

# Official Journal

of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6986

C 248

Volume 28

30 September 1985

English edition

## Information and Notices

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents	Page
	<b>I Information</b>	
	<b>European Parliament</b>	
	<i>Written Questions with answer</i>	
85/C 248/01	No 1103/84 by Mr Niall Andrews to the Commission Subject: 'Aid to Vietnam' . . . . .	1
85/C 248/02	No 1328/84 by Mr David Martin to the Commission Subject: Granting of humanitarian aid to Vietnam . . . . . Joint answer to Written Questions No 1103/84 and No 1328/84. . . . .	1 1
85/C 248/03	No 1803/84 by Mrs Jeanette Oppenheim to the Commission Subject: Length of time involved in registering trade marks in Italy . . . . .	2
85/C 248/04	No 1833/84 by Mrs Christiane Scrivener to the Commission Subject: Establishment in the United Kingdom of a machine-tool factory owned by a Japanese company . . . . .	2
85/C 248/05	No 1933/84 by Mrs Dorothee Piermont, Mr Bram van der Lek and Mrs Else Hammerich to the Commission Subject: Spanish oil scandal of 1981 ('sindrome toxico'). . . . .	3
85/C 248/06	No 2047/84 by Mr Florus Wijsenbeek to the Commission Subject: Shipment of cultural items between Member States . . . . .	4
85/C 248/07	No 2212/84 by Mrs Gabriele Peus to the Commission Subject: Settlement of health insurance bills in the Community . . . . .	5
85/C 248/08	No 2232/84 by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission Subject: The Berlin Centre and the Dublin Foundation . . . . .	5

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents ( <i>continued</i> )	Page
85/C 248/09	No 2242/84 by Mr Michel Debatisse to the Commission Subject: Total cost of enlargement . . . . .	6
85/C 248/10	No 2250/84 by Mr Alexandros Alavanos to the Commission Subject: Insurance companies in Greece . . . . .	6
85/C 248/11	No 2252/84 by Mr Fernand Herman to the Commission Subject: Financing of agricultural structure policy. . . . .	6
85/C 248/12	No 2302/84 by Mr Richard Cottrell to the Commission Subject: Imports of tyres for motor vehicles. . . . .	7
85/C 248/13	No 2317/84 by Mr John Taylor to the Commission Subject: EEC grants to North/South cooperation organization . . . . .	8
85/C 248/14	No 2368/84 by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission Subject: Cooperation in education . . . . .	8
85/C 248/15	No 2403/84 by Mr Rudolf Wedekind to the Commission Subject: Placing of orders for German-language books. . . . .	9
85/C 248/16	No 2417/84 by Mr Sylvester Barrett to the Commission Subject: South-west Kerry integrated development programme . . . . .	10
85/C 248/17	No 2422/84 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: Third Lomé Convention . . . . .	10
85/C 248/18	No 2433/84 by Lady Elles to the Commission Subject: Customs declaration forms . . . . .	10
85/C 248/19	No 2462/84 by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck to the Commission Subject: Sickness insurance for the former spouses of EEC officials . . . . .	11
85/C 248/20	No 2492/84 by Mrs Dorothee Piermont to the Commission Subject: The alleged 'fascism' of the German Green Party . . . . .	11
85/C 248/21	No 2501/84 by Mr Frank Schwalba-Hoth to the Council Subject: Validity of <i>laissez-passers</i> issued by the Belgian authorities . . . . .	12
85/C 248/22	No 3/85 by Mr Peter Price to the Commission Subject: Information policy . . . . .	12
85/C 248/23	No 13/85 by Mr Konstantinos Stavrou to the Commission Subject: Designation of cheeses . . . . .	13
85/C 248/24	No 63/85 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: Withholding taxes on dividends to parent companies in other Member States by the Federal Republic of Germany . . . . .	13
85/C 248/25	No 92/85 by Mr Alain Carignon to the Commission Subject: Hiring and firing of scientific staff . . . . .	14
85/C 248/26	No 93/85 by Mr Gordon Adam to the Commission Subject: Grants for tourist projects . . . . .	14
85/C 248/27	No 105/85 by Mr Willy Kuijpers to the Commission Subject: Transport of radioactive waste . . . . .	15
85/C 248/28	No 113/85 by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck to the Commission Subject: Creation of a European fund for venture capital . . . . .	15
85/C 248/29	No 122/85 by Mr Karel De Gucht to the Commission Subject: Development area status for Hageland . . . . .	16

<u>Notice No</u>	<u>Contents (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
85/C 248/30	No 132/85 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Commission Subject: Local food surpluses and deliveries of food aid in Africa . . . . .	16
85/C 248/31	No 145/85 by Mr Karel Van Miert to the Commission Subject: Custody and abduction of children across national borders. . . . .	17
85/C 248/32	No 191/85 by Mr Willy Kuijpers to the Commission Subject: Export of pesticides to Third World countries . . . . .	18
85/C 248/33	No 202/85 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Commission Subject: Price of cocoa . . . . .	19
85/C 248/34	No 232/85 by Mr Ray Mac Sharry to the Commission Subject: Funding of the integrated Mediterranean programmes . . . . .	19
85/C 248/35	No 247/85 by Mr Benjamin Visser to the Commission Subject: Sale of inland waterway vessels to third countries. . . . .	20
85/C 248/36	No 254/85 by Mr Tom Normanton to the Council Subject: Europeans owning property anywhere in the EEC. . . . .	20
85/C 248/37	No 286/85 by Mr Daniel Ducarme to the Commission Subject: Taxation . . . . .	20
85/C 248/38	No 327/85 by Mrs Johanna Maij-Weggen to the Commission Subject: Connection between the distance from home to the workplace and the incidence of illness, absenteeism and family problems . . . . .	21
85/C 248/39	No 330/85 by Mrs Johanna Maij-Weggen and Mrs Yvonne van Rooy to the Commission Subject: Pollution of the River Meuse. . . . .	21
85/C 248/40	No 398/85 by Mr François Roelants du Vivier to the Commission Subject: Accidents involving the transport of dangerous products . . . . .	22
85/C 248/41	No 544/85 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Commission Subject: Movement of dangerous products by road. . . . . Joint answer to Written Questions No 398/85 and No 544/85. . . . .	22 22
85/C 248/42	No 410/85 by Lord O'Hagan to the Commission Subject: Transport of live animals . . . . .	23
85/C 248/43	No 423/85 by Mr Hans-Jurgen Zahorka to the Council Subject: The possibility of quicker clearance for Members of the European Parliament departing from Brussels Airport . . . . .	23
85/C 248/44	No 433/85 by Mr James Provan to the Commission Subject: The John Deere Company . . . . .	24
85/C 248/45	No 441/85 by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck to the Commission Subject: French Anti-trust Bill . . . . .	24
85/C 248/46	No 460/85 by Mr Karl von Wogau to the Commission Subject: Implementation of VAT Directives in Italy. . . . .	25
85/C 248/47	No 467/85 by Mr Gerhard Schmid to the Council Subject: Famine in Ethiopia . . . . .	25
85/C 248/48	No 470/85 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Council Subject: Directive to harmonize practice concerning allowances for duty-free goods . . . . .	26
85/C 248/49	No 491/85 by Mr James Provan to the Commission Subject: The John Deere Company . . . . .	27

(Continued overleaf)

Notice No

Contents (*continued*)

Page

85/C 248/50	No 537/85 by Mr Paul Staes to the Commission Subject: Projects in central and South America . . . . .	27
85/C 248/51	No 635/85 by Mr Georges Sutra de Germa to the Council Subject: Special horticultural tariff in the Netherlands . . . . .	28
85/C 248/52	No 723/85 by Mrs Beata Brookes to the Council Subject: Specific Community measures in favour of areas adversely affected by restructuring of the textile and clothing industry . . . . .	28
85/C 248/53	No 732/85 by Mrs Caroline Jackson to the Council Subject: Implementation of CITES . . . . .	28
85/C 248/54	No 744/85 by Mr Thomas Megahy to the Council Subject: Consumer credit . . . . .	29

## I

*(Information)*

## EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

## WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1103/84**

by Mr Niall Andrews (RDE — IRL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

*(19 November 1984)**(85/C 248/01)**Subject: Aid to Vietnam*

Will the Commission indicate what action they have taken to implement the resolution of the European Parliament of 17 February 1984 (Doc. 1-1344/83) concerning humanitarian aid to Vietnam?

Furthermore, will the Commission state what its position is in relation to food aid, emergency aid and humanitarian development projects in Vietnam submitted to it by NGOs cofinancing under the Commission's cofinancing scheme?

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1328/84**

by Mr David Martin (S — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

*(3 December 1984)**(85/C 248/02)**Subject: Granting of humanitarian aid to Vietnam*

The Commission has stated that, subject to adequate controls, it will resume food aid to Vietnam. Will it indicate what food aid has been sent to Vietnam in

1984 and what food aid is planned for 1985? Will it also indicate any other humanitarian aid planned for Vietnam?

**Joint answer given by Mr Cheysson  
to Written Questions No 1103/84 and No 1328/84  
on behalf of the Commission**

*(1 July 1985)*

Concerning the resumption of food aid supplies to Vietnam, the Commission refers the Honourable Members to its answers to the following Written Questions:

- No 1326/80 by Mr Glinne, OJ No C 88, 21. 4. 1981, p. 1;
- No 1329/81 by Mr Denis, OJ No C 82, 1. 4. 1982, p. 6;
- No 1967/81 by Mr Thomas, OJ No C 225, 30. 8. 1982, p. 2;
- No 55/82 by Mr Cousté, OJ No C 225, 30. 8. 1982, p. 3;
- No 1598/82 by Mrs Lizin, OJ No C 93, 7. 4. 1983, p. 8.

However, the Commission is prepared to examine favourably requests for humanitarian aid which directly benefit the Vietnamese population (see point 5 of Parliament's resolution of 17 February 1984). On several occasions since 1979, aid of this kind has been supplied through international or non-governmental organizations.

Notably, the Commission has just decided to grant emergency aid of 300 tonnes of skimmed milk powder and 100 tonnes of dried fish, for the victims of typhoon Agnes. This aid is to be supplied through UNICEF.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1803/84**

by Mrs Jeanette Oppenheim (ED — DK)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 February 1985)

(85/C 248/03)

*Subject:* Length of time involved in registering trade marks in Italy

Is the Commission aware that the Italian authorities discriminate against undertakings from other Member States wishing to register trade marks in Italy by the unusual length of time involved in dealing with such cases—which is often so long that, where approval is granted, the actual registration period has almost expired—and what does it intend to do in order to eliminate this technical barrier to trade which is clearly at variance with the provisions of the Treaty of Rome?

**Supplementary answer given by Lord Cockfield  
on behalf of the Commission**

(27 June 1985)

Further to its answer of 11 March 1985<sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission is able to inform the Honourable Member that its investigations have shown that the time elapsing between the date on which trade mark applications are submitted by Italian undertakings and the date on which they are registered is the same as that for applications submitted by undertakings from other Member States. It is true that, at the moment, this process is exceptionally long, stretching over a number of years. However, the Italian authorities do ensure that trade marks are registered strictly in order of the date on which they were submitted. No evidence was found of any discrimination treatment against trade mark applications submitted by undertakings from other Member States.

The Italian Government has informed the Commission that the national patent office, which is also responsible for trade mark registration, is being reorganized at the moment. It is fair to assume that, in two years' time, the period needed for trade mark registration will be within limits that are normally acceptable, with any backlog that has built up in the meantime being cleared.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 97, 18. 4. 1985, p. 40.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1833/84**

by Mrs Christiane Scrivener (L — F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 February 1985)

(85/C 248/04)

*Subject:* Establishment in the United Kingdom of a machine-tool factory owned by a Japanese company

In answer to my Written Question No 811/84<sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission indicated that it had attached a certain number of conditions to its authorization of the aid which the Government of the United Kingdom planned to grant to the Japanese undertaking Yamazaki for the construction of a machine-tool plant. It emphasizes, for instance, that the manufacturer has undertaken to guarantee a transfer of technology to Community manufacturers, primarily by allowing them permanent access to the factory for the purposes of demonstration and the dissemination of know-how.

Can the Commission specify what practical steps it proposes to take to ensure that European manufacturers are given free and full access to the technology involved?

In addition, would the Commission be willing to accept the manufacturers' proposal calling for a European demand—incentive procedure along the lines of the French MECA procedure, whereby subsidies (of the order of 20 to 25%) would be paid to encourage the industrial users of machine tools to acquire modern equipment of European origin, especially flexible manufacturing systems?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 8, 10. 1. 1985, p. 19.

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

(21 June 1985)

The Commission has, as it has already indicated to the Parliament, taken specific steps to monitor the progress of the Yamazaki project and the technology transfer involved, as well as its impact on the market. The UK Government has been requested to report every six months on the project once the new factory comes on line. The Commission will be in close contact with the European Machine Tool Makers Coordination Committee (CECIMO) with a view to verifying—taking into account more particularly the direct experience of its members—that the conditions for access to the plant, demonstration of flexible manufacturing systems and dissemination of technology have been created and are maintained.

The United Kingdom Government has accepted the terms on which the Commission gave its authorization for the proposed State aid to this project.

With reference to the last part of the question, the Commission can confirm that CECIMO has proposed that a European fund should be created for the purpose of assisting the machine tool industry to invest in advanced production equipment. The Commission is not, however, favourable in principle to setting up a fund for promoting investments in a particular sector of industry. Moreover, the present budgetary situation of the Community hardly allows the creation of a fund which, according to CECIMO, would require an initial endowment of 250 million ECU.

---

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1933/84

by Mrs Dorothee Piermont (ARC — D), Mr Bram van der Lek (ARC — NL) and Mrs Else Hammerich (ARC — DK)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(11 February 1985)

(85/C 248/05)

*Subject:* Spanish oil scandal of 1981 ('síndrome tóxico')

In spring 1981 an epidemic of unknown origin (the 'síndrome tóxico') hit Spain, in which 531 people died and 24 000 suffered incurable injuries.

At the time the Spanish Government and authorities decided almost immediately to consider denaturated rapeseed oil as the cause of the epidemic.

As early as the summer of 1981, however, serious doubts, backed up by scientific evidence, were being voiced about this official line, among others by Dr Antonio Muro, Deputy Director of the Royal Hospital in Madrid, and Professor Luis Frontela, Professor of Forensic Medicine at the University of Seville. These doubts were based on epidemiological, clinical, neurological, anatomic, pathological and toxicological observations and tests.

The Commission is hereby requested to provide the necessary details, as soon as possible, to answer the following questions relating to this serious case concerning a prospective Member State:

1. Why have the Spanish authorities responsible (Centro de Alimentación y Nutrición de Mahadahonda, Instituto Nacional de Toxicología; Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Plan Nacional del Síndrome Tóxico) only sought the cause of the poisoning in denaturated rapeseed oil?
2. What reasons are given for this?

3. Does the WHO support the view that oil was the carrier of the poison?
4. Who carried out the epidemiological study from which it was deduced that oil was the carrier of the poison?
5. Which experts appointed by the WHO evaluated the epidemiological study?
6. Who had access to the meetings held in Madrid by the experts appointed by the WHO?
7. Were questionnaires, studies, results, etc., from the investigations on which the oil hypothesis is based published and where?
8. Would the cause have been found if other possible carriers of the poison had been investigated?
9. How and with what medicaments have those affected in Spain been treated?
10. Would a different hypothesis about the cause of the poisoning also have necessitated different treatment for those affected?
11. Could at least some deaths and permanent injuries have been avoided thereby?
12. Were other treatments used in individual cases and if so, how successfully?
13. How have the Spanish authorities responsible reacted to other lines of inquiry, e.g. to the hypothesis of pesticides as the cause? Have they supported, not encouraged or hindered these investigations?
14. On the basis of these alternative investigations, which pesticides, active ingredients or ingredient thereof are suspected of causing the 'síndrome tóxico'?
15. Which companies manufacture pesticides with the suspected active ingredients?
16. Do the possible manufacturers include companies with headquarters in the Federal Republic of Germany? If so, which companies and which products are concerned?
17. Are there Community regulations, directives, codes of practice or the like to regulate the manufacture of such products and the responsibility for their effects, and which apply both to the parent companies and to foreign subsidiaries?
18. What legislative provisions and safety regulations are there in Spain for the sale and use of pesticides?
19. Which authorities or official bodies are responsible for monitoring compliance with these regulations?
20. What is their geographical breakdown? What are their resources in terms of finance and staffing (number, qualifications)?
21. If the pesticide hypothesis proves correct, can such a disaster on a Community-wide scale be ruled out?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield  
on behalf of the Commission**

(2 July 1985)

Since 1981 the Commission has kept itself closely informed on cases of poisoning by adulterated cooking oils in Spain and on the measures taken there with regard to exports to the Community.

A meeting between a senior Spanish delegation and Commission officials in Brussels, and a meeting of the Standing Committee on Foodstuffs comprising experts from the Member States and Commission representatives have enabled the situation to be brought up to date and any risk to the Community to be averted.

It is interesting to note that no case of poisoning of this type has been reported within the Community.

It has, moreover, proved impossible to accept the theory of poisoning by pesticides since no plausible explanation has been advanced to corroborate this.

The summary report by the WHO on the file referred to by the Honourable Members was made public in 1983 and may be obtained from the WHO's regional European office in Copenhagen.

Point 17 raised by the Honourable Members calls upon the Commission to inform them whether the Community has laid down rules on the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous preparations (pesticides) and chemical substances<sup>(1)</sup>.

Under this legislation actual product responsibility lies with the person marketing such products within the Community.

Following the negotiations which have taken place, Spain will apply the relevant Community legislation following accession.

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 78/631/EEC and Directive 67/548/EEC, as last amended by Directive 79/831/EEC, OJ No L 259, 15. 10. 1979, p. 10.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2047/84**

by Mr Florus Wijsenbeek (L — NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 February 1985)

(85/C 248/06)

*Subject:* Shipment of cultural items between Member States

Can the Commission explain how it is that, in addition to VAT, cultural items (such as books) that are shipped between Member States are liable to customs duty, which often amounts to a third of the price of the book?

Can the Commission not put pressure on the governments concerned to put an end to this in the interests of cultural exchange and the creation of a free Community market?

If not, can the Commission take the initiative of proposing European legislation to this end?

Furthermore, is the Commission willing to bring this to the attention of the Committee for a Citizens' Europe chaired by Mr Adonnino?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield  
on behalf of the Commission**

(28 June 1985)

There are no longer any customs duties between Member States of the Community. The customs clearance fee is a flat-rate payment to cover the cost of the import formalities carried out by the postal services on those items referred to by the Honourable Member which are not admitted tax-free.

Customs clearance charges are payable under the terms of the Universal Postal Convention concluded in 1974 at Lausanne. In 1978 Member States agreed to a Commission proposal to dispense with these charges on consignments within the Community which are not liable to tax. However, payment can still be demanded — except in the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy — if a tax is collected. The Commission is currently examining whether this payment is compatible with the EEC Treaty in the light of rulings by the Court of Justice.

The *ad hoc* Committee on a People's Europe chaired by Mr Adonnino has already looked at the problem raised by the Honourable Member. In its interim report, which was endorsed by the European Council, it calls on Member States to abolish customs clearance fees levied on the dispatch or receipt of small consignments.

The fundamental solution to this problem lies, however, in the abolition of frontier formalities altogether; the Commission has already announced that it will be putting forward an intensive programme of proposals for achieving this by 1992.



**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2212/84**

by Mrs Gabrielle Peus (PPE — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(11 March 1985)

(85/C 248/07)

*Subject:* Settlement of health insurance bills in the Community

1. Is the Commission aware that in the Netherlands doctors (in this instance an ANOZ doctor) will not accept international health insurance certificates from German tourists because of the protracted and costly administrative procedures involved in claiming from German health insurance schemes?
2. Is it also aware that German statutory sickness insurance schemes (in this instance the BEK) will not refund in full medical expenses incurred in the Netherlands?
3. Can it indicate whether the mutual acceptance of medical expenses and their settlement by health insurance schemes in the 10 individual Member States are covered by legal provisions and if so, which provisions (with details of their publication in the Official Journal)?
4. Can it also indicate whether steps have been taken towards harmonization of the settlement procedure to allow simplification and a full refund of expenses and if not, what measures it intends to take to amend existing provisions in this field?

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

(27 June 1985)

1. As far as the Commission is aware, cases such as that reported by the Honourable Member are rare. Generally speaking, Dutch doctors provide treatment free of charge, in the event of immediate need, to nationals of other Member States temporarily resident in the Netherlands.
2. The Commission is aware that rates of reimbursement for medical expenses borne by nationals of other Member States may, in some cases, not cover these expenses in their entirety. This situation arises from the application to insured persons of rules which vary depending on the national legislation in question.
3. Unless special agreements exist between social security institutions in the various Member States, Article 34 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 574/72<sup>(1)</sup> determines the methods of reimbursement for expenses

incurred during a stay in another Member State. Reimbursement is made in accordance with the provisions of the legislation of the country of temporary residence.

4. Community rules on social security have established procedures for coordination between national legislations; features peculiar to these legislations and their constant evolution make it impossible to go beyond the rules for coordination proposed by the Commission and adopted by the Council.

<sup>(1)</sup> Coordinated texts for Regulations 1408/71 and 574/72 published under Regulations (EEC) 2000/83 and 2001/83, OJ No L 230, 22. 8. 1983, p. 1 and 6.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2232/84**

by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(11 March 1985)

(85/C 248/08)

*Subject:* The Berlin Centre and the Dublin Foundation

As early as in 1979, the Court of Auditors recommended that explanatory notes on accounting policies be included in the accounts of the Berlin Centre and the Dublin Foundation.

Four years later, the Court of Auditors found that this had still not been done.

Can the Commission say what action it is going to take in order to comply with the wishes of the Court of Auditors?

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

(3 July 1985)

The matter to which the Honourable Member refers was raised for the first time in 1984 in the reports on the 1983 accounts sent by the Court of Auditors to the Berlin Centre and the Dublin Foundation.

In their replies, both bodies agreed to the Court's request and the relevant explanatory notes were included in their 1984 revenue and expenditure accounts.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2242/84**  
 by Mr Michel Debatisse (EPP — F)  
 to the Commission of the European Communities  
 (11 March 1985)  
 (85/C 248/09)

*Subject:* Total cost of enlargement

1. Can the Commission give an up-to-date estimate of the total cost of enlargement, including:
  - the estimated cost of programmes to be undertaken in the framework of the common policies;
  - the estimated cost of specific programmes,
  - estimated additional administrative costs for the various Community Institutions?
2. Can the Commission state to what extent the contributions from the new Member States will cover the additional expenses due to enlargement in the two years following ratification?

**Answer given by Mr Christophersen**  
 on behalf of the Commission  
 (21 June 1985)

1. The Commission does not think it proper at this stage to publish a detailed assessment of the kind requested by the Honourable Member.

In global terms, the net budgetary cost of enlargement (for the present 10 Member States) can be estimated at roughly 0,1% of VAT at the end of the transitional period; this ignores any booster effect that membership of the Community might have, particularly on the agricultural production of the new Member States.

2. Without a special mechanism the total own resources paid by Spain and Portugal during the first two years of the transitional period would be substantially more than the total additional expenditure resulting from enlargement.

In order to avoid any budgetary imbalance and to accommodate the special needs of Portugal, a transitional financial mechanism similar to the one adopted for Greece has been agreed for the new Member States. Spain and Portugal will be entitled to a degressive repayment from the expenditure side of a proportion of VAT contributions<sup>(1)</sup>: 87% in 1986, 70% in 1987, 55% in 1988, 40% in 1989, 25% in 1990 and 5% in 1991.

<sup>(1)</sup> Or, in the case of Portugal for the three years following accession, a proportion of the GNP-based financial contribution.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2250/84**  
 by Mr Alexandros Alavanos (COM — GR)  
 to the Commission of the European Communities  
 (13 March 1985)  
 (85/C 248/10)

*Subject:* Insurance companies in Greece

What precise stage has been reached in Commission intervention regarding insurance companies in Greece?

Is it correct that at the end of December the Directorate-General for Competition once again demanded that an end be put to discrimination against private insurance companies? Is not the Commission in contravention of Article 14 of Law 1256/62 in its endeavour to stop State property and assets being insured by public insurance companies and to prevent State banks from recommending their borrowers to ensure with public insurance companies? Is it correct that these measures were taken in response to pressure from foreign insurance companies with branches in Greece?

**Answer given by Mr Sutherland**  
 on behalf of the Commission  
 (8 July 1985)

The problem concerning the insurance system in Greece, to which the Honourable Member refers, has been the subject of a Commission Decision published in the Official Journal<sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 152, 11. 6. 1985, p. 25.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2252/84**  
 by Mr Fernand Herman (PPE — B)  
 to the Commission of the European Communities  
 (13 March 1985)  
 (85/C 248/11)

*Subject:* Financing of agricultural structure policy

According to information published following the last meetings of the Councils of Ministers for Finance/Economic Affairs and Agriculture, I understand that the Presidents of these Councils have instructed COR-EPER to draw up new proposals for the financing of agricultural structure policy.

Does the Commission not take the view that the President of the Council should have instructed the Commission itself to carry out this task?

Given that the President of the Commission stated before the European Parliament that he intended to use every means available to him under the Treaties to ensure absolute priority for Community interests, does the Commission not take the view that it should make representations to the Council in order to end these practices and ensure greater respect for its exclusive right to submit proposals?

Answer given by Mr Delors  
on behalf of the Commission  
(21 June 1985)

Under Article 4 of the Merger Treaty, the Permanent Representatives Committee is responsible for preparing the work of the Council and for carrying out the tasks assigned to it by the Council. It is natural that the Committee should be instructed to attempt to reconcile the views of the different delegations when the Member States are unable to reach agreement.

The Commission's participation in the Committee's attempts to produce a consensus among the Member States does not affect its right of initiative. In particular, the Commission always retains the option of amending its proposals to ensure that the Community interest prevails.

There can be no other interpretation of the Council press releases on the financing of the agricultural struc-

tures policy issued after the meetings of the Agriculture Ministers on 14 and 15 January and the Economic and Financial Affairs Ministers on 11 February.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2302/84  
by Mr Richard Cottrell (ED — GB)  
to the Commission of the European Communities  
(18 March 1985)  
(85/C 248/12)

*Subject:* Imports of tyres for motor vehicles

Will the Commission describe the present position regarding the import into the Community of tyres for motor vehicles? What proportion of the market is held by non-EEC importers as a whole, and what are the subdivisions into (a) EFTA and associated States, (b) East European, (c) North American and (d) other categories? What proportion of total imports are entering via East Germany and is there evidence that this category of imports amounts to a substantial and unfair competitive factor for Community tyre manufacturers? Would the Commission view imports from Eastern Europe via East Germany as dumping?

Answer given by Mr De Clercq  
on behalf of the Commission  
(19 June 1985)

(a) Imports of tyres for motor vehicles into the Community from third countries were 7,8 million in the first half of 1984. This represented an increase of almost 10% compared with imports in the first half of 1983, the increase arising mainly in imports from EFTA countries and countries other than those in North America and Eastern Europe.

(b) The breakdown of imports by subdivision and the respective market shares in each half year from January 1983 to June 1984 are:

	January to June 1983		July to December 1983		January to June 1984	
	Quantity ('000s)	Market Share (%)	Quantity ('000s)	Market Share (%)	Quantity ('000s)	Market Share (%)
EFTA countries	1 407	4,6	1 592	5,2	1 828	5,8
Eastern Europe	794	2,6	743	2,6	807	2,6
North America	176	0,6	184	0,6	180	0,6
Other	4 728	15,4	3 637	14,3	4 995	15,9
Total	7 105	23,2	6 156	22,7	7 810	24,9

(c) Imports of tyres for motor vehicles from the German Democratic Republic decreased from 460 thousand in the first half of 1983 to 320 thousand in the first half of 1984, their market share falling from 1,5% to 1,0% and their share of total imports declining from 6,5% to 4,1%. The Commission is not aware of any problems being caused to Community tyre manufacturers by these imports.

(d) The fact that imports enter the Community from the German Democratic Republic would not prevent anti-dumping action from being taken if it were to be established during the course of a formal investigation that they were, in fact, dumped and had caused injury to a Community industry. Such an investigation would only be initiated on receipt of a complaint from the Community industry affected containing sufficient preliminary evidence to justify the initiation.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2317/84**

**by Mr John Taylor (ED — GB)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(18 March 1985)

(85/C 248/13)

*Subject:* EEC grants to North/South cooperation organization

Which projects of the North/South cooperation organization operating both in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland received EEC financial support during the year 1984; and how much did the EEC contribute to each project?

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

(11 July 1985)

The organization 'Cooperation North' received the following assistance from the Community in 1984:

- 9 000 ECU towards its 1984 programme;
- 32 500 ECU (50 % of total costs) for a cross-border cooperation study in Ireland in the fields of new technology and small and medium-sized enterprises;
- 26 000 ECU within the framework of the Community's programme to promote the social integration of disabled people;
- 30 000 ECU within the framework of the Community's youth exchange programme.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2368/84**

**by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC — B)**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(21 March 1985)

(85/C 248/14)

*Subject:* Cooperation in education

In 1984 the Commission funded 409 joint study programmes and awarded 136 grants to teachers in higher

education and 300 to local administrative staff to enable them to familiarize themselves with the teaching systems in other Member States.

1. Can the Commission provide more detailed information on the type and content of the above study programmes?
2. Will the Commission provide a breakdown of the above grants by Member State and, for Belgium specifically, by language community?

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

(28 June 1985)

*Joint Study Programmes*

Since 1976 the Commission has supported 409 joint study programmes. In the academic year 1984/85, 193 grants were awarded for the development of joint study programmes, 75 of which were for new programmes and 118 grants were used in order to support the further development of already existing programmes.

On top of these grants, for the second consecutive year, the Commission awarded 123 grants to teaching staff and personnel in higher education for the preparation of joint study programmes.

*Short Study Visits*

For the establishment of contacts within the Community and for the promotion of mutual understanding of its system of higher education in 1984/85, the Commission awarded 136 short study visit grants. These grants are available to teaching staff and administrative personnel in the field of higher education in the Member States.

*Study Visits for Education Specialists*

The programme of study visits for education specialists is intended to enable staff responsible for education at local and regional level to benefit from experience of the other Member States during the review and reorientation of their work. The aim is also to provide those responsible for policy with reliable, selective and up-

to-date information regarding the development of education throughout the Community in the form of participants' reports.

The visits are organized by the Member States on the basis of annual programmes drawn up by the Commission. Reports on the education system of the coun-

try visited and the topics selected, and visits to education establishments are part of the programme. Details of the 1985/86 programme which contains more information will be sent to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat-General of the European Parliament<sup>(1)</sup>.

(1) Document V/2087/84.

Country	Joint study programmes	Visits in preparation for the joint study programmes	Study visits for personnel in higher education	Study visits for education specialists
Belgium (N)	6	2	4	12
Belgium (F)	17	5	6	12
Denmark	3	10	5	18
Federal Republic of Germany	28	23	15	46
France	42	26	12	46
Greece	4	3	17	24
Ireland	6	5	10	18
Italy	12	26	28	46
Luxembourg	1	—	—	8
Netherlands	12	8	12	24
United Kingdom	71	37	44	46
Total	202	145	153	300

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2403/84**

by Mr Rudolf Wedekind (PPE — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 March 1985)

(85/C 248/15)

*Subject:* Placing of orders for German-language books

Recently the Commission decided to place all its orders for German-language books in Luxembourg with only one or two suppliers.

Can the Commission confirm that:

1. this method of placing orders, based on administrative decisions, removes any chance certain suppliers have of competing for orders;
2. this method of placing orders is incompatible with the market principles of Community competition policy, which the Commission in particular, as guardian of the Treaties, should seek to promote in its own procurement policy rather than encouraging the development of a network of privileged suppliers;

3. in placing orders in the future it will seek to ensure that all competitors are given due consideration?

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

(1 July 1985)

The Commission's central library in Luxembourg currently purchases its German-language books from three suppliers in the Federal Republic of Germany.

All three suppliers have a good market reputation and the appropriate Commission departments have checked that they are competitive in terms of both price, and reliability and quality of service.

While it should be remembered that German-language books account for only a small proportion of the library's purchases, the Commission will nevertheless continue to monitor the market and, if necessary, change supplier(s).

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2417/84**

by Mr Sylvester Barrett (RDE — IRL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 March 1985)

(85/C 248/16)

*Subject:* South-west Kerry integrated development programme

Will the Commission indicate whether or not the Irish Government has yet forwarded a proposal from the South-West Kerry Development Organization for an EEC-backed integrated programme for this region?

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

(10 June 1985)

To date the Commission has not received any formal proposal from the Irish Government for an integrated programme in the south-west Kerry area.

Should such a proposal be endorsed by the central Government authorities in Ireland, it may be considered by the Commission for aid from the funds available for preparatory studies leading to integrated operations.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2422/84**

by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 March 1985)

(85/C 248/17)

*Subject:* Third Lomé Convention

Will the Commission state the sum of money allocated for development projects in each of the countries signatory, as beneficiaries, to the Third Lomé Convention?

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

(2 July 1985)

At the start of each convention, the Commission divides the sum of money available as objectively as possible, and notifies each ACP State individually, of the share of the total programmable financial aid which has been allocated to it. The Commission has just done so for Lomé III.

As in the past, the Commission has not published the bare figures giving the results of the breakdown since it could only be interpreted in the light of a detailed account of the methods used.

Furthermore, such information would not represent exactly the Community's contribution to the various countries concerned, because during the convention they will, to different degrees, receive additional resources (regional cooperation, Stabex, Sysmin, resources administered by the EIB, emergency aid, and so on).

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2433/84**

by Lady Elles (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 March 1985)

(85/C 248/18)

*Subject:* Customs declaration forms

Can the Commission explain why customs declaration forms are still necessary for parcels being posted from one Member State to another Member State of the European Communities?

Can the Commission also explain why in the case of Belgium and Luxembourg not only one but two copies of a non-adhesive customs declaration form are required, whereas parcels being posted to countries outside the Community in some cases only need one such form?

Will the Commission please indicate what steps it intends to take to eliminate this unnecessary bureaucracy?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield  
on behalf of the Commission**

(26 June 1985)

Although customs duties no longer apply to goods being sent within the Community, fiscal frontiers do continue to exist between its Member States who therefore require the sender of parcels to provide an indication of the contents to enable the authorities to charge any taxes which may be due. Of course, the effect of the declaration in many instances is to permit the recipient of the parcel to benefit from relief from taxes under Community rules, and the Commission continues to press the Council to increase the value of the allowance. The sender declares that the value of a parcel is within the relevant allowance, then the parcel is normally delivered without further formalities.

So far as the particular question relating to Belgium and Luxembourg is concerned, the Commission is in contact with the national authorities of those Member States in order to find out why this apparent anomaly exists and will provide the Honourable Member with further details in due course.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2462/84**

by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck (S — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 March 1985)

(85/C 248/19)

*Subject:* Sickness insurance for the former spouses of EEC officials

After a divorce, pursuant to Article 72 (8) (10) (40) of the Staff Regulations, the ex-spouse of an official can obtain repayment of medical costs for a maximum of one year, in so far as he or she is not covered by any other insurance.

A number of cases have come to my attention recently where couples have divorced after 30 years of marriage. In most cases the wife gave up her career to come to Belgium with her partner. Her entitlement to a pension and to sickness insurance is thus linked to the status of her spouse. The position with regard to pensions can usually be regularized, as national legislation provides for such cases. However, to obtain cover for sickness and invalidity a new insurance must be taken out which carries a higher premium and excludes the effects of previous illnesses.

Is the discrimination against this group compatible with the social objectives of the European Community?

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

(2 July 1985)

The Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities provide for sickness insurance cover for officials, their spouse, where he or she is not eligible for benefits of the same nature and of the same level by virtue of any other legal provision or regulations, their children and any other dependants within the meaning of the Staff Regulations.

Rigid application of this provision would automatically exclude the ex-spouse of an official immediately from the date of the decree absolute. This could produce a

serious vacuum, particularly on account of the waiting period imposed by certain national legislations when new insurance, private or compulsory, is taken out.

It was to ensure that ex-spouses who lose their entitlement under the sickness insurance scheme do not find themselves without any sickness insurance cover that Council Regulation (EEC) No 2078/83<sup>(1)</sup> filled this vacuum, especially for those not in paid employment.

Under this legislation ex-spouses who can prove that they cannot be covered by any other scheme may continue to be insured under the sickness insurance scheme provided for by the Staff Regulations for a maximum of one year without having to pay any contributions.

This period of one year, which runs from the date of the decree absolute, should enable divorcees to make arrangements for sickness insurance cover under national legislation applicable to them following the severance of their ties with a Community official. National cover of this nature is available in all the Member States.

This situation arising from loss of entitlement under the sickness insurance scheme for Community officials, comparable in fact to that of children or other persons who cease to be dependent on an official, in no way prejudices the social policy for workers advocated by the Community.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 203, 27. 7. 1984, p. 1.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2492/84**

by Mrs Dorothee Piermont (ARC — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 April 1985)

(85/C 248/20)

*Subject:* The alleged 'fascism' of the German Green Party

1. What information does the Commission possess concerning the links between the European Schiller Association, the 'Europäische Arbeiterpartei' (European Workers' Party) and the political organizations in Europe that have joined the campaign being waged by these two organizations against the 'fascism' of the German Green Party?

2. What information does the Commission possess concerning the sources of the European Schiller Association's funds, and in particular concerning grants it has received from European Community funds?

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

(27 June 1985)

The Commission has not made any grants to the organization referred to by the Honourable Member and has no information on it.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2501/84  
by Mr Frank Schwalba-Hoth (ARC — D)  
to the Council of the European Communities**

(1 April 1985)

(85/C 248/21)

*Subject:* Validity of *laissez-passers* issued by the Belgian authorities

1. What is the Council's judgment of the following incident:

At approximately 5.00 p.m. on 8 January 1985, having just arrived from London, I tried to go through passport control at Brussels airport and showed the *laissez-passer* for Members of the European Parliament issued to me at the end of last year by the Belgian government.

The official on duty refused to let me through, demanded to see additional documents, disputed the validity of such *laissez-passers*, kept me waiting for 10 minutes and then confiscated the Belgian identity document.

2. How many other *laissez-passers* have been unwarrantably confiscated to date and when will my document be returned to me?

**Answer**

(29 July 1985)

The Council has been informed by the Belgian authorities that in response to many requests from Members of the European Parliament the Belgian Government issues them with special *laissez-passers* designed to ease their journey through passport control upon arrival at Zaventem airport.

Together with this card, Members are also issued with instructions concerning its character and use.

As it is stated in these instructions, this special *laissez-passer* does not constitute a valid travel document for entry into Belgium (passport, national identity card or European Communities *laissez-passer*), but permits those showing them to go through the special control gate reserved for Members of the European Parliament.

As is also stated in the instructions, the passport control official is entitled to ask to see a travel document. It would appear from information given by the Belgian authorities that in the case described by the Honourable Member, the passport control official acted in accordance with the abovementioned instructions. It would also appear from this information that the *laissez-passer* was not confiscated but was left in the official's hands by the Honourable Member, who has since had his card returned to him.

So far no *laissez-passers* have been confiscated by the Zaventem passport control authorities.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 3/85**

by Mr Peter Price (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 April 1985)

(85/C 248/22)

*Subject:* Information policy

How many officials are assigned to Directorate-General X (Information), and where are they based?

**Answer given by Mr Ripa de Meana  
on behalf of the Commission**

(21 June 1985)

The total number of officials assigned to Directorate-General X is 317. 168 of these are assigned to Brussels.

The breakdown by category is as follows:

- A category: 106;
- B category: 81;
- C category: 125;
- D category: 6.

Directorate-General X also has 174 local agents, all but one of which are assigned outside Brussels.

In order to give a full picture of the staff situation in the external Press and Information Offices the following figures include both officials and local agents assigned to each of them:

- Ankara: 9;
- Athens: 13;
- Bangkok: 5;
- Belgrade: 1;
- Bonn (including Berlin and Munich): 35;



Canberra: 7;  
 Caracas (including Santiago): 12;  
 Copenhagen: 15;  
 Dublin: 12;  
 Geneva: 10;  
 The Hague: 15;  
 Lisbon: 11;  
 London (including Belfast, Cardiff and Edinburgh): 37;  
 Luxembourg: 5;  
 Madrid: 13;  
 New Delhi: 7;  
 Ottawa: 7;  
 Paris (including Marseille): 34;  
 Rome (including Milan): 33;  
 Tokyo: 11;  
 Washington (including New York): 30.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 13/85**

by Mr Konstantinos Stavrou (PPE — GR)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 April 1985)

(85/C 248/23)

*Subject:* Designation of cheeses

In the light of Written Question No 2100/84<sup>(1)</sup> by Mr Willi Rothley,

1. Does the Commission think it appropriate that a product described as 'feta' cheese should be manufactured in Denmark?
2. Does it not intend to restrict the use of certain names and designations to cheeses traditionally produced in one Member State and forming a part of the traditional culture of that state?
3. Does the Commission not consider it necessary to make proper provision for systematically informing the consumer as to the country of origin of the cheese put up for sale so as to guarantee the authenticity of the product?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 241, 23. 9. 1985.

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

(21 June 1985)

1 and 2. Well before the creation of a common market, some of the Member States adopted national legislation under the Stresa Convention defining designations of origin which made it possible to identify regions of manufacture and so safeguard the essential characteristics of traditional products (e.g. Parmigiano Reggiano, Roquefort, etc.).

The Greek authorities did not take advantage of this opportunity at the time with the result that, as the Honourable Member indicates, 'feta' describes a type of cheese and is not a designation of origin.

Accordingly, the Commission does not consider it inappropriate that feta should be manufactured outside Greece; indeed, most cheeses are manufactured in locations other than that of which they bear the name.

The Commission does not feel it is necessary, in implementing the common agricultural policy, for it to take steps to restrict the manufacture of certain cheeses to the regions where they were exclusively made in the past.

3. Article 3 (1) (7) of Council Directive 79/112/EEC<sup>(1)</sup> requires that the labelling of foodstuffs should include 'particulars of the place of origin or provenance in the cases where failure to give such particulars might mislead the consumer to a material degree as to the true origin or provenance of the foodstuff'.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 33, 8. 2. 1979, p. 1.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 63/85**

by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 April 1985)

(85/C 248/24)

*Subject:* Withholding taxes on dividends to parent companies in other Member States by the Federal Republic of Germany

Is the Commission in a position to open court procedures against the Federal Republic of Germany for maintaining in force withholding taxes on dividends to parent companies in other member States?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield  
 on behalf of the Commission**

(1 July 1985)

1. The Commission considers that the complex system of withholding taxes on dividends to parent companies in other Member States should be regulated through harmonized rules based upon Community Directives.

2. For this reason a draft Directive on a common fiscal regime for parent companies and subsidiaries in several Member States<sup>(1)</sup> as well as a draft Directive concerning the harmonization of systems of company taxation and of withholding taxes on dividends<sup>(2)</sup> have been transmitted to the Council by the Commission.

These proposals are still under consideration in the Council. The Commission is pressing hard for Council agreement on these and is not at present considering Court proceedings.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 39, 22. 3. 1969, p. 7.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 253, 5. 11. 1975, p. 2.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 92/85**  
by Mr Alain Carignon (RDE — F)  
to the Commission of the European Communities  
(15 April 1985)  
(85/C 248/25)

*Subject:* Hiring and firing of scientific staff

A report of 10 December 1984, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights (Document 2-1158/84), considers the arrangements for the termination of the service of certain officials in the scientific and technical services. These measures would involve 120 officials, and would cost about 24 million ECU in redundancy payments.

On the other hand, a report dated 9 January 1985, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology (Document 2-1365/84), refers to plans for the recruitment of extra staff for the implementation of a study programme on the management and storage of radioactive waste, the cost of this programme being approximately 200 million ECU.

I am astonished at this duplication of expenditure and would like the Commission of the European Communities to inform me of the reasons which prevent the use in the new study programme of the staff whose dismissal is proving so costly.

**Answer given by Mr Narjes**  
on behalf of the Commission  
(25 June 1985)

The proposal for a Regulation introducing measures to terminate the service of certain officials in the scientific and technical services<sup>(1)</sup> concerns staff of the Joint Research Centre. It is designed primarily to lower the average age of staff and to acquire new skills to meet the changing demands of the JRC multiannual programme.

This has all been explained already at very great length in the course of Parliament's debate on the Commission's proposals<sup>(2)</sup>.

The R and D programme on the management and storage of radioactive waste (1985 to 1989) referred to by the Honourable Member was adopted by the Council on 12 March 1985<sup>(3)</sup> with necessary funds estimated at 62 million ECU, including expenditure on a staff of 12, i.e. two more than the previous programme.

Staff costs account for less than 10% of total expenditure, most of which is for cost-sharing contracts to be concluded with research organizations in the Member States.

The two additional members of staff assigned to the programme have been redeployed from staff already on the spot without making use of JRC personnel.

The Commission would stress that it will continue to encourage mobility among European researchers, its own staff included, whenever possible and advisable.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(84) 214 final.

<sup>(2)</sup> Verbatim report of proceedings for 17 January 1985.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No L 83, 25 March 1985.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 93/85**  
by Mr Gordon Adam (S — GB)  
to the Commission of the European Communities  
(15 April 1985)  
(85/C 248/26)

*Subject:* Grants for tourist projects

Will the Commission please list the number of tourist-based schemes which were included in the EAGGF grants allocated to the northern region of the United Kingdom during 1984?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen**  
on behalf of the Commission  
(27 June 1985)

The EAGGF Guidance Section does not, as part of any direct measures, help finance tourist-based schemes.

Article 10 (2) of Directive 75/268/EEC on mountain and hill farming and farming in certain less-favoured areas<sup>(1)</sup> states that 'in less-favoured farming areas which are suitable for the development of a tourist or craft industry, the system of incentives provided for in Article 8 of Directive 72/159/EEC<sup>(2)</sup>, and adapted by Article 9 (1) of this Directive, may also be applied to investment on farms, for tourist or craft industry purposes, of a total amount not exceeding 10 000 units of account per farm (14 564 ECU as from 1 January 1984)'.

There is therefore no specific investment grant for tourist-based schemes; the investment concerned may be included in a farm development plan.

The EAGGF Guidance Section reimbursed the United Kingdom Government a total of 36,7 million ECU in respect of 1984. Part of that sum was for less-favoured areas in the northern region of the United Kingdom, but there is no way of stating whether the expenditure declared in respect of development plans covers any tourist-based schemes.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 128, 19. 5. 1975, p. 6.

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

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 105/85

by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 April 1985)

(85/C 248/27)

*Subject:* Transport of radioactive waste

On several occasions each year, radioactive waste is carried by train from the nuclear power station in Doel to the reprocessing plant in La Hague.

Will the Commission answer the following questions?:

- Is there an EEC Directive on the surveillance and safety of such loads?
- If not, is there a proposal for a Directive on the subject?
- Is there a Directive on the information required to be given to the local authorities through whose area the train runs and also to the residents of these areas?
- If not, is there a proposal for a Directive on this subject?

#### Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis on behalf of the Commission

(1 July 1985)

The transport of radioactive material is amply covered by the Council Directive laying down basic safety standards for the health protection of the general public and workers against the dangers of ionizing radiation<sup>(1)</sup>.

Under Article 45 of this Directive each Member State shall initiate action in regard to surveillance and intervention wherever necessary.

The aspects more specifically linked with the safety of the transport of radioactive materials are referred to in Article 33: checking of the effectiveness of protective shielding, drawing up of emergency plans.

As regards the information to be given to local authorities and the general public in areas through which radioactive material is transported, the Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the fact that the European Parliament asked the Governments of the Member States to provide all those concerned with advance information<sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Directive of 3 September 1984 amending Directive 80/836/Euratom as regards the basic safety standards for the health protection of the general public and workers against ionizing radiation; OJ No L 265, 5. 10. 1984.

<sup>(2)</sup> Resolution of the European Parliament of 13 September 1984 on the environment and in particular the accident involving the Mont Louis; OJ No C 274, 15. 10. 1984.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 113/85

by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck (S — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 April 1985)

(85/C 248/28)

*Subject:* Creation of a European fund for venture capital

The Commission is financing 50% of a study being carried out by Granville and Co. of London in preparation for a European fund for venture capital (Euramtech Venture Capital). This Fund's capital of £ 10 million is being supplied by members of the European Venture Capital Association (EVCA).

When does the Commission intend to consult and inform the European Parliament on this matter?

**Answer given by Mr Narjes  
on behalf of the Commission**  
(2 July 1985)

The Commission would inform the Honourable Member that it initiated this pilot project on the basis of the appropriations earmarked for carrying out exploratory projects in the field of innovation which it administers in accordance with Article 205 of the EEC Treaty.

The Commission has not yet issued any official information concerning the case mentioned. It presumes that the Honourable Member is basing her request for information on a press article—an article which, it should be added, contained a number of inaccuracies.

In actual fact, the project in question involves the award of a grant, charged against Article 7520 of the budget and reimbursable in the event of success, to Granville and Co. of London.

That company has undertaken, together with other members of the European Venture Capital Association (EVCA) from six Member States, to carry out a pilot project. The venture capital syndicate which will be responsible for this project was set up following a restricted invitation to tender addressed to all members of the EVCA.

The aim of this experimental measure is to prepare and launch the first venture capital fund to specialize in a given branch of activity at Community level.

The cost of preparing and setting up the fund is being shared equally between the Commission and the syndicate members. However, the Commission's contribution will not exceed 250 000 ECU.

As the preparatory work is being spread over a year, it would seem premature to make any forecast of the amount of capital in such a fund. In any case, if the fund does materialize, its launching will be marked by an invitation to the public to subscribe for shares in it. In that event, expenditure incurred by the Commission during the preparatory phase would have to be reimbursed from the fund.

The Commission will ensure that the lessons learnt from this pilot project are disseminated as widely as possible and will itself draw the necessary conclusions from it.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 122/85**  
**by Mr Karel De Gucht (L — B)**  
**to the Commission of the European Communities**  
(17 April 1985)  
(85/C 248/29)

*Subject:* Development area status for Hageland

On 22 July 1985, Hageland will lose its development area status, which was granted for a three-year period only.

Can the Commission say what decision it is likely to take on this matter and, in other words, whether it is prepared to extend the development area status of Hageland beyond 22 July 1985 in view of the fact that there has been no change or improvement in the economic position of the area, in either absolute or relative terms, that would justify a decision to abolish its development area status?

**Answer given by Mr Sutherland  
on behalf of the Commission**  
(27 June 1985)

Commission Decision 82/740/EEC of 22 July 1982 on the designation of development areas in Belgium<sup>(1)</sup> provides for the grant of aid in 'Noord-Hageland' for a period of three years from the date of the Decision, which also stipulates that the Commission is to review the socio-economic situation in the area before that period expires.

In the light of its review, the Commission will decide whether or not 'Noord-Hageland' is to remain an assisted area.

The Commission will embark on its review very shortly. It will take into account the most recent socio-economic data.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 312, 9. 11. 1982, p. 18.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 132/85**  
**by Mr Ernest Glinne (S — B)**  
**to the Commission of the European Communities**  
(17 April 1985)  
(85/C 248/30)

*Subject:* Local food surpluses and deliveries of food aid in Africa

Zimbabwe and Tanzania, by way of example, are giving serious cause to question whether local food production and foreign food aid in Africa are really inadequate.

Zimbabwe is one of 20 African countries on whose behalf the United Nations launched an appeal for special emergency aid of US \$ 1 500 million. In fact Zimbabwe is fortunately in a position to export one million tonnes of maize this year while stockpiling a further 500 000 tonnes as a safeguard against drought and easily meeting the needs of its population.

The United Nations had predicted a drop in Zimbabwe's food production to 20 % below the normal level and requested international food aid in addition to the 210 000 tonnes already offered, 'two million inhabitants of Zimbabwe being totally dependent on the free distribution of food' ...

On the basis of this case I should like to know whether the list of African countries requiring emergency food aid has been properly established and whether the Commission shares the views of the United Nations. No one disputes the urgent needs of Mali, Mauritania, Burkina-Faso, Niger, Chad, Sudan, Ethiopia and Somalia, nor those of Mozambique and Angola, 10 countries in all. The cases of the other 10 on the UN list are far less convincing.

Friendly Tanzania, for example, with the support of the UN, claims to need US \$ 63,2 million worth of emergency aid, half of it in food. But the FAO itself estimates that Tanzania has a surplus of 120 000 tonnes this year, not counting the 140 000 tonnes of international food aid already on its way.

It is therefore important to ascertain, country by country:

1. Whether local production is not being siphoned off both inside and outside the country through semi-clandestine channels and on the black market above the official prices;
2. Whether the provision of foreign aid is not going to depress further local production which should be encouraged, even at the cost of administrative reforms which may upset local bureaucrats or other entrenched interests.

Food aid can be an expression of solidarity between peoples; it can also, by poor choice of target, inhibit or even stifle the adaptation of local production capacity and the production of food surpluses in the often neglected rural zones of Africa.

Since the needs of the 20 African countries in question were discussed at a UN conference last week in Geneva, could the Commission comment on the credibility and accuracy of the requests for emergency food aid in each case as presented by this international organization?

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

(25 June 1985)

The Commission is not in a position to comment in detail on the international organizations' estimates for food deficits in drought-stricken countries.

It is extremely difficult to assess production and consumption of staple foods in African countries because of the prevalence of subsistence farming and the absence of reliable statistics. There are also technical problems, as in the case of Zimbabwe mentioned by the Honourable Member, where the results of a bad year (May 1984 to April 1985) were published at the same time as forecasts for May 1985 to April 1986 which are fairly optimistic.

It does happen, therefore, as the Honourable Member points out, that food aid comes onto the markets of recipient countries at the wrong moment. The Commission does its best to prevent such situations arising, and no food aid has in fact been allocated to Zimbabwe.

It should be pointed out, however, that the opposite can also happen, and the consequences are just as serious: if requirements are underestimated (or donors think that the figures are inflated), no action is taken and thousands if not millions of people suffer as a result.

The Commission, like other donors, therefore treats the shortfall estimates published by international organizations as evidence rather than fact, to be interpreted in the light of other more qualitative assessments.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 145/85**

by Mr Karel Van Miert (S — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 April 1985)

(85/C 248/31)

*Subject:* Custody and abduction of children across national borders

In its resolution of 16 March 1984 on the above subject<sup>(1)</sup>, the European Parliament requested the Commission to recommend the Member States to adopt a protocol supplementing, in the field of the recognition and enforcement of decisions relating to custody, the Brussels Convention on jurisdiction and the enforcement of judgments.

What steps has the Commission already taken in this area and with what results?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 104, 16. 4. 1984, p. 135.

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield  
on behalf of the Commission**

(1 July 1985)

The Commission considers that, where the custody of children is concerned, the only valid solution at Community level would be in the form of an adjunct to the Council of Europe Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Decisions concerning Custody of Children. Any action by the Commission should await implementation of that Convention.

The Commission is pursuing its efforts to secure ratification of the Strasbourg Convention by the Member States and to avoid a situation in which they expressed reservations that would have to be taken into account in the Community.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 191/85**

by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 April 1985)

(85/C 248/32)

*Subject:* Export of pesticides to Third World countries

Can the Commission indicate:

- (a) what pesticides are authorized for agricultural and horticultural use in the Community Member States? Can it supply a list of the products concerned with reference to the relevant Community Directive or internal legislation, including acaricides, algicides, bactericides, fungicides, herbicides, insecticides, molluscicides, nematocides and rodenticides?
- (b) what pesticides are prohibited in the agricultural and horticultural industries of the Community

Member States? Can it supply a list of products with reference to the relevant Community Directive or internal legislation?

- (c) what pesticides are exported from the Community Member States to Third World countries? Can it supply a list of the products, the name of the exporter, the destination in the Third World and the export figures for each company, product or country?
- (d) whether international guidelines on the import and export of pesticides to the Third World exist?

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

(19 July 1985)

No Community text has been adopted concerning authorization of plant health products. The Member States have authorized many thousands of preparations containing over 500 active substances. The Commission is not able to undertake the extensive research required in order to answer the Honourable Member's question in detail.

In general, the Member States apply the principle of a positive list, i.e. that only authorized products can be marketed, all others being prohibited.

However the Member States' liberty to authorize products is limited by Directive 79/117/EEC<sup>(1)</sup>. Apart from certain temporary derogations, the Member States may not authorize products containing active substances which appear in the list annexed to the Directive, a copy of which will be sent direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

The Commission regrets that it is only partly able to answer this question. The only official source of statistics at its disposal is the NIMEXE<sup>(2)</sup>, where pesticides appear under code 38.11 and are subdivided into broad categories according to their utilization (insecticides, fungicides, etc.) and not according to active substances. As already mentioned in its answer to Written Question No 1082/82 by Mr Rogers<sup>(3)</sup>, the Commission can provide certain statistics which, owing to volume involved, will be sent to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

Various international organizations have adopted measures relating to international trade in prohibited or strictly limited products, notably chemicals:

— United Nations General Assembly (1982): Resolution 37/137 on protection against products harmful to health and the environment: provisional list

of products the consumption and/or the sale of which have been prohibited, withdrawn, strictly limited or, in the case of pharmaceutical products, not approved by Governments.

- GATT (1982): Ministerial Decision on exports of prohibited goods at national level.
- OECD (1984): Council Recommendation concerning the exchange of information on the export of prohibited or strictly limited chemicals.
- UNEP (1984): Provisional notification system for prohibited or strictly limited chemicals.

Lastly, the FAO is finalizing a draft international code of conduct for the distribution and use of pesticides.

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ No L 33, 8. 2. 1979, p. 36.

(<sup>2</sup>) Nomenclature of goods for the external trade statistics of the Community and statistics of trade between Member States; OJ No L 337, 24. 12. 1984.

(<sup>3</sup>) OJ No C 339, 27. 12. 1982, p. 10.

These three sessions, in which Ivory Coast also participated very actively (the head of delegation acting as spokesman for the producers' group), made it possible, thanks to Community initiatives based on Commission proposals, to achieve significant progress towards concluding a fourth International Cocoa Agreement.

A consensus has already been reached on almost all the economic provisions of the new agreement except for the crucial issues of price levels and adjustment mechanisms, on which, in spite of an appreciable narrowing of positions, agreement has not been achieved owing in particular to the uncertainties associated with the international monetary situation.

In addition to, and in parallel with, the efforts made in the ACP-EEC Conventions to foster the commodities sector, notably through Stabex, the Commission has always endeavoured to promote the conclusion of international agreements to stabilize commodity prices and will continue to do everything it can to bring about the rapid conclusion of a fourth International Cocoa Agreement which is both effective and realistic.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 202/85

by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 April 1985)

(85/C 248/33)

*Subject:* Price of cocoa

The chairman of the conference for the renewal of the International Cocoa Agreement hoped that an agreement would be reached in Geneva, despite major difficulties on intervention prices.

It is regrettable that the Ivory Coast, the world's largest producer and an ACP State, and the USA, the world's largest consumer, were not present at this conference.

What is the Commission's policy in this area? What conclusions did the EEC draw from this conference, particularly as regards Stabex and the Third Lomé Convention?

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

(1 July 1985)

The Community and its Member States participated in the three sessions of the international conference on cocoa which were held in Geneva in 1984 and early 1985 (7 to 25 May 1984, 8 October to 2 November 1984 and 18 February to 15 March 1985).

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 232/85

by Mr Ray Mac Sharry (RDE — IRL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 April 1985)

(85/C 248/34)

*Subject:* Funding of the integrated Mediterranean programmes

Will the Commission give an assurance that funding of the integrated Mediterranean programmes will not be at the expense of other programmes, notably those financed under the ESF, the ERDF and the EAGGF?

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

(10 July 1985)

As the Honourable Member can see from Article 11 of the proposal for a Regulation instituting integrated Mediterranean programmes (<sup>1</sup>), the Commission intends to operate these programmes without prejudice to the measures of the structural Funds for the priority or less prosperous regions not covered by the IMPs. This is to be facilitated by an increase in real terms in the allocations received by the Funds.

(<sup>1</sup>) COM(85) 180 final.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 247/85**  
 by Mr Benjamin Visser (S — NL)  
 to the Commission of the European Communities  
 (23 May 1985)  
 (85/C 248/35)

*Subject:* Sale of inland waterway vessels to third countries

1. Does the Commission not consider that the answer given on 13 March 1985 totally fails to reply to the points raised in my question of 12 October 1984 (Written Question No 1052/84) <sup>(1)</sup>?
2. Is the Commission now prepared to try to give direct answers, in so far as it can, to the specific questions I put to it on 12 October last year?
3. Since the answer given suggests that it is extremely unlikely that the Commission has now responded to the recommendations in this area contained in the Albers report (PE 87.786/fin.), can the Commission indicate how it intends to implement the resolutions adopted by Parliament?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 118, 13. 5. 1985, p. 1.

**Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis**  
 on behalf of the Commission  
 (28 June 1985)

The Commission reiterates the answer given to the Honourable Member's Written Question No 1052/84, namely that it considers that, where technically and financially feasible, the selling of inland waterway vessels to third countries can only make a marginal contribution to bringing about a reduction in capacity and that in this connection the responsibility for taking a decision lies in the first place with the vessel owners.

The small amount of sales is in fact due to technical difficulties and the cost of transporting the generally old, not to say dilapidated, vessels in question to non-European countries.

The Commission emphasizes once again that it is in favour of reducing inland waterway capacity and that it will continue to support any national moves to this end. In this light, and as with the scrapping schemes, the Commission will assess any aid the Member States may grant for opening up export markets for these vessels in interested third countries.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 254/85**  
 by Mr Tom Normanton (ED — GB)  
 to the Council of the European Communities  
 (29 April 1985)  
 (85/C 248/36)

*Subject:* Europeans owning property anywhere in the EEC

To ask the Council what steps are being taken to ensure that Member States signatory to the Treaty of Rome comply with the solemn undertakings they entered into, in particular in respect of the rights under the Treaty for all citizens freely to acquire and enjoy ownership of property anywhere in the Community?

**Answer**  
 (29 July 1985)

The Council does not see what provisions of the Treaty the Honourable Member is referring to when he speaks of the general right of all citizens freely to acquire and enjoy ownership of property anywhere in the Community.

In any event it draws the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that if a Member State failed to fulfil an obligation under the Treaty, it would be the responsibility of the Commission to ensure that the Treaty was complied with and, if necessary, to institute proceedings at the Court of Justice for that purpose.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 286/85**  
 by Mr Daniel Ducarme (L — B)  
 to the Commission of the European Communities  
 (28 April 1985)  
 (85/C 248/37)

*Subject:* Taxation

Will the Commission provide a detailed list of the tax-relief measures introduced by each Member State since 1980 in respect both of companies and private individuals?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield**  
 on behalf of the Commission  
 (27 June 1985)

Compiling a detailed answer to the question put by the Honourable Member requires protracted, painstaking research that the Commission is unable to undertake at the moment.



**WRITTEN QUESTION No 327/85**

by Mrs Johanna Maij-Weggen (PPE — NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 May 1985)

(85/C 248/38)

*Subject:* Connection between the distance from home to the workplace and the incidence of illness, absenteeism and family problems

Is the Commission aware of the report drawn up by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions in Dublin on the connection between the distance from home to the workplace and the incidence of illness, absenteeism and family problems?

In view of the conclusions of that report, does the Commission intend to take certain measures at Community level on behalf of commuters, and if so, what would such measures be?

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

(5 July 1985)

The Commission is aware of the report referred to by the Honourable Member.

When the time comes the Commission will draw the appropriate conclusions from this study and from the 1982 European study on travel from home to the workplace and its consequences, as well as the study under way on participation in the planning, financing and management of transport between home and the place of work also in hand for the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 330/85**

by Mrs Johanna Maij-Weggen and Mrs Yvonne van Rooy (PPE — NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(4 May 1985)

(85/C 248/39)

*Subject:* Pollution of the River Meuse

1. Is the Commission aware of the report drawn up recently by the Stichting Reinwater (Reinwater Foundation) on the pollution of the River Meuse<sup>(1)</sup>?

2. Is it aware that, according to that report, four Belgian undertakings are discharging on a large scale into the River Meuse substances classified as polluting or highly polluting:

— Phénix: Trichloroethene, iron, manganese, copper, chrome and oil;

— Cockerill: zinc, copper, lead and manganese;

— Nouveau Hall de Cuivre et Zinc: copper and cadmium;

— Armco, Liege: iron, manganese, copper and oil?

3. Can it indicate whether the undertakings involved have been authorized to discharge those waste substances?

4. Can it indicate which of the substances being discharged are covered by Community Directives and whether those Directives have already been converted into national legislation in Belgium, i.e. whether or not those Directives are already being applied in Belgium?

5. What is its opinion of the Foundation's idea of setting up an 'International Commission for the River Meuse' involving France, Belgium and the Netherlands, and is it prepared to take the initiative in this matter?

<sup>(1)</sup> *Maaswater onderzocht* (Investigation into the quality of the water in the River Meuse): Stichting Reinwater, Vossiusstraat 20, Amsterdam, Netherlands — October 1984.

**Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis  
on behalf of the Commission**

(8 July 1985)

Although the Commission has not received this report it is aware that industrial undertakings in the Liege basin discharge pollutant waste into the River Meuse.

Of the substances quoted, only cadmium is currently covered by Directive 83/153/EEC<sup>(1)</sup>, under which authorizations in respect of discharges are granted by the Member States, which must comply with the Directive within two years. This Directive will enter into force on 28 September 1985. The Commission has not yet received the implementing legislation from Belgium.

Article 10 of Directive 76/464/EEC<sup>(2)</sup> provides that 'where appropriate, one or more Member States may individually or jointly take more stringent measures than those provided for under this Directive'.

The Commission thus welcomes any contacts between Member States to give better environmental protection. It is aware that there has been contact of this kind between the three Member States concerned by the Meuse basin. However, the initiative of setting up an 'International Commission for the River Meuse' is outside the Commission's field of competence, especially as a new instrument will be available when the nego-

tiations currently in progress within the Council of Europe culminate in the signature of the European Convention for the Protection of International Watercourses against Pollution. As a signatory to this Convention, the Community will be able to take an active part in the work of the international commissions to be set up under the Convention.

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ No L 291, 24. 10. 1983, p. 1.

(<sup>2</sup>) OJ No L 129, 18. 5. 1976, p. 23.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 398/85

by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 May 1985)

(85/C 248/40)

*Subject:* Accidents involving the transport of dangerous products

During the night of Tuesday, 2 and Wednesday, 3 April 1985, a collision occurred on the German motorway between Fribourg and Basle between a road tanker, another heavy goods vehicle and a car. Three people died in the accident and the burning tanker released a toxic cloud which affected two neighbouring villages, one in Germany and the other in France, and resulted in nearly a 100 cases of poisoning.

On Wednesday, 10 April, within the space of a few hours, three accidents involving lorries transporting dangerous substances occurred on French territory, causing the death of two persons and the outbreak of fire in a dozen or so houses.

1. What lessons does the Commission draw from accidents of this kind? Would it not agree that they point to serious legal deficiencies which need to be remedied at European level?
2. On a more general level, could the Commission:
  - (a) specify the number of accidents involving the transport of dangerous products and dangerous waste that have occurred over the past few years in the European Community?
  - (b) provide statistical data on such accidents, with a breakdown by Member State and mode of transport (road, rail, air, internal shipping and maritime shipping)?
  - (c) provide details of the civil damage caused by these accidents?
  - (d) provide details of the causes of these accidents and, in particular, of the extent to which the relevant legal requirements were respected?

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 544/85

by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (L — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 May 1985)

(85/C 248/41)

*Subject:* Movement of dangerous products by road

Three recent accidents in France near Lyons, Saint-Dié and Sigean (Aude)—coming after the poisoning of more than 25 people by toxic gases on the Cologne-Koblenz motorway in the Federal Republic of Germany, when several drums containing chemical products fell from a lorry—have turned the spotlight once again on the continual risk inherent in moving chemical products and liquid gas by road.

The Commission has already taken a series of measures relating to this type of transport. Would it not, however, be advisable to tighten them up, given the spate of accidents caused by what the press calls 'bombs on wheels'?

Joint answer given by Mr Clinton Davis  
to Written Questions No 398/85 and No 544/85  
on behalf of the Commission

(8 July 1985)

1. The type of accident referred to by the Honourable Member can mostly be attributed to human error rather than to a lack of technical prescriptions at international level. Stricter enforcement and control of the existing rules and agreements would therefore help to reduce such incidents. Whilst this control is the responsibility of national or local bodies, the Commission is investigating the possibilities of improvement in this field by the use of modern information techniques. Moreover the Commission intends, in the framework of Road Safety Year 1986, to make proposals on more uniform specific driver training and on roadworthiness control of vehicles, as indicated in its latest communication to the Council (<sup>1</sup>). An interservice working group has also been created by the Commission to study the problems caused by the movement of dangerous substances by all means of transportation. This working group has not yet reached its conclusions, and its work might lead to proposals to the Council for action in that field.

2. The Commission is unable to provide the comprehensive statistics requested concerning accidents in which dangerous goods were involved. Efforts to collect such statistics in several Member States have resulted

in a very large volume of data about accidents in general, of which only a very small minority could be considered as aggravated by dangerous goods.

The most complete recent study in this field has been made by the Belgian Institut du Transport Routier over the years 1980-1983. In this four-year period some 240 000 road accidents occurred in Belgium involving personal injuries (320 000) or deaths (just under 9 000). The total number of accidents known where dangerous goods were involved was 343, causing 25 deaths and 220 cases of personal injury. Only in 75 of these accidents was the situation aggravated by the dangerous goods which resulted in one person killed and five injured, all during the single accident near Huy in 1983.

As this study can be considered as reasonably representative for the Community, its conclusions and recommendations form the basis of the actions envisaged by the Commission in paragraph 1.

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. COM(85) 239 final.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 410/85

by Lord O'Hagan (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 May 1985)

(85/C 248/42)

*Subject:* Transport of live animals

Much concern has recently been expressed in the United Kingdom about the transport of live animals in the EEC.

1. What Community legislation already exists?
2. Is it adequate?
3. Is the Commission sure that it is being enforced?
4. What further action does the Commission now propose?

Answer given by Mr Andriessen  
on behalf of the Commission

(10 July 1985)

1. Community rules to protect animals in transport are laid down in Council Directive 77/489/EEC on the protection of animals during international transport<sup>(1)</sup>, and in Council Directive 81/389/EEC<sup>(2)</sup> establishing measures necessary for the implementation of Directive 77/489/EEC.

2. The Commission considers that this legislation gives a good basis to ensure the protection of all species of animals during international transport. The detailed technical provisions found in these rules must be applied to journeys made by land, air or water. It is necessary, however, to ensure that the provisions laid down are applied in practice.

3. From time to time complaints of non-enforcement of the Community rules in the different Member States have been brought to the attention of the Commission. The Commission has not failed to act rapidly to ensure that Member States fulfil their obligations in relation to these Community provisions. Recently a complaint alleging the non-enforcement by the United Kingdom and France has been received from the Royal Society for the Protection of Animals.

4. The Commission is making a detailed study of the complaints brought to its attention. It has already requested the observations of the United Kingdom and French governments. It will fulfil its obligations to ensure that Community rules are applied.

The Commission will also continue to support as far as possible the work already done in the field of research which is carried out under the Scientific Committee for Agricultural Research regarding questions of animal transport.

In addition the Commission considers that a valuable contribution could be made to the practical application of these legal rules by the development of Community codes of practice. To this end a contract has been given to provide a framework for the development of codes of practice for the transport of animals.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 200, 8. 8. 1977, p. 10.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No L 150, 6. 6. 1981, p. 1.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 423/85

by Mr Hans-Jurgen Zahorka (PPE — D)

to the Council of the European Communities

(9 May 1985)

(85/C 248/43)

*Subject:* The possibility of quicker clearance for Members of the European Parliament departing from Brussels Airport

Fortunately Members of the European Parliament arriving at Brussels Airport may, on presentation of a *laissez-passer*, use a special entry door and pass rapidly through customs and border controls. In view of the long queues which sometimes occur at the border controls for departing passengers and the technical feasibility of a special door at Brussels Airport for Members of

Parliament who are often caught between their professional obligations in Brussels on the one hand and fixed departure times on the other, so that they sometimes only reach their planes at the last minute, would the Council request the Belgian Government to make similar arrangements in respect of departure from Brussels Airport?

**Answer**  
(29 July 1985)

Article 8 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities states that no administrative or other restriction shall be imposed on the free movement of members of the Assembly travelling to or from the place of meeting of the Assembly.

The Belgian authorities have informed the Council of the measures they have taken to enable these provisions to be fully complied with and in particular of their decision to issue Members of the European Parliament with a special *laissez-passer*.

It is for the Belgian authorities to determine the way in which this *laissez-passer* should be used.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 433/85**  
by Mr James Provan (ED — GB)  
to the Commission of the European Communities  
(9 May 1985)  
(85/C 248/44)

*Subject:* The John Deere Company

Is the Commission satisfied that, following a substantial fine on the John Deere Company, that company is now honouring the trading practices expected of them in the European Community?

If not, will it carry out a further investigation?

**Answer given by Mr Sutherland  
on behalf of the Commission**  
(8 July 1985)

The Commission has no reason to believe that John Deere has any intention not to live up to the compliance

programme which it instituted after having been informed of the Commission's objections to the export bans contained in its distribution agreements<sup>(1)</sup>. If the Commission became aware of any indication to the contrary, it would of course take the appropriate steps.

<sup>(1)</sup> See notably paragraph 41 of the Commission's Decision in the John Deere Case, 14 December 1984, OJ No L 35, 7. 2. 1985.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 441/85**  
by Mrs Marijke Van Hemeldonck (S — B)  
to the Commission of the European Communities  
(9 May 1985)  
(85/C 248/45)

*Subject:* French Anti-trust Bill

The French Minister, Mr Bérégovoy, recently tabled a bill proposing that the committee on competition should have more scope in the anti-trust sector, which means that this committee's powers would be comparable with those of the German Federal Cartels Office.

Does the Commission not regard the fact that the Member States are assuming greater powers in the field of competition as a sign that its own efforts in this area are inadequate?

Does the Commission not think that there should be a clearer distinction between national and Community powers in the field of competition (e.g. the Federal Cartels Office's intervention in the takeover of Grundig by the Netherlands firm Philips, and the case of fraud involving Loewe-Opta)?

Does the Commission think that current differences in the ways in which national anti-trust authorities take action is an obstacle to the development of the common market?

What policy does the Commission intend to pursue in this area?

**Answer given by Mr Sutherland  
on behalf of the Commission**  
(8 July 1985)

The Commission has always welcomed efforts by Member States to safeguard effective competition at national level<sup>(1)</sup>. It has, however, also consistently ensured that measures taken by national competition authorities do not lead to conflicts with Community competition policy, which could arise in cases where parallel application

of Community and national law is possible. As a result of the very close and regular contacts which the Commission maintains with the competent authorities of the Member States, cases of European dimension are as a rule reserved for treatment under Community law, while cases involving intervention by both national and Community authorities are decided on a basis of mutual cooperation and concertation.

In the specific case cited by the Honourable Member (Philips-Grundig), the facts involved did not give rise to application of the competition rules of the EEC Treaty, and the intervention by the national authorities in question did not therefore in any way impinge upon Community competences.

In view of the supremacy of Community law and the fact that experience has shown that cases of conflict are very rare and have always been resolved satisfactorily, the Commission does not consider that there is a need for legislative steps to demarcate Community and national competence.

The Commission agrees that if national competition legislation and implementation were to diverge substantially from one Member State to another, problems relating to the unity of the common market could arise. However, the reports which the Commission receives each year from the Member States regarding developments in their national competition policies and which are summarized in the Commission's annual reports on competition policy, indicate that developments are in fact tending to move in the same direction<sup>(2)</sup>. Finally, the Commission believes that a rigorous enforcement of the Community's competition rules—also by national courts—will serve to promote the development of the common market.

<sup>(1)</sup> See Sixth (points 66 and 67) and Seventh (point 75) Reports on Competition Policy.

<sup>(2)</sup> *ibid.*

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 460/85

by Mr Karl von Wogau (PPE — D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 May 1985)

(85/C 248/46)

*Subject:* Implementation of VAT Directives in Italy

Is the Commission aware that difficulties are repeatedly encountered in connection with the refund of VAT by the Italian financial authorities?

For example, in a specific case, repayment was refused on the grounds that the invoices had been made out in a foreign currency.

What steps does the Commission intend to take in order to ensure the smooth functioning of VAT repayments in the Community?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield  
on behalf of the Commission

(10 July 1985)

1. The Eighth Council Directive of 6 December 1979 (79/1072/EEC)<sup>(1)</sup>, which governs the refund of turnover tax to taxable persons not established in the territory of the State, has been implemented by Italy (see Ministerial Decree of 20 May 1982, GU No 146, 29 May 1982).

2. The Commission has repeatedly stressed to the Italian Government the need to speed up administrative practice concerning refunds and as a result there has been some improvement; the Commission will continue to press for an acceleration of refunds.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 331, 27. 12. 1979, p. 11.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 467/85

by Mr Gerhard Schmid (S — D)

to the Council of the European Communities

(20 May 1985)

(85/C 248/47)

*Subject:* Famine in Ethiopia

In August 1984 the Ethiopian Government submitted to foreign embassies the petition entitled *Review of current situation in drought-affected regions of Ethiopia*. Its main point was that Ethiopia had no further stocks of grain and that promised food aid had not materialized. Only after a BBC television film in October 1984 did international aid start flowing. In November 1984 the Community provided additional appropriations from the current budget.

1. When did the Council learn of the Ethiopian Government's petition?
2. How did the Council react to the urgent nature of the problem it described?
3. How is it possible that, by his own admission, the German Minister for Economic Cooperation and Member of the Council, Dr Jürgen Warnke, only learned of the disastrous famine in the middle of October 1984?

**Answer**  
(29 July 1985)

Following an initial emergency plan of nearly 80 million ECU introduced in April 1984, the Commission gave the Council its assessment in October 1984 of the worsening of the situation in the drought-affected countries in Africa, particularly Ethiopia, stressing the need to step up emergency aid to them considerably.

Thanks to adequate preparation and close cooperation between all institutions concerned (Parliament, Council and Commission), a second emergency plan, comprising immediate aid totalling 32 million ECU and short-term food aid equivalent to 100 000 tonnes of cereals and having an estimated value of 25 million ECU, was set in motion within a few days, implementation of the first measures starting on 1 November 1984.

This action was followed by the establishment by the European Council meeting in Dublin in December 1984 of a Plan to combat famine in Africa, which was on a much bigger scale since it involved the sending by the Community and the Member States of 1 200 000 tonnes of cereals or equivalent as emergency aid by the next harvest (a figure exceeded in practice), more than a quarter of that aid being received by Ethiopia.

It thus emerges that measures to assist the famine-stricken population in Ethiopia were taken with the utmost urgency, bearing in mind the need for reliable information on the nature and extent of requirements and on the most suitable means of meeting them.

In addition, without prejudice to longer-term action, the Council has adopted a Plan which makes it possible to detect critical situations in Africa as early as possible and to provide emergency resources to cope with them, so as to improve further the speed of response and the suitability of the aid for meeting requirements in the unfortunate eventuality of such situations arising again after the present crisis is over.

At its meeting on 22 May 1985 the Council agreed to the entry in Chapter 92 of the draft budget of the total amount of payment appropriations voted by Parliament during the first reading and included in the budget adopted.

With regard to the question raised in point 3, the Council would remind the Honourable Member that it does not normally adopt positions on statements made by its Member States.

However, the Council would like to add that it has been told that the Government of the Federal Republic

of Germany started implementing an initial programme of special aid to alleviate the famine in Africa in June 1984.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 470/85**  
**by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED — GB)**  
**to the Council of the European Communities**

(20 May 1985)

(85/C 248/48)

*Subject:* Directive to harmonize practice concerning allowances for duty-free goods

What is holding up adoption of the Commission's 1983 proposals for a Directive<sup>(1)</sup> to regulate and harmonize practice concerning allowances for duty-free goods for intra-Community travellers?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 114, 28. 4. 1983, p. 4 and 7.

**Answer**  
(29 July 1985)

1. On the basis of the proposal for a Sixth Directive increasing duty-free allowances for travellers from other Member States, the Council as long ago as 30 April 1984 adopted a Directive which raised the allowance for travellers within the Community to 280 ECU as of 1 July 1984, while granting some derogations to Ireland, Denmark and Greece.

At its meeting on 11 June 1985, the Council agreed to raise these exemptions as from 1 October 1985 to 350 ECU for adult travellers, with the option of limiting them to 90 ECU in the case of travellers under 15 years of age. At the same time, it decided to raise—also with effect from 1 October 1985—the quantitative exemptions applicable to Community travel as regards still wines, coffee and tea. Denmark, Ireland and Greece are continuing to enjoy certain derogations from the Community arrangements.

2. The proposal for a Seventh Directive relating to sales of duty-free goods within the Community was examined by the competent authorities within the Council between December 1983 and September 1984.

On 14 February 1984 the Court of Justice delivered its REWE II Judgment (Case No 278/82). In that Judgment, the Court ruled on, among other things, the question of tax exemptions applicable to goods sold in duty-free shops on ferries plying regularly between Member States.

The Council was unable to arrive at a joint position either on the implications of this Judgment or on the details of any legislation it might adopt in this area.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 491/85**

by Mr James Provan (ED — GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 May 1985)

(85/C 248/49)

*Subject:* The John Deere Company

Is the Commission satisfied that, following a substantial fine on the John Deere Company, that that company is now honouring the trading practices expected of them in the European Community, and are the other agricultural machinery manufacturers, who were under investigation, now complying with Article 85<sup>(1)</sup> of the EEC Treaty?

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

(8 July 1985)

On the conduct of Deere and Company, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to his earlier Written Question No 433/85<sup>(1)</sup> which remains valid.

As to the conduct of other agricultural machinery manufacturers, the Commission is continuing its investigations. Some have admitted infringing Article 85<sup>(1)</sup> and further decisions are therefore envisaged. Until its investigations are completed, the Commission cannot assure the Honourable Member that every such manufacturer is complying with the Community's rules on competition. In this connection, if any of the Honourable Member's constituents or other interested parties believe that there is cause for complaint, there is a statutory complaints procedure open to them.

<sup>(1)</sup> See page 24 of this Official Journal.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 537/85**

by Mr Paul Staes (ARC — B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 May 1985)

(85/C 248/50)

*Subject:* Projects in central and South America

Will the Commissioner responsible provide the following information:

1. A list of all projects in central and South America carried out with Community aid.
2. Details of the individual projects.
3. The deadline agreed for the implementation of the projects.
4. The amounts put up by:
  - the Community institutions, specifying which;
  - the private sector, specifying the undertakings concerned;
  - the Latin-American countries concerned, specifying which.
5. A list of the projects in respect of which negotiations are currently in progress or applications have been submitted to the Community authorities, specifying the estimated amounts involved, planned deadlines, the parties concerned and their respective contributions?

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

(8 July 1985)

Owing to the volume involved, the Commission is sending direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretary General summary tables of aid granted to Latin America since 1979 by means of the various instruments at the Commission's disposal, and also a detailed account of the projects/programmes of financial and technical assistance to the central and South American countries funded since 1976.

In most cases, the project titles indicate the nature of the operations carried out. For any further details the Honourable Member is requested to consult the various annual reports on the execution of this aid.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 635/85**  
**by Mr Georges Sutra de Germa (S — F)**  
**to the Council of the European Communities**  
 (5 June 1985)  
 (85/C 248/51)

*Subject:* Special horticultural tariff in the Netherlands

I have received the Council's answer to my Written Question No 1432/84<sup>(1)</sup>.

I am bound to say that I am not satisfied by this, since I asked a political question which has apparently not been answered.

I would therefore welcome a further, political response, rather than notification of a decision taken by the Commission.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 135, 3. 6. 1985, p. 16.

**Answer**  
 (29 July 1985)

The Council cannot be called upon to interpret the motives of any of the Member States of the Community.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 723/85**  
**by Mrs Beata Brookes (ED — GB)**  
**to the Council of the European Communities**  
 (17 June 1985)  
 (85/C 248/52)

*Subject:* Specific Community measures in favour of areas adversely affected by restructuring of the textile and clothing industry

Council Regulation (EEC) No 219/84<sup>(1)</sup> enumerates five criteria that must be met by adversely affected zones, but does not specify the thresholds of these criteria.

I am led to believe that for criterion (b), 'industrial employment dependent in large measure on the textile and clothing industry', a threshold of 20% has been decided by the Council.

Would the Council specify where its Decision has been published?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 27, 31. 3. 1984, p. 22.

**Answer**  
 (29 July 1985)

1. In Article 2 (2) of Regulation (EEC) No 219/84 the Council laid down the zones covered by this specific measure in Belgium, France, Ireland, Italy, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands on the basis of the criteria referred to in Article 2 (1).

2. The Regulation does not lay down a threshold for criterion (b), which refers solely to 'industrial employment dependent *in large measure* on the textile and clothing industry'.

The Council has not taken any Decision of the kind mentioned by the Honourable Member.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 732/85**  
**by Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED — GB)**  
**to the Council of the European Communities**  
 (17 June 1985)  
 (85/C 248/53)

*Subject:* Implementation of CITES

Will the Council of Ministers detail the steps it has taken and finance it has made available to honour its pledge made in Gaborone, Botswana, in 1983 to the meeting of party states to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, that adequate staff and finances would be allocated in order to ensure full implementation of CITES within the Community?

**Answer**  
 (29 July 1985)

1. The Council is aware of the importance of the management and monitoring work resulting from the adoption of Regulation No 3626/82<sup>(1)</sup> on the implementation in the Community of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.



2. It would nevertheless give a reminder that it behoves the Commission, which is the body responsible for ensuring that the work in question is duly carried out, to manage and distribute to the best advantage the appropriations and staff assigned to it by the budgetary authority.

regulatory and administrative measures of the Member States in the field of consumer credit?

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ No L 384, 31. 12. 1982.

**Answer**

(29 July 1985)

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 744/85**

**by Mr Thomas Megahy (S — GB)**

**to the Council of the European Communities**

(18 June 1985)

(85/C 248/54)

*Subject:* Consumer credit

What progress is being made inside the Council on the proposal for an EEC Directive on harmonizing legal,

Work is continuing in the Council on this proposal for a Directive and progress has been made on several of the technical aspects. The proposal nevertheless raises a number of complex issues, in view of the variety of situations in the Member States, particularly with regard to contractual law, banking systems, taxation and the current state of national law on consumer protection in the field of credit.

In view of this situation, the Council noted at its meeting on 21 May 1985 that it was advisable to concentrate initially on certain provisions which could be given priority treatment in order to enable the Council to reach agreement more quickly.

---