

Official Journal

of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6986

C 266

Volume 25

11 October 1982

English edition

Information and Notices

Contents

I Information

European Parliament

Written Questions with answer:

No 335/82 by Mr Michel to the Commission	
Subject: Harmonization of legal matters – progress report	1
No 431/82 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission	
Subject: Reduction in river-salmon catches	1
No 522/82 by Mr Cousté to the Commission	
Subject: Community programmes to combat unemployment	2
No 524/82 by Mrs Lizin to the Commission	
Subject: Negotiations between Mr Davignon and the Turkish Deputy Prime Minister	3
No 569/82 by Mr Beyer de Ryke to the Commission	
Subject: Baby seals – import of skins	3
No 573/82 by Mr Cousté to the Commission	
Subject: European car market	3
No 597/82 by Mrs Le Roux to the Commission	
Subject: Lifting of the ban by the USA on dumping radioactive waste at sea	4
No 671/82 by Mrs Buchan to the Commission	
Subject: Ban on 2,4,5-T and related substances in the EEC	4
No 673/82 by Mrs Buchan to the Commission	
Subject: Scientific Committee for Pesticides	5
No 677/82 by Mr Seefeld to the Commission	
Subject: Safety at airports in the Community	5
No 684/82 by Mr Pearce to the Commission	
Subject: Gas from the Soviet-Union to the Federal Republic of Germany	5
No 698/82 by Mr Wurtz to the Commission	
Subject: Commission survey of EEC iron and steel undertakings	6

Contents (continued)

No 706/82 by Mr Schwartzberg to the Foreign Ministers of the 10 Member States of the Community meeting in political cooperation Subject: The situation of the Jewish community in Syria	7
No 733/82 by Mrs Théobald-Paoli to the Commission Subject: Relations between the European Community and China in the field of research and technology	7
No 734/82 by Mrs Théobald-Paoli to the Commission Subject: Measures taken by the Japanese Government to promote imports of manufactured goods to Japan	8
No 794/82 by Mr Prag to the Foreign Ministers of the 10 Member States of the European Economic Community meeting in political cooperation Subject: Implementation of crisis procedures	8
No 797/82 by Mr Blaney to the Commission Subject: Development of coastal areas and state of fish stocks	9
No 798/82 by Mrs Lizin to the Commission Subject: Status of welfare nurses in Belgium	9
No 802/82 by Mr Marck to the Commission Subject: Community food aid	10
No 806/82 by Mr Lomas and Mr Megahy to the Commission Subject: Spanish accession	10
No 809/82 by Mrs Squarcialupi to the Commission Subject: Application in the Member States of the Directive on the conservation of bird life	11
No 812/82 by Mr Prout to the Commission Subject: Competition procedures	11
No 825/82 by Mr Prag to the Commission Subject: Action to help those suffering from multiple sclerosis	12
No 827/82 by Mr Cousté to the Commission Subject: Increase in interest rates on credit granted to the USSR	12
No 829/82 by Mr Nyborg to the Commission Subject: Damage caused by storm tides in Denmark	12
No 835/82 by Mr Schwartzberg to the Commission Subject: Obstacles to trade created by German insurance companies	13
No 840/82 by Mrs Le Roux to the Commission Subject: Use of co-responsibility funds	13
No 849/82 by Mr Robert Jackson to the Foreign Ministers of the 10 Member States of the European Economic Community meeting in political cooperation Subject: Hunger strike in USSR	14
No 854/82 by Mr Jürgens to the Commission Subject: Pollution of the North Sea by oil, including waste oil	14
No 872/82 by Mr Tyrrell to the Commission Subject: Right of establishment of doctors	15
No 904/82 by Mr Beyer de Ryke to the Commission Subject: Economic sanctions against Argentina	16
No 905/82 by Mr Beyer de Ryke to the Council Subject: Situation in Gibraltar	16

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

WRITTEN QUESTION No 335/82

by Mr Michel

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 April 1982)

Subject: Harmonization of legal matters – progress report

In the light of the outcome of the Benelux ministerial working party on legal affairs which, on 17 March 1982 in Brussels, discussed unification and harmonization of legal matters within these three Member States, has the Commission any practical conclusions, to draw and can it indicate present or future consequences at Community level?

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission

(2 September 1982)

It was with a great deal of interest that the Commission took note of the outcome of the Benelux ministerial working party on legal affairs regarding certain proposals to unify and harmonize the law. These proposals concern penalty clauses, the temporal and territorial scope of criminal law, harmonization of the law on the sale of goods and deprivation of the right to drive a motor vehicle.

While it considers that these matters are of undoubted importance, the Commission cannot devote particular attention to them for the time being. It does not intend at present to take any measures in the abovementioned legal fields. It prefers to concentrate on those areas of the law which are likely to promote economic development and help create a citizens' Europe.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 431/82

by Mrs Ewing

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 May 1982)

Subject: Reduction in river-salmon catches

What are the Commission estimates of the reduction of salmon catches in Community rivers over the past 20 years?

Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis,
on behalf of the Commission

(2 September 1982)

The last Working Group on North-Atlantic Salmon of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), which met in April 1982, produced a report which reached the Services of the Commission in July 1982.

In this report, table 6 gives the nominal catches of salmon in home waters for 20 years since 1960 for each country. For most countries or regions catches do not vary very much. The only significant reduction seems to have occurred in Ireland since the very high catches of the mid-70's.

An extract of this table, which does not necessarily reflect the views of ICES, is given below:

TABLE 6

Nominal catches of salmon in home waters (in tonnes round fresh weight) 1960 – 1981

Year	France	England and Wales	Scotland (g)			Ireland (b)			Northern Ireland (b) (c)
	T	T	S	G	T	S	G	T	T
1960	50 – 100	283	927	509	1 436	—	—	743	139
1961	50 – 100	232	772	424	1 196	—	—	707	132
1962	50 – 100	318	808	932	1 740	—	—	1 459	356
1963	50 – 100	325	1 168	530	1 698	—	—	1 458	306
1964	50 – 100	307	913	1 001	1 914	—	—	1 617	377
1965	50 – 100	320	835	728	1 563	—	—	1 457	281
1966	50 – 100	387	788	836	1 624	—	—	1 238	287
1967	50 – 100	420	857	1 276	2 133	—	—	1 463	449
1968	50 – 100	282	783	780	1 563	—	—	1 413	312
1969	50 – 100	377	539	1 408	1 947	—	—	1 730	267
1970	50 – 100	527	503	826	1 329	—	—	1 787	297
1971	50 – 100	426	496	923	1 419	—	—	1 639	234
1972	34	442	588	1 105	1 693	200	1 604	1 804	210
1973	12	450	661	1 303	1 964	244	1 686	1 930	182
1974	13	383	578	1 053	1 631	170	1 958	2 128	184
1975	25	447	669	892	1 561	274	1 942	2 216	164
1976	9	208	328	682	1 010	109	1 452	1 561	113
1977	19	345	369	762	1 131	145	1 227	1 372	110
1978	20	349	780	510	1 290	147	1 082	1 230	148
1979	10	261	697	528	1 225	105	922	1 097	99
1980	30	348	807	283	1 090	202	745	947	122
1981 (a)	20	492	816	372	1 188	164	521	685	101

S = Salmon (two or more sea winter fish).

G = Grilse (one sea winter fish).

T = S + G.

(a) = Provisional figures.

(b) = Catch on River Foyle allocated on basis 50 % Ireland and 50 % Northern Ireland.

(c) = Not including angling catch (mainly grilse).

(g) = Salmon and grilse figures for 1962 – 1977 corrected for grilse error.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 522/82**by Mr Cousté****to the Commission of the European Communities***(14 May 1982)**Subject: Community programmes to combat unemployment*

Within the Standing Committee on Employment, a new Community programme to tackle unemployment is currently being discussed by the Community authorities. Can the Commission say how many previous employment programmes it has implemented since the start of the first energy crisis? In so far as these

programmes have, to date, proved to be inadequate and ineffective, what conclusions does it draw for the immediate future?

**Answer given by Mr Richard
on behalf of the Commission***(8 September 1982)*

The Commission working paper ⁽¹⁾ submitted to the Standing Committee on Employment for discussion on 27 April 1982 constituted the basis of the first

⁽¹⁾ SEC(82) 535, 31 March 1982.

Community action to combat unemployment which subsequently became the subject of the Council resolution of 12 July 1982.

This action programme is the logical follow-up to previous work, in particular the communication on the problem of unemployment – points for examination ⁽¹⁾, submitted to the Standing Committee on Employment at its meeting on 19 May 1981, and the Commission contribution to the preparation for the joint Council meeting of the Ministers of Economic Affairs, Finance and Social Affairs on 11 June 1981.

⁽¹⁾ COM(81) 154 final, 24 April 1981.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 524/82

by Mrs Lizin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 May 1982)

Subject: Negotiations between Mr Davignon and the Turkish Deputy Prime Minister

Has the Commission given a special mandate to Mr Davignon to meet the Turkish Deputy Prime Minister and minister responsible for finance, Mr Ozal, in order to discuss the subjects of textiles and steel?

Is such a meeting compatible with the attitude adopted by the Commission towards the Turkish Government?

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

(8 September 1982)

Mr Davignon met the Turkish Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Ozal, in order to discuss with him possible solutions to various problems concerning textiles, a sector which falls within Mr Davignon's sphere of responsibility.

The problems discussed by Mr Davignon and Mr Ozal were in connection with calls for the imposition of safeguard clauses and an anti-dumping proceeding initiated following complaints from the Community textile industry, to which the Commission, in accordance with the EEC Treaty and legislation derived from it, is bound to respond.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 569/82

by Mr Beyer de Ryke

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 June 1982)

Subject: Baby seals – imports of skins

Further to the resolution adopted by the European Parliament at the March part-session ⁽¹⁾, can the Commission state what practical measures it intends to take, or has already taken, to prohibit imports of these skins into the Member States of the Community?

⁽¹⁾ Doc. 1 – 984/81.

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

(2 September 1982)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the reply to Oral Question No H-77/82 by Mr Johnson, which it gave during question time at Parliament's July part-session ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1 – 287 (July 1982).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 573/82

by Mr Cousté

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 June 1982)

Subject: European car market

Will the Commission soon be in a position to make known its conclusions on restrictive practices in the distribution of motor cars in the Community and, if so, when?

What progress has it made in its investigation of British Leyland?

Is United Kingdom policy in this area – coming as it does on top of the almost permanent conflict between the UK and the rest of the Community – likely to lead to reconsideration of its membership of the Community?

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

(7 September 1982)

The phrasing of the Honourable Member's question suggests a misunderstanding of the nature of the problem.

The representations which the Commission has received in support of action to eliminate barriers to trade in motor cars in the common market have come primarily from citizens of the United Kingdom. A number of the Commission's investigations into the barriers to parallel imports of motor cars in the common market erected by certain manufacturers, based in various Member States, are nearing completion.

The Commission will shortly be in a position to draw its conclusions from these investigations and to decide what action needs to be taken in the light of the rules on competition applying to undertakings.

As to the attitude of the United Kingdom authorities, the Commission would point out that they have already, on 2 February this year, expressed publicly before Parliament at Westminster their determination to work out, in consultation with the motor vehicle industry and the motor trade, a solution to the problems facing parallel imports as a result of the exclusive nature of the certificate of conformity for motor vehicles. This positive stance on the part of the UK authorities was in part in response to intervention by the Commission. The Commission would like to make it clear that the restrictive practices referred to by the Honourable Member are the responsibility of the manufacturer alone since the administrative practices relating to motor vehicle registration (which is the subject of a wide-ranging investigation by the Commission covering most Member States) are not at issue.

The practices referred to are attributable to certain motor vehicle manufacturers and not to the public authorities in any Member State.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 597/82

by Mrs Le Roux

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 June 1982)

Subject: Lifting of the ban by the USA on dumping radioactive waste at sea

The United States Federal Environmental Protection Agency is preparing to lift the total ban on dumping radioactive waste at sea which has been in force in the United States for 12 years.

1. What consequences may the lifting of this ban have for the Community?
2. Has this matter been considered at official EEC/USA meetings?

3. If not, could this matter be considered at the next meeting between the competent officials of the Commission and the Government of the United States?

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

(7 September 1982)

As the Commission indicated in its reply to the Honourable Member's Oral Question No H-151/82 ⁽¹⁾, no mention was made either during official meetings between the EEC and the United States, or at technical meetings of the attitude of the United States Government towards the disposal of radioactive waste at sea.

The Commission raised the question of a possible lifting of the United States' ban on dumping of radioactive waste at sea with the Office of Radiation Programmes of the US Environment Protection Agency.

The Commission was informed that, while the United States did not ban the dumping of low-level wastes, there was a total ban on the dumping of high-level wastes at sea. The United States Government did not plan to modify the latter.

⁽¹⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-287 (July 1982).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 671/82

by Mrs Buchan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 June 1982)

Subject: Ban on 2,4,5,-T and related substances in the EEC

Is the Commission now in a position to respond to the question of banning 2,4,5,-T and related substances in the EEC?

Would such a ban, if implemented, be confined to the use of 2,4,5,-T within the EEC or would it also include the manufacture of 2,4,5,-T?

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

(10 September 1982)

In its communication of 17 June 1982 to the Council concerning the marketing and use of plant protection products containing 2,4,5,-T ⁽¹⁾, the Commission

⁽¹⁾ COM(82) 332 final.

concluded that, on the basis of existing scientific evidence, a Community-wide prohibition would not be justified.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 673/82

by Mrs Buchan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 June 1982)

Subject: Scientific Committee for Pesticides

Did the Scientific Committee for Pesticides take into account the evidence and recommendations of the British Advisory Committee on Pesticides 9th Report (when preparing the report on the marketing and use of 2,4,5-T), and if so, why is this report not included in the references to the Committee's report?

Answer given by Mr Dalsager
on behalf of the Commission

(9 September 1982)

The Commission presumes, that the Honourable Member is referring to the report entitled 'Further review of the safety for use in the UK of the herbicide 2,4,5-T', published by the UK Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food in December 1980. This was available to the Scientific Committee for Pesticides and is cited under reference (26) of its report.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 677/82

by Mr Seefeld

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 June 1982)

Subject: Safety at airports in the Community

According to press reports (1), the Pilots Association 'Cockpit' has placed half of all civil airports in the Federal Republic of Germany on the black list of the international umbrella organization 'International Federation of Air Line Pilots' (IFALPA). It described the airports in question as 'unsatisfactory' and 'very unsatisfactory' in referring to serious safety defects.

Will the Commission state:

1. How seriously it takes 'Cockpit's' assessment?
2. Whether airports in other EEC States have been similarly criticised?
3. What possibility it sees for measures to improve airports in the Member States, what action it intends to take, and how soon?

Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis
on behalf of the Commission

(2 September 1982)

1. Control of safety at airports in the Member States is a matter for the national administration concerned; they work on the basis of the International Civil Aviation Organization's recommendations, standards and recommended practices.

The Commission is aware that IFALPA prepares a list of airports considered dangerous by the members of its affiliated national pilots' associations.

This is not without value as a means of making known the opinion of one class of users about the level of airport safety.

2. This information is not in the Commission's possession.

3. The Commission has always attached great importance to improving the safety of air transport. It has therefore taken this factor into account when examination aerodrome improvement projects put up for ERDF and EIB support. Neither is it out of the question that the 'Proposal for a Regulation on support for projects of Community interest in transport infrastructure' (1) might in the future be applied to airports and enable consideration to be given to certain investments impinging upon safety.

(1) OJ No C 207, 2 September 1975, as amended by OJ No C 249, 18 October 1977 and OJ No C 89, 10 April 1980.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 684/82

by Mr Pearce

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 June 1982)

Subject: Gas from the Soviet-Union to the Federal Republic of Germany

What view does the Commission take, on strategic and economic grounds, of the current proposals to supply gas

(1) E.g. *Süddeutsche Zeitung* of 18 May 1982, page 5.

from the Soviet Union to the Federal Republic of Germany, bearing in mind the political leverage that this would give to the Soviet Union if it wished to avail itself of it?

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

(9 September 1982)

The Commission has already given information relating to the new contracts for imports of natural gas from the USSR in its answers to the following questions:

Written Question No 1773/80 by Mr Berkhouwer ⁽¹⁾
Written Question No 2056/80 by Mr Damseaux ⁽²⁾
Written Question No 1629/81 by Mr Galland ⁽³⁾
Written Question No 326/82 by Mr Beyer de Ryke ⁽⁴⁾
Oral Question No H-793/80 by Mme Macciocchi ⁽⁵⁾

and also by means of Vice-President Davignon's interventions in the debate in Parliament on 18 February 1982 on Mr de la Malène's motion concerning Soviet gas ⁽⁶⁾.

Natural gas from the USSR, which has the world's largest reserves, offers a means of meeting Community requirements and a measure of diversification away from the Community's much larger dependence on imported oil.

It is estimated that natural gas from the USSR, including the new contracts, would only represent 5.4% of the Federal Republic of Germany's total energy consumption in 1990. The figure for the Community as a whole would be just under 4%, assuming the quantities of gas currently under negotiation were agreed.

The Commission nevertheless recognizes the importance of ensuring the security of natural gas supplies to the Community and proposed a series of measures in its communications to the Energy Councils of October 1981 ⁽⁷⁾ and March 1982 ⁽⁸⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 88, 21. 4. 1981, p. 7.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 222, 2. 9. 1981, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 92, 13. 4. 1982, p. 33.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 198, 2. 8. 1982, p. 24.

⁽⁵⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1 – 269 (March 1981).

⁽⁶⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1 – 280 (February 1982).

⁽⁷⁾ COM(81) 530 final 'communication from the Commission to the Council concerning natural gas'.

⁽⁸⁾ COM(82) 45 final 'communication from the Commission to the Council concerning measures to enhance the security of natural gas supplies to the Community'.

The latter Council noted that the Commission would, after further studies, make more specific proposals for measures to reinforce the security of supplies.

This work, now being carried out in conjunction with officials of Member States, should allow some conclusions to be drawn in time for the November 1982 Energy Council.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 698/82

by Mr Wurtz

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 June 1982)

Subject: Commission survey of EEC iron and steel undertakings

On 11 May, the European Commission published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* a questionnaire addressed to European steel producers which should make it possible to draw up an accurate list of steel undertakings in terms of country and product and assess the state of restructuring in these undertakings.

Can the Commission inform the Members of Parliament as a whole and the committees concerned of the results of this survey and of the ideas and conclusions which it has drawn from it?

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

(9 September 1982)

The question asked by the Honourable Member relates to a survey of the situation of steelworks as at 1 January 1982. This survey was carried out pursuant to Decision No 3302/81/ECSC ⁽¹⁾ on the information to be furnished by steel undertakings pursuant to Article 46, 47 and 54 of the ECSC Treaty.

The survey in question is in progress and the first replies have already been received and will be evaluated as soon as possible. The findings will be particularly useful for shaping the Commission's policy on the restructuring of the steel industry. The conclusions arising from it will be made available in a form which has yet to be decided.

The attention of the Honourable Member is also drawn to the annual survey of investment in the Community

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 333, 20. 11. 1981, p. 35.

coalmining and iron and steel industries which deals with complementary aspects in the same sector. The latest edition was published in November 1981 by the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities ⁽¹⁾ and is available from the Publishing and Distribution Division of the European Parliament, Centre européen, Luxembourg.

⁽¹⁾ Catalogue number CB-33-81-085-EN-C.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 706/82

by Mr Schwartzberg

to the Foreign Ministers of the 10 Member States of the Community meeting in political cooperation

(17 June 1982)

Subject: The situation of the Jewish community in Syria

Can the Foreign Ministers state what representations they have made or intend to make to the Syrian authorities to bring to an end the severe discrimination practised against Syrian citizens of the Jewish faith and to guarantee them genuine equality before the law and the most basic rights, particularly personal security, freedom of religion, access to higher education, and the right to emigrate if they so desire, in accordance with Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?

Answer

(8 September 1982)

The question raised by the Honourable Member has not been discussed in the framework of political cooperation.

Available information suggests that the Syrian Government adopted a decree in late 1976/early 1977 abolishing officially discriminatory provisions previously directed against Syrian citizens of the Jewish faith.

As regards the right of Jews to leave Syria and the right to emigrate, however, the conditions which prevailed before 1976/77 remain the same. That is, they must pay a security when leaving the country. Such security can be demanded of other Syrian citizens, but generally speaking it is compulsory only for Jews. Authorization to emigrate is always required of citizens of the Jewish faith as well as of a certain number of other groups in the population according to criteria relating to age and profession.

The Ten will continue to follow closely the situation of Jews in Syria and in other countries.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 733/82

by Mrs Théobald-Paoli

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 June 1982)

Subject: Relations between the European Community and China in the field of research and technology

When a group of Chinese experts visited the Commission last November they expressed keen interest in cooperation on research and technology in agriculture, energy (and the use of raw materials) and communications.

Has the Commission drafted a cooperation programme with China in these areas?

Can Vice-President Davignon's visit to China be viewed as the prelude to a series of very high level meetings between representatives of the Community and China?

Answer given by Mr Haferkamp on behalf of the Commission

(10 September 1982)

Mr Davignon's visit to China (from 12 to 19 June) is one in a series of high-level meetings between the Commission and the Chinese Government inaugurated by Sir Christopher Soames in 1975.

This visit enabled existing contacts to be pursued and provided a new impetus for relations between the two sides, particularly in the field of science and technology.

In response to the Community's offer, the Chinese authorities showed their interest in exchanging information on methods relating to the forward planning, organization, management and evaluation of research programmes.

The contacts on this subject and on other cooperation topics (for example, research in the energy field) will be continued in the second half of 1982.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 734/82**by Mrs Théobald-Paoli****to the Commission of the European Communities***(17 June 1982)*

Subject: Measures taken by the Japanese Government to promote imports of manufactured goods to Japan

Can the Commission give details, point by point, of its opinion on the measures taken by the Japanese Government to promote imports of manufactured goods to Japan, which were adopted in anticipation of the forthcoming Versailles Summit of industrialized countries and announced at the 'Quadrilateral' meeting of 12 and 13 May at the Chateau d'Esclimont?

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

(8 September 1982)

On 28 May the Japanese Government published a second series of measures intended to open up the Japanese market more to goods from its trading partners.

There are three aspects to these measures:

(a) Customs duties and quotas.

As regards customs duties, 96 duties will be eliminated and 119 will be reduced on 1 April 1983. The tariff headings concerned are, however, in most cases partial headings only ('ex' headings), and half the reductions will be Tokyo Round reductions applied ahead of schedule. The value of Japanese imports from the Community affected by these amendments (approximately 8%) was 152 000 million yen in 1981. The main products of interest for the Community are cut diamonds (elimination of 3.1% duty), Butadiene (elimination of 6.6% duty), certain machine tools (elimination of duties ranging from 7% to 4%) and, in the case of reductions, certain computer components (reduction of 10% - 7% duties to 6% - 4.9%) and tyres (reduction of existing rates of 5.8% or 6.6% to 4%). The size of these changes does not meet the requests made by the Community, for instance in the list which it submitted to the Japanese authorities in December 1981. The changes in the food sector are particularly insignificant.

As regards quotas, there are no changes for the shoe and leather sector, which is of particular interest to European firms. The impact on European exports of the quotas changes for pigmeat preserves is difficult to assess.

(b) General measures.

These are indications of intention or action in a number of non-tariff fields, such as technical standards, authorization for retailers to sell imported cigarettes and tobacco, difficulties relating to distribution networks and, even financial and banking activities; although these indications of intent or action appear to reflect awareness of the difficulties, it is nevertheless difficult to evaluate their effect, pending the implementation in practice of the measures announced (for example as regards the well-known difficulties connected with distribution networks).

(c) Statement by the Prime Minister.

The packet of measures was accompanied by a statement by the Prime Minister, Mr Suzuki, asking those who are engaged in everyday economic activities to extend a welcoming hand to foreign-manufactured goods and investments and to give the maximum assistance to foreign firms in their efforts to develop products which will meet market conditions.

The Commission considers that the recent Japanese measures reflect a greater awareness by the Japanese Government of the imbalance between its exports of manufactured products and its imports and of the resulting need for efforts to improve the situation. These measures, which follow those announced at the beginning of the year, are a further step in the right direction.

These measures will not, however, be sufficient to have a rapid or radical effect on the trade imbalance. In view of the Community's requests to Japan and the importance of the Japanese economy in the world, and consequently its responsibilities in maintaining the world economic and trade system, further progress remains to be made.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 794/82**by Mr Prag**

**to the Foreign Ministers of the 10 Member States of the
European Economic Community meeting in political
cooperation**

(29 June 1982)

Subject: Implementation of crisis procedures

Will the Foreign Ministers list those meetings that have been convened of:

(a) Ministers,

(b) the Political Committee,
 (c) heads of mission in third countries,
 in accordance with paragraph 13 of the London Report,
 together with dates and principal subjects discussed?

Answer

(8 September 1982)

According to paragraph 13 of the London report, the Political Committee or, if necessary, a ministerial meeting will convene within 48 hours at the request of three Member States. The same procedure will apply in third countries at the level of heads of mission. This procedure has been applied for the Poland, the Falkland and the Middle-East crises.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 797/82

by Mr Blancy

to the Commission of the European Communities

(29 June 1982)

Subject: Development of coastal areas and state of fish stocks

Has the Commission presented a report to the Council on the economic and social development of coastal areas of the Member States and on the state of fish stocks?

Has the Commission tabled proposals, on the basis of this report and in keeping with the objectives of a common fisheries policy, regarding the measures to come into force following the expiration of the existing derogations, which apply until 31 December 1982?

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

(2 September 1982)

As the Commission has already stated in its answer to Written Question No 1136/79 by Miss Quin ⁽¹⁾, it considers that its communication of 23 September 1976 and its proposals of 6 October 1976 on the common fisheries policy ⁽²⁾ satisfied the requirements of Article 103 of the Act of Accession. The Commission has

updated these documents by its modified proposal of 11 June 1982 for a Council Regulation establishing a Community system for the conservation and management of fishery resources ⁽¹⁾. In the explanatory memorandum to this proposal the Commission has described the underlying objectives of the common fisheries policy taking account of the economic and social development of coastal areas of the Member States and the state of stocks.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(82) 368 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 798/82

by Mrs Lizin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(29 June 1982)

Subject: Status of welfare nurses in Belgium

Having regard to Community legislation, can the Commission state what will from now on be the status of welfare nurses in Belgium?

Will their diplomas be recognized?

Has Belgium made all the necessary legal arrangements?

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

(2 September 1982)

At present, there are no EEC Directives on nurses other than Directives 77/452/EEC and 77/453/EEC on nurses responsible, for general care ⁽¹⁾. The Belgian diploma of 'infirmier social' is not therefore required to be recognized in other Member States under EEC legislation, nor is Belgium required to take any implementing legislation in respect of this category of nurse.

The remit of the Advisory Committee on Training in Nursing, set up on adoption of Directives 77/452/EEC and 77/453/EEC, includes within its terms, the training of 'the various categories of nursing personnel' throughout the Community. The Committee is at present examining the training programmes of other categories of nurse, particularly the psychiatric nurse, but has not as yet broached the subject of Belgian 'infirmier social'.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 176, 15. 7. 1977.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 167, 7. 7. 1980, p. 4.

⁽²⁾ Doc. COM(76) 500 final and COM(75) 535 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 802/82**by Mr Marck****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 July 1982)**Subject: Community food aid*

Can the Commission indicate:

1. How far the World Food Council and the World Health Organization were involved in, or consulted on, the drafting of the Community's food-aid programme?
2. How far the available food supplies within the Community and the actual needs of the problem areas were taken into account during the drafting of the programme?
3. Whether there are grounds for the claim that there are significant gaps in the Community's overall food programme as regards supplies of animal proteins, a situation which has led not only to an intolerably high rate of infant mortality but also to serious consequences for the normal growth and development of children?
4. How far the specific food shortages in each of the countries and areas chosen to receive food aid were taken into account in the allocation of available food aid?

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

(8 September 1982)

1. The yearly food-aid programmes are drawn up in close cooperation with the FAO (the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization) on all points relating to recipients' needs, determined with regard to local production, commercial imports and aid from other donors. Similar consultation takes place with the WHO (World Health Organization) on nutritional questions, including vitamin requirements.
- 2 and 4. For a number of years now the Commission has been endeavouring, in the light of the kind of food-aid requests being submitted by recipients, to improve its food-aid programmes both quantitatively and qualitatively. It has long been pressing for increases in the amount of cereals to be made available, for instance. In qualitative terms, the aid is as far as possible being geared ever more closely to the dietary habits of the recipients; millet, beans and so on will be sent even though they are not always to be had on the Community market, and must be bought on the world market.
3. The animal proteins which the Community is able to supply to counter malnutrition are mainly in the form of milk powder. The quantity of milk powder supplied by

the Community as food aid can be regarded as adequate, given the developing countries' distribution capacity, and covers a considerable proportion of the recipient countries' protein requirements. Contrary to the misgivings expressed by the Honourable Member, the Community is far and away the largest regular donor of animal protein food aid. One of the big problems of malnutrition, however, is that proteins can only be properly assimilated where there is no calorie deficit.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 806/82**by Mr Lomas and Mr Megahy****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 July 1982)**Subject: Spanish accession*

Spain has recently put forward a document to the Community confirming that it would like a 10-year transition period in which to align its tariff levels to those of the Common External Tariff, and also a 10-year transition period regarding tariff concessions given to third countries of the Community.

What is the Commission's view on this request and would a similar 10-year transition period be considered regarding movement of labour, capital and goods into Gibraltar?

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

(8 September 1982)

It is correct that Spain has requested a period of application approaching 10 years for transitional measures in connection with the elimination of customs duties between Spain and the other Member States, the alignment of Spanish customs duties on the Common Customs Tariff (CCT) and, in principle, the alignment of Spanish duties on the preferential tariff arrangements applied by the Community. Spain also considers that the period of application of the transitional measures should be the same for all chapters in which provision is made for such measures, including agriculture.

The Community, on the other hand, has consistently maintained that the period of application of the transitional measures should be tailored in each case to the problems arising. It has already been agreed in the negotiating conference that in the capital movements

chapter, for example, real estate investments in the present Member States by residents of Spain will be liberalized five years after accession and that operations involving securities will be liberalized after three years.

The Community feels, however, that the period of application for the different transitional measures to be agreed concerning tariff adjustments in the industrial field should be the same in all cases. The Conference has not yet reached agreement on this point.

Generally speaking, the transitional measures will apply to relations between Spain and Gibraltar, as no special transitional arrangements are envisaged. It should be pointed out, however, that Gibraltar is not part of the customs territory of the Community and that the common agricultural policy and Community turnover tax rules do not apply to it.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 809/82

by Mrs Squarcialupi

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 July 1982)

Subject: Application in the Member States of the Directive on the conservation of bird life

In its reply to my Written Question No 2266/80 on the Member States' compliance with the Community Directive on the conservation of bird life, the Commission stated that it was examining the texts forwarded by the Member States and would if necessary initiate the procedures laid down in the Treaty for failure by the Member States to apply the Directive or fully incorporate it in their law.

One year after this answer, can the Commission give the results of its examination of the texts with particular reference to Italy?

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission

(2 September 1982)

The Commission considers that Italy has failed to apply Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds⁽¹⁾ satisfactorily and has therefore initiated infringement proceedings against that Member State.

The Commission is keeping a very close watch on the application of the Directive. Before long a number of other Member States will soon face infringement proceedings.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 812/82

by Mr Prout

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 July 1982)

Subject: Competition procedures

The Commission states in the Eleventh Report that it is in principle prepared to allow access to the file in competition cases. This is a welcome answer to requests for improvements to the procedures which have been made in the Parliament and elsewhere. Would the Commission confirm:

- (a) that access would be permitted in all cases;
- (b) that the public interest and rights of defence require that parties are aware at all times of any accusations made against them and that in order to minimise misunderstandings of fact and evidence and to avoid unnecessary proceedings, the Commission will allow firms whose activities are under investigation the maximum opportunity practicable to discuss the case with the officials concerned and to examine the dossier (subject to confidentiality of third-party business secrets)?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission

(2 September 1982)

The Commission confirms that, subject to the confidentiality of the business secrets of other companies and of the Commission's own documents, it allows every firm involved in a procedure to have access to the file on its particular case. Access is granted to the firms concerned once they have received the statement of objections provided for in Article 19 (1) of Regulation No 17⁽¹⁾, which normally indicates the initiation of the procedure against them.

The Commission would point out that although its administrative procedures are essentially conducted in writing, in practice it operates an open-door policy towards the firms involved. The oral hearing, as envisaged by the rules in force, provides an opportunity for clarifying certain matters which have not been settled during the written procedure. Where appropriate, the Commission also makes every effort to see that questions of fact are clarified in advance of the hearing.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 103, 25. 4. 1979.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 13, 21. 2. 1962, p. 204/62 (English version: OJ Special Edition 1959-1962).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 825/82**by Mr Prag****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 July 1982)*

Subject: Action to help those suffering from multiple sclerosis

Will the Commission state what action is taken by the Member States to help those suffering from multiple sclerosis, and what degree of coordination the Commission has been able to achieve?

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

(9 September 1982)

Multiple sclerosis is a neurological disease characterized by cycles of remission and recurrence. The cause is still unknown and there is no specific treatment. The disease is frequently the cause of increasing disability and handicap. Rehabilitation is an important part of the care of patients with multiple sclerosis and this is an element of the Action Programme on Social Integration of Disabled People.

The Commission has been involved in coordinating epidemiologic studies on the prevalence of multiple sclerosis in Scotland, Denmark, Italy, Malta, Greece and France. The aim of these studies is, by comparison between countries with varying levels of the disease, to find clues which might lead to a better understanding of the cause of the disease and methods for its prevention.

The International Federation of Multiple Sclerosis Societies is very active in coordinating activities in Europe and throughout the World. Arising out of the Action Programme on the Social Integration of Disabled People, the Commission is seeking to establish links with this and other organizations of similar objectives working at Community level.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 827/82**by Mr Cousté****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 July 1982)*

Subject: Increase in interest rates on credit granted to the USSR

In its answer of 29 April 1982 to Written Question No 10/82 ⁽¹⁾ concerning the increase in interest rates on credit granted to the USSR and the policy applied in this

matter by the Community, the Commission said that negotiations would begin shortly but it was at that time unable to provide any further details.

Is the Commission now in a position, two months later, to provide further details and, if not, when will it be able to do so?

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

(8 September 1982)

The negotiations conducted by the Commission with the participants to the Arrangement on Guidelines for Officially Supported Export Credits have now been concluded.

The reclassification of the USSR among Category 1 buyer countries and the increase in interest rates for that category mean that henceforward the interest rate applicable to transactions with the USSR has been raised to 12.15 % for export credits with a repayment term of two to five years to 12.4 % for credits over five to eight and a half years.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 829/82**by Mr Nyborg****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 July 1982)*

Subject: Damage caused by storm tides in Denmark

Can the Commission explain why the delegation of officials who visited Denmark to inspect the damage caused by storm tides in southern Jutland in November 1981 did not go any higher than Esbjerg, although the most serious damage to the coast occurred some 75 km further north?

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

(2 September 1982)

The purpose of sending delegations of Commission officials to areas which have been granted emergency aid is not to obtain a detailed assessment of the damage caused by the disaster.

Their function is to ensure, in conjunction with the competent national authorities, that the aid is put to the best possible use.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 138, 1. 6. 1982, p. 14.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 835/82**by Mr Schwartzberg****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 July 1982)**Subject:* Obstacles to trade created by German insurance companies

German insurance companies require certain industrial products to bear certificates stating that they conform to certain technical standards (DIN) before they can be marketed in the Federal Republic of Germany. Unless products originating in other Member States meet these requirements, their users cannot insure them. The products in question are, in most cases, imported capital equipment.

Does the Commission not consider that this practice constitutes an ingenious but effective form of camouflaged protectionism designed to give German industry an advantage on the domestic market?

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

(2 September 1982)

The Commission is collecting the information it needs to answer the Honourable Member's questions.

It will inform him of its findings as soon as possible.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 840/82**by Mrs Le Roux****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 July 1982)**Subject:* Use of co-responsibility funds

Can the Commission say what proportion of co-responsibility funds has remained unused each year and how these sums were eventually allocated?

In particular, can it say what use has been or is to be made of the 230 million ECU left over at the end of 1981 and which it has refused to bring forward to 1982?

In view of this situation, does the Commission not think that it should make proposals for the abolition of the co-responsibility levy?

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

(10 September 1982)

The table below gives figures for revenue from the co-responsibility levy and for expenditure consequent upon specific measures adopted under the programmes for the use of levy funds in the milk sector:

(million ECU)

	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Revenue	24.1	156.1	94.2	222.9	478.5
Expenditure	7.5	53.4	110.3	109.4	217.1 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Includes a sum of 100 million ECU carried over to 1982 as a contribution towards financing special sales of skimmed-milk powder in sectors other than calf feed.

Revenue not used to finance specific measures has been used to supplement EAGGF, Guarantee Section, expenditure in the milk and milk products sector, including the financing of schemes already in operation and considered as priority measures, namely:

- improving the conditions under which milk products are exported,
- measures to facilitate the sale of butter,
- aid for skimmed-milk powder.

In view of the current surpluses in the milk sector, the Commission does not consider it appropriate to propose abolishing the co-responsibility levy.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 849/82**by Mr Robert Jackson****to the Foreign Ministers of the 10 Member States of the European Economic Community meeting in political cooperation***(8 July 1982)**Subject: Hunger strike in USSR*

1. Is the conference of Foreign Ministers aware of the hunger strike being carried out in the USSR by Mrs Tatyana Lozanskaya, Yuri Balovlenkov, Tatyana Azure, and Josif Kiblitky, who have been denied exit visas from the Soviet Union?

2. Will the President-in-Office add these names to the alas, already too long, list of cases to be taken up with the Soviet authorities in the context of the Helsinki review?

Answer*(8 September 1982)*

The Foreign Ministers of the Ten closely follow the development of the hunger strike in the Soviet Union mentioned by the Honourable Member, as well as other family reunification cases.

Tatyana Lozanskaya and Tatyana Azure have been promised exit-visas by the Soviet authorities and have subsequently stopped their hunger strike. For the time being an exit-visa has been refused to Yuri Balovlenkov for alleged security reasons. Mr Kiblitky left the USSR August 3, 1982, to be reunited with his family in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Within the framework of political cooperation the Foreign Ministers of the Ten make continuous assessments of the situation with a view to securing the implementation of all the commitments of the Helsinki Final Act. In the course of the whole CSCE process the Ten have given special attention to these crucial questions. They will continue doing so at the Madrid CSCE follow-up meeting, which resumes 9 November 1982.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 854/82**by Mr Jürgens****to the Commission of the European Communities***(8 July 1982)**Subject: Pollution of the North Sea by oil, including waste oil*

1. Within the framework of the future Community environmental policy, what approach is envisaged by the

Commission, and what measures does it intend to take, to help combat oil pollution of the North Sea, in particular the Waddenzee, an area of unique biological value in Europe? Does the Commission consider the measures envisaged to date to be adequate?

2. Does the Commission agree that the disposal of waste oil in the sea, because there are no facilities for this purpose in many Community ports, is no longer acceptable, and will it immediately take measures to allow and prescribe disposal in the ports?

**Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission***(2 September 1982)*

1. The Commission is concerned (a) about oil discharged into the North Sea from land-based sources and from drilling and production platforms and (b) about discharges from ships.

Where the first category of discharges is concerned, the Commission takes part in the work undertaken under the Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution from Land-based Sources, to which the EEC is a Contracting Party ⁽¹⁾. The Commission will endeavour to ensure that this work is pursued with vigour, in particular in relation to refinery discharges. Where appropriate, the Commission will prepare proposals for submission to the Council under Directive 76/464/EEC of 4 May 1979 on pollution caused by certain dangerous substances discharged into the aquatic environment of the Community ⁽²⁾.

The Commission is also responsible for the implementation of Council Directive 75/439/EEC of 16 June 1975 on the disposal of waste oils ⁽³⁾.

With a view to preventing and controlling pollution caused by discharges from ships, the Commission is taking the action envisaged in its communication to the Council of 26 June 1980 on a plan to combat oil pollution of the sea, on which the European Parliament expressed its opinion on 16 January 1981 ⁽⁴⁾.

In this connection, the Commission is taking appropriate steps to implement the information system established by the Council on 3 December 1981 ⁽⁵⁾. It is putting the finishing touches to proposals concerning the drawing-up of contingency plans for emergencies, and is making arrangements for support for pilot schemes to combat pollution.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 194, 25. 7. 1975, p. 5.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 129, 18. 5. 1976, p. 23.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 194, 25. 7. 1975, p. 23.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 28, 9. 2. 1981, p. 55.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 355, 10. 12. 1981, p. 52.

The Commission also intends to make a contribution towards preventing pollution of the North Sea caused by oils discharges. To this end, it has submitted a proposal for a Directive concerning the enforcement, in respect of shipping using Community ports, of international standards for shipping safety and pollution prevention ⁽¹⁾. This proposal, on which Parliament gave a favourable opinion on 16 January 1981 ⁽²⁾ has not yet been approved by the Council, but quite a few of its provisions have been included in the Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control of Ships which was signed on 26 January 1982 by the maritime authorities of 14 European States, and took effect on 1 July 1982. A Commission representative sits on the Committee responsible for ensuring the correct application of the Memorandum.

The Commission is also responsible for the application of Council Directive 79/115/EEC of 21 December 1978 concerning pilotage of vessels by deep-sea pilots in the North Sea and English Channel ⁽³⁾ and Council Directive 79/116/EEC, also of 21 December 1978 concerning minimum requirements for certain tankers entering or leaving Community ports ⁽⁴⁾.

The Community also has another means of controlling pollution caused by oil discharges: the Directives adopted by the Council with a view to improving water quality. Two of these relate to the marine environment: Directive 76/160/EEC of 8 December 1975, concerning the quality of bathing water ⁽⁵⁾ and Directive 79/923/EEC of 30 October 1979 on the quality required of shellfish waters ⁽⁶⁾. Under Article 13 of Directive 76/160/EEC, the Member States submit regularly to the Commission reports on bathing water and the most significant characteristics thereof. After prior consent has been obtained from the Member States the Commission publishes the information obtained.

2. The Commission is of the opinion that oil should be discharged at sea only in strict conformity with the MARPOL Convention, as amended by the 1978 Protocol, once this Convention enters into force, probably in 1983. The Commission is aware that this requires the installation in ports of facilities for receiving and treating waste oil, particularly in the Mediterranean area. In this connection, the Commission is having a study carried out into the technical and economic

feasibility of establishing or modernizing such facilities in the main Mediterranean ports and oil terminals. This study will be completed before the end of 1982.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 872/82

by Mr Tyrrell

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 July 1982)

Subject: Right of establishment of doctors

1. Will the Commission state the number of doctors who have exercised or are exercising the right of establishment under Directives 75/362/EEC ⁽¹⁾ and 75/363/EEC ⁽²⁾ according to the Member State of origin and the host Member State?
2. What transitional arrangements have been proposed regarding the implementation of Directives 75/362/EEC and 75/363/EEC in respect of the accession to the Community of Spain and Portugal?
3. What enquiries have the Commission made, and with what result, regarding the professional qualifications in each acceding Member State in fulfilment of Articles 1, 2 and 3 of Directive 75/363/EEC?
4. Has the Commission any knowledge of enquiries by a Member State concerning the authenticity of diplomas as provided for in Article 22 of Directive 75/362/EEC?
5. Does the Commission propose that transitional arrangements will be appropriate for Spain and Portugal at the time of their accession in order to ensure that the standards laid down in 75/362/EEC and 75/363/EEC can be fulfilled?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 167, 30. 6. 1975, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 167, 30. 6. 1975, p. 14.

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

(2 September 1982)

1. In the Bulletin of the European Communities Nos 9-1978, 12-1979, 3-1981 and 12-1981 the Commission published statistics on the migrations of doctors under Directives 75/362/EEC and 75/363/EEC for the years 1977, 1978, 1979 and 1980. The data for 1981 should be available by the end of 1982 and will also be published in the Bulletin. These data show the total number of migrant doctors settling in a Member State and also a breakdown by nationality and by country of issue of their diplomas.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 192, 30. 7. 1980, p. 8.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 28, 9. 2. 1981, p. 52.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 33, 8. 2. 1979, p. 32.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 33, 8. 2. 1979, p. 33.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 31, 5. 2. 1976, p. 1.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ No L 281, 10. 11. 1979, p. 47.

2 and 5. With respect to Directives 75/362/EEC and 75/363/EEC, the two applicant countries have agreed to accept the *acquis communautaire* without reservation from the date of their accession, i.e. they have declared their willingness to make any necessary amendments by that date to the national provisions in force to bring the into line with the requirements of the two Directives mentioned above. Consequently, no transitional arrangement has been requested either by Spain or Portugal or by the Community.

3. In the course of the accession negotiations, the Commission has collected data on the qualifications of doctors in Spain and Portugal. Generally-speaking, the medical diplomas and some of the diplomas in medical specializations conferred under regulations currently in force appear to comply with Articles 1, 2 and 3 of Directive 75/363/EEC.

4. The procedures set out in Article 22 of Directive 75/362/EEC take place via bilateral contacts between the Member States concerned. To date no complaints have been made to the Commission regarding difficulties encountered in this sphere.

did not apply, however, to the release for free circulation of products accompanied by import documents issued before the date of its entry into force, or to be imported pursuant to contracts concluded before that date or *en route* to the Community at that date.

In adopting those arrangements, the Community wished to take into account its obligations and legitimate commercial interests involved.

As indicated in the first paragraph, the suspension of imports was not selective, covering as it did all products originating in Argentina.

It is not possible to indicate the total volume of trade affected by the suspension measure since other factors also had an influence on trade, and it is difficult to evaluate the relative importance of the factors involved. Those other factors include the disruption caused by the military operations – this applies both to Argentina and to its neighbours – and the collapse of the Argentinian market as a result of the hostilities.

The Commission does not envisage any special aid to Community firms in this context.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 904/82

by Mr Beyer de Ryke

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 July 1982)

Subject: Economic sanctions against Argentina

From the beginning of April until 22 June trade sanctions were imposed against Argentina by the Council of Ministers of the Ten.

Can the Commission indicate the total volume of trade held up by this embargo and the main economic and industrial sectors affected?

Can it also indicate whether it is considering granting special aid to undertakings which suffered a loss of earnings as a result of the embargo?

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

(10 September 1982)

Between 16 April and 22 June the importation for release for free circulation in the Community of all products originating in Argentina was suspended. That suspension

WRITTEN QUESTION No 905/82

by Mr Beyer de Ryke

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 July 1982)

Subject: Situation in Gibraltar

Monday 21 June, on the occasion of a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Ten, talks were held between the United Kingdom and Spanish Ministers on the situation in Gibraltar.

Could the Council state whether it intends to explore the possibilities of a European solution to the problem?

Answer (*)

(8 September 1982)

The Foreign Ministers of the Ten have not discussed the possibility of playing a role in the Gibraltar problem.

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

