

English edition

Information and Notices

<u>Notice No</u>	<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
	I Information	
	European Parliament	
	<i>Written Questions with answer:</i>	
84/C 188/01	No 1490/83 by Mrs Barbara Castle to the Commission Subject: Transport of live animals	1
84/C 188/02	No 1516/83 by Mr Pol Marck to the Commission Subject: Community dairy policy	1
84/C 188/03	No 1592/83 by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté to the Commission Subject: Appropriations earmarked for preparations for the European elections	2
84/C 188/04	No 1647/83 by Mr Karel De Gucht to the Commission Subject: Approval of the budgets of the European Schools	3
84/C 188/05	No 1855/83 by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté to the Commission Subject: Common market in radio and television	3
84/C 188/06	No 1857/83 by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté to the Commission Subject: Common European telecommunications policy	4
84/C 188/07	No 1871/83 by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck to the Commission Subject: Oil pollution of the North Sea by the discharge of waste materials from tankers at sea	4
84/C 188/08	No 1936/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Shipbuilding's importance to regional employment	5
84/C 188/09	No 1937/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Unemployment amongst older workers in shipbuilding areas	6
84/C 188/10	No 1938/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Youth unemployment in shipbuilding areas	6
84/C 188/11	No 1939/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Male unemployment in shipbuilding areas	6

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
84/C 188/12	No 1940/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Unemployment in EEC shipbuilding areas	7
84/C 188/13	No 1941/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: European employment in shipbuilding	7
84/C 188/14	No 1942/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Rates of pay in shipbuilding	7
84/C 188/15	No 1943/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Trades unions concerned in shipbuilding	7
84/C 188/16	No 1944/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Membership of the EEC Shipbuilders Linking Committee	8
84/C 188/17	No 1945/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Corporate structure, size and products of private sector shipyard concerns	8
84/C 188/18	No 1946/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Shipbuilding yards in Europe	8
84/C 188/19	No 1947/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Ownership structure of shipbuilding	8
84/C 188/20	No 1948/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Total EEC employment deriving from shipbuilding	8
84/C 188/21	No 1949/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Employment in the shipbuilding industry	8
84/C 188/22	No 1950/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Employment in the shipping industry	8
84/C 188/23	No 1951/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Shipping industry's home credit support scheme	9
84/C 188/24	No 1952/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Role of the EIB in shipbuilding investment	9
84/C 188/25	No 1953/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: ERDF investments in shipbuilding	9
84/C 188/26	No 1954/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Shipbuilding and vessel environmental standards	9
84/C 188/27	No 1955/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: EEC achievements in shipbuilding	9
84/C 188/28	No 1956/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: New measures to safeguard shipbuilding	10
84/C 188/29	No 1957/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Acquisition of information on the maritime industries	10
84/C 188/30	No 1958/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Commission 'task force' for a shipbuilding survival plan	10
84/C 188/31	No 1959/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Adapting of ECSC measures to shipbuilding	10
84/C 188/32	No 1960/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Specialization as a response to the shipbuilding crisis	10

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
84/C 188/33	No 1961/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Incentives to establish new business in shipbuilding areas	10
84/C 188/34	No 1962/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Establishment of new industry in shipbuilding areas	11
84/C 188/35	No 1963/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Investment in the shipbuilding industry	11
84/C 188/36	No 1964/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Korea's political determination to dominate shipbuilding	11
84/C 188/37	No 1965/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Korea's use of shipbuilding as a foreign currency earner	11
84/C 188/38	No 1966/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Korean expansion in shipbuilding	11
84/C 188/39	No 1967/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Wage rates in Korean shipbuilding	11
84/C 188/40	No 1968/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Hours worked in Korean shipbuilding	12
84/C 188/41	No 1969/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Trade unions in Korean shipyards	12
84/C 188/42	No 1970/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Work in Korean shipyards as an alternative to military service	12
84/C 188/43	No 1971/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Korean shipowners' participation in world markets	12
84/C 188/44	No 1972/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: EEC-Japan relations	12
84/C 188/45	No 1973/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Trade unions in Japanese shipyards	12
84/C 188/46	No 1974/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Participation of Japanese shipowners in world markets	12
84/C 188/47	No 1975/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Share of 1983 new order intake	12
84/C 188/48	No 1976/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Participation of US shipowners in world markets	13
84/C 188/49	No 1977/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Organization of Asian shipbuilding	13
84/C 188/50	No 1978/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: World shipbuilding capacity	13
84/C 188/51	No 1979/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Shipbuilding output	13
84/C 188/52	No 1980/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Lead time to reconstruct a shipbuilding industry	13

(Continued overleaf)

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
84/C 188/53	No 1981/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Community trade as a proportion of world trade	14
84/C 188/54	No 1982/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Community and Member States' seaborne trade as a fraction of gross domestic product	14
84/C 188/55	No 1983/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: States' total and seaborne trade as a fraction of gross domestic product	14
84/C 188/56	No 1984/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: European Community reliance on seaborne trade, economic sectors	14
84/C 188/57	No 1985//83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Relationship between economic growth and trade growth	14
84/C 188/58	No 1986/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Economic and strategic importance of the merchant fleet	14
84/C 188/59	No 1987/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: The ability of the current level of European shipbuilding capacity to respond to likely future demand	15
84/C 188/60	No 1988/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Capacity of world and States' shipping	15
84/C 188/61	No 1989/83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Economic and strategic importance of shipbuilding	15
84/C 188/62	No 1991//83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: EEC funding of shipbuilding research and development	15
84/C 188/63	No 1993//83 by Ms Joyce Quin to the Commission Subject: Shipbuilding 'scrap and build' policy	15
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1936/83 to 1989/83, 1991/83 and 1993/83 by Ms Quin	15
84/C 188/64	No 2020/83 by Mr Otmar Franz to the Commission Subject: Cattenom nuclear power station	19
84/C 188/65	No 2035/83 by Mr Dieter Rogalla to the Commission Subject: Manning levels in the Commission	20
84/C 188/66	No 2081/83 by Mr Aart Geurtsen to the Commission Subject: Situation on the medicinal products market	21
84/C 188/67	No 2086/83 by Mr Alfred Lomas to the Commission Subject: Restrictions on importation of certain products from the Federal Republic of Germany	22
84/C 188/68	No 2101/83 by Mr Olaf Schwenke to the Commission Subject: Right to lead guided tours in the EC	22
84/C 188/69	No 2154/83 by Mr Gerhard Schmid to the Commission Subject: ERDF aid	23
84/C 188/70	No 2168/83 by Mr Spyridon Plaskovitis to the Commission Subject: Granting of special economic aid to regions of Greece affected by natural disasters ...	23

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
84/C 188/71	No 2180/83 by Mr Nikolaos Vgenopoulos to the Commission Subject: Irregularities in the administration of the common agricultural policy	24
84/C 188/72	No 2183/83 by Mr Horst Seefeld to the Commission Subject: French law of 31 December 1975 on the compulsory use of the French language in trade	24
84/C 188/73	No 2186/83 by Mr Dieter Rogalla to the Commission Subject: Customs union – Community administration	25
84/C 188/74	No 2189/83 by Mr Dieter Rogalla to the Commission Subject: Customs authority premises at Community internal frontiers	26
84/C 188/75	No 2210/83 by Mr Pol Marck to the Commission Subject: Recruitment of successful candidates in examinations	26
84/C 188/76	No 2216/83 by Mr Erik Blumenfeld to the Commission Subject: East-West Trade	27
84/C 188/77	No 2220/83 by Mr Dieter Rogalla to the Commission Subject: The levying of customs and excise duties where small sums are involved	27
84/C 188/78	No 2222/83 by Mr Dimitrios Adamou to the Commission Subject: The threat to the survival of the Greek wood-processing industry	28
84/C 188/79	No 2223/83 by Mr Alexandros Alavanos to the Commission Subject: A new blow dealt by the Commission to the Greek iron and steel industry	28
84/C 188/80	No 2227/83 by Mr Robert Moreland to the Commission Subject: Potential of the ceramic industries in China	29
84/C 188/81	No 2239/83 by Mr Jens-Peter Bonde to the Commission Subject: Danish Information Office	29
84/C 188/82	No 2253/83 by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin to the Commission Subject: Inspection of public and private slaughterhouses in Belgium and related delays in this country	30
84/C 188/83	No 2255/83 by Mrs Raymonde Dury to the Commission Subject: Known undesirable effects on two anti-inflammatory drugs currently on the market ...	30
84/C 188/84	No 16/84 by Mrs Raymonde Dury to the Commission Subject: Restriction of the use of two commercial anti-inflammatory drugs	31
84/C 188/85	No 2266/83 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Commission Subject: Special EEC aid for areas of Belgium affected by catastrophic flooding	31
84/C 188/86	No 2268/83 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Commission Subject: Brussels – Extensions of the EEC buildings	32
84/C 188/87	No 2287/83 by Mr George Patterson to the Commission Subject: Safety of private swimming pools	32
84/C 188/88	No 2289/83 by Sir Fred Warner to the Commission Subject: Social Fund guidelines	33

(Continued overleaf)

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
84/C 188/89	No 2291/83 by Mr David Curry to the Commission Subject: Application of Community dairy sector measures to producer processors	33
84/C 188/90	No 2309/83 by Mr Gérard Fuchs to the Commission Subject: Functioning of the GSP	34
84/C 188/91	No 2319/83 by Mr Michael Welsh to the Council Subject: Remarks by the President-in-Office of the Council to the US Congressional Delegation to the European Parliament	34
84/C 188/92	No 2329/83 by Lord O'Hagan to the Commission Subject: Tachographs	35
84/C 188/93	No 2343/83 by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin to the Commission Subject: Subsidized coach service between Belgium and Greece	35
84/C 188/94	No 2360/83 by Mrs Henriette Poirer to the Commission Subject: Imports of maize gluten from the United States	36
84/C 188/95	No 2361/83 by Mr Maurice Martin to the Commission Subject: Wine harvest declarations	36
84/C 188/96	No 2367/83 by Mr Basil de Ferranti to the Commission Subject: Car purchasers throughout Europe	37
84/C 188/97	No 2392/83 by Mr Basil de Ferranti to the Commission Subject: Temporary staff in Germany	38
84/C 188/98	No 4/84 by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté to the Commission Subject: Early retirement and unemployment	38
84/C 188/99	No 90/84 by Mr Guy Fernandez to the Commission Subject: Establishment of young farmers	39
84/C 188/100	No 91/84 by Mr Guy Fernandez to the Commission Subject: Establishment of young farmers	39
84/C 188/101	No 123/84 by Mr Doeke Eisma to the Commission Subject: Reprocessing of radioactive waste in the USA	39
84/C 188/102	No 143/84 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Council Subject: Iran-Iraq war – Gulf oil dependence of EEC countries – Straits of Hormuz	40
84/C 188/103	No 151/84 by Mr Christopher Jackson to the Commission Subject: Absence of a common organization of the market for potatoes	40
84/C 188/104	No 195/84 by Mr Willy Vernimmen to the Council Subject: Agricultural structures	41
84/C 188/105	No 198/84 by Mr Willy Vernimmen to the Council Subject: Community loans to provide balance-of-payments support	41
84/C 188/106	No 331/84 by Mrs Gloria Hooper to the Commission Subject: Opening of shops on Sundays	42

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1490/83

by Mrs Barbara Castle (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 December 1983)

(84/C 188/01)

Subject: Transport of live animals

Further to my Written Question No 1844/82 ⁽¹⁾ would the Commission say when it will be issuing a report on the outcome of its study of the notifications made under Directive 81/389/EEC ⁽²⁾ on the protection of animals during international transport?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 167, 27. 6. 1983, p. 2.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 150, 6. 6. 1981, p. 1.

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

(22 May 1984)

The Commission has now received details of the measures notified by all Member States, with the exception of Greece, in connection with the implementation of this Directive. The Commission is taking appropriate steps to assure compliance by this latter Member State with its obligations under the Directive.

All Member States except Greece have adopted legislation in order to apply the Directive within their territories. The Directive itself establishes procedures for dealing with irregular implementations of Community rules in the domain of international transport which *inter alia* permits appropriate decisions to be taken after consultation of the Permanent Veterinary Committee.

The Commission is not proposing to issue a report concerning the routine action it has taken with regard to

the implementation by Member States of this Directive but it assures the Honourable Member that it will take all necessary action to ensure that the rules laid down by the Council are fully respected in practice.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1516/83

by Mr Pol Marck (PPE – B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 January 1984)

(84/C 188/02)

Subject: Community dairy policy

When the dairy policy was conceived some 20 to 25 years ago, it was based on the assumption that milk was a product that required a large amount of land and was labour intensive, its production being best suited to small and medium-sized farms, and that consequently production would not rise more quickly than demand. This led to a market and pricing policy that did not go hand in hand with a balance between supply and demand.

Can the Commission say:

1. (a) to what extent present milk production is still based on farm-produced fodder?
- (b) what was the trend in imports of concentrates from third countries from 1980 to 1982?
2. to what extent is milk production still labour intensive and carried out by farms of less than 20 hectares?
3. how many milk producers were there in each Member State in 1970 and 1982 respectively and how many head of dairy cattle?

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

(28 May 1984)

1 (a) Farm-produced fodder covers on average about 70% of the feed requirements of dairy cows.

(b) The Commission has no statistics providing a breakdown of imported feedingstuffs according to the type of stockfarming in which they are used. The Commission can, however, provide the Honourable Member with data concerning the Community's production of compound feedingstuffs for cattle, which increased from 28 000 000 tonnes in 1980 to 29 300 000 tonnes in 1982.

Such compound feedingstuffs represent the main outlet for the raw materials imported from non-member countries. Between 1980 and 1982 total imports of the

raw materials most commonly used in cattle feed were as follows:

- imports of maize gluten feed rose from 2 600 000 to 2 800 000 tonnes,
- imports of citrus pulp fell from 1 600 000 to 1 300 000 tonnes,
- imports of soya and other oilseeds (in terms of oilcake equivalent) rose from 20 600 000 to 24 800 000 tonnes.

2. Farms of less than 20 hectares accounted for about 55% of milk production in 1982.

3. No comparable figures are available for the years 1970 and 1982. However, comparable figures for the number of dairy producers and dairy cows for the years 1973 and 1981 (December) are indicated below.

	Producers (1 000)		Number of dairy cows (1 000)	
	1973	1981	1973	1981
Germany	630,1	430,9	5 486,0	5 468,4
France	497,0	458,2	7 683,0	7 053,4
Italy	607,0	467,7	3 051,0	3 016,2
Netherlands	99,0	66,9	2 255,0	2 419,0
Belgium	85,0	52,9	1 000,0	968,6
Luxembourg	5,0	2,8	68,0	67,1
United Kingdom	93,0	58,7	3 544,0	3 293,5
Ireland	144,0	92,1	1 431,4	1 458,3
Denmark	72,0	39,5	1 064,0	1 016,2
EUR 9	2 432,1	1 669,7	25 604,4	24 760,7
Greece	n.a.	93,7	n.a.	242,0
EUR 10	n.a.	1 763,4	n.a.	25 002,7

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1592/83

by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté (DEP - F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 January 1984)

(84/C 188/03)

Subject: Appropriations earmarked for preparations for the European elections

Can the Commission say what appropriations are earmarked for preparations for the European elections, and specify the amount allocated to each Member State?

Also, how does it intend to maximize the European public's awareness of these elections, and what initiatives have already been taken with this aim?

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

(17 May 1984)

The Commission would point out that neither the Council nor Parliament allocated additional funds to the Commission for a specific information campaign for the European elections in 1984.

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the answers it has already given to the following questions:

- Oral Question No H - 42/83 by Mr Hutton ⁽¹⁾,
- Oral Question No H - 333/83 by Mr Rogalla ⁽²⁾,

— Written Question No 645/83 by Mr Rogalla ⁽³⁾.

He should also refer to oral question with debate No 0-85/83 by Mr Glinne and others ⁽⁴⁾ and the detailed statement made by Mr Natali, Vice President in reply.

⁽¹⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-299 (May 1983).

⁽²⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-306 (November 1983).

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 315, 21. 11. 1983, p. 6.

⁽⁴⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-304 (October 1983).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1647/83

by Mr Karel De Gucht (L-B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 January 1984)

(84/C 188/04)

Subject: Approval of the budgets of the European Schools

On 13 April 1962, the Protocol on the setting-up of the European Schools with reference to the Statute of the European School signed at Luxembourg on 12 April 1957, was signed in Luxembourg.

Article 7 of the Protocol stipulates that the Board of Governors shall approve the draft budgets of the European Schools, in so far as they concern it, and transmit them to the appropriate authorities of the European Communities.

Can the Commission say whether, and on what date and by what procedure, the 1984 draft budgets approved by the Board of Governors in May 1983 were transmitted to Parliament and the Council?

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

(28 May 1984)

The Commission regrets that the draft budget of the European Schools was not transmitted as stipulated in Article 7 of the Protocol of April 1962.

It notes that the budget schedule of the Board of Governors of the European Schools does not coincide with the Commission's schedule for submitting the Community's preliminary draft budget. When it submits its preliminary draft budget, the Commission also forwards all available supporting documents for the budget proposal concerning the European Schools.

Since the Board of Governors of the European Schools is maintaining its current budget schedule, it must make its own arrangements for transmitting a draft budget to the budgetary authority.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1855/83

by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté (DEP-F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 February 1984)

(84/C 188/05)

Subject: Common market in radio and television

Has the Commission decided whether the radio and television sector falls within the scope of the Treaty of Rome and whether it has jurisdiction in this area?

What plans has the Commission drawn up in this sphere and how will they be implemented?

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

(2 May 1984)

The Commission is currently preparing a Green Paper, 'Europe-wide television', dealing with the establishment of a common market in broadcasting, particularly by satellite and by cable. It is doing so in response to the suggestion made in Parliament's resolution on radio and television broadcasting in the European Community, adopted on 12 March 1982 ⁽¹⁾.

A major chapter in the Green Paper discusses the applicability of the EEC Treaty to radio and television and the powers it confers in this sphere in the light of the Court of Justice's rulings in the Sacchi ⁽²⁾, Debaue ⁽³⁾, Coditel I ⁽⁴⁾ and Coditel II ⁽⁵⁾ cases.

In another chapter the Commission explains the measures it considers the Community should take in order to establish a common market in broadcasting.

As soon as the text has been adopted by the Commission, which should be very shortly, the Green Paper will be published and forwarded to Parliament.

⁽¹⁾ Cf. answer to Written Question No 1690/83 by Mr Karel De Gucht, OJ No C 158, 18. 6. 1984, p. 4.

⁽²⁾ Case 155/73 / 1974 / ECR 409.

⁽³⁾ Case 52/79 / 1980 / ECR 833.

⁽⁴⁾ Case 62/79 / 1980 / ECR 881.

⁽⁵⁾ Case 262/81 / 1982 / ECR 3381.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1857/83
by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté (DEP – F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 February 1984)
(84/C 188/06)

Subject: Common European telecommunications policy

Can the Commission say what decisions have been taken in the area of a common European telecommunications policy?

Will it please indicate:

- the points on which agreement has been reached by all the Member States,
- the provisions in respect of which objections have been raised (what objections and by which Member States)?

Will the standardization of telecommunications tariffs be the main aspect of the common policy and if so when and on what basis?

Answer given by Mr Davignon
on behalf of the Commission

(11 May 1984)

In response to the September Commission communication entitled 'Telecommunications – lines of action' ⁽¹⁾, the Council has set up a group of senior officials to join the Commission in thinking out a Community telecommunications policy based on the six lines of action described therein.

Already talks and deliberations have started and seem likely to reach agreement on four of the lines of action:

- (a) expansion of the market in terminal equipment;
- (b) gradual expansion of the market in components for telecommunications networks;
- (c) coordinated forward-looking approach to the development of telecommunications within the Community;
- (d) planning of a limited number of telecommunications infrastructure projects of common concern.

Tariffs will be discussed in connection with the coordinated forward-looking approach to the development of telecommunications.

That leaves two more lines of action to consider:

- (i) fields of research requiring Community-wide cooperation and

- (ii) the arrangements for granting aid from the Community's financial instruments, where appropriate.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(83) 573, 29. 9. 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1871/83
by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck (S – B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 February 1984)
(84/C 188/07)

Subject: Oil pollution of the North Sea by the discharge of waste materials from tankers at sea

In January 1984, as in every other year, many dead seabirds were washed up on the beaches of Belgium and the Netherlands, the victims of oil slicks at sea.

Once again it has been demonstrated that the provisions prohibiting or controlling the discharge of waste water from tankers at sea have been observed inadequately, if at all.

What steps has the Commission taken over the past year to ensure that the ban on flushing out ships' holds at sea has been complied with? Has the 1973 to 1978 Marpol Convention on the prevention of pollution by ships already entered into force? Which Member States have already ratified the Convention? Which Member States have not yet ratified this Convention and why?

What progress has been made as regards the Commission proposal for a Council Directive on compliance with international standards on shipping safety and the prevention of pollution by ships using Community ports?

What were the results of the study carried out for the Commission on equipment for the discharge of waste hydrocarbons in the ports? What were the results of the studies carried out on the marking of crude oil so that this type of pollution cannot be regarded as pollution from an unknown source, which is still the case at present?

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission

(24 May 1984)

The Commission fully shares the concern expressed by the Honourable Member with regard to the pollution of marine fauna and flora and the marine environment in general as a result of certain instances of discharges from

tankers at sea. The Commission is well aware of the effects as already frequently indicated, in particular in its reply to the Honorable Member's Written Question No 2185/82 ⁽¹⁾.

Under the action programme of the European Communities on the control and reduction of pollution caused by hydrocarbons discharged at sea, set up under the Council resolution of 26 June 1978 ⁽²⁾, the Commission provided financial incentives in 1983, and will continue to do so in 1984, to encourage pilot projects, e.g. concerning remote sensing, to develop equipment for controlling and reducing this type of pollution.

Although the Community as such is not a signatory to the 1973 to 1978 Marpol Convention, the Commission considers that tankers should discharge oil at sea only in strict compliance with the rules of this Convention, of which Annex I on hydrocarbons entered into force on 2 October 1983.

So far this Convention has been ratified by seven Member States (Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom).

In compliance with the Council recommendation of 26 June 1978 on the ratification of Conventions on safety in shipping ⁽³⁾ the Member States should have ratified this Convention by 1 June 1980.

The Commission has received no information as to why Belgium and Ireland have not yet done so, but, from participating in the memorandum of understanding of 16 January 1982 on the monitoring of compliance with the relevant international conventions by port States, the Commission understands that these two Member States are due to complete their ratification procedures this year.

With regard to the proposal for a Council Directive concerning the enforcement, in respect of shipping using Community ports, of international standards for shipping safety and pollution prevention ⁽³⁾, the Commission will shortly be sending the Council a communication which takes into account the current work under the memorandum of understanding mentioned in the previous paragraph.

On the face of it, the study on ballast water reception facilities in the Mediterranean, carried out at the Commission's request, indicates that 17 of the ports included in the survey already have reception facilities which comply with the provisions of Marpol 1973 to 1978, but 35 would appear to have facilities that are substandard or unsuitable, or no facilities at all.

As regards the studies on oil tagging, the Commission would remind the Honourable Member that, following the Council Decisions adopting research programmes to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre ⁽⁴⁾, work is

now in progress on the application of remote sensing techniques to fields such as the optical detection of pollution due to hydrocarbons. The aim here is to establish an operational laser system capable of analyzing hydrocarbons offshore.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 177, 4. 7. 1983.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 162, 8. 7. 1978, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 194, 19. 7. 1978, p. 17.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 192, 30. 7. 1980, p. 8.

⁽⁴⁾ Programme for 1980 to 1983: OJ No L 72, 18. 3. 1980.
Programme for 1984 to 1987: OJ No L 3, 5. 1. 1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1936/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/08)

Subject: Shipbuilding's importance to regional employment

Will the Commission give the percentage of the male workforce employed in shipbuilding in those regions of the EEC where it is a major employer, including in particular:

United Kingdom:

Tyneside, Wearside, Teesside, Clydeside, Merseyside, Humberside, Leith and the Southampton area.

France:

Toulon, Nantes-St. Nazaire, Dunkirk, Bordeaux, Rouen, Le Havre and La Rochelle.

Federal Republic of Germany:

Bremen-Bremerhaven, Emden, Hamburg, Kiel, Lubeck, Rendsburg and Flensburg.

Italy:

Trieste, Venice, Livorno, Messina, Ancona, Palermo and Genoa.

Belgium:

Temse, Hemiksen and Hoboken.

Denmark:

Aalborg, Nakskov, Copenhagen, Aarhus, Frederickshaven, Ringkobing, Svendborg and Odense.

Netherlands:

Groningen area, Monnikendam, Harlingen, Rotterdam, Lobith, Dordrecht, Vlissingen and Schiedam.

Eire:

Cork.

Greece:

Piraeus?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1937/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/09)

Subject: Unemployment amongst older workers in shipbuilding areas

Will the Commission give figures regarding the level of unemployment amongst men aged 55 years and over in the major shipbuilding areas of the EEC, including in particular statistics (both total numbers and percentage level) for the following areas:

United Kingdom:

Tyneside, Wearside, Teesside, Clydeside, Merseyside, Humberside, Leith and the Southampton area.

France:

Toulon, Nantes-St. Nazaire, Dunkirk, Bordeaux, Rouen, Le Havre and La Rochelle.

Federal Republic of Germany:

Bremen-Bremerhaven, Emden, Hamburg, Kiel, Lubeck, Rendsburg and Flensburg.

Italy:

Trieste, Venice, Livorno, Messina, Ancona, Palermo and Genoa.

Belgium:

Temse, Hemiksen and Hoboken.

Denmark:

Aalborg, Nakskov, Copenhagen, Aarhus, Frederickshaven, Ringkobing, Svendborg and Odense.

Netherlands:

Groningen area, Monnikendam, Harlingen, Rotterdam, Lobith, Dordrecht, Vlissingen and Schiedam.

Eire:

Cork.

Greece:

Piraeus?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1938/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/10)

Subject: Youth unemployment in shipbuilding areas

Will the Commission give figures about the level of youth unemployment in the major shipbuilding areas of the

EEC, including in particular statistics (both total numbers and percentage level) for the following areas:

United Kingdom:

Tyneside, Wearside, Teesside, Clydeside, Merseyside, Humberside, Leith and the Southampton area.

France:

Toulon, Nantes-St. Nazaire, Dunkirk, Bordeaux, Rouen, Le Havre and La Rochelle.

Federal Republic of Germany:

Bremen-Bremerhaven, Emden, Hamburg, Kiel, Lubeck, Rendsburg and Flensburg.

Italy:

Trieste, Venice, Livorno, Messina, Ancona, Palermo and Genoa.

Belgium:

Temse, Hemiksen and Hoboken.

Denmark:

Aalborg, Nakskov, Copenhagen, Aarhus, Frederickshaven, Ringkobing, Svendborg and Odense.

Netherlands:

Groningen area, Monnikendam, Harlingen, Rotterdam, Lobith, Dordrecht, Vlissingen and Schiedam.

Eire:

Cork.

Greece:

Piraeus?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1939/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/11)

Subject: Male unemployment in shipbuilding areas

Will the Commission give figures about the level of male unemployment in the major shipbuilding areas of the EEC, including in particular statistics (both in total numbers and percentage level) for the following areas:

United Kingdom:

Tyneside, Wearside, Teesside, Clydeside, Merseyside, Humberside, Leith and the Southampton area.

France:

Toulon, Nantes-St. Nazaire, Dunkirk, Bordeaux, Rouen, Le Havre and La Rochelle.

Federal Republic of Germany:

Bremen-Bremerhaven, Emden, Hamburg, Kiel, Lubeck, Rendsburg and Flensburg.

Italy:

Trieste, Venice, Livorno, Messina, Ancona, Palermo and Genoa.

Belgium:

Temse, Hemiksen and Hoboken.

Denmark:

Aalborg, Nakskov, Copenhagen, Aarhus, Frederickshaven, Ringkøbing, Svendborg and Odense.

Netherlands:

Groningen area, Monnikendam, Harlingen, Rotterdam, Lobith, Dordrecht, Vlissingen and Schiedam.

Eire:

Cork.

Greece:

Piraeus?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1940/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/12)

Subject: Unemployment in EEC shipbuilding areas

Will the Commission give figures about the general level of unemployment in the major shipbuilding areas of the EEC including in particular statistics (both total numbers and percentage level) for the following areas:

United Kingdom:

Tyneside, Wearside, Teesside, Clydeside, Merseyside, Humberside, Leith and the Southampton area.

France:

Toulon, Nantes-St. Nazaire, Dunkirk, Bordeaux, Rouen, Le Havre and La Rochelle.

Federal Republic of Germany:

Bremen-Bremerhaven, Emden, Hamburg, Kiel, Lubeck, Rendsburg and Flensburg.

Italy:

Trieste, Venice, Livorno, Messina, Ancona, Palermo and Genoa.

Belgium:

Temse, Hemiksen and Hoboken.

Denmark:

Aalborg, Nakskov, Copenhagen, Aarhus, Frederickshaven, Ringkøbing, Svendborg and Odense.

Netherlands:

Groningen area, Monnikendam, Harlingen, Rotterdam, Lobith, Dordrecht, Vlissingen and Schiedam.

Eire:

Cork.

Greece:

Piraeus?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1941/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/13)

Subject: European employment in shipbuilding

For the years 1973 and 1983, for each Member State of the European Community, and for Japan and Korea, can the Commission provide statistics (or estimates) showing the numbers employed in both the whole shipbuilding industry and in each of its sectors (merchant ships, warships, engine-building, offshore structures, navigation and communication and control instruments)?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1942/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/14)

Subject: Rates of pay in shipbuilding

Will the Commission give a comparison of average rates of pay and social benefits received by workers of broadly comparable grades in the shipbuilding industry? Work grades considered might be general labourer, joinery and outfitting, plater/boilermaker, draftsman, office clerk.

Where such figures are publicly known, what remuneration does the chairman (or other executive head) of each shipbuilding company in the European Community receive?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1943/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/15)

Subject: Trades unions concerned in shipbuilding

Can the Commission supply a list of the names, trades groups represented, executive heads and head office

address for all the trades unions involved in shipbuilding in each member country of the European Community?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1944/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/16)

Subject: Membership of the EEC Shipbuilders Linking Committee

Will the Commission please publish the composition of the EEC Shipbuilders Linking Committee; specifically, who are its participants, whom do they represent, and where could they be contacted by interested parties?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1945/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/17)

Subject: Corporate structure, size and products of private sector shipyard concerns

Will the Commission list the total group size, the percentage of business deriving from each of the group's major product divisions, and the percentage of total employment so derived for each private sector concern involved in shipbuilding in the EEC? Can the Commission give similar figures for Japanese and Korean concerns?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1946/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/18)

Subject: Shipbuilding yards in Europe

In the interests of public information, of aiding contacts between trade unions and workforces at all levels, and to aid political action in canvassing and collating views:

Will the Commission list those shipbuilding installations in the European Community with more than 100 employees, give the name and nature (public/private, single product/conglomerate), and the installations' activities (merchant, warship, engine-building, etc.)?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1947/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/19)

Subject: Ownership structure of shipbuilding

For each State of the European Community, for Japan and Korea; can the Commission briefly state what the ownership structure of the shipbuilding industry is; what percentage of capacity is owned by how many groups; are those groups publicly or privately owned; are the groups multi-product or single product?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1948/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/20)

Subject: Total EEC employment deriving from shipbuilding

What does the Commission estimate as being the total number of workers in the EEC who are either directly employed by the shipbuilding industry or in industries dependent on shipbuilding continuance for their survival?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1949/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/21)

Subject: Employment in the shipbuilding industry

What is the worldwide workforce employed in all sectors of the shipbuilding industry; what is the total workforce in each of the following States?:

Japan, Korea, Taiwan, China, Indonesia, Australia, India, Yugoslavia, Canada, South Africa, Brazil, Argentina, USA, USSR, Poland, German Democratic Republic, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Portugal, each European Community Member State?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1950/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 February 1984)

(84/C 188/22)

Subject: Employment in the shipping industry

What is the total employment in merchant shipping worldwide? What proportion are nationals of European Community States?

What are the total numbers employed in merchant shipping from each of the European Community States, from Japan, Korea, China, Norway, USA and USSR?

What proportion of the manpower employed in merchant shipping by companies based in the European Community are not nationals of Community Member States?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1951/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/23)

Subject: Shipping industry's home credit support scheme

What progress has the Commission made in introducing a home credit support regime to encourage EEC shipowners to order in EEC yards?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1952/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/24)

Subject: Role of the EIB in shipbuilding investment

With reference to Written Question No 237/83 ⁽¹⁾ by Mrs Danielle De March.

In view of the European Investment Bank's primary role as an arm of Community regional policy;

In view of the concentration of shipbuilding in the less-favoured regions;

In view of the need for more substantial capital investment in shipbuilding to ensure maximum ability to compete with Japanese, Korean and other shipyards;

Was the Commission satisfied to have to report in their answer to Mrs Danielle De March that the EIB had made no loans in respect of investments in the shipbuilding or ship-repair industries in the Community?

Since the Commission reported that such loans are permissible under the EEC Treaty and the European Investment Bank's statute, will they give the reasons why none had been made?

Will the Commission hold discussions with the EIB and with the shipbuilding industry towards ensuring that the Bank can act as a source of low cost, guaranteed finance for shipbuilding?

In view of the long lead times in vessel construction, and the importance of low-cost finance in securing orders, and the fact that vessels are themselves capital projects of some economic importance, are the Commission and the EIB able to give consideration to the possibility of the Bank offering low-cost finance for vessel construction?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 167, 27. 6. 1983, p. 3.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1953/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/25)

Subject: ERDF investments in shipbuilding

In reply to Written Question No 237/83 ⁽¹⁾ by Mrs Danielle De March, the Commission provides a table showing the breakdown of Regional Fund investments in shipbuilding between 1975 and 1982; the United Kingdom is the EEC's largest shipbuilding nation, and the United Kingdom shipbuilding industry has undergone substantial restructuring during the period covered by the question, yet it ranks a poor fifth in terms of Regional Fund investment. Why is this?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 167, 27. 6. 1983, p. 3.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1954/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/26)

Subject: Shipbuilding and vessel environmental standards

Has the Commission considered the possibility of a tax on vessels which are unsound on grounds of safety, environment or navigational capability, thus removing such vessels from European ports and waters, and enhancing demand for new vessels?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1955/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/27)

Subject: EEC achievements in shipbuilding

Article 2 of the EEC Treaty requires the Commission to promote throughout the Community a harmonious

development of economic activities and a continuous and balanced expansion. Does the Commission feel that it has met this aim with regard to the shipbuilding industry?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1956/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/28)

Subject: New measures to safeguard shipbuilding

In view of the lack of orders placed by European shipowners of one country in the shipyards of other countries of the EEC does the Commission not now agree that the purposes of its Directives on shipbuilding have not been achieved and that new measures to safeguard EEC shipbuilding as a whole and enable it to survive under the threat of Far Eastern competition are now necessary?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1957/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/29)

Subject: Acquisition of information on the maritime industries

Does the Commission subscribe to, or receive as a matter of course, the various market analyses published by shipping companies and other concerns which give detailed information on the state of the maritime industries?

Could the Commission publish a regular review of such information, together with its own statistical information and opinion, in order to maintain well informed public debate on a vital industry currently in need of public support?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1958/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/30)

Subject: Commission 'task force' for a shipbuilding survival plan

Has the Commission made any progress towards the creation of a 'task force' within the Commission and consisting of appropriate officials of relevant

Commission directorates (e.g. industry, competition, transport, social affairs and employment, regional policy, external relations) to make urgent proposals to bring about a survival plan for European Community shipbuilding as requested by the Socialist Group of the European Parliament in its telegram of 14 December 1983?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1959/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/31)

Subject: Adapting of ECSC measures to shipbuilding

What progress has the Commission made towards adapting many of the measures available to help the coal and steel industries to include shipbuilding?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1960/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/32)

Subject: Specialization as a response to the shipbuilding crisis

Does the Commission agree that the intermittent profitability of a few shipbuilding companies in the Association of West European Shipbuilders is due primarily to a very high level of specialization?

Does the Commission see shipyard specialization as a tenable response to preserve capacity and employment in shipbuilding in the European Community; would specialization imply an inability to meet the broad requirements of the Community's merchant fleet?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1961/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/33)

Subject: Incentives to establish new business in shipbuilding areas

For each Member State of the European Community, and for each shipbuilding region where inter-regional

differences exist, will the Commission list the incentives offered to the establishment of new business, both giving the type of the incentive and its financial value?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1962/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/34)

Subject: Establishment of new industry in shipbuilding areas

What studies has the Commission made regarding the rate of setting up of new industries in the areas affected by the decline in shipbuilding? Will the Commission please give the results of such a study if it has been carried out, or consider mounting such a study if it has not?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1963/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/35)

Subject: Investment in the shipbuilding industry

For each of the States listed below, can the Commission give estimates of total capital investment in shipbuilding during the last decade:

Japan, Korea, Taiwan, China, Indonesia, Australia, India, Yugoslavia, Canada, South Africa, Brazil, Argentina, USA, USSR, Poland, German Democratic Republic, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Portugal, each European Community Member State?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1964/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/36)

Subject: Korea's political determination to dominate shipbuilding

How does the Commission react to the statement by the Prime Minister of South Korea (*Financial Times* 19 October 1983) that he wishes to see his country

become the world's premier shipbuilding nation; what means is the Government of South Korea taking towards this end?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1965/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/37)

Subject: Korea's use of shipbuilding as a foreign currency earner

Does the Commission agree that the shipbuilding industry in South Korea is regarded primarily as a foreign exchange earner and therefore the price of South Korean ships accords more with a desire to win such earnings, than with any intention to cover intra-national costs?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1966/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/38)

Subject: Korean expansion in shipbuilding

Will the Commission give briefly the history of Korean shipbuilding and do they confirm that the start-up of the giant corporations involved was government funded?

How do the South Korean Government justify their massive expansion in shipbuilding during a period when they are creating world over-capacity: does the Commission think that Korean expansion in shipbuilding is justified?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1967/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/39)

Subject: Wage rates in Korean shipbuilding

Since the answer to my Oral Question No H-31/83 ⁽¹⁾ has the Commission any more specific information about the level of shipyard workers' wages in South Korea; and if not, why not?

Is it true that in South Korea real wages were depressed suddenly and dramatically by 18 % in 1980?

⁽¹⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No D0299 (May 1983).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1968/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/40)

Subject: Hours worked in Korean shipbuilding

Will the Commission report on the average length of the working week, and the average hours worked per year, by workers in Korean shipyards; in quantitative terms, how significant a factor do they believe reportedly lower health and safety standards in Korean shipyards are to production costs?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1972/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/44)

Subject: EEC-Japan relations

Much publicity has been given to the achievement of an accord between the EEC and Japan regarding trade in video recorders, resulting from wider trade negotiations in November 1983. Was the shipbuilding industry discussed during those talks, and if so, what was the broad tenor of the discussion?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1969/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/41)

Subject: Trade unions in Korean shipyards

What is the trade union structure of the workforce in South Korean shipyards? What percentage of the workers in South Korean shipyards are members of trade unions?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1973/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/45)

Subject: Trade unions in Japanese shipyards

What is the trade union structure of the workforce in Japanese shipyards; what percentage of the workers in Japanese shipyards are members of trade unions?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1970/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/42)

Subject: Work in Korean shipyards as an alternative to military service

Is it true that in South Korea working in the shipyards is an alternative to military service?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1974/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/46)

Subject: Participation of Japanese shipowners in world markets

How many shipbuilding orders have Japanese shipowners placed outside Japan in the last 20 years?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1971/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/43)

Subject: Korean shipowners' participation in world markets

How many shipbuilding orders have South Korean shipowners placed outside South Korea in the last five years?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1975/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/47)

Subject: Share of 1983 new order intake

Press reports give figures from Lev Sychrava Associates in London showing that in 1983 Japan boosted new order intake by 133 %, and Korea by 163 % whilst EEC yards suffered a 33 % drop. Can the Commission give their estimates of new order intake for each of the EEC

Member States, Japan, Korea, China, USA, Taiwan and other shipbuilding States during the years 1982 and 1983?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1976/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/48)

Subject: Participation of US shipowners in world markets

How many shipbuilding orders have United States shipowners placed outside the US in the last 20 years; what percentage of the total tonnage ordered did this represent?

Can the Commission outline the reasons for US shipowners' order placing preferences; will this matter be discussed in EEC-US trade talks?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1977/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/49)

Subject: Organization of Asian shipbuilding

In a resolution 'on the crisis in the shipbuilding industry' adopted on 10 February 1983 the European Parliament called 'on the Commission to examine and evaluate the advantages of Japanese and Korean large-scale vertically integrated business structures and national economic collaboration, with particular regard to shipbuilding's role as a key sector'.

Has the Commission made any such investigation of the underlying reasons for Asian shipyards' success in winning market share more comprehensive than that presented in Doc. COM(83) 65; if not, will they do so and publish the results?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1978/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/50)

Subject: World shipbuilding capacity

In its document Doc. COM(83) 65, the Commission estimated world shipbuilding capacity as 20 000 000

CGRT, 3 500 000 CGRT being within the European Community. What change has taken place within the last year?

What are the shipbuilding capacities of world shipbuilding nations including:

Japan, Korea, Taiwan, China, Indonesia, Australia, India, Yugoslavia, Canada, South Africa, Brazil, Argentina, USA, USSR, Poland, German Democratic Republic, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Portugal, each European Community Member State?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1979/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/51)

Subject: Shipbuilding output

During the four-year period to 1983, and for each of the States listed below, what was the output of merchant vessels, in terms of both CGRT and dollar value?

What was the output of warships, approximately, in dollar value?

What was the output of offshore structures and ocean engineering?

What was the output of marine engines and power plant?

What value of ship repair work was undertaken?

States of interest are: Japan, Korea, Taiwan, China, Indonesia, Australia, India, Yugoslavia, Canada, South Africa, Brazil, Argentina, USA, USSR, Poland, German Democratic Republic, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Portugal, each European Community Member State.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1980/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/52)

Subject: Lead time to reconstruct a shipbuilding industry

Assuming that European capacity in merchant shipbuilding is allowed to decline significantly further, with consequent dissipation of the requisite skills and sale or scrapping of capital equipment, how long does the Commission anticipate it would take to restore

shipbuilding capacity to levels adequate to serve Europe's trade needs if an Asian or other cartel in shipbuilding exploited its potential economic power to demand higher prices for ships?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1981/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/53)

Subject: Community trade as a proportion of world trade

What is the total volume (by value or tonnage) of world seaborne trade? What proportion of this is accounted for by intra-Community trade and EEC trade with third countries?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1982/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/54)

Subject: Community and Member States' seaborne trade as a fraction of gross domestic product

In the Commission's 'European File' publication 'The external trade of the European Community', it is said that external trade accounts for an average one-quarter of the GDP of Community countries.

For the years 1973 and 1983, for the European Community as a whole and for each Member State, can the Commission provide figures for the proportion of GDP accounted for by external trade (including intra-EEC) by trade with other Community countries and the proportion of GDP in each category carried by sea?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1983/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/55)

Subject: States' total and seaborne trade as a fraction of gross domestic product

For the years 1973 and 1983, can the Commission provide figures for the proportion of GDP accounted for by external trade and the proportion of GDP which is carried by sea for each of the following:

Japan, Korea, China, Brazil, Argentina, USA, USSR, Poland, German Democratic Republic, Sweden, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Canada and Australia?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1984/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/56)

Subject: European Community reliance on seaborne trade, economic sectors

For the years 1973 and 1983, for the European Community as a whole and for each Member State, can the Commission provide figures for the tonnage and value of goods carried, both as imports and exports, in each of the following categories:

food, drink and agricultural products, oil, coal, mineral raw materials, pulp and timber, chemicals, machinery and transport equipment?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1985/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/57)

Subject: Relationship between economic growth and trade growth

Does the Commission not agree that a positive relationship would normally be expected between economic growth and growth in trade? What relationships were actually found for Member States' economies and trade during the decade 1973 to 1983?

What was the relationship for the European Community?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1986/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/58)

Subject: Economic and strategic importance of the merchant fleet

Will the Commission confirm that it views the existence of a merchant fleet capable of supporting the European Community's trading needs, both in terms of tonnage and vessel type, as being in the long-term economic and strategic interests of the Community?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1987/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S-GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/59)

Subject: The ability of the current level of European shipbuilding capacity to respond to likely future demand

Does the Commission not agree that European Community shipbuilding has declined with the result that its capacity is too small to meet anticipated replacement and incremental demand for merchant tonnage in the years to the end of this century? Does it not therefore agree that Europe is so far from being self-sufficient that it is consequently in a weak position particularly in its relations with certain Asian countries?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1988/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S-GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/60)

Subject: Capacity of world and States' shipping

What is the total capacity (in dead weight tonnes) of world shipping by vessel type? (Crude oil tankers, oil products tankers, combined carriers, bulk carriers, Ro Ro, refrigerated vessels, vehicle carriers, general cargo vessels, container vessels, passenger vessels and ferries, chemical carriers, gas carriers, others).

What proportion of the world tonnage of each vessel type is registered under the flag of each Member State, Japan, Korea, China, Norway, USA and USSR?

What proportion of world tonnage of each vessel type is owned by companies based in each Member State, Japan, Korea, China, Norway, USA and USSR?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1989/83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S-GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/61)

Subject: Economic and strategic importance of shipbuilding

Will the Commission confirm that it views the existence of a shipbuilding industry able to supply the needs of the

European Community's merchant fleet as being in the long-term economic and strategic interests of the Community?

Does the Commission believe that there is a danger of the world merchant shipbuilding market becoming entirely dominated by one or two countries, giving rise to a virtual monopoly, with consequent exposure to politically determined price rises?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1991//83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S-GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/62)

Subject: EEC funding of shipbuilding research and development

What steps has the European Commission taken towards presenting proposals for an EEC funded research and development programme for shipbuilding?

What, in the Commission's view, would be the advantages of such a programme?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1993//83

by Ms Joyce Quin (S-GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 February 1984)

(84/C 188/63)

Subject: Shipbuilding 'scrap and build' policy

When did the Commission last discuss the question of a 'scrap and build' policy for the EEC shipbuilding industry? Will it give its reasons for not pursuing this idea at the present time?

Will the Commission publish its views on the possibility of introducing a variable scrapping premium to encourage shipowners to dispose of surplus capacity and provide stability with regard to one of the factors affecting shipbuilding orders?

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

to Written Questions Nos 1936/83 to 1989/83,
1991/83
and 1993/83 by Ms Quin

(25 April 1984)

For the convenience of the Honourable Member, the Commission has grouped its replies under the following five themes:

— employment and social affairs

— situation and policy

— financing

— merchant fleet and seaborne trade

— Asian competition

Employment and social affairs

1936/83, 1937/83, 1938/83, 1939/83, 1940/83

The Commission does not have a complete breakdown of employment and unemployment for the specific shipbuilding regions or zones mentioned; the figures which are available (1981) refer to conventional designations of regional employment and unemployment (as described in the Yearbook of Regional Statistics, Eurostat, 1983).

1942/83

The European Metalworker's Federation prepared, in 1979, and on behalf of the Commission, a report on the working conditions in the European shipbuilding industry. A further report (1983) will be available in the very near future.

1943/83

The European Metalworkers' Federation, rue Fossé-aux-Loups 38, B-1000 Brussels, could supply names and addresses of trade groups represented.

1941/83 and 1949/83

The latest available employment figures for the Community are published in the Commission's periodical reports on the state of the shipbuilding industry. The last published was in September 1983 ⁽¹⁾. The Commission cannot provide reliable estimates for other countries.

1948/83

Indirect employment related to shipbuilding is bound to vary widely from one region to another, but no figures have been provided to the Commission.

1950/83

The Commission is conducting a survey on employment in merchant shipping in the Member States in order to update the currently available figures ⁽²⁾. At the same time the OECD is undertaking a similar exercise for its Member States.

Situation and policy

1944/83, 1945/83, 1946/84, 1947/83

The current Secretary of the EEC Shipbuilders' Linking Committee is Mr. A. P. De Lange, Postbus 308, NL-2600 AH Delft.

It is for the Linking Committee to decide whether it will make available details of the Committee's composition, the structure of individual firms, their employment, and products, as requested by the Honourable Member. The Commission cannot give such figures for Japanese and Korean concerns.

1955/83

The Commission's efforts to promote harmonious development in the shipbuilding industry have been partly frustrated by a variety of factors, including the market situation and political constraints.

1956/83

See the debate on Oral Question No H-300/83 by the Honourable Member, 16 November 1983 ⁽³⁾.

1958/83

The Commission has already replied to the telegram of 14 December 1983 from the Socialist Group of the European Parliament.

1959/83

Owing to the existence of separate Treaty and separate funding for the Coal and Steel Community, the measures taken for those industries cannot be applied to shipbuilding.

1960/83

In the Commission's view, specialization might well be an appropriate response to some of the problems of restructuring, but specialization carries risks of its own. Only the firms involved can judge whether in their individual circumstances they can accept such risks.

1963/83

The Commission has no full information about investments in the shipbuilding industry in the countries listed.

1975/83 and 1979/83

The Commission's report COM(83) 483 final (September 1983) gave details of the shares of new orders and output for 1982. Data for 1983 are expected to become available in March 1984.

1976/83

Orders placed by United States shipowners for registration under US flag:

	1979		1980		1981		1982	
	10 ³ tjbc	%	10 ³ tjbc	%	10 ³ tjbc	%	10 ³ tjbc	%
Total	449	100	546	100	335	100	802	100
Of which in other countries	23	5	29	5	7	2	306	38

A special situation exists for United States shipowners owing to the provision of special aids and regulations for the building and operation of ships in the USA. This matter is discussed in EEC-US bilateral consultations.

1978/83

Shipbuilding capacity is difficult to assess with precision. In a general way it can be stated that capacity has increased in Korea, remained stable in Japan, and been reduced in Europe.

1980/83, 1986/83, 1987/83, 1989/83

The Community regards merchant shipping and shipbuilding as important activities from both a social and strategic point of view, but these should be subject to free market forces (see Council resolution of 19 September 1978, § 1 (*)).

The Commission cannot anticipate lead-times or other aspects of the operation of these forces.

1991/83

In its resolution of 25 July 1983 (⁵), on framework programmes for Community R, D and D, the Community recognized the priority need for technological renewal also for industries other than high technology industries.

Consequently, the Commission has proposed to the Council a programme on basic technological research in new production technologies and new materials (⁶). Many of the items proposed by the shipbuilding industry are indeed covered by this programme and the shipbuilding industry has already expressed a considerable interest. The further proposals of the shipbuilding industry will be considered in the context of the results of this programme and the overall policy towards this sector.

Moreover, the Commission will undertake, together with the industry, a case study on the productivity impact of new technologies in this sector.

1993/83

Since 1981, neither shipowners nor shipbuilders favour a link between scrapping old ships and building new ones.

The Commission is considering with interested parties, what actions might result in the placing of more orders in Community yards without stimulating artificially the overall demand for new ships.

Financing

1951/83

The Commission is exploring with interested parties the possibility of introducing a home credit scheme for Community shipowners.

1952/83

The Commission is fully aware of European Investment Bank financing activities. The mere fact of eligibility of an investment project does not, however, automatically assume the granting of a loan. There must also be the willingness to invest and an economically and technically viable project suitable for loan financing. EIB loans as well as loans from other Community sources – as opposed to grants – are financed through borrowings on the capital markets. This limits the possibilities to 'act as a source of low-cost, guaranteed finance'.

As outlined in the answer to Written Question No 237/83 of Mrs De March (⁷), there were no EIB loans for investment in shipyards in the period 1975 to 1982. Before 1975, the EIB contributed 12 300 000 ECU towards shipyard investment in Italy and Denmark.

The Bank has informed the Commission that, in addition, 34 credits worth some 15 000 000 ECU, have been drawn from global loans on EIB and NCI resources from 1975 to the end of 1983, helping to finance investment by smaller ship-building and ship-repair undertakings in the Community.

(million ECU)

Member State	Number of projects	Amount
Denmark	2	0,59
France	4	0,93
Greece	1	0,70
Ireland	12	1,07
Italy	14	11,34
United Kingdom	1	0,26

It may be relevant to mention that European Investment Bank loans, totalling 58 700 000 ECU, have gone towards the acquisition and commissioning of ships, mainly for the improvement of communications between States of the Community.

1953/83, 1961/83, 1962/83

The total amount of ERDF aid given over the period 1975 to 1982 to projects within the shipbuilding sector (4 200 000 ECU or 0,3% of total ERDF aid to investments in industrial, handicraft and service activities) is at such a low level that the distribution of this aid between Member States could not be interpreted as having any particular significance.

The importance of the reconversion problems in the United Kingdom shipbuilding areas however have explicitly been recognized by the Commission: Council Regulation (EEC) No 2617/80⁽⁸⁾, as amended by Regulation (EEC) No 217/84⁽⁹⁾, institutes specific Community regional development economic activities in certain zones adversely affected by restructuring of the shipbuilding industry. The areas covered and the incentives provided are listed in the Regulation mentioned. The first of these Regulations only covered areas in the United Kingdom and the cost of the Community's contribution to the first measures was estimated at 17 000 000 ECU over a five-year period. Under the second Regulation the United Kingdom is also by far the most important beneficiary.

No specific studies have been made regarding the rate of setting up of new industries in areas affected by the decline in shipbuilding nor does the Commission at present envisage mounting such studies. The Commission however draws the attention of the Honourable Member to the fact that within the second series of Community specific measures recently adopted by the Council, an amendment to each Regulation has been added which particularly provides that 'when each special programme has been implemented, a report including information on the number and nature of the jobs created and maintained shall be presented by the Commission to the Regional Policy Committee and to the European Parliament'.

Merchant fleet and seaborne trade

1954/83

The Commission envisaged in its July 1980 proposal⁽¹⁰⁾ that:

'1. A Member State shall levy a fee to the owner or operator of a ship which has been inspected and on which deficiencies have been found'.

'2. The penalties specified . . . shall be adequate in severity to discourage violations'.

This proposal was overtaken by events as the memorandum of understanding on port state control (MOU) took effect on 1 July 1982, signed by the Maritime authorities of 14 States including nine maritime Member States.

The Commission prefers at present a policy of dissuasion based on this MOU and will, through its membership of the PSC Committee, remain vigilant to ensure that the MOU is being implemented in a harmonized way in the Member States.

1957/83

The Commission receives full information on the maritime industries. The Commission agrees that a well-informed public debate is important, and will try to contribute appropriately to it.

1981/83

World seaborne trade figures can be found in the statistical annex of the annual report of the Maritime Transport Committee of OECD.

1982/83, 1983/83

The Commission does not dispose of data concerning external trade distributed by mode of transport.

1984/83

Some statistical information concerning international goods traffic is published in the 'Statistical Yearbook Transport, Communications, Tourism, edition 1983' published by the Statistical Office of the European Communities.

1985/83

The Commission can confirm the existence of a positive relationship between growth in trade of the Member States or of the Community as a whole and growth of their BIP. The average elasticity of exports in relation to BIP being even higher during the period 1973 to 1983, indicates that exports play an increasing role in support of the economic activity.

Elasticity of exports/BIP

Year	B	DK	D	GR	F	IRL	I	NL	UK	EUR 10
1973/60	1,9	—	1,8	1,5	1,7	—	2,1	1,9	1,7	1,7
1983/73	2,0	2,3	2,75	2,4	2,1	2,6	3,2	1,3	2,3	2,3

1988/83

Total capacity of world shipping by vessel type and its proportion of world tonnage registered under the flag of specific states, can be found in Lloyd's Register of Shipping, Statistical Table (in GRT only).

Some figures relative to the proposition of world tonnage of each vessels type owned by companies based in the stated countries Member States are provided by Lloyd's Register of Shipping and by the UNCTAD reports on beneficial ownership of open registry fleets (Committee on Shipping).

Asian competition

1964/83, 1965/83, 1966/83, 1967/83, 1968/83, 1969/83, 1970/83, 1971/83

To the extent that Korean policy on shipbuilding capacity and pricing disturbs the already troubled world market, the Commission agrees that these negative effects should continue to be brought to the Korean authorities' attention at every opportunity. It must try, as has been its policy in the past, to convince Korea that its long-term interest lies in sharing in the burden of the crisis. The Commission therefore tries, on every possible occasion, to persuade the Korean authorities of the possibility of international cooperation in this matter and of the wisdom of such an approach. Hence the Commission raised the matter during the first EC Commission-Korea 'high-level consultations' held in Seoul on 28 and 29 March 1983. The Commission will do so again during the next consultations in Brussels in Spring 1984.

In answer to the Honourable Member's Written Question No 1491/83 ⁽¹¹⁾, the Commission regretted that official detailed information on South Korean wage levels, working conditions, and financial assistance was not available.

1972/83, 1973/83, 1974/83

The problems of the shipbuilding industry are discussed with the Japanese authorities in the framework of the OECD and the regular high level consultations. The problems of shipbuilding are of quite a different nature from those of trade in video tape recorders and therefore were not treated in the same manner in November 1983.

The Commission cannot provide details of the structure of Japanese shipyard trade unions.

To the Commission's knowledge, orders placed by Japanese shipowners outside Japan have been close to zero for many years.

1977/83

The Commission is certainly interested in the underlying reasons for the success of Asian shipyards, but does not intend to publish a report on this subject.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(83) 483 final.

⁽²⁾ Commission Doc. V/1423/1/81.

⁽³⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, Annex to OJ No 1-306 of 16 November 1983.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 229, 27. 9. 1978, p. 1.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No C 208, 4. 8. 1983, p. 1.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ No C 230, 27. 8. 1983, p. 3.

⁽⁷⁾ OJ No C 167, 27. 6. 1983, p. 3.

⁽⁸⁾ OJ No L 271, 15. 10. 1980, p. 16.

⁽⁹⁾ OJ No L 27, 31. 1. 1984, p. 15.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Doc. COM(80) 360 final.

⁽¹¹⁾ OJ No C 105, 16. 4. 1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2020/83

by Mr Otmar Franz (PPE - D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 February 1984)

(84/C 188/64)

Subject: Cattenom nuclear power station

Is it true as reported in the press, that the maximum population exposure doses used in the licensing procedure for the construction of the fourth unit of the nuclear power station in Cattenom (Lorraine), are approximately 17 times higher than the German limit, while the limits for the discharge of radioactive substances in suspension from the stack are approximately 160 times higher than those applicable in the Federal Republic? Would this cause the immediate and more distant surroundings, especially the land used for agriculture and drinking water catchment areas, to be exposed to radioactivity? Does the disposal of heavy metals (cadmium, lead, mercury) pose a problem?

Will the Commission take steps in this case to defend the vital interests of the public? What practical measures are

to be taken in the near future to apply standard exposure levels throughout the Community?

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

(11 May 1984)

The French authorities have not yet laid down limits for the discharge of radioactive effluents from the Cattenom nuclear power station.

However, the French Ministerial Order of 11 August 1976⁽¹⁾ stipulates that the limits for discharges from nuclear power stations may in no case exceed 80 000 Ci of rare gases per year and 5 Ci of halogens and aerosols per year per 3 000 MWth (approximately 1 000 MWe).

The limits laid down by the French authorities for power stations already completed or under construction have so far been considerably lower than those ceiling values. Thus the limits established for the Paluel power station, which is of the same type and has the same capacity as Cattenom (4 × 1 300 MWe) are 90 000 Ci of rare gases per year and 3 Ci of halogens and aerosols per year.

Calculations have shown that the doses resulting from such discharges and received by the local population via the various possible exposure pathways (inhalation, external irradiation, ingestion of contaminated agricultural products and drinking water, etc.) are in no case greater than the dose limits laid down in the Federal Republic of Germany for exposure of the public to radioactive effluents.

The Commission would point out that the protection of the general public and workers against the dangers of radiation is based on the Directive of 2 February 1959 laying down the basic safety standards, as last amended on 15 July 1980⁽²⁾.

Furthermore, pursuant to Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty, the Member States are obliged to communicate to the Commission their plans for the discharge of radioactive effluents. The Commission delivers an opinion regarding the radiological consequences of such discharges for the neighbouring Member States. When formulating such opinions, it also studies the established discharge limits and compares them with those laid down in the case of other similar installations.

Every two years, the Commission also publishes a report on the discharges of radioactive effluents effected by all the nuclear power stations and reprocessing plants in the Community. It emerges from these reports that the discharges generally differ little in the case of nuclear power stations of the same type. A copy of such a report will be sent to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of the European Parliament.

Since Cattenom is a nuclear power station, there should not be any problems in connection with the discharge of heavy metals.

- (1) Order concerning the regulations specific to nuclear power stations equipped with light-water reactors and applicable to the limits and procedures in respect of the discharge of gaseous effluents therefrom (*Official Journal of the European Communities* of 1 September 1976).
- (2) Council Directive 80/836/Euratom, (OJ No L 246, 17. 9. 1980).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2035/83

by Mr Dieter Rogalla (S – D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 February 1984)

(84/C 188/65)

Subject: Manning levels in the Commission

1. Does the Commission as a whole share the view expressed by one of its members, Mr Burke at the night sitting on the Thursday of the December part-session, that, contrary to appearances, the Commission is greatly understaffed?
2. In which areas is this the case, and what steps have been taken by the Commission in previous years to bring to the attention of the Council of Ministers and Parliament its need for additional staff?
3. What arrangements have been made by the Commission for internal staff transfers and with what success?

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

(15 May 1984)

1. Yes. Staff numbers fall well short of what the Commission needs to cope with its many responsibilities.
2. Staff shortages affect all departments. However, the Commission has always made a point of identifying the areas in which staff are most needed.

The Commission assesses its manning requirements every year when it prepares the preliminary draft budget and asks for additional posts. It attempts to hold a genuine dialogue with the budgetary authority and to this end provides detailed grounds for posts. The discussion with the Council is normally confined to a general, very restrictive overall assessment. Parliament, on the other hand, tends to examine the Commission's requests and agree that they should be met, in part at least.

In the 1984 preliminary draft budget the Commission indicated its priorities by asking for a further 293 permanent posts under the operating budget (management and supervisory duties, revitalization of the internal market, commercial protection, energy, financial instruments, information technology, transport) and 135 new posts under the research budget. The budgetary authority finally granted about 100 of the 'operating' posts (about one-third of the initial request) and 129 of the 'research' posts.

3. The Commission has been encouraging internal staff mobility for many years. This is achieved in the following ways:

- each Director-General has considerable power to reassign officials within his Directorate-General in line with workload; exercise of this power has been highlighted in the context of general Commission policy on staff mobility;
- the Commission has conducted a series of surveys of the organization of its Directorates-General; these enable it to assess existing structures and the prospects for internal and interdepartmental mobility;
- in the past the Commission has frequently set up *ad hoc* Task Forces to handle urgent and/or unforeseen specific tasks; this formula allows a core of officials from different departments or Directorates-General to be assembled at short notice to carry out specific duties for a limited time;
- more recently, the Commission has taken a number of posts from each Directorate-General to build up a small annual reserve; this can be drawn on to meet urgent limited requirements which cannot be met by redeployment within the Directorates-General concerned.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2081/83

by Mr Aart Geurtsen (L - NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(21 February 1984)

(84/C 188/66)

Subject: Situation on the medicinal products market

How and when does the Commission intend to take action on the following aspects of the market in medicinal products:

- (a) excessive price disparities on the European market, mainly attributable to the price freezes in France and Italy and which are undesirable from the point of view of free movement of goods;

- (b) the fact that a central register of medicinal products has not been established for all Member States;
- (c) extension of the validity of patents in the US?

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission

(15 May 1984)

The Commission requests the Honourable Member to refer to the answer it gave to Written Question No 2152/82 by Mr Wedekind ⁽¹⁾.

It would point out to the Honourable Member that it has already approached the French Government asking for explanations concerning the regulations in question.

In its work to promote the free movement of proprietary medicinal products within the Community, the Commission has at various times envisaged the possibility of setting up a centralized Community system for the registration of medicines, but the difficulties encountered have always appeared to be insuperable. Apart from the political and legal problems it would raise, the setting up of such a system would initially involve considerable administrative expenditure and it would have to operate in conjunction with the national systems for some time. At the end of 1980, therefore, the Commission suggested a different solution based on the mutual recognition of national marketing authorizations: a medicinal product manufactured and marketed in one Member State on the basis of harmonized provisions would on principle be admitted into any other Member State, except in exceptional cases submitted for the opinion of the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products. This approach was endorsed by the European Parliament in its resolution of 16 October 1981 ⁽²⁾. The proposal was incorporated by the Council in Directive 83/570/EEC ⁽³⁾, the preamble to which follows the general lines set out above, the recitals in the Directive simply ask that any Member State should give due consideration to an authorization granted by another Member State.

In pursuance of the American legislation on patents, all patents have a standard validity of 17 years as from the date of their granting.

The European Patent Convention, which entered into force in 1977, has extended the life of a patent to 20 years as from the date when application for it was filed. The Commission considers that, for the present, there is no reason to warrant the adoption for proprietary medicinal products of special regulations which would extend the monopoly conferred by a patent beyond 20 years.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 189, 14. 7. 1983.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 287, 9. 11. 1981, p. 127.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 332, 28. 11. 1983, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2086/83

by Mr Alfred Lomas (S – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(21 February 1984)

(84/C 188/67)

Subject: Restrictions on importation of certain products from the Federal Republic of Germany

Following an outbreak of swine fever in the Federal Republic of Germany in June 1983, a restriction was introduced on the importation of meat products from Germany.

However, it is now apparent that parcels are being sent from Germany containing, amongst other things, meat products such as German sausage, and that the parcels are being held at the Customs and Excise and then returned to the addressor.

This happened to a constituent of mine, prior to the Christmas period; the parcel was from her parents and was intended for the grandchildren.

I understand that this was within the law, but would it not be possible for legislation to be passed that would enable the Customs and Excise to open the parcel, remove the offending item and forward the rest of the parcel on to the addressee?

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

(16 May 1984)

The Commission has no responsibility for the conduct of relations between the customs administrations and the postal authorities of the Member States, nor for the treatment accorded to prohibited goods sent by post from one Member State to another, provided that any procedures and practices applied are compatible with Community law.

As regards the particular problem reported by the Honourable Member, the Commission can only agree with him that it would be preferable for the United Kingdom postal authorities, at the request of the customs administration, which is usually responsible for checking goods sent by post, even if they are already in free circulation in the Community, to remove the prohibited article from the parcel. To do this the addressee would have to be asked to be present, or at least invited to give assent to this removal. Only if the addressee refused such a solution would it then be necessary to send back the parcel. It would thus be possible to avoid some of the disappointment inevitably experienced by citizens who cannot understand why the creation of the Community has not made it easier, in certain cases, to exchange presents between Member States.

The Commission will put this point of view to the United Kingdom authorities in the hope that they will be able to adopt a more flexible approach to the problem. If there is any further development in the matter, the Honourable Member will be informed personally.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2101/83

by Mr Olaf Schwenke (S – D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 February 1984)

(84/C 188/68)

Subject: Right to lead guided tours in the EC

Notwithstanding the right to freedom of movement and freedom to choose one's place of employment within the Community which is guaranteed by the EEC Treaty, in some Member States – especially Greece – foreign tourist guides (experts in art history) are prohibited from carrying on their occupation. Tourist groups are thus compelled to rely on local tourist guides (who are often insufficiently qualified and inadequately trained in foreign languages).

Can the Commission corroborate this observation and, if so, say to which Member States it applies?

What steps has the Commission so far taken to prevent this violation of the Treaty occurring in future?

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

(18 May 1984)

The profession of tourist guide is subject to statutory rules in Greece and Italy. Access to and the pursuit of this profession is confined to nationals of the countries in question holding the vocational qualifications required by national law.

The nationality requirement is incompatible with the directly applicable provisions of Articles 52 and 59 of the EEC Treaty and is therefore no longer valid in respect of nationals of other Member States.

The Commission has repeatedly drawn the attention of the Member States in question to their duty both to cease applying this requirement and to abolish it formally. The procedure provided for in Article 169 of the EEC Treaty has already been initiated against Italy in this connection.

In contrast, the provisions of Greek and Italian law concerning vocational qualifications, which apply equally to nationals of the countries in question and to foreigners, do not breach Community law. The national

authorities may therefore prohibit persons who do not hold the qualifications in question from exercising the profession of tourist guide in their territory.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2154/83

by Mr Gerhard Schmid (S-D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 March 1984)

(84/C 188/69)

Subject: ERDF aid

On page 7 of *Official Journal of the European Communities* No C 246 of 20 September 1982, it is stated that aid has been granted to project No 80/02/04/019 001 for the new construction of a high-speed gas main in Landshut Land.

1. Can the Commission confirm that this new gas main for which aid was granted was in fact constructed in the Landshut Land area?
2. If so, which gas main is it?
3. If not, which project has the Commission subsidized under this number?

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

(24 April 1984)

1. The Commission confirms that a high-pressure gas main project in the district of Landshut (Bavaria) was assisted from the European Regional Development Fund.
2. The assisted project involved the first stage of construction of a high-pressure gas main from Tiefenbach (MEGAL) via Passau-Ruhstorf-Pocking-Birnbach with a branch line to Griesbach and Bad Fussing (Inn line).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2168/83

by Mr Spyridon Plaskovitis (S-GR)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 March 1984)

(84/C 188/70)

Subject: Granting of special economic aid to regions of Greece affected by natural disasters

In a series of resolutions by urgent procedure the European Parliament has repeatedly urged the

Commission to grant special economic aid to regions of Greece affected by natural disasters. These include in particular:

1. Resolution Doc. 1-721/82 on the granting of economic aid for the drawing up and execution of a programme for protecting Athens against fires following the major fires in the Athens region;
2. Resolution Doc. 1-854/82 on the granting of economic aid to victims of flooding in Katerini;
3. Resolution Doc. 1-1382/82 on economic aid for regions of Crete following the recent natural disasters;
4. Resolution Doc. 1-550/83 on economic aid for regions of Northern Greece affected by violent storms;
5. Resolution Doc. 1-1189/83 on the granting of special economic aid to Greece in view of the damage caused by recent snowstorms.

However, no special economic aid as provided for in the appropriate budget headings has so far been granted.

I should like to ask the Commission:

- (a) Why has no special economic aid been granted as yet?
- (b) What are the criteria used by the Commission to determine which areas should receive special economic aid?
- (c) Which countries or regions of the Community have in the last three years received special economic aid following natural disasters?

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

(7 May 1984)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the answer it gave to his Oral Question No H-722/83 at question time during Parliament's March part-session ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission would add that on 3 February it decided to grant 350 000 ECU from budget Article 690 for the victims of the snowstorms which hit northern Greece in December 1983.

This is the case referred to in resolution 1-1189/83, cited by the Honourable Member in point 5 of his question.

The other cases cited by the Honourable Member are not eligible under Article 690.

The criteria for granting emergency aid are based on the heading of Article 690, 'Aid to disaster victims in the Community'.

Only natural disasters which can be seen to have had exceptionally far-reaching and grave consequences for the population are therefore eligible; furthermore, the aid must directly benefit the disaster victims.

(¹) Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-310 (March 1984).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2180/83

by Mr Nikolaos Vgenopoulos (S - GR)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/71)

Subject: Irregularities in the administration of the common agricultural policy

The annual report of the Court of Auditors on the implementation of the budget for 1982 states that there were 213 cases of irregularity (fraud) in the administration of the CAP, accounting for a total of 35 000 000 ECU.

Can the Commission give a detailed statement of the irregularities together with the amount involved in each case?

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

(22 May 1984)

214 cases of irregularities were reported by the Member States in 1982, involving a total of 34 972 711 ECU.

The Commission takes the view that the preparation of a list giving a detailed description of each of these cases with the relevant amount would involve a great deal of work and would be of only limited use.

On the other hand, the Honourable Member may wish to consult the 12th financial report on the EAGGF Guarantee Section for 1982 (¹), in particular Annex 17, which gives a breakdown of the number of cases and relevant amounts, by Member State and by CAP area of activity.

(¹) Doc. COM(83) 531 final, 15. 9. 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2183/83

by Mr Horst Seefeld (S - D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/72)

Subject: French law of 31 December 1975 on the compulsory use of the French language in trade

In its reply to my Written Question No 2319/82 (¹), the Commission reported on the procedure whereby it had succeeded in restricting application of the above law in the case of Community products, at least as far as imports were concerned. I welcome this success.

I have, however, subsequently had cases referred to me on both the importing and marketing sides where it has been required that all documents and information on goods and labels must be given in French, in addition to the original language, a requirement that seems to me to constitute a highly serious obstruction to trade. Whereas pursuant to the rulings of the European Court of Justice on Article 30 of the EEC Treaty for example, the Member States cannot even necessarily insist on a product description - which is compulsory under Dutch law - being given in the national language (judgment of 16 December 1980 on national regulations on descriptions of alcoholic beverages), France is insisting on the use of the French language for all information carried on goods and labels.

1. Will the fact that the above law on the use of the French language has, as the Commission confirms been adopted pursuant to French law on consumer protection, have a direct binding effect on its interpretation under Community law in the light of Article 30?
2. Does the Commission see any infringement of consumer interests in the current widespread use in the Community of a standard type of label in the language of the country of origin, e.g. in German for German wines, in French for French wine, in English for whisky, etc., inasmuch as such labelling (in addition to information required under the relevant product-description rules) might be regarded as containing totally meaningless information, the precise translation of which into the relevant language is completely beyond the ken of the average consumer, or does it share with me the view that consumer interests are not on the whole adversely affected by this practice?
3. Should it not be regarded as standard practice, not to say as a welcome adjunct to inner penetration of markets, for consumers in the Community to get to know and, indeed, come to appreciate, typical

products of other Member States in their original packaging and labelled in the original language, without a full translation of every detail of information into the language of the country of destination (again, apart from any information the provision of which should be compulsory)?

4. Does the Commission therefore agree that cases clearly may exist on the marketing side where the requirement, pursuant to the French 1975 law, of a French translation of all information appearing on a product or label can be greatly in excess of what is genuinely needed to protect the interests of the French consumer?

(¹) OJ No C 212, 8. 8. 1982, p. 5.

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

(7 May 1984)

In his question the Honourable Member states that he had referred to him a number of cases where the use of French on documents or in information on goods and labels is required at both the import and marketing stage.

First of all, the Commission would point out that in an administrative decision published in the *Bulletin officiel des Douanes* No 4332 of 13 April 1983 the French authorities stated that, in the case of goods imported from other Member States, in whatever form, the requirements for labelling or documents to be in French applied to the marketing, not the customs clearance, stage.

The Commission would, therefore, like to receive details of the cases where use of the French language has been required at the import stage.

1. An administrative measure which creates or may create barriers to trade among the Member States cannot be justified solely on the grounds that it is required to protect consumers.

If obstacles to freedom of movement are to be justified on these grounds, the rules imposed must be essential to the protection of consumers' interests, that is, they must be both the most appropriate measures and those least likely to create barriers.

- 2 and 3. The Commission's view is that the consumer should be able to understand the essential information given on a product.

It also realizes that changes in labelling or the translation of information may be expensive and sometimes difficult to carry out and so may create obstacles to the free movement of goods between the Member States.

3. With regard to the need to reconcile the two objectives, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member States to Council Directive 79/112/EEC of 18 December 1978 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs for sale to the ultimate consumer, which provides in Article 14 that Member States shall ensure that the sale of foodstuffs within their own territories is prohibited if the compulsory particulars (Articles 3 and 4 (2)) do not appear in a language easily understood by purchasers, unless other measures have been taken to ensure that the purchaser is informed.
4. The Commission does not disagree with the Honourable Member States that the French law of 1975 on the use of the French language may constitute a barrier under Article 30. Nevertheless, it considers that it could only decide that this was indeed the case on the basis of conclusive concrete evidence of the requirements imposed.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2186/83

by Mr Dieter Rogalla (S - D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/73)

Subject: Customs union - Community administration

1. What action has the Commission taken to administer the customs union under Community law, pursuant to Article 9 of the EEC Treaty?

2. What estimate can the Commission make of the staffing requirements of a European customs administration under Community law?

3. Should not action in this connection have been taken already, why has it not been taken, and when does the Commission intend to act and on what time-scale?

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

(27 April 1984)

1 and 3. The Commission takes the view that the setting up of a Community customs administration will be the result of a gradual integration process. The Honourable Member is referred in this connection to the Commission's answer to Written Question No 1616/81 by Mr Irmer ⁽¹⁾.

2. With regard to the number of staff required by a Community customs administration for employment in the Member States, the Commission is not able to give a reliable estimate. However, the personnel requirements within the Community institutions would be considerably above the number currently dealing with customs union work.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 118, 10. 5. 1982, p. 9.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2189/83

by Mr Dieter Rogalla (S - D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 March 1984)

(84/C 188/74)

Subject: Customs authority premises at Community internal frontiers

1. Does the Commission share my view that it would be desirable for the Member States not to construct any new premises at the Community's internal frontiers for customs control activities at such frontiers?

2. If so, is the Commission prepared to use its authority as guardian of the Treaties, in particular in the field of customs union, to prohibit the Member States from taking such action by opening Treaty infringement procedures pursuant to Article 169 of the EEC Treaty?

3. Is the Commission also prepared to assume full legal responsibility pursuant to Article 169 of the EEC Treaty by seeking a ruling of the European Court of Justice if need be?

4. If not, what action does the Commission consider appropriate on its part in order to call an immediate and effective halt to what can only be an entirely incomprehensible development in the eyes of every EEC citizen?

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

(4 May 1984)

1. In its judgment of 25 October 1971 ⁽¹⁾ the Court of Justice stated that frontier controls remained justified if

they were necessary for application of Article 36 of the EEC Treaty, for the levying of internal taxation, transit controls and for statistical surveys. Though the Member States are required to perform these tasks with every concern for reducing formalities and checks to an absolute minimum, their proper application, not least to keep traffic flowing smoothly, depends upon maintaining a suitable infrastructure. This means that in practice it may be necessary to erect new buildings.

2 and 3. In Treaty infringement procedures the Commission acts against any interference in the free movement of goods that exceeds the justified measure of control. The construction of buildings in itself would not in normal circumstances be liable to impede free goods traffic.

4. In view of the heavy pressure upon the public authorities in all Member States for tight budget management, the Commission is sure that those responsible take all due care in assessing the need for new buildings. The Commission would also point out that it takes every opportunity to give credibility to its policy of strengthening the internal market by the gradual removal of internal frontiers.

⁽¹⁾ Case 159/78 / 1979 / ECR 3247.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2210/83

by Mr Pol Marck (PPE - B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/75)

Subject: Recruitment of successful candidates in examinations

To my great surprise I note that the order of merit of the successful candidates in recruitment examinations is not observed by the Commission.

I can understand that the nationality of candidates is taken into consideration. I cannot understand why the order of merit is not followed within the same nationality.

Can the Commission state whether, with a view to avoiding abuses and favouritism, there is any kind of provision for an accountability procedure in cases where the order of merit is not observed?

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

(18 May 1984)

When recruiting from lists of successful candidates, the Commission's principle is to observe the order of merit decided on by the Selection Board.

It departs from this principle only for objective reasons based on the interests of the service, e.g. when the training or professional experience of a successful candidate are particularly suited to the post to be filled.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2216/83

by Mr Erik Blumenfeld (PPE - D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/76)

Subject: East-West Trade

Further to the answer delivered by Commissioner Dalsager in Question Time on 15 February 1984 concerning the transactions of the firm Interagra in East-West trade ⁽¹⁾, is the Commission prepared to provide a general statement listing the agricultural products delivered by the EEC to the Soviet Union and to the East European States of Comecon in 1983? If so could it supply a breakdown according to firms, countries and products?

⁽¹⁾ Question No H-591/83 by Mr Habsburg - Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-309 (February 1984).

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

(3 May 1984)

Exhaustive annual export statistics for the Community are not available before April, May and June of the following year, depending on the ability of Member States to respect the timetable for the delivery of such statistics. Once such Community statistics are available, they are communicated to the Parliament as a matter of course. Figures for individual firms are not available to the Commission.

Because there is a risk of delay by at least one Member State in results for the year 1983, the Commission is

sending direct to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of Parliament a summary of the figures for the first nine months of 1982 and 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2220/83

by Mr Dieter Rogalla (S - D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/77)

Subject: The levying of customs and excise duties where small sums are involved

1. Is the Commission aware of the following incident:

At an election rally in Bochum on 7 February 1984 I was notified of complaints by Professor Wolfgang Heinemann of Bochum-Langendreer that some time ago his wife had been requested by the main customs office to pay duty on and collect a small parcel sent by her mother from the United Kingdom. Mrs. Heinemann travelled to the main customs office in Bochum by public transport. The return ticket cost DM 4. A customs official informed her that the parcel contained a 125 gram packet of tea, which is apparently the standard size in the United Kingdom. She was informed that she would have to pay duty on 25 grams of tea and that this amounted to the derisory sum of DM 0,75?

2. Is the Commission prepared to take this and other similar incidents as an opportunity to discuss with Member States the need for a balance between expenditure incurred in levying customs and excise duties and the tax revenue produced?

3. Does the Commission agree that this disproportion between expenditure and possible tax revenue is inevitably a source of public discontent and is liable to prejudice cooperation within the EEC?

4. What initiatives has the Commission taken in the past - or is it prepared to take at present - to put an end to absurdities of this kind?

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

(11 May 1984)

Tax reliefs on the importation of goods in small consignments of a non-commercial character within the Community are governed by Council Directive 74/651/EEC of 19 December 1974 as amended ⁽¹⁾.

Under this Directive, Member States may reduce the relief allowed for small consignments in respect of products subject to the quantitative limits referred to in Article 4 (1) of Council Directive 69/169/EEC ⁽²⁾, or prohibit any allowance for those products. The products concerned are tobacco, alcoholic beverages, perfume, coffee and tea, for which the Member States may, in accordance with those provisions, fix the quantities to be admitted tax free provided they do not exceed the maximum authorized for each product.

On 8 April 1983 the Commission sent to the Council a proposal for a Sixth Directive ⁽³⁾ amending Directive 69/169/EEC on tax-free allowances for travellers. Besides a multiannual programme for increasing the allowances, the Commission also proposes that quantitative restrictions be eliminated for coffee, tea and extracts and essences of tea and coffee as from 1 January 1985. The adoption of this measure would automatically cover small consignments. On 13 December 1983 the Commission sent to the Council a proposal for a Fourth Directive ⁽⁴⁾ whereby a multiannual programme for increasing allowances for small consignments would raise the total value of allowances from 70 to 130 ECU by 1 January 1987.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 354, 30. 12. 1974, p. 57; Council Directive 78/1034/EEC of 19 December 1978 (OJ No L 366, 28. 12. 1978, p. 33) and Council Directive 81/934/EEC of 17 November 1981 (OJ No L 338, 25. 11. 1981, p. 25).

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 133, 4. 6. 1969, p. 6.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 114, 28. 4. 1983, p. 4.

⁽⁴⁾ Doc. COM(83) 730 final (OJ No C 3, 6. 1. 1984, p. 5).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2222/83

by Mr Dimitrios Adamou (COM - GR)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/78)

Subject: The threat to the survival of the Greek wood-processing industry

On 30 November 1983 more than 8 500 workers from 1 700 wood-processing factories and workshops in the prefecture of Thessaloniki held a 24-hour warning strike: their principal demand was that the sector should be protected to ensure its survival.

The Greek wood-processing and furniture manufacturing industry is one of the basic processing sectors in Greece, employing tens of thousands of workers.

In view of the absence of a modern infrastructure and the high cost of production the very survival of the sector is threatened and the situation is about to enter a critical phase, since from 1 January 1984 all restrictions will be abolished on furniture imports (the customs warehouses are already piled up with imported furniture).

What measures does the Commission intend taking to protect the Greek wood-processing industry from ruinous competition and to safeguard the jobs of thousands of workers in this sector?

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

(11 May 1984)

Imports of furniture into Greece from non-member States are limited to 2 820 tonnes up to 31 October 1984, in accordance with Article 2 (1) of Commission Decision 84/38/EEC of 11 January 1984 ⁽¹⁾ with effect from 1 January 1984.

The Greek administration, in recent contacts with the Commission services, has announced the preparation of a sectoral plan in wood, furniture and paper which aims at improving the competitiveness of the industry. When the Greek Government has presented its plans the Commission will be in a better position to define the options available at Community level for the Greek industry.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 23, 28. 1. 1984, p. 37.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2223/83

by Mr Alexandros Alavanos (COM - GR)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/79)

Subject: A new blow dealt by the Commission to the Greek iron and steel industry

The Commission has taken two decisions which constitute a new blow to the Greek iron and steel industry and will have direct repercussions on the workers in this sector:

- (a) it has decided to fix iron and steel exports between Member States of the Community at 1981/82 export levels, which will mean an abrupt decline in Greek exports since Greek exports over that period were minimal;
- (b) it has decided to allow all Member States to export rolled steel products to Greece without laying down minimum prices and without according Greece corresponding rights.

The latter decision, which infringes the Treaty of Accession, virtually puts an end to the production of rolled steel in Greece, which means a further cut-back in the work done by the Greek iron and steel industry, the laying-off of many workers and consequently an increase in the unemployment already afflicting this sector. In view of this state of affairs, what measures does the Commission intend taking to prevent these decisions being implemented?

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

(11 May 1984)

The Council, in its meeting of 22 December 1983, made the following statement.

'With regard to Greek undertakings, the Member States recognize that the reference period taken for traditional trade (June 1981 – July 1982) is not representative.

Therefore, no abnormal situation would arise in respect of the flows from Greek undertakings if the latter observe the proportion of their production quotas which they are permitted to deliver to the common market and provided imports into Greece of products originating in third countries do not increase significantly compared with 1983'.

As for the exemption from the minimum price regulations, as given in Decision No 3715/83/ECSC ⁽¹⁾, of steel products supplied by Community undertakings for the further manufacture of ECSC products on the territory of the Hellenic Republic, this was introduced at the specific request of the Greek Government, and cannot therefore be regarded as a breach of the Treaty of Accession.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 373, 31. 12. 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2227/83

by Mr Robert Moreland (ED – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/80)

Subject: Potential of the ceramic industries in China

1. Is the Commission concerned at the potential of the ceramic industry of China to become the dominant ceramic industry in the world?

2. Will the Commission undertake a detailed survey of that industry in China and its potential effects on the Community's ceramic industry?

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

(11 May 1984)

1. The Commission is well aware of the potential of China's ceramic industry, one of China's traditional industries.

As pointed out in reply to the Honourable Member's Oral Question No H-535/83 in February 1984 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission constantly monitors imports of ceramics from a number of countries in the Far East, including the People's Republic of China.

Quotas have been imposed on most ceramics imported from the People's Republic. Under the terms of the trade agreement between the EEC and the People's Republic, these are reviewed once a year by the EEC-China Joint Committee before being fixed definitively by the Council.

Naturally, all due consideration is given to the interests of the Community's ceramic industry each time the quotas come up for review.

2. Under the circumstances, the Commission therefore sees no need to undertake a more detailed survey of the ceramic industry in China.

⁽¹⁾ Verbatim report on proceedings of 15 February 1984, p. 180.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2239/83

by Mr Jens-Peter Bonde (CDI – DK)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/81)

Subject: Danish Information Office

Will the Commission provide details of

1. the amount spent on information activities in 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983 and the amount likely to be spent in 1984?

2. the names and addresses of Danish organizations that have received subsidies from the Commission, together with the amount and purpose in each case?

3. the number of persons employed at the Commission's office in Denmark for each of the years from 1979 to 1984?

4. the number of freelance workers together with the wages/fees paid to each person?
5. the approximate amount spent by the Danish office in utilizing the central information services, including publications?
6. expenditure in 1983 broken down according to major publications, salaries, fees, entertainment, gifts, etc.?

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

(17 May 1984)

The staff (all grades) of the Commission's information office in Denmark totalled 13 in 1979, 14 in 1980 and 15 since 1981.

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question No 1849/82 by Mr Bogh for the other detailed information requested by him.

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

(14 May 1984)

Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964 was incorporated into Belgian law in 1965 by two Royal Decrees of 24 April of that year ⁽¹⁾. It has been amended on a number of occasions, most recently by Council Directive 83/90/EEC of 7 February 1983 ⁽²⁾.

To the Commission's knowledge Belgium has not failed to meet its obligations and Belgian slaughterhouses are in a position to compete on equal terms with those in other Member States.

The purpose of the visits by Commission officials to Belgian slaughterhouses at the end of 1983 was to give the authorities and the establishments themselves an opportunity to take any action that might be necessary before the inspections proper, under Article 9 of Directive 64/433/EEC, begin in 1985.

⁽¹⁾ Moniteur belge No 124, 29. 6. 1965.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 59, 5. 3. 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2253/83

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S-B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/82)

Subject: Inspection of public and private slaughterhouses in Belgium and related delays in this country

The Commission has just started to inspect public and private slaughterhouses in order to check that meat is given the EEC stamp on the basis of compliance with European health regulations (Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964 ⁽¹⁾).

However, this Directive was not introduced into Belgian law until as late as 9 February 1981, by Royal Decree, and the checks themselves did not begin until the start of 1983.

Is the Commission contemplating taking into account this abnormal situation, which places Belgian slaughterhouses at a disadvantage as regards competition with slaughterhouses in Member States that fulfilled their legal obligations in good time?

Might a deferral or provisional measures be possible?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 121, 29. 7. 1964, p. 2012/64.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2255/83

by Mrs Raymonde Dury (S-B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 March 1984)

(84/C 188/83)

Subject: Known undesirable effects on two anti-inflammatory drugs currently on the market

Two anti-inflammatory drugs used to treat rheumatism exhibit a number of undesirable side effects which may result in death. These are phenylbutazone and oxyphenbutazone, marketed as Butazolodin and Tanderil by Ciba-Geigy.

Furthermore, in late December, Ciba-Geigy issued a confidential report underlining once again the problems connected with this category of drugs and the extremely dangerous nature of phenylbutazone and oxyphenbutazone.

The report refers to 1 182 deaths that may be linked to Butazolodin or Tanderil; this number only covers the cases throughout the world reported to Ciba-Geigy during the period from 1952 to 1981. The real figure is certainly much higher.

1. What steps does the Commission intend to take to halt sales of Butazolidin and Tanderil within the countries of the Community?
2. What steps does it intend to take to ensure that all citizens of the Community receive the same degree of protection?
3. How are the instruction slips accompanying pharmaceutical products drafted in the various countries of the Community, and does the Commission intend to take steps to standardize them?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 16/84

by Mrs Raymonde Dury (S - B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 April 1984)

(84/C 188/84)

Subject: Restriction of the use of two commercial anti-inflammatory drugs

During March the problems of anti-rheumatic drugs, in particular Butazolidin and Tanderil, surfaced again following a confidential report published by the manufacturer, Ciba-Geigy.

Ciba-Geigy has just drawn back in that it has restricted the use in Belgium of these two medicinal preparations and halted the sale of Tanderil suppositories for children.

The length of treatment with Tanderil is also to be restricted, and stopped altogether for children under 14 years of age.

1. What steps does the Commission intend to take to require the manufacturer to extend its decision to all Community countries where these products are sold?
2. What proposals does the Commission intend to make with a view to setting up a European registration committee for all medicinal preparations?

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

(14 May 1984)

In accordance with Council Directive 65/65/EEC ⁽¹⁾, it is up to the Member States and not the Commission to take suitable measures for the placing on the market of medicinal products. To coordinate national decisions, the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products, which was set up by Council Directive 75/319/EEC ⁽²⁾, met in January 1984 to discuss what measures should be taken to restrict the use of phenylbutazone (Butazolidine)

and oxyphenbutazone (Tanderil). Since then, in consequence of the deliberations of the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products, measures similar to those taken in Belgium have been decided upon in the other Member States.

In December 1980, the Commission proposed ⁽³⁾ the setting up of a system for the mutual recognition of marketing authorizations, in preference to a European register, to facilitate the movement of medicinal products in the Community. The Parliament approved this course in its resolution of 16 October 1981 ⁽⁴⁾.

Finally, the Council, in adopting Directive 83/570/EEC ⁽⁵⁾, confirmed this general trend, in particular in a recital which reads as follows:

'Whereas the approximation of laws brought about in this connection must enable a proprietary product, manufactured and marketed in one Member State on the basis of harmonized provisions, to be allowed into another Member State, taking into due consideration the initial authorization, save in exceptional cases submitted for an opinion to the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products set up by Directive 75/319/EEC.'

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 22, 9. 2. 1965.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 147, 9. 6. 1975.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 355, 31. 12. 1980.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 287, 9. 11. 1981.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 332, 28. 11. 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2266/83

by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L - B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 March 1984)

(84/C 188/85)

Subject: Special EEC aid for areas of Belgium affected by catastrophic flooding

At its sitting of 17 February the Belgian Government declared the area ravaged by the storms, heavy rainfall and flooding in Belgium on 7 to 9 February a national disaster area. 154 Belgian communes were affected.

Does the Commission intend granting special aid to the worst affected districts and to farmers and stock breeders in the disaster area, some of whom lost practically everything in the floods?

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

(21 May 1984)

After studying the facts of the case referred to by the Honourable Member concerning the flooding in Belgium from 7 to 9 February, the Commission decided not to grant emergency aid under Article 690 of the budget.

Since the appropriations in this Article are very limited – and indeed for this year were cut by a third compared with previous years – the criteria for granting emergency aid must be applied strictly.

Such aid can only be granted in the case of a natural disaster causing particularly extensive and serious damage. In the case in question, it appears that the overall amount of damage to both public and private property is relatively low in relation to the size of the affected area, which covers virtually all the Belgian provinces.

The Belgian Government has been informed of this decision.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2268/83

by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L – B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 March 1984)

(84/C 188/86)

Subject: Brussels – Extensions of the EEC buildings

The controversy over the problem of extensions to the EEC buildings in the Schumann-Froissart-Belliard quarter of Brussels has recently flared up once more.

The Secretary of State, Mrs Cécile Goor, on behalf of the Belgian Government, and the executive of the Brussels region have drawn up a number of new principles with regard to the plan for the sector put forward and adopted in 1979.

Can the Commission state its position on the new plan, and whether the extensions provided for in the plan put forward by the Belgian Public Works Authority exactly meet the needs of its services as regards surface area of offices?

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

(15 May 1984)

The Commission was not involved in defining the new principles with regard to the sector plan put forward and

adopted in 1979. This is a matter for the Belgian authorities alone.

The information available to the Commission suggests that these principles relate in the main to the plans for a new building to house the Council Secretariat.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2287/83

by Mr George Patterson (ED – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 March 1984)

(84/C 188/87)

Subject: Safety of private swimming pools

1. How many children under the age of 14 years have drowned in private swimming pools in recent years in the various Member States?
2. Which Community States, if any, have legislation requiring fencing around private swimming pools, or other safety regulations?

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

(2 May 1984)

1. The Commission is currently running a test exercise in data gathering on accidents in which a product is implicated. This exercise is being conducted in hospital emergency wards, which prevents deaths due to drowning from being covered, since the victims are not sent to hospitals but to a forensic institute. The Commission is therefore examining how to make a survey of drowning accidents, and is due to put forward a draft Council Decision on the setting up of an overall Community system for the safety of products in June 1984.

2. The Commission is not aware of national swimming pool safety legislation. The industry estimates that there are between 100 000 and 150 000 private swimming pools in Europe; normally, the customer requires a cover, in the form of an awning or sliding roof, to be built to protect the pool against weather in winter and to conserve heat at night during the summer. Indirectly such systems serve to prevent accidents when pools are not supervised; some clients with young children have fences built round their pools, others install warning systems – sonar, wave detectors – set off by a

body falling into the pool. Finally, there would appear to be more bathing accidents in rivers and ponds than in private swimming pools.

completed and the related forms and requisite information presented by 3 April if the applications were to be considered eligible.

(1) Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-307 (December 1983).

(2) OJ No L 289, 22. 10. 1983, p. 38.

(3) OJ No L 289, 22. 10. 1983, p. 1.

(4) OJ No L 377, 31. 12. 1983.

(5) Doc. COM(84) 53 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2289/83

by Sir Fred Warner (ED - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 March 1984)

(84/C 188/88)

Subject: Social Fund guidelines

The late publication of the Social Fund guidelines only two months before the closing date for receipt of applications in Brussels, let alone in the national capitals, meant that it was almost impossible for applicants to give any time to considering their applications for Social Fund grants in 1984. What steps does the Commission intend taking to ensure that such a delay has not deprived suitable applicants of the opportunity to obtain funds?

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

(10 May 1984)

As the Commission informed Parliament⁽¹⁾, the conditions determining the eligibility of applications for Fund assistance are laid down in Decision 83/516/EEC⁽²⁾ and Council Regulation (EEC) 2950/83 of 17 October 1983⁽³⁾ rather than in the guidelines for the management of the Fund. In view of the delay affecting approval of the guidelines, the Commission extended the time limit initially laid down for the submission of applications for Fund assistance for 1984.

Thus by derogation from Articles 1 and 2 of Commission Decision 83/678/EEC of 22 December 1983⁽⁴⁾, it was made possible for the Member States to submit their applications for assistance by 13 March 1984 in the form of lists of operations stating no more than the names of the bodies concerned and the amounts requested for each body.

This provision was the subject of a Commission Decision adopted on 17 January 1984⁽⁵⁾ and notified to the Member States forthwith.

In this Decision, the Commission also provided that applications submitted in simplified form should be duly

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2291/83

by Mr David Curry (ED - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 March 1984)

(84/C 188/89)

Subject: Application of Community dairy sector measures to producer processors

Regulations (EEC) No 1079/77⁽¹⁾ and (EEC) No 1822/77⁽²⁾ refer in their recitals to the application of the co-responsibility levy to certain dairy products sold directly from the farm and to milk used on the farm in making butter and cream and qualifying for aid for the skimmed milk produced in this process.

Does the Commission accept that the flat rate co-responsibility levy should apply to farm sales and use of these products and other products sold off the farm?

Is it the Commission's intention that the proposed 'super-levy' intended to reinforce the discipline of quotas should apply to producers who process milk into products to be sold directly off the farm?

(1) OJ No L 131, 26. 5. 1977, p. 6.

(2) OJ No L 203, 9. 8. 1977, p. 1.

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

(16 May 1984)

The co-responsibility levy is paid by producers - not situated in mountainous areas or certain regions in Italy and Greece - for milk delivered to the dairy. At present, the producer only pays the levy on milk used for the production of farm butter and cream if he applies for aid for liquid skimmed milk obtained in the production process.

In Council Regulations (EEC) No 856/84 and (EEC) No 857/84 ⁽¹⁾, it is indicated that the supplementary levy is payable by every milk producer on the quantities of milk and/or milk equivalent he has sold for direct consumption and which during the 12 months concerned exceed a reference quantity.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 90, 1. 4. 1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2309/83

by Mr Gérard Fuchs (S-F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 March 1984)

(84/C 188/90)

Subject: Functioning of the GSP

Can the Commission state what requests and complaints it has received from what countries in the last two operational years of the GSP (problems in defining products, thresholds considered inadequate, etc.)?

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

(3 March 1984)

Although the Commission has always insisted that the Community's GSP scheme remains formally autonomous and non-negotiable, nevertheless it has also made it clear to beneficiary countries that it would be willing to receive and listen to comments and criticisms on its functioning and suggestions as to how it might be approved. The Commission therefore, now receives each year a wide variety of observations in such forms as notes verbales, aide-mémoires, comments at meetings of Joint Commissions under Cooperation Agreements with a number of beneficiary countries etc. relating to different aspects of the Community's GSP scheme – product coverage and tariff treatment notably as regards Chapters 1 to 24 of the Common Customs Tariff, the operation of the Community's machinery of preferential limits – tariff quotas and ceilings for industrial and textile products and rules of origin. Another important opportunity for exchanges of views on the GSP scheme is provided by the informal and private plurilateral consultations which can take place in parallel with the meetings of the UNCTAD Special Committee on Preferences.

The volume of these representations to the Commission during 1982 and 1983 is much too vast for reprinting in

the *Official Journal of the European Communities*, but the Commission will shortly send to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of the Parliament what it considers to be a typical selection.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2319/83

by Mr Michael Welsh (ED-GB)

to the Council of the European Communities

(26 March 1984)

(84/C 188/91)

Subject: Remarks by the President-in-Office of the Council to the US Congressional Delegation to the European Parliament

In its written answer to my Oral Question No H-671/83 ⁽¹⁾, the Council confirmed that the speech made by the acting President-in-Office on January 20 was 'perfectly in line with the Council's position on the subjects dealt with'.

In this speech the President-in-Office stated that, since the United States had supported the enlargement of the Community through the accession of Spain and Portugal, it must be prepared to pay an appropriate political price, notably by accepting limitations on cereal substitute imports and the institution of a tax on vegetable oils and fats.

1. Why does the Council believe that it is incumbent on the Americans to pay a price for the Community's enlargement?
2. Does the Council believe that enlargement is conditional on the implementation of these measures?
3. Is it normal practice for such speeches to be drafted by the Council Secretariat presumed to speak for the Council as a whole, or are they prepared by the minister's private office?
4. Does the Council wish to reconsider its answer to Oral Question No H-671/83?

⁽¹⁾ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1 – 309 (February 1984).

Answer

(5 June 1984)

The Council confirms the reply it gave to Oral Question No H/671/83. The Commission proposals to which the Honourable Member refers should be seen in the context of the problems posed by reform of the CAP and enlargement.

As part of the series of decisions concerning the common agricultural policy that it took at its meeting on 31 March 1984, the Council authorized the Commission to open negotiations or consultations under Article XXVIII of GATT with a view to temporary and partial suspension of the tariff concessions for maize by-products.

The proposal introducing a tax on vegetable oils is still being examined by the Council.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2329/83

by Lord O'Hagan (ED - GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 March 1984)

(84/C 188/92)

Subject: Tachographs

The Community legislation on tachographs is excellent in theory but difficult to implement. In particular there is still some misunderstanding about exemption for vehicles which are not in regular commercial use on the road.

1. Has the Commission completed its review of the exemption from tachograph legislation?
2. How does the proposed legislation affect the following:
 - (a) farmer's tractors and forestry vehicles;
 - (b) school minibuses;
 - (c) vehicles engaged in road safety competitions;
 - (d) vehicles in fund raising activities for charity?

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

(16 May 1984)

1. On 12 March 1984 the Commission approved a draft for a Regulation modifying the social regulations in road transport, together with a draft for a recommendation aiming at improving their implementation throughout the Community. The proposals were submitted to the Council on 20 March 1984 ⁽¹⁾.

2. Among other modifications to the Regulations, the Commission has clarified and extended the list of categories of transport which are or may be exempted from the provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 543/69 and the requirement to fit a tachograph, where these categories are of relatively minor economic importance to the transport market.

Thus, the proposal exempts all vehicles belonging to or hired by agricultural or forestry undertakings when used within a 50 km radius of their base, passenger vehicles with up to 17 seats including the driver's and all private goods transport.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(84) 147.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2343/83

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S - B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 March 1984)

(84/C 188/93)

Subject: Subsidized coach service between Belgium and Greece

The travel company Orban de Huy is running a subsidized coach service, without intermediate stops, between Belgium and Greece, mainly designed for immigrants.

The Belgian Ministry of Transport has authorized this service.

But at the present time the Orban company has a coach held up in Rixhem (Haut-Rhin, France) by the French authorities.

Will the Commission say if this hold-up complies with the Council Regulation (EEC) No 517/72 ⁽¹⁾?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 67, 20. 3. 1972, p. 19.

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

(15 May 1984)

According to information received this is a regular coach service between Belgium and Greece operating as a 'closed door' service through the territories of the Member States it crosses in transit, and picking up and setting down passengers solely in Belgium and Greece.

Under the terms of Council Regulation (EEC) No 517/72 of 28 February 1972 on the introduction of common rules for regular and special regular services by coach and bus between Member States, operation of this service is subject to authorization. Although the operator had received a favourable response from the Belgian authorities, he did not possess the requisite authorization to operate this service and was hence in breach of the Regulation. The penalty imposed by the French authorities was hence justified.

It should be noted that, in accordance with Article 13 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 517/72, the decision to

introduce a regular service of this kind is to be taken by agreement between the Member States in whose territory passengers are to be taken up or set down. It takes effect one month after its notification to the Member States whose territories are crossed in transit without passengers being taken up or set down. If these Member States consider that this decision is liable to give rise to serious difficulties, they may object to the decision before it takes effect by referring the matter to the Commission.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2360/83

by Mrs Henriette Poirer (COM – F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 March 1984)

(84/C 188/94)

Subject: Imports of maize gluten from the United States

In its answer of 5 October 1983 to my Written Question No 789/83⁽¹⁾ on imports of maize gluten, the Commission stated that it was willing to enter into negotiations within GATT. It did not, however, give specific answers to certain questions, which I am therefore repeating below:

1. Has the Commission decided to ask for the unbinding of the zero duty rate currently applied?
2. Does the Commission take the view that this unbinding can be carried out without compensation by the EEC since GATT does not provide for compensation in the case of products which do not benefit from production subsidies, which is precisely the case with maize gluten in the United States through the subsidies granted for ethanol or isoglucose?

In view of the breakdown of imports among the Member States, I would add a further question:

3. Does the Commission recognize that there has been in recent months a correlation between imports of substitute products and increases in dairy production? Is it prepared to take account of this in its proposals for the reform of the CAP?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 323, 28. 11. 1983, p. 22.

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

(22 May 1984)

1. The Commission has recommended that the Council authorize it to enter into negotiations and

consultations with a view to modifying the GATT concessions on certain maize industry residues (including maize gluten-based animal feed) on the basis of Article XXVIII. This recommendation is currently being studied.

2. Article XXVIII of the GATT specifies that a tariff concession may be modified only by negotiation and agreement with the contracting parties primarily concerned. It also stipulates that 'in such negotiations and agreements, which may include provisions for compensatory adjustment with respect to other products, the contracting parties concerned shall endeavour to maintain a general level of reciprocal and mutually advantageous concessions not less favourable to trade' than that existing previously. The General Agreement also specifies that if the contracting parties cannot reach agreement, the contracting party which proposes to modify or withdraw the concession shall be free to do so, the other contracting party or parties concerned thus being free to withdraw substantially equivalent concessions. On account of the constraints inherent in such negotiations and the fact that the outcome cannot be foreseen the Commission cannot comment at this stage on the possibility of reaching such agreement without compensation. However, the Commission will not fail to make the point that production of maize gluten feed in the United States is encouraged by the subsidies granted for ethanol and by the price protection enjoyed by isoglucose. The Commission does not take the view that GATT does not provide for compensation in the case of products which receive production subsidies.

3. The Commission indeed considers that there is a certain correlation between imports, of certain substitute products, such as maize gluten feed, and increases in dairy production. The Commission took this into account in its proposals for reform of the CAP. Hence its request for modification of the concessions in question.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2361/83

by Mr Maurice Martin (COM – F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 March 1984)

(84/C 188/95)

Subject: Wine harvest declarations

1. Can the Commission say why it decided to accept as valid wine harvest declarations which give no indication of yield per hectare?
2. Does the Commission recognize that its decision places producers in the different Member States on an

unequal footing, to the disadvantage of the French wine growers who observe very strict production and management criteria?

3. Does the Commission not consider that these assessment difficulties are likely to compromise the measures provided for in the Regulations on wine and prevent them from being applied correctly?

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

(22 May 1984)

1 and 2. Although the Commission submitted its draft Regulation to government experts as early as June 1983, Regulation (EEC) No 2408/83 on harvest and stock declarations relating to wine-sector products was formally adopted only on 25 August. The Regulation requires for the first time that the harvest declarations should include various items of information relating to the determination of the yield per hectare of the vineyards.

Those Member States whose national law had not included this obligation had to cope with a number of administrative difficulties connected with the printing and distribution of the new forms and administrative circulars. These difficulties were aggravated in the regions in which vinification is carried out by the merchants purchasing the harvests and in the Member States where the wine cooperatives had previously been required to make an overall declaration for all their members. Consequently, many wine-growers were unable to obtain in time the information needed to provide full declarations. Accordingly, and as the data in the forward balance-sheet adopted on 15 December 1983 did not justify activation of the compulsory distillation operation referred to in Article 41 of basic Regulation (EEC) No 337/79, the Commission thought it fair to relax the original arrangements to avoid penalizing wine-growers who had run into difficulties. The Commission stresses that this waiver is of an exceptional character confined to 1983/84 only and is without prejudice to the full application of the new Regulation for future marketing years.

3. Aware of the importance of information on yields per hectare in harvest declarations, the Commission is planning to lay before the Management Committee for Wine in the very near future a proposal designed to ensure proper and uniform application of the harvest declaration arrangements from the beginning of the next marketing year onwards, so that all the facts and figures needed for consistent and effective application of market management instruments will be available.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2367/83

by Mr Basil de Ferranti (ED – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 March 1984)

(84/C 188/96)

Subject: Car purchasers throughout Europe

In view of the fact that the problem of buying a right-hand drive car – other than in the United Kingdom – has been extremely difficult and is a continuing source of annoyance, particularly to citizens of the United Kingdom, could the Commission say what is being done to restore the rights of EEC citizens to purchase cars anywhere within the EEC without let or hindrance, and give a date as to when this will be possible?

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

(15 May 1984)

The right of citizens in the Community to purchase cars anywhere in the common market has been consistently defended by the Commission ever since its first BMW decision (Decision 75/73/EEC of 13 December 1974 ⁽¹⁾). As far as the Commission knows this right is generally not threatened by the dealer agreements applied in the motor industry.

Some manufacturers have, however, begun refusing to supply RHD vehicles on the Continent or making purchase substantially more difficult. The Commission has taken immediate steps against this practice ⁽²⁾, which it regards as an attempt to shield the UK market and, as such, a practice which disqualifies the manufacturer's exclusive and selective distribution systems from exemption under the EEC competition rules. An agreement or concerted practice with the same object would also, in its view, be incompatible with the Treaty. The Commission has accordingly taken up the most clear-cut and important cases and is considering what action can be taken. In the Ford case, it adopted interim measures on 18 August 1982 (Decision 82/628/EEC) ⁽³⁾. This Decision was, however, not upheld by the Court of Justice in its appeal judgment of 28 February 1984 ⁽⁴⁾. The Court did point to another procedure (Article 15 (6) of Council Regulation No 17) which the Commission might use instead.

The Commission has since taken a Decision (83/560/EEC of 16 November 1983 ⁽⁵⁾) on the substantive issues of the case and the manufacturer's appeal against this decision is now before the Court of Justice. The Court's judgment on this appeal should clarify whether or not the restrictive dealership agreements current in the motor trade are incompatible with Community law when prospective UK buyers

cannot under any circumstances obtain RHD cars, which the manufacturer produces in any case, from his franchised dealers on the Continent. The Commission is also seeking clarification of the question of the extent to which price differentials between RHD and LHD vehicles are consistent with the competition rules.

(¹) OJ No L 29, 3. 2. 1975, p. 1.

(²) Commission activities and EC rules for the automobile industry 1981/83 – Progress report presented to the European Parliament and the Council, COM(83) 633 final of 21 December 1983, paragraphs 1.1 to 1.3.

(³) OJ No L 256, 2. 3. 1982, p. 20.

(⁴) Joined Cases Nos 228 and 229/82 (not yet reported).

(⁵) OJ No L 327, 16. 11. 1983, p. 31.

— a temporary worker may not be placed at the disposal of the user undertaking for more than three months.

In the Commission's view there is no question of a restraint on the freedom of movement of workers, or the freedom to provide services, on the part of the Federal Republic of Germany. The latter is within its rights to require businesses providing services from other Member States to obtain an authorization on the basis of the same criteria as those applying to German undertakings.

The Commission's opinion on this point is in accordance with the judgment by the Court of 17 December 1981 in Case No 279/80 (¹).

(¹) Reports 1981, p. 3305.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2393/83

by Mr Basil de Ferranti (ED – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 March 1984)

(84/C 188/97)

Subject: Temporary staff in Germany

Could the Commission confirm whether it is true that in Germany temporary staff from other Member States have to be permanently employed by the company which assigns them, and that they cannot remain at any one location longer than 13 weeks in any one year?

If so, would the Commission agree that this is a restraint on freedom of movement?

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

(10 May 1984)

No temporary employment business, be it German or from another Member State, may operate in the Federal Republic of Germany without prior authorization from the Bundesanstalt für Arbeit. The latter grants this authorization, without any discrimination on the basis of nationality or place of establishment, exclusively to businesses, German or from other Member States, which observe the conditions laid down in German law. These conditions include the following, in particular:

— temporary employment businesses must conclude employment contracts of indefinite duration with temporary workers (except for legitimate reasons which concern the worker himself),

WRITTEN QUESTION No 4/84

by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté (DEP – F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 April 1984)

(84/C 188/98)

Subject: Early retirement and unemployment

Is the Commission aware of the results achieved by the international experts brought together by the International Labour Office, who say that 'pension schemes are not the right instrument for combating the effects of the recession'? These experts reportedly recommend increasing retirement pensions rather than lowering the age at which they can be taken.

What is the Commission's view of the solution put forward? Are there any countries applying such a policy, which are they and what are the results?

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

(16 May 1984)

The study in question ('Into the 21st century: the development of social security') is the work of leading international experts on social security, and the Commission will certainly take note of it in determining its own point of view.

With regard to the more specific point raised by the Honourable Member, the Commission would refer him to Council recommendation 82/857/EEC of 10 December 1982 on the principles of a Community

policy with regard to retirement age ⁽¹⁾, which favours flexible (i.e. early or late) retirement.

With regard to the policies applied in the Member States, the overriding tendency has been to introduce early retirement, financed, not by retirement pension schemes, but by bridging pensioning schemes as part of measures to fight unemployment (in certain cases the unemployment insurance schemes bear part of the cost) or sectoral arrangements.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 357, 18. 12. 1982, p. 27.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 90/84

by Mr Guy Fernandez (COM - F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 April 1984)

(84/C 188/99)

Subject: Establishment of young farmers

Could the Commission provide me with a list of national aid schemes to promote the establishment of young farmers?

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

(23 May 1984)

All the information available on specific aids to young farmers taking over farms for the first time in the Member States has been supplied by the Commission for the drafting of the report by Mrs Simone Martin on the establishment of young farmers in the Community. The information is annexed to the report ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ PE 84.716 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 91/84

by Mr Guy Fernandez (COM - F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 April 1984)

(84/C 188/100)

Subject: Establishment of young farmers

Could not the Commission propose that young farmers should be exempt from the co-responsibility levy on milk,

up to a certain ceiling, in order to help them become established?

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

(23 May 1984)

The Council has not provided for any exemption from the co-responsibility levy for young farmers. On the other hand, Regulation (EEC) No 857/84 ⁽¹⁾ laying down general rules for implementing the additional levy provides that the Member States may grant to young farmers setting up after 31 December 1980 a specific reference quantity of milk which may be sold free of the additional levy.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 90, 1. 4. 1984, p. 13.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 123/84

by Mr Doeke Eisma (NI - NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 April 1984)

(84/C 188/101)

Subject: Reprocessing of radioactive waste in the USA

During consideration on 18 January of the Walz report on the storage of radioactive waste, I asked the Commission why the reprocessing of spent fuel elements had been banned in the USA since 1977. Commissioner Narjes replied that reprocessing is carried out there by private undertakings and that the process is not economically viable. In view of the fact that it is not customary for governments to prohibit private investments on economic grounds alone, there must have been other reasons for the American ban - perhaps relating to security or the risks involved.

Is the Commission willing to ask the US administration what considerations were involved in deciding upon such a ban and to inform Parliament of the outcome so that we can benefit from this in the European research programme?

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

(22 May 1984)

The situation with regard to spent-fuel reprocessing in the United States is clear, and there is no need for further

inquiries. The current situation reflects the policy changes that have taken place:

In April 1977, President Carter announced that commercial reprocessing in the US was to be suspended indefinitely.

In October 1981, President Reagan lifted the ban imposed by the previous administration.

President Reagan also stated that it was essential for the private sector to take the initiative in developing commercial reprocessing services. Although American private industry clearly welcomed the prospect of a resumption of reprocessing activities, it is reluctant – having suffered the setback of a four-year moratorium – to resume operations in this sector unless assurances and financial commitments are forthcoming from the US administration.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 143/84

by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L – B)

to the Council of the European Communities

(17 April 1984)

(84/C 188/102)

Subject: Iran-Iraq war – Gulf oil dependence of EEC countries – Straits of Hormuz

Developments in the appalling war between Iran and Iraq are leading to an escalation which, in view of the threats to the Straits of Hormuz, puts Europe's energy supplies at risk.

Can the Council say what the overall level of dependence of Member States for oil products on producer countries in the region affected by this war is? Can it say what solutions and what plans for replacement energy supplies exist in the event of the wells drying up as a result of the war? Can it say whether there is any joint European plan to cope with such an eventuality?

Answer

(12 June 1984)

1. The Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the fact that the Commission, whose departments keep an eye on the various aspects of oil supply problems, would

doubtless be in a better position to reply to the first question.

2. The Council is, for its part, aware of the risks which might arise for the security of the Community's oil supplies and has already drawn up extensive crisis contingency plans for dealing immediately, if necessary, with any situation such as that referred to by the Honourable Member. Measures which should be mentioned in this connection are:

- Council Directive 68/414/EEC of 20 December 1968 imposing an obligation on Member States of the EEC to maintain minimum stocks of crude oil and/or petroleum products ⁽¹⁾,
- Council Directive 73/238/EEC of 24 July 1973 on measures to mitigate the effects of difficulties in the supply of crude oil and petroleum products ⁽²⁾,
- Council Decision 77/186/EEC of 14 February 1977 on the exporting of crude oil and petroleum products from one Member State to another in the event of supply difficulties ⁽³⁾, and
- Council Decision 77/706/EEC of 7 November 1977 on the setting of a Community target for a reduction in the consumption of primary sources of energy in the event of difficulties in the supply of crude oil and petroleum products ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 308, 23. 12. 1968.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 228, 16. 9. 1973.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 61, 5. 3. 1977, p. 23.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 292, 16. 11. 1977.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 151/84

by Mr Christopher Jackson (ED – GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 April 1984)

(84/C 188/103)

Subject: Absence of a common organization of the market for potatoes

In view of the Commission's statement in answer to Written Question No 2095/80 of 25 February 1981 ⁽¹⁾ that 'in the absence of a common organization of the market for potatoes, Member States are still free to organize their internal market arrangements for these products on a national basis', are Member States in so doing entitled to contravene, or be exempted from, the provisions of the Treaty of Rome?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 103, 6. 5. 1981, p. 32.

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

(23 May 1984)

In the absence of a common organization of the market in potatoes, Member States are not prohibited from maintaining internal mechanisms forming part of a national organization of the market to support producers to those products.

However, Member States are not exempted, even with regard to these products, from respect of the principle of free circulation of goods and the rules of competition to the extent that these latter rules have been applied to agricultural products not yet subject to a common organization of the market by Council Regulation No 26 of 1962 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ Special English Edition December 1972.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 195/84

by Mr Willy Vernimmen (S - B)

to the Council of the European Communities

(2 April 1984)

(84/C 188/104)

Subject: Agricultural structures

On 9 and 10 January 1984 the Council had a wide-ranging discussion of five proposals designed, among other things, to extend (until 30 June 1984) the validity of common measures under the socio-structural Directives 72/159/EEC ⁽¹⁾, 72/160/EEC ⁽²⁾ and 72/161/EEC ⁽³⁾, on the understanding that the Member States would be at liberty to replace the development plan with a farm improvement plan.

Can the Council indicate the reasons for and implications of this change in policy?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 96, 23. 4. 1972, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 96, 23. 4. 1972, p. 9.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 96, 23. 4. 1972, p. 15.

Answer

(12 June 1984)

At its meeting on 27 and 28 February 1984 the Council agreed to extend until 30 June 1984 the scheduled deadline for the common measures decided on in Council Directives 72/159/EEC, 72/160/EEC, 72/161/EEC and 75/268/EEC to guarantee the essential continuity in this connection ⁽¹⁾.

Pending a decision on the Commission proposal to review the agricultural structures policy, the Council decided at the same meeting to take account of certain aspects of the new measures proposed by the Commission concerning relaxation of the conditions for eligibility for Community aid by introducing farm improvement plans which would be more flexible than the development plans. In particular the Council agreed to grant EAGGF aid to improvement plans approved between 1 January and 29 February 1984 and proposed to grant similar aid to improvement plans approved after 29 February 1984 provided their characteristics conformed to those adopted by the Council in the context of the future Regulation on the improvement of agricultural structures.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 72, 15. 3. 1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 198/84

by Mr Willy Vernimmen (S - B)

to the Council of the European Communities

(2 April 1984)

(84/C 188/105)

Subject: Community loans to provide balance-of-payments support

On 12 December 1983, the Council of Finance Ministers discussed possible changes to the Community loan arrangements. This was prompted by the decision taken by the Council in May to raise a loan on behalf of the French Republic under the arrangements for Community loans to provide balance-of-payments support to Member States.

Can the Council say what changes to the existing arrangements are being considered?

Answer

(12 June 1984)

At its meeting on 12 December 1983 the Council held an exchange of views on the functioning of the mechanism of Community loans to provide balance-of-payments support for the Member States. After this exchange of views the Council noted that the Commission intended to submit proposals to it on this subject.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 331/84
by Mrs Gloria Hooper (ED - GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 April 1984)

(84/C 188/106)

Subject: Opening of shops on Sundays

Is the Commission aware of the different restrictions imposed by some Member States regarding the opening of shops on Sundays?

In view of the fact that this variation in regulations gives an unfair advantage to certain shops, contrary to EEC

competition policy, does the Commission have any proposals to bring national laws in this area into line?

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission

(13 June 1984)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the reply to the Oral Question No H-330/83 by Mr Seligman, which it gave during question time at Parliament's November 1983 part-session ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Debates of the European Parliament of 16 November 1983.

THIRTEENTH REPORT ON COMPETITION POLICY

The Report on Competition Policy is published annually by the Commission of the European Communities in response to the request of the European Parliament made by a resolution of 7 June 1971. This Report, which is published in conjunction with the General Report on the Activities of the Communities, is designed to give a general view of the competition policy followed during the past year. Part One covers general competition policy. Part Two deals with competition policy towards enterprises. Part Three is concerned with competition policy and government assistance to enterprises and Part Four with the development of concentration, competition and competitiveness.

292 pages

Published in: Danish, Dutch, English, French, German, Greek and Italian.

ISBN 92-825-4231-9

CB-38-83-823-EN-C

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg: ECU 11,97; BFR 550; IRL 8,80; UKL 6,90; USD 1.

OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg

**SEVENTEENTH GENERAL REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE
EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES — 1983**

The General Report on the Activities of the European Communities is published annually by the Commission as required by Article 18 of the Treaty of 8 April 1965 establishing a single Council and a single Commission of the European Communities.

The Report is presented to the European Parliament and provides a general picture of Community activities over the past year.

Published in: Danish, Dutch, English, French, German, Greek and Italian.

ISBN 92-825-4189-4

Catalogue number: CB-38-83-774-EN-C

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg: ECU 4,90 BFR 225 IRL 3,60 UKL 2,80
USD 4,50.

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

