting workers who were regarded as 'heads of household' than for other workers created precisely the sort of the problems which Directive 79/7/EEC <sup>(1)</sup> sought to eliminate.

The definition of the head of household in Belgian legislation has the effect of depriving women of the right to head of household allowances.

Can the Commission state:

1. Whether this legislation, and the statement by the present Belgian Government which proposes to strengthen the position of heads of household by taking account of family commitments and in particular the earnings of working couples to establish the level of social security benefits, are compatible with Directive 79/7/EEC?
2. If this is not the case, what can the Commission do to prevent the Belgian Government taking measures in violation of the Directive or to encourage implementation of the Directive?
3. How could the Commission acquire a Community instrument to enable it to avoid such unfavourable developments between the adoption of a Directive and its implementation?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 6, 10. 1. 1979, p. 24.

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

*(12 July 1982)*

1 and 2. The decrees referred to in 1 raise problems with respect to the application of Directive 79/7/



EEC; particularly as regards indirect discrimination. In its new programme 'Community Action on Behalf of Women' the Commission states its intention to study the question of indirect discrimination. It has also requested the Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men to deliver an opinion on problems connected with the implementation of Directive 79/7/EEC. Once this additional information is available the Commission will inform the governments of these problems without waiting until the time limit for entry into force of the Directive expires.

3. The Commission, as guardian of the Treaties, will look at all individual cases which come to its notice to see whether a measure taken by a Member State, after the adoption of Directive 79/7/EEC, is such as to compromise the realization of a particular objective of that Directive within the time limit laid down to give it effect. If the Commission were to consider this to be the case, then it could always envisage the introduction of breach of treaty proceedings before the Court of Justice.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 198/82**

**by Mr Antoniozzi**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 April 1982)*

**Subject:** Excise duty on wine in the United Kingdom

Can the Commission confirm that United Kingdom law requires excise duty on beer to be paid within thirty days of its release for consumption whereas the duty on wine must be paid when it is given customs clearance?

If so, what steps does the Commission intend to take against this measure which is contrary to the Community Treaties?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 271/82**

**by Mr Diana**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(26 April 1982)*

**Subject:** Period allowed for the payment of excise duties on the consumption of beer and wine

Can the Commission confirm that in the United Kingdom there is a rule in force providing that excise duty on beer can be paid within 30 days whereas the same payment in the case of wine must be made at the time of customs clearance; if this is so, does the Commission not think that this amounts to discrimination against the consumption of wine in favour of beer?

**Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 198/82 and 271/82 given by Mr Tugendhat on behalf of the Commission**

*(5 June 1982)*

The Commission is aware of the problem referred to by the Honourable Members as regards the time limits for the payment of excise duty on imported wine and domestic beer currently imposed in the United Kingdom.

The Commission has already brought this matter to the attention of the United Kingdom authorities, but has postponed its final decision pending the outcome of the proceedings brought against the United Kingdom in connection with the taxation of wine.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 232/82**

**by Mr Penders**

**to the Council of the European Communities**

*(19 April 1982)*

**Subject:** Attendance by the President of the Council at the world economic summit in Versailles

The timing of the world summit provides an opportunity to break away from the pattern whereby in the past only the major Member States of the Community have attended the world economic summit as President-in-office of the Council.

Will the Council ensure that the President-in-office next June attends the world economic summit in Versailles?

**Answer**

*(6 July 1982)*

The Honourable Member is asked to refer to the reply given by the Council to Written Question No 1797/81 put by Mr van Aerssen <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 140, 14. 6. 1982, p. 8.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 235/82**

by Mrs Ewing

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 April 1982)

*Subject:* Petrol cost variations within the Member States

What estimate does the Commission have of petrol price variations within the various Member States?

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

(7 July 1982)

The Commission does not have detailed information on gasoline price variations within the Member States, and the national experts on the Commission's Oil Prices Group have recently advised that it would be almost impossible to provide meaningful data. However, for the past two years, Member States have provided selected and mainly aggregated price data for a number of petroleum products — including both premium and regular grade gasoline — for publication in the Commission's weekly oil bulletin and as a practical step towards improved energy price transparency.

Within Member States, areas of low prices move freely in response to competitive circumstances and sales promotion campaigns. Consequently extreme price variations for comparable point-of-sale methods occur over quite short distances in both urban and rural areas. Nevertheless, there is a tendency for prices to be highest in remote areas involving long journeys from refineries and where low sales volumes raise unit distribution costs.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 262/82**

by Mr Welsh

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 April 1982)

*Subject:* Greek requirements for certificates of origin

In its replies to my Written Questions No 1943/80 (1) and No 887/81 (2) the Commission confirmed

that 'under the EEC Treaty certificates of origin can no longer be demanded in trade between Member States for goods of Community origin'.

Nevertheless a company in my constituency has been requested by their customer in Athens to provide certificates of origin for goods manufactured in the Community which would normally be accompanied by an EEC transit document.

Could the Commission state:

1. Whether the provisions of the Treaty of Rome covering free movement of goods apply also to Greece?
2. Whether any derogations have been granted to Greece which would enable the authorities to require certificates of origin and if so for how long?
3. If the answer to paragraph 2 is affirmative, would the Commission supply references to the Accession Treaty or the Community Regulation establishing the derogation in question?
4. Where goods are exported from the United Kingdom but manufactured elsewhere are the Greek authorities entitled to demand that certificates of origin are countersigned by the Greek consul?

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

(5 July 1982)

1. Article 35 of the Act of Accession provides that quantitative restrictions and measures having equivalent effect are abolished from the date of accession. In trade between Greece and the other Member States, any restrictive measure, such as a requirement to produce certificates of origin, must therefore be assessed in the light of Articles 30 *et seq.* of the EEC Treaty.

2 and 3. The Act of Accession makes no provision for any derogation from Article 35 in this context; nor has Greece been authorized by the Commission (under Decision 80/47/EEC of 20 December 1979 on surveillance and protective measures which Member States may be authorized to take in respect of the imports of certain products originating in third countries and put into free circulation in another Member State (1)) to require the production of such certificates.

4. From the foregoing it is quite clear that the Greek authorities are not entitled to require certificates of origin for goods put into free circulation in

(1) OJ No C 134, 4. 6. 1981, p. 10.

(2) OJ No C 333, 21. 12. 1981, p. 16.

(1) OJ No L 16, 22. 1. 1980, p. 14.

the United Kingdom and re-exported to Greece. The Commission would be glad if the Honourable Member would supply it with the facts so that it can investigate this matter, and it will not fail to approach the Greek authorities.

which will form part of the overall framework programme for Community research and development.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 272/82**

**by Mrs Théobald-Paoli**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(26 April 1982)*

*Subject: Development of robotics*

1. The United States and Japan have launched substantial programmes aimed at extending the industrial applications of robotics.
2. Can the Commission state what action it has taken and what initiatives it envisages in favour of research and development in this field?
3. The Commission is currently preparing a general outline programme for research and development: does it include incentives for robotics?

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

*(12 July 1982)*

1 and 2. The Commission, being fully aware of the Japanese and American programmes in the field of robotics, is presently undertaking discussions with the Community-based informatics and machine tool industries with a view to a research and development programme which could assist in establishing a competitive European capability in the field of computer aided design and manufacturing where the application of robotics would be an important element. Until these discussions are concluded, the creation of a Community research and development programme in the field of computer aided design and manufacturing remains open.

3. Although for the time being no specific research action on the application of robotics is planned, the Commission would also like to inform the Honourable Member of preliminary discussions and enquiries concerning the need for a programme on basic technological research. These activities are elements in the development of an industrial research policy

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 282/82**

**by Mr Vandemeulebroucke**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(26 April 1982)*

*Subject: Pilot plants for energy from biomass*

With reference to the answer given to Written Question No 1293/81 <sup>(1)</sup>:

1. Why is the Commission pursuing only four of the 23 proposals submitted?
2. Were the others rejected for technical reasons, or could the Commission usefully employ more funds than are available to it?
3. What is the grant to be made for the four projects, and what percentage is this of the total cost of the projects? Is this the optimum level of grant?
4. How many research projects in the biomass sector are currently being financed by the Commission out of how many projects submitted? What is the total sum involved, and could more funds usefully be spent?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 43, 17. 2. 1982, p. 16.

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

*(12 July 1982)*

1 and 2. The Commission considers the construction of four pilot plants for the production of methanol from wood sufficient for the exploration and the development of the presently most promising technologies of fixed-bed and fluidized-bed processes. This limitation was specified in the call for proposals <sup>(1)</sup>.

Whereas some proposals did not fulfil the conditions laid down in the call for proposals, others were very carefully considered but finally discarded in favour of the four remaining pilot projects.

3. The total financial contribution of the Commission to the four pilot projects is 2.77 million ECU. As specified in the call for proposals, the Com-

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 18, 27. 1. 1982, p. 2.

munity contribution to an individual project should not be higher than 600 000 ECU. In application of these conditions three projects will receive a 50 % financial contribution. For the fourth very large project the Community participation attains 15 %, the minimum level to ensure, under the circumstances, the necessary degree of Community participation in a very important pilot plant project.

4. The Commission is supporting 41 research projects in the field of energy from biomass, out of 110 submitted proposals. The total expenditure involved is 4.4 million ECU. More funds could be spent very usefully.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 283/82**

**by Mr Notenboom, Mr Malangré and Mr Croux  
to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(26 April 1982)*

*Subject: Problems of trans-frontier workers in the European region of Maas-Rhine*

The Commission has on several occasions referred to the disadvantages which persons commuting daily or weekly across the internal borders of the Community suffer as a result of the differences between income tax and social security systems in the Member States, a situation which also seriously hampers the mobility of labour and is a further cause of unemployment.

For this reason the Commission has formulated proposals with a view to harmonizing certain aspects of the laws governing income tax and other related matters. Furthermore, pending the advent of Community rules, a number of bilateral agreements are in force between Member States which serve to remove or alleviate certain unfair effects of the national systems.

Meanwhile, trans-frontier commuters or ex-commuters (where their pension is concerned) are still faced with many injustices which, in some cases, are alleviated but only with a great deal of difficulty. However, new injustices arise regularly as a result of changes made to legislation.

More specifically in the European region of Maas-Rhine where workers commute daily to and from three Member States (Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands) the lack or inadequate degree of harmonization together with the complexity of legislation is felt to be an enormous obstacle to finding appropriate employment.

Is the Commission prepared to provide active support for the regional authorities by providing infor-

mation for trans-frontier commuters and those considering trans-frontier employment and by constantly monitoring the difficulties which those living in frontier areas encounter in matters relating to their work, pensions and salaries?

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

*(9 July 1982)*

Given that the information measures undertaken by the authorities of the Meuse-Rhine European region are local, direct and rapid, the Commission — although willing to look into the possibilities of assistance — believes that such assistance would be ineffectual in view of the nature of the regional general data available to the Commission and the time needed to collect it.

In addition, with respect to employment possibilities as regards cross-frontier workers, the Commission recalls that cooperation exists between the frontier employment offices based on Community provisions on freedom of movement for workers<sup>(1)</sup> which allows for the direct clearing of vacancies and applications for employment between frontier areas, the former to include details as regards remuneration.

In the case of pensions, the national institutions in the Meuse-Rhine region are clearly better placed than the Commission to supply detailed statistics on the matter in question.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 257, 19. 10. 1968.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 288/82**

**by Mrs Lizin  
to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(26 April 1982)*

*Subject: Anti-dumping procedure against Romania*

Can the Commission state whether it considers that the anti-dumping procedures adopted in respect of the following Romanian products are still relevant: gas piping, electric motors, hardboard, PVC, trichlorethylene, Dinoseb (insecticide) and refrigerators?

What are, product by product, the Commission's reasons for maintaining these procedures? Does the Commission not consider it important to maintain good relations with Romania and that this implies

taking account of Romania's efforts to maintain a healthy level of economic activity and adjust its trade practices in the manner requested by the EEC?

Does the Commission consider that different policies in our relations with the eastern European countries now justify a more restrictive attitude?

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

(9 July 1982)

The Commission is able to inform the Honourable Member as follows regarding the proceedings to which she refers.

Four of these proceedings have now been terminated or soon will be: in the case of electric motors, a provisional anti-dumping duty was introduced by the Commission on 30 March <sup>(1)</sup>; in the case of gas piping, Romanian exporters have made the offer of a price undertaking considered acceptable by the Commission and this proceeding has therefore been terminated <sup>(2)</sup>.

With regard to Dinoseb (insecticide), following a reexamination of the anti-dumping duty currently applicable to imports originating in Romania, maintenance of this duty at the level fixed (40 %) was found to be justified <sup>(3)</sup>; in the case of refrigerators, Romanian exporters have made the offer of a price undertaking and the Commission has proposed to the Council that the proceeding be terminated.

The other three proceedings, concerning PVC, trichlorethylene and hardboard, were initiated in 1981 on the basis of complaints by the industries concerned and involve sufficient proof of dumping and of substantial injury caused: they are in progress and are intended to enable the Commission to obtain the necessary information with a view to a subsequent decision.

The Commission, which attaches the greatest importance to the Agreements concluded with Romania, essentially shares the Honourable Member's view that it is important to maintain and indeed improve trade relations between the Community and Romania; such relations should, however, be based on compliance with the various rules in force and with the multilateral international obligations which bind both parties, in particular those resulting from the GATT Anti-Dumping Code.

The Commission has accordingly seen fit to initiate anti-dumping proceedings in respect of Romanian

exports where it has appeared that such exports were being dumped.

The Commission has, however, endeavoured to enable the Romanian exporters in question to correct their trade practices by raising their export prices and this approach has very often succeeded in avoiding the need to resort to unilateral anti-dumping measures. Moreover, at the request of the Romanian authorities, the Commission discussed this problem with them in detail in March.

Finally, the question of a more restrictive policy towards Romania does not arise. Anti-dumping proceedings are and will continue to be based on the individual merits of each case, these being assessed impartially in accordance with Community legislation and the GATT Anti-Dumping Code.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 300/82**

**by Mr Irmer**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(26 April 1982)

*Subject:* Danger to health from cadmium

1. Is the Commission aware of reports that disposable nappies and dummy teats for babies contain cadmium, which is a danger to health?
2. What does the Commission intend to do to remove this threat to health?

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

(9 July 1982)

The Commission is well aware of the dangers to health that cadmium can have and it intends to send the Council a proposal for a Directive which would extend screenings of the population for lead to the poisoning risk due to cadmium and to other metals.

The Scientific Committee for Toxicology and Ecotoxicology is currently devoting considerable attention to the question of cadmium.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 85, 31. 3. 1982, p. 9.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No L 150, 29. 5. 1982, p. 1.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No L 128, 11. 5. 1982, p. 17.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 308/82****by Mr Pearce****to the Commission of the European Communities***(26 April 1982)**Subject: Britain and the EMS*

What contacts have taken place recently between the Commission and the United Kingdom authorities regarding the possibility of the United Kingdom joining the European monetary system and when does the Commission think this event is likely to take place?

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

*(6 July 1982)*

The Commission and the monetary authorities of all Member States, including those of the United Kingdom, are in frequent contact. The question of the full participation of sterling in the exchange rate mechanism of the European monetary system is regularly discussed.

The Commission has repeatedly stated its position that full participation is desirable both for sterling, for the system as a whole and for its development.

The precise timing of such a move would also need close consultation between the UK and the other EMS participants. Given the nature of foreign exchange markets, it would not be appropriate for the Commission to publicize any tentative views it might have as to the likely date of this event.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 324/82****by Mr Beyer de Ryke****to the Commission of the European Communities***(27 April 1982)*

*Subject: Despoilment of the property of European nationals resident overseas — ACP-EEC Convention*

Can the Commission say what attention has been paid to this particular delicate matter when negotiating the ACP conventions, i.e. what collective or individual procedures, other than the State-to-State agreements concluded in certain specific cases, exist for indemnifying European nationals residing in the service of or with the approval of their governments in independent ACP territories or countries for the

despoilment of their movable or immovable property?

Furthermore, with a view to resolving this problem in the best interests of all concerned and in particular the several million European nationals whose property has been despoiled in the course of decolonization, could the Commission consider introducing a specific protocol to cover all disputes still outstanding with certain ACP states?

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

*(5 July 1982)*

The problem raised by the Honourable Member has not so far been discussed in negotiating and implementing the ACP-EEC Convention. The Commission would point out that, whatever possibilities may exist for informal contacts on the subject between the Commission and the ACP States, this 'particular delicate matter' — it is certainly that — does not fall within the scope of the Community, but is a matter for the Member States.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 341/82****by Mr Albers****to the Commission of the European Communities***(27 April 1982)*

*Subject: Rear fog lights and brake lights*

The High Council of the Netherlands has voted against double rear fog lights and double brake lights.

The Netherlands police are now carrying out special checks for unauthorized lights on motor vehicles.

1. With reference to Written Questions No 1959/79 <sup>(1)</sup> and No 505/81 <sup>(2)</sup>, does the Commission intend to bring forward early proposals to revise Directive 76/756/EEC <sup>(3)</sup> in the light of the above decision?
2. In view of the growth in trans-frontier motor traffic in the European Community, is it still the Commission's policy to promote road safety through technical harmonization?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 178, 16. 7. 1980, p. 27.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 210, 19. 8. 1981, p. 26.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No L 262 of 27. 9. 1976, p. 1.

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

(5 July 1982)

1. The Commission does not intend to revise Directive 76/756/EEC as regards the provisions relating to the number of rear fog lights and brake lights in the near future. As far as the Commission knows, the Netherlands national laws are properly aligned on the Community provisions governed by Directive 76/756/EEC as regards requirements for the installation of these lights in vehicles, the permitted number of rear fog lights being one, the installation of a second being optional for the manufacturer, and the permitted number of brake lights being two, and two only.

The experts who were consulted recently by the Commission on this point have confirmed the validity of these provisions.

It is, however, appropriate to point out that the harmonization method is the so-called 'optional' method, and so some Member States — albeit the minority — do not forbid the presence on vehicles of two extra brake lights in their national laws.

2. Yes, although it should not be forgotten that, in addition to measures relating to the construction of motor vehicles, road safety can be improved by other measures such as those relating to traffic.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 353/82**

**by Mr Pearce**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(27 April 1982)

*Subject:* Dialogue with the Arab OPEC countries

What steps has the Commission taken to set up a regular system of meetings with the main Arab oil-exporting countries to discuss oil prices and the effects of the surpluses which OPEC countries have of hard currency and the effect of these surpluses on world economy?

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

(12 July 1982)

No regular system of meetings takes place with the main Arab oil-exporting countries specifically to discuss oil prices and balance of payments surpluses.

Contacts do occur with these countries within the framework of the Euro-Arab Dialogue, although their frequency has recently diminished, for political reasons. The subject of oil only figures on the Dialogue's agenda in its sub-group on refining and petrochemicals. A working group also exists on financial cooperation.

The Commission has expressed on various occasions the need for closer cooperation with energy producers, particularly of oil.

One of the purposes of the envisaged 'global negotiations' within the United Nations would be to allow such discussions on a broader basis and specifically to aim at the establishment of an 'energy forum' within the UN.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 355/82**

**by Mr De Gucht**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(30 April 1982)

*Subject:* Division of Belgium

The economies of the Belgian regions are closely interlinked. What percentage of each region's share of the gross national product would be sacrificed if a division of Belgium were accompanied by a ruthless severing of the economic links between regions?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 356/82**

**by Mr De Gucht**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(30 April 1982)

*Subject:* Monetary union

Does the Commission consider that monetary union can be maintained between Flanders, Wallonia and, possibly, Brussels if they become, at least *de facto*, separate states with strictly separate, and even opposing industrial policies, separate credit institutions and, possibly, totally diverging economic policies?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 357/82****by Mr De Gucht****to the Commission of the European Communities***(30 April 1982)**Subject: Division of Belgium*

Does the Commission take the view that a division of Belgium could be of economic advantage to the various regions?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 358/82****by Mr De Gucht****to the Commission of the European Communities***(30 April 1982)**Subject: Division of Belgium*

Would a division of Belgium be consonant with the policy of economic and monetary convergence propounded by the Commission or would it not rather run counter to such a policy?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 359/82****by Mr De Gucht****to the Commission of the European Communities***(30 April 1982)**Subject: State aid to the coal mines of Campine*

By how many billion francs would it be necessary to increase state aid to the coal mines of Campine in order to make good the loss in revenue that would arise if the Walloon electric power stations and steel undertakings no longer used coal from the Campine coalfields?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 360/82****by Mr De Gucht****to the Commission of the European Communities***(30 April 1982)**Subject: Regionalization*

The Belgian Government has recommended that the five remaining national sectors of the economy be administered at regional level.

In practical terms this means that the Minister for Economic Affairs would no longer be the Commis-

sion's interlocutor on matters concerning the steel and textile sectors for example, since matters which clearly provide scope for discussion would fall within the exclusive competence of the provinces.

In such a case, whom would the Commission consider as its interlocutor, and what would happen if the Commission continued to assign this role to the Minister for Economic Affairs, especially if the latter was unable to reconcile the views of the Commission and those of the regions?

**Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 355/82, 356/82, 357/82, 358/82, 359/82 and 360/82  
given by Mr Thorn  
on behalf of the Commission**

*(9 July 1982)*

It is not the Commission's practice to answer hypothetical questions.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 364/82****by Mr Rogalla****to the Commission of the European Communities***(30 April 1982)**Subject: Answers to Written Questions*

1. The Commission has a large and expert staff. Will it state what percentage of answers to Written Questions put by Members of the European Parliament are prepared by members of the Commission personally?

2. Are the members of Commission aware that a large number of the Commission's answers have the appearance of being bureaucratic or statistical in nature and so fail to correspond to the ideas which they themselves express in debate in the European Parliament or its committees?

3. What, in the Commission's view, are the possibilities of reducing this discrepancy?

4. Does the Commission think it possible in its answers to such Written Questions to be more forceful than has been the case in the past in performing its role as the driving force behind the Community and so to exert pressure on the Council and Member States to work together more effectively than hitherto?

5. Is it possible to shorten the time elapsing between question and answer and to make the answer procedure more direct than has so far been the case?



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

(6 July 1982)

1, 2 and 3. The nature and political character of the Commission's answers depends entirely on the nature and political character of the questions asked by the Members of Parliament.

Answers to Written Questions fall within the political responsibility of the Commission.

4. The Commission is aware of the importance of the role that Written Questions and answers can play.

5. The departments of both the Commission and Parliament are currently examining ways of simplifying certain aspects of the procedures, mainly with a view to reducing the time taken to give the answers.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 368/82**

by Mr Normanton

to the Council of the European Communities

(30 April 1982)

*Subject:* Membership of the Council

Will the President of the Council of Ministers publish in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* a list of the members of the various Councils, indicating which of the Ministers have served in the European Parliament or in the Commission (and for how long)?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 369/82**

by Mr Normanton

to the Council of the European Communities

(30 April 1982)

*Subject:* Membership of the Council and the Parliament

Will the President of the Council of Ministers use his good offices to collect from Member States the names of Ministers who have, at some time, served in the European Parliament, and will he publish this information in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*, for the enlightenment of the electorate of Europe?

**Joint answer to Written Questions  
Nos 368/82 and 369/82  
of the European Communities**

(6 July 1982)

The Council welcomes the fact that Members of the European Parliament become:

- members of the Council as a result of their appointment to the government of a Member State,
- members of the Commission.

This situation should permit a better understanding of the problems which arise in each of these three institutions.

However, the Council does not possess the statistical data requested by the Honourable Member.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 372/82**

by Ms Quin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 April 1982)

*Subject:* The indebtedness of farmers, and measures to alleviate it

To what extent has the indebtedness of farmers in each of the Member States increased in recent years?

To what does the Commission attribute this indebtedness?

Does the Commission think that expectations of farmers that constantly rising farm prices would be agreed within the CAP may have encouraged them to borrow more than would otherwise have been considered prudent?

Will the Commission consider agricultural structure proposals to help farmers reduce their indebtedness in return for some restructuring or reshaping of their activities (along the lines required of European steelmakers or shipbuilders when they receive government or EEC assistance)?

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

(7 July 1982)

The indebtedness of farmers increased in each of the Member States in recent years. According to the available information the most important annual rates of increase (up to 40 %) have been observed in Ireland and in the United Kingdom. In the other Member States the total indebtedness increased by about 5 % to 17 %. The economic importance of the total indebtedness is different: Danish farmers have by far the highest debts (in 1980 253 % of the final agricultural production), followed by France (1978: 86 %) and the Federal Republic of Germany (71 %).

In Italy this relationship is about 25 %, in the other Member States 50 % to 55 %).

The Commission considers it quite normal that indebtedness increases together with the economic development of the farm sector. The increasing inflation rate and the unfavourable income evolution may have forced farmers in some Member States to engage more loans. The Commission does not think that the increasing indebtedness has been influenced by expectations of farmers that farm prices would constantly rise within the CAP particularly since it has promoted the idea of a prudent price policy for a number of years already.

The Commission does not believe that the indebtedness of farmers may be reduced in the short term through the implementation of specific structural measures. The implementation, particularly if it involves a fundamental reorganization of farm business, will also demand investment by farmers themselves and it has to be borne in mind that the effects of structural measures are normally of a medium- and long-term nature.

situation of the regions of the Community <sup>(2)</sup>. In that report the Commission draws attention to certain weak points in the statistics used, in particular as regards the regional level of the analysis and the difficulty of obtaining recent figures. The Commission undertook to work closely with national statistics' departments in order to refine certain analyses — in particular, so far as the available statistical information allowed, to examine regional problems on the basis of smaller geographical units (level III of the Nomenclature of Statistical Territorial Units).

The Commission reiterated this intention in response to Parliament's resolution of 17 February 1982 on the first periodic report on the social and economic situation of the regions of the Community <sup>(3)</sup>.

This will improve the quality of the statistics required for Social and Regional Fund purposes.

<sup>(2)</sup> Doc. COM(80) 816 final.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No C 66, 15. 3. 1982, p. 34.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 376/82

by Ms Quin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 April 1982)

*Subject:* Regional and social statistics

Does the Commission accept that Community statistics are not currently made available at the level of detail and frequency to enable a more sophisticated and responsive social and regional policy to be implemented successfully?

If it does accept this, can it indicate what steps are being taken or will be taken to enable more relevant statistics to be compiled for Social and Regional Fund purposes?

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

(12 July 1982)

Pursuant to the Council resolution of 6 February 1979 concerning the guidelines for Community regional policy <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission drew up in 1981 the first periodic report on the social and economic

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 36, 9. 2. 1979, p. 10.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 379/82

by Ms Quin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 April 1982)

*Subject:* Mediterranean agriculture and structural policy

As the Commission has been asked by the Council to produce new measures to aid farmers in the Mediterranean regions of the Community, can it indicate what general conclusions — if any — can be drawn from the success or otherwise of structural measures previously agreed for the Mediterranean regions?

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

(5 July 1982)

With regard to major measures such as irrigation <sup>(1)</sup>, infrastructure <sup>(2)</sup> and afforestation <sup>(3)</sup> concerning France and Italy, the reports sent by the Member States concerned show that the work carried out has

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EEC) No 1362/78 of 19 June 1978, OJ No L 166, 23. 6. 1978.

<sup>(2)</sup> Regulation (EEC) No 1760/78 of 25 July 1978, OJ No L 205, 28. 7. 1978, p. 1.

<sup>(3)</sup> Regulation (EEC) No 269/79 of 6 February 1979, OJ No L 38, 14. 2. 1979, p. 1.

achieved the objectives set in the respective Regulations: the operations are going forward at a satisfactory pace, with the exception of certain cases where delays have occurred for procedural reasons, notably with regard to the specific measure on irrigation.

Implementation of the Regulation<sup>(1)</sup> making improvements to the Regulation on the processing and marketing of agricultural products to assist the Mezzogiorno, the Languedoc-Roussillon and certain French departments in the wine sector also confirms the success of this operation.

Implementation of other measures, such as, for example, those relating to wine growing in the south of France<sup>(2)</sup> and irrigation in Corsica<sup>(3)</sup> has been retarded by teething troubles, but the rate of implementation gathered momentum early in 1981 following efforts to explain and publicize the work at local level.

With regard to the implementation of the integrated development programme for Locère<sup>(4)</sup>, the Commission's endorsement of the programme presented by France at the end of January 1982 has just been obtained.

Lastly, with regard to protection against floods in the Hérault valley<sup>(5)</sup>, information available to the Commission staff indicates that work on the preparation of the programme is not yet complete.

The Regulation on agricultural advisory services in Italy<sup>(6)</sup> is a complex document and institutional problems in Italy have also prevented prompt execution of this operation. However, a realistic forecast is that the first training courses for agricultural advisers will begin in 1983: the Italian regions have agreed, following approval of the training programmes, to the establishment of five training centres at which the courses will be given.

With regard to the development of beef/veal, sheepmeat and goatmeat production<sup>(7)</sup> in Italy, the Ital-

ian Government will be notifying the outline programme in the very near future; the Italian regions will then have to submit their special development programmes. It is likely that the operation can start next autumn.

With regard to the Regulation on groups of cotton producers for Greece and Italy<sup>(8)</sup>, it is too early to give firm information, since these countries are now preparing the implementing programmes.

Overall, the various specific common measures for the Mediterranean regions are being implemented in a relatively satisfactory manner.

<sup>(8)</sup> Regulation (EEC) No 389/82 of 15 February 1982, OJ No L 51, 23. 2. 1982, p. 1.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 395/82

by Mr Beyer de Ryke

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 May 1982)

*Subject:* EEC-Japan relations

The French Minister for Foreign Trade, Mr Michel Jobert, has recently returned from a fact-finding visit to Japan.

On 21 March, before leaving Tokyo, Mr Jobert stated publicly that he 'was ready to wager that protectionist measures might well be announced in Europe within the next six months if Japan did not reduce its \$ 10 000 million trade surplus with the EEC'.

On what global and sectoral plan for trade redeployment will the Commission base its future negotiations with Japan?

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

(17 June 1982)

In its answer to Written Question No 98/82 by Mr Vernimmen<sup>(1)</sup> the Commission gave an account of the 'comprehensive common strategy' adopted by the Council on 22 March.

In that answer the Honourable Member will find the information of the Community's attitude to Japan.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 167, 5. 7. 1982, p. 20.

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EEC) No 1361/78 of 19 June 1978, amending Regulation (EEC) No 355/77, OJ No L 166, 23. 6. 1978, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 78/627/EEC of 19 June 1978, OJ No L 206, 29. 7. 1978, p. 1.

<sup>(3)</sup> Directive 79/173/EEC of 6 February 1979, OJ No L 38, 14. 2. 1979, p. 15.

<sup>(4)</sup> Regulation (EEC) No 1940/81 of 30 June 1981, OJ No L 197, 20. 7. 1981, p. 9.

<sup>(5)</sup> Directive 79/174/EEC of 6 February 1979, OJ No L 38, 14. 2. 1979, p. 18.

<sup>(6)</sup> Regulation (EEC) No 270/79 of 6 February 1979, OJ No L 38, 14. 2. 1979, p. 6.

<sup>(7)</sup> Regulation (EEC) No 1944/81 of 30 June 1981, OJ No L 197, 20. 7. 1982, p. 27.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 407/82**

by Mrs Dury

to the Council of the European Communities

(4 May 1982)

*Subject:* Possible withdrawal of Greenland from the Community

Given the possible withdraw of Greenland from the European Community, can the Council of Ministers answer the following questions:

1. What would be the consequences as regards the seat currently occupied by the representative of Greenland in the European Parliament?
2. Would it be possible, at the next elections of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage, for this seat to be allotted to Belgium and, more specifically, a German-speaking Belgian representative, as envisaged during discussions preceding the Act of 20 September 1976?

**Answer**

(6 July 1982)

Article 2 of the Act of 20 September 1976 concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage lays down the number of elected representatives in each Member State.

No proposal to modify the allocation laid down by this Article 2 has been laid before the Council.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 414/82**

by Mr Brok

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 May 1982)

*Subject:* Construction of the Point Salines/Grenada Airport

1. Is it true that the European Community is supporting the construction of the Point Salines/Grenada airport by making available 2 million ECU?
2. Does the Commission consider it possible that this airport could be used primarily for military purposes?
3. Does the Commission consider it possible that the airport could also be used by Cuban and Soviet military aircraft?

4. For what purposes other than military is the airport to be used?

5. Is the Commission aware of US State Department documents which claim that Grenada has become an important ally of Cuba and that the airport which is under construction is clearly of strategic importance, as Cuba's MIG aircraft and troop carriers will thus be able to operate over a wider range?

6. Does the Commission share American fears that this airport will provide Cuban aircraft on their way to Africa with guaranteed refuelling facilities?

7. Has the American Government commented on the European Community's support for the construction of the airport and, if so, in what terms?

8. Is the European Community promoting other projects which could be used for military purposes by Soviet units or their military allies and, if so, what projects are involved?

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

(9 July 1982)

1. The Commission has received a financing request for part of the equipment for the international airport at Point Salines. This request was made under Article 136 of the second Lomé Convention by the authorities of Grenada and St Lucia, and has been backed up by the Secretariat of the Caribbean Community and Common Market (Caricom) on behalf of all the ACP States and OCT of the Caribbean region. The Community has not yet taken a decision on the matter.

2, 3 and 4. According to the authorities concerned, the purpose of building the airport is to strengthen the Grenadian economy by improving tourism and trade. This is undoubtedly an essential factor in the economic development of islands of this kind, which are heavily dependent on exports of a few agricultural products. The possibility that this airport, like any other airport, could be used for ends other than tourism and trade in a given political situation and if an independent government so decides, is not of specific relevance to this project and cannot consequently be ruled out.

5. The Commission is aware of the American position and the concern expressed by the United States as to the possible utilization of this airport.

6. The Commission would point out that the plans which it has seen do not reveal any fuel storage capacities other than those required for normal tourist and trade traffic.

7. The United States authorities, through contacts between US administration and Commission officials, have regularly informed the Commission of their government's position regarding possible financing for the project.

The Community does not finance military projects in the ACP States.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 423/83**

**by Mr Costanzo**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(4 May 1982)*

*Subject: Special aid to young farmers*

Article 8 (3) of Directive 81/528/EEC <sup>(1)</sup> amending Directive 72/159/EEC <sup>(2)</sup> on the modernization of farms provides that a special aid of up to 7 254 ECU *per capita* may be granted to young farmers who submit a farm development plan.

If, however, an application is submitted by two or more young farmers, the total amount of the special aid may not exceed 10 881 ECU.

Would the Commission not agree that this financial provision is a disincentive to group farming, which should be encouraged and maintained?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 197, 20. 7. 1981, p. 41.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No L 96, 23. 4. 1972, p. 1.

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

*(12 July 1982)*

The Commission does not agree that the provision of Directive 81/528/EEC on group farming limiting the special aid to young farmers carrying out a joint development plan to 10 881 ECU is a disincentive.

Article 12 of Directive 72/159/EEC on the modernization of farms, which provides for a launching aid for recognized groups of farms, still applies and this aid may be granted independently of the special aid for young farmers.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 444/82**

**by Mr Moreland**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(10 May 1982)*

*Subject: US corporate taxation*

1. Does the Commission oppose the taxation applied in a number of States in the USA under which a company's tax liability is calculated as a portion of the world-wide profits of the entire group?

2. Has the Commission expressed objections to the USA in any discussions with the US government?

3. Has the Commission raised the issue with the Foreign Ministers and/or the Council?

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

*(6 July 1982)*

1. The Commission is indeed opposed to the system, known as the Unitary Tax System, referred to by the Honourable Member. It is deeply concerned at the increasing number of States of the USA adopting it as the basis of their methods of assessing tax on corporation. The main concern of the Commission in this matter is the danger of double taxation where the unitary tax base is applied.

2. The objections of the Community have been presented to the US administration in formal notes, of which the most recent was presented by the Embassy of the United Kingdom (in the exercise of the function of presidency for the time being) on October 31, 1981. The Commission expressed its views in letters sent by the Head of its Delegation in Washington to the US administration (Mr Donald Regan, Secretary of The Treasury, and Mr William Brock, US Trade Representative) on 21 December 1981. This letter was instrumental in persuading the administration to file an *amicus curiae* brief opposing the system with the Supreme Court, in the case

of Chicago Bridge and Iron Co. v. Caterpillar Tractor Co., a case in which the constitutionality of the principle of unitary taxation is the point of issue.

3. In all its actions in this matter the Commission has acted in concert with the Presidency and in consultation with the Member States, in this case coordinated through their diplomatic representatives in Washington.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 447/82**

**by Mr Moreland**

**to the Council of the European Communities**

*(10 May 1982)*

*Subject: Rear-view mirrors on three-wheeled vehicles*

1. What progress has been made on the Commission proposal on the approximation of the law of the Member States relating to rear-view mirrors for two or three-wheeled motor vehicles?

2. Does the Council agree that three-wheeled saloon cars with standard car steering wheels should be subject to the same rear view mirror requirements as four-wheeled cars, i.e. one internal and one off-side external rear-view mirror? If not what objections have been raised?

**Answer**

*(6 July 1982)*

On 22 July 1980 the Council adopted a Directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to rear-view mirrors for two-wheeled motor vehicles with or without a side-car <sup>(1)</sup>, which does not cover three-wheeled vehicles with cab. In this connection the Council did, however, take note of a statement by the United Kingdom delegation asking the Commission to draw up as soon as possible a proposal for a Directive on the fitting of rear-view mirrors to three-wheeled vehicles with cab. To date the Council has not received any proposal on this subject from the Commission.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 229, 30. 8. 1980.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 452/82**

**by Mr Schwartzberg**

**to the Council of the European Communities**

*(10 May 1982)*

*Subject: Unfair Japanese competition*

At its meeting of 22 and 23 March 1982 the Council decided that, as the Community had not obtained the concessions it expected from the series of negotiations with Japan in the framework of GATT, and as bilateral discussions had not produced any satisfactory results, the procedures provided for under Article XXIII of GATT should be initiated against Japan.

1. What are these procedures?
2. When will they be implemented?
3. By whom (Commission, Member States)?

**Answer**

*(6 July 1982)*

Article XXIII of GATT foresees the possibility of procedures in two stages. Under the terms of para. 1, the contracting party which invokes the use of the Article, can submit written representations or proposals on the basis of which bilateral consultations are held.

Paragraph 2 foresees that if no solution is reached as a result of the bilateral consultations under paragraph 1, the matter may be considered in a multi-lateral framework by GATT contracting parties as a whole, who will carry out investigations and either make appropriate recommendations or give a ruling on the problem under discussion.

The Community's request for consultations with Japan under Article XXIII, paragraph 1, was made in writing to the Japanese Ambassador to GATT in a letter handed over on 25 March and the Community subsequently submitted written representations which were delivered to the Japanese Ambassador on 7 April 1982.

Formal consultations with the Japanese began on 18 and 19 May 1982.

As the matter concerns trade policy, the Commission is conducting the consultations on behalf of the Community in accordance with the terms of Article 113 of the Treaty of Rome.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 460/82****by Mr Prout****to the Commission of the European Communities***(10 May 1982)**Subject:* German law on the promotion of employment

A German law consolidating measures for the promotion of employment (the *Arbeitsförderungs-Konsolidierungsgesetz-BGBL. I*, p. 1497) entered into force on 1 January 1982. It is my understanding that the effect of that law will be to prevent the use of workers employed by employment agencies in building construction work in Germany from 1 April 1982 at the latest. In view of the fact that this will cause great hardship to enterprises in all Community countries who supply such services in Germany will the Commission answer the following questions:

1. When, if at all, was the Commission informed by the German authorities of the proposed adoption of this law?
2. If it was not so informed, when, and how, did it come to know about the law?
3. How does the Commission view the law in terms of the provisions of the EEC Treaty on the freedom to provide services, in particular Article 62?
4. In the light of the recent judgment of the European Court of Justice in Case 279/80<sup>(1)</sup> — Alfred John Webb — does the Commission really feel that it is in the interests of the Community, and in keeping with EEC law, that such draconian measures be taken and, if not, is it going to press the German Government to adopt more appropriate measures, such as an effective system of control by licensing.

<sup>(1)</sup> Reference: OJ No C 21, 30. 1. 1981, p. 2; Judgment: OJ No C 50, 25. 2. 1982, p. 7.

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

*(9 July 1982)*

1. The Commission was not informed by the German authorities of the draft law in question.
2. It became aware of this matter in December 1981 as a result of the publication of the law in the *BGBL*.
3. The law in question does not appear to contravene Community legislation since the ban on the use of temporary workers supplied by employment businesses in the building sector in the Federal

Republic of Germany appears to be in the public interest (need to protect the labour market and the legitimate interests of the workers concerned); also, the law makes no distinction between German temporary employment businesses and those established in other Member States.

4. The Commission's views as set out above appear to be in conformity with the recent judgments by the Court of Justice to which the Honourable Member refers.

The measures taken by the German authorities are in any case in line with those in effect in certain other Member States which have, for many years, imposed a ban on the activities of temporary employment businesses, whether in all sectors (e.g. Italy), in certain sectors (e.g. Belgium, the Netherlands) or in one specific sector only (Denmark).

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 461/82****by Mr Prout****to the Commission of the European Communities***(10 May 1982)**Subject:* Employment agency work

I understand that, following the judgment of the European Court of Justice in Case 279/80<sup>(1)</sup> — Alfred John Webb — on 17 December 1981, the Commission decided to consider the whole question of employment agency work.

Is this in fact the case? If so, would the Commission specify what it is doing and what it is proposing to do? If not, then, particularly in the light of the German *Arbeitsförderungs-Konsolidierungsgesetz* of 22 December 1981, will it consider looking at the question of employment agency work as a matter of urgency?

<sup>(1)</sup> Reference: OJ No C 21, 30. 1. 1981, p. 2; Judgment: OJ No C 50, 25. 2. 1982, p. 7.

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

*(9 July 1982)*

The Commission has indicated its intention to propose Community action in the field of temporary

work on a number of occasions in recent years <sup>(1)</sup>. The decision to put forward a proposal cannot therefore be said to be the outcome of the very recent judgment in the Webb case.

On 6 April 1982 the Commission approved a proposal for a Directive concerning temporary work (supply of temporary workers by employment businesses and recruitment of employees on fixed-duration contract) <sup>(2)</sup>. One of the three objectives of this proposal is to ensure that only sound, reputable businesses can engage in the supply of temporary workers with a view to eliminating malpractices in this field both within individual countries and in the cross-frontier context.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(79) 188 final; COM(80) 186 final; COM(80) 351 final; COM(80) 154/2 final; Commission programmes for 1979, 1980 and 1981. Commission answers to Written Questions No 37/73 by Mr Vredeling (OJ No C 57, 17. 7. 1973, p. 36), No 75/74 by Mr Bermani (OJ No C 77, 4. 7. 1974, p. 34), No 468/77 by Mr Dondelinger (OJ No C 305, 19. 12. 1977, p. 5), No 1341/80 by Mr O'Connell (OJ No C 345, 31. 12. 1980, p. 21) and No 1683/80 by Mr Croux, Mr Malangré and Mr Notenboom (OJ No C 78, 6. 4. 1981, p. 16).

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(82) 155.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 467/82

by Mr Capanna

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 May 1982)

*Subject:* Safety of workers in nuclear power stations

The Canadian nuclear energy authority has disclosed the first death from cancer of one of its employees following exposure to ionizing radiation.

The worker in question was employed at the Chalk River Research Centre near Ottawa. One of his co-workers who, likewise, had never been exposed to a dose of radiation higher than the permitted level, also contracted a form of cancer which was recognized as being directly linked to his work.

1. In view of these cases and the admission by Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd, does the Commission not feel the Community should review the question of safeguards for workers in nuclear power stations?
2. Does the Commission not feel it appropriate, in the light of what happened at the Chalk River Research Centre, to suspend the expansion of

civilian nuclear projects until the safety of working conditions in nuclear power stations can be guaranteed?

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

(6 July 1982)

The cancer which has afflicted the two Canadian workers has in fact resulted in their receiving compensation under the heading of 'occupational disease' since the 'presumption of origin' principle has been taken into consideration.

Occupational diseases, except for very rare examples, are non-specific; thus, the link between cause and effect is impossible to demonstrate, especially when exposure levels are low — as in the case of the Canadian workers. It is therefore often agreed that, to accelerate the indemnity procedures for those inflicted with the misfortune, one should be as accommodating as possible when granting compensation.

According to the information which the Commission has available and from the medical observations relating to the Canadian workers, it can be confirmed:

that the low level of exposure measured is well within the annual fixed limits;

that the absence of valid data in the scientific literature makes it impossible, in the two cases in question, to attribute any critical role in the pathogenesis of the diseases in question to ionizing radiations;

that exposure to other nuisances (asbestos, fluorine) should not be ignored, this having been the case with the Canadian workers.

In conclusion and on the basis of these facts, the Commission does not consider it necessary to revise the basic principles intended to ensure the protection of workers and the population against the dangers of ionizing radiations, principles which were updated in the Council Directive of 15 July 1980 <sup>(1)</sup>.

It also considers that given the fact that work in the nuclear industry can be considered satisfactory from the health point of view in relation to most other industries, there is no need to hold back the development of nuclear energy used for peaceful purposes in the Member States.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 246, 17. 9. 1980.



**WRITTEN QUESTION No 470/82****by Mr Radoux****to the Commission of the European Communities***(10 May 1982)**Subject:* Relations between the EEC and the East European countries

Following the events of 13 December 1981, can the Commission say what measures it has taken with regard to the East European countries and how long such measures will last?

**Answer given by Mr Haferkamp  
on behalf of the Commission***(9 July 1982)*

Since 13 December 1981 the Commission has taken the following action with regard to East European countries:

**(a) USSR:**

- (i) the Commission put forward proposals for measures to cut imports from the USSR, which were adopted by the Council on 15 March. The Council Regulation is valid until 31 December <sup>(1)</sup>;
- (ii) the Commission has also proposed that the USSR's export credit classification under the Arrangement on Guidelines for Officially Supported Export Credits (the Consensus) be changed, and on 15 February the Council instructed the Commission to begin negotiations with the other Consensus Participants. The proposal is currently being discussed and could be adopted as part of an across-the-board reclassification of countries under the Arrangement.

**(b) Poland:**

- (i) the Commission has withdrawn its proposal for the third 'B' instalment of special sales of farm products to Poland;
- (ii) as a gesture of solidarity with the people of Poland, the Commission has granted two instalments of emergency aid, one worth 2 million ECU and the other 8 million ECU.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 72, 16. 3. 1982.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 471/82****by Mrs Théobald-Paoli****to the Commission of the European Communities***(10 May 1982)**Subject:* Mediterranean horticulture

In the face of competition, frequently from non-European countries, horticulturalists from the Mediterranean areas of the Community urgently need to carry out a technological revolution in their glass-house heating (and air-conditioning for the summer).

Indications are that a new type of glasshouse, with double walls containing circulating water, should be developed: this process, which has already been tried out in the Var, has proved to be particularly low on energy consumption (project carried out by the Experimental Horticultural College at Hyères).

What aid would the Commission consider granting to this project, which would help to reduce expenditure on imported flowers, which in France amounts to FF 2 000 million? Could the appropriations for energy saving, scientific research, agriculture (agricultural research) or the development of the Mediterranean regions be allocated for this purpose?

**Answer given by Mr Giolitti  
on behalf of the Commission***(12 July 1982)*

Under the 1979-1983 research programme, an expert group on energy saving and protected crops has been set up to study the technical aspects of glass-house construction <sup>(1)</sup>.

At the present stage of these studies, all that can be said with certainty is that in the Mediterranean areas various types of glasshouse construction are feasible, including that mentioned by the Honourable Member.

It would be premature, however, to say whether this type of project could qualify for any aid.

If the regions concerned were eligible for aid from the European Regional Development Fund, a possible course of action would be for the Member State in question to submit an application in respect of investments in firms manufacturing such equipment.

Since the process mentioned by the Honourable Member has already been tested, the project would

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 316, 30. 10. 1978, p. 37.

no longer qualify as a demonstration project and would not therefore be eligible for financial assistance under Council Regulation (EEC) No 1303/78 (1).

The research programmes, including the second Energy Research and Development Programme, make no provision for a Community contribution towards projects such as that described by the Honourable Member.

(1) OJ No L 158, 16. 6. 1978, p. 6.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 479/82**

**by Mr Habsburg**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(14 May 1982)*

*Subject:* Gradual amalgamation of airlines in the Community

In view of the increasing difficulties of the national airlines, is it not perhaps time for renewed action aimed at the gradual amalgamation of airlines in the Community?

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

*(5 July 1982)*

The poor financial situation of a number of Community airlines depends very largely upon the current economic situation in general.

The Commission is aware of the fact that rationalization of air services may be promoted by increased cooperation between airlines which possibly leads to mergers or certain forms of partial integration, provided that these do not give rise to situations which are incompatible with the EEC Treaty or which have adverse effects on the Community. Among other things to bear in mind here is the possible risk of job losses.

Previous experience with mergers in Europe and the United States have, in any case, not been very encouraging. Those in the United States have been fairly recent. The Commission therefore feels that it is primarily up to the airlines themselves to examine the merits of any prospective mergers. If, in specific

cases, assistance were sought, the Commission would certainly look into the matter.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 482/82**

**by Mrs Dury**

**to the Council of the European Communities**

*(14 May 1982)*

*Subject:* Use by the Member States of the 'Luxembourg compromise' (right of veto)

To clarify the position for research workers and academics, could the Council state in how many cases in recent years the Member States have used their 'veto' on the grounds of 'vital interests' on a proposal for a Directive or Regulation, on the basis of the Luxembourg compromise of January 1966?

**Answer**

*(6 July 1982)*

The Council would point out that, under Article 18 of its Rules of Procedure, the deliberations of the Council, and therefore the result of the voting leading to the decisions reached, are covered by the obligation of professional secrecy.

As it has pointed out to the Parliament on several occasions in recent years, the Council takes the view that the provisions of the Treaty whereby decisions can be adopted by a simple or qualified majority do not prevent members of the Council from continuing their efforts to reach consensus before the Council acts.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 493/82**

**by Mr Davern**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(14 May 1982)*

*Subject:* Waterford bridge

Will the Commission state whether or not it has received any requests for aid for the high-level and low-level bridges at Waterford in Ireland and if so, will the Commission provide details of the requests and the likelihood of any aid being granted from Community funds?

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

(12 July 1982)

The Commission made two commitments for grants from the European Regional Development Fund in September 1980 and September 1981 to a group of investments, which included the replacement of an existing bridge across the River Suir at Waterford City by a four-lane low-level bridge.

The sum of these two groups of investments is £ Irl 20 907 626 on which the ERDF grant is 30 %.

The European Investment Bank has financed many road improvement schemes to assist regional development in Ireland. At end-April 1982, the Bank had lent the equivalent of £ Irl 44.1 million (66.1 million ECU) for works throughout the country. A further £ Irl 13 million (19.4 million ECUs) was lent from the resources of the New Community Instrument for borrowing and lending, for which the bank handles the lending operations under Community mandate.

For reasons of confidentiality which promoters expect in their negotiations, the EIB does not comment on whether individual projects have been submitted to it for future financing; the results of any discussions are only made public if and when a loan contract is signed.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 495/82**

**by Mr Davern**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(14 May 1982)

*Subject:* Voting rights for merchant seamen

1. Will the Commission provide details of the position in each of the Member States with regard to voting rights for merchant seamen in the context of direct elections to the European Parliament?

2. Can the Commission state whether or not it has contacted the Member States with regard to this matter?

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

(6 July 1982)

1. The laws of the Member States concerning the direct elections to the European Parliament in general have no special provisions for merchant seamen. The ordinary rules of residence and of right to vote by mail must be applied. For details of these the Commission refers the Honourable Member to the Parliamentary Report on electoral laws of the Parliaments of the Member States of the European Communities, August 1977 (1).

2. No such contact has been made.

(1) PE 50 159.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 496/82**

**by Mr Flanagan**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(14 May 1982)

*Subject:* Expenditure per head of population

According to the Commission, government expenditure per head of population during 1980 in the Member States amounted to 5 215 ECU in Denmark while in contrast the figure in Ireland amounted to 1 630 ECU. Can the Commission explain the reasons for the substantial variation between these two Member States and do not these figures further underline the economic disparities existing within the Community?

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

(6 July 1982)

Government expenditure in 1980 accounted for nearly 59 % of gross domestic product in Denmark and for about 55 % in Ireland; as gross domestic product per head of population in Denmark is considerably higher than in Ireland, there is a substantial difference between the two countries in the amount of government expenditure per head of population, expressed in a common currency.

As is well known, there are large economic disparities between Member States, which reflect a wide range of factors that have determined economic

developments over a long period. The Commission, for its part, is anxious to encourage greater economic convergence and takes this into account when formulating general economic policy guidelines. In addition, most of the lending activity of the Community institutions is aimed at reducing structural imbalances, and is particularly helpful for those Member States like Ireland which are less prosperous. Following the effective and full participation of Ireland in the exchange rate and intervention mechanism of the EMS, the bulk of loans granted to Ireland by the Community institutions is made available on special conditions, with an interest subsidy.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 501/82**

**by Mr Alber and Mr von Wogau  
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(14 May 1982)

*Subject:* Currency exchange fees in the European Community

Can the Commission indicate the annual costs incurred through the exchange of Member States' currencies?

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

(12 July 1982)

If by 'annual costs incurred through the exchange of Member States' currencies' the Honourable Members mean the amounts of intervention to support the Community currencies on the foreign exchange markets, the Commission would point out that it is up to the national monetary authorities concerned to make the figures public. The figures are usually considered confidential, especially when they refer to the recent past.

The following table shows the pattern of Member States' total reserves from 1979 to 1981. However, no reliable conclusions can be drawn about intervention amounts since these reserves include the proceeds of direct and indirect foreign borrowings contracted by the Member States during the period, for which precise figures are not always available.

**Total reserves of the Member States of the Community**

(in million ECU)

	1979	1980	1981
Federal Republic of Germany	+ 359	412	3 956
France	4 697	8 854	- 78
Italy	3 934	5 187	1 114
Netherlands	1 161	3 719	- 134
Belgium	558	2 289	-1 291
United Kingdom	1 882	2 134	-1 655
Ireland	- 408	651	+ 260
Denmark	- 41	344	- 232
Greece	- 70	212	- 160

*Sources:* International Monetary Fund: International Financial Statistics, May 1982.  
Commission departments.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 515/82**

**by Mr Patterson  
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(14 May 1982)

*Subject:* Commission staff

in LA grades, British nationals are disproportionately few in number among the Commission's staff. Will the Commission give an assurance that its recruiting policies aim at correcting the present imbalance so that there is adequate and comparable representation of all Community nationalities among all grades of its staff, taking account of relative populations?

The Commission's answer to Mr Damseaux's Written Question No 1138/81 <sup>(1)</sup> shows that other than

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 345, 31. 12. 1981, p. 18.

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

(6 July 1982)

The Commission's recruitment policies have always sought to ensure that Article 27 of the Staff Regulations were respected. This in itself should lead to a broad balance in the long term though clearly from time to time there are fluctuations within a general position. The Commission is aware that at the moment there is a comparative shortfall of UK staff and it would hope to see this redressed in the medium term future, using the normal and well established methods.

The authorities in the Council which exercise the powers conferred by the Staff Regulations on the appointing authority do not place any obstacle in the way of the recruitment of officials of British nationality. However, despite advertising campaigns in various British newspapers, there is a shortage of British applicants for open competitions for category B, C, D and even A posts, and a consequent shortage of successful candidates after the competitions.

This phenomenon does not concern only British nationals. The same recruitment problems arise regarding other countries such as Denmark and the Netherlands.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 516/82**

**by Mr Patterson**

**to the Council of the European Communities**

(14 May 1982)

*Subject:* Council staff

The answer to Mr Damseaux's Written Question No 1139/81<sup>(1)</sup> showed that officials of British nationality in Grades B, C and D of the Council staff are disproportionately few compared with officials of other nationalities. What steps does the Council propose to take to ensure a broad numerical balance between the nationals of all Member States on its staff, taking account of relative populations?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 12, 18. 1. 1982, p. 16.

**Answer**

(6 July 1982)

Article 27 of the Staff Regulations of officials of the European Communities stipulates that:

'Recruitment shall be directed to securing for the institution the services of officials of the highest standard of ability, efficiency and integrity, recruited on the broadest possible geographical basis from among nationals of Member States of the Communities.

Officials shall be selected without reference to race, creed or sex.

No posts shall be reserved for nationals of any specific Member State.'

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 523/82**

**by Mr Seefeld**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(24 May 1982)

*Subject:* Use of side-lights in France

Since the beginning of the year France has once again allowed motorists to use only side-lights when driving through areas with street lighting. This decision was taken by the French Government notwithstanding the decision by the European Conference of Ministers of Transport to standardize road traffic regulations in Europe.

1. Was the Commission informed of this French measures before it was introduced?
2. What view does the Commission take of such a unilateral national measure at a time when continual efforts are being made to standardize national road safety provisions?

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

(7 July 1982)

1. No.
2. The Commission supports the work being carried out in other international organizations with a view to standardizing traffic regulations. It would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that the resolution adopted by the European Conference of Ministers of Transport on this subject is not legally binding and that the new French regulations simply allow motorists to use side-lights and do not require them to do so. In practice, it would

seem that French motorists are increasingly using dipped-beam headlights. Moreover, once a number of problems concerning the adjustment of lights have been resolved, *de facto* standardization can be expected in this area.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 526/82**

**by Mr Normanton**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(30 April 1982)*

*Subject:* Citizens' Band radio

In recent years there has been considerable controversy concerning the use of what is termed Citizens' Band radio equipment.

The British Government has legislated on the frequency bands now to be used and the type of radio system for two-way communication. It is said by many users of CB radio equipment that the British legislation on the subject is fundamentally different from that which applies to the rest of the European Economic Community.

Does the Commission consider that this is an area to which Community legislation should apply uniformly and if so, what proposals has the Commission for such harmonization?

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

*(7 July 1982)*

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Question No 250/82 by Mr Hutton<sup>(1)</sup> and No 310/82 by Sir Fred Warner<sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 188, 22. 7. 1982.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 535/82**

**by Mr Pearce**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(24 May 1982)*

*Subject:* Aid to developing countries

Will the Commission in future accept that published figures of aid to developing countries expressed as a percentage of GDP should not, in the case of France, include contributions by the French Government to its own overseas territories?

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

*(7 July 1982)*

Official Development Assistance (ODA) statistics drawn up on the basis of a list of developing countries agreed within the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC). This list includes the dependencies of certain industrialized countries, such as France and other Member States.

The question of excluding these dependencies from the list of developing countries has not been settled. However, France has decided to work towards an ODA target of 0.7 % of GNP by 1988, flows to its overseas departments and territories not being taken into account.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 563/82**

**by Mrs Dury**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(1 June 1982)*

*Subject:* NCI

Which Belgian projects have been funded since the creation of the New Community Instrument and what amounts are involved?

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

*(7 July 1982)*

To date, no investment projects in Belgium have been financed out of the resources of the New Community Borrowing and Lending Instrument (NCI).

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 600/82**

**by Mrs Squarcialupi**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(7 June 1982)*

*Subject:* Dangers of NCR copying paper

In Sweden, the International Warning System for the health and safety of workers has indicated that NCR copying paper (i.e. not requiring carbons) has

caused irritation of the eyes, mucous membranes and skin as well as other general symptoms such as nausea and headaches. The warning was sent to health authorities by the International Labour Organization which stressed that no convincing explanation has yet been found for these phenomena. Indeed, certain skin tests carried out with the paper and the chemical substances used in its manufacture have not produced any allergic reactions. However, similar cases have been positively identified in a number of offices in Italian banks.

Can the Commission provide any information on the subject and say what initiatives it intends to take?

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

(9 July 1982)

The Commission has received a summary of the replies received by the International Labour Office concerning their request for information on health hazards related to carbonless copy paper.

These replies indicate that:

- comparatively little information is available,
- only a small proportion of users are involved,
- a cause/effect relationship between the symptoms observed and the use of carbonless papers has not yet been established,
- neither a particular type of paper nor one of its components seem specifically connected with the complaints,
- more information is being sought.

In view of these facts the Commission does not consider that any action on its part is currently justified.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 612/82**

**by Mr Price**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(7 June 1982)

*Subject:* Presence of Commissioners

In respect of each of the following:

- (a) Oral Questions answered during Question Time (Rule 44);

(b) Oral Questions with debate (Rule 42);

(c) debates on motions for resolutions contained in Parliament's own-initiative reports (Rule 102); and

(d) debates on motions for resolutions containing Parliament's opinion on proposed legislation (Rule 32),

will the Commission state the number of times since 1 January 1981 that the Commission's response has been given by the Commissioner responsible for portfolio concerned and the number of times that it has been given by another Commissioner?

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

(7 July 1982)

The Commission would remind the Honourable Member that any statement in the House by one of its Members is made on behalf of the full Commission, in which the principle of collective political responsibility applies.

In any case the Commission does not have the kind of statistics requested by the Honourable Member.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 621/82**

**by Mr Pedini and Mr Filippi**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(7 June 1982)

*Subject:* Isolation of the elderly in modern society

The danger of isolation among the elderly in modern society, as recently pointed out by the European Parliament, is the subject of much dispute and one of the main reasons for staying on at work until the maximum retirement age is precisely the need for self-fulfilment and the fear of isolation in retirement.

Are there any pilot projects in the European Economic Community for the reinsertion of the elderly in society through employment, perhaps on a voluntary basis, in the social services particularly those of a civic nature?

What role does the Commission play in these projects?

Is it possible to enhance through such experiments the contribution that the elderly can make towards

increasing the sense of solidarity between the generations of contemporary European society?

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

*(9 July 1982)*

Various pilot schemes and many permanent and structured measures to integrate the elderly into society are under way in the Member States.

The Commission has supported some pilot schemes directed to this end in the context of the European Programme of Pilot Schemes and Studies to Combat Poverty. In 1982 the Commission is supporting a number of projects concerning the elderly. In addition a study has been commissioned describing and analyzing any significant actions implemented in the Community to promote the independence of old people and their participation in the life of the Community.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 624/82**

**by Mrs Fullet**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(7 June 1982)*

*Subject:* Distribution of replies to Written Questions by Member of Parliament

Can the Commission explain why questions and replies are distributed solely to journalists accredited by the Commission and are not received by journalists accredited by the European Parliament?

Why does the Commission not first forward the replies to the Members of Parliament concerned and to Parliament itself?

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

*(6 July 1982)*

The Commission's answers to Written Questions by Members of the European Parliament are released

to journalists in the Commission's press room 48 hours after transmittal to Parliament by which time it is presumed that they have reached their destination. The answers are also transmitted to the information offices in the Member States.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 651/82**

**by Mr de Courcy Ling**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(15 June 1982)*

*Subject:* Eligibility of Coventry for ESF funds

Is the Commission aware that although in 1980 only 27 % of those reaching school-leaving age in Coventry found permanent employment, Coventry does not qualify as a priority region for the purposes of the Social Fund, and will the Commission undertake to find ways of channelling Social Fund aid to Coventry?

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

*(9 July 1982)*

The Social Fund's young people field of intervention gives priority to regions where youth unemployment is either above the Community average or substantially above the national average. The statistics for this comparison are derived from the biennial Community-wide Labour Force Sample Survey. At the time of the last survey the West Midlands region, which includes Coventry, did not satisfy either of the criteria for inclusion in the list of priority regions. The Commission will update the list before the end of 1982, as soon as the results of the latest survey, conducted in 1981, are available. If the West Midlands then meet the criteria, the region will be included in the revised list of youth unemployment priority regions.



**CLASSIFICATION OF CHEMICALS IN THE COMMON CUSTOMS TARIFF OF  
THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES**

**IN SIX LANGUAGES**

- Twenty thousand chemical names (internationally accepted common names, systematic names and synonyms).
- Six languages: Danish (Vol. I), German (Vol. II), English (Vol. III), French (Vol. IV), Italian (Vol. V) and Dutch (Vol. VI).
- Index of equivalent names in all six languages (Vol. VII — six languages).

Features of this publication are:

- the classification (heading and subheading) of a chemical in the Common Customs Tariff of the European Communities can be ascertained immediately from its name in any one of the six languages;
- the equivalent names are listed in all six languages (multilingual glossary).

The chemical names listed may be used to gain access to the European Communities Data and Information Network (ECDIN).

Each volume (except Vol. VII) may be ordered separately.

Price per single-language volume: ECU 9·60, Bfrs 400, £ Irl 6·70, £ 5·25, US \$ 11·50.

Price of a single-language volume plus the six-language volume: ECU 36·30, Bfrs 1 500, £ Irl 25·20, £ 19·50, US \$ 41.

Price of the complete publication: ECU 72, Bfrs 3 000, £ Irl 50, £ 39·20, US \$ 85·25.

Orders should be sent to:

OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES  
L-2985 Luxembourg

## THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY'S RESEARCH POLICY

**Science and research are foundation stones for long-term economic development.  
The pace of progress depends on them as much today as in the past.**

**It was therefore inevitable that from the outset the European Community would be involved in them. In the future much will depend on whether the European countries and the European Community show themselves capable of adopting a policy commensurate with the issues at stake.**

What can and must the Community do to encourage research within its territory?

The Community has no intention of taking over from the industrial and government research effort in the Member States. However, it is in a position to carry out in its own research centres and with its own funds various specific projects that serve the common interests of the Community.

It can also provide financial support of up to 50 % of the cost for certain projects carried out by one or more Member States.

The Community also has a coordinating role. Its main aim is to facilitate discussion between those responsible for national research projects. These discussions can cover a wide variety of aims and achievements.

The Community is currently giving priority to the execution and promotion of research in several key areas. The first is the security of our supplies of raw materials (energy, food, other raw materials), followed by efforts to increase the competitiveness of industry, then the improvement of living and working conditions and finally the protection of our environment.

1980 — 28 pp., 1 tab., 4 ill. — 16.2 x 22.9 cm / European Documentation Series — 5-1980

ISBN 92-825-2020-X / Catalogue number: CB-NC-80-005-EN-C / £Irl 0.65 / £ 0.65 / \$US 1.30

### **This publication is available at the following addresses:**

#### *Information offices*

**DUBLIN:**  
39 Molesworth Street,  
Dublin 2,  
tel. 76 0353.

**LONDON:**  
20 Kensington Palace Gardens,  
London W8 4QQ,  
tel. 727 8090.

**BELFAST:**  
9/15 Bedford Street,  
Windsor House.

**CARDIFF:**  
4 Cathedral Road,  
Cardiff CF1 9SG,  
tel. 27 1631.

**EDINBURGH:**  
7 Alva Street,  
Edinburgh EH2 4PH,  
tel. 225 2058.

**OTTAWA:**  
Inn of the Provinces — Office  
Tower  
(Suite 1110)  
350 Sparks Street,  
Ottawa, Ont. K1R 7S8,  
tel. 238 6464.

**WASHINGTON:**  
2100 M. Street, N.W.  
(Suite 707), Washington,  
DC 20037-USA,  
tel. 202 862 9500.

**NEW YORK:**  
1 Dag Hammarskjöld Plaza,  
245 East 47th Street,  
New York, NY 10017-USA,  
tel. 212 371 3804.

#### *Sales offices*

**IRELAND:**  
Government Publications,  
Sales Office, GPO Arcade,  
Dublin 1.

Stationery Office,  
Dublin 4,  
tel. 78 9644.

**UNITED KINGDOM:**  
HM Stationery Office,  
PO Box 569, London SE1 9NH,  
tel. 928 6977, ext. 365.

**GRAND DUCHY OF  
LUXEMBOURG  
and OTHER COUNTRIES:**  
Office for Official Publications of  
the European Communities,  
Boîte postale 1003, Luxembourg,  
tel. 49 00 81.

