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EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

WRITTEN QUESTION No 376/84
by Mr Ulrich Irmer (L — D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(4 June 1984)
(85/C 71/01)

Subject: Tourist couriers in France

1. Is the Commission aware that under regulations laid down by the French Government in October 1983 foreign couriers may not conduct guided tours in France and that for a number of weeks non-French couriers have had to pay sometimes considerable fines?

2. Does the Commission consider this action to be compatible with the Treaties and what does it intend to do to counter it?

Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

1. The Honourable Member's question would appear to relate to the occupation of tourist guide (guide interprète), i.e. the activity of conducting guided tours and commenting on the sights of a country. The Commission is aware that in France this occupation is regulated by Law No 75-627 of 11 July 1975 and Decrees Nos 77-363 of 28 March 1977 and 83-912 of 13 October 1983. The Law and the 1977 Decree primarily concern the requirement that any person undertaking gainful employment as a tourist guide in the departments and communes set out in a list issued by the relevant Ministry must hold a 'carte professionnelle' (licence). A 'carte professionnelle' will only be issued to persons holding a specified vocational qualification. For its part, the 1983 Decree provides, amongst other things, for the imposition of fines on persons pursuing the occupation of tourist guide in breach of these provisions.

The Commission is also aware that tourist guides from other Member States have recently been prevented from providing services in France and in several cases fined because they did not hold a 'carte professionnelle'.

2. The provisions of the abovementioned legal instruments are admittedly applicable equally to French nationals and nationals of other Member States. Nevertheless, they impede freedom of movement — and more especially the freedom to provide services.

The Commission regards this situation as unsatisfactory and therefore took the step, once having obtained the relevant facts, of examining the legal position carefully in the light of the interpretation recently placed on Article 59 of the EEC Treaty — to the effect that non-discriminatory provisions in force in the host country may be unlawful if they unjustifiably impede the provision of services. On the basis of its findings, the Commission intends to take appropriate steps vis-à-vis the French Government (and the governments of the other Member States which regulate the activities of tourist guides) without delay.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 506/84
by Mr Karl von Wogau (PPE — D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(16 July 1984)
(85/C 71/02)

Subject: Obstacles to coach tours in France

Is the Commission aware that, under a French decree, foreign tour couriers are not only prevented from giving information about tourist sights but are also prohibited from making announcements of a purely organizational nature?
Does the Commission share the view that this action contravenes the principle of the freedom to provide services within the Community and what steps has it taken to remove these obstacles?

Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

1. The occupation of tourist guide, i.e. the business of explaining the sights of a country to tourists, is subject to statutory regulation in France. In this connection, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question No 376/84 by Mr Irmer(1).

In contrast, the activities of tour couriers, i.e. the provision of information on technical matters to the group of tourists accompanied, are not subject to statutory regulation in France and are therefore open without restriction to both French nationals and nationals of other Member States. If, therefore, tour couriers from other Member States are prevented from pursuing their occupation in France, the French authorities are in breach of their obligations under Community law, in particular Article 59 of the EEC Treaty.

2. The Commission has drawn the French Government's attention to the legal position and called on it to issue appropriate instructions to subordinate authorities. Information recently received from the relevant German professional associations, which had previously complained to the Commission on this matter indicates that the scope for German tour couriers to operate in France has since shown a satisfactory improvement.

(1) See page 1 of this Official Journal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 635/84
by Mr Karl von Wogau (EPP — D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(27 August 1984)
(85/C 71/03)

Subject: Bank charges on intra-Community transactions

The varying and complex array of bank charges for payments effected between countries within the Community represents a genuine obstacle to the free development of the common market, especially for small and medium-sized undertakings. Although these charges are commercial terms set by the banks and subject to free competition, greater clarity would seem necessary to the further development of the common market. For example, the German banks have agreed voluntarily to a kind of standardized tariff for large scale German domestic payments.

1. In view of the completely disparate and complex charges set by banks within the European Community, does the Commission believe that a uniform scale of charges at Community level would help remove these barriers to the freedom to provide services?

2. Does the Commission therefore intend to submit proposals to the Council pursuant to Article 63 (2) of the EEC Treaty for a standardized scale of charges by banks for payments within the Community?

Answer given by Mr Tugendhat on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Commission realizes that the level of bank charges may have effects on the actual volume of cross-border transactions and shares the Honourable Member's interest in seeing uneconomically high charges reduced since they may serve as barriers to financial integration.

Although the Honourable Member's question specifically concerns small and medium-sized undertakings, the same problem exists for tourism and other private transactions, and for this reason the Commission intends to take this problem up as part of the follow-up to the Fontainebleau European Council decision on the need to create a Peoples' Europe (Europe des citoyens).

The Commission will pursue this issue and, in particular, discuss it with the industry concerned at the level of the 'Committee of Credit Associations'.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 752/84
by Mrs Francesca Marinaro (COM — I)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(28 September 1984)
(85/C 71/04)

Subject: The application in EEC countries of resolutions and Directives on emigration

1. Can the Commission state what action is being taken to ensure the implementation of the resolutions adopted by the European Parliament on emi-
Answer given by Mr Richard on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Communities' policy on migration continues to be one of the Commission's preoccupations, particularly in the light of the resolution of the European Parliament of 18 November 1983(1). The Commission intends to propose to the Council that it should seek the advice of the European Parliament regarding any communication or proposal in this area. During the debate in Parliament the Commission will explain how it has acted, or intends to act, in accordance with the abovementioned resolution. At the same time, on the basis of the results of its ongoing supervision activities, the Commission will report on the extent to which Community provisions regarding the free movement of individuals are being applied.

In February 1984, the Commission submitted a preliminary report(2) to the Council and the European Parliament on the implementation of Directive 77/486/EEC concerning the education of the children of migrant workers(3). It has also written to the Member States to clarify situations where the application of the Directive may be unclear or incomplete.

Moreover, in order to make it easier for EEC nationals who move from one country to another to find work, the Commission has submitted a proposal to the Council for a Decision on the comparability of vocational training qualifications between Member States of the European Community(4).

This proposal was amended following consultation with the European Parliament and in accordance with amendments accepted by the Commission in the plenary session of 17 February 1984(5). With regard to the recognition of diplomas, the Honourable Member is referred to the Commission's answers to Written Questions No 172/83 by Mrs Dury(6) and No 540/83 by Mr Cousté(7). Moreover, in its communication of 24 September 1984 to the Council, entitled 'A people's Europe — implementing the conclusions of the Fontainebleau European Council'(8), which was transmitted to the European Parliament, the Commission proposed a more comprehensive and flexible procedure for recognizing diplomas than that applied at present, which would be applicable in many areas.

Finally, with regard to manifestations of racism and xenophobia, which have recently become more frequent, the Commission considers — as it declared in the communication to the Council concerning the implementation of a Mediterranean policy for the enlarged Community(9) — that the Community should, through a declaration issued by the European Council itself 'make a formal acknowledgement of the contribution made by immigrant workers to the Community's development, and condemn the racist attitudes of which they are increasingly the victims'.

(2) COM(84) 54 final.
(4) OJ No C 264, 4.10.1983.
(7) OJ No C 279, 17.10.1983.
(8) COM(84) 446 final.
(9) COM(84) 107 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 782/84
by Mr Horst Seefeld (S — D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(28 September 1984)
(85/C 71/05)

Subject: European passport

Can the Commission explain:

1. When the 'European passport' will be introduced in the individual Member States?
2. Whether its introduction is likely to be delayed beyond the deadline of 1 January 1985 fixed by the governments, and if so why?

3. What steps the Commission has taken to expedite the introduction of the 'European passport'?

---

WRITTEN QUESTION No 851/84
by Mr Hans-Joachim Seeler (S - D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(17 October 1984)
(85/C 71/06)

Subject: Introduction of a European passport on 1 January 1985

According to press reports, doubts have arisen as to whether the joint European passport can be introduced for citizens of the 10 Member States of the Community on 1 January 1985.

1. Are these reports true and, if so, what are the reasons for the delay?
2. If so, what does the Commission intend to do to make the governments of the Member States fulfil their undertakings towards the citizens of Europe?
3. Is the Commission aware that if this European passport is not introduced on 1 January 1985, the European Communities and governments of the Member States would have seriously failed to fulfil their undertaking to the people of Europe which would lead to a further loss of confidence in the European Community and a loss of credibility in decisions taken by its institutions?

Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The information available to the Commission is as follows:

— Italy has already started issuing 5 000 copies of the European passport, which will be generally available as from 1 January 1985;
— Denmark, France, Luxembourg and Ireland are to start issuing the European passport on 1 January 1985;
— Belgium will keep to the deadline set unless technical difficulties prevent it from doing so;
— the Netherlands has stated that introduction of the European passport will be slightly delayed owing to technical difficulties and has not given a firm date for its introduction;
— Greece is to start issuing the European passport before the end of 1985.

Two Member States have stated that introduction of the European passport will be delayed:

— the Federal Republic of Germany has apparently not yet completed discussions about the design of the European passport, but will introduce it as soon as possible and at the latest by 1 January 1986;
— the United Kingdom is to start issuing a machine-readable European passport in 1987 and the delay is to enable the necessary equipment to be installed.

In its communication entitled 'A People's Europe' (1), which it transmitted to the Council and Parliament in September 1984, the Commission expressed its opinion on the probable delay in the introduction of the European passport in several Member States in very clear terms. The Commission considers any delay to be unacceptable. Any Member State allowing such a delay to occur is failing to acknowledge the project's urgency for the policy of integration and such an attitude would run counter to the Presidency's conclusions on the Fontainebleau European Council (point 6) which recommended that the necessary decisions should be taken 'to ensure that this passport is actually available to Member States' nationals by 1 January 1985 at the latest'.

For its part, the Commission will do its utmost to ensure that this is done.

(1) COM(84) 446 final.

---

WRITTEN QUESTION No 789/84
by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC - B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 October 1984)
(85/C 71/07)

Subject: Transport of toxic waste

We understand that there have been contacts between the Belgian and Italian authorities with a view to placing the dioxin from Seveso in steel drums in Belgium and dumping it in the Atlantic Ocean. Such practices run counter to the recent Directive on transfrontier agreements on the transport of toxic waste which, however, is not yet in force.
Was the Commission involved in the contacts between Italian and Belgian ministries and ministers?

Were any third parties involved (private individuals, industry, other countries)?

What was the outcome of these contacts?

Where is the Seveso dioxin at present?

What plans exist for rendering the dioxin harmless in an ecologically responsible manner?

---

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

(4 January 1985)

The Commission has no knowledge of any contacts, talks or negotiations between Italy and Belgium or between them and any third parties (whether private individuals, industry or other countries) with a view to dumping the dioxin from Seveso at sea and has nothing to add to the answer which it gave on 17 November 1983 to Written Question No 800/83 by Mr Wedekind.(1)

The Commission has plans to send the Council a fresh proposal to control dumping at sea.

At the moment the dioxin from Seveso is in Hofmann-Laroche’s vaults in Basle, where it will remain under the supervision of the Swiss local and federal authorities until methods of destroying it in the incinerator without endangering human beings or the environment have been devised.

According to the latest reports, the trials have now reached the final stage.

---


---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 802/84**

by Mr Ian Paisley (NI — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 October 1984)

(85/C 71/08)

**Subject:** European judicial area

1. Can the Commission state what action it has taken on the resolution of the European Parliament of 9 July 1982(1) on a European judicial area and what proposals it has made for a Directive providing for the suppression of terrorism in the Member States and establishing common principles for extradition between Member States?

2. Can the Commission state what proposals it has made for directives dealing with mutual assistance in criminal matters, the compellability of witnesses, the taking of witness statements, and the transfer of prisoners pursuant to paragraph 10 of the resolution of the European Parliament of 9 July 1982 on a European judicial area?

---


---

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

(4 January 1985)

During the Conference of Ministers of Justice held in Luxembourg on 25 October 1982, the Commission representative reminded the Ministers of the terms of Parliament’s resolution of 9 July 1982 on the establishment of common principles for extradition between Member States. The Commission is associated with the efforts by the Ten to work out a joint position in the areas mentioned by the Honourable Member.

---

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 813/84**

by Mr Hans Nord (L — NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 October 1984)

(85/C 71/09)

**Subject:** 'Statistical' nature of customs formalities for intra-Community trade in steel products

In answer to my Written Question No 2055/83 (1) asking how the Commission reconciles Decision 3717/83/ECSC (2) with the ban on market-sharing contained in Article 4 (d) of the ECSC Treaty, the Commission says that it regards the accompanying document as a statistical return that has nothing to do with market-sharing. Although this answer is satisfactory, it leaves a number of questions open.

1. Is it correct that Article 15 (b) of quota Decision 234/84/ECSC (3) gives the Commission special powers to penalize producers supplying the common market in a way that differs from their traditional pattern of deliveries?

2. What is the effect of Article 15 (b), if not market-sharing?

3. Is it correct that the accompanying document is supposed to furnish the information required for the application of Article 15 (b) of Decision 234/84/ECSC?

4. Should the Commission’s answer to my Written Question of 21 February 1984 therefore be taken...
to mean that the Commission does not intend to make use of its powers under Article 15 (b)?

Answer given by Mr Davignon on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

On 22 December 1983, the Council recognized that the stability of traditional patterns of deliveries of steel products within the Community is an essential factor which must be preserved if the restructuring of the steel industry is to be carried out within a competitive context compatible with the solidarity imposed by the production quota system. Accordingly, Commission Decision 3717/83/ECSC (1) introduces an accompanying document which permits a full and exact survey and identification of movements of certain steel products within the Community. Article 15B of Decision 234/84/ECSC (2) requires the Commission to examine, on receipt of a complaint received from a Member State, whether deliveries of products, falling within categories Ia, Ib, II and III (as defined by that Decision), have been altered to a significant extent compared with traditional deliveries. If the Commission considers, after taking into account all the circumstances of the case, that a complaint is justified and that the alteration in traditional deliveries is due to the fact that the undertakings are guilty of practices contrary to Community law, the undertakings concerned will be requested to correct the imbalance in their traditional deliveries. The Commission may, in such cases where an undertaking does not correct an imbalance in its traditional deliveries, reduce the part of that undertaking’s quota that may be delivered in the Community during the following quarter by an amount not exceeding the imbalance in traditional deliveries, in accordance with Article 15B of Decision 234/84/ECSC.

It should be noted, however, that if the Commission’s enquiries have revealed breaches of Community law, for example in relation to the price rules (Articles 60 and 61 of the Treaty of Paris), quota regulations (Article 58), competition rules (Articles 65 and 66) or State aids, the Community will in the first instance apply the sanctions prescribed for those breaches.

It will be seen therefore that the effect of Article 15B is not to divide the Community but on the contrary simply to provide an extra means of ensuring the unity of the Community market by supporting the stability of the market and the solidarity of the industry during the crucial period when a major restructuring of the industry is taking place. The Commission will fully discharge its responsibilities as defined in Article 15B of Decision No 234/84/ECSC.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 822/84  
by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)  
to the Commission of the European Communities  
(9 October 1984)  
(85/C 71/10)

Subject: Receipt of subsidies by sea-ports

Does the Commission consider that it is a breach of the competition rules applicable in the Community that some sea-ports receive subsidies from public funds and some do not?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

Article 92, paragraph 1, of the EEC Treaty provides that aids granted by a Member State or through State resources in any form whatsoever which distort or threaten to distort competition by favouring certain undertakings or the production of certain goods and which have an effect on trade between Member States are incompatible with the common market.

To the extent that sea-ports or firms carrying out port-related activities can be deemed to be undertakings in the sense of this Article, the rules on State aids would apply as in any other case.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 849/84  
by Mr Ernest Mühlen (PPE — L)  
to the Commission of the European Communities  
(9 October 1984)  
(85/C 71/11)

Subject: Application of the dairy quota system

1. Is the Commission of the European Communities aware that various Member States are faced with considerable delays in the application of quotas for dairy products and that in some cases farmers do not yet know what reference quantities they are allowed (particularly in case of hardship)?
2. Seeing that the milk year is already far-advanced and hence it is impossible to make the initial calculations within the time limits laid down, is the Commission prepared to respond to the urgent appeals, launched by groups of producers and political authorities at both national and Community level, that statements and calculations concerning the supplementary levy should be made all at once at the end of the milk year, since it is extremely unlikely that the initial calculations will be made by the deadline of 1 November?

Answer given by Mr Dalsager on behalf of the Commission

(4 January 1985)

The Commission is aware that for reasons of administrative difficulty in a number of Member States, there have been delays in the communication of reference quantities to certain persons liable for levy, in particular, producers who have applied for special case treatment under Articles 3 and 4 of Regulation (EEC) No 857/84 (1). The Commission has also recognized that, because of the period required for the adaptation of production, the amount of the levy to be collected for the first payment period could lead to financial problems for a number of those liable.

For these reasons, the Commission decided by Regulation (EEC) No 3010/84 (2) to limit the first levy payment to 50% of the amount due for the first two quarters of application and to collect the balance at the end of the marketing year. The Commission also decided by Regulation (EEC) No 3291/ 84 (3) to authorize Member States to extend the period for the first payment of the levy to the 75 days following 30 September 1984. This extension should enable Member States to complete the necessary administrative procedures by the time the first levy payments are required.

1. At its meeting on 19 and 20 December 1984 the Council adopted Council Regulation (EEC) No 3656/84 of 28 December 1984 opening, allocating and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for herrings, fresh or chilled, falling within subheading 03.01 B I a) 2 aa) of the Common Customs Tariff (1).
2. The Council intends to examine in due course import arrangements applicable to subsequent imports of herrings.


WRITTEN QUESTION No 860/84
by Mr Antonino Buttafuoco (DR — I)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(17 October 1984)
(85/C 71/13)

Subject: Seizure of Community fishing vessels in the Sicilian Channel by the Tunisian armed forces

A Tunisian military patrol boat opened fire on fishing vessels based in Mazara del Vallo, which were engaged in normal fishing activity off the island of Lampedusa.

As a result of this incident, one of the boats was seriously damaged, and another large vessel of 144 tonnes with a crew of 11, was escorted under seizure to Sfax, despite the intervention of an Italian naval vessel which was patrolling the area.

Can the Commission evaluate the current state of relations between the EEC and Tunisia, and how does it intend to protect Community interests in the Sicilian Channel?

Can it also indicate whether the Italo-Tunisian Fisheries Agreement, ratified in 1982, albeit after some delay, is now actually in force?

Answer given by Mr Kontogeorgis on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Commission has not been officially informed of the incident to which the Honourable Member is referring.

The Fishery Agreement between Tunisia and Italy, signed on 19 June 1976, expired on 19 June 1979. Negotiating directives for a fishery agreement between the Community and Tunisia were adopted in 1979 but Tunisia has refused hitherto to enter into negotiations with the Community on the conclusion of a new fishery agreement which could offer particular advantages to Italian fishermen by restoring their traditional activities.

---

WRITTEN QUESTION No 870/84
by Mr Karel Van Miert (S — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(17 October 1984)
(85/C 71/14)

Subject: Belgian textile plan for 1984

The Commission has just rejected the Belgian textile plan for 1984. This means that the aid of Bfrs 1 300 million proposed by the Belgian Government for the textile and clothing industry cannot be implemented.

On the basis of what criteria did the Commission come to its decision? Can the Commission provide details for each criterion, by sub-sector and by firm?

With regard to employment, did the Commission also bear in mind the possible effect of new technologies on employment when reaching its decision? If so, how was this done? If not, why not?

In the case of the sub-sectors for which prior notification was required, can the Commission give a detailed review of the aid granted under the Belgian textile plan for 1983, by sub-sector and by firm?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Commission confirms that, having regard to the criteria set out in Article 92 et seq. of the EEC Treaty, it has adopted a final negative decision in respect of the proposed Belgian aid scheme for the textile and clothing industry which was to replace previous aid programmes.

After scrutiny of the scheme and hearing the comments of third parties, the Commission concluded that the proposed programme could not be regarded as compatible with the common market. In view of the results achieved by the previous aid schemes of 1982 and 1983 in favour of the Belgian textile and clothing industry, the Commission took the view that further aids would not promote a development in the interest of the Community. Furthermore, the proposed aid scheme would, by artificially lowering the investment costs of companies in the sector, weaken the competitive position of other textile and clothing producers in the EC and would have the effect of distorting competition, particularly as a large share of the Belgian production is exported to other Member States.

The recent development and present situation of the Belgian textile and clothing industry is, particularly in comparison with its EC counterparts, a favourable one: textile and clothing production in Belgium
increased while the decline recorded in most other Member States during the last few years continued. Other economic indicators, like the degree of equipment utilization, the length of activity guaranteed by the order books, turnover, exports and, particularly, investment underline the favourable economic situation of the Belgian textile and clothing industry. At the same time, the long-lasting negative trend in employment has been stopped and even partly reversed and, furthermore, the Belgian share of total EC production has risen. Therefore, the Commission also considered that the Belgian textile and clothing industry is in a comparatively advantageous position to cope with any problems arising from the introduction of new technologies. Furthermore, the aid proposal for 1984 was not specifically intended by the Belgian Government to provide assistance for the industry in this respect.

Under the 1983 aid programme, the Belgian Government has not submitted any prior notification of proposed support for companies in sub-sectors of the textile and clothing industry which were subject to the specific procedure as referred to by the Honourable Member. The Commission therefore concludes that no aids have been granted to these sectors under the aid scheme in question except for companies with less than 150 employees, which have not been subject to the said procedure.

At Community level, the Council and the representatives of the governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, adopted on 7 June 1984 a resolution on the reduction of checks on individuals at the Community's internal frontiers (1). In particular, this resolution provides that 'the Member States shall take appropriate measures to reduce waiting time and the duration of checks to the minimum necessary. ... To this end they may, for instance:

- set up special checkpoints for the nationals of the Member States, if crossing-time would be reduced as a result,

- carry out any checks which are considered necessary on these nationals by means of spot checks, unless this is not possible for reasons of public security'.

In addition, the European Council, meeting at Fontainebleau, called on the Council and the Member States 'to put in hand without delay a study of the measures which could be taken to bring about in the near future, and in any case before the middle of 1985:

- the abolition of all police and customs formalities for people crossing intra-Community frontiers'.

In 'A People's Europe — Implementing the conclusions of the Fontainebleau European Council' (2), the Commission gave a detailed account of its ideas and the methods it felt should be followed to pave the way for the eventual abolition of checks on individuals at the Community's internal frontiers. This document would no doubt be of interest to the Honourable Member.

At bilateral level, a number of Member States have agreed to introduce measures:

- Following the Franco-German summit at RamboUILiet in June 1984, France and the Federal Republic of Germany signed an agreement on 13 July on the gradual abolition of checks at frontiers between the two countries. Under this agreement, which also described the second and third stages which were to lead to the complete abolition of checks, it was decided that the first stage would involve:

  - the introduction, as a general rule, of a simple visual check on vehicles which could cross the frontier at reduced speed without having to stop,

  - the introduction of joint checkpoints at three frontier posts so that vehicles would have to stop only once; this facility was extended to 15 frontier posts following the recent Franco-German summit at Bad Kreuznach in October 1984;
— the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany have concluded specific agreements on small-scale frontier traffic, which came into force on 1 May 1984;

— local agreements have been concluded between Belgium and Germany to facilitate border crossings between these two Member States;

— the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg decided at the meeting of Benelux Ministers on 12 December 1984 to open negotiations with France and Germany on simplifying border crossing procedures, taking as a model the provisions of the Franco-German agreement of July 1984;

— France and Italy have also started negotiations to consider the scope for simplifying checks at the Franco-Italian border.

(2) COM(84) 446 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 895/84
by Mr Alain Carignon (RDE — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(24 October 1984)
(85/C 71/16)

Subject: Need for an accelerated and immediate ratification of the Convention on Jurisdiction and the Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters of 27 September 1968 by the various Member States

Under Article 3 (2) of the Acts of Accession of 22 January 1972 and 28 May 1979, the 10 Member States undertook to extend the application of the Convention on Jurisdiction and the enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters to Denmark, the United Kingdom, Greece and Ireland.

These obligations have already been partially met as instruments of accession to the Convention were signed on 9 November 1978 and 25 October 1982.

However, there is still a long way to go as a number of Member States have not yet ratified these instruments. For those subject to European legislation, the situation has not changed since 1 February 1973 when the 1968 Convention entered into force between the six founder Member States.

Is the Commission, as guardian of the Treaties, satisfied with the way in which the Member States have met the abovementioned obligations? Does it think it right that, 10 years after the first enlargement of the Community, the new Member States are still not bound by the 1968 Convention? Does it think it right that almost six years after the 1978 Convention was signed, it has still not entered into force? What steps and procedures does it envisage to expedite the entry into force of the instruments of accession to the Convention? When can these instruments be expected to take effect?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1092/84
by Mr Alain Carignon (RDE — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(24 October 1984)
(85/C 71/17)

Subject: Jurisdiction and enforcement of judgments

In Written Questions No 1132/83 (1) and No 462/84 (2), Mr Bernard Cousté asked the Commission to give a progress report on the ratification and preparations for the ratification of the Conventions of 9 October 1978 and 25 October 1982 on the accession to the Convention of 27 September 1968 by Denmark, the United Kingdom, Greece and Ireland.

Unfortunately, the answer to Written Question No 462/84 is incomplete since it does not mention:


Why is this answer incomplete?

As the extension of the Convention of 27 September 1968 is an important factor in strengthening the internal market, should it not be one of the Commission's priorities to have the 1978 and 1982 Conventions implemented as soon as possible?

In view of the provisions of Article 3 (2) of the Acts of Accession, is the Commission not being too cautious and pessimistic when it claims that it cannot
influence the timetables of Member States’ Parlia-
m ents? Can the governments explain the delays in
depositing their instruments of ratification? What
does the Commission intend to do to speed up the
timelines of Member States’ Parlia-
m ents? Could it provide an accurate, complete and pre-
cise update of its answers to Written Questions
No 1132/83 and No 462/84?

(1) OJ No C 24, 30. 1. 1984, p. 27.

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Convention of Accession of 9 October 1978 of
Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom to the
Convention on jurisdiction and the enforcement of
judgments in civil and commercial matters was rati-
fied by the Netherlands on 8 December 1980, by
Italy on 7 May 1981, by Luxembourg on 22 October
1981, by the Federal Republic of Germany on
7 March 1984 and by France on 27 February 1984.

The United Kingdom is expected to deposit the
instrument of ratification at any moment, Parlia-
m ent having given its approval in 1983.

The 1982 Convention on the accession of Greece
was ratified by the Netherlands on 19 July 1983, by
France on 27 February 1984 and by Italy on
18 October 1984.

It appears to the Commission that the 1978 Conven-
tion could take effect between the original Member
States and at least the United Kingdom by the end
of 1985 provided the Belgian Parliament passes the
law ratifying it in the first half of the year.

Like the Honourable Member, the Commission
finds it regrettable that not all the procedures for
ratifying the 1978 Convention have yet been com-
pleted.

Bearing in mind the complexity of the matter, the
legal differences, and the economic interests at
stake, it is understandable that the negotiations with
Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom on the
1978 Convention should have lasted roughly as long
as the negotiations on the original, 1968 Conven-
tion.

As regards implementation of the 1978 Convention,
the Commission would emphasize that it has no

WRITTEN QUESTION No 904/84
by Mr George Patterson (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(24 October 1984)
(85/C 71/18)

Subject: Bus services

Why are there no regular bus services using the
motorways between Community cities such as Paris,
Brussels and Cologne?

How many specific proposals have the Commission
made to facilitate the running of such services by
public or private operators, and what has happened
to them?

Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis
on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

There is indeed a regular coach service on each of
the routes mentioned by the Honourable Member.
They are run by subsidiaries of the railways and use
motorways except in part of French territory.

Council Regulation No 517/72/EEC (1) makes this
type of transport subject to authorization. Author-
izations are issued by the Member States’ competent
authorities, which have to examine whether the ser-
vice being applied for is not already being provided
satisfactorily in both qualitative and quantitative
terms by existing passenger transport services.

The Commission plays no part in the issue of an
authorization but a dispute may be referred to it at
the request of one of the Member States concerned.
It then makes a decision which is communicated to
States concerned as soon as possible. This has been
done in specific cases.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 921/84
by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(24 October 1984)
(85/C 71/19)

Subject: Checks carried out by fisheries inspectors

In connection with the monitoring of fisheries agreements, inspections are carried out by the Commission.
Can the Commission state whether an assessment report has already been drawn up on all the inspections that have been carried out? If so, can it inform me of its findings?

Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Commission has decided to initiate the infringement procedure under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty against those Member States whose quotas were exceeded in 1983 and 1984 and which are failing to apply properly the Community rules concerning the recording of catches and the technical measures for the conservation of resources.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 941/84
by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(29 October 1984)
(85/C 71/20)

Subject: Genetic engineering techniques in agriculture

What commitment has been made by the Commission over the last three years to fund research into genetic engineering techniques in agriculture and what support is planned to be provided to facilitate the development of commercially attractive products in this field over the next five years? Does it share my view that this technology has a major contribution to make to the future of European agriculture?

Answer given by Mr Davignon on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Commission has implemented its Research and Training Programme in Biomolecular Engineering (1982 to 1986) with the objective of removing the bottlenecks which prevent applications to agriculture and to agro-food industries of recent discoveries in genetic and enzyme engineering. The Council adopted the programme in two stages, with budget appropriations of 8 million ECU (1982/83) and 7 million ECU (1984 to 1986). These funds are being spent on cost-shared research contracts with public or private bodies in the Member States, on training contracts with post-doctoral recipients of grants and host laboratories, on meetings and workshops where ideas, material and staff are exchanged between groups and transnational cooperative programmes are further activated.

Two years after its start, this programme can already claim to have contributed to the first production of a monocotyledonous plant transformed with an engineered gene, and has also allowed the development of new host-vector systems considered of direct interest to food processes, employing perfectly innocuous organisms.

The Biomolecular Engineering Programme (BEP) is expected to become part of a broader programme which would foresee integrated approaches in pre-competitive research, in training, in developing infrastructures and in concertation between national and Community policies. The proposal for this Research Action Programme in Biotechnology was presented in April 1984 by the Commission to the Council. The European Parliament gave its opinion on 14 December 1984, the Council adopted the programme on 19 December 1984. This programme places a strong emphasis on the proper transfer of technology to European agriculture and industry and on the participation of industries in the programme. The amount necessary to implement the Commission proposal is 88.5 million ECU for the period 1985 to 1989. However, the development of a commercial product is not, in the strict sense, part of this Community programme, which aims essentially at bridging the gap between basic research and applied research.

This technology will indeed make a major contribution to the future of European agriculture. In the short term, animal husbandry will benefit from recent developments in the genetic engineering of veterinary vaccines or hormones, and from the applications to animal breeding of embryo culture and transplantation techniques. In the longer term, the cloning and transfer of single genes into cultivated species will open new avenues of plant breeding, aimed at strategic objectives such as European self-sufficiency in proteins for animal feeding, reduced dependence on chemical compounds in the field,
improvement of nutritional quality of food crops, etc. The efficiency of additional research inputs in agricultural biotechnology is expected to be rewarding, since the effort in this field has long been under-proportionate (for example, the number of molecular biologists in the field of plant proteins — of all sorts and origins — is still lower by at least two orders of magnitude than the number of their colleagues in the field of blood proteins only).

(1) COM(84) 230.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 942/84**
by Mr Werner Munch (PPE — D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(29 October 1984)
(85/C 71/21)

Subject: Use of Belgian port facilities for the export of cereals and mixed fodder products

In connection with the initial storage of cereals and mixed fodder products, recommendation 77/335/EEC (1) has been amended to the effect that Belgian ports must be used for the transport of cereals inasmuch as facilities there for the storage of cereals and mixed fodder have been or are being newly built or modernized.

Since German ports also play an important part in handling cereal and mixed fodder products, can the Commission say:

1. Why it is essential to use Belgian port facilities for the export of cereals and mixed fodder?
2. How important it considers German ports to be for exports of this type?
3. What measures it has taken or intends to take to stop German ports being put at a competitive disadvantage by the change in recommendation 77/335/EEC?

It goes without saying that if there are structural deficiencies in the port facilities of other Member States the Commission will examine with the same attention any specific programme that these Member States present to it.

(1) OJ No L 123, 17. 5. 1977, p. 22.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 949/84**
by Mr James Provan (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(29 October 1984)
(85/C 71/22)

Subject: Agricultural budget

---

(1) OJ No L 51, 23. 2. 1977.
(2) OJ No L 139, 25. 5. 1984.
At this time of budgetary crisis, is it the Commission's policy to continue to support, through Section III B, Titles 1 and 2, of the Community budget, agricultural products whose cost to the Community budget represents more than one-half of the total market value of that product within the Community, and if so, in what way is this continued budgetary support compatible with the principles and guidelines governing the Community's budgetary policy, particularly budgetary discipline?

Answer given by Mr Dalsager on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Commission is mindful of the cost to the budget of the EEC market organizations as a whole. Through its action, a quota system has been introduced for milk and guarantee thresholds have been extended to many products.

It should be noted with regard to the ratio between expenditure on a sector and the value of its production, that this depends mainly on the type of system applied in the sector concerned.

Thus, in the main sectors where imports are partially or totally exempt from levy or are subject to very low customs duty only, the common organization of the market laid down in the basic regulations generally makes provision for aid to producers or consumers (deficiency payments) with a view to protecting Community production to some extent vis-à-vis the price levels and fluctuations on the world market. This mainly concerns raw tobacco, oilseeds, protein products and olive oil, where as a consequence of aid to producers and (where relevant) to consumers, the level of expenditure is fairly high in relation to the value of the product.

The Commission wishes to point out that for these products it has also taken measures aimed at achieving some control of expenditure, such as for example the introduction of the guarantee threshold for oilseeds, the limitation of production aid to olive oil from trees planted before a given date, and the reduction of prices for tobacco where buying in exceeds certain quantities.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 961/84
by Mr Ray Mac Sharry (RDE — IRL)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(29 October 1984)
(85/C 71/23)

Subject: Timber processing

A recent report by the AIB (Allied Irish Banks) on 'Private investment and forestry in Ireland' outlined the case for setting up an integrated programme for the timber processing industry to ensure that such units have the plant, labour and management skills as well as the capacity to produce and sell a high-quality product competitively.

Would the Commission outline the ways in which Community aid could assist such an integrated programme?

Answer given by Mr Davignon on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

No specific Community aid is available for such a programme. However, the facilities of the Regional Fund, the Social Fund and the European Investment Bank are available in accordance with their particular criteria.

The Community is already making funds available to support forestry development and the timber processing industry in Ireland in the form of loans from the European Investment Bank.

A total of £ Irl 56 million in EIB loans is being used by the Forest and Wildlife Service of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry mainly for the afforestation of some 60 000 hectares of land considered marginal for agriculture, but also for the construction and improvement of forest roads, the purchase of forest harvesting equipment, the development of market and research facilities, the provision of new amenities for tourism and for wildlife conservation, involving the establishment of a number of game sanctuaries and nature reserves.

The timber processing industry has access to EIB funds both in the form of direct loans from the Bank and through its global loans, i.e. lines of credit opened by the EIB to Irish financial institutions for on-lending in smaller amounts to help finance investment by small and medium-sized industrial and agro-industrial enterprises throughout Ireland. To date, 180 such ventures, involved in timber processing and wood product manufacture, have availed themselves of the EIB global loan facility, drawing credits totalling nearly £ Irl 10 million.
The Community is furthermore helping to promote raw material supply to such a programme through the forestry provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 1820/80 (1) for the stimulation of agricultural development in the less-favoured areas of the West of Ireland.


WRITTEN QUESTION No 972/84
by Mr Christopher Jackson (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(8 November 1984)
(85/C 71/24)

Subject: The protection of bees from the effects of toxic pesticides

Spraying crops in flower with pesticides is forbidden in certain EEC countries. In other countries such practice does much damage to all pollinating insects and in addition causes commercial damage through the destruction of bees.

1. Is there any sign of progress on the proposal made by the Commission to the Council on 9 September 1976 for a Directive concerning the type approval of plant protection products which, when adopted, could provide a framework in which subsequently Community criteria could be established for the protection of bees?

2. If this Directive is blocked, will the Commission consider proposing another Directive specifically prohibiting the spraying with pesticides of crops in flower?

Answer given by Mr Dalsager on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

By its resolution of 10 May 1984 establishing a programme of work in the field of the harmonization of veterinary, plant health and animal feedingstuffs legislation (1), the Council agreed a timetable providing inter alia for adoption of the proposal, to which the Honourable Member refers, by 1 January 1986.

The Commission welcomes this and will continue to participate actively in the work of the Council towards resolution of the outstanding problems.

(1) OJ No C 134, 22.5.1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 975/84
by Mr Finn Lynge (S — DK)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(8 November 1984)
(85/C 71/25)

Subject: Importation of skins of certain seal pups and products derived therefrom

What measures have been taken by the 10 Member States to implement, in their national legislation, Article 3 (exemptions for products resulting from traditional hunting by the Inuit people) of the Council Directive of 28 March 1983 concerning the importation into Member States of skins of certain seal pups and products derived therefrom?

Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

In three Member States — Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands — a certificate of authenticity issued by the competent authorities in the country of origin must be presented to obtain an import licence for products derived from traditional hunting by the Inuit people.

The measures adopted in the other Member States to implement the Directive on the importation into Member States of skins of certain seal pups (1) make no specific provision in respect of these products as they do not come within the scope of the Directive.


WRITTEN QUESTION No 977/84
by Mr Otmar Franz (PPE — D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(8 November 1984)
(85/C 71/26)

Subject: Ratification of the additional protocols to the Geneva Red Cross Conventions

The Diplomatic Conference of 1977 in Geneva adopted two additional protocols to the 1949 Red Cross Conventions, concerning the protection of individuals against the effects of war and the general protection of the civilian population.

Can the Commission indicate which Community Member States have so far ratified these additional protocols and what measures it has taken to secure ratification by the remainder?
Answer given by Mr Richard 
on behalf of the Commission 
(4 January 1985)

From the information available to the Commission it would appear that only Denmark has ratified both additional protocols on the protection of victims of international armed conflicts and the protection of victims of non-international armed conflicts respectively.

France has ratified only the latter.

The Commission has no means of ensuring that the protocols referred to are ratified by the Member States where questions of humanitarian law governing peoples involved in armed conflicts are concerned.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 983/84 
by Mr Leslie Huckfield (S — GB) 
to the Commission of the European Communities 
(8 November 1984) 
(85/C 71/27)

Subject: Allocation of ERDF funds to the Member States

Will the Commission make a statement giving details of the monitoring it exercises over the allocation of European Regional Development Funds to Member States, stating in each case how they ensure that governments add to these grants their own additional payments under the principles of 'additionality'?

Answer given by Mr Giolitti 
on behalf of the Commission 
(18 December 1984)

As regards the use of aid granted by the Community, most Member States indicate that they have already taken overall account of Fund assistance when drawing up the regional development items of their national budgets.

Despite this undertaking there are difficulties for the Commission, particularly at a time of general budget retrenchment, in assessing whether Fund resources are being used on top of national expenditure and in estimating whether national regional development budgets would have been lower if ERDF assistance was not available.

In relation to specific investment in industrial and service activities, Article 4 (2) (a) of the current Fund Regulation provides that ERDF aid may either supplement aid granted to the investment by public authorities or remain credited to those authorities and be considered as a partial repayment of such aid. Up to now, Member States have almost always opted for the latter arrangement.

The new ERDF Regulation, which comes into effect on 1 January 1985 (1), preserves the obligation on Member States to identify separately amounts received from the Fund. The Regulation also contains some important new provisions which may facilitate the implementation of additionality throughout the Member States. These include:

— a greater concentration on programme financing which should enable Member States to take into account at an earlier stage global amounts of ERDF aid for programme investment,

— an increase in resources available for Community programmes ('non-quota' aid under the existing Fund Regulation). This will enable the Commission on its own initiative to devote larger amounts to promote actions which complement national measures.


WRITTEN QUESTION No 993/84 
by Mr Emmanuel Maffre-Baugé (COM— F) 
to the Commission of the European Communities 
(8 November 1984) 
(85/C 71/28)

Subject: Market organizations in the fisheries sector

The common organization of markets in the fishery products sector has given rise to discrimination among fishermen, between those in receipt of Community aid and the rest.

1. Is the Commission aware of this state of affairs and would it be willing to amend the present system of withdrawal by introducing an element of selectivity to take account of the intended use of the products, i.e. processing or marketing in the wet state?

2. Does the Commission not take the view that the withdrawal price should be applied to all the species which are subject to quotas? Would it be willing to submit proposals to that effect to the Council?

3. Would the Commission be willing to propose an amendment to the rules, in order to protect the Community market more effectively from imports from third countries?

Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis 
on behalf of the Commission 
(4 January 1984)

1. Varying withdrawal prices for fresh products depending on their future use, as proposed by the
Honourable Member, would have the effect of splitting up the market; this would affect the incomes of producers by superimposing on market forces a structure serving the interests of different groups of users. Differentiated prices would also cause considerable monitoring problems because landings of fresh products are largely sold at auction without being sorted beforehand in terms of their ultimate destination. It is not uncommon for processing companies and wholesale dealers to buy fresh products at auction and decide later whether to send them for processing or market them directly in the light of requirements.

2. The EEC market organization is designed to stabilize markets, and particularly prices, while resource policy is aimed at the conservation of stocks. Because of these different objectives not all the species subject to TACs and quotas can be included automatically in the price system of the market organization. This is why the Commission has left out of the price system certain luxury products and bulk products less suitable for selling for human consumption, even if they are subject to TACs and quotas.

3. When the market organization was reviewed in 1981, appropriate instruments were incorporated to provide more effective protection of the Community market against low-price imports from non-Community countries. As a result the Commission has several times, at the request of certain Member States, adopted protective measures against imports from non-Community countries which were disturbing or liable to disturb the Community market.

The system protecting the Community market, to be effective, depends in part on regular information of proper quality being supplied to the Commission by Member States in compliance with the requirements of Community legislation.

Answer given by Mr Giolitti on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

In the opinion it delivered on the proposal for a Regulation on the protection of forests against fire and acid rain(1) Parliament did not opt for the Committee on Agriculture's suggestion to which the Honourable Member refers. That suggestion was probably rejected by Parliament on the grounds that it calls in question the very rules on which the operation of the internal market is based and the international trade agreements which the Community has entered into.

Such a measure, which would run counter to the Community's policy to date, cannot be looked at in isolation in order to determine its impact on production and employment. It could, indirectly, have a major effect on international trade as a whole and therefore on the Community's economy generally. Moreover, the effect cannot be estimated since it depends in particular on decisions by the Community's trading partners over which the Community has no control whatsoever.

Accordingly the Commission does not intend, for any of the other Community financial instruments accompanying its policies, to change the practice it has followed so far.

the EEC. In its document of 12 April 1984, COM(84) 224 final, it pointed out that in the short term, the increase in both the quantity of seeds imported to the Community from third countries and recorded prices had led to a reduction in the surface area under cultivation and caused producers' income to fall. These developments ran counter to all of the Community's efforts to diversify agricultural production. The Commission quite properly concluded that to remedy the present situation and avert more serious dangers in the future, appropriate measures of sufficient scope were needed as a matter of urgency to protect the Community's independence in the production of hybrid maize seeds. It was in effect seeking a mandate from the Council to modify the tariff concessions in GATT.

A few months later, the Commission withdrew its draft on the grounds that imports had fallen in the 1983/84 marketing year. However, this reduction appears to be linked purely to cyclical economic factors.

1. Can the Commission indicate precisely why it withdrew its recommendation to the Council? Can this retreat be explained by the fear of clashing with certain countries in GATT?

2. Even allowing for the cyclical decline in 1983/84, the increase in imports since 1979/80 remains high. Is the Commission now calling into question the analyses and conclusions set out in its document COM(84) 224 final?

3. Would the Commission be disposed to revive its proposal if the forecasts for 1984/85 were to indicate a possible increase in imports and a reduction in the area under cultivation in the EEC?

Answer given by Mr Dalsager on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

1. The Commission withdrew its recommendation for a Decision modifying the tariff concession on hybrid maize seed for sowing (1) because the Member States' representatives on the Council Article 113 Committee were unable to agree on its initial recommendation, which was based on a forecast of a substantial increase in imports in the 1983/84 marketing year.

It emerged, moreover, when the statistics for 1983/84 became available that the expected increase had not materialized, that imports were actually lower than for the 1981/82 and 1982/83 marketing years and that there had been some increase in the areas sown in the Community.

2. This drop in imports in 1983/84 does appear to result to some extent from the operation of cyclical factors. It is difficult, however, at the moment to estimate their importance.

The Commission confirms its point of view as expressed in the recommendation for a Decision referred to above, namely that the Community market in hybrid maize seed should be protected if signs emerge in the future of a massive increase in imports.

3. The Commission will therefore be prepared to take appropriate measures applying to trade with non-member countries, subject to respect for the GATT rules, should it appear that disturbances are arising or are likely to arise in the market in hybrid maize.

(1) Doc. COM(84) 224 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1016/84
by Mr Madron Seligman (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(12 November 1984)
(85/C 71/31)

Subject: Financial assistance in language teaching

Is anything being done by the Community to provide financial assistance in language teaching for students or teachers or for providing support for development work in assessment of language courses?

Answer given by Mr Richard on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

At present, the Commission has only very modest resources available to encourage, in accordance with the Council resolution of 9 February 1976 (1), the exchange of information and experience in foreign-language teaching.

In response to the conclusions of the Council and Ministers of Education meeting within the Council on 4 June 1982 and the Parliament resolutions on foreign-language teaching (2), the Commission intends to propose that a specific budget heading should be entered in the 1986 draft budget to finance action such as discussions between national representatives on problems of methodology and assess-
ment in respect of foreign-language teaching, legal and administrative obstacles which prevent students and teachers of foreign languages from staying in other Member States, study visits for inspectors and administrators responsible for foreign-language teaching, subsidies (depending on distances and cost of living), and initial and in-service training courses for foreign-language teachers.

Under the joint study programme, the Commission intends to provide specific aid for higher education institutions receiving, for one or two half-years, students from other Member States who are preparing to teach the language of the host country. The Commission is closely monitoring the work of the Council of Europe aimed at promoting foreign-language teaching.

Current proposals do not cover research into the assessment of language teaching as such.


**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1024/84**
by Mr John Hume (S — GB) to the Commission of the European Communities
(12 November 1984)
(85/C 71/32)

**Subject:** Control of nuclear materials and the disposal of nuclear waste

Has the Commission examined the measures being taken by the United Kingdom Government to control the storage, processing and disposal of radioactive materials at the Sellafield nuclear plant, in order to ascertain whether or not they are in conformity with EEC Regulations? If so, will the Commission make a statement?

What proposals does the Commission intend to make to deal with the problem of the dumping of radioactive wastes at sea, and what bearing will these proposals have on the current practices at Sellafield in the UK?

**Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission**
(4 January 1985)

The relevant Community Regulations are given in Council Directive 80/836/Euratom on basic safety standards (1) and the Commission has no evidence which suggests that the requirements of this Directive are being breached. On the contrary, extensive data on Sellafield are published periodically and these have always shown that the dose limits laid down in the Directive are respected. Moreover, it is known that, in accordance with the principle that the doses incurred should also be as low as reasonably achievable, the operator (British Nuclear Fuels plc) has already taken and is continuing to take steps to reduce the discharges of radioactive effluents and hence decrease the doses to the members of the population. The Commission regularly examines the data as it becomes available.

As regards the dumping of radioactive wastes into the sea in packaged form, the Commission is awaiting the results of a number of international studies currently in progress before reviewing the position; further information was given in the Commission's reply to Written Question No 585/84 by Mr Roelants du Vivier (2).

(2) OJ No C 8, 1. 1. 1985, p. 5.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1032/84**
by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC — B) to the Commission of the European Communities
(12 November 1984)
(85/C 71/33)

**Subject:** Belgium's failure to implement Directive 78/659/EEC

Belgium has passed certain legislation and introduced certain regulations in pursuance of Directive 78/659/EEC of 18 July 1978 (1) on the quality of fresh waters needing protection or improvement in order to support fish life.

It has not, however, designated salmonid and cyprinid waters in compliance with Article 4 of this Directive. Could the Commission state in this connection whether it has instituted an action against Belgium for failure to fulfil its obligations, as provided for in Article 169 of the Treaty of Rome.


**Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission**
(4 January 1985)

July 1978 on the quality of fresh waters needing protection or improvement in order to support fish life. The Commission has therefore withdrawn the action initiated against Belgium before the Court of Justice on 9 January 1984 for failure to implement this Directive.

This legislation will now have to be followed by a series of specific measures by the regional authorities, notably to designate the water bodies concerned, to appoint the supervisory authorities and so on.

The Commission has reminded the Belgian authorities of their obligations under Article 4 of the Directive and will not hesitate to bring fresh infringement proceedings against Belgium should they fail to honour them in reasonable time.

2. The Commission will be presenting to the Council and to Parliament early this year a summary report on measures taken by Member States to recycle waste paper and to use recycled paper.

(1) OJ No C 141, 25. 5. 1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1049/84
by Mr Benjamin Visser (S — NL) to the Commission of the European Communities
(13 November 1984)
(85/C 71/35)

Subject: Slow completion of customs formalities at the Italian border

1. Is the Commission aware that, in September, action was again taken by lorry drivers at the Italian border near Chiasso in protest at the continued slowness of customs formalities, despite earlier assurances by the competent Italian authorities that matters would be improved?

2. What direct action did the Commission take at the time to end the protest, for example, by entering into consultations with the Italian authorities to persuade them to take specific measures to improve freight transport formalities at the Italian border?

3. Is the Commission considering the possibility of introducing 'flying squads' of Community officials with the task of carrying out checks at all internal borders, without notifying the national authorities in advance, in order to ascertain the efficiency and speed with which border formalities are completed?

Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

1 and 2. Following the difficulties experienced at certain crossing-points on the Italian border, particularly early in 1984, the Commission now believes, both from its own observation and from information provided by interested circles, that there has been a significant improvement in the speed and efficiency with which the Italian authorities carry out frontier controls and formalities. On this subject the Commission would draw the Honourable Member’s attention to its answer to Written Question No 518/84 by Mr Rogalla (1) in which recent developments in Italy and the Commission’s actions in this field are explained.
The Commission is aware that there are occasional incidents of the kind which have occurred at Chiasso and at other frontier posts elsewhere in the Community, and where necessary the Commission continues to undertake specific actions to help resolve particular problems as well as pursuing its overall programme aimed at reducing and simplifying controls and formalities.

3. The Commission has already suggested, in its communication to the Council on controls and formalities in trade within the Community (2), that one measure to be envisaged is to send officials on a regular basis to observe the way in which procedures are carried out at frontiers, in order to identify and, where possible, solve particular problems. However, the Commission has proposed, for the time being, informing the national authorities when such visits take place.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1059/84
by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(13 November 1984)
(85/C 71/36)

Subject: Community investment aid for coal mines in Campine

On 15 September we learnt that coal mines in Campine would not be eligible for investment aid from the Community.

Does the Commission feel that it is appropriate, in this context, simply to take account of one production factor, i.e. activities underground, thereby ignoring factors such as capital, automation and surface activities?

Answer given by Mr Davignon on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

It is still the Commission's intention to improve the economic viability of the Community's coal industry. In view of the different economic situations of individual pits, this means that profitable pits and those with marginal losses should be encouraged to increase their productivity and profitability by means of Community aids to investment. Pits which, by contrast, cannot hope to become competitive in future by reason of very high losses and low productivity, as is the case in the Belgian coal industry, should not participate in Community-wide investment aids. The Commission has taken the view that Community money should then be provided to help with the social consequences of restructuring, and has secured a Council Decision (1) providing an extra 60 million ECU for this purpose for 1984, by means of a transfer from the EEC budget.

As regards the adoption of underground productivity as the sole quantified criterion for eligibility, it should be stressed that:

— this applies evenly to all mines in the Member States,
— it is a technical criterion which shows a fairly stable development,
— it can be calculated on an internationally comparable basis.

Apart from the productivity criterion, the Commission would require and receive details from undertakings of their general financial position, investment strategy, competitiveness, etc., which would also be taken into consideration when deciding on the making of grants.

The reason why the Commission decided to calculate productivity solely for underground operations — i.e. to exclude surface operations — was that in several cases it would not be possible to apportion surface installations to the different pits which they serve in common.

The automatization of production could not be a criterion for eligibility because automatization is 100% in nearly all pits of the Community.

Capital costs are part of total production costs. Production costs and final prices concern economic criteria and cannot easily be compared internationally because, for example, of fluctuations in the exchange rates of different currencies, and also market fluctuations from other causes. This explains why the Commission has chosen only technical criteria for investment aid eligibility.


(2) Doc. COM(84) 134 final, 4.4. 1984, see especially p. 18.
WRITTEN QUESTION No 1065/84
by Mr Jean-Pierre Abelin (PPE — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(13 November 1984)
(85/C 71/37)
Subject: Imports of standardized electrical engines originating in the Eastern-bloc countries

Having been approached on several occasions by the representatives of the industries concerned in the Member States, the Commission cannot be unaware of the problems raised by the Comecon countries' dumping prices in the area of standardized electrical engines between 1 and 100 horsepower. Several Member States, especially France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Italy are particularly affected by these kinds of imports. The immediate future of several European firms is directly threatened by practices which result in cost prices that are 20 to 30% less than those of manufacturers in the Member States.

Could the Commission indicate:
1. the urgent measures and safeguards which it intends to take in order to restore the conditions of competition?
2. the manner in which the representatives of the industries in the Member States will be involved in the deliberations and work of the Commission?
3. whether it does not feel that it is essential, as an interim protective measure, to introduce without delay quota arrangements for standardized electrical engines originating in the Eastern-bloc countries?

Answer given by Mr Haferkamp
on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

Steps have already been taken to protect Community producers against imports of low-priced motors from Eastern Europe. As the result of an anti-dumping investigation concerning standardized electric motors of 0.75 kW to 75 kW, undertakings were given by exporters from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland and Romania to raise their prices in February 1980 (1) and by the USSR exporter in June 1980 (2). Later, as the result of a formal review of these undertakings, a definitive duty was imposed on imports from the USSR and new undertakings were given by the other exporters to raise their prices further (3). Finally, in 1984, as the result of an informal review, the exporters undertook to raise their prices in January 1984 and again in July 1984. The USSR exporter also gave a similar price undertaking (4). Overall, this action has led to the prices of these imports being raised substantially since 1979 and to a dramatic decrease in the volumes exported.

1 and 3. In view of the anti-dumping action already taken, it is not considered appropriate to apply protective measures of another kind.

2. The representatives of Community industry have been advised that the Commission would be prepared to carry out a further review of the price undertakings if they were to provide sufficient evidence to justify such action. During a review, they would be free to make any representations they wished and any allegations would be fully investigated.

(4) OJ No L 95, 5.4.1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1072/84
by Mr Gene Fitzgerald (RDE — IRL)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(13 November 1984)
(85/C 71/38)
Subject: Verolme shipyard

Will the Commission indicate whether or not it has received any requests from the Irish Government to help prevent the closure of the Verolme shipyard in Cork and if not, will the Commission indicate what measures the Irish Government can take with Community support to safeguard the jobs and skills of the highly trained workforce at Verolme?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

In accordance with the Fifth Directive (1) on aids for shipbuilding the Commission and the Irish Government have at regular intervals reviewed developments concerning the shipbuilding industry in the Cork area and the assistance extended to it. The Directive makes the granting of aids to shipyards conditional on restructuring efforts designed to eliminate overcapacity and restore profitability. Thus the Commission had in the past authorized…
special rescue aid for the Verolme shipyard in Cork but it has become apparent that in a context of a continuing worldwide crisis in shipbuilding and of a substantial overcapacity of that industry in the Community, this yard had very little prospect of ever becoming competitive and profitable.

Consequently, the Commission understands well that the Irish authorities were unable to prevent the closure of the yard and sought to promote alternative industry in this area, which has an unemployment rate of close to 20%. The Commission has undertaken to adopt a sympathetic approach towards special schemes Member States may wish to introduce aimed at helping to redevelop areas where shipyard closures or major capacity reductions in the industry are producing grave social or regional problems, by attracting new industry into such areas.

In the present case this would concern, more particularly, requests for grants from the ERDF and the Social Fund as well as the operation of the Irish regional aid system as governed by the Industrial Development Act 1969.

Answer given by Mr Dalsager on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Commission has already reacted to the public concern regarding the treatment of live animals in international transport. It would draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the results of these actions. On a proposal from the Commission, the Council, on 18 July 1977, adopted Council Directive 77/489/EEC (1) concerning the protection of animals in international transport. This text lays down many detailed legislative provisions concerning the international transport of animals.

In addition, it was subsequently accepted that more detailed Community provisions were necessary in order to ensure that uniform steps were taken by Member States to apply the provisions laid down in the basic Community rules.

In consequence, on a second proposal from the Commission on 12 May 1981, the Council adopted Directive 81/389/EEC (2) establishing certain measures necessary for the application of Directive 77/489/EEC.

The Commission continues to follow this matter closely and to devote resources to the problems of this sector. To this end it has asked its Standing Committee for Agricultural Research to examine whether there are good physiological, ethological and economic reasons for limiting the final journey to the abattoir of animals for immediate slaughter. This work is nearly complete and a report will be made to the Council when the Commission has studied the results.

The Commission intends to continue its policy of actively following this question in particular to ensure the effective application of these existing rules and their improvement where possible.

(1) OJ No L 200, 8.8.1977.
(2) OJ No L 150, 6.6.1981.

Could the Council also indicate the dates on which the Commission referred these proposals to it and the reasons why no agreement can be reached on them in the Council?

Is the Council prepared to provide Parliament with a list of such proposals at regular intervals (e.g. every six months)?

Answer
(31 January 1985)

The Council would refer the Honourable Member to the list, drawn up by the Commission, of proposals pending before the Council (COM(84) 1621 final).

The Council would draw the Honourable Member’s attention to the fact that an examination of the number of texts adopted by the Council shows that there tends to be a balance between the number of proposals submitted by the Commission and the number of Regulations, Directives and Decisions adopted by the Council. Thus, over the period 1979 to 1983, the Commission forwarded 2,926 proposals to the Council, 2,732 of which were adopted by the Council over that same period.

It is nevertheless true that a number of proposals are still before the Council and in certain cases have been for some time. Some of these proposals are highly technical and complex, requiring detailed and in-depth examination. Others are periodically withdrawn by the Commission, as they are out of date.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1088/84 by Mr Dieter Rogalla (S — D) to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 November 1984)
(85/C 71/42)

Subject: Customs clearance between Member States

1. How does the Commission view the Italian Government’s moves to increase staff numbers at the check-points at border crossings that deal with goods traffic between Italy and other Member States?
2. Is it possible that increases in staff numbers of this kind will lead to an increase in the charges for customs clearance?
3. What harmonization of customs clearance charges in the Member States has taken place to date and have these efforts also extended to charges for the services of the authorities?
4. Can the Commission supply a list showing the unit costs, e.g. per lorry, per kilogram, per item cleared, that arise:
   (a) for action by the authorities,
   (b) for the services of private cross-border forwarding agents and the like,
   (c) for other services,
when goods cross the border from one Member State to another?

5. If it is not possible to draw up a list of this kind, how are the abovementioned charges calculated in the various Member States, according to what criteria and, where applicable, with or without consultations with the haulage industry?

Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

1. As it indicated in its answer to Written Question No 518/84 by the Honourable Member (1), the Commission views positively the efforts made by the Italian authorities to accelerate and facilitate the completion of border controls and formalities and will continue to make suggestions and comments where it believes that this may contribute to further improvements.

2. The Italian customs authorities charge declarants for clearing goods, including those in intra-Community trade, outside normal working hours, in order to help meet the cost of the additional hours for which staff must be paid; such charges thus represent a payment for special services rendered. The charges fixed in 1978 were increased by Law No 302 of 13 July 1984, but the Commission understands that increases were necessary to keep pace with inflation. It should be noted that the same law also provides for significant improvements in working practices by extending opening times of offices and increasing numbers of staff, measures which are in line with Council Directive 83/643/EEC on the facilitation of physical inspections and administrative formalities in the carriage of goods between Member States (2).

3. Member States have clearly developed differing practices as regards payment for special services such as clearance of goods at times when offices are closed for normal business or attendance of customs officers at places other than offices. The Commission would only intervene directly in such matters if it believed that declarants were obliged to incur unnecessary costs in order to carry out simple, everyday procedures. In a more general manner, however, the Commission has sought to ensure a reasonable provision of services by proposing the above-mentioned Directive 83/643/EEC which the Council adopted on 1 December 1983.

4 and 5. As regards charges for the various kinds of specialized inspection, examination or control, such as veterinary inspection, under the conditions fixed by the Court of Justice in a large number of judgments, any charges which, among other things, do not represent a payment for particular services rendered, in proportion with those services, and which are not part of a general system of taxation in the Member State in question, would be considered as equivalent to a customs duty and therefore illegal.

Declarants must, of course, pay the charges made by customs clearance agents where the latter's services are used. The Commission has never made any proposals regarding these charges, which are a private matter between such agents and their clients, and for the same reason the Commission is unable to give any information relating to the level of charges. The Commission believes, however, that declarants must be enabled to avoid such costs by carrying out their own formalities if they wish and has never hesitated to act where it has suspected that this possibility was not provided. It further believes that its actions to reduce and simplify frontier controls and formalities will make it easier for declarants to carry out these tasks themselves.

The Commission does not possess the information on costs sought by the Honourable Member. Given the great variety of factors which can affect the costs in question even within a single Member State, it would be very difficult to provide an answer, the preparation of which would in any case be extremely costly in both time and money.


WRITTEN QUESTION No 1096/84
by Mr Thomas Megahy (S — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 November 1984)
(85/C 71/43)

Subject: Privately owned telecommunications

In which countries of the EEC are the telecommunications industries privately owned? Does the existence of privately owned telecommunications pres-
ent difficulty with regard to the problems of opening the public procurement markets in this area of activity?

Answer given by Mr Davignon on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

Industrial companies which produce telecommunications equipment are generally privately owned in the Community. In France and Italy, some major companies are either directly publicly owned or are part of major public corporations.

The administrations in the Community which provide telecommunications network services are generally under public control, with a status varying from being a government agency to a publicly controlled corporation. In the United Kingdom the major carrier has now been privatized and a second privately owned carrier now exists.

The Community's telecommunications policy must take into account the different situations in the Member States. The adoption on 12 November 1984 of recommendation 84/550/EEC by the Council (*) concerning the first phase of opening up access to public telecommunications contracts, demonstrates that the different situations in the Member States regarding ownership of both equipment companies and network carriers do not present insurmountable difficulties concerning the opening of public procurement markets.

Answer
(31 January 1985)

1. On 18 September 1984 the Commission submitted to the Council a communication on cooperation at Community level on health-related problems. That communication deals inter alia with diseases due to smoking.

2. At their informal meeting on 29 November 1984 the Ministers for Health exchanged views on the problem of smoking with reference to national experience and positions.

3. Regarding the problem of advertisements, the Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the fact that if an advertisement concerning the consumption of tobacco is misleading, it falls within the scope of the Council Directive of 10 September 1984 relating to the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning misleading advertising (†).


WRITTEN QUESTION No 1100/84
by Mr Thomas Megahy (S — GB)
to the Council of the European Communities
(19 November 1984)
(85/C 71/44)

Subject: Ban on advertisements encouraging smoking

When considering cooperation and joint action on health problems, particularly those caused by cigarette smoking, will the Council of Ministers take account of the statement issued by the British Medical Association in which it demands a total ban on tobacco advertising. In the words of the BMA's Head of Professional Division 'advertising, sports and arts sponsorship, competitions, clothes bearing brand names and holidays are all part of the industry's attempt to fool their consumers into believing that smoking is glamorous, healthy and desirable. These same consumers are our patients, and we know that smoking causes appalling illness and may cause unnecessary deaths.'

Answer given by Mr Davignon on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

It is specified in Article 12 of the amended proposal for a Council Regulation concerning financial support by the Community in favour of industries producing solid fuels that investment projects shall be
eligible for Community aid only if they result in an increase in the long-term net production capacity of the undertaking in question, and that they must relate to:
— the preparation of sites for production,
— installations, machines and buildings directly associated with the production of brown coal.

Other conditions, set out in Articles 11 and 13 of the amended proposal, must also be satisfied.

Production of brown coal in France totals around 2.5 million tonnes per annum. Brown coal is produced at Arjuzanx and at Meyrueil. Charbonnages de France is responsible for both fields.

As the amended proposal for a Regulation has not yet been adopted by the Council, the Commission has not yet contacted Charbonnages de France to see whether its investment projects relating to brown coal production are likely to satisfy the above criteria.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1109/84
by Mr Francis Wurtz (COM — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 November 1984)
(85/C 71/46)

Subject: Allocation of investment aid to the Community coal industry

In the light of the preparatory studies which it has doubtless carried out, can the Commission indicate which French undertakings producing coal are eligible for financial support under the amended proposal for a regulation (COM(84) 469 final) concerning Community industries producing solid fuels?

Answer given by Mr Davignon on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

It is specified in Article 4 of the amended proposal for a Council Regulation concerning financial support by the Community in favour of industries producing solid fuels that investment projects shall be eligible for Community aid only if:
— they concern existing pits with an output of at least 420 kilograms per man hour;
— productivity is at least 5 % higher after completion of the investment;
— they relate to installations, machines or buildings directly associated with the production or preparation of hard coal.

Other conditions, set out in Articles 3 and 5 of the amended proposal, must also be satisfied.

As the amended proposal has not yet been adopted by the Council, the Commission has not yet contacted Charbonnages de France to see exactly which investment projects will be likely to satisfy the above criteria.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1130/84
by Mrs Marie-Noelle Lienemann (S — F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(20 November 1984)
(85/C 71/47)

Subject: Compulsory liquidation of the Danish firm Christian Rovsing

At the beginning of December 1984, the Danish firm Christian Rovsing was put into liquidation by the commercial court. What action do the Commission and the Danish Government intend to take to ensure that the firm retains its European character and to prevent an American or Japanese company acquiring a holding in it? Does the Commission think that, given its present position, the firm will be able to honour its commitments under the ESPRIT programme, and, if so, how?

Answer given by Mr Davignon on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

Christian Rovsing AS filed for bankruptcy on 3 September 1984. The Commission has been informed that the company has been divided up into several separate companies with new owners. The new group, Christian Rovsing 1984 AS, with participation of Danish ITT, has not been involved in any ESPRIT activities. A new company, Procos AS, as well as the former company Christian Rovsing International AS, are presently negotiating ESPRIT contracts.

Christian Rovsing International AS, a subsidiary of Christian Rovsing AS and also participating in the
ESPRIT programme, was not included in the bankruptcy of the parent company; as a consequence of that, it has changed ownership, which is now totally Danish, as formally notified to the Commission by the new management.

The Commission has not taken any action regarding the forming of the consortium and is not aware of actions on the part of the Danish Government.

The Commission is taking action to assess the capability of Christian Rovsing AS's successor, Rovsing Systems AS, and Christian Rovsing International AS to fulfil the commitment towards the ESPRIT programme; this action is in progress.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1144/84 by Mrs Eileen Lemass (RDE — IRL) to the Commission of the European Communities (20 November 1984) (85/C 71/48)

Subject: Shiftwork and employment

1. Will the Commission indicate what studies have been carried out at European level regarding the value of shiftwork in the creation or maintenance of employment for both men and women?

2. To what extent has the impact of new technology on the organization of shiftwork and workers been studied at European level and following from this, what conclusions have been reached to date?

Answer given by Mr Richard on behalf of the Commission (4 January 1985)

1. The issue of shiftwork has been a prominent part of the work programmes 1977 to 1980 and 1981 to 1984 of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. A review of the Foundation's research into shiftwork in the first programme, which covered 67 research topics, was published in April 1982(1); another review covering the second programme, which has included 24 research projects on shiftwork, is scheduled to be ready by the end of 1985(2).

In the context of work-sharing and the reduction and reorganization of working time, the Commission has carried out a limited number of studies which have considered *inter alia* the potential employment effects of reducing individual working hours for shift workers. The Commission would draw attention in particular to a synthetical study carried out by the Battelle-Institute(3) and seeking to establish, on the basis of 1980 data, the quantitative impact on employment of various reductions in weekly working time for shiftworkers.

2. The relationship between new technologies and shiftwork has been extensively studied in the framework of the abovementioned work programmes of the Foundation. Firm conclusions should await the presentation of the final review report, but it seems to be safe to say at this stage that there are no specific causal links between the two phenomena(4).

The installation of new technologies may, however, especially when it is linked to a more capital-intensive production process, lead management to have more recourse to shiftwork in its various forms than hitherto has been the case in order to utilize more efficiently the productive capacity of the plant, especially where initial capital outlay has been very high. The same also applies to services which are highly computerized like banks and insurance companies. This does not necessarily mean that shiftwork in its classical form and involving 'unsocial hours' will increase, but it could entail in particular more forms of rotational work and indeed other flexible working patterns. Such arrangements are already being successfully negotiated in collective agreements in various Member States.

The New Community Action Programme on the promotion of equal opportunities for women (1982 to 1985)(5) provides for an analysis for trends in female employment to be made. The objective is to remedy the often serious lack of quantitative and qualitative data on various aspects of women's employment and thus, to lay an effective base for further measures to promote greater employment equality. The Commission has set up an expert group to this end; one of the aspects being studied by this group is that of working conditions, including shiftwork.

---


(2) European Foundation, Programme of Work 1984.


(5) Doc. COM(81) 75 final.
WRITTEN QUESTION No 1147/84
by Mr David Martin (S — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(20 November 1984)
(85/C 71/49)

Subject: EEC code of conduct for companies with subsidiaries in South Africa

A recent report on 107 British companies operating in South Africa points to widespread abuse of the EEC code. For example, it identifies: seven companies which pay starvation wages (below minimum living level) to at least 1700 workers; 39 companies which pay less than the EEC recommended wage (supplementary living level) to almost 9000 workers; and only 20 companies which recognize independent black or non-racial trade unions. The last report by the DTI in Great Britain shows an increased number of workers being paid less than the minimum living level and the supplementary living level.

1. What proposal do the Member States propose to ensure that a larger proportion of companies make an annual report to their national governments? (In the UK, for example, only 154 out of some 400 are asked to do so, and 12 of these refuse to participate in the code: companies can reorganize to avoid having a single 50% shareholding which brings them under the code.)

2. What checks are made by the Member States to ensure that where reports are made (and produced by management alone) they do not conceal the real wage levels being paid, and that the companies do implement in reality their expressed aims concerning trade union rights and black advancement?

3. What do the Member States propose to ensure that companies pay the supplementary living level, and recognize independent trade unions? Also that the glaring gap is closed between the wages of women and men? (There are cases where the wages of women employees are excluded from annual reports.)

4. Will the Commission take action against companies that infringe the code, and if so, what?

Answer given by Mr Haferkamp on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Commission is aware of the fact that, in respect of wage levels and trade union rights, certain European companies operating subsidiaries in South Africa are not complying with the provisions set out in the Code of Conduct. The application of the Code of Conduct remains the responsibility of the individual Member States meeting in the framework of European Political Cooperation, and as such, the Commission is unable to propose changes mentioned by the Honourable Member to the conditions of that application, nor is the Commission able to oblige companies to comply with the provisions of the Code, the nature of which is entirely voluntary.

The Commission would remind the Honourable Member that, on 20 November 1984, in the framework of European Political Cooperation, the Ten made a declaration on the Code of Conduct, following the Fourth Community analysis of the reports of Member States on the implementation of the Code of Conduct in the period from July 1981 to June 1983. It is the Commission's understanding that a copy of this analysis has been forwarded to the European Parliament.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1156/84
by Mr George Patterson (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(20 November 1984)
(85/C 71/50)

Subject: Incorrect procedures followed by Belgian customs officials

A UK company based in my constituency which supplies electronic equipment to ships is being accused of non-discharge of a T2 document at the port of delivery because customs officials in Ostend wrongly kept the document when the driver passed through their customs on his way to the final destination, a Greek ship moored in Ghent. No advice or information to the effect that he should keep the T2 form for presentation to customs at Ghent was given to him by the Ostend customs, which kept all copies of the T2 form and did not even pass them to the Ghent authorities at a later stage.

As a result, a Belgian customs tax has been levied on this company for non-compliance with Community transit regulations of £ 1465.
Does the Commission agree that, while border formalities still exist, customs officials should be properly trained to be familiar with the relevant regulations and that it is quite unacceptable for the officials themselves to follow incorrect procedures which subsequently cause serious problems for the importer or exporter? Can the Commission propose any measures at Community level to penalize customs offices where incorrect procedures are carried out resulting in delays or, as in this case, charges and fines being imposed on the importer/exporter?

Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Commission agrees that, so long as frontier formalities exist, the officials charged with carrying them out should be trained to do so correctly. The Commission believes, moreover, that this is generally the case.

The particular case reported by the Honourable Member seems, at first sight, a strange one, since customs officials at Ostend are necessarily very familiar with Community transit formalities. Even if, however, a mistake was made, it is difficult to understand why it was not possible to rectify the mistake.

The Commission would therefore request the Honourable Member to provide full details of the case in order that enquiries may be made.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1157/84
by Mr Ray Mac Sharry (RDE — IRL)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(20 November 1984)
(85/C 71/51)
Subject: Vintners

Will the Commission indicate:
1. the numbers of registered vintners in each of the Member States;
2. and also, where possible, the average gross and net profits enjoyed by this sector in each Member State?

Answer given by Mr Burke on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 1985)

Compiling statistics on commercial undertakings raises many problems in several Member States, owing in particular to the difficulty of surveying small undertakings, which account for the greatest proportion of commercial undertakings.

Furthermore, in the countries where such statistics exist, the breakdown by trade sector is not detailed enough to allow undertakings whose major activity is trade in wine to be singled out from the whole range of undertakings trading in foodstuffs, beverages and tobacco.

It is also impossible in the Community statistics available to distinguish the turnover and net profits from wine from the turnover and net profits from goods sold by traders in foodstuffs as a whole.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1167/84
by Mr Ray Mac Sharry (RDE — IRL)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(13 November 1984)
(85/C 71/52)
Subject: Windscale

Is the Commission aware of the widespread concern on both sides of the Irish Sea about the possible health hazards posed by the nuclear reprocessing plant at Windscale recently highlighted in a number of reports. Does the Commission agree that an inquiry with the aim of assessing the situation would be appropriate?

Answer given by Mr Richard on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Commission is fully conscious of the concern on both sides of the Irish Sea arising from a number of recent reports alleging that the Sellafield (Windscale) nuclear reprocessing plant represents a hazard to public health.

However, as stated in the answer to Written Question No 283/84 by Mr Eisma(1), the maximum doses to members of the local population respect the dose limits laid down in the Community Basic Safety Standards(2) and in Ireland are less than 1/50th of these limits. Moreover, regarding in particu-
lar the above average incidence of leukaemia in children local to Sellafield, the report of the independent advisory group chaired by Sir Douglas Black (3) states that calculations of the radiation exposure do not support the view that Sellafield discharges are a causal factor. Such calculations are, however, subject to uncertainties. The proposition cannot therefore be totally discounted but it is difficult to see what scientific evidence would suffice to do so; the report made a number of recommendations for further, mainly epidemiological, studies and these have been accepted by the United Kingdom Government. Finally it can be noted that the operator at Sellafield has already reduced the radioactive discharges and plans additional measures in this sense.

In view of the above, the Commission, as stated in the answer to Written Question No 706/84 by Mrs Lizin (4), does not feel it necessary to initiate any additional inquiry specific to the Sellafield situation. However, it will continue to monitor the situation and has already announced in the answer to Mr Eisma its intention to examine the accumulation of radioactive effluents from different sources in marine waters, including the Irish Sea.

Answer given by Mr Davignon on behalf of the Commission

(4 January 1985)

The Commission fully shares the Honourable Member's concern over the level of Community funding for a common research and development policy. Although the potential of European science, with its tradition of excellence, inventiveness and variety in approach is the equal of any of Europe's major trading partners, it is generally felt that this potential can be exploited more effectively within an integrated Community approach.

The first framework programme for Community scientific and technical activities for the years 1984 to 1987, which received full support from the European Parliament, constitutes an answer to this need. Whereas the intentions and objectives of the framework programme were approved by Council resolution of 25 July 1983 (1), the Council did unfortunately not come to a decision upon the financial requirements which the Commission had evaluated at 3,750 million ECU for the years 1984 to 1987.

As a result, the continuation of Community research activities and the initiation of Community action in new research areas has been seriously jeopardized. At a time when competitiveness in high technology areas is of crucial importance, any failure to provide an adequate answer to this challenge at Community level will have damaging long-term consequences.


WRITTEN QUESTION No 1182/84
by Mr Ray Mac Sharry (RDE — IRL)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 November 1984)

(85/C 71/54)

Subject: Fisheries

In view of the weakness of the herring market, which is basically attributable to the 1977 action of the EEC Commission in closing down the major European herring fisheries, what measures are planned by the Commission to stabilize the market in herring?

Does the Commission accept the argument for the implementation of an export refund, on a basis similar to that which was applied for mackerel?

Does the Commission agree that such a refund, together with close monitoring of withdrawal, would lead to a stabilization of the market?
What action is planned by the Commission to remedy the disastrous situation of the herring market?

Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis on behalf of the Commission (4 January 1985)

The Commission wishes to remind the Honourable Member that herring fishing was banned in 1977 by Council Regulation (EEC) No 2115/77 (1) because of the severe depletion of stocks in most Community waters.

The reopening of the herring fishery in certain geographical areas, particularly in the North Sea, and the resulting sharp increase in Community production, which is now under way and will continue, will have an effect on market equilibrium.

On 18 May 1984 the Commission sent the Council a report on the situation in the herring market (2). A second report, on the evaluation of the resources available and the quality requirements of the processing industry, has recently been submitted to the Council (3).

In the light of the general policy guidelines emerging from the Council discussions, the Commission will propose any measures necessary to restore market equilibrium.

(2) COM(84) 280 final.
(3) COM(84) 629 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1193/84 by Mr Willy Vernimmen (S — B) to the Commission of the European Communities (22 November 1984) (85/C 71/55)

Subject: EEC-EFTA

On Monday, 9 April 1984, a meeting took place at ministerial level in Luxembourg between the EEC and EFTA. On its conclusion, the ministers declared that cooperation would be continued both inside and outside the framework of free trade agreements. The latter option in particular looks to be an interesting departure, for previously all measures were strictly circumscribed by free trade agreements, which formed a far too narrow framework. The ministers agreed that concertation on working conditions and social welfare would be considered. In addition, efforts to reduce unemployment would be intensified. It was intended that both sides of industry should actively participate in this process.

Can the Commission indicate whether, following this meeting, there are genuine prospects for:

(a) concertation at western European level regarding a joint recovery policy and an active employment policy;
(b) systematic involvement of both sides of industry in defining the scope of cooperation between the EEC and EFTA?

Answer given by Mr Haferkamp on behalf of the Commission (4 January 1985)

The Commission considers that the ever increasing interdependence between the Community and the rest of western Europe is a valid reason for concerted action with regard to economic and employment policies, this by way of an extension of the Community’s present close trade links with its neighbours. The Community and EFTA ministers, who met in Luxembourg on 9 April 1984, indeed recommended such concerted action, in which both sides of industry would be expected to participate.

The Commission considers that such concerted action with the EFTA countries could prove stimulating, especially since the latter have had some success in dealing with the problems of unemployment and industrial restructuring.

The Commission has already opened bilateral discussions with the EFTA countries on the situation and the economic prospects.

The Commission is an favour of the closest possible association between workers and employers in the Member States and their counterparts in the EFTA countries as far as concerted action on economic and social policies is concerned. It should be noted in this connection that the UNICE and ETUC membership includes industrial organizations in the EFTA countries.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1199/84 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L — B) to the Commission of the European Communities (22 November 1984) (85/C 71/56)

Subject: Economic aid to Poland

At the end of September, a high-level delegation from the French employers’ organization visited
Poland to discuss the reactivation of that country's economy.

Was the Commission informed of the outcome of this visit, and has it lent its support to the possible solutions outlined between the two sides for the various economic sectors?

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

(4 January 1985)

According to the information available to the Commission, the visit by a delegation from the French employers' organization to Poland, referred to by the Honourable Member, took place in early October. The Commission is not associated with any solutions outlined in these contacts, nor has it been informed of them.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1205/84**

by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 December 1984)

(85/C 71/57)

**Subject:** EEC policy for Central America

Can the Commission tell me what is the prevailing assessment of the situation in Central America, following the meeting held in Costa Rica on 28 September 1984 between the Foreign Ministers of the Community, together with those of Spain and Portugal, and the representatives of the States of Central America and the Contadora Group (Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and Panama)?

Can the Commission evaluate the medium-term prospects for a European initiative in this troubled part of the world?

---

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

(4 January 1985)

The Commission is very happy that the meeting in San José took place and with its results. The groundwork was laid for a structured political and economic dialogue with Central America, so that cooperation with the region can be reinforced. Thus, the meeting clearly showed Europe's sense of responsibility and its solidarity with the peace process in Central America.

Following what was agreed in San José the Commission began exploratory talks in Guatemala on 10 and 11 December 1984 with the six countries of the Central American isthmus, on the initiation of negotiations for a framework agreement on economic and trade cooperation, providing for an increased financial commitment to the region. Through such an overall agreement the Commission hopes that it can strengthen cooperation between the Community and Central America and thus help to bring about peace and stability in this troubled region.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1214/84**

by Lord O'Hagan (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 November 1984)

(85/C 71/58)

**Subject:** Dairy quotas

There are different estimates of the effect of the introduction of dairy quotas on farmers within the Member States.

Will the Commission now issue comprehensive figures making clear the reduction of dairy output in each Member State in each month since the introduction of quotas?
The reduction (or increase) in milk deliveries per month since April 1984 compared with the same month in 1983 and per Member State can be given as follows (in thousand tonnes):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>-7,0</td>
<td>+4,5</td>
<td>-12,4</td>
<td>-11,6</td>
<td>-14,5</td>
<td>-11,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>-11,1</td>
<td>-6,6</td>
<td>-21,2</td>
<td>-41,2</td>
<td>-45,5</td>
<td>-39,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Republic of Germany</td>
<td>-9,4</td>
<td>-41,1</td>
<td>-82,1</td>
<td>-147,6</td>
<td>-139,7</td>
<td>-156,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>-0,6</td>
<td>-1,9</td>
<td>+2,8</td>
<td>+0,8</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>+0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+26,2</td>
<td>+110,5</td>
<td>+23,9</td>
<td>-21,3</td>
<td>-74,0</td>
<td>-63,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>+22,8</td>
<td>+64,4</td>
<td>+24,0</td>
<td>+8,1</td>
<td>+20,3</td>
<td>+23,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+6,8</td>
<td>-4,3</td>
<td>-9,3</td>
<td>+14,5</td>
<td>-12,8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>-0,8</td>
<td>+1,4</td>
<td>+1,7</td>
<td>+1,7</td>
<td>+2,6</td>
<td>+1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>-43,3</td>
<td>-24,1</td>
<td>-62,4</td>
<td>-62,6</td>
<td>-72,7</td>
<td>-58,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>-57,0</td>
<td>-82,2</td>
<td>-140,5</td>
<td>-193,2</td>
<td>-162,3</td>
<td>-130,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Provisional estimate.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1252/84
by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(27 November 1984)
(85/C 71/59)

Subject: European Patents Office

Following entry into force of the Community Patents Convention, which departments of the European Patents Office will become Community institutions within the meaning of Section 2 (1) (c) of the British Nationality Act 1981?

Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The interpretation of section 2 (1) (c) of the British Nationality Act 1981 is a matter falling within the competence of the United Kingdom authorities. However, as regards Community law, the Commission considers that special departments to be set up pursuant to Article 143 of the European Patent Convention and Article 7 of the Community Patent Convention will not constitute institutions of the Communities within the meaning of the relevant provisions of the Treaties establishing the European Communities as amended.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1264/84
by Mr Karel Van Miert (S — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(27 November 1984)
(85/C 71/60)

Subject: Lord Cockfield

Is it possible under Community law for a life peer to be appointed Member of the Commission? If so, under what conditions?

Is it not necessary for a life peer first to resign from the House of Lords?

Should a life peer be appointed Member of the Commission, would it still be possible for him to speak in the House of Lords in his capacity as peer?

Answer given by Mr Delors on behalf of the Commission
(28 January 1985)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the reply to the Oral Question H-437 by Mr Lomas, which it gave during question time at Parliament’s December 1984 part-session (1).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1298/84
by Mr Raphael Chanterie (PPE — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(3 December 1984)
(85/C 71/61)

Subject: Dumping of titanium dioxide in the North Sea

In a number of fishing areas (Heligoland, Hook of Holland) fishermen have been complaining for years that they have to throw back 20 to 50% of their catches because the fish are affected by fin rot, ulcers and tumours. This situation is caused by the dumping of vast quantities of titanium dioxide at sea. The Community is currently drawing up a programme to put a stop to the dumping of TIO₂ by 1990.

What progress has been made in drawing up such a programme?

To what extent are non-Community countries (e.g. Finland) involved in the programme to combat this transfrontier problem?

Answer given by Mr Narjes on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

The Honourable Member is referred to the proposal for a Council Directive on procedures for harmonizing the programmes for the reduction and eventual elimination of pollution caused by waste from the titanium dioxide industry, which was submitted on 18 April 1983 (1) and subsequently amended under Article 149(2) of the EEC Treaty on 10 April 1984 (2).

The proposal now being discussed by the Council lays down a timetable for banning or reducing discharges of the various types of liquid, solid and gaseous waste arising from the two processes for manufacturing titanium dioxide. Depending on the type of waste and on the nature of the discharge site, the timetable proposed covers the period 1 January 1986 to 1 July 1993.

In the case of non-Community producers such as Norway, measures to reduce and eventually eliminate pollution from the industry depending on the method of dumping employed (e.g. at sea, or in estuaries) are best dealt with under the Oslo Convention or the Paris Convention.

(2) OJ No C 138, 26. 5. 1983, p. 5.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1311/84
by Mrs Barbara Castle (S — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(3 December 1984)
(85/C 71/62)

Subject: Provision for elderly people

Will the Commission institute comparative studies of services provided for the elderly in each Member State of the EEC, including residential accommodation provided by municipalities or other public authorities, day centres, meals on wheels, health care, chiropody and whether fees are charged for such services and at what levels, and provisions for home helps, sheltered housing, aids and adaptations for the handicapped, dental care and spectacles, so that a proper assessment can be made of the quality of health and other care for the elderly in the different Member States?

Answer given by Mr Sutherland on behalf of the Commission
(31 January 1985)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question No 1009/84 by Mrs Chouraqui (1).


WRITTEN QUESTION No 1318/84
by Lady Elles (ED — GB)
to the Council of the European Communities
(3 December 1984)
(85/C 71/63)

Subject: National identity cards

Can the President-in-Office state how many Member States issue national identity cards for their citizens and how many Member States accept a national identity card in lieu of a passport as right of entry by a Community citizen?

Answer
(31 January 1985)

Six Member States (Belgium, Germany, Greece, France, Italy and Luxembourg) issue identity cards to their nationals.
All Member States allow into their territory Member State nationals holding an identity card, subject to compliance with the various conditions laid down for entry.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1354/84
by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(5 December 1984)
(85/C 71/64)

Subject: Quota limit on imports of Canadian newsprint

To ask the Commission how it can justify the current quota limit on imports of Canadian newsprint into the Community? Does it not agree that, in addition to closing the European market place to certain historically reliable producers of high quality newsprint, the current quota limit greatly strengthens the position of Scandinavian newsprint producers in particular, and EFTA producers in general, in fixing the price at which they are prepared to sell their products within the Community?

Answer given by Mr Haferkamp on behalf of the Commission
(9 January 1985)

In 1984 two additional quotas for newsprint on a duty-free basis were opened to meet the needs of the newspaper industry. The total quota for Canadian newsprint in 1984 was thus in excess of 625 000 tons: this represents in practice duty-free access for all Community imports, as before, whether from Scandinavia or from other sources, to meet the needs of the press. The adjustment of the 1984 quota was made only to take into account the fact that, as from 1 January 1984, imports from EFTA countries entered under the free trade agreements and therefore were not included in the quota.

The Community's intention was to maintain the status quo in terms of duty-free access for Canada. This was in particular designed to keep the balance between the different interests of the EC newspaper industry, i.e. to maintain both a production capacity in the Community and competition between EC production and imports from all sources in order to obtain the best price.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1361/84
by Mr Barry Seal (S — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(5 December 1984)
(85/C 71/65)

Subject: Progress on Multifibre Arrangement

The current term of the Multifibre Arrangement (MFA) is due to expire in July 1986, and international negotiations are now beginning to fix the terms on which it will be renewed, bearing in mind the implications of the MFA to the Community's textile and clothing industries, with 2,5 million employees, can the Commission state:

1. What timetable it envisages for settling the EEC's negotiating position?

2. What arrangements will be made for consultations with the European Parliament?

3. What arrangements will be made for consultations with the textile and clothing industries, including notably the trade unions?

4. Will the Commission take fully into account the significance of the MFA to regional problems in the Community, with the textile industries largely concentrated in a number of specific regions, many with particularly high levels of unemployment?

Answer given by Mr Haferkamp on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

1. The Community's position regarding the textile trade regime which will follow the expiry of MFA III will be formulated during the coming year. A communication from the Commission to the Council regarding the Community's position on the post-MFA III regime will be prepared before the summer. The Council will then have to adopt general policy guidelines in time for the GATT Textiles Committee meeting in July 1985 when the Arrange ment participants will, in accordance with Article 10, paragraph 5, of the MFA, begin discussions on whether the Arrangement should be extended, modified or discontinued.

2. The views of the Parliament will be taken into consideration by the Commission when its proposal to the Council is defined. It should be emphasized that the Commission is always ready to participate in the discussions on textile policy held by various Parliamentary Committees with an interest in textile matters.
3. The Commission has regular meetings with representatives of the textile and clothing industry. The Commission Working Party on the Textile Sector was accorded permanent status by a Commission Decision on 23 July 1980 in order to facilitate the progress of consultation with both employers and trade unions on matters related to textile trade and industrial policies. This group meets at least three or four times a year, although more frequent meetings can be held as and when the need arises.

In the coming months, during which the Community's position regarding the future textile trade regime will be formulated, the process of consultations with industry will be actively pursued. As part of this effort the Commission has already arranged two meetings, both of which were chaired by Vice-President Davignon; the first of these, on 7 December, was with trade union representatives and the second, on 20 December, was with the employers.

4. The Commission is, of course, aware of the regional dimension of the crisis in the textile sector. This has always been an important consideration in the formulation of the Community's textile trade policy.

Within the framework of regional policy the importance of the assessment of the regional impact of the major Community policies has been recognized since 1977 and has been re-affirmed in the new European Regional Development Fund Regulation.

The Commission proposed in October 1982 a specific regional development measure regarding the textile and clothing sector in the framework of the non-quota section of the European Regional Development Fund which has been adopted by the Council on 18 January 1984. At present 34 regions, characterized by high concentration of the textile and clothing industry and by high levels of unemployment, benefit from this measure.

The Commission has committed itself to maintain, together with the Member States, a constant review of the areas affected by the decline of the textile and clothing industry. As a result of this commitment it adopted a proposal on 7 December 1984 for complementing the abovementioned measure.


WRITTEN QUESTION No 1366/84
by Mr George Patterson (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(5 December 1984)
(85/C 71/66)

Subject: Commission investigation into State aids

Has the European Commission investigated claims that the French company Boussac-Saint Frères is receiving aid from the French Government, which is producing distortion of competition in the market?

If so, when did the Commission start its inquiry and has it received the requested information from the French authorities?

Does the Commission agree that when hidden and illegal aids are being provided to a company in contravention of EEC competition rules, any delay by Member States in supplying the Commission with necessary information simply prolongs the unfair advantage of the company concerned, to the detriment of other competitors in the market? What measures will the Commission propose to counter such delaying tactics?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 1985)

In July 1983, the Commission received a first complaint concerning alleged State aids for the construction of a new soft tissue plant by the conglomerate in question.

Not having received a notification of such aids, the Commission requested that the French Government provide information on any public intervention for the tissue plant.

In view of the reply received and in view of further complaints, the Commission gradually extended its investigation to cover all of the conglomerate’s activities. This investigation led to the initiation of the procedure foreseen in Article 93 (2) of the EEC Treaty in November 1984.

The Commission shares the Honourable Member’s concern regarding aids granted without notification to and authorization by the Commission, delaying tactics by Member States when requested to provide information and non-compliance with Commission
decisions on aid, all of which create and prolong distortions of competition and which, unfortunately, no longer are exceptional occurrences.

In a letter to the Member States in September 1983, the Commission made it clear that aids granted without notification and before a final decision within the procedure of Article 93 (2) EEC may be subject to a recovery order.

In several decisions on illicit State aids taken after September 1983, the Commission has indeed demanded that these aids be withdrawn. Further steps, to ensure that infringements and delaying tactics do not pay, are being studied.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1370/84
by Mr Peter Price (ED — GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(5 December 1984)
(85/C 71/67)

Subject: EDF contract: LIAT Airways

In view of the problems in relations with our Caribbean ACP partners caused by the Commission's attitude to the contract for the supply of urgently needed aircraft to LIAT Airways, and the need to learn from this experience, will the Commission:

1. Publish the criteria set by them for the aircraft concerned; and

2. Allow an appropriate independent body to assess these criteria, the suitability of the aircraft under consideration in meeting the actual needs of the airline and the Commission's system for dealing with such contracts?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1391/84
by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L — B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(10 December 1984)
(85/C 71/68)

Subject: Contract for the purchase of medium-haul aircraft by LIAT (the Leeward Islands airline) — EEC aid

In connection with a contract for the purchase of four aircraft with the aid of 26 million ECU from Community funds, at the end of October Mr Pisani gave British Aerospace one week to produce new evidence proving that the Hawker Siddeley Super 748 aircraft (manufactured in the United Kingdom) was more economical than its competitor, the ATR-42 developed by Aerospatiale (France) and Aeritalia (Italy).

According to the press and certain British Members of Parliament the procedure followed by the Commission in considering the tenders is open to criticism.

What exactly is the situation?

Answer given by Mr Natali
on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 1985)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the replies given to Oral Question H-378/84 by Mr Newman and H-483/84 by Mr Price which it gave during question time at December 1984 Parliament's part session (1).