

English edition

## Information and Notices

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents	Page
	<b>I Information</b>	
	<b>European Parliament</b>	
	<i>Written Questions with answer:</i>	
84/C 283/01	No 1289/83 by Mrs Alphonsine Phlix to the Commission Subject: Government discrimination in favour of own national airlines (Supplementary answer) .....	1
84/C 283/02	No 1721/83 by Mr Rudolf Wedekind to the Commission Subject: Sultanas, currants .....	1
84/C 283/03	No 2056/83 by Mr Dieter Rogalla to the Commission Subject: Purity requirements for beer .....	2
84/C 283/04	No 225/84 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: Beer .....	2
	Joint answer given to Written Questions No 2056/83 and No 225/84 .....	2
84/C 283/05	No 113/84 by Mr Dieter Rogalla to the Commission Subject: Freedom of movement for members of the European Parliament .....	3
84/C 283/06	No 160/84 by Mr Ulrich Irmer to the Commission Subject: Draft Regulation on the conditions of employment of the staff of the European Agency for Cooperation (EAC) .....	3
84/C 283/07	No 216/84 by Mrs Hanna Walz to the Commission Subject: Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) .....	4
84/C 283/08	No 329/84 by Mr Michael Welsh to the Commission Subject: Steel capacity cuts .....	4
84/C 283/09	No 364/84 by Mr Leonidas Kyrkos to the Commission Subject: Diversion of the waters of the river Achelos towards the plains of Thessaly .....	5
84/C 283/10	No 374/84 by Mr Alfredo Diana to the Commission Subject: Combating air pollution .....	6

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
84/C 283/11	No 408/84 by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission Subject: Irregularities in herring catches in the southern North Sea .....	7
84/C 283/12	No 430/84 by Mr Doeke Eisma to the Commission Subject: Disposal of radioactive waste at sea .....	9
84/C 283/13	No 443/84 by Sir Fred Warner to the Commission Subject: Duty-free allowances .....	10
84/C 283/14	No 456/84 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Commission Subject: The Thomson/Philips agreement on microcomputers .....	10
84/C 283/15	No 464/84 by Mr Anthony Simpson to the Commission Subject: Import of cheap imitation ceramic goods from Taiwan .....	11
84/C 283/16	No 477/84 by Mr Eisso Woltjer to the Commission Subject: Egg imports from third countries .....	11
84/C 283/17	No 500/84 by Mr Hans-Joachim Seeler to the Commission Subject: Trade agreements between the Community and the People's Republic of Hungary .....	13
84/C 283/18	No 501/84 by Mr Hans-Joachim Seeler to the Commission Subject: Progress in negotiations between the Community and Comecon .....	13
84/C 283/19	No 503/84 by Mr Eisso Woltjer to the Commission Subject: British share under the A arrangements for imports of frozen beef for processing .....	14
84/C 283/20	No 509/84 by Mr Anthony Simpson to the Commission Subject: Transport and insurance costs of sending food aid to third countries .....	14
84/C 283/21	No 511/84 by Mr Aldo Bonaccini to the Commission Subject: Category of executives and technicians .....	15
84/C 283/22	No 517/84 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: EEC Directive on containers of liquids for human consumption .....	15
84/C 283/23	No 535/84 by Mr Hans-Gert Pöttering to the Commission Subject: Pig breeding — distortion of competition .....	16
84/C 283/24	No 537/84 by Mr Otmar Franz to the Commission Subject: Translation of the German expression 'Soziale Marktwirtschaft' .....	16
84/C 283/25	No 548/84 by Mr Pol Marck to the Commission Subject: British eggs .....	17
84/C 283/26	No 580/84 by Mr Christopher Jackson to the Commission Subject: Regulation on distribution of motor vehicles .....	17
84/C 283/27	No 589/84 by Mr François Roelands du Vivier to the Commission Subject: Community symbol to indicate the cleanliness of beaches .....	17
84/C 283/28	No 618/84 by Mr Michael Elliott to the Commission Subject: United Kingdom — Corporal punishment of children .....	17
84/C 283/29	No 621/84 by Mr Pol Marck to the Commission Subject: Cut-price drinking milk .....	18
84/C 283/30	No 663/84 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Council Subject: Amnesty measures in Poland — Solidarity .....	18

## I

*(Information)*

## EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

## WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1289/83**  
**by Mrs Alphonsine Phlix (PPE — B)**  
**to the Commission of the European Communities**  
*(3 November 1983)*  
*(84/C 283/01)*

*Subject:* Government discrimination in favour of own national airlines

The British Department of Trade and Industry, through the British Overseas Trade Board, insists that British airlines be used whenever possible and makes this a condition for financing trade promotion visits and export market surveys undertaken by private companies.

1. Is it permissible for national governments to discriminate in this fashion in favour of their own national airlines?
2. Which Member States do discriminate in favour of their own national airlines in the manner described above?
3. What action does the Commission propose to take against this?

**Supplementary answer given by Mr Contogeorgis**  
**on behalf of the Commission**  
*(20 September 1984)*

1. The Commission has been informed by the United Kingdom Government that it does not insist that British airlines are used as a condition of financing trade promotion visits and export market surveys undertaken by private companies and that assistance is not withheld when foreign airlines are used.

2. The Commission is not aware of discrimination of the nature mentioned by the Honourable Member in other Member States.
3. Consequently, the Commission does not see the need for any action.

(<sup>1</sup>) A first answer was already given on 3 November 1983 (OJ No C 14, 19. 1. 1984, p. 18).

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1721/83**  
**by Mr Rudolf Wedekind (PPE — D)**  
**to the Commission of the European Communities**  
*(23 January 1984)*  
*(84/C 283/02)*

*Subject:* Sultanas, currants

Can the Commission say what the current situation is on the dried grape market (sultanas, currants)?

Can the Commission also state the output figures and the financial resources required for market support for these two product groups in 1982 and this year, and what they are likely to be next year?

What will the Commission do to counter continued excess production of sultanas and currants?

Does the Commission not think that — in view of the importance of these products for Greek agriculture — steps should be taken immediately to alleviate the market situation for these two products?

Will the Commission place more emphasis on quality when considering action in this area, as sultanas

and currants from Greece are only of second-rate quality whereas top-quality products from third countries are artificially made more expensive by the levy system?

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

*(7 September 1984)*

Sales of grapes from the 1983 harvest, which yielded 175 000 tonnes, have proceeded at a faster rate this season than did those for the 1982 harvest at the same time, the 1982 sales having left end-of-season (end August) stocks of 27 000 tonnes.

1982 production was 75 000 tonnes of sultanas and 67 000 tonnes of currants. In 1982, real expenditure was 15 million ECU, for 1983 the definite expenditure is 108,7 million ECU, and for 1984 the latest expenditure estimate is 253 million ECU. These figures cover all dried grapes and dried figs.

The Commission had proposed to the Council a number of alterations to the market organization as operated previously for dried grapes. The changes finally adopted by the Council at the end of March 1984 are as follows:

- the storage agencies may buy in only during the last two months of the marketing year,
- a minimum import price has been introduced,
- a guarantee threshold (90 000 tonnes of sultanas and 65 000 tonnes of currants) has been introduced.

Whenever the guarantee threshold is exceeded, the overrun being calculated by reference to the average quantities produced in previous marketing years, the minimum price to be paid to the grower is reduced for the following marketing year on the basis of the overrun.

In addition to these measures, the Commission has proposed to the Council that it approve definitive withdrawal from the normal commercial markets of stocks of dried grapes from the 1982 marketing year, for allocation to uses other than human consumption<sup>(1)</sup>.

This proposal went to Parliament before the end of its last term, but Parliament decided to hold over its opinion.

The problem of the quality of dried grapes was raised when the Council took the decisions on the market organization mentioned above. On this occasion, the Council recommended that the Commis-

sion tighten up quality standards. Arrangements are now being made to ensure that the stricter standards can apply from the beginning of the 1984/85 marketing year.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(84) 251 final.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2056/83**

**by Mr Dieter Rogalla (S — D)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(10 May 1984)*

*(84/C 283/03)*

*Subject: Purity requirements for beer*

What stage has the case: Commission v. Federal Republic of Germany reached?

When can a judgment be expected on purity requirements for beer/beer imports?

Have other, similar cases been brought under Article 30, in particular with regard to imports of beer between the Member States?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 225/84**

**by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(10 May 1984)*

*(84/C 283/04)*

*Subject: Beer*

Further to my Oral Question H-331/83, what is the outcome of the proceedings referred to in the Commission's answer to that question?

**Joint answer given by Mr Thorn  
on behalf of the Commission  
to Written Questions No 2056/83 and No 225/84**

*(12 September 1984)*

1. In the context of the infringement procedure against the Federal Republic of Germany with regard to the import restrictions following from the

application of the 'beer purity law', the Commission has recently seized the Court of Justice.

2. No answer is possible at this stage.
3. Yes, an infringement procedure is under instruction against Greece in respect of provisions similar to those in force in the Federal Republic of Germany. This case has also just been referred to the Court of Justice.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 113/84**

**by Mr Dieter Rogalla (S — D)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(13 April 1984)*

*(84/C 283/05)*

*Subject:* Freedom of movement for members of the European Parliament

1. What steps does the Commission take — as guardian of the Treaties — to ensure that members of the European Parliament travelling to sittings in Strasbourg or committee meetings in Brussels are not stopped at the Community's internal frontiers or, if they are stopped, are allowed to continue their journey immediately upon notification of their status as members of the European Parliament?
2. What information does the Commission exchange with which Member States, and at what intervals, to ensure observance of the principles of freedom of movement for persons and goods at internal frontiers, in particular for members travelling on official business?
3. How does the Commission explain the fact that the author of this question was stopped at the Niederdorf frontier crossing (between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands) on 29 February 1984 while travelling from Bochum to Brussels for a meeting of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and, after stating where he was going and why and producing his diplomatic passport, was looked up in the wanted persons list and subjected to other harassment by a Dutch customs officer named Hendriks?
4. What steps does the Commission intend to take to clear up this matter?

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

*(4 September 1984)*

The Commission has informed the Dutch authorities of the Honourable Member's unfortunate

experience. It has asked that an inquiry be set up whose findings should help to avoid any repetition of such incidents.

Despite this incident, the Commission considers that the competent authorities in the Member States are fully cognizant with the principles of free movement of persons and goods.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 160/84**

**by Mr Ulrich Irmer (L — D)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(17 April 1984)*

*(84/C 283/06)*

*Subject:* Draft Regulation on the conditions of employment of the staff of the European Agency for Cooperation (EAC) <sup>(1)</sup>

Whilst refusing to discuss questions connected with the conditions of employment of officials of the EAC on the pretext that the case has been brought before the Court of Justice, why does the Commission, at the same time and without awaiting the decision by the Court of Justice, want to make the staff of the EAC subject to a Regulation in respect of their conditions of employment?

Does not the Commission feel that, in so doing, it is applying a double standard, depending on whether the European Parliament wants to discuss these questions with it or whether it wants to enforce a decision of its own in this connection?

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. GTA/0026 — Rev. 1, 5. 12. 1983.

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

*(5 September 1984)*

Article 14 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 3245/81 of 26 October 1981 setting up a European Agency for Cooperation <sup>(1)</sup>, adopted with Parliament's approval, provides that the 'general terms of recruitment and of employment and the general system of remuneration, allowances and additional payments for the staff referred to in Article 3 <sup>(1)</sup> and for the staff of the Agency's headquarters shall be determined by specific provisions adopted by the Commission after the Committee referred to in the second subparagraph of Article 12 (2) has delivered its opinion'.

It should be emphasized that the Council, in adopting the Regulation, stated that the specific

provisions concerned could, if necessary, be drafted by analogy with the provisions applicable to temporary Community staff.

The draft Regulation to which the Honourable Member refers is only a working basis for current negotiations with the staff concerned, the outcome of which will be assessed by the Commission when it has all the relevant information to hand.

The Honourable Member may rest assured that the Commission is not attempting to impose conditions of employment on EAC staff and will continue to keep Parliament informed of developments through the appropriate channels.

(1) OJ No L 328, 16. 11. 1981, p. 1.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 216/84**

**by Mrs Hanna Walz (PPE — D)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(2 May 1984)

(84/C 283/07)

*Subject:* Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

1. Does the Commission regard the Committee for Plant Genetic Resources, which the most recent FAO conference decided to set up, as an appropriate instrument of North-South agricultural policy?
2. Or, conversely, does the Commission agree, with the United States and Canada in particular, that the existing system coordinated by the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources is perfectly adequate?
3. What is the Commission's attitude towards the proposals contained in the International Agreement on Plant Genetic Resources, which was also adopted at the FAO conference?
4. Was the Commission involved in any way in influencing opinion within the FAO in favour of a 'world order' for plant genetic material?
5. Does the Commission consider that it is necessary for Member States of the European Community to coordinate their respective positions towards the FAO's call for adhesion to the 'International Undertaking'?

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

(19 September 1984)

1, 2 and 3. The Commission is aware both of Resolution 8/83, together with the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources, adopted at

the last FAO Conference and of Resolution 1/85, relating to the establishment of a Commission for Plant Genetic Resources, adopted by the FAO Council on 24 November 1983.

The Commission supports the aims of the International Undertaking.

It recognizes that the establishment of a specialized body is foreseen therein. However, at the present time, it has at its disposal no information on the programme of work or the working methods of the newly established Commission for Plant Genetic Resources. It is for that reason too early to pass judgement on the suitability of this Commission.

Quite apart from that question, the Commission shares in any case the widely held opinion that the past and current activities of the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources (IBPGR) have proved their worth. It would therefore support the argument that the proper functioning of those activities should not be prejudiced.

4. In the course of the last FAO Conference, the Commission made, in the name of the European Community and of its Member States, a declaration in which it approved the aims and the form of the proposals as they then stood and raised a number of issues of concern to the Community.

5. The Commission takes the view, in the light of Article 116 of the EEC Treaty and of the economic significance which the development of plant varieties holds for agriculture and the industries based on biotechnology, that the Member States of the Community should adopt a common position in regard to the implementation of the 'International Undertaking'. To this end, it has proposed that the Governments of the Member States of the Community adhere to the Undertaking with certain reservations and precisions in accordance with its Article 11.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 329/84**

**by Mr Michael Welsh (ED — GB)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(28 May 1984)

(84/C 283/08)

*Subject:* Steel capacity cuts

Table 1 of the Commission's fifth report on the application of the rules for aids to the steel industry (COM(84) 142 final) contains a column showing net capacity reductions made since 1980 and reduction commitments by Member States. Can the Commission provide a breakdown of this information by Member State to distinguish between capacity cuts actually carried out and reduction commitments yet to be effected: (a) as at 29 June 1983 and (b) now?

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

(13 September 1984)

1. The aim in restructuring the Community steel industry in the period up to 1986 is to improve the balance between supply and demand and to provide producers with industrial structures which enable them to operate competitively, hence, without State aid. The crucial element here is, of course, the capacity reductions to be made by 1 January 1986.

However, it is in the companies' interest to carry out the planned closures as rapidly as possible, especially as a means of securing an early return to financial balance.

2. The capacity reductions made in the Member States by 12 May 1984 are listed in column 3 of the table below.

The following should be borne in mind:

- these figures will change radically between now and the end of the year on account of major closures which certain Member States have undertaken to carry out during the next two quarters (France and Luxembourg),
- other Member States have given undertakings to make cuts which go far beyond (Netherlands and Luxembourg) or some way beyond (Federal Republic of Germany) the cuts called for by the Commission and shown in column 2.

3. These are net reductions which take into account capacity closed down and additions to capacity following certain investments. The figures may have to be adjusted as certain restructuring plans are finalized and expert studies now in hand become available.

('000 tonnes)

Hot-rolled products	1	2		3
	Maximum possible production in 1980 (per year <sup>(1)</sup> )	Minimum reductions called for by the Commission in its Decisions of 29 June 1983 and agreed (per year)		Reductions made by 12 May 1984
		'000 tonnes	% of 1	
Belgium	16 028	3 105	19,4	1 186
Denmark	941	66	7,0	66
Federal Republic of Germany	53 117	6 010 <sup>(1)</sup>	11,3	4 109
France	26 869	5 311	19,8	841
Italy	36 294	5 834	16,1	780
Luxembourg	5 215	960	18,4	10
Netherlands	7 297	950	13,0	(90) <sup>(2)</sup>
United Kingdom	22 840	4 500	19,7	4 290
EUR-8	168 601	26 736	15,9	11 192

<sup>(1)</sup> Excluding one particular company.

<sup>(2)</sup> Increase in capacity.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 364/84  
by Mr Leonidas Kyrkos (COM — GR)  
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(29 May 1984)

(84/C 283/09)

*Subject:* Diversion of the waters of the river Achelos towards the plains of Thessaly

The Greek Government recently announced an important project: the diversion of the waters of the

river Achelos to the plains of Thessaly. The aim of this project is to increase electricity production, thus reducing the dependence of Greece on oil; this will also have a considerable impact on agriculture in this region to the benefit of farmers, both in Greece and the rest of the Community, since production will shift from surplus crops to crops of which there is a shortage in the Community.

Does the Commission intend financing this project beyond the framework of the quotas provided for with regard to Greece in the various structural funds of the Community?

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

(24 September 1984)

The major project to which the Honourable Member refers has recently been submitted to the Commission by the Greek Government in the wake of the Greek Memorandum. The Greek authorities have provided the Commission with the dossier for a series of major projects which the Commission, in its reply to the Greek Memorandum, had undertaken to examine with a view to the possibility of Community assistance.

The Commission intends to announce its position with regard to these projects during the second half of 1984.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 374/84**

**by Mr Alfredo Diana (PPE — I)  
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(4 June 1984)

(84/C 283/10)

*Subject:* Combating air pollution

Whereas the Commission, in the context of its third action programme on the environment, has reaffirmed its intention of increasing its efforts to combat air pollution;

whereas the European Parliament recently called for the launching of a 'major programme of measures to combat air pollution'<sup>(1)</sup> under which, among other things, emissions of the major components of air pollution would have to be reduced by half within the next five years,

whereas there are plans for the construction of a number of coal-fired thermo-electric power stations in Italy, including in particular a 640-MW power station to be built in the district of Tavazzano and Montanaso Lombardo in Lombardy, a notably windless and humid region,

whereas an application has been made for assistance from the European Investment Bank in respect of this project,

would the Commission state:

1. whether it is aware of the general situation with regard to air and water pollution in the special context of the Po Valley;
2. whether due consideration has been given to the effects on the local population and on agriculture of the pollution which would be caused by the proposed plant in view of the choice of a

coal-fired power-station and locally prevailing climatic and weather conditions;

3. whether it does not believe that all new large-scale power stations planned should utilize combustion techniques designed to reduce the incidence of pollution to the greatest extent possible and equipment to clean and desulphurize the fumes emitted;
4. whether it does not believe that it would be appropriate to expand the monitoring system, provided for under proposals for Regulations solely in respect of the Community's forests, so as to embrace certain agricultural areas which have a high proportion of crops particularly susceptible to the effects of acid rain.

<sup>(1)</sup> Resolution of the European Parliament of 20 January 1984 — Muntingh report: Doc. 1-1168-83 (OJ No C 46, 20. 2. 1984, p. 117).

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

(18 September 1984)

1. The Commission has no monographs in its possession on atmospheric and water pollution in the Val Padana. Nevertheless, it has certain information on this region, mainly from the exchange of information on atmospheric pollution under the Council Decisions of 24 June 1975 and 24 June 1982<sup>(1)</sup>.

2. Notification of the Community by the Member States of the building of conventional power-stations is purely a formality requiring no opinion from the Commission, which is only called on to deliver such when the authorities involved lodge a request for action by the European Investment Bank. The Commission then studies the various aspects of the request and especially those relating to the environment. In its opinion, the Commission bases the requirements applying to pollutant emissions by the planned facility on the various aspects of the problem (installed power, type of fuel, pollution load within the area under scrutiny, available state of the art, Community legislation envisaged, etc.).

As the European Investment Bank has received no request for a loan in respect of the power plant in question, it has not been possible to deliver an opinion.

3. The Commission shares the view of the Honourable Member as regards the requirements to be applied to new plants and would like to remind him that, on 19 December 1983, it addressed to the Council a proposal for a Directive on the limitation of pollutants into the air from large combustion plants<sup>(2)</sup>. This proposal is currently being discussed within the Council and an opinion has been requested from the European Parliament.





Time	December																																					
18			x			x	x	x			x	x	x			x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x			x								x		
15						x	x	x				x	x				x	x	x	x				x	x												x	
12						x	x	x				x	x			x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x										x	
9						x	x	x				x	x				x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x										x	
6						x	x	x				x	x				x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x										x	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31							

  

	January																																						
18	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x																							x	
15	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x																							x	
12	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x																								
9	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x																							x	x
6	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x																							x	x
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31								

  

	February									
18	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
15	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x
12	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x
9	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x
6	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Record of observations when wind-speed exceeded force 7 on the Beaufort scale.

The Sea Fisheries Department (Ministry of Agriculture) provided the following information:

'When wind speeds exceed force 7 our vessels do not normally trawl in pairs for herring. In October 1983 there were nine days with wind speeds of force 8 or more, four in November, eight in December, 18 in January 1984 and eight from 1 to 10 February.

Because of bad weather, there were only 11 days in January 1984 when herring was sold. No pairs of herring trawlers were at sea on the following days in January: 1, 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23 and 24. On 4, 9 and 10 January the trawler pairs returned early to harbour.

Between 1 and 10 February there were four small sales from vessels that had stopped fishing early.'

1. Has the Commission already made inquiries into this matter? If so, what was the outcome? If not, will it do so, as this can only enhance the credibility of the quota system?
2. What resources are available to the Commission to prevent such situations arising, to exercise effective control and to ensure that the provisions are applied by all concerned?

3. In the light of this information from an official source, is the Commission prepared:

- (a) to institute proceedings against the Danish authorities for violation of the herring quota;
- (b) to rectify the situation caused by the irregular Danish herring catch, which *inter alia* worked to the detriment of the Belgian sea fisheries, by granting a more favourable herring quota to Belgian sea fishermen?

- Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis  
on behalf of the Commission

(13 September 1984)

1. The Commission replied to the first part of the Honourable Member's question in its answer to Written Question No 2330/83 by Mr Tolman<sup>(1)</sup>. It should also be pointed out that the fishing method used by the Danish vessels concerned enables large quantities of herring to be caught within a very brief period and that a wind-speed of force 7 does not necessarily rule out herring fishing.
2. To ensure compliance with the legislation on internal resources under the common fisheries

policy, Commission staff may be present when control operations are carried out by national bodies. Since the end of 1983, a large number of such control operations have taken place both at sea and at ports in all the Member States.

3. For the reasons mentioned in 1 above, the Commission does not intend to initiate an infringement procedure against Denmark in this matter or to propose any reallocation of herring quotas among the Member States.

(1) OJ No C 194, 23. 7. 1984.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 430/84**

by Mr Doeke Eisma (NI — NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 June 1984)

(84/C 283/12)

*Subject:* Disposal of radioactive waste at sea

The Technical Working Group (TWG) of the States signatory to the Paris Convention (1974 Treaty on the prevention of marine pollution from land-based sources) met on 26 to 29 March 1984.

Discussions were held on an proposal tabled by the Nordic countries (Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Iceland) that, in order to keep the disposal of radioactive waste at sea to a minimum, the signatories to the Convention should use the best available technology in the operation of existing nuclear reprocessing plants and in the construction of all new ones.

The TWG decided to table this proposal to the sixth annual meeting of the Paris Committee (the executive body of the Paris Convention), to be held from 20 to 22 June 1984 in Oslo. In addition to those who tabled the report, the proposal was supported by the Federal Republic of Germany and Ireland. To be accepted by the Paris Committee, it must obtain two-thirds of the votes, that is to say eight votes.

1. Is the Commission aware that high concentrations of radioactive material have been found in the Barents Sea and off the east coast of Greenland, to which they have been carried by sea currents?
2. Is the Commission aware that certain of these radioactive materials accumulate in marine animals and are very harmful to the health of humans and marine animals?
3. Does the Commission agree with Parliament (see Eisma report on the dumping of chemical and radioactive waste at sea, adopted in March 1984) that discharges of radioactive substances from nuclear plant into the sea must be ended?

4. Is the Commission prepared to recommend that the Member States apart from those mentioned above, which have ratified or signed the Paris Convention, that is to say, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, support the above proposal by the TWG in the Paris Committee?

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

(13 September 1984)

1. The Commission, in the framework of its radiation protection research programme, is supporting measurements of radioactivity in temperate and arctic waters of the north Atlantic region. A fraction of the activity detected can be attributed to effluent discharges from nuclear fuel reprocessing plants in the Community and the concentrations measured cannot be described as 'high' from the radiological point of view; detection has been possible due to the highly sensitive methods used.

2. The Commission contributes to the better understanding and knowledge of the absorption and possible accumulation of radionuclides through several studies in the context of its radiation protection research programme.

The behaviour of radionuclides in the environment and the transfer of radioactivity to man is taken into account with due conservatism in the evaluation of the consequences of releases of radionuclides from nuclear installations. These evaluations indicate that radiation exposures attributable to radioactive effluent releases from nuclear installations amount only to a fraction of the limits prescribed by the Council Directive establishing basic norms for radiation protection<sup>(1)</sup>.

3. A complete ban on radioactive effluent discharges into the sea from nuclear installations, as put forward by the parliamentary resolution of 14 March 1984<sup>(2)</sup>, would not be feasible. However, the Commission stresses the fact that the basic safety standards for radiation protection require, not only that the dose limits be respected, but also that all exposures (and hence, by implication, all discharges of radioactive effluents) be kept as low as reasonably achievable.

Moreover, the Commission recognizes that marine discharges from multiple, individually safe sources could collectively constitute a radiological hazard and is studying this aspect.

4. As for the Paris Convention, the Convention Commission, with the exception of the French delegation which temporarily reserved its positions, has adopted the following recommendation:

'In order to minimize radioactive discharges into the marine environment, Contracting Parties shall

take account of the best available technology at existing nuclear reprocessing plants and whenever new reprocessing plants are constructed.'

(1) OJ No L 246, 17. 9. 1980.

(2) Minutes of the sitting of 14 March 1984 (OJ No C 104, 16. 4. 1984).

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 443/84**

**by Sir Fred Warner (ED — GB)**  
to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 June 1984)

(84/C 283/13)

*Subject:* Duty-free allowances

With regard to the Parliament's resolution of 14 December 1983<sup>(1)</sup>, and proposed amendments to the draft Sixth and Seventh Directives on exemption from turnover tax and excise duty, could the Commission say why its amended proposals (COM(84) 102 final, COM(84) 103 final) do not take into account the Parliament's view on the level of tax-free allowances to persons travelling between Member States, that they should be increased to 210 ECU and not limited to 45 ECU?

(1) OJ No C 10, 16. 1. 1984, p. 44.

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

(3 September 1984)

The Commission did not take into account the amendment referred to by the Honourable Member because, in its opinion, goods on which tax and duty normally chargeable have been paid cannot be treated in the same way as goods on which no tax or duty has been paid. The Court of Justice, in its judgment in Case 278/82<sup>(1)</sup>, endorsed the principle of that distinction and ruled that the provisions of the Directives relating to the exemptions from turnover tax and excise duty at present in force are to be interpreted to mean that goods purchased free of such tax and duty in one Member State may, on importation into another Member State, qualify only for the exemptions available to travellers coming from a non-member country.

The Commission would also point out that, if the proposal for a Directive relating to allowances for travellers coming from non-member countries, which it sent to the Council on 2 April 1984<sup>(2)</sup>, is adopted, the limit of 45 ECU, which may seem unduly low by comparison with the allowance

granted to persons travelling between Member States, will be raised significantly: to 60 ECU in 1985, 70 ECU in 1986, 80 ECU in 1987 and 85 ECU in 1988.

(1) European Court Report, 1984.

(2) OJ No C 102, 14. 4. 1984, p. 10.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 456/84**

**by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L — B)**  
to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 June 1984)

(84/C 283/14)

*Subject:* The Thomson/Philips agreement on micro-computers

The French firm, Thomson, has offered to cooperate with the Dutch firm, Philips, to develop a European home microcomputer industry which will be credible on a world scale.

Can the Commission state whether it has been informed of the contents of this agreement which, according to press reports, provides for the establishment of European norms for microcomputers?

Furthermore, does the Commission intend to contribute to the creation of this microcomputer research industry on the lines suggested by Mr Steve Jobs, managing-director of Apple II, during President Mitterrand's recent visit to the United States, by developing software in French and in languages other than English?

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

(10 September 1984)

The Commission has no specific knowledge of such an agreement. Community assistance in the field of data processing is both through direct financial support and by other means.

It would not be in accordance with Commission policy to give direct financial support to aid the creation of a microcomputer research industry, but in the longer term the support given to the micro-electronics and software industries under the Esprit programme, which has a long lead-time and applies to the precompetition stage, should have favourable consequences for computers of all kinds. One of the main objectives of software development under Esprit and in Member States' R & D programmes is to move in the direction of user-friendliness, and a

major problem here to tackle is the language in which the user addresses the computer. Under Esprit the basic research is carried out by partners in at least two Member States, but it is expected that subsequent product development — which should eventually include the use of different languages to address the computer — will be carried out by the individual partners separately and without Community aid.

Other aid includes encouragement of the exchange of researchers in the data-processing field and supporting the application of data processing and the use of computers in the industrial and research context — through the multiannual data-processing and microelectronics programmes, for example — but the support of products and of product development is neither undertaken nor envisaged.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 464/84**

**by Mr Anthony Simpson (ED — GB)**  
to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 June 1984)

(84/C 283/15)

*Subject:* Import of cheap imitation ceramic goods from Taiwan

As it indicated in its reply to Oral Question H-535/83<sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission is aware of the serious damage suffered by the Community's ceramics industry due to the exporting of cheap imitations of Community designs from Taiwan and other Far Eastern countries.

Will the Commission state precisely what action it has taken since it replied to Oral Question H-535/83 to counter this problem and with what effect? Will it also indicate what further steps, legal and diplomatic, it intends to take?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-0309 (February 1984).

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

(14 September 1984)

The Commission is aware of the problems created for the Community's ceramics industry by exports of cheap imitations of Community designs from

Taiwan and other Far Eastern countries, in particular the Republic of Korea.

This matter was raised at high-level talks with the Korean authorities in Seoul at the end of March 1983, and again at recent meetings in Brussels on 3 and 4 July, at which the Korean authorities stated that their Government firmly intended to take action to stop the production of imitations and referred to current measures being taken to improve the present regulations. The Commission reserved the right to bring the subject up again with reference to specific cases.

As for Taiwan, it should be noted that the matter cannot be handled via normal diplomatic channels since neither the Community nor individual Member States have diplomatic ties with the country. However, in view of the importance of the subject, the Commission has taken the opportunity of establishing contacts with business circles in Taiwan to raise the subject of these imitations and the serious damage suffered by the industries concerned, and to stress the importance of strengthening measures aimed at putting a stop to them. It would seem that the pertinent legislation and regulations have recently been considerably tightened up, with the result that in general terms some improvement in the situation can be seen.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 477/84**

**by Mr Eisso Woltjer (S — NL)**  
to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 July 1984)

(84/C 283/16)

*Subject:* Egg imports from third countries

1. Can the Commission provide the following information made available to it under Article 5 of the Regulation on eggs and poultry (Regulation (EEC) No 163/67<sup>(1)</sup>):

- what are the price levels and what is the average quantity of eggs imported from third countries, classified according to country of origin and country of destination?
- what is the market price in Member States of eggs imported from third countries within the meaning of the Regulation?
- what is the price on the representative markets?

2. Can the Commission indicate how it is possible that, despite a Community market price of 88 ECU

per 100 kilograms and a sluice-gate price and supplementary levy of 128 ECU per 100 kilograms, tens of millions of eggs are imported into the Community?

3. Can the Commission also indicate whether it is correct that, in the period February to April 1984, about 3 470 tonnes of eggs were imported into the Community at 30 to 40 ECU per 100 kilograms less than the average price?

4. Does the Commission consider that the invoice values for imports are to be trusted if a sluice-gate price of 106 ECU per 100 kilograms is entered on the documents, while the internal wholesale price is 88 ECU per 100 kilograms?

5. Can the Commission indicate why at present it is not applying, or only partially applying, the Community Regulation laying down supplementary levies in respect of imports of poultry products from third countries?

6. Can the Commission indicate why it did not consider it necessary to impose supplementary levies on egg imports from Finland, East Germany and Poland?

7. What measures does the Commission envisage taking in respect of possible false invoice prices as part of its policy of preventing disruption of the Community egg market?

(1) OJ No 129, 28. 6. 1967, p. 2577/67.

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

(19 September 1984)

1. The Commission is endeavouring to develop the closest possible cooperation with national authorities and trade organizations in order to obtain information such as that referred to by the Honourable Member. The offer price for goods imported into the Community is determined — using data supplied by the Member States — in the course of the meetings which are regularly held by the Management Committee for Poultrymeat and Eggs.

There are no non-market constraints on egg pricing, and changes — mainly determined by supply and demand — tend to occur daily. Since there is no specific price for imported eggs, it is the Community offer price which is used as a basis, although representative market prices, which are notified to the Management Committee at each meeting, are also taken into consideration.

2. Since the egg market is protected above all on the basis of differences between feed-grain prices, it is possible, during a period of crisis, for a situation

to arise in which the protective element exceeds the market price. If sufficient information becomes available, additional amounts are applied. In certain Member States, such a situation may result in the eggs being imported under inward processing arrangements.

3. During the period referred to by the Honourable Member, the Commission did indeed record offer prices which were below the sluice-gate price. Additional amounts were therefore applied to imports, as follows:

- 25 ECU per 100 kilograms for eggs in shell from Hungary, Yugoslavia or Israel, later increased to 40 ECU per 100 kilograms for all non-member countries (Regulations (EEC) No 1357/84<sup>(1)</sup> and (EEC) No 1595/84<sup>(2)</sup>),
- 50 ECU per 100 kilograms for eggs, whole, liquid or frozen, from Czechoslovakia, subsequently 30 ECU per 100 kilograms in the case of Czechoslovakia and Finland (Regulations (EEC) No 1358/84<sup>(3)</sup> and (EEC) No 1596/84<sup>(4)</sup>),
- 50 ECU per 100 kilograms for egg yolks, dried, from Sweden (Regulations (EEC) No 1358/84 and (EEC) No 1596/84).

4. Particulars of the invoices submitted to the competent authorities are not notified to the Commission, which refers only to the customs documents which are forwarded to it. If it seems that imported products may have been put onto the market under abnormal conditions, the Commission seeks, together with the national authorities, to obtain additional information.

5. Both in the case of eggs and poultrymeat, the Commission makes full use of the machinery available to it. Cases regularly occur in which additional amounts are applied to imports and in which these amounts are altered in the light of changes in offer prices.

6. The Commission has on several occasions applied additional amounts for imports of eggs from Finland or the German Democratic Republic, viz.:

- Regulations (EEC) No 1595/84 and (EEC) No 1596/84 in the case of Finland,
- Regulations (EEC) No 666/83<sup>(5)</sup>, (EEC) No 1919/83<sup>(6)</sup>, (EEC) No 2920/83<sup>(7)</sup>, (EEC) No 5253/83<sup>(8)</sup> and (EEC) No 1595/84 in the case of the German Democratic Republic.

Poland is one of the non-member countries which have undertaken to comply with the sluice-gate price for eggs in shell (Regulation No 54/65/EEC<sup>(9)</sup>). Additional amounts are not applied to imports of eggs in shell from that country.

7. As pointed out in 4 above, the Commission is endeavouring to develop contacts with Member States with a view to improving the transmission of data on offer prices for products from non-member

countries. In this respect, special attention is paid to the market in eggs, which is hardly ever stable.

- (1) OJ No L 131, 17. 5. 1984, p. 26.
- (2) OJ No L 152, 8. 6. 1984, p. 8.
- (3) OJ No L 131, 17. 5. 1984, p. 28.
- (4) OJ No L 152, 8. 6. 1984, p. 10.
- (5) OJ No L 78, 24. 3. 1983, p. 17.
- (6) OJ No L 190, 14. 7. 1983, p. 34.
- (7) OJ No L 287, 20. 10. 1983, p. 21.
- (8) OJ No L 321, 18. 11. 1983, p. 24.
- (9) OJ No 59, 8. 4. 1965, p. 848/65.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 500/84**  
by Mr Hans-Joachim Seeler (S — D)  
to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 July 1984)  
(84/C 283/17)

*Subject:* Trade agreements between the Community and the People's Republic of Hungary

For some time negotiations have been in progress on a treaty governing economic and trade relations between the People's Republic of Hungary and the European Community.

1. What stage has been reached in the treaty negotiations between the Community and the People's Republic of Hungary?
2. Can the conclusion of a cooperation agreement between the two partners be expected in the foreseeable future?
3. What does the Commission hope to achieve by a treaty governing economic and trade relations between the People's Republic of Hungary and the Community?

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

(13 September 1984)

The Commission has had several talks with the Hungarian authorities on a number of occasions since 1983 on the improvement of trade relations between the Community and Hungary, the last talks being held in May this year.

The aim of these informal meetings has been to explore the possibilities for opening negotiations on a trade agreement between the Community and Hungary. The talks have made it possible for the two sides to outline their respective positions, but it is not yet clear whether it will be possible to embark upon formal negotiations which might be entered into in the near future.

The Commission considers that the conclusion of a trade agreement with Hungary based on the practical conditions of trade with that country would make it possible to find appropriate solutions to the specific problems that exist and would provide a new framework for trade relations between the Community and Hungary.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 501/84**  
by Mr Hans-Joachim Seeler (S — D)  
to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 July 1984)  
(84/C 283/18)

*Subject:* Progress in negotiations between the Community and Comecon

For some years negotiations have been in progress between the European Community and Comecon on the conclusion of an agreement on mutual economic and trade relations.

1. What stage have the negotiations on such an agreement reached?
2. What are the obstacles to progress in the negotiations and, in particular, what is preventing the Soviet Union from recognizing the European Community?
3. Does the Commission intend to take the initiative in the foreseeable future to resume the negotiations and bring them to a successful conclusion?

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

(13 September 1984)

1. Three meetings at expert level took place in 1980 to try to draw up a text for an agreement between the Community and the CMEA (Comecon). These meetings did not, however, enable agreement to be reached on a number of essential points. The negotiation rests with a letter of March 1981 from Vice-President Haferkamp to the Chairman of the CMEA Executive Committee, Mr Lukonov, recalling the differences of view between the two sides and recommending a change in the CMEA position. This letter has received no reply.

2. The difficulties which led to the suspension of the negotiations after the last meeting in October 1980, and which have not been resolved since, concerned two main problems. One of these was that the CMEA wanted to negotiate an agreement which

would be basically an agreement on trade, despite the fact that the CMEA has neither a common commercial policy nor instruments which would enable such a policy to be carried out. In the Community's view, therefore, there is no reason to include trade provisions in the CMEA agreement, while bilateral agreements concluded with CMEA member countries, on the basis of the specific trade relations each country has with the Community and of the economic situation of each, could bring about a development of trade relations. The second problem was the wish of the CMEA side to provide for a Joint Committee which, besides the implementation of the CMEA-EEC Agreement, would also examine bilateral trade and economic questions which are, or may be, dealt with in agreements between the Community and individual CMEA countries. As regards the second part of this question, it would be inappropriate for the Commission to speculate on the motives which inspire the Soviet Government in its dealings with the Community.

3. In his letter of 20 March 1981 to Mr Lukanov, Chairman of the CMEA Executive Committee, Vice-President Haferkamp emphasized that the Community had throughout adopted a constructive attitude based upon the political will to establish useful relations between the Community and the CMEA, and remained ready to continue the negotiations on a pragmatic and realistic basis and without preconditions. This remains the Commission's position.

3. Can the Commission indicate how it intends to prevent one Member State obtaining the lion's share of the relatively small import quota under the A arrangements, which means that there is virtually nothing left for applications from other Member States?

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

*(3 September 1984)*

1. It is much too early to consider detailed figures for 1984, but the Commission has noted that British processors are very interested in the arrangements mentioned and indeed in all the schemes for imports of meat for processing from non-member countries.

2. The British processors' keen interest in the A arrangements does not alter the fact that, in order to qualify, each applicant must meet the very rigorous conditions laid down by Community regulations and supervised by the Member States.

Applications for import licences from applicants not meeting these conditions are not entertained and not sent on to the Commission with a view to authorization to issue licences.

3. The Commission is very concerned to ensure that all applicants established in the Community have free and fair access to preferential import arrangements. The Commission's staff ensure such access to all applicants meeting the requirements, for the A arrangements as well as for other schemes.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 503/84**

by Mr Eisso Woltjer (S — NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

*(16 July 1984)*

(84/C 283/19)

*Subject:* British share under the A arrangements for imports of frozen beef for processing

1. Can the Commission explain how the British share of imports under the A arrangements in the meat sector has managed to increase from less than 30% in 1979 to 60% in 1984?

2. Is it true that, by comparison with other Member States, the British meat products industry submits many more applications for imports under the A arrangements and that in many cases these involve sub-divisions of undertakings?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 509/84**

by Mr Anthony Simpson (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

*(16 July 1984)*

(84/C 283/20)

*Subject:* Transport and insurance costs of sending food aid to third countries

When food is sent to third countries under the Community's food-aid programme:

1. who pays the costs incurred for:
  - transport,
  - insurance in transit?
2. who negotiates and agrees the price with:
  - the transporter,
  - the insurer?



3. is any form of tender procedure used in these negotiations and, if so, who publishes and organizes the tender?

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

(13 September 1984)

1. Food aid is granted to beneficiary countries, according to their level of development, by one of three different types of delivery:
- fob (free on board): in this case, the beneficiary must organize to pay for the sea transport and international transport itself,
  - cif (cost, insurance and freight): in this case the beneficiary must only organize and pay for the internal transport, whereas the sea transport and insurance are paid for by the Community,
  - fad (free at delivery): in this case all the transport costs, i.e. both the sea transport and internal transport, and insurance are paid for by the Community.

When the transport costs are the responsibility of the Community, they are included in the tenders published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*.

2 and 3. The tenderer submit a global price which includes supply, transport, and insurance. One exception to this rule is mobilization of foodstuffs on the world market (about 10% of cases) usually for emergency food aid for which, in view of the urgency, private contracts are resorted to.

As described above therefore, it is the successful tenderer who — but for some cases of emergency food aid — negotiates and concludes the transport and insurance contracts and is responsible for the necessary packaging.

As indicated above, for the mobilization on the Community markets, the tender procedure is published by the Commission in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*; in the L series for cereals and milk products and in the C series for vegetable oil.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 511/84  
by Mr Aldo Bonaccini (COM — I)  
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(16 July 1984)

(84/C 283/21)

*Subject:* Category of executives and technicians

Having regard to the growing importance of the role currently played by executives and technicians in the organization of industrial and commercial undertakings,

whereas their legal and contractual status is highly unfavourable or at least unsure under the legislation of some Member States,

has the Commission looked into this matter and/or does it intend to introduce any measures in this area?

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

(18 September 1984)

The Commission is aware of the problems faced by executives and technicians, and is keeping a close watch on developments.

Adopting an overall approach aimed at tackling the problems and difficulties currently faced by all workers, the Commission regularly takes account, in its work and proposals, of the social and occupational interests of executives and technicians.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 517/84**

**by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(16 July 1984)

(84/C 283/22)

*Subject:* EEC Directive on containers of liquids for human consumption

Why does the EEC Directive on containers of liquids for human consumption exclude bottles for olive oil, whereas bottles for other edible oils are included? Is this merely pandering to the interests of those Member States which produce olive oil to the detriment of those which bottle other edible oils? Why, in any case, should bottles for edible oil be categorized in the draft Directive together with soft

drink containers when, by the very nature of the product, the temptation to discard edible oil containers is vastly less than the temptation to discard soft drink containers?

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

(17 September 1984)

The proposal for a Directive on containers of liquids for human consumption <sup>(1)</sup>, sent to the Council on 23 April 1983, does not exclude bottles for olive oil. It is general in scope and leaves to the Member States the ways and means of achieving the objective, which is:

- to reduce the tonnage and/or volume of containers in waste which are destined to be thrown away, and
- to promote the use of refillable and/or recyclable containers.

However, the second sentence of Article 6 of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3172/80 laying down implementing rules in respect of the system of consumption aid for olive oil <sup>(2)</sup>, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1975/84 <sup>(3)</sup>, provides in the interests of sound administration and supervision that, in respect of olive-oil containers with a net content of five litres or less, the re-use of containers shall be forbidden.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 204, 13. 8. 1981, p. 6.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No L 331, 9. 12. 1980, p. 27.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No L 185, 12. 7. 1984, p. 17.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 535/84  
by Mr Hans-Gert Pöttering (PPE — D)  
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(25 July 1984)

(84/C 283/23)

*Subject:* Pig breeding — distortion of competition

1. Is the Commission aware that in the Netherlands and in the Dutch/German border area it is widely rumoured that a pig-breeding unit stretching for 36 kilometres is planned or under construction?
2. Is the Commission also aware that these measures have received considerable national financial support?
3. What action does the Commission intend to take — if these reports are true — to prevent the distortion of competition *vis-à-vis* neighbouring farmers on the German side of the border?

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

(11 September 1984)

The Commission has no information concerning the construction of pig-breeding units totalling 36 kilometres in length, under execution or planned in the Netherlands. The Netherlands authorities have stated that such investment is not being carried out and is not contemplated.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 537/84**

**by Mr Otmar Franz (PPE — D)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(25 July 1983)

(84/C 283/24)

*Subject:* Translation of the German expression 'Soziale Marktwirtschaft'

While the German expression 'Soziale Marktwirtschaft' is being used to an increasing extent, translation of this term into the other Community languages remains inconsistent. Since it would be highly desirable for a standard term to be adopted in all official languages, the following translations have been established by a European Peoples Party working party in consultation with competent interpreters together with members of parliament from the various Member States:

German: Soziale Marktwirtschaft,  
English: social market economy,  
Dutch: sociale markt economie,  
French: économie de marché sociale,  
Italian: economia sociale di mercato,  
Greek: κοινωνική οικονομία της αγοράς,  
Danish: social markedsøkonomi.

Is the Commission prepared to ensure that, in future, these terms alone are employed by its translators and interpreters for official translations into the working languages of the European Community?

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

(13 September 1984)

The Commission welcomes the move by the Honourable Member and the persons mentioned in his question to find a fixed equivalent in the other six official languages of the economic concept of 'Soziale Marktwirtschaft' which Professor A. Mueller-Armack helped to coin (see *Meyers Enzyklopädisches Lexikon* 1978).

The Commission always encourages its translators and interpreters to use appropriate new terminological equivalents.

As for the translations proposed by the Honourable Member, the Commission will send direct to him and Parliament's Secretariat a list of the expressions which it has adopted.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 548/84**

**by Mr Pol Marck (PPE — B)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(8 August 1984)*

*(84/C 283/25)*

*Subject:* British eggs

Can the Commission confirm that British eggs are being sold on the market at Kruishoutem (Belgium) at dumping prices, levies apparently being used as export subsidies?

What action does the Commission intend to take against this violation of the rules of the Treaty?

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

*(13 September 1984)*

According to the information available to the Commission, the United Kingdom has not exported any eggs to Belgium recently.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 580/84**

**by Mr Christopher Jackson (ED — GB)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(20 August 1984)*

*(84/C 283/26)*

*Subject:* Regulation on distribution of motor vehicles

At the parliamentary part-session of May 1984, the Commissioner responsible for competition indicated to me that it was his intention to introduce the new Regulation governing block exemption for car distribution by the end of this year. In view of the considerable importance of this measure to consumers throughout the European Community, can he indicate whether this is still the timetable?

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

*(17 September 1984)*

It is the intention of the Commission that the Regulation on the exemption of certain categories of motor vehicle distribution agreements enter into force on 1 January 1985.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 589/84**

**by Mr François Roelands du Vivier (ARC — B)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(20 August 1984)*

*(84/C 283/27)*

*Subject:* Community symbol to indicate the cleanliness of beaches

In its resolution of 24 May 1984 on 'bathing water' <sup>(1)</sup>, the European Parliament called on the Commission to 'encourage those local authorities whose beaches have met Community standards to display and advertise a Community-recognized symbol endorsing their cleanliness'.

What action has the Commission taken on this request, and what specific proposals does it have on the subject of a Community symbol for this purpose?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 172, 2. 7. 1984, p. 158.

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

*(19 September 1984)*

Owing to urgent work in other areas, the Commission has so far taken no practical action on the resolution of the European Parliament of 24 May 1984 on bathing water.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 618/84**

**by Mr Michael Elliott (S — GB)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(27 August 1984)*

*(84/C 283/28)*

*Subject:* United Kingdom — Corporal punishment of children

1. What action is being taken to ensure compliance by the Government of the United Kingdom

and local education authorities with the decision of the European Court in February 1982 regarding the use by UK schools of corporal punishment on children, in defiance of the wishes of their parents?

2. Will a report on this matter be made to the relevant committee of the European Parliament in order that the continued use by British schools of this degrading form of punishment can be fully discussed and appropriate recommendations made?

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

*(21 September 1984)*

This question is a matter for the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 621/84**

**by Mr Pol Marck (PPE — B)  
to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(27 August 1984)*

*(84/C 283/29)*

*Subject: Cut-price drinking milk*

In answer to my Written Question No 1829/83 <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission undertook to inquire into the conditions governing the import and export of milk in the Netherlands and Belgium.

What progress has been made by this inquiry and what conclusions have been reached by the Commission?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 152, 12. 6. 1984, p. 11.

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

*(21 September 1984)*

After inquiries into the conditions governing the marketing of Dutch milk in Belgium and of Belgian milk exported to the Netherlands, the Commission has carried out an investigation under Council Regulation No 17/62 <sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission can inform the Honourable Member that it is continuing its

action under Regulation No 17/62, but that it has not yet reached its conclusion.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No 13, 21. 2. 1962.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 663/84**  
**by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L — B)**  
**to the Council of the European Communities**  
*(27 August 1984)*  
*(84/C 283/30)*

*Subject: Amnesty measures in Poland — Solidarity*

In a statement received by the Western press in Warsaw, seven former national leaders of the trade union 'Solidarity', including Lech Walesa, have emphasized in the strongest possible terms that 'a return to the agreements of August 1980 and to the principles of trade union pluralism and respect for civic rights which they contained is an essential precondition for delivering Poland from its political and economic crisis.

Only observance of these conditions will ensure that the amnesty law is not just a passing interlude'.

Does the Council intend, in the context of respect for human and civic rights and for the Helsinki Agreements, to remind the Polish authorities via diplomatic channels of their obligations in this respect, bearing in mind that trade union and opposition leaders, such as Mr Lis, Solidarity's deputy leader, remain in prison in violation of their personal rights?

**Answer <sup>(1)</sup>**

*(27 September 1984)*

The Ten frequently remind the Polish Government of their concern for the rights and freedoms proclaimed in the Helsinki Final Act and the Concluding Document of the Madrid meeting, and particularly for trade union freedom. In their most recent Joint Declaration on Poland, the Ministers of the Ten welcomed the announcement of the July amnesty and expressed the hope that it would be followed up by other measures which would help promote national reconciliation.

<sup>(1)</sup> This reply has been provided by the Foreign Ministers of the 10 Member States of the European Communities meeting in political cooperation, within whose province the question came.