

Official Journal

of the European Communities

ISSN 0378 - 6986

C 133

Volume 30

18 May 1987

English edition

Information and Notices

<u>Notice No</u>	<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
	I Information	
	European Parliament	
	<i>Written Questions with answer:</i>	
87/C 133/01	No 19/86 by Mrs Vera Squarcialupi to the Commission Subject: Imported mushrooms from Asia rejected by the USA and on sale in Italy	1
87/C 133/02	No 621/86 by Mr Carlos Bencomo Mendoza to the Commission Subject: Community financing for the construction of the airport on the island of Gomera	1
87/C 133/03	No 680/86 by Mr Michelangelo Ciancaglini to the Commission Subject: Broadcasting of RAI programmes in Belgium	2
87/C 133/04	No 696/86 by Mr Kenneth Collins to the Commission Subject: Vacancy for the post of head of the Commission's London Office	2
87/C 133/05	No 1975/86 by Mr Hugh McMahon to the Commission Subject: Vacancy in London Press Office of the Commission	2
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 696/86 and 1975/86	3
87/C 133/06	No 707/86 by Mr Pieter Dankert to the Commission Subject: Failure to take proceedings in respect of Community budget fraud	3
87/C 133/07	No 728/86 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: Danish discrimination against foreign beer	4
87/C 133/08	No 759/86 by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo to the Commission Subject: A press agency for the European Community	4
87/C 133/09	No 838/86 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Commission Subject: Exports of white wine to the USA — Quota restrictions and tariffs applied by the USA	4
87/C 133/10	No 884/86 by Mr Richard Cottrell to the Commission Subject: Tourist attractions in Lisbon	5
87/C 133/11	No 953/86 by Mr Willy Kuijpers to the Commission Subject: Regulation on food surpluses and their use for the less-privileged	5

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
87/C 133/12	No 959/86 by Mr James Elles to the Commission Subject: Terminology to be used when referring to the European Communities	6
87/C 133/13	No 1014/86 by Mr Arturo Escuder Croft to the Commission Subject: Avocado imports in 1985	6
87/C 133/14	No 1049/86 by Mr Ernest Mühlen to the Commission Subject: Cable relay of RTL broadcasts in Bremen	7
87/C 133/15	No 1054/86 by Mr Alasdair Hutton to the Commission Subject: Support for audio-visual information	8
87/C 133/16	No 1087/86 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Commission Subject: Radioactive hay	8
87/C 133/17	No 1129/86 by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo to the Commission Subject: Community action to encourage the formation of groups of small and medium-sized undertakings in the tourism sector	8
87/C 133/18	No 1130/86 by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo to the Commission Subject: European school of journalism	9
87/C 133/19	No 1163/86 by Mr Louis Eyraud to the Commission Subject: Commission decision of 30 April 1986 on guidelines for the European Social Fund ...	9
87/C 133/20	No 1169/86 by Mr Paul Staes to the Commission Subject: Financing for nuclear power stations	10
87/C 133/21	No 1214/86 by Mr Otmar Franz to the Commission Subject: Admissibility of investment aid to companies involved in both the manufacture and processing of steel	10
87/C 133/22	No 1234/86 by Mr José Happart to the Commission Subject: Use of agricultural surpluses for the poor	11
87/C 133/23	No 1253/86 by Mr Horst Seefeld to the Commission Subject: Harassment of Community citizens when entering the USA	11
87/C 133/24	No 1287/86 by Mr Joachim Dalsass to the Commission Subject: Financing of the 'Women help Women' action centre set up by the South Tyrol Catholic Families Association in Bolzano	12
87/C 133/25	No 1327/86 by Mr Axel Zarges to the Commission Subject: Financial support for organizations at European Community level concerned with animals, game, nature conservation and the environment	12
87/C 133/26	No 1338/86 by Mr Terence Pitt to the Commission Subject: United Kingdom market and imports of heavy trailers	13
87/C 133/27	No 1366/86 by Mr Edward Newman to the Commission Subject: Import of Namibian and South African uranium oxide into the Community	13
87/C 133/28	No 1368/86 by Mr Edward Newman to the Commission Subject: Implementation of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom)	14
87/C 133/29	No 1370/86 by Mr Dieter Rogalla to the Commission Subject: Price of milk for the consumer	14
87/C 133/30	No 1379/86 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: Irradiation of food	15

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
87/C 133/31	No 1388/86 by Mr Arturo Escuder Croft to the Commission Subject: Regulations on imitation milk products	15
87/C 133/32	No 1396/86 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: Barley exported from the north of England	16
87/C 133/33	No 1397/86 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: Foreign-language teachers in Great Britain	16
87/C 133/34	No 1398/86 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: British teachers in France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium and Italy	16
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1397/86 and 1398/86	16
87/C 133/35	No 1438/86 by Mr Louis Eyraud to the Commission Subject: Sheepmeat market	16
87/C 133/36	No 1443/86 by Mr Alfons Boesmans to the Commission Subject: Intensive chicken-rearing units	17
87/C 133/37	No 1449/86 by Mr Gijs de Vries to the Commission Subject: European Media Venture Fund	17
87/C 133/38	No 1451/86 by Mr Willy Vernimmen to the Commission Subject: Community assistance for Turkish guest workers	18
87/C 133/39	No 1463/86 by Mr Florus Wijsenbeek to the Commission Subject: Freedom of establishment for dentists	18
87/C 133/40	No 1469/86 by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin to the Commission Subject: Social aids to the iron and steel industry	19
87/C 133/41	No 1479/86 by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo to the Commission Subject: A publication about trade fairs and exhibitions of interest to visitors to the European Community	20
87/C 133/42	No 1487/86 by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin to the Commission Subject: Commission patronage of sporting events	20
87/C 133/43	No 1492/86 by Mr William Newton Dunn to the Commission Subject: Exchanges with Hungarian schools	21
87/C 133/44	No 1500/86 by Mr Hemmo Muntingh to the Commission Subject: The wolf (<i>Canis lupus signatus</i>) and other protected animal species in Spain and Portugal and pine and eucalyptus plantations for commercial purposes	21
87/C 133/45	No 1503/86 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Commission Subject: Abolition of aid for the repatriation of Greek, Spanish and Portuguese nationals leaving France	22
87/C 133/46	No 1511/86 by Mr Fernand Herman to the Commission Subject: Prenatal and maternity benefits	23
87/C 133/47	No 1517/86 by Mr John McCartin to the Commission Subject: Harmonization of driving test procedures	24
87/C 133/48	No 1521/86 by Mr Michael Hindley to the Commission Subject: Sale of 100 133 tonnes of beef to Brazil	24

(Continued overleaf)

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
87/C 133/49	No 1530/86 by Mr Alasdair Hutton to the Commission Subject: Mobility of European Community citizens in Greece	24
87/C 133/50	No 1534/86 by Mrs Undine-Uta Bloch von Blottnitz to the Commission Subject: Payment made by the Government of the <i>Land</i> Baden-Württemberg to the car manufacturer Daimler-Benz for the development of a site near Rastatt	25
87/C 133/51	No 1588/86 by Mr Victor Arbeloa Muru to the Commission Subject: Inclusion of Valle de Erro (Navarra, Spain) among hill-farming areas	26
87/C 133/52	No 1613/86 by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin to the Commission Subject: Treatment of children receiving nursery and primary school education in Belgium whose parents are foreign nationals (including EEC nationals)	26
87/C 133/53	No 1691/86 by Mr Francois Roelants du Vivier to the Commission Subject: Legality of Belgian measures in education	26
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1613/86 and 1691/86	27
87/C 133/54	No 1616/86 by Mr François Roelants du Vivier to the Commission Subject: Concentration of the food sector in the retail trade	27
87/C 133/55	No 1630/86 by Mr Willy Kuijpers to the Commission Subject: Illegal sale of dwellings in France	27
87/C 133/56	No 1646/86 by Mr Pol Marck to the Commission Subject: Importation from France of eggs not suitable for human consumption	28
87/C 133/57	No 1649/86 by Mr Alfons Boesmans to the Commission Subject: Situation of conscientious objectors in Greece	28
87/C 133/58	No 1650/86 by Mr Alfons Boesmans to the Commission Subject: Situation of conscientious objectors in Belgium	28
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1649/86 and 1650/86	29
87/C 133/59	No 1684/86 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Commission Subject: Distinction drawn between pupils whose parents are subject to taxation in Belgium and those whose parents are not	29
87/C 133/60	No 1685/86 by Mr Alasdair Hutton to the Commission Subject: Commission communications with Member States	29
87/C 133/61	No 1695/86 by Mr François Roelants du Vivier to the Commission Subject: Subsidization of tax exemption for fuels used in agriculture	30
87/C 133/62	No 1697/86 by Mr Florus Wijzenbeek to the Commission Subject: The European Schools in Brussels	30
87/C 133/63	No 1704/86 by Mrs Sylvie Le Roux to the Commission Subject: Consequences of the dairy quotas policy	31
87/C 133/64	No 1729/86 by Mr Giorgio Almirante, Mr Antonio Tripodi and Mr Pino Romuladi to the Commission Subject: Management of the funds of the European Social Fund by Intercoascit in Bonn	32
87/C 133/65	No 1744/86 by Mr Lambert Croux to the Commission Subject: Employment of handicapped persons	33
87/C 133/66	No 1759/86 by Mrs Mary Banotti to the Commission Subject: VAT on medical equipment	34
87/C 133/67	No 1762/86 by Mr Pierre Bernard-Reymond to the Commission Subject: Number of cars in the Member States of the European Community	34

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
87/C 133/68	No 1768/86 by Mr Mauro Chiabrando, Mr Nino Pisoni and Mr Franco Borgo to the Commission Subject: Premiums for keeping calves on farms	35
87/C 133/69	No 1775/86 by Mr José Álvarez de Paz, Mr José Garcia Raya and Mr José Bueno Vicente to the Commission Subject: Approximation of laws relating to collective redundancies	35
87/C 133/70	No 1782/86 by Mr José Álvarez de Paz, Mr José Herrero Merediz and Mr José Bueno Vicente to the Commission Subject: Disclosure of certain information on employment by steel-making undertakings	36
87/C 133/71	No 1783/86 by Mr José Álvarez de Paz, Mr José Garcia Raya and Mr José Bueno Vicente to the Commission Subject: Restrictions on movement and residence within the Community for workers of Member States and their families	36
87/C 133/72	No 1784/86 by Mr José Álvarez de Paz, Mr José Herrero Merediz and Mr José Bueno Vicente to the Commission Subject: Protection of employees in the event of the insolvency of their employer	37
87/C 133/73	No 1786/86 by Mr José Álvarez de Paz, Mr José Garcia Raya and Mr José Bueno Vicente to the Commission Subject: Safety signs at work	37
87/C 133/74	No 1795/86 by Mrs Ursula Braun-Moser to the Commission Subject: Harmonization of working conditions for those employed in tourism	37
87/C 133/75	No 1806/86 by Mr Derek Prag to the Commission Subject: Possible Community standards for car number plates	38
87/C 133/76	No 1819/86 by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin to the Commission Subject: Beekeeping: beekeepers' cooperatives	38
87/C 133/77	No 1843/86 by Mr Emmanuel Maffre-Baugé to the Commission Subject: Development of cork production	38
87/C 133/78	No 1845/86 by Mr Kenneth Collins to the Commission Subject: Anabolic agents in animal production	39
87/C 133/79	No 1850/86 by Mrs Undine-Uta Bloch von Blottnitz to the Commission Subject: Plans to build a reprocessing plant for radioactive waste in Belgium	39
87/C 133/80	No 1940/86 by Mr Jef Ulburghs to the Commission Subject: Participation in the construction of a reprocessing plant in Mol (Belgium)	39
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1850/86 and 1940/86	39
87/C 133/81	No 1854/86 by Mr Jean-Marie Vanlerenberghe, Mr Jacques Mallet, Mrs Nicole Fontaine and Mr Jean-Pierre Abelin to the Commission Subject: Submission of tenders by European firms for the construction of Kansai airport (Japan)	39
87/C 133/82	No 1856/86 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: Female unemployment	40
87/C 133/83	No 1859/86 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins to the Commission Subject: Danger of rabies	40
87/C 133/84	No 1862/86 by Mr François Roelants du Vivier to the Commission Subject: Availability of information reports to be forwarded by the Member States under the provisions of Directives	41
87/C 133/85	No 1863/86 by Mr Jon Gangoiti Llaguno to the Commission Subject: Situation of the iron and steel industry in the Community context	41

(Continued overleaf)

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
87/C 133/86	No 1866/86 by Mrs Bodil Boserup to the Commission Subject: Encouragement for exchanges of young workers	42
87/C 133/87	No 1871/86 by Mr Luis Perinat Elio to the Commission Subject: Selection criteria for determining the European Community's policy on medical research	42
87/C 133/88	No 1874/86 by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo to the Commission Subject: Dictionary of the European Community	43
87/C 133/89	No 1875/86 by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo to the Commission Subject: Imposition of VAT on sporting activities of yacht clubs	43
87/C 133/90	No 1878/86 by Mr José Alvarez de Eulate Penaranda to the Commission Subject: Rationalization of relations between the Commission and the Ministries of Agriculture in the Member States	44
87/C 133/91	No 1883/86 by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin to the Commission Subject: Social measures to compensate for the liberalization of the steel market	44
87/C 133/92	No 1896/86 by Mr Pieter Dankert to the Commission Subject: The Member States' attitude towards combating fraud and irregularities with regard to Community regulations	44
87/C 133/93	No 1902/86 by Mr Victor Arbeloa Muru to the Commission Subject: Voluntary relief work in the Third World	45
87/C 133/94	No 1923/86 by Mr Christopher Jackson to the Commission Subject: Electronic equipment	45
87/C 133/95	No 1929/86 by Mr Bryan Cassidy to the Commission Subject: Angola	46
87/C 133/96	No 1930/86 by Mr Bryan Cassidy to the Commission Subject: Angola	46
87/C 133/97	No 1934/86 by Mrs Vera Squarcialupi to the Commission Subject: Consumption of psychopharmaceuticals	47
87/C 133/98	No 1938/86 by Mr Antonio Iodice to the Commission Subject: Training of pharmacists	47
87/C 133/99	No 1941/86 by Mr Alexandros Alavanos to the Commission Subject: Commission refusal to provide information to a Member of the European Parliament ..	47
87/C 133/100	No 1949/86 by Mr José Barros Moura to the Commission Subject: Programme for the decommissioning or temporary immobilization of cod-fishing vessels	48
87/C 133/101	No 1958/86 by Mr Pieter Dankert and Mr Eisso Woltjer to the Commission Subject: Cost of public storage of agricultural produce	48
87/C 133/102	No 1961/86 by Mr Richard Cottrell to the Commission Subject: Proposed rail crossing of the Dornoch Firth	49
87/C 133/103	No 1976/86 by Mr Hugh McMahon to the Commission Subject: Culture capital of Europe	50
87/C 133/104	No 1979/86 by Mr Michael Hindley to the Commission Subject: Mercury-based soaps	50
87/C 133/105	No 1991/86 by Mr Jean-Paul Bachy to the Commission Subject: Weekend hours of trading of certain businesses	50

(Continued on inside back cover)

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
87/C 133/106	No 1992/86 by Mr Hans-Jürgen Zahorka to the Commission Subject: Appraisal of the activities of the US Export-Import Bank in the light of the extension of the Bank's statutes from 15 October 1986	51
87/C 133/107	No 2002/86 by Mr Robert Battersby to the Commission Subject: Commission fining policy in competition cases	52
87/C 133/108	No 2003/86 by Mr Victor Arbeloa Muru to the Commission Subject: Aid for the repair and restoration of historic town centres	52
87/C 133/109	No 2010/86 by Mr Otto von Habsburg to the Commission Subject: Aid for black people in South Africa	53
87/C 133/110	No 2433/86 by Mr Kenneth Collins to the Commission Subject: Staff vacancies in the Commission	53
87/C 133/111	No 2675/86 by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke to the Council Subject: Development of new and renewable energy sources	53
87/C 133/112	No 2843/86 by Mr Alfred Lomas and others to the Council Subject: The foreign debt of Third World countries	54
87/C 133/113	No 2938/86 by Mr Enrique Sapena Granell to the Council Subject: Use of flags of convenience in place of flags of the Community fleet	55
87/C 133/114	No 3080/86 by Mrs Martine Lehideux to the Council Subject: AIDS threat	55

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

WRITTEN QUESTION No 19/86
by Mrs Vera Squarcialupi (COM—I)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(10 April 1986)
(87/C 133/01)

Subject: Imported mushrooms from Asia rejected by the USA and on sale in Italy

The Italian Mushrooms-Growers' Association recently condemned the introduction on to the Italian market of fresh and dried mushrooms from China, Korea and Taiwan which it alleged had not undergone health or mycological inspections of any kind. These mushrooms could be dangerous to the consumer as they are from countries that use pesticides outlawed in Italy because they are dangerous. They were apparently rejected by the United States because of the harmful substances they contain, which also increase the weight of the mushrooms by 120 %, whereas it is normal for it to be reduced by 40—45 %. Labelling regulations were also flouted, as the packaging of the preserved mushrooms does not indicated the product's origin.

Could the Commission state whether similar cases have been uncovered in other Member States and whether it could bring the dangerous goods information system into play in this case?

Supplementary answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission
(5 February 1987)

Further to the answer given on 30 May 1986 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission is now in a position to inform the Honourable Member that enquiries which it conducted in Italy and the other Member States produced no confirmation of the matter

referred to. As a result, the Commission concluded that no danger to human health existed and that there was no reason to bring its warning system into operation.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 175, 14. 7. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 621/86
by Mr Carlos Bencomo Mendoza (LDR—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 June 1986)
(87/C 133/02)

Subject: Community financing for the construction of the airport on the island of Gomera

The island of Gomera has no airport, which aggravates its peripheral position in relation to the rest of the Community.

Will the Commission say in what ways the Community participates in the building of airports in island regions?

Does it consider that it would be possible and appropriate to finance infrastructures such as that on Gomera, which, by ending the inhabitants' isolation, would help to give Europe a more distinct image?

Answer given by Mr Pfeiffer
on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 1986)

The Commission has not yet received any grant applications for projects of this kind on the island of Gomera.

It can assure the Honourable Member that any such application would be carefully examined in the light of the

priorities and assessment criteria laid down by Council Regulation (EEC) No 1787/84 of 19 June 1984 on the European Regional Development Fund ⁽¹⁾.

The island or peripheral character of an area or region is one of the criteria which is particularly taken into account in assessing grant applications submitted to the Commission by national authorities.

Furthermore, as the EIB's principal task is to promote regional development, it might provide assistance for an airport construction project on the island of Gomera in the Canary Islands if that project should prove to be economically and technically viable.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 169, 28. 6. 1984, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 680/86

by Mr Michelangelo Ciancaglini (PPE—I)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 July 1986)
(87/C 133/03)

Subject: Broadcasting of RAI programmes in Belgium

1. Is it true that RAI programmes are broadcast in some areas of Belgium, while in others the cable television companies refuse arbitrarily to do so?

2. If so, does the Commission not consider that this arbitrary behaviour represents a breach of the provisions of the EEC Treaty, particularly those concerning the prevention of discrimination against Community citizens and the freedom to provide services?

Furthermore, does the Commission not consider that the refusal to broadcast RAI programmes by some cable television companies is a violation of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty, since these companies enjoy a monopoly situation?

3. What measures will the Commission take to counter these discriminatory actions which are a clear violation of the spirit and letter of the EEC Treaty?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission

(29 October 1986)

The Commission is aware of this situation, which has already been dealt with in the reply to Written Question No 106/86 by Mr Kuijpers, to which the Honourable Member is referred ⁽¹⁾.

Moreover, the Commission is in the process of examining a complaint concerning the failure to relay RAI programmes to certain municipalities in the Flemish-speaking area of Brabant.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 91, 6. 4. 1987, p. 2.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 696/86

by Mr Kenneth Collins (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 July 1986)
(87/C 133/04)

Subject: Vacancy for the post of head of the Commission's London Office

1. Is the Commission aware of the present low state of morale and uncertainty among the staff in the London Office of the Commission and are they aware of the persistent rumours which have appeared in newspapers in the United Kingdom about the senior staff in that office?

2. Will the Commission say what procedures were followed to fill the post vacated by Mr George Scott at the London Office of the Commission? Will they say how many applications were received from internal candidates and will they say how many of these candidates were interviewed?

3. Will the Commission say how many applications were received for the post vacated by Mr George Scott at the London Office of the Commission following the placing of advertisements in British newspapers and will they say how many of these candidates were from outside the existing Commission staff? Will they further say what procedures they followed to draw up a shortlist and to arrange interviews?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1975/86

by Mr Hugh McMahon (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1986)
(87/C 133/05)

Subject: Vacancy in London Press Office of the Commission

Can the Commission inform the House of the progress made so far in filling this vacancy and can it assure the Assembly that the appointment has been made free from political pressure from the Commissioner for the Internal Market, Lord Cockfield?

**Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 696/86 and
1975/86**

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

(30 January 1987)

1. The Commission attaches great importance to the operation of its Information Offices and is concerned about all matters which affect their staffs.

2. Applications from Commission staff for the post of Head of the London Office were invited under the rotation procedure. Eleven members of staff applied and their personal files were carefully scrutinized to see whether they possessed the qualifications required. Two applicants were interviewed for the purpose of investigating further how their qualifications measured up to the needs of the post.

3. The Committee appointed by the Commission to supervise the rotation procedure found that none of the internal applicants had the desired qualifications.

On 10 December the Commission considered the Committee's conclusions and decided:

- (a) to consider null and void the phases of the external selection procedure already completed;
- (b) to assign a temporary A 3 post to the London Office;
- (c) to relaunch an external selection procedure with a view to filling this temporary post after publication of appropriate advertisements.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 707/86

by Mr Pieter Dankert (S—NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 July 1986)

(87/C 133/06)

*Subject: Failure to take proceedings in respect of
Community budget fraud*

Proceedings can no longer be continued against suspects in a very extensive case of Community budget fraud concerning textile imports because the trial has taken such a long time. This was the decision of the Amsterdam Court of Justice in the 'trial of the century' against I.B. of Amstelveen, which is said to have evaded payment of Fl 6 million in import duties by arranging for goods to be imported from countries other than their true country of origin.

1. Has the Commission taken note of the decision by the Amsterdam Court of Justice that proceedings cannot be

continued against the suspects in the above fraud case because too much time has elapsed between their commencement in 1980 and the handling of the appeal in the higher court which is due in September 1986?

2. Is the Commission aware that a good year-and-a-half elapsed before the judgment of the court was promulgated and that the length of time the trial was taking was an important reason for upholding the appeal to Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, under which suspects may escape the penalties imposed?
3. Have the Netherlands authorities fulfilled their obligation to put the unpaid import duties at the disposal of the Community? Have the duties in question, estimated at Fl 6 million, been paid to the Community or have circumstances prevented their collection? If they have not been paid, what action does the Commission intend to take?
4. Having regard to the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the Corigliano case, have the Netherlands authorities rightly upheld the appeal on grounds of the 'reasonable time' clause in this case? If not, why not?
5. Has the Commission taken note of the speech by the President of the Court of 's-Hertogenbosch, Mr van Haren, on 19 February 1986, in which it was stated that an increasing number of appeals are being made in Netherlands legal practice to Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights?
6. Is the trend noted by Mr van Haren also occurring in other Member States in cases of Community budget fraud? If so, which countries are involved and what action does the Commission intend to take?

**Supplementary answer given by Mr Delors
on behalf of the Commission**

(4 February 1987)

Further to its answer of 19 September 1986⁽¹⁾, the Commission can now inform the Honourable Member of the result of its investigations.

In the first place, the Commission would point out that it is for the national courts to decide whether and how to apply Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The Commission has no information as to how, in practice, this Article is being applied by the courts of the various Member States.

As regards the particular case at hand, Article 6 was only applied to its criminal aspects: a separate administrative action, which was not affected by the decision not to pursue the fraud, was brought to recover the duties not paid as a result of that fraud. The own resources involved were

credited to the Commission's accounts in 1980 and 1981. The fraud did not, therefore, result in any loss to the Community budget.

(¹) OJ No C 277, 3. 11. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 728/86

by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 July 1986)

(87/C 133/07)

Subject: Danish discrimination against foreign beer

Following the answer to my Written Question No 2986/85 (¹), am I to assume that the Commission's refusal to take effective steps to end the scandalous Danish prohibition of the import into Denmark of foreign beer is due to lack of political courage or some other political factor, or are there really legal difficulties and, if so, what are they?

(¹) OJ No C 214, 25. 8. 1986, p. 31.

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

(16 February 1987)

The Commission understands that the Honourable Member's question refers to the effects on imports of beer and soft drinks from other Member States, of the Danish Decree 397 of 2 July 1981 on containers for beer, mineral water and soft drinks, as last amended by Decree 95 of 16 March 1984.

After a careful examination of all the aspects involved in this complex and sensitive matter, the Commission has now decided to bring the case before the Court of Justice under the procedure laid down in Article 169 of the EEC Treaty.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 759/86

by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo (ED—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 July 1986)

(87/C 133/08)

Subject: A press agency for the European Community

The ever-increasing influence of the European Community's activities on the overall development of the national life of the Member States means that more information of both a political and a technical nature must be disseminated, so that the general public may be properly acquainted with the ideas behind the Community's whole political and economic *raison d'être*.

Although great efforts have been made in this direction by the various Community Information Offices, it would seem that the time has come for the Community to issue information about the Community directly, in order to create a closer link with the media both inside and outside the Community and make a more effective impression as a political entity in the world at large.

Does the Commission therefore think that the time has come for the Community to have its own press agency to channel information on the Community more effectively and profitably in both the political and the economic spheres?

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

(4 November 1986)

The Commission takes note with care of the encouraging interest shown by the Honourable Member in the furthering of European Community information work and of his specific suggestion concerning the creation of a Community press agency.

On this latter suggestion, the Commission feels that press agencies and other media are at their most credible and effective when, as is the practice in the Community, they are independent of governments and public institutions.

The Commission feels that this consideration is important both as concerns their freedom to report and comment and as concerns their credibility in the eyes of the public. The Commission notes moreover the considerable effort that the existing news agencies devote to the coverage of Community affairs.

The Commission assures the Honourable Member that it continues to seek all appropriate means to promote information and understanding about the Community among European public opinion within the limited human and financial resources available to it.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 838/86

by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (LDR—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 July 1986)

(87/C 133/09)

Subject: Exports of white wine to the USA — Quota restrictions and tariffs applied by the USA

Can the Commission indicate the impact in financial terms of the quota restrictions and fiscal tariffs introduced by the United States which will affect French and Italian exporters of white wines to the USA?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(7 November 1986)

In the context of the dispute between the United States and the Community on various aspects of the recent enlargement of the Community, the United States authorities introduced, from 19 May 1986, quantitative ceilings on imports of various products originating in the Community. These products include white wine valued at more than US\$ 4 a gallon. For this product the ceiling for 1986 has been calculated by the United States authorities to be 40% above the level of imports in 1985. Imports of this product to date have not been limited by the ceiling.

When the United States authorities announced the ceilings mentioned above they also indicated their intention to take steps to suspend temporarily certain GATT tariff concessions on a range of products, including white wine valued at less than US\$ 4 a gallon. Since then these essentially procedural steps have been taken but no changes in tariff rates have been introduced for any of the products following the agreement reached on 1 July between the Community and the United States.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 884/86

by Mr Richard Cottrell (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(14 July 1986)
(87/C 133/10)

Subject: Tourist attractions in Lisbon

One way of assisting the recovery of the flagging Portuguese economy would be to stimulate tourism, especially in the capital, Lisbon. Characteristic of Lisbon are the delightfully decrepit street trams, some of considerable vintage, which enable visitors to see the sights cheaply and with great charm. In America, a similar street car system (coping with the same kind of gradients) has become the international symbol of San Francisco. Without doubt, something similar could be achieved with parts of the tramway system in Lisbon. It would be a tragedy if modern-minded bureaucrats rip up the tram tracks and replace them with expensive, air-polluting buses. Is the Commission prepared to suggest to the Portuguese authorities that they have an undeveloped tourist asset on their hands which, with imagination and Community assistance, could greatly benefit the tourist economy?

**Answer given by Mr Pfeiffer
on behalf of the Commission**
(15 December 1986)

While the Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern, it would point out that the problem in question is one which comes solely within the competence of the Member States.

The Commission is, however, taking an active interest in the promotion of tourism and is prepared to support eligible projects also by ERDF assistance. For the time being and pending the examination of the Portuguese regional aid scheme by the competent services of the Commission there are, however, no ERDF interventions in this area.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 953/86

by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(16 July 1986)
(87/C 133/11)

Subject: Regulation on food surpluses and their use for the less-privileged

Less-privileged groups of people in the European Community might derive much more benefit from the enormous food surpluses. It appears, however, from press reports that the dozen or so regulations on the subject are very little used.

Can the Commission say to what extent efforts have been made to ensure that all sections of the population in the Member States make use of the food surpluses? What has been the result of these efforts?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(2 February 1987)

There are public stocks of food because of the need to withdraw surplus produce from the market in order to support the market price. If market prices rise above the intervention price the stocks are sold back onto the market. This rarely happens, however, where the market surplus has a structural character. In these circumstances, to make the stocks available to the general public would defeat the object of intervention. However, a number of measures have been taken to benefit consumers by selling stocks cheaply in circumstances where there is little or no possibility of competition with the market for the fresh product. Some of these are limited to special categories, notably socially disadvantaged groups, but others have a more general effect in lowering the costs of manufacturers in the areas of, for

instance, patisserie and ice-cream made with butter and processed meat products made with beef. The Commission has recently produced a brochure entitled 'Food surpluses: Disposal for welfare purposes' which describes the current efforts of the Commission and the various Member States to make available food at reduced prices.

Recently, the Commission proposed and the Council approved an extension of the existing Community-financed scheme to sell butter more cheaply to a greater proportion of disadvantaged people. However, reduced price sales of surplus produce to all categories of the population would be self-defeating and excessively expensive.

The Commission has also decided to provide some food free of charge (through voluntary organizations) to help victims of the cold spell.

A copy of the brochure referred to above will be sent directly to the Honourable Member and the Secretariat of Parliament.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 959/86

by Mr James Elles (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 July 1986)

(87/C 133/12)

Subject: Terminology to be used when referring to the European Communities

A recent press release issued by the London Office of the Commission included the phrase 'the 12 Common Market Member States' (paragraph 2 of a release dated June 1986 concerning People and Technology — Investing in Training for Europe's Future).

1. Does the Commission believe this is the correct way in which the European Community should be labelled particularly in the light of amendments to the original Treaties establishing the European Communities?

2. If not, will the Commission make it clear what the correct terminology — including the designation — is that should be used when referring to the European Communities?

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

(9 December 1986)

The Honourable Member will be aware that from time to time the European Communities are wrongly referred to in popular usage as 'the Common Market'.

Material intended for a wide public is drafted with a view to balancing accessibility to a large public with precision of terminology.

The Commission is inclined to the view that a stricter regard for labelling would have been justified in the case to which he refers: this would have led to the use of the term 'The European Communities', as appears from Article 3 of the Single European Act.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1014/86

by Mr Arturo Escuder Croft (ED—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 July 1986)

(87/C 133/13)

Subject: Avocado imports in 1985

For some years, producers in the Canary Islands have been replacing banana crops with other crops such as avocados, which are not yet in full production, since this requires several years.

In order to determine the export potential for the Canaries in this market, it is essential to ascertain the volume of internal consumption in the Community.

Will the Commission therefore give details of avocado imports during 1985 by each of the countries of the European Community, specifying the quantities in tonnes, the value of the products and their country of origin?

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

(10 November 1986)

Statistics for imports of avocados into the Community in 1985 are given below.

Imports of avocados into the EEC in 1985

('000 kg)

	D	F	I	NL	B/Lux	UK	IRL	DK	GR
Extra EEC	4 945	59 056	1 200	2 352	1 213	13 545	53	1 243	33
Of which:									
Israel	3 834	34 676	1 087	1 529	805	7 648	52	1 105	3
South Africa	727	9 866	109	470	364	3 657	0	52	28
Spain	65	8 561	1	72	10	253	0	0	0
Canaries	7	375	0	57	0	747	0	0	0
Martinique	3	3 829	2	5	2	0	0	0	0
United States	0	961	0	9	4	509	0	80	0
Kenya	294	465	2	97	3	537	0	0	0
Brazil	1	171	0	113	4	26	0	0	0

('000 ECU)

	D	F	I	NL	B/Lux	UK	IRL	DK	GR
Extra EEC	6 468	76 305	1 485	3 009	1 617	19 719	64	1 594	49
Of which:									
Israel	4 913	44 226	1 300	1 898	1 041	11 601	64	1 399	6
South Africa	1 020	14 073	178	648	512	5 073	0	79	40
Spain	76	11 132	2	83	11	351	0	0	0
Canaries	8	506	0	68	0	993	0	0	0
Martinique	6	3 891	3	9	3	0	0	0	0
United States	0	1 316	0	5	6	677	0	107	0
Kenya	423	684	3	141	5	720	0	1	1
Brazil	2	251	0	156	5	34	0	0	0

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1049/86

by Mr Ernest Mühlen (PPE—L)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1986)

(87/C 133/14)

2. If so, what steps does it propose to take to ensure that its views prevail and, in this particular case, that the freedom to broadcast television programmes, which it is defending, is assured?

(¹) Written Question No 1370/85 (OJ No C 123, 22. 5. 1986, p. 2).

Subject: Cable relay of RTL broadcasts in Bremen

With reference to the Commission's written answer to my written question concerning authorization for RTL programmes in the Federal Republic of Germany (¹), I should like to inform the Commission that the statements made in its answer have been disputed by the Senate of Bremen.

In this connection, I should like to ask the Commission the following supplementary questions:

1. Having regard to the arguments put forward by the Senate of Bremen, does the Commission still maintain the views set out in its answer to my abovementioned written question?

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

(2 December 1986)

1. Yes.
2. The Commission has initiated the procedure provided for in Article 169 of the EEC Treaty.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1054/86

by Mr Alasdair Hutton (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 July 1986)

(87/C 133/15)

Subject: Support for audio-visual information

Does the Commission agree that radio and television are the most effective way of passing on information to the general public to create a greater general awareness of the work of the European Community?

Does the Commission agree that films and other audio-visual aids should be available for use by educational and training institutions and available at seminars and exhibitions, etc.?

Would the Commission say how much it spent in 1985 and proposes to spend in 1986 on:

- support for the audio-visual industry;
- audio-visual information, both for radio and television as well as non-broadcast material;
- written information;
- other information activities?

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

(4 November 1986)

The Commission is convinced that the media in general, and today television in particular, provide the best channel for creating a greater public awareness of the Community.

The Commission is equally convinced of the importance of using video, film and other audiovisual material in fields like education, training and promotion.

Audiovisual material, whether for TV or for other use, is expensive to produce, but can have far greater impact than more traditional information material, especially with younger people who are growing up in an increasingly audio-visual society. The Commission acknowledges the enormous importance of its activity in this sector, and, within its very limited information budget, gives what technical and financial support it can to TV and radio programmes on Community affairs and produces one or two films a year for educational and other use. It hopes gradually to expand its activity in these fields.

The breakdown of the Commission's information budget is being communicated directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat General of the European Parliament.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1087/86

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

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 133/16)

Subject: Radioactive hay

Federal German experts have just stated in the American periodical 'Nature' that the hay that will be harvested in Bavaria in a few months' time will contain a possibly dangerous dose of radioactivity.

Is the Commission aware of this article? What measures might be taken to provide winter feed for the cattle in the areas concerned?

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

(2 December 1986)

The Commission has no knowledge of the study mentioned by the Honourable Member.

If any national scheme to assist areas where hay might be deemed unfit for consumption is notified to the Commission, it will review the matter with all the necessary care and attention.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1129/86

by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 133/17)

Subject: Community action to encourage the formation of groups of small and medium-sized undertakings in the tourism sector

The trend in financial negotiation in the tourist sector in the European Economic Community has been almost exclusively towards wholesale contracting as regards planning the campaigns which the various parties involved in such negotiation have to deal with.

The result of this concentration in the hands of wholesale dealers has been to cause some degree of distress to the small and medium-sized undertakings in the sector, as it means that they are forced to accept the conditions imposed on them by the wholesale bodies concerned, which take advantage of their dominant position to impose adverse trading conditions.

This would be mitigated, however, if encouragement was given to the formation of groups among the small and medium-sized undertakings in question, which would help to improve their negotiating position against the wholesale dealers.

Does the Commission therefore think it would be useful to initiate a Community enactment to encourage and promote groups of small and medium-sized undertakings involved in tourism, for their own protection and advantage?

**Answer given by Mr Matutes
on behalf of the Commission**
(10 November 1986)

The Commission is well aware of the importance of tourism as a significant component of the Community's economy.

So that this branch of the economy may be more effectively involved in the Community's deliberations and measures, the Commission has set up a tourism department within the Transport Directorate-General.

Small and medium-sized undertakings are receiving particular attention from the Commission.

However, the action programme which the Commission recently put before the Council and Parliament ⁽¹⁾ does not propose measures specifically aimed at protecting small and medium-sized undertakings against other interest groups.

On the other hand, Regulation (EEC) No 2137/85 adopted by the Council on 25 July 1985 on the European Economic Interest Grouping (EEIG) will provide a general legal framework for cooperation between firms on an international level, irrespective of their economic sectors. This new legal entity under European law was created above all to provide a solution to the problems facing small and medium-sized undertakings.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. COM(86) 445.

for covering the Community's work are daily required to possess a greater volume of specialized knowledge on Community matters.

It therefore seems increasingly as though it would be useful if a training centre were set up within the Community, to which people professionally involved in news-gathering could go both to acquire solid basic training by following an appropriate course of study and to update knowledge required for specialization in Community affairs.

Has the Commission given any thought to the usefulness of considering whether there is any point in setting up a training centre such as the above, to disseminate a wider knowledge of the subjects which journalists covering the growth of the Community normally have to deal with throughout the Community?

**Answer given by Mr Ripa di Meana
on behalf of the Commission**
(26 January 1987)

The Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that, in view of the increase in Community activities, the Community dimension should figure more prominently in journalist training.

Hence its support for developing basic training in such a way as to ensure that professional journalists are more familiar with Community activities and its steps in this direction.

As regards television in particular, the Commission is working on a number of pilot projects to develop regular programmes of exchanges for young journalists working at the different European broadcasting stations and of seminars for editors and persons responsible for specialized information.

These programmes should allow participants to improve their knowledge of European affairs, working methods in other countries, and the functioning of the Community institutions.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1130/86
by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 September 1986)
(87/C 133/18)

Subject: European school of journalism

The increase in the working size of the European Economic Community means that professional journalists responsible

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1163/86
by Mr Louis Eyraud (S—F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(2 September 1986)
(87/C 133/19)

Subject: Commission decision of 30 April 1986 on guidelines for the European Social Fund

In its decision of 30 April 1986 on guidelines for the European Social Fund, the Commission 'declassified' certain

areas which had hitherto been regarded as priority areas. What alternative financing does the Commission envisage to allow those measures which everyone recognizes as useful to continue, particularly those relating to training, which could be seriously compromised without European Social Fund support? (I do not include of course the measures designated as priority measures on qualitative criteria under the decision of 30 April 1986 which will continue to be eligible for European Social Fund financing.)

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

(10 November 1986)

The concentration of the Community's budgetary resources in those regions which are most affected by social and economic problems is a basic concern of the Commission in the context of budgetary restrictions. With this aim in mind the Commission decided to reduce the number of priority regions for purposes of assistance from the European Social Fund. In 1987, the working population in these regions will be 57% of the working population of the Community as against 63% in 1986. This decision was indispensable in order to limit recourse to an across-the-board reduction in appropriations as applied in those cases where the appropriations requested for programmes regarded as priority by the Commission exceed the budget allocated to the Social Fund. If this reduction is too great, Fund beneficiaries will receive too small a proportion of the appropriations which they expect to receive from the Community; hence there is a considerable risk that it will prove impossible to implement the programme. This situation is unacceptable and for this reason the Commission is trying to ensure that operations mounted in disadvantaged regions have a chance of success.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1169/86

by Mr Paul Staes (ARC—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 133/20)

Subject: Financing for nuclear power stations

It was announced at the beginning of July that a bank consortium headed by the *Westdeutsche Landesbank*, together with the European Commission was issuing a loan of 100 million ECU. This loan was to finance nuclear power stations.

Does the Commission not believe that after the events in Chernobyl, the violent reactions, particularly in the Federal Republic of Germany and the forthcoming debate on the future of Community energy policy, in particular in the

European Parliament, that it is hardly appropriate, especially on the initiative of the Commission, to take such steps?

Why is the Commission not prepared to freeze this loan, at least for the time being?

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

(4 December 1986)

The Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the final communiqué from The Hague meeting of the European Council on 26—27 June 1986, which recognizes *inter alia* 'the fact that nuclear energy is being increasingly used in a number of countries'.

In the light of that statement, in particular, the Commission does not consider that it should have frozen the loan to which the Honourable Member refers.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1214/86

by Mr Otmar Franz (PPE—D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 133/21)

Subject: Admissibility of investment aid to companies involved in both the manufacture and processing of steel

Under the provisions of Articles 92 and 93 of the EEC Treaty, governments may grant State aids for investment projects to companies which process steel. Under Article 4 of the ECSC Treaty, however, investment aid to companies which manufacture steel is expressly prohibited.

There are many companies which both manufacture and process steel. If aid is granted for investment in the processing sector, a corresponding proportion of the company's own funds is released for investment in its manufacturing sector. This could enable the company to implement an investment programme which is at variance with the Commission's general objectives.

Will the Commission consider aid for investment projects in such instances not only under the rules set out in the EEC Treaty (Articles 92 and 93), but also under those set out in the ECSC Treaty (Article 54 (4) and (5))?

How will the Commission ensure that companies do not circumvent the ban on aid laid down in Article 54 (5) of the ECSC Treaty?

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

(17 December 1986)

The Commission fully shares the Honourable Member's concern, and has recently undertaken a thoroughgoing study of industries downstream from ECSC steelmaking which are controlled to any degree by steel groups.

Preliminary conclusions have recently been discussed with the steel experts nominated by Member States.

When this study is complete the Commission will if necessary make known the attitude it proposes to take towards these industries in exercising the powers conferred on it by Articles 92 and 93 of the EEC Treaty.

of which is to boarden and improve access for disadvantaged persons to the scheme for the disposal of butter stocks at reduced prices.

The Commission has often explained its policy on the disposal of stocks. The implementation of this policy is monitored and adapted regularly by the Commission on the basis of the market situation.

Sales of beef (the only type of meat of which there are Community stocks) at reduced prices have been organized since 1979: Access for charities and voluntary organizations to these sales is restricted by the refusal of many member countries (except France, Italy, Belgium and Greece) to implement the scheme in their countries.

The Commission has also decided to supply some food free (through voluntary organizations) to victims of the cold spell.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1234/86

by Mr José Happart (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 133/22)

Subject: Use of agricultural surpluses for the poor

Charity organizations such as 'les restaurants du cœur' are experiencing difficulties in procuring food for the poor.

As the Commission intends to introduce a policy to dispose of surplus food stocks, has it already drawn up proposals for the Council on the problem of procuring food stocks?

Has the Commission envisaged financial support to enable local authorities to fulfill all their responsibilities towards the poor?

Does it intend to make public its policy of disposing of stocks?

Poverty is inducing the public to buy cheap meat. Why does the Commission not contemplate selling meat at reduced prices on the internal market?

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

(23 January 1987)

The Council has adopted various Commission proposals concerning the disposal of food surpluses for welfare purposes. These proposals are described in a document entitled 'Food surpluses and disposal for welfare purposes', a copy of which will be sent directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat General of Parliament. The Council still has to approve a Commission proposal the aim

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1253/86

by Mr Horst Seefeld (S—D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 133/23)

Subject: Harassment of Community citizens when entering the USA

I have received complaints to the effect that, when citizens of Community Member States enter the United States of America, considerable difficulties arise owing to an antiquated checking system. Travellers at their wits' end report waiting times of up to four hours at John F. Kennedy Airport, New York, in labyrinthine, windowless corridors. People already waiting in the endless queues often have fainting fits.

1. What ways has the Commission — possibly through its mission in the USA — of protesting to the American Government at these undignified methods of clearing passengers and of pressing for them to be abolished?
2. Does the Commission share the view of many disgusted citizens that, if no improvements are forthcoming, US citizens travelling to Europe should be treated in exactly the same way as currently happens in the USA?

**Answer given by Mr De Clercq
on behalf of the Commission**

(17 December 1986)

1. The underlying problem of the often lengthy and unpleasant clearance procedures for Community citizens

arriving in the United States is that they continue to be subject to US visa requirements. It is the Commission's view that Member States' citizens should not be subject to US visa requirements, given that US citizens can travel to and within the Community without needing a visa, subject to the most recent measures announced by the French Government for security reasons on 14 September.

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's assessment of the practices described in the question.

Since the Community does not yet have a common policy on visas, it does not have exclusive competence in the matter.

2. The Commission points out that the abolition of checks at internal frontiers should be accompanied by the development of a Community policy on visas (together with a Directive on coordination of the rules on residence, entry and access to employment applicable to nationals of non-Community countries). Consequently the Commission envisages a proposal for a Directive on a Community policy on visas for 1988, to be adopted by the Council by 1990.

In the light of the above, the Commission is at this stage not in a position to propose a revision of national visa legislation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1287/86

by Mr Joachim Dalsass (PPE—I)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 September 1986)

(87/C 133/24)

Subject: Financing of the 'Women help Women' action centre set up by the South Tyrol Catholic Families Association in Bolzano

The South Tyrol Catholic Families Association, together with various other associations and organizations, has set up a 'Women help Women' action centre to provide women in adverse circumstances, because of difficult family situations or living conditions, with practical emergency assistance. It is not only an advisory centre but also provides help as quickly and unbureaucratically as possible to women who are often no longer able to cope on their own with day-to-day problems and difficulties. Such a service requires considerable funding if it is to intervene effectively.

Would the Commission be in a position to give financial support to such a service? If so, what steps should be taken in order to obtain such support?

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

(10 November 1986)

The Commission would be very interested to know the exact nature of the project for which the Centre referred to by the Honourable Member might wish to request a subsidy.

A centre of the kind described could qualify for Community aid if it wished to carry out a project in line with the objectives and actions contained in the Medium-Term Community Programme on Equal Opportunities for Women (1986—1990). No special application form is needed for this purpose, but an applicant for such aid must send the Commission the following information:

- a full description of the project (objectives, measures, ways and means, etc.),
- details of the envisaged budget, by item, in national currency,
- any other sources of finance to be used (e.g. other grants or loans, own contribution or bank loans), and
- the bank account (number, address and title holder) to which a possible subsidy should be transferred.

It is important to note in this context that, although the Commission can give financial help to projects, it cannot subsidise the running expenses of an organization. A copy of the Community Programme referred to above ⁽¹⁾ is being sent directly to the Honourable Member for his information and to the Secretariat General of the Parliament.

⁽¹⁾ COM(85) 801 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1327/86

by Mr Axel Zarges (PPE—D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 September 1986)

(87/C 133/25)

Subject: Financial support for organizations at European Community level concerned with animals, game, nature conservation and the environment

My Written Question No 156/86 to the Commission was precise and to the point. The answer given by the Commissioner Clinton Davis on 1 July 1986 was couched in very general terms, was imprecise and vague. A Member is entitled to receive from the Commission proper, full replies to questions.

I would therefore repeat and put as supplementary questions;

1. Is the Commission prepared to give financial support to the valuable activities relating to hunting animals and the environment by FACE and its 6,5 million members

throughout the Community (the conservation of wild fauna, the creation of optimum ecological conditions and giving proper importance to nature conservation and environmental protection in conjunction with the care and protection of game in areas developed and cultivated by man)? The Court of Justice allows such financial support.

2. Are there other non-governmental organizations, similar to the Eurogroup for Animal welfare, at Community level, i.e. in all Member States, active in the field of environmental protection and the care and protection of game and other animals, receiving financial support from the Commission?
3. How much does the Commission or the European Community pay each year to the Eurogroup for Animal Welfare?

(¹) OJ No C 299, 24. 11. 1986, p. 49.

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

(22 January 1987)

1. Under budget line 6681 — support for European organizations in the field of animal welfare — which, until June 1986 was frozen as a result of action of the European Court of Justice — the Commission will, as stated in reply to the Honourable Member's earlier Written Question No 156/86, examine all valid proposals for support made by organizations for the protection of animals.
2. The Commission has over the years given financial support to a number of non-governmental organizations active in the field of environmental protection.
3. No grants have as yet been paid to Eurogroup for Animal Welfare under budget line 6681, though consideration is at present being given to this possibility.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1338/86

by Mr Terence Pitt (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 September 1986)

(87/C 133/26)

Subject: United Kingdom market and imports of heavy trailers

Would the Commission state the total Community demand for heavy trailers, of a semi- and drawbar type exceeding 24 tonnes gross weight, over each of the last five years and will it

identify the Member States which have in this five-year period increased their proportion of the total Community market and those which have lost production?

Would the Commission also state whether it is conducting investigations, or whether it has received complaints, on the matter of unfair non-tariff barriers to trade between Member States in this sector of vehicle manufacture?

Will the Commission specifically state whether it is taking any action on the decision of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany not to recognize approval tests carried out in other Member States on vehicles which it imports?

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

(3 November 1986)

1. The Commission has not made a systematic study of this market. However, it will be pleased to provide relevant statistical information on production and sales in a number of Member States, as well as on Community external trade, drawn from national sources and Eurostat publications.
2. The Commission has not received any complaints on unfair trading barriers in this sector, nor any information on a decision by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany of the kind the Honourable Member mentions. If further information can be provided on this matter, in particular whether any Member State duplicates tests, the Commission would not hesitate to take this matter up in an appropriate way.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1366/86

by Mr Edward Newman (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(18 September 1986)

(87/C 133/27)

Subject: Import of Namibian and South African uranium oxide into the Community

In the light of Chapters VI and VIII of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom), and of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist South African regime and the consequential United Nations Decree No 1 (1974) for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

Could the Commission please specify:

- (a) under what contracts is uranium oxide originating from South Africa currently being imported into the Community?
- (b) under what contracts is uranium oxide originating from Namibia being currently imported into the Community?

**Answer given by Mr Mosar
on behalf of the Commission**
(8 December 1986)

The Commission does not consider itself authorized to answer the questions put by the Honourable Member, since the transactions to which he refers are covered by trade secrecy.

(d) As regards IAEA safeguards, such materials are also subject, depending on where they are held, to the provisions of the Agreement between Euratom, its nine NNWS (non-nuclear-weapon-States) and the International Atomic Energy Authority, the Agreement between Euratom, the United Kingdom and the International Atomic Energy Authority, the Agreement between Euratom, France and the International Atomic Energy Authority, and various agreements between Spain, the International Atomic Energy Authority and third countries.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1368/86
by Mr Edward Newman (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 September 1986)
(87/C 133/28)

Subject: Implementation of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom)

In the light of the Euratom Treaty, in particular Chapters VI and VIII thereof, could the Commission answer the following questions:

- (a) When the provisions of the Euratom Treaty came into force in the United Kingdom, did Euratom acquire ownership of all uranium oxide then held in the United Kingdom (as specified in Article 86 of the Euratom Treaty)? If not, which stocks were acquired by Euratom?
- (b) If the United Kingdom, or any other Member State, acquires uranium oxide for military purposes, does Euratom own this material?
- (c) How many tonnes of uranium oxide, owned by Euratom, are currently held in the United Kingdom? What is the breakdown, in tonnes, by country of origin of this material?
- (d) What safeguards apply to the use of uranium oxide in the Member States, including the United Kingdom?

**Answer given by Mr Mosar
on behalf of the Commission**
(22 January 1987)

- (a) Yes, within the meaning of the Euratom Treaty and where such stocks are special fissile materials subject to the safeguards provided for in Chapter VII of the Euratom Treaty.
- (b) No.
- (c) Since the information requested by the Honourable Member is a trade secret, the Commission regrets that it is not in a position to answer this part of the question.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1370/86
by Mr Dieter Rogalla (S—D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 September 1986)
(87/C 133/29)

Subject: Price of milk for the consumer

1. Is the Commission aware that, in Sardinia, a litre of UHT milk from the local dairy, Arborer, is marketed at Lit 1 100 and Lit 600 per litre and half-litre respectively, while in the same shop a litre of comparable UHT milk produced in, and imported from, Bavaria costs only Lit 1 000?
2. How does the Commission account for this rather implausible price disparity? Does such pricing further the programmes launched by the Commission to improve farmers' livelihoods in the Member States, and is it in keeping with them?
3. Does the Commission agree that, in a properly organized agricultural market where, to a large extent, the dairy sector is publicly funded on the basis of attractive guaranteed prices, the pricing policy referred to is tantamount to unjustifiably aggressive competition, and is it prepared to take appropriate action quickly to protect local, traditional dairy farmers?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(27 January 1987)

1. The Commission has no information concerning consumer prices for drinking milk broken down by region.
2. The price differences mentioned by the Honourable Member are caused by differences in the cost of producing raw milk. According to the latest publication of Eurostat (Agricultural Prices No 2/86), the average farmgate price in 1985 for milk with 3,7% fat content in Italy was 34,00 ECU/100 kg (excluding VAT) and 27,06 ECU/100 kg in the Federal Republic of Germany (the third highest price), while on average Irish producers obtained only 22,83 ECU/100 kg. These differences were influenced by a number of factors, notably differing structures of dairy farming and processing, differing production programmes and farming systems and differing sizes of the production sectors.

Also, in the case of Italy, the differences are accounted for by the fact that, under Law No 306, the regions must fix a minimum producer price for milk. This is implemented in a manner which has the effect that the prices set are a good deal higher than the Community's target price for milk. At the instance of the Commission, the Court of Justice of the European Communities has already ruled that the relevant clause in Law No 306 is incompatible with Community requirements.

3. The Commission does not agree that the case in question is one of 'cut-throat' competition. The price difference noted by the Honourable Member corresponds to the differing costs of producing raw milk.

It should also be noted that the rate of self-sufficiency for milk in Italy is well under 100% and that imports from other Member States are therefore in keeping with the concept of a common market and, indeed, desirable.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1379/86

by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(18 September 1986)

(87/C 133/30)

Subject: Irradiation of food

Is the Commission satisfied that it has full information about the development of irradiation of food in the Member States, to ensure the safety of consumers, and would it consider carrying out a study of the legal provisions in the Member States relating to irradiation and the level of knowledge of this matter currently available to Member State authorities?

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

(2 December 1986)

Yes. The Scientific Committee for Food has, on behalf of the Commission, carried out a full scientific review of information internationally available.

The Commission is now discussing with Member States the form of a possible Community act on food irradiation. It is not therefore necessary to carry out a further study on legislation in the Member States.

The Honourable Member is referred to the Commission's reply to Written Question No 885/86 by Mr Cottrell ⁽¹⁾ for further details.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 54, 2. 3. 1987, p. 30.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1388/86

by Mr Arturo Escuder Croft (ED—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(18 September 1986)

(87/C 133/31)

Subject: Regulations on imitation milk products

Community stocks of milk products are rising steadily and face fierce competition from imitation products, such as imitation drinking milk, imitation condensed milk, etc.

According to reliable estimates, millions of tonnes of these imitation products are consumed every year, representing very serious competition for the sale of milk products.

1. Does the Commission intend to submit proposals for regulations governing the presentation and consumption of imitation milk products?
2. Has the Commission looked into the consequences of a total ban on the production and marketing of these imitation products?

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

(22 January 1987)

1. The Commission has not adopted any specific provisions concerning the presentation and release for consumption of imitations of milk and milk products. On the other hand, it laid before the Council on 29 March 1984 a proposal concerning the names given to milk and milk products on marketing ⁽¹⁾, which was the subject of an amendment sent to the Council on 18 April 1986 ⁽²⁾: the Commission preferred to adopt rules designed to reserve certain names solely for milk and milk products. If this proposal were adopted by the Council, the result would be that certain names and certain presentations associated with milk or milk products, liable to mislead consumers, could no longer be used for imitations.

2. The Commission has not contemplated prohibiting the production or marketing of imitation products within the Community, and has therefore not considered the implications of such a measure.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 111, 26. 4. 1984, p. 7.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 234, 16. 9. 1986, p. 2.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1396/86

by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 September 1986)
(87/C 133/32)

Subject: Barley exported from the north of England

Will the Commission give the exact locations in the north of England from which the 263 152 tonnes of barley were exported to third countries under the provisions of Article 2 of Regulation (EEC) No 3217/85 ⁽¹⁾?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 303, 16. 11. 1985, p. 38.

Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(20 November 1986)

The 'North' which is specified in Article 2 of Regulation (EEC) No 3217/85, refers to the North of England and Scotland.

690 000 tonnes of barley were exported under the Regulation, and the location of the stores in the North, which have been provided by the Intervention Board at Reading are as follows:

Scotland

Arbroath
Evanton
Duns
Drumlithie
Penicuik
Turriff
Stracathro
Keith
Leven
Fearn

Northern England

Hull
Driffield
Tholthorpe
Bridlington
Blyth
Belford
Goxhill

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1397/86

by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 September 1986)
(87/C 133/33)

Subject: Foreign-language teachers in Great Britain

Is it lawful for British employers of foreign-language teachers to employ natives of those countries in preference to British nationals?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1398/86

by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 September 1986)
(87/C 133/34)

Subject: British teachers in France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium and Italy

Is it the case that people of British nationality are prohibited from obtaining work as teachers of English in France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium and Italy?

Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1397/86 and 1398/86 given by Mr Marin
on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 1986)

Community law on the free movement of persons does not prohibit British education establishments from employing foreign teachers to teach foreign languages in preference to British teachers.

In virtually all other Member States, English is usually taught in both private and public establishments by teachers who are nationals of the state in question.

The Commission considers that such posts should be accessible to nationals of other Member States on an equal footing with nationals of the host Member State. Only in a very few cases where the employment of a teacher in a public establishment could entail participation in the exercise of powers conferred by public law and duties designed to safeguard the general interests of the State or other public authorities, could exception to free access to the post in question provided for in Article 48 (4) of the Treaty be invoked.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1438/86

by Mr Louis Eyraud (S—F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(26 September 1986)
(87/C 133/35)

Subject: Sheepmeat market

During his visit to Limousin, Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission, acknowledged that the beef, veal and sheepmeat producers were in an increasingly precarious situation and stated that he was willing to consider any suggestions put forward.

In the light of the facts and the Commissioner's statement, could the Commission introduce a ceiling of 500 ewes per flock for allocating the ewe premium and harmonize the common organization of markets in sheepmeat throughout the Community, while retaining the concept of sensitive areas?

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

(5 February 1987)

In the 1986 price proposals and related measures, the Commission in fact proposed a ceiling on the number of ewes per farm eligible for the ewe premium, but the Council did not accept this. The harmonization of the entire sheepmeat organization has long been a Commission objective.

In the short term, the Commission has just adopted a number of measures to cover the difficulties sheepfarmers have to contend with: aids to private storage, a 75% advance in 1986 (instead of 30%) of the estimated premium, a proposal to the Council for the devaluation of the French Franc, and the seasonal modulation of the ewe premium.

To date the Commission has made no specific proposals for the harmonization at Community level of standards for the protection of the environment in connection with the intensive rearing of poultry.

Nevertheless, in its recent Green Paper entitled 'Perspectives for the Common Agricultural Policy' ⁽¹⁾, the Commission suggested common action to control the problems arising from intensive livestock production. It considers such action as being not only in the interest of protecting the environment, but also desirable with a view to ensuring fair conditions of competition, and feels that it could take the form of the issue of permits for the construction of buildings for intensive livestock production and for the exercise of such activities.

⁽¹⁾ COM(85) 333 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1443/86

by Mr Alfons Boesmans (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 September 1986)

(87/C 133/36)

Subject: Intensive chicken-rearing units

For some considerable time, an undertaking of this nature has been causing problems in St Pauwels (in East Flanders, Belgium) because of inordinate stench, noise and ground pollution.

In the Netherlands the building of this kind of chicken farm has in fact been banned since 1985.

What exactly are the present European standards for building and operating chicken farms and which Member States have already introduced these standards?

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

(29 January 1987)

Since 1985 the Netherlands has had an agricultural and environmental law prohibiting for two years the setting up of any intensive chicken or pig-rearing units in areas that already have a very high density of such undertakings.

As far as the Commission is aware, similar measures have not been adopted in any other Member State. Authorization to operate such undertakings, however, is frequently subject to environmental protection restrictions, for example in the context of the 'Gülleverordnung' in the Federal Republic of Germany or the law on classified industrial units in France.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1449/86

by Mr Gijs de Vries (LDR—NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 September 1986)

(87/C 133/37)

Subject: European Media Venture Fund

A serious shortage of venture capital exists for the financing of television and film productions in the European Community. In general, each country finances television and film productions nationally. In addition, most productions are distributed in a single Member State only.

The demand for television and film productions is forecasted to grow substantially over the next few years. As the European Parliament has repeatedly emphasized, the European television and film production industry will have to be stimulated to meet this increase in demand.

In 1985, the Commission published a draft resolution on a Community aid scheme for non-documentary cinema and television co-productions (COM(85) 174 final). As subsequent discussions at Council level have made clear, however, the chances of this draft Regulation being adopted are small.

A few months ago the Euro Media Venture Fund (EMVF) was set up to provide venture capital with the specific purpose of obtaining rights to or producing television programmes and films which cater for an international public. The EMVF will become operational as soon as financial support from the Community has been secured. A guarantee is being sought to finance losses incurred on investments by EMVF for the next four years of up to 50% of the nominal investments, with an aggregate maximum of 160 million ECU.

EMVF will be incorporated in Luxembourg as a limited liability company according to Luxembourgish law. Pierson,

Heldring & Pierson NV is the initiator of EMVF. EMVF's shares will be placed with European investors by a syndicate of European banks headed by Pierson, Heldring & Pierson NV. The shares will be issued in ECU.

EMF presented its plans to the European Commission in May 1986. What is the reaction of the Commission?

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

(8 December 1986)

The European Media Venture Fund (EMVF) initiated by Pierson, Heldring & Pierson NV is a proposition which is of interest to the Commission.

Within the framework of its Action Programme for the European Audiovisual Media Products Industry, the Commission is closely following developments in the field of media credit and financing. In this field a group of European banking institutions, including Pierson, Heldring & Pierson, are now studying ways and means to set up a Europe-wide credit system for audiovisual — cinema and television — production in conjunction with a parallel distribution system.

Under the Action Programme referred to above, the Commission will during 1987 organize a number of workshops on specialized subjects in the fields of production, distribution and financing. These workshops will be aimed at defining the areas of individual projects with a possibility of future sponsoring by the Commission. The encouragement to a Europe-wide financing system will be one of the first subjects to be considered.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1451/86

by Mr Willy Vernimmen (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 September 1986)

(87/C 133/38)

Subject: Community assistance for Turkish guest workers

Could the Commission indicate whether the Community provides any financial assistance for Turkish guest workers, more particularly for them to attend language classes?

If so:

- what are the conditions for qualification for such assistance (student numbers, course content, etc.)?
- what projects have qualified for Community assistance to date and what sums has the Community provided?

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

(19 December 1986)

Financial aid for the social integration of Turkish workers and members of their family is granted by the Commission under various headings:

- The European Social Fund grants assistance for vocational training, in combination with language training, to migrant workers, irrespective of nationality. It is impossible to give figures concerning individual nationalities since generally speaking these measures relate to persons of several nationalities without any distinction being made.
- As part of the action programme on education ⁽¹⁾, several pilot projects are in part aimed at improving the teaching of Turkish language and culture: Belgian Limbourg, primary education (1976—1982), Leyden, primary education (1977—1980), Enschede, nursery and primary education (1979—1982), Marseilles, nursery and primary education (1979—1982), Belgian Limbourg, secondary education (1982—1987).

A pilot project carried out in Berlin, from 1982 to 1986, in cooperation with the Federal Government and the *Land* authorities, was aimed at developing and trying out in practice teaching materials for Turkish pupils at secondary schools who had chosen the Turkish language as a foreign language ⁽²⁾. The contribution by the Commission to the Berlin pilot project was 60 000 ECU per year.

In this context Directive 77/486/EEC ⁽³⁾ should be recalled which requires the Member States to promote the teaching of the language and culture of origin in cooperation with the country of origin and in coordination with normal teaching.

When this Directive was adopted the political will of the Council and the Member States was confirmed to realize the aims of the Directive on behalf of all the children of migrant workers, whether or not they came from Member States.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 38, 19. 2. 1976.

⁽²⁾ Doc. COM(84) 244.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 199, 6. 8. 1977, p. 32.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1463/86

by Mr Florus Wijsenbeek (LDR—NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 September 1986)

(87/C 133/39)

Subject: Freedom of establishment for dentists

Can the Commission state whether the report in the *Algemeen Dagblad* of 4 September 1986 is true, namely

that the Netherlands, notwithstanding the freedom of establishment granted to dentists in the European Community, does not admit foreign dentists and that the Federal Republic of Germany is considering a similar measure?

If this is so, what steps is the Commission considering taking against such infringements of the European rules on the mutual recognition of diplomas. Will the Commission also outline the rules on the establishment of dentists in the other Member States, including Spain and Portugal?

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

(19 December 1986)

As far as the Commission is aware, the Netherlands is not opposed to freedom of establishment on its territory for dentists from other Member States. At the same time, the Netherlands has taken measures which have the effect of freeing the sickness insurance funds from the obligation to approve any dentist automatically for purposes of reimbursing medical costs. This has led to the appearance of waiting lists for purposes of approval. However, Dutch dentists and dentists from other Member States are included on the waiting lists in the order in which they have applied and according to the Dutch authorities no discrimination is made between them when names on the lists come up for approval.

The problems currently applying in the Netherlands are basically the result of the fact that the number of students graduating from dental schools exceeds the numbers which can be approved for purposes of reimbursement from the sickness insurance funds. The Dutch authorities have already taken certain measures to deal with the resultant imbalance, in particular by closing the Utrecht Dental School. Other measures are in progress. At the same time these measures will not take full effect until several years have elapsed and the surplus of dentists graduating from dental schools has been absorbed. Even though this situation is to be regretted, as is obvious from the foregoing (and subject to a more detailed examination currently in progress), the Commission cannot contend that the Dutch authorities have infringed Community law.

The Commission has no information to the effect that the Federal Republic of Germany is planning similar measures.

The right of establishment in a Member State of dentists coming from other Member States is governed by Articles 52 ff. of the EEC Treaty as well as by Council Directives 78/686/EEC and 78/687/EEC⁽¹⁾, as amended by Directive 81/1957/EEC⁽²⁾ and the Acts of Accession relating on the one hand to Greece⁽³⁾ and on the other to Spain and Portugal⁽⁴⁾.

As regards free movement of dentists from Member States in relation to Greece, this is covered by Article 45 of the

Accession Treaty which in paragraph 1 (2) provides that 'the present Member States and the Hellenic Republic may retain in force until 1 January 1988, with regard to Hellenic nationals and to nationals of the present Member States respectively, national provisions submitting to prior authorization immigration undertaken with a view to pursuing an activity as an employed person and/or the taking up of pursuit of paid employment.'

For derogations of a similar kind as regards Spain and Portugal, in addition to referring to the answer given by the Commission to his Written Question No 1937/85⁽⁵⁾, the Honourable Member is referred to the answer to Written Question No 3162/85 by Mrs Lenz⁽⁶⁾.

The Commission hopes that all Member States will continue to respect Community law as regards the free movement of dentists as they have done up to the present.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 233, 24. 8. 1978, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 385, 31. 12. 1981, p. 25.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 291, 19. 11. 1979, p. 9.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 302, 15. 11. 1985, p. 9.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 119, 20. 5. 1986.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ No L 277, 3. 11. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1469/86

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 September 1986)

(87/C 133/40)

Subject: Social aids to the iron and steel industry

Can the Commission provide a statement of the amounts received by the Member States' Governments under the different social aids (Article 56, social section, vocational training) in the iron and steel industry since 1980?

Does the Commission have a breakdown by undertaking? Can it provide details for Cockerill-Sambre and Usinor for the same period?

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

(6 November 1986)

In the 1980-85 period, the total of readaptation aid paid to ECSC workers in the various Member States under Article 56 (2) (b) of the ECSC Treaty was as follows:

Member State	Total (ECU)
Belgium	46 438 250
Denmark	3 775 500
Germany	126 327 500
France	134 366 000
Ireland	1 126 000
Italy	77 742 000
Luxembourg	20 249 000
Netherlands	6 205 500
United Kingdom	367 537 500
Total	783 767 250

These totals include so-called traditional aids — granted under procedures agreed bilaterally between the Commission and national governments and including income support allowances for workers who are unemployed or who have been redeployed, bridging pension allowances, aids for geographic mobility and vocational training — and aids granted under the social support measures programme according to criteria adopted by the Council, which make it possible to assume, in particular, the costs resulting from early retirement.

They do not include conversion loan aids (Article 56 (2) (a)) — which concern redeployment of workers in both the coal and steel industries, so that it is impossible to give figures for the steel sector alone — or, for a similar reason, the aid granted by the European Social Fund.

As regards a breakdown by undertaking, it is impossible to give one for the total of social aid granted, such amounts being indissociable (particularly those granted under the social support measures) from those granted to the workers of other steel undertakings.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1479/86

by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 September 1986)

(87/C 133/41)

Subject: A publication about trade fairs and exhibitions of interest to visitors to the European Community

As business activities in the tourist industry have increased and expanded, there has at the same time been a development of trade fairs, exhibitions and other events aimed at informing the business sector concerned and the general public about various features, attractions and special characteristics of specific geographical regions of interest to visitors and businesses in the sector concerned in such regions.

In view of the growing number of such exhibitions and other events in the tourist sector, there is an obvious need for a publication giving details of all the relevant fairs, exhibitions and other events organized in the various Community countries. This would help business people to find out what the Community has to offer visitors, and would bring events of major interest to their attention.

In accordance with this need for a comprehensive publication covering the subject, would the Commission be willing to promote, launch and even produce such a publication in order to help to develop the Community's potential for attracting visitors?

Answer given by Mr Ripa di Meana on behalf of the Commission

(17 December 1986)

In its communication to the Council on 'Community action in the field of tourism' ⁽¹⁾, the Commission stressed the development of cultural tourism as being of great interest to the Community in that it would draw tourists from non-Community countries to the Community with its rich cultural heritage. At the same time, it would increase the awareness of Community nationals of that heritage and the fact that it belongs to all of them.

In that communication the Commission likewise expressed its readiness to collaborate with the relevant bodies in the Member States and with the Council of Europe to promote the organization of joint actions related to specific interests and expressions of both ancient and modern European cultural activity.

The budget resources at the Commission's disposal are such that it is at present unable either to promote or issue at its own expense the publication to which the Honourable Member refers. It is nevertheless prepared to consult with the relevant bodies in the Member States in an endeavour to decide jointly on initiatives which might be taken in this field.

⁽¹⁾ COM(86) 32 final, 31. 1. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1487/86

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 October 1986)

(87/C 133/42)

Subject: Commission patronage of sporting events

The President of the Commission gave the starting signal for the Community's Tour of the Future. This was a particularly happy idea of the Commission's, calculated to spread the concept of European unity via sporting events.

Does the Commission intend to repeat the experiment? If so, has it drawn up a calendar, and what events will it be sponsoring in the near future?

**Answer given by Mr Ripa di Meana
on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 1986)**

The Commission is pleased to hear the Honourable Member's favourable opinion of the 'Tour de l'Avenir' European Community Cycle Race. Under its self-imposed rules, the Commission's patronage is restricted to exceptional events of a broad and genuine European significance. This is in line with the recommendations by the *ad hoc* Committee on a People's Europe which were adopted by the Milan European Council.

The Commission has already agreed to sponsor a number of other sporting events and is also considering other plans. Some of the most important events are:

- the European Community Championship tennis tournament in Antwerp from 31 October to 9 November;
- the European Community Swimming Championships in Leeds on 11 and 12 April 1987;
- the Constitution Race, an amateur transatlantic yacht race to mark the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome and the 200th anniversary of the Constitution of the United States, May and July 1987;
- the second European Yacht Race, from mid-July to mid-August 1987.

One of the Commission's other main objectives in the field of sport is to encourage the national teams of the Member States to wear the Community emblem alongside their national badges. There are a number of obstacles to this, but the Commission is engaged in talks with the national sports federations and the Olympic authorities.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1492/86

by Mr William Newton Dunn (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 October 1986)

(87/C 133/43)

Subject: Exchanges with Hungarian schools

From my contacts with ordinary people in Hungary this summer, I am acutely aware of their wish for increasingly closer contacts with the European Community.

One of the best long-term ways to foster closer contacts would be to assist exchange visits between groups of school-children in Hungary and in the Community.

Similar considerations would surely apply to the other East European states which at present still suffer from forcible Russian military occupation.

Is the Commission able and willing to propose ways to assist such exchanges?

**Answer given by Mr De Clercq
on behalf of the Commission**

(3 December 1986)

The Commission naturally welcomes the fact that the Hungarian people wish to have increasingly closer contacts with the European Community. This is fully in line with the policy which the European Community intends to pursue towards Hungary.

The importance of the development of contacts between pupils from different countries as a means of increasing comprehension about the reality of Europe was stressed by the Council and the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council on 3 June 1986, as well as by the European Council in its acceptance of the report of the Adonnino Committee on a People's Europe. In this light, a programme to promote youth (as opposed to school) exchanges, the 'YES for Europe' programme, was proposed by the Commission earlier this year, and it is currently under discussion with the Council. However, this programme will be confined to the Member States of the Community.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1500/86

by Mr Hemmo Muntingh (S—NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 October 1986)

(87/C 133/44)

Subject: The wolf (Canis lupus signatus) and other protected animal species in Spain and Portugal and pine and eucalyptus plantations for commercial purposes

Under the Berne Convention ⁽¹⁾, the wolf (*Canis lupus*) is listed as a strictly protected species. Despite having this status, wolves in Spain and Portugal (sub-species *Canis lupus signatus*) are under serious threat to the knowledge of, and in certain cases with the active encouragement of, national and regional authorities. At the beginning of this year 10 wolves were killed over a period of two months, 6 in an organized drive, 2 by professional hunters and 2 by illegal hunters. In certain areas, rewards are also being offered for exterminating wolves (for example by the Cantabrian Agricultural Council).

In view of the fact that the main reason given for killing wolves is the damage to livestock farmers, a solution should be sought in the prevention of such damage or in compensation. The second option is quite feasible since the damage caused by wolves is extremely limited. Prevention could take the form of encouraging the use of sheep dogs. In the United States, this method has proved successful using European species of dogs.

The habitat of the wolf is being severely restricted by the direct threat of hunting. As a result, the wolf population is also extremely sensitive to destruction of the habitat such as that caused by the felling of old woods (particularly indigenous oak woods) and the introduction of pine and eucalyptus plantations for timber production. This activity not only adversely affects the wolf but also many other species of fauna including the strictly protected lynx (*Lynx pardina*) and Black vulture (*Aegypius monachus*), which are both listed in the Annexes to the Berne Convention and the Directive on birds ⁽²⁾.

1. What means does the Commission have of urging the Spanish and Portuguese authorities to introduce measures to protect the wolf and is the Commission prepared to make use of them?
2. Is the Community involved in any way in the pine and/or eucalyptus plantations for timber production in Spain and/or Portugal?
3. If so, is the Commission prepared to consider requiring the Spanish and Portuguese authorities to produce guarantees as to the protection of animal species threatened by these projects, particularly species which have protected status under the Directive on Birds or the Berne Convention?

⁽¹⁾ Council Decision concerning the conclusion of the Convention on the conservation of European wildlife and natural habitats (OJ No L 38, 10. 2. 1982).

⁽²⁾ Council Directive 79/409/EEC (OJ No L 103, 25. 4. 1979, pp. 1—18).

Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis
on behalf of the Commission

(6 February 1987)

1. The wolf has always been feared and hated because of its predation on domestic livestock. The human response has been to eradicate the species. Over the past few centuries it has been exterminated from all Member States except Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal, where it is now threatened by habitat loss, prey extermination, illegal killing, and competition, from and hybridization with, stray dogs.

The situation is presented in the report entitled 'Conservation of species of wild flora and vertebrate fauna threatened in the Community (1984)'.

The Commission intends to participate in the elaboration and application of conservation management plans in the relevant Member States. To this end it has established contacts with scientific experts and competent authorities in these Member States.

2 and 3. No specific Community forestry programme has been enacted for either Spain or Portugal as yet but there are general provisions under Regulation (EEC) No 3827/85 ⁽¹⁾ which extends Regulation (EEC) No 797/85 ⁽²⁾ *et al.* to the new Iberian Member States. Under Article 20 of Regulation (EEC) No 797/85, forestry measures in agricultural holdings are eligible for Community support.

Council Regulation (EEC) No 3828/85 ⁽³⁾ adopting an agricultural improvement programme for Portugal includes forestry measures under Article 22. The work programme pertaining to the Regulation has been approved by the Commission on 27 November 1986.

With regard to Community involvement in the plantation of pine or eucalyptus for timber production, the Commission does not specify which tree species are used but requires that they comply with sound forest management and take necessary account of environmental considerations. The criteria for species selection would rest with the relevant national authority responsible for implementing the programme.

However, if planting in specific cases were felt to threaten the survival of the animal species cited, then their use would not be appropriate. The Commission should, however, be advised of such potential threats.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 372, 31. 12. 1985.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 93, 30. 3. 1985.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 372, 31. 12. 1985.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1503/86

by Mr Ernest Glinne (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 October 1986)

(87/C 133/45)

Subject: Abolition of aid for the repatriation of Greek, Spanish and Portuguese nationals leaving France

By circular dated 19 July, the French Minister of Social-Affairs and Employment abolished aid for immigrant workers from Greece, Spain and Portugal to return to those countries, on the grounds of those countries' membership of the Community, and the right of free circulation to be

enjoyed by those immigrants in the more or less long term. This circular states therefore that nobody could stop workers from those countries who had received such repatriation aid from returning to French territory and taking up paid employment there.

Does the Commission not feel that the wording of this circular shows scant respect for the right to free movement of the workers of the Member States of the Community in that it states with regret that in future the French State would no longer be able to prevent nationals of the countries mentioned from taking up paid employment?

What is the Commission's opinion of this decision which discriminates against workers' families while they do not yet have the same rights regarding employment or residence as French nationals and nationals of the other Member States of the Community?

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

(19 December 1986)

The Commission considers that repatriation aid programmes adopted by several Member States and the ways in which they are applied come under national jurisdiction, although concertation on this subject might have made possible the promotion of a migration policy which would have formed part of overall measures designed to improve the transparency of the employment market in the Community.

Moreover, payment of repatriation aid presupposes a commitment on the part of the entitled person to leave the country on a permanent basis. The Commission considers that encouragement to return home of this sort is such as to conflict with Community order to the extent that it is addressed to nationals of the Member States who would be expected, in return for financial inducements, to renounce permanently their right to free movements as guaranteed under the Treaty which would imply the right to return at a later date to exercise professional activities in the host Member State where they were previously established.

Accordingly, since under Community law Greek, Spanish and Portuguese nationals at present benefit from the right of freedom of movement and are to benefit in the future from the full right of freedom of movement of workers, any agreement, explicit or tacit, which would require them to abandon these rights on a permanent basis would appear to be illegal.

The national decision to which the Honourable Member refers and which prohibits such agreements is accordingly not subject to criticism.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1511/86

by Mr Fernand Herman (PPE—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 October 1986)

(87/C 133/46)

Subject: Prenatal and maternity benefits

Before expectant mothers in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg can obtain prenatal and maternity benefits from the national family allowances fund, they are required to have been legally resident in the Grand Duchy for a year preceding the birth, even if they are citizens of a Community Member State.

Can the Commission say:

- whether it believes this requirement to be compatible with Articles 48 to 51 of the Treaty of Rome;
- if it is not, what measures does the Commission intend to take to rectify the situation?

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

(3 February 1987)

Maternity benefits provided for by Luxembourg law are excluded from the scope of application of Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 on social security for migrant workers pursuant to its Article 1 (u) (i) and its Annex II, II, H.

However, they can be regarded as a social benefit to which the rule of equal treatment applies by virtue of Article 7 (2) of Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 on the freedom of movement of workers within the Community.

The Court of Justice has repeatedly ruled that this rule of equal treatment not only bans patent discriminations based on nationality, but also all covert forms of discrimination which, by applying other criteria, produce the same result.

It is undeniable that the condition regarding prior residence to which the granting of maternity allowances is subject both for Luxembourg nationals and nationals of other Member States does not have the same significance in relation to both of these categories.

Although the intention of the Luxembourg authorities, in imposing this residence condition, was to ensure regular medical examinations of pregnant women and infants, the indirect differentiation which results from it would be likely to exclude improperly a number of Community workers and members of their families living in Luxembourg from prenatal and maternity benefits, if it should be found that

medical examinations carried out in other Member States were not being taken into account by the Luxembourg authorities. Furthermore, frontier workers employed in Luxembourg, but resident in an adjacent country, and members of their families are prevented by this condition from claiming the benefits in question.

The Commission will discuss with the Luxembourg authorities ways of dealing with this situation without compromising prenatal medical examinations and the examination of newborn children.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1517/86

by Mr John McCartin (PPE—IRL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 October 1986)

(87/C 133/47)

Subject: Harmonization of driving test procedures

Can the Commission state whether it was permissible for Belgian driving test authorities to refuse an applicant (from another Member State) the opportunity of taking the driving test when the applicant was unable to produce her identity card owing to its theft in Holland but did produce a document from the Dutch police verifying that the theft of the identity card and other personal belongings had taken place?

Would it have made any difference if the theft had taken place in Belgium and the document the applicant produced had come from the Belgian police?

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

(16 December 1986)

A driving licence is issued only if an applicant has passed a practical and theoretical test and meets the medical standards set by Council Directive 80/1263/EEC of 21 December 1980⁽¹⁾.

Member States may apply their own national laws in respect of other conditions governing the issue of driving licences, in particular those concerning the identity documents to be provided.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 175, 31. 12. 1980, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1521/86

by Mr Michael Hindley (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 October 1986)

(87/C 133/48)

Subject: Sale of 100 000 tonnes of beef to Brazil

What guarantees has the Commission sought and obtained that the beef sold to Brazil will not be exported from that country to the Community or to other countries in the form of processed meat?

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

(27 January 1987)

The justification for the recent sales of intervention beef to Brazil is the need for that country to import meat to compensate for a shortage on its domestic market. When the sales were negotiated, the Brazilian authorities gave an undertaking that the products sold by the Community to Brazil would be used to meet domestic consumer demand and would not alter the traditional level of exports of meat from Brazil to the Community. By choosing a single purchaser — in this case a government agency — the Commission also obtained a further guarantee that the meat would not find its way back in the form of processed products, to the Community or to the world market.

It should also be noted that, in view of the current shortage, the Brazilian authorities have banned all exports of meat and processed meat products.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1530/86

by Mr Alasdair Hutton (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 October 1986)

(87/C 133/49)

Subject: Mobility of European Community citizens in Greece

A Scottish doctor who recently moved his practice to Greece found on his arrival:

— that although the Greek Consul in Scotland had told him he would be entitled to two years' exemption from Greek tax, the Greek customs authorities demanded £ 30 000 duty on his four-year-old car which had cost £ 3 700. He was given one month to pay, to take the car out of the country or have it sequestered;

— that in order to get a permit to practice medicine he had to have a chest x-ray, a psychiatric assessment, a dermatologist's report and provide a specimen of faeces. These conditions do not have to be met by local doctors nor are they demanded from Greek doctors applying to work in the United Kingdom.

1. Does the Commission believe that these actions are against the spirit of the free movement of Community citizens and non-discrimination against Community citizens of another Member State?
2. Does the Commission regard these actions as being unusual in Greece or does it have evidence which indicates that these are common experiences?
3. Has the Commission discussed similar actions with the Greek authorities in the past?
4. Have the Greek authorities given any assurances in the past about respecting free movement and non-discrimination?
5. Will the Commission do all in its power to compel the Greek authorities to respect free movement and non-discrimination?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission**
(22 December 1986)

The question submitted by the Honourable Member is in two distinct parts, one concerning the requirement imposed on a migrant Community doctor to submit to a medical examination before being authorized to practice in Greece, the other concerning the amount of the tax demanded from this person in respect of the import into Greece of his car.

1. With regard to the first part of the question, it may be noted that under Article 13 of the 'Doctors' Directive 75/362/EEC⁽¹⁾, where a host Member State requires of its own nationals wishing to take up or pursue the activity of doctor a certificate of physical or mental health, that State may require a similar document from the migrant doctor, but must accept as sufficient evidence the presentation of the document required in the Member State of origin or the Member State from which the foreign national comes.

As far as the Commission is aware, no such document is required by the Greek authorities from Greek doctors wishing to take up or pursue the related profession. Consequently, in the Commission's opinion an attestation of this kind may not be required from migrants.

Before taking a position on the specific case cited — which, incidentally, is the first of its kind to be notified to the Commission — and taking the matter up, if necessary, with the Greek authorities, the Commission

would like to have further details regarding the case in question.

2. With regard to the second part of the question, it should be noted that under Greek national legislation at present in effect, imports of passenger cars occasioned by the owner's change of residence are exempt from taxation on condition that the cubic capacity of the vehicle's engine does not exceed 1600 cc; for vehicles with engines of a larger capacity, in the event of importation due to a change of residence, the tax charged corresponds to one-third of that normally levied in other cases in which cars are imported permanently.

Under the provisions of Article 12 (1), second subparagraph, of the Community Directive in this area⁽²⁾, Greece is authorized to defer the full application of this Directive, which provides for exemption from duty irrespective of engine capacity, until the introduction of VAT on 1 January 1987.

As regards the level of the Greek duty in question, the Commission considers the latter to be disproportionately high for passenger cars of large cylinder capacity (all of which are imported); the Commission also believes that the method of calculation used to determine the tax base for imported used vehicles is such as to artificially inflate this base and, consequently, the amounts payable. The Commission has already taken this matter up with the Greek authorities.

As regards the case cited by the Honourable Member, the Commission would like to have more exhaustive details (type of vehicle, under what heading payment was demanded, etc.), with a view, if necessary, to taking further steps *vis-à-vis* the Greek authorities.

3. The Commission therefore requests the Honourable Member to ask the migrant doctor in question to submit full details regarding the two aspects of his complaint.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 167, 30. 6. 1975.

⁽²⁾ Council Directive 83/183/EEC of 28 January 1983 (OJ No L 105, 23. 4. 1983, p. 64).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1534/86

by Mrs Undine-Uta Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC—D)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 October 1986)

(87/C 133/50)

Subject: Payment made by the Government of the Land Baden-Württemberg to the car manufacturer Daimler-Benz for the development of a site near Rastatt

According to the Ministry of Economic Affairs in Bonn, the Commission has called for a report clarifying the payment of DM 140 000 made by the Government of Baden-Württemberg to the car manufacturer Daimler-Benz. The

Land Government and the Federal Government disagree on whether this payment constitutes a structural measure or is a covert subsidy.

1. How would the Commission categorize this payment?
2. Why has the Commission called for an explanatory report?

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

(5 December 1986)

On the basis of the information available to it, the Commission has doubts about whether the price to be charged in the planned sale of land to the firm and the promise to bear the costs of preparing the land are compatible with the Community's rules on aid. Accordingly, on 29 October, it initiated the procedure provided for in Article 93 (2) of the EEC Treaty.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1588/86

by Mr Victor Arbeloa Muru (S—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 October 1986)

(87/C 133/51)

Subject: Inclusion of Valle de Erro (Navarra, Spain) among hill-farming areas

The town council of Valle de Erro (Navarra, Spain) has told me that it is surprised to see the area included — in accordance with Directive 75/268/EEC ⁽¹⁾ (Spain) among hill-farming areas, which means that it is separated from its natural surroundings, the district of Burguete and Roncevalles, to which it belongs for both geographical and administrative reasons, and is included among other districts which have little in common with Valle de Erro, such as Valle de Ibargoiti or Regata del Bidasoa.

Does the Commission not consider it would be preferable to include the Valle de Erro among the mountain-farming areas instead of the hill-farming areas?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 128, 19. 5. 1975, p. 1.

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

(3 February 1987)

The criteria used to define in Spain mountain areas within the meaning of Article 3 (3) of Directive 75/268/EEC are those set out in the second recital of Council Directive 86/466/EEC of 14 July 1986 concerning the Community

list of less-favoured farming areas within the meaning of Directive 75/268/EEC (Spain) ⁽¹⁾.

Article 2 (1) of Directive 75/268/EEC provides, moreover, that it is the responsibility of the Member States to communicate to the Commission the boundaries of the areas eligible for inclusion in the Community list of less-favoured farming areas and all relevant information concerning the characteristics of those areas.

Since the delimitation of mountain areas within the meaning of Article 3 (3) is based on local administrative areas or parts thereof, it is necessary to check whether the physical requirements laid down in Directive 86/466/EEC are met in this particular case.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 273, 24. 9. 1986, p. 104.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1613/86

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 October 1986)

(87/C 133/52)

Subject: Treatment of children receiving nursery and primary school education in Belgium whose parents are foreign nationals (including EEC nationals)

Is the Commission aware that, for the purpose of obtaining state grants, a coefficient of 0,8 is applied to children whose parents are of foreign nationality and pay taxes in a State other than Belgium or Luxembourg, whereas a coefficient of 1 is applied to Belgian (and Luxembourg) children?

In view of the principle of equality of treatment for EEC nationals, is this not a discriminatory practice?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1691/86

by Mr Francois Roelants du Vivier (ARC—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(29 October 1986)

(87/C 133/53)

Subject: Legality of Belgian measures in education

The Belgian Government has decided that in future a factor of 0,8 instead of 1 will be taken in calculating the allowances and salary subsidies for pupils' parents who do not pay tax in Belgium.

Does such a decision not infringe Community law and, in particular, the rules regarding freedom of movements for persons and services?

Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1613/86 and 1691/86 given by Mr Marin on behalf of the Commission

(13 January 1987)

The Commission is aware of the problem referred to by the Honourable Members. Following an initial examination of the rules in question, the Commission takes the view that the application of the 0,8 weighting to pupils whose parents are not subject to personal income tax as an inhabitant of Belgium could prove to be contrary to Community law to the extent to which it also relates to those pupils in Belgium who come within the scope of the Community rules on the free movement of persons as well as those pupils who come from other Member States and who have come to Belgium with the sole aim of attending vocational training courses and that as a result it would hinder the access of these pupils to instruction given in that Member State.

The Commission has asked the Belgian authorities to provide additional information on the criteria used for applying the rules in question. The Commission will not fail to take any necessary measures.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1616/86

**by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(22 October 1986)

(87/C 133/54)

Subject: Concentration of the food sector in the retail trade

To supplement the very interesting information it provides in answer to my Written Question No 282/86 ⁽¹⁾, could the Commission specify the data which afford the most disturbing evidence of an increasing concentration of the food sector in the retail trade?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 91, 6. 4. 1987, p. 3.

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

(4 December 1986)

The trend towards greater concentration in food retailing referred to by the Commission in its answer to Written Question No 282/86 by the Honourable Member ⁽¹⁾ prompted it to commission a study by a research institute in 1985. The purpose of the study is to analyze the factors determining the development of concentration in the distribution of consumer goods, and in particular foodstuffs, within the common market. The effects on the purchasing power of distributors will also be analyzed. The study will be

available at the end of this year, and the Commission will then provide the Honourable Member with a more detailed answer.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 91, 6. 4. 1987, p. 3.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1630/86

**by Mr Willy Kuijpers (ARC—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(22 October 1986)

(87/C 133/55)

Subject: Illegal sale of dwellings in France

In an earlier question I raised the matter of the illegal sale of holiday homes in Spain.

I have now been informed of the following situation. A person who used to run a business in France closed it down and moved to Belgium. As required by law, he informed his social security office. Something went wrong, however, for calls on payment continued to be sent to his old address in France, now uninhabited. Since the individual concerned never returned to this address, he knew nothing of the back payments due until the social security office decided to hold a public sale of his uninhabited property. It did not send him any notification of its decision to sell, for which a court order was required; the sale went ahead and the proceeds are at present frozen by the court.

Is the Commission aware of this case?

To what extent is such a procedure compatible with the Treaty of Rome?

What action does the Commission intend to take in view of the frequent instances of the illegal sale of property abroad already pending before it?

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

(5 December 1986)

1. The Commission is unaware of the facts described by the Honourable Member.

2. On the basis of those facts, and notwithstanding the opinion that each individual may have on this type of procedure, it does not appear that the French legislation applied in the case in point contains any form of discrimination applied by reason of nationality in respect of persons benefiting under the provisions of Community law.

3. The Commission does not intend to take any action in the matter subject to the fact that national bodies of legislation may not discriminate against those benefiting under the provisions of Community law (e.g. persons in paid

employment, self-employed persons, suppliers and recipients of services, etc.) by reason of their nationality.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1646/86

by Mr Pol Marck (PPE—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 October 1986)

(87/C 133/56)

Subject: Importation from France of eggs not suitable for human consumption

Pursuant to Commissioner Andriessen's reply to my Written Question No 2782/85 ⁽¹⁾, I should like to know whether the French Government was justified in collecting monetary compensatory amounts (MCAs) for the exportation from France of eggs unsuitable for human consumption during the periods 19 December 1980 to 23 February 1982 and 24 February 1982 to 23 May 1983?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 290, 17. 11. 1986, p. 5.

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

(29 January 1987)

Community rules, in particular Article 3 of Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3154/85 (replacing Article 3 of Regulation (EEC) No 1371/81) provide that MCA's on foodstuffs which are unsuitable for human consumption shall be collected but not granted. That means in practice that, e.g., exports of eggs unsuitable for human consumption from a country applying a negative MCA (like France) are being charged, whereas imports into another negative MCA country do not benefit from any grants of MCA's.

Those rules ensure that Community funds are not being wasted and trade in such products is not encouraged.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1649/86

by Mr Alfons Boesmans (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 October 1986)

(87/C 133/57)

Subject: Situation of conscientious objectors in Greece

In its resolution on conscientious objection to military service ⁽¹⁾, the European Parliament urged that the duration

of alternative service when carried out within a civil administration or organization should not exceed the period of normal military service.

In Greece the only possibility open to conscientious objectors is to do a period of alternative service that is twice as long as normal military service, i.e. it lasts four years. Furthermore, it can be performed only within the military organization.

Does the Commission not take the view, in the light of the forthcoming direct elections to the European Parliament in Greece, that the Greek Government should pass legislation as soon as possible to remedy this situation, with full account being taken of all the points contained in the abovementioned resolutions?

If so, what representations has the Commission so far made to the Greek authorities and with what precise result?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 68, 14. 3. 1983, p. 14.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1650/86

by Mr Alfons Boesmans (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 October 1986)

(87/C 133/58)

Subject: Situation of conscientious objectors in Belgium

In its resolution on conscientious objection to military service ⁽¹⁾, the European Parliament pointed out that the performance of alternative service may not be regarded as a sanction and should preferably be organized in the social field or in the field of aid and development cooperation.

The Belgian Government has this month decided to introduce an extended period (24 months) of civilian service in both the social and the aid and development cooperation fields, whereas the normal military service in Belgium last 12 months.

It was also decided that on the priority list of establishments which can take on conscientious objectors, development cooperation should be given the second-lowest and the cultural sector the lowest priority.

It is also the Government's intention to increase the pay of those doing normal military service but not that of those performing civilian service.

What action does the Commission intend to take to persuade the Belgian Government to withdraw the above measures which discriminate against conscientious objectors?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 68, 14. 3. 1983, p. 14.

**Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1649/86 and
1650/86 given by Mr Ripa di Meana
on behalf of the Commission**

(3 December 1986)

The Commission has already stated in reply to a number of written or oral questions that it has no authority in this field.

The Commission is therefore not in a position to make the representations suggested by the Honourable Member.

However, the Commission is aware of the political nature of the problem and of the way in which the differences in national legislation on the status of conscientious objectors may be felt by citizens in the various Member States.

The Commission would also point out that the work on conscientious objection within the competent bodies of the Council of Europe — in which the Commission participates as an observer — has just been completed. The draft recommendation approved by the Steering Committee for Human Rights will be submitted to the Assembly of the Council of Europe.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1684/86

by Mr Ernest Glinne (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(29 October 1986)

(87/C 133/59)

Subject: Distinction drawn between pupils whose parents are subject to taxation in Belgium and those whose parents are not

Since fairly recently, the parents of pupils in Belgian schools have been asked to fill out a form in which they must declare on their honour whether or not they are subject to taxation as individuals in Belgium.

The Belgian Government has decided that for staffing calculations (number of teachers, maintenance staff, etc.) and operational subsidies, school heads must verify when a child is enrolled whether that child's parents or the persons exercising parental authority are subject to taxation in Belgium. In the case of pupils whose parents pay tax in Belgium, a coefficient of 1 is applied; in the case of others, that coefficient is 0,8.

The situation of children of international civil servants is not clear, since a distinction is drawn between parents who do not pay tax in Belgium and those who pay a tax other than Belgian tax according to an international agreement.

Will the Commission reply to the following questions:

1. What is the situation, in the light of this decision by the Belgian Government, of the children of international civil servants living in Belgium whose financial contribution to the GNP is more than negligible?
2. Are these rules not contrary to the free movement of persons within the Community, since a French child, for example, who attends a Belgian school near to the frontier is no longer considered to be a complete child, with the result that school heads may be placed in the situation where they must either give preferment to children who are worth 100% or be forced to dismiss staff, to the detriment of the quality of the education provided?

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

(13 January 1987)

1. As regards the Belgian rules referred to by the Honourable Member ⁽¹⁾, the position of officials of the European Communities is covered by Chapter V, Article 13 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities of 8 April 1965 which states that 'officials and other servants of the Communities shall be liable to a tax for the benefit of the Communities on salaries, wages and emoluments paid to them by the Communities. They shall be exempt from national taxes on salaries, wages and emoluments paid by the Communities'.

The Commission has issued appropriate instructions to its officials to demand application of the Protocol.

2. On the question of how these rules affect other Community and non-Community nationals who are covered by the rules of Community law, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the joint answer given to Written Questions No 1613/86 by Mrs Lizin and No 1691/86 by Mr Roelants du Vivier ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ See page 27 of this Official Journal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1685/86

by Mr Alasdair Hutton (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(29 October 1986)

(87/C 133/60)

Subject: Commission communications with Member States

1. At what level in the Commission (e.g. President, Member, Director-General) are the following signed:

1. letters of formal notice under Article 169,
2. reasoned opinions under Article 169,
3. letters concerning failure to comply with a judgment of the Court of Justice (Article 171),
4. letters concerning failure to notify national measures implementing Directives,
5. other communications concerning a Member State's compliance with Community obligations?

2. For each of the above five categories of communications, what is the level in the Governments of the Member States (e.g. Minister, senior civil servant) to which they are addressed?

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

(5 December 1986)

Letters relating to the initiation and subsequent stages of infringement proceedings are signed on behalf of the Commission by one of its Members and addressed to the Foreign Minister of the Member State concerned.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1695/86
by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(29 October 1986)

(87/C 133/61)

Subject: Subsidization of tax exemption for fuels used in agriculture

According to a report published by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (the environmental impact of financial incentives for agricultural production, Legislative Study No 38, p. 27), incentives to mechanize agriculture in some countries take the form of subsidies or tax exemption for fuels used by farmers, e.g. in France and the Federal Republic of Germany. Could the Commission:

1. confirm this situation?
2. state whether or not it results in distortions of competition in the Community?
3. state to what extent it considers that the mechanization of farming warrants further encouragement in the Community at the present time?

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

(27 January 1987)

1. All the Member States (in the Community of Ten) grant tax concessions related to the use of fuels in farming. These concessions vary from Member State to Member State. The Community Report on 'Public expenditure on agriculture' ⁽¹⁾ gives details under code number 1730.

In Spain a similar subsidy is granted in the form of direct aid, the maintenance of which on a transitional basis was authorized by Council Regulation (EEC) No 3773/85 ⁽²⁾ pursuant to Article 80 of the Act of Accession.

2. As such aid schemes are to be found in almost all the Member States, the Commission feels that no great risks of distortion of competition arise as a consequence in the Community.

3. It is doubtful whether the objective of tax exemption for fuels used by farmers is always to encourage mechanization; similarly, for example, aids for the purchase of agricultural machinery are not necessarily aimed at increasing the degree of mechanization.

In any case, there are great differences at present in the Community as regards mechanization in farming and clearly the development of agricultural structures in some regions, which the Community encourages, necessarily entails an increase in mechanization.

⁽¹⁾ Study P.229, November 1984.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 362, 31. 12. 1985, p. 32.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1697/86
by Mr Florus Wijzenbeek (LDR—NL)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(29 October 1986)

(87/C 133/62)

Subject: The European Schools in Brussels

Is it correct that the premises made available by the Belgian Government for the European Schools in Brussels are inadequate, particularly in view of the recent increase in the number of pupils following the accession of Spain and Portugal?

Is it also correct that the plans to build a third European School in Brussels have been shelved for the time being, mainly because of opposition from the German and French permanent representatives?

Does the Commission consider that the duties of cultural attaché to the French permanent representative are compatible with those of principal of the Lycée Français in Brussels?

What measures does the Commission propose to take, other than the provision of temporary classrooms, to resolve the acute shortage of premises at the European School in Brussels both now and in the future?

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

(2 February 1987)

Following the accession of Spain and Portugal, the creation of Spanish and Portuguese language sections at the European Schools in Brussels is indeed causing a shortage of space, the full effects of which will be felt in the next few years.

The authorities concerned, the Belgian Government, the Board of Governors of the European Schools and the Commission, are making every necessary effort to ensure that over the next few years the schools can operate in a harmonious manner.

The Commission, working closely with the Belgian authorities responsible for providing premises in Brussels, has brought the matter to the attention of the Board of Governors.

It seems likely that in the medium term an annexe will be opened in Brussels.

Pending the provision of this annexe, the Belgian Government appears willing to provide temporary premises in the short term.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1704/86

by Mrs Sylvie Le Roux (COM—F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(29 October 1986)

(87/C 133/63)

Subject: Consequences of the dairy quotas policy

By introducing a quota policy in the dairy sector, the Community has imposed a strict limit on Community dairy production. Other producing and exporting countries have taken advantage of this to develop their own production and edge the Community out of certain sectors of the market.

1. Can the Commission provide a comparative breakdown of dairy production trends since 1983 showing the respective market shares of the Community and the other producing and exporting countries, particularly New Zealand, Australia, Canada and the USA?

2. How does the Commission propose to assert the Community's position on the world dairy products market (international agreements with producer countries, long-term contracts, etc.)?

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

(16 January 1987)

1. According to information available to the Commission, and illustrated in Table I, the global milk supply in the 12 Member States, Poland, USSR, North America and Oceania is still increasing, in spite of efforts to discourage the growth of milk production in certain countries.

In 1985 and 1986, only in the Community will the production be at a significantly lower level compared with 1983. In fact, the reduction in EUR(12) from 1983 to 1985 amounted to 3,6 million tonnes or 3,3%.

However, about 3 million tonnes, or 83% of the EEC reduction, were balanced by increases in the US, New Zealand and Australia. In addition, the USSR increased production levels in that same period by 2,2 million tonnes or 2%.

In general, the international market for dairy products is over-supplied and the part of non-commercial concessionary trade has become too important. Thus, a further decrease of milk production levels is necessary to reduce stocks and protect commercial trade. As far as the Community is concerned, reductions of the guaranteed quantities of 2% in April 1987 and a further 1% in April 1988 is already decided by the Council, and the Commission recently in its interim report on the application of the levy system ⁽¹⁾ proposed additional reductions of 2% in 1987 and 1% in 1988.

The world market shares of certain important exporting countries are illustrated in Table II. It is evident that the Community has lost market shares for certain products during this difficult period of policy adaptation, not least due to the non-commercial development of the market. The background to this situation has been one of economic problems in several developing countries, irregular currency developments and falling oil prices.

2. To increase the competitive ability of the Community exporters, the Commission has introduced a system of higher flexibility for adoption and publication of special refunds and has updated general refund levels. However, against the background of important and growing international stocks representing more than one year of world trade with all dairy products, a longer term solution to world trade problems can only be found through international cooperation and

negotiations. Important topics for international cooperation are measures to coordinate international surplus disposal and the general use of internal disposal measures to reduce the effect of surpluses on world trade.

The Community is actively participating in the International Dairy Arrangement under GATT, and regrets the absence as full members of such countries as the US, Canada and Austria.

(¹) COM(86) 645 final.

Table I
International development of milk deliveries (cows' milk)

	('000 tonnes)					
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986 (estimation) (¹)
EEC (12)	101,0	104,5	109,1	106,7	105,5	106,2
USA	59,3	60,6	62,3	60,1	64,1	64,7
Canada	7,3	7,6	7,4	7,5	7,3	7,2
New Zealand	6,1	6,4	6,8	7,5	7,7	7,9
Australia	5,3	5,6	5,9	6,1	6,2	6,0
USSR (production)	88,9	91,0	96,5	97,9	98,2	102,0
Poland (production)	15,1	15,5	16,1	16,7	16,6	15,8

(¹) Commission's estimates (DG VI).

Table II
World market exports of certain dairy products (¹)

	1983		1984		1985	
	'000 tonnes	%	'000 tonnes	%	'000 tonnes	%
Butter/buteroil equivalent (including food aid)						
Total world exports	771,7	100,0	786,0	100,0	856,3	100,0
Of which:						
EEC (10)	355,0	46,0	380,2	48,4	387,5	45,3
New Zealand	227,7	29,5	202,7	25,8	258,8	30,2
Australia	15,5	2,0	36,0	4,6	56,7	6,6
Canada	4,1	0,5	0,3	—	0,9	0,1
USA	33,0	4,3	50,0	6,4	44,0	5,1
Skimmed-milk powder (including food aid)						
Total world exports	875,0	100,0	1 018,2	100,0	1 078,3	100,0
Of which:						
EEC (10)	192,0	21,9	307,0	30,2	309,0	28,7
New Zealand	155,0	17,7	167,0	16,4	172,9	16,0
Australia	56,0	6,4	70,0	6,9	90,2	8,4
Canada	82,0	9,4	70,0	6,9	60,6	5,6
USA	234,0	26,7	264,5	26,0	304,9	28,3

	1983		1984		1985	
	'000 tonnes	%	'000 tonnes	%	'000 tonnes	%
Whole milk powder						
Total world exports	595,0	100,0	695,6	100,0	716,7	100,0
Of which:						
EEC (10)	394,0	66,2	484,0	69,6	476,0	66,4
New Zealand	95,0	16,0	106,8	15,4	134,6	18,8
Australia	34,0	5,7	27,3	3,9	31,7	4,4
Canada	12,0	2,0	12,0	1,7	15,0	2,1
USA	10,0	1,7	6,1	0,9	40,6	5,7
Cheese						
Total world exports	812,2	100,0	900,4	100,0	855,1	100,0
Of which:						
EEC (10)	405,0	49,9	468,9	52,0	408,0	47,7
New Zealand	75,4	9,3	87,3	9,7	87,5	10,2
Australia	54,4	6,7	56,9	6,3	73,6	8,6
Canada	4,8	0,6	5,3	0,6	10,5	1,2
USA	18,0	2,2	16,7	1,9	15,7	1,8
Condensed milk						
Total world exports	715,0	100,0	760,0	100,0	756,0	100,0
Of which:						
EEC (10)	522,0	73,0	521,0	69,0	545,0	72,0
New Zealand	1,0	—	0	—	0	—
Australia	10,0	1,0	8,0	1,0	9,0	1,0
Canada	89,0	12,0	133,0	18,0	104,0	14,0
USA	3,0	—	4,0	1,0	5,0	1,0

(¹) Source: GATT/FAO.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1729/86

by Mr Giorgio Almirante, Mr Antonio Tripodi and Mr Pino Romuladi (DR—I)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 October 1986)

(87/C 133/64)

Subject: Management of the funds of the European Social Fund by Intercoascit in Bonn

Does the Commission intend to have administrative checks carried out on the Intercoascit in Bonn, which manages a number of the funds of the European Social Fund and which, despite not yet having closed its 1985 accounts, has already wrongly received the payments for 1986. What criteria are applied to the assignment of funds to the various Intercoascit operating in the Member States in which there are Italians in education who require assistance? What forms do the administrative checks take and how often are checks carried out on the spot? Finally, can the Commission give the full amount of the payments made to such organizations operating in Member States over the last five years and give details of the projects involved?

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

(5 February 1987)

Applications for payment are checked on the spot or on the basis of supporting documents. The Intercoascits have not yet been subjected to an on-the-spot check by the Commission, but are regularly monitored by the local offices of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and by the Ministry itself before submitting any application for payment of a balance.

Applications for European Social Fund assistance are approved on the basis of the rules governing the missions and working of this Community instrument and the guidelines for its management, in this context — with particular reference to migrant workers — on the basis of point 4.8 for 1985 ⁽¹⁾ and point 4.7 for the 1986 financial year ⁽²⁾.

The Member States are required to submit their applications for aid before 21 October of each year and their applications for payment within the 10 months following the end of the actions in question. Since the applications for aid are approved before 31 March of each year (in 1986, exceptionally, at the beginning of May) and since the advances are paid immediately after this approval, the advances relating to the applications approved for 1986 could have been paid out before the payment of the balance for 1985, application for which need not have been made until 30 October 1986 at the latest.

The amounts of aid approved from the European Social Fund over the last five years to the Intercoascits are as follows (in million ECU):

1982 =	2,8,
1983 =	3,1,
1984 =	0,8,
1985 =	2,6,
1986 =	3,0.

⁽¹⁾ Decision 85/261/EEC, 30. 4. 1985 (OJ No L 133, 22. 5. 1985, p. 28).

⁽²⁾ Decision 86/221/EEC, 30. 4. 1986 (OJ No L 153, 7. 6. 1986, p. 61).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1744/86

by Mr Lambert Croux (PPE—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 October 1986)

(87/C 133/65)

Subject: Employment of handicapped persons

Most Member States have few statistical resources, if any, for verifying the proportion of the total workforce accounted for

by the handicapped, as became apparent from a study conducted in 1981 by the Statistical Office of the European Community.

Will the Commission say:

1. whether a follow-up study has now been conducted with reference to the above problem?
2. which Member States have, in the meantime, improved their statistics on employment of handicapped persons?
3. what are the latest figures for each Member State, where known, for the percentage of handicapped persons out of work?

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

(2 February 1987)

The Honourable Member is probably aware of the report published by the Statistical Office in 1983 on the employment of disabled persons as part of its aim of carrying out, on an occasional basis, studies in fields where information of a regular nature is lacking.

Since then no study has been initiated and the Commission is not aware of what the Member States may have done in this field.

Two years from the date of adoption (24 July 1986) of the Recommendation on the employment of disabled persons ⁽¹⁾, the Commission is required to put before the Council a report on its implementation. This report will be based on the national reports drawn up by the Member States.

To ensure the efficacy of the report referred to above, the Commission proposes to set up a working party of senior national officials, who will be instructed to draw up a joint structure and methodology for the preparation of these reports. The Commission feels that this will be more effective than a comprehensive study on this topic.

The Commission does not wish to anticipate the findings of its report by attempting — on the basis of the currently available information (which is unsatisfactory, as the Honourable Member himself points out) — to specify advances made in the processing of data in the various Member States and the percentage of disabled persons.

In view of the inadequacy of the information available on the disabled working population (whether in or out of employment), it is impossible to work out the percentages for disabled persons out of work.

However, some Member States regularly publish the number of disabled persons registered as unemployed. For September 1986 the figures were as follows:

	Total	Men	Women
Germany	120 549	80 437	40 112
France	39 777	29 997	9 780
Netherlands	8 385	6 827	1 558
Belgium	33 525 ⁽¹⁾		

⁽¹⁾ Greatly reduced aptitude: 8 250; partly reduced aptitude: 23 605; sheltered workshops: 1 670.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 225, 12. 8. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1759/86

by Mrs Mary Banotti (PPE—IRL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 October 1986)

(87/C 133/66)

Subject: VAT on medical equipment

Can the Commission please provide information as to which Member States charge VAT on medical equipment and at what rate?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission

(13 February 1987)

In referring to 'medical equipment' it is assumed that the Honourable Member refers to the instruments and apparatus used by medical practitioners in the exercise of their profession.

Those goods are subject to VAT in all Member States. The individual rates of VAT applicable are understood to be as follows:

B: 19 %
DK: 22 %
D: 14 %
F: 18,6 %
GR: 18 %
IRL: 25 %
I: 18 %
L: 12 %
NL: 20 %
P: 16 %
E: 6 %
UK: 15 %.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1762/86

by Mr Pierre Bernard-Reymond (PPE—F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 October 1986)

(87/C 133/67)

Subject: Number of cars in the Member States of the European Community

Can the Commission say how many cars there are on the roads throughout the twelve Member States of the Community in each of the following categories:

- 4 horsepower or less;
- 5—7 horsepower;
- 8—9 horsepower;
- 10—11 horsepower;
- 12—16 horsepower;
- 17 horsepower and over?

Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis
on behalf of the Commission

(4 February 1987)

The Commission does not have available information according to the French fiscal engine capacity classes requested but does have data broken down by cubic capacity (up to 1 400 cc, 1 400 cc—2 000 cc, over 2 000 cc) for the largest Member States. Details of this are given in tables below.

Table 1

EC-12 — Number of cars in use by engine size and fuel type

The Commission estimates the number of cars on the road in the Community (EC-12) to be 105 million, broken down as follows:

	Cars in use (millions)	%
Petrol-engined	96,9	92,1
of which:		
— 1 400 cc	57,2	54,4
1 400 — 2 000 cc	33,6	31,9
+ 2 000 cc	6,1	5,8
Diesel-engined	8,3	7,9
Total	105,2	100

If present trends in diesel car demand continue, the share of diesels should increase steadily over the next 10 years, while the number of petrol-engined cars will remain stable or show only a slight rise.

Table 2

New car sales in the Member States by engine size and fuel type (%)
1985

(% of total car market)

	Germany	France	Italy	United Kingdom	Spain	EC-12
Petrol cars						
— 1 400 cc	33	54	63	51	55	50
1 400 — 2 000 cc	36	28	11	39	20	29
+ 2 000 cc	8	3	1	6	2	4
Sub-total	78	85	75	96	76	83
Diesel cars	22	15	25	4	24	17

Total new car market

(millions)

	Germany	France	Italy	United Kingdom	Spain	EC-12
	2,38	1,77	1,75	1,83	0,57	9,58

	Germany	France	Italy	United Kingdom	Spain	EC-12
Total number of cars in use	26,00	21,20	21,25	17,71	9,27	105,2
% diesel	10	9	10	1	6	8

Please note that the percentage breakdown refers to the new car market in 1985 and not the overall total. For the reasons explained above, the current diesel share of cars on the road is below that of the new car market.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1768/86

by Mr Mauro Chiabrando, Mr Nino Pisoni and Mr Franco Borgo (PPE—I)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1986)

(87/C 133/68)

Subject: Premiums for keeping calves on farms

In its answer of 6 March 1986 to Written Question No 2462/85, the Commission stated that it had not been

informed that France was offering French breeders aid amounting to FF 500 for every calf kept on the farm.

The Commission added that it would be seeking information from the French Government and would not fail to act in accordance with Articles 92 and 93 of the EEC Treaty.

Since the author has still not received any specific information on the matter:

1. Can the Commission state what results its investigation has produced?
2. If the allegations are correct, can the Commission state what steps it has taken under the Treaty?

(¹) OJ No C 142, 9. 6. 1986, p. 23.

Answer given by Mr Andriessen on behalf of the Commission

(5 February 1987)

Further to Written Question No 2462/85 (¹), the Commission has asked the French authorities for information on the aid scheme mentioned by the Honourable Members.

In response, the French authorities have informed the Commission that this scheme will not now be implemented.

(¹) OJ No C 142, 9. 6. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1775/86

by Mr José Álvarez de Paz, Mr José García Raya and Mr José Bueno Vicente (S—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1986)

(87/C 133/69)

Subject: Approximation of laws relating to collective redundancies

The Council Directive of 17 February 1975 (75/129/EEC) (¹) refers to the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies.

What action has been taken in the Community pursuant to this Directive?

(¹) OJ No L 48, 22. 2. 1975, p. 29.

Answer given by Mr Marin on behalf of the Commission

(10 February 1987)

Infringement procedures have been initiated against Belgium, Italy and Greece.

In its judgment of 28 March 1985 (Case No 215/83), the Court of Justice ruled that the Kingdom of Belgium had failed to meet its Community obligations by not applying the Directive to closures of undertakings that were not the result of a legal decision, and by wrongly excluding certain categories of workers. Since then Belgium has met its Community obligations in full through the Royal Decrees of 20 December 1985 and 11 June 1986, which became applicable on 1 July 1986.

In its judgment of 8 June 1982 (Case No 91/81), the Court of Justice ruled that the Italian Republic had failed to meet its Community obligations by not applying all the provisions of the Directive to a number of sectors, specifically agriculture and commerce, and by requiring neither the notification nor the intervention of the public authorities with a view to finding a solution to the problems raised by planned collective redundancies. In its judgment of 6 November 1985, the Court of Justice noted that the Italian Republic, having failed to implement the judgment of 8 June 1982, had once again failed to carry out its Community obligations. Since then, Italy has made no notification to the Commission of appropriate legislation, nor has an answer been received to the Commission's letter of 20 October 1986.

The procedure initiated against Greece for not applying the Directive to workers in the construction sector was dropped following the adoption of Law No 1568 of 18 October 1985.

For all other Member States, with the exception of Spain, texts containing transposition legislation have been sent to the Commission, which is currently making a detailed analysis of these texts and the conditions in which they have actually been interpreted and applied since they entered into force.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1782/86

by Mr José Álvarez de Paz, Mr José Herrero Merediz and Mr José Bueno Vicente (S—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1986)

(87/C 133/70)

Subject: Disclosure of certain information on employment by steel-making undertakings

Commission Decision No 1870/75/ECSC⁽¹⁾ of 17 July 1975 relates to the requirement that steel-making undertakings disclose certain information on employment.

Does the Commission consider that undertakings are fulfilling this requirement satisfactorily?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 190, 23. 7. 1975, p. 26.

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

(23 January 1987)

Community steelworkers are complying satisfactorily with the obligation imposed on them by Commission Decision No 1870/75/ECSC of 17 July 1975 to provide information on employment trends in the iron and steel industry. This information keeps the Commission up-to-date on planned changes affecting employment in this sector and enables it, where necessary, to adapt its policy accordingly.

Such information from individual firms, broken down by Member State, is published every month by the Statistical Office of the European Communities⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Statistical Office of the European Communities — rapid statistics — employment ECSC — iron and steel.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1783/86

by Mr José Álvarez de Paz, Mr José García Raya and Mr José Bueno Vicente (S—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1986)

(87/C 133/71)

Subject: Restrictions on movement and residence within the Community for workers of Member States and their families

The Council Directive of 15 October 1968 (68/360/EEC)⁽¹⁾ refers to the abolition of restrictions on movement and residence within the Community for workers of Member States and their families.

Does the Commission consider that the present situation in respect of movement and residence within the Community for workers and their families is satisfactory?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 257, 19. 10. 1968, p. 13.

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

(29 January 1987)

The Commission considers that the nine Member States have correctly transposed the provisions of Directive 68/360/EEC into their national legislation.

As regards Greece, Spain and Portugal this Directive will not be fully applicable until the end of the transitional measures provided for in the Acts of Accession of 1979 and 1985.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1784/86

by Mr José Álvarez de Paz, Mr José Herrero Merediz and Mr José Bueno Vicente (S—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1986)

(87/C 133/72)

Subject: Protection of employees in the event of the insolvency of their employer

The Council Directive of 20 October 1980 (80/987/EEC) ⁽¹⁾ refers to the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the protection of employees in the event of the insolvency of their employer.

Are the measures prescribed in the various laws being applied throughout the Community?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 283, 20. 10. 1980, p. 23.

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

(12 February 1987)

Infringement procedures have been initiated against the Italian Republic and against the Hellenic Republic but the Court of Justice has not yet been asked to rule on the complaints raised by the Commission.

As regards the other Member States, with the exception of Spain, texts relating to the transposition of the legislation have been forwarded to the Commission which is at present examining these texts in detail together with the conditions in which they have actually been interpreted and applied since their entry into force.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1786/86

by Mr José Álvarez de Paz, Mr José García Raya and Mr José Bueno Vicente (S—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1986)

(87/C 133/73)

Subject: Safety signs at work

The Council Directive of 25 July 1977 (77/576/EEC) ⁽¹⁾ refers to the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to the provision of safety signs at work. It was amended by the 1979 Act of Accession of Greece and by Directive 79/640/EEC of 21 June 1979.

Are the measures contained in the Directive being applied throughout the Community?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 229, 7. 9. 1977, p. 12.

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

(26 February 1987)

Spain has not yet informed the Commission of the measures it is required to take to implement Article 395 of the Act of Accession. The measures taken by Portugal have been notified and are currently under examination. All the other Member States have complied with the provisions of the Directive referred to.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1795/86

by Mrs Ursula Braun-Moser (PPE—D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1986)

(87/C 133/74)

Subject: Harmonization of working conditions for those employed in tourism

1. Will the Commission take measures (Directive, opinion etc.) to harmonize the working conditions for those employed in tourism in the Member States ⁽¹⁾.

2. What reasons can the Commission provide for its reluctance to act hitherto?

⁽¹⁾ See also my motions for resolutions on these subjects relating in particular to:

- the discrepant conditions for opening travel agencies in the individual Member States of the European Communities (Doc. B 2-1393/85),
- the harmonization of provisions covering the liability of European tour operators (Doc. B 2-96/86),
- recognition throughout Europe of tour managers (Doc. B 2-98/86).

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

(27 January 1987)

1. No.

2. The constant practice of the approximation at Community level of legislation governing freedom of movement for the pursuit of professional activities consists in amending the relevant national provisions in so far as this is necessary to facilitate this freedom of movement, but does not involve introducing rules on particular occupations which would be uniform throughout the Community. Certain provisions of Community law to facilitate freedom of movement already exist in a number of areas connected with tourism:

- Article 6 (3) of Directive 82/470/EEC of 29 June 1982 (self-employed persons in services incidental to transport) in the case of travel agents ⁽¹⁾;

— Article 7 of Directive 75/368/EEC of 16 June 1975 ('various activities') in the case of couriers ⁽²⁾.

The activities of tourist guides are expressly excluded from the scope of Directive 75/368/EEC. The Commission is nevertheless endeavouring to facilitate freedom of movement for those pursuing this occupation as well. The Commission would also refer the Honourable member in this connection to its answer to Written Question No 376/84 by Mr Irmer ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 213, 21. 7. 1982.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 167, 30. 6. 1975.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 71, 18. 3. 1985.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1806/86

by Mr Derek Prag (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1986)

(87/C 133/75)

Subject: Possible Community standards for car number plates

In view of the continuing growth in cross-border car travel in the Community, and the consequent increase in the number of accidents involving residents of more than one Member State, the difficulty of reading car number plates from certain countries of the Community has become very evident. In some cases, the letters and figures are too small to be legible, and in other cases they cannot be read after dark as they are not illuminated. This can mean that identification by witnesses of an accident is uncertain.

Will the Commission examine the possibility of proposing Community-wide standards for number plates and country of origin plates?

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

(29 January 1987)

The introduction of a Community number plate is being studied by Commission departments, which will certainly look at the matters raised by the Honourable Member.

This whole question does, however, raise a number of problems which have been outlined in answers to Written Questions No 1614/85 by Mr Mühlen ⁽¹⁾ and No 2493/85 by Mrs Lienemann ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 78, 7. 4. 1986, p. 30.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 233, 15. 9. 1986, p. 3.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1819/86

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizit (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 November 1986)

(87/C 133/76)

Subject: Beekeeping: beekeepers' cooperatives

Can beekeepers' cooperatives be regarded as undertakings which should be encouraged in Europe, and could they thereby be eligible for Social Fund aid?

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

(28 January 1987)

The European Social Fund contributes to the financing of measures which are basically concerned with vocational training and employment assistance. Assistance from the Fund can be granted primarily to encourage the employment of young people aged under 25, and in particular those whose opportunities of employment are limited. Aid can also be granted to encourage the employment of certain categories of persons aged over 25. To the extent that the persons covered by the Honourable Member's question correspond to the criteria set out in the rules and guidelines of the Fund, consideration could be given to financing measures relating to their training and employment.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1843/86

by Mr Emmanuel Maffre-Baugé (COM—F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 November 1986)

(87/C 133/77)

Subject: Development of cork production

Although cork is included in the list of products covered by the common agricultural policy (Annex II to the Treaty of Rome), no real Community measures have been taken on its behalf. Production is currently slowing down, although it could contribute to development and employment in some of the less-favoured regions.

Is the Commission aware of the development potential of cork production?

Is it prepared to propose special Community measures to step up cork production in the Community, protect it against imports and enable it better to meet the increasing demand?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(28 January 1987)

The Commission is well aware of the production potential for cork and that this potential is not being fully realised.

With regard to Community action in the cork sector, it is proposed to carry out an in-depth study of all aspects of the industry. In the light of the results of such a study, specific actions may then be proposed according to the needs identified.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1845/86
by Mr Kenneth Collins (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(7 November 1986)
(87/C 133/78)

Subject: Anabolic agents in animal production

Will the Commission now agree to publish the report of the Scientific Working Group on Anabolic Agents in Animal Production, which was chaired by Professor Lamming and whose final report has never been made available.

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(22 January 1987)

The Commission published the work of the Scientific Group referred to by the Honourable Member in its series Agriculture Report EUR 8913 of 1984. The Group has made no other report.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1850/86
by Mrs Undine-Uta Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC—D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(7 November 1986)
(87/C 133/79)

Subject: Plans to build a reprocessing plant for radioactive waste in Belgium

The press has reported that the mayor of Andenne has proposed his town as a suitable site for a Belgian nuclear reprocessing plant.

Are there in fact plans to build a reprocessing plant in Belgium?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1940/86
by Mr Jef Ulburghs (NI—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(21 November 1986)
(87/C 133/80)

Subject: Participation in the construction of a reprocessing plant in Mol (Belgium)

A report in the weekly magazine 'Der Spiegel' of 13 October 1986 states that on 5 November 1986 the DWK (German nuclear fuel reprocessing company) is soon to take a decision on whether to participate in the construction of a reprocessing plant in Mol (Belgium). It is said that the capacity of the new processing plant will be 300 tonnes.

In view of the social implications of the use of nuclear energy and the debate which has taken on a new intensity in our society since the recent nuclear accidents in Chernobyl and Hamm, will the Commission supply information on the new plans for the construction of a processing plant in Mol and any projects being considered for Eurochimique in Mol?

**Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1850/86 and
1940/86 given by Mr Mosar
on behalf of the Commission**
(23 February 1987)

The Commission would point out to the Honourable Member that it is not its practice to comment on articles in the press.

As regards the plans for the reprocessing of irradiated nuclear fuel, Belgium has considered restarting the former Eurochemic reprocessing plant in Dessel, Belgium, which has become the property of Belgium, under the terms of the agreement between Eurochemic (OECD Joint Undertaking) and the Belgian Government.

According to the information which the Commission has to hand, a decision not to do so has just been taken.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1854/86
by Mr Jean-Marie Vanlerenberghe (PPE—F), Mr Jacques Mallet (RDE—F), Mrs Nicole Fontaine (PPE—F) and Mr Jean-Pierre Abelin (PPE—F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(13 November 1986)
(87/C 133/81)

Subject: Submission of tenders by European firms for the construction of Kansai airport (Japan)

Can the Commission state whether, as a result of the contacts which it has had with the Japanese authorities, European

companies will be invited to submit tenders on equal terms with Japanese and American companies for the second stage of the work on the construction of the new Kansai international airport?

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

(27 January 1987)

The Commission has pointed out on a number of occasions to the Japanese authorities that European companies are interested in participating in the Kansai International Airport project. The Japanese authorities have expressed their willingness to inform interested European companies of the procedures to be followed by foreign companies wishing to participate in the project. No guarantee has been given, however, that European companies will necessarily be invited to submit tenders; this will depend on whether they are judged to be qualified suppliers by the Kansai International Airport Company.

The Commission intends to monitor developments in the publicising and granting of contracts, to provide interested companies with information where necessary, and to take up with the Japanese authorities the case of any European company which believes that it has not been treated fairly.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1856/86

by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 November 1986)

(87/C 133/82)

Subject: Female unemployment

What legislative proposals has the Commission submitted to the Council in the last two years, in the field of women's affairs, whose main effect would be the relief of unemployment among women?

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

(3 February 1987)

The initiatives being developed by the Commission to promote equal opportunities for women are for the most part aimed at combating unemployment among women.

A main objective is to promote the desegregation of employment at a time when the segregation of women's employment is one of the chief causes of the worrying level of unemployment among women.

Of the initiatives taken in this field by the Commission, mention should be made first of the communication sent to the Council in March 1983 on measures to combat unemployment amongst women⁽¹⁾, together with a draft resolution⁽²⁾, which resulted in the resolution adopted by the Council on 7 June 1984⁽³⁾.

The resolution emphasizes in particular the need to develop positive measures to improve the position of women in this context; in May 1984, the Commission forwarded a proposal for a recommendation to the Council⁽⁴⁾ on the promotion of positive action for women, which the Council adopted on 13 December 1984⁽⁵⁾.

The new Medium-Term Programme on Equal Opportunities 1986—1990⁽⁶⁾ should also have a major impact on female unemployment. Indeed it states in its introduction that 'the continuing rise in the unemployment rate of women gives particular cause for concern'.

Another proposal for a Directive presented by the Commission under its Action Programme 1982—1985 concerns parental leave and leave for family reasons⁽⁷⁾, which includes among its objectives the promotion of employment and action to combat unemployment, notably through the replacement of workers on leave.

Finally, many of the initiatives taken in recent years by the Commission in the field of employment (e.g. youth employment, adaptation of working time, local employment initiatives, long-term unemployed) and vocational training (e.g. training in the 1980s, training and the new technologies) should have an effect on the fight against women's unemployment.

⁽¹⁾ COM(83) 653 final.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 65, 6. 2. 1984, p. 8.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 161, 21. 6. 1984, p. 4.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 43, 30. 5. 1984.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 331, 19. 12. 1984, p. 34.

⁽⁶⁾ COM(85) 801 final and Council resolution (OJ No C 203, 12. 8. 1986).

⁽⁷⁾ COM(83) 686 final and amended COM(84) 631 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1859/86

by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 November 1986)

(87/C 133/83)

Subject: Danger of rabies

Can the Commission say what it is doing to ensure that the incidence of outbreaks of rabies within the Community is minimized and that effective procedures — including the

closest possible cooperation between the Governments of the Twelve — are in place to deal with any outbreaks?

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

(28 January 1987)

The Commission will in the near future be making a report on the rabies situation within the Community. The report will be accompanied by proposals whose aim will be to increase cooperation between the Member States with a view to reducing the amount of rabies.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1862/86

by Mr François Roelants du Vivier (ARC—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 November 1986)

(87/C 133/84)

Subject: Availability of information reports to be forwarded by the Member States under the provisions of Directives

Further to the Commission's answer to my Written Question No 295/85 ⁽¹⁾ in July 1985, I requested the Belgian Permanent Representative to the European Communities to forward to me the Belgian information report drawn up pursuant to Article 6 of Directive 76/464/EEC ⁽²⁾.

More than 13 months have now passed and I have still not received the said report. Under these circumstances, will the Commission:

1. change its position and forward the aforementioned information report to me itself?
2. state what procedure it has in mind for the future to ensure greater transparency in respect of information forwarded by the Member States in accordance with Directives?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 255, 7. 10. 1985, p. 36.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 129, 18. 5. 1976, p. 23.

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

(19 February 1987)

1. On receipt of the Honourable Member's question, the Commission asked the Belgian Permanent Representation and the State Secretariat for the Environment to inform it whether the Belgian report drawn up pursuant to Article 7 of Directive 76/464/EEC could be forwarded to the Honourable Member. Despite repeated requests, no reply has been received to date.

2. Quite apart from the reasons given in the third part of the answer to the Honourable Member's Written Question No 295/85, which are still valid, the Commission intends, as indicated in the draft fourth action programme on the environment ⁽¹⁾, to submit a proposal for a Directive to standardize and rationalize the general obligation to submit reports. In the proposal in question the Commission will make provision for wider publication of the reports so as to make the implementation of the Directives in question more transparent.

⁽¹⁾ COM(86) 485 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1863/86

by Mr Jon Gangoiti Llaguno (PPE—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 November 1986)

(87/C 133/85)

Subject: Situation of the iron and steel industry in the Community context

Under the terms of the Treaty of Accession, the Spanish Government undertook to reduce its iron and steel production over the three-year transitional period from 21 to 19 million tonnes. In this connection, the Commission and the Spanish Government must jointly review the situation and progress of the reconversion plans for the Spanish iron and steel industry.

Does the Commission consider that the developments which have so far been approved by the Spanish Government with regard to the real situation and the progress of the reconversion plans for the Spanish iron and steel industry are sufficient?

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

(28 January 1987)

Under Protocol 10 to the Act of Accession of Spain to the European Communities, the maximum production capacity of the Spanish steel industry must not exceed 18 million tonnes at the end of the transitional period (31 December 1988).

The Commission and the Spanish Government, in conjunction with the undertakings concerned and with the assistance of outside consultants jointly appointed for the purpose, are now considering the means required to attain that objective.

Under the same Protocol the Commission has assessed the prospects for viability of firms with restructuring programmes approved by the Spanish Government. This assessment, also conducted with assistance from independent consultants, resulted in the Commission proposing to the Spanish Government, on the basis of the

provisions of Point 3 of the Protocol, that the said plans should be supplemented so that the undertakings in question can be restored to viability.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1866/86

by Mrs Bodil Boserup (COM—DK)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 November 1986)

(87/C 133/86)

Subject: Encouragement for exchanges of young workers

Will the Commission say which Danish organizations and individuals have received money, and thus aid, from the fund for 'Exchanges of young workers' (budget item 6 430 in 1986 and 6 330 in 1987) in the 1983—86 period? Which organizations and individuals can expect to receive aid in 1987? Have any accounts been submitted and approved in respect of the use of this money?

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

(3 February 1987)

The organization in Denmark which has obtained funding over the period 1983—1986 (post 6 430) to promote young worker exchanges is the Danish Youth Council (DUF).

It is not possible to say at this stage which organization and individuals will benefit from the programme in 1987, since this depends on who sends in project proposals to the Commission throughout 1987.

The first report by the Commission to the Council on the progress of the Third Joint Programme for the exchange of Young Workers ⁽¹⁾ is currently being prepared and will be presented in 1987.

⁽¹⁾ Council Decision 84/636/EEC of 13 December 1984 (OJ No L 331, 19. 12. 1984, p. 36).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1871/86

by Mr Luis Perinat Elio (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 November 1986)

(87/C 133/87)

Subject: Selection criteria for determining the European Community's policy on medical research

The advances being made in the research carried out in the context of the European Community's ongoing programme

in the medical sector prove that the steps taken by the Community are fully justified, as regards both the subjects of research and the researchers chosen to carry it out.

Particularly noteworthy in this regard is the fact that the Commission has tried to focus its efforts on research into two of the grave scourges afflicting us today: cancer and AIDS.

Nonetheless, as general information for medical researchers, could the Commission say what criteria it applies in selecting the research areas its programmes are to focus on and the people who are to be commissioned to carry out the research?

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

(5 February 1987)

The Commission recently proposed a new coordination programme in the field of medical and health research for 1987—1989 ⁽¹⁾, which specifically includes work on cancer and AIDS. This programme is a continuation of the two preceding programmes in this area, and the close collaboration which has developed between the Commission and the national authorities responsible for research and public health has considerably facilitated this task of coordination.

The specific projects forming the research areas chosen for this programme were selected according to the following criteria:

- each project should be of importance to the Community as a whole;
- the project should have practical importance from the medico-social and in particular from the economic point of view;
- its scientific content should complement existing projects;
- on scientific grounds: either the project should be implemented jointly or could be carried out more effectively at Community level than separately in each Member State; and
- the project should be expected to give clear and reasonably early results.

Medical research is an example of a programme which is coordinated by the Commission and where the scope of the constituent scientific projects is determined jointly at Community level.

Unlike cost-shared actions (which are selected and co-financed by the Commission), the choice of the teams participating in this type of research is made by the Member

States, which finance the projects completely and are responsible for their implementation. The Commission's role is confined to coordination and exchange of knowledge.

In this way, medical research in the Community can be conducted in the most efficient way with very little outlay.

(¹) COM(86) 549 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1874/86

by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(13 November 1986)
(87/C 133/88)

Subject: Dictionary of the European Community

The variety of activities in which the European Community is involved via the different spheres of action for which it is responsible under the Treaties has brought together a whole complex of terminology which can confuse an interested enquirer, owing to the richness and variety of the concepts and the nomenclature used in the normal course of Community business.

This complexity is particularly striking to enquirers into Community matters who are nationals of the two new Member States, and strangers to the development of the Community in past years and to the variations in terminology which have gradually arisen as a result.

Consequently, does the Commission think it would be useful to produce a Dictionary of the European Community bringing together terms and expressions with connotations and meanings specific to the Community, so that anyone interested in a particular Community topic can find out precisely what is meant by terms used in the everyday parlance relating to the various activities of the European Economic Community?

Answer given by Mr Christophersen
on behalf of the Commission
(12 February 1987)

In view of the wide range of Community activities and the various languages used in its departments, it became clear at an early stage that it would be necessary to produce glossaries and other terminological aids. The first of them date from 1962. The Commission's terminology service has since

produced a number of glossaries, many of which already contain Spanish and Portuguese.

The complete set of glossaries is available in Parliament's libraries in Brussels and Luxembourg.

In addition, all the terms contained in these glossaries have been entered in Eurodicautom, the Commission's terminological data base. Eurodicautom offers all nine Community languages, contains over 400 000 terms and more than 100 000 abbreviations, and can be accessed by outside users.

The Commission is sending further, more detailed information direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1875/86

by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(13 November 1986)
(87/C 133/89)

Subject: Imposition of VAT on sporting activities of yacht clubs

Generally speaking, VAT is supposed to be a tax on the profit produced by the commercial transaction involving the product on which the tax is levied.

However, if the operation on which VAT is to be levied falls outside the scope of taxation applying to the commercial transaction involving the taxable product, the obvious question is whether activities or services which do not touch on the commercial transaction concerned should be taxed.

In view of this, and so as to dispel any doubts, could the Commission state whether non-professional sporting activities which are, in the strict sense, non-profit-making, carried on by a yacht club, can as such be liable to VAT?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission
(22 January 1987)

Under the common system of VAT, certain sporting activities qualify for exemption. According to Article 13 (A) (1) (m) of the Sixth Directive (¹), Member States are required to exempt, under conditions which they are to lay down, 'certain services closely linked to sport . . . supplied by non-profit-making organizations to persons taking part in sport . . . '.

Like any other sporting club, therefore, a nautical sports club is eligible for exemption.

(¹) OJ No L 145, 13. 6. 1977.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1878/86

by Mr José Alvarez de Eulate Penaranda (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 November 1986)

(87/C 133/90)

Subject: Rationalization of relations between the Commission and the Ministries of Agriculture in the Member States

The importance of the Community's activity in the sphere of agriculture increases considerably from year to year; some thought must therefore be given to ways of rationalizing the process whereby contact is established and relations maintained between the relevant Commission departments and the Ministries of Agriculture in the various Member States.

Frequently the fact that the various departments of certain Ministries of Agriculture are widely scattered leads to a regrettable waste of time which hampers the efficiency one should expect from such departments.

The existing system of contacts and links between national and Community bodies should therefore be improved. This could perhaps be achieved by setting up a Directorate-General for Relations with the European Community in every Ministry of Agriculture in the Member States, as already exists in some Community countries.

Does the Commission therefore consider that the Member States should be asked to set up such Directorates-General, so as to facilitate procedure concerning Community agricultural affairs?

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

(3 February 1987)

In general, the existing channels between the Commission and the national ministries have catered adequately for the needs arising from the installation and monitoring of the common agricultural policy.

Naturally, the increased workload created by developments in agriculture and successive enlargements of the Community may raise the question of rationalization.

It is not, however, for the Commission to intervene in the internal organization of Member States' government departments.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1883/86

by Mrs Anne-Marie Lizin (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 November 1986)

(87/C 133/91)

Subject: Social measures to compensate for the liberalization of the steel market

Does the Commission intend to propose specific social measures to aid those steel industries which are bound to suffer as a result of liberalization, in particular the Walloon iron and steel industry?

What budget will the Commission be proposing for this purpose?

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

(27 January 1987)

Steel industry workers whose jobs are affected by the liberalization of the steel market are entitled to the ECSC redeployment aids provided for in Article 56 (2) (b) of the Treaty of Paris and granted either under bilateral agreements between the Commission/High Authority and the individual Member States or within the context of the special measures for the steel industry proposed by the Commission.

These workers may also benefit directly or indirectly from the measures provided for in the Commission's action programme for stronger Community structural measures to assist the Community's steel restructuring (¹) which it sent to the Council and Parliament in July 1986.

(¹) COM(86) 422.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1896/86

by Mr Pieter Dankert (S—NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 November 1986)

(87/C 133/92)

Subject: The Member States' attitude towards combating fraud and irregularities with regard to Community regulations

1. Does the Commission agree with the comment in section 4.28 of the Court of Auditors' report on the 1984 budget year that the Member States are not always attentive

to the financial interests of the Community and that there is a virtually universal lack of cooperation in certain areas?

2. Can the Commission give a figure for the financial loss sustained by the Community in 1984 as a result of this attitude by the Member States?

3. Which Member States have often demonstrated unwillingness to cooperate with the Commission on certain investigations, particularly those into fraud and irregularities on their territory, as pointed out in section 4.28?

4. Which Member States refused to cooperate in an inquiry when it turned out that it was their nationals who had benefited, as pointed out under section 4.28?

5. Have the Member States alluded to in questions 3 and 4 acted contrary to their obligations under Community law and particularly under Article 5 of the EEC Treaty?

6. If so, has the Commission initiated the procedure laid down in Article 169 of the EEC Treaty?

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

(12 February 1987)

1. The Commission would point out that any assessment made by the Court of Auditors of the extent of the problems raised by the Honourable Member is the responsibility of that institution.

However, the Commission agrees that there are areas where improvements can, and should, be achieved. Efforts to this effect are already being made, both in the context of bilateral contacts with Member States, and on a more general basis.

2. It is virtually impossible to state what would be involved in the circumstances referred to by the Honourable Member, since any assessment would have to be made on the basis of subjective criteria.

3—6. In the type of cases mentioned, it would not be the practice of the Commission to publish the name of the Member States concerned.

Although improvements are desirable, as mentioned above, the Commission has not so far deemed the problems to be of such a nature as to conflict with Article 5 of the EEC Treaty. It has consequently not found it appropriate to initiate the procedure laid down in Article 169 of the Treaty.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1902/86

by Mr Victor Arbeloa Muru (S—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(13 November 1986)

(87/C 133/93)

Subject: Voluntary relief work in the Third World

How many non-governmental and governmental organizations involved in relief work and/or the organization of volunteer workers in the 'Third World' are there in the European Community?

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

(22 January 1987)

The Commission does not know precisely how many non-governmental and voluntary organizations working in the development field are based in the Member States of the Community. It works regularly in conjunction with some 500 organizations which specialize in the various aspects of development cooperation (food aid, emergency aid, co-financing of development projects, etc.).

The Commission would point out that it does not keep records on NGOs operating in the Member States based on their religious, political or ideological affiliations, since such factors have no influence on the Commission's decisions regarding cooperation with the organizations concerned.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1923/86

by Mr Christopher Jackson (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(21 November 1986)

(87/C 133/94)

Subject: Electronic equipment

Difficulty has been experienced by political groups in the European Parliament when taking electronic equipment belonging to Parliament, such as computers and printers, to group meetings, study days, etc. in Community countries outside the normal places of work of the institutions because export licences are required.

Are there any EEC provisions, either general or relating to the Community institutions, which free official Parliament equipment taken temporarily for use at such meetings from the necessity of customs declaration, licences, etc?

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

(4 February 1987)

Article 4 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities provides that the Communities shall be exempt from all customs duties, prohibitions and restrictions on imports and exports in respect of articles intended for their official use. There should thus be no restrictions on movement of the equipment belonging to the Parliament mentioned by the Honourable Member.

The Commission was informed in 1983 by officials of the Parliament of certain difficulties which had arisen at one frontier crossing-point over the question of the procedure to be used when material belonging to the Parliament is transported between Member States. In view of the importance and, in many cases, the urgency of the operations concerned, agreement was reached on an administrative arrangement between the authorities of the Member States, dispensing the consignment of goods intended for the official use of the European Parliament, and which are carried by its own services, from the application of Community transit formalities, provided such goods are accompanied by an official certificate issued by the Parliament. This document is now known and accepted by the customs authorities of the Member States, and no further problems have been reported since 1983.

Without full details of the difficulty referred to by the Honourable Member, the Commission does not know whether there has been a failure to apply the abovementioned arrangement correctly, or whether he refers to cases where equipment belonging to the Parliament was transported in circumstances which did not make the equipment's status sufficiently clear. It is obvious that the authorities which, pending the completion of the internal market, exercise the remaining checks and examinations at the borders between Member States, must always be sure that goods for which the benefit of the Protocol referred to previously is claimed are genuinely entitled to that benefit, and it may be that cases have arisen in which evidence of entitlement was required.

The Commission is particularly puzzled by the reference to export licences, since it has not previously heard of difficulties of this kind. It may be noted that Article 34 of the EEC Treaty provides that quantitative restrictions on exports and all measures having equivalent effect shall be prohibited between Member States. If the Honourable Member provides full details of the kind of difficulty which has arisen, the Commission will provide him with a more precise answer and, of course, take any measures which seem to be necessary.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1929/86

by Mr Bryan Cassidy (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(21 November 1986)

(87/C 133/95)

Subject: Angola

How much Community aid will be given to Angola under the Third Lomé Convention?

What proposals has the Commission received from the Angolan Government for projects under this aid programme?

How soon will they be implemented?

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

(26 January 1987)

The programmable aid resources allocated to Angola in the context of the Lomé III national indicative programme amount to 95 million ECU. The indicative programme was signed in Luanda on 1 October. The Community aid will be concentrated on two specific targets: food self-sufficiency (including assistance for agriculture, livestock production and fisheries) and the reactivation of production through the rehabilitation of existing back-up infrastructure for the agri-food sector (communications, rural electrification, etc). In addition, activities outside these focal sectors are envisaged with a view to the development of human resources (in particular vocational training) and the improvement of local health conditions. The Angolan Government has already presented to the Commission a number of programmes and projects for implementation under the indicative programme.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1930/86

by Mr Bryan Cassidy (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(21 November 1986)

(87/C 133/96)

Subject: Angola

Is the Commission satisfied that its officials in Angola itself and in Brussels are receiving full cooperation from the MPLA administration in Angola in planning and administering Community aid projects?

**Answer given by Mr Natali
on behalf of the Commission**
(26 January 1987)

Yes. A Commission Delegation was set up in Luanda in April, and Lomé III programming has proceeded satisfactorily and in the manner intended under the Convention.

Have any amendments or modifications been proposed to the Articles on pharmaceutical training in Council Directives 85/432/EEC ⁽²⁾ and 85/433/EEC ⁽³⁾?

Does not the Commission consider that the scope of this committee's duties should be extended with a view to the full implementation of the internal market and freedom of movement for Community citizens?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 253, 24. 9. 1985, p. 43.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 253, 24. 9. 1985, p. 34.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 253, 24. 9. 1985, p. 37.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1934/86
by Mrs Vera Squarcialupi (COM—I)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(21 November 1986)
(87/C 133/97)

Subject: Consumption of psychopharmaceuticals

On the basis of the results of the inquiry carried out by the European Parliament into the drug problem in Europe and, in particular, the use of psychopharmaceuticals, can the Commission state how much the consumption of analgesics has risen in recent years? To give an example, the figures for the first half of 1985 and the first half of 1986 indicate that in Italy the consumption of a certain analgesic — Tengesic — has risen by 144% for the tablet form and 184% for the liquid form.

**Answer given by Mr Marin
on behalf of the Commission**
(15 January 1987)

The Commission does not at present have any figures on the use of analgesics.

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission**
(4 February 1986)

Since the members of the Advisory Committee on Pharmaceutical Training set up by the Council Decision of 16 September 1985 have not yet been nominated by the Member States, the Council has been unable to appoint them in accordance with Article 3 (3) of the abovementioned Decision.

Because of this, and also the fact that the deadline for the incorporation into national law of Directive 85/432/EEC and 85/433/EEC does not expire until 30 September 1987, the Commission believes it is too early to propose amendments concerning the minimum requirements for pharmaceutical training laid down by the said Directives.

Like the other Advisory Committees already set up on training in other health professions (doctors, nurses responsible for general care, dentists, midwives), the Commission believes that the Advisory Committee on Pharmaceutical Training will be of prime importance in achieving a comparably high standard of training capable of ensuring that pharmacists benefit from free movement under the best conditions.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1938/86
by Mr Antonio Iodice (PPE—I)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(21 November 1986)
(87/C 133/98)

Subject: Training of pharmacists

With regard to the advisory committee on pharmaceutical training, set up by the Council Decision of 16 September 1985 ⁽¹⁾, can the Commission state what results, if any, have so far been achieved by this body with particular reference to the adaptation of pharmaceutical training to developments in pharmaceutical science and teaching methods?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1941/86
by Mr Alexandros Alavanos (COM—GR)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(21 November 1986)
(87/C 133/99)

Subject: Commission refusal to provide information to a Member of the European Parliament

In my previous Written Question No 636/86 ⁽¹⁾ on Greece's payments into and receipts from the Community budget, the Commissioner, Mr Christophersen, refused to provide information on receipts on the grounds that the Commission had expressed reservations on establishing tables of statistics that could be used to argue for 'just returns' (3. 10. 1986, QXW0636/86 — EL). A few days later, the Community

services gave the relevant information on Greece's receipts from the Community budget to journalists (published in the Greek newspaper 'Express' on 25 October 1986).

Does the Commission take the view that it can provide information only when it confirms its opinions, that it can refuse to provide it when it might support different opinions and can withhold from an MEP information which it gives to journalists a few days later? Does the Commission take such an undeniably novel view of its obligations as regards parliamentary control? If not, then what comments does it have to make about Mr Christophersen's answer to my previous question?

Moreover, can the Commission now give me in full the information I asked for in my previous question?

(¹) OJ No C 330, 22. 12. 1986, p. 31.

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

(13 March 1987)

The Commission can only confirm the answer given by Mr Christophersen on its behalf on 3 October 1986 to the Honourable Member's Written Question No 636/86 (¹).

As regards the articles of 25 October 1986 in the Greek newspaper 'Express', the author had clearly used for 1981—84 the information published by the Court of Auditors in its Annual Report for 1984 (²). The definition of annual expenditure used in these statistics is not the same as that applied by the Commission for correcting budgetary imbalances.

The — less complete — information relating to 1985 must have been collated by the author from a variety of sources, such as, for example, the ERDF 1985 Annual Report.

(¹) OJ No C 330, 22. 12. 1986.

(²) OJ No C 326, 16. 12. 1985, pp. 148 and 149.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1949/86

**by Mr José Barros Moura (COM—P)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(21 November 1986)

(87/C 133/100)

Subject: Programme for the decommissioning or temporary immobilization of cod-fishing vessels

Can the Commission explain the conditions and criteria for the granting of aids to Portuguese shipowners engaged in the

cod-fishing industry whose boats have been prevented, since Portugal's accession to the Community, from operating in Canadian waters, since the Community does not have a fishery agreement with Canada?

**Answer given by Mr Cardoso e Cunha
on behalf of the Commission**

(19 February 1987)

By Decision 86/539/EEC of 3 November 1986 (¹), the Commission approved the measures envisaged by Portugal for an aid scheme in 1986 to finance measures involving the temporary or permanent decommissioning of certain fishing vessels pursuant to Council Directive 83/515/EEC concerning certain measures to adjust capacity in the fisheries sector (²). It is the criteria and conditions of this Directive which were applied in the case referred to by the Honourable Member.

(¹) OJ No L 319, 14. 11. 1986, p. 74.

(²) OJ No L 290, 22. 10. 1983, p. 15.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1958/86

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

(21 November 1986)

(87/C 133/101)

Subject: Cost of public storage of agricultural produce

1. Could the Commission indicate the average annual cost (technical and financing costs) in ECU per tonne of the public storage of common wheat, durum wheat, barley, rye, olive oil, tobacco, butter, cheese, skimmed-milk powder, beef and veal, sheepmeat, goatmeat and pigmeat on the basis of the situation described in the fourteenth financial report on the EAGGF (COM(86) 492 final)?

2. Could the Commission indicate the approximate market value of these commodities in ECU per tonne as at 30 November 1985?

3. Could the Commission indicate, for each commodity, the average loss in ECU per tonne borne by the Community as a result of sales of this produce since 30 November 1985?

4. Could the Commission indicate the loss per commodity, as a percentage of 1985—1986 intervention prices, on sales since 30 November 1985?

5. Could the Commission indicate the approximate losses per commodity, as percentages of 1985—1986 intervention

prices, if the produce in storage at 30 November 1986 is kept in public storage for one, two, three, four, five or six years?

6. What conclusions does the Commission draw from the replies to these questions?

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

(12 February 1987)

1. The cost of public storage — technical and financing — for the main agricultural products was as follows for 1984:

Product	Storage costs	Financing costs
Common wheat	21,0 ECU/t	9,8 ECU/t
Durum wheat		
Barley		
Rye		
Olive oil	218,7 ECU/t	147,9 ECU/t
Tobacco	276,8 ECU/t	67,0 ECU/t
Butter	162,1 ECU/t	281,0 ECU/t
Cheese	No public stocks	
Skimmed-milk powder	39,0 ECU/t	123,8 ECU/t
Beef	275,8 ECU/t	119,3 ECU/t
Sheepmeat	No public stocks	
Pigmeat		

These figures have been calculated, as requested by the Honourable Member, on the basis of the Commission's financial report on the EAGGF ⁽¹⁾. They are thus accounting averages, based on the stocks at the beginning and at the end of the year.

2. The market value of the products in store on 31 November 1985 was estimated as follows for the establishment of the annex to the 1985 revenue and expenditure account:

Common wheat	162,7 ECU/tonne
Durum wheat	201,1 ECU/tonne
Barley	156,5 ECU/tonne
Rye	148,3 ECU/tonne
Olive oil	1 533,3 ECU/tonne
Tobacco	402,9 ECU/tonne
Butter	1 229,5 ECU/tonne
Skimmed-milk powder	954,1 ECU/tonne
Beef	
— quarters	1 117,8 ECU/tonne
— bone	2 566,2 ECU/tonne
Pigmeat	621,1 ECU/tonne

3 and 4. The figures for average losses per tonne for all products marketed after 30 November 1985 will become available only when the 1986 accounts have been closed.

5. The losses as a result of public storage, as percentages of the 1985/86 intervention prices, are estimated as follows:

Product	After 1 year	After 2 years	After 3 years
Common wheat	18	33	48
Durum wheat	16	31	45
Barley	18	33	48
Rye	18	34	49
Olive oil	16	30	43
Tobacco	15	26	36
Butter	12	22	33
Skimmed-milk powder	10	19	27
Beef			
— quarters	34	46	58
— boned	32	42	51
Pigmeat ⁽¹⁾	63	75	88

⁽¹⁾ Special intervention operation, following veterinary action.

These losses are calculated allowing for storage costs (but not including the temporary reduction in Community financing of 25 %) and the rate of interest of 7 %. For the meats there is a clause allowing technical depreciation on entry into intervention because of freezing; this cost has been included in the loss for the first year.

6. The Commission is well aware of the heavy financial cost of carrying public agricultural stocks. Its policy remains that of restoring market equilibria and therefore of scaling down public intervention. In this connection, it has recently submitted a report on action to be taken with regard to milk, and it will bear these considerations in mind when submitting the 1987/88 price proposals.

⁽¹⁾ COM(85) 492 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1961/86

by Mr Richard Cottrell (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(21 November 1986)

(87/C 133/102)

Subject: Proposed rail crossing of the Dornoch Firth

In the House of Commons on 26 October, it was stated that a dossier of proposals sent to Brussels for consideration under the European Regional Development Fund included a strong case for including a rail crossing with the proposed Dornoch road bridge in Scotland. This appears to contradict the reply to my Written Question No 1092/86 ⁽¹⁾ from Mr Stanley Clinton Davis. This Member must state that it has always

been his impression that the United Kingdom authorities did consult the Commission with regard to arrangements for the Dornoch crossing. Will the Commission now shed further light on the matter.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 45, 23. 2. 1987, p. 32.

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

(9 March 1987)

The Commission is unable to provide any further information to the Honourable Member with regard to the Dornoch rail crossing; the position remains as set out in the reply to Written Question No 1092/86 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 45, 23. 2. 1987.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1976/86

by Mr Hugh McMahon (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1986)

(87/C 133/103)

Subject: Culture capital of Europe

Can the Commission inform the House what the contributions were from the individual Member States for the expenditure towards the projects of the cultural capital of Europe in Athens and Florence and what assistance will be forthcoming for Paris and Glasgow?

As the present United Kingdom Minister for Arts has said that it is unlikely that the United Kingdom Government will provide additional financial aid, will the Commission make any representations to the government on behalf of the United Kingdom on this matter?

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

(26 January 1987)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the resolution of the Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs, meeting within the Council, of 13 June 1985 concerning the annual event 'European City of Culture' ⁽¹⁾.

Section III of this resolution provides that 'The Member State in which the designated "European City of Culture" lies decides which authority inside the Member State will take responsibility for organizing and financing the event.'

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 153, 22. 6. 1985.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1979/86

by Mr Michael Hindley (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1986)

(87/C 133/104)

Subject: Mercury-based soaps

What steps has the Commission taken to seek a ban on the export of mercury-based soaps from the Community, and what steps does the Commission intend to take?

Which Member States have imposed a unilateral ban on the export and production of mercury-based soaps?

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

(3 March 1987)

Under Article 4 of Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products ⁽¹⁾, as last amended by Directive 86/199/EEC ⁽²⁾, Member States shall prohibit the marketing, within the Community, of soaps containing mercury.

According to the information available to the Commission, soaps of this type are not produced in France or the Federal Republic of Germany. On the other hand they are produced in the United Kingdom for export to non-member countries.

As regards the wider problem of trade in dangerous products, the Commission has sent the Council a proposal for a Regulation ⁽³⁾ concerning export from and import into the Community of certain dangerous chemicals, together with a recommendation for a Council decision authorizing the Commission to negotiate, on behalf of the Community within the framework of the OECD and UNEP, the notification and consultation procedures concerning trade in dangerous chemicals.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 262, 27. 9. 1986, p. 169.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 149, 3. 6. 1986, p. 38.

⁽³⁾ COM(86) 362 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1991/86

by Mr Jean-Paul Bachy (S—F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1986)

(87/C 133/105)

Subject: Weekend hours of trading of certain businesses

The existence of different laws in one country and another concerning the hours of trading of certain businesses,

particularly at the weekend, creates extremely damaging distortion of competition for the businesses concerned. This situation is particularly apparent in border areas and there is a great risk that a move towards deregulating hours of business will develop, thus threatening the principle of the weekly break which also constitutes a time-honoured social right in many countries.

If there is any sense in the notion of building Europe it lies in the endeavour to harmonize social legislation in a progressive direction, not in bringing about its outright repeal.

What measures does the Commission intend to take:

- to avoid the risks of social deregulation deriving from the opening of borders and the aim of establishing a single European market by the early 1990s,
- to promote a change in working hours in the commercial sector at European level in order to prevent distortions which increase competition and 'social dumping' practices,
- to instigate all the consultation and negotiation necessary between employers and employees on this subject with a view to drawing up a European Directive?

**Answer given by Mr Marin
on behalf of the Commission
(9 March 1987)**

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the replies given to Written Questions Nos 225/83 by Mrs Rabbethge ⁽¹⁾, 226/84 by Mr Albers and Mrs Viehoff ⁽²⁾, 331/84 by Mr Hooper ⁽³⁾, 467/84 by Mr Franz ⁽⁴⁾ and Oral Question No H-330/83 by Mr Seligman ⁽⁵⁾ on this topic.

The Commission recalls that the wider question of the reduction and reorganization of working time was the subject of a draft recommendation which the Council failed to approve in June 1984.

The reorganization of working time, in connection with a new organization of work in undertakings, is at present the subject of exchanges of views between the two sides of industry as part of the social dialogue. The Commission intends to submit a communication dealing with these problems in the first half of 1987.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 219, 16. 8. 1983.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 232, 3. 9. 1984.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 188, 16. 7. 1984.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No C 328, 10. 12. 1984.

⁽⁵⁾ Extract from the summary record of the session of the European Parliament held on 16 November 1983.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1992/86
by Mr Hans-Jürgen Zahorka (PPE—D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(24 November 1986)
(87/C 133/106)**

Subject: Appraisal of the activities of the US Export-Import Bank in the light of the extension of the Bank's statutes from 15 October 1986

On 15 October 1986 the US President extended the statutes of the Export-Import Bank for a further six years (H.R. 5548; Export-Import Bank Act Amendments of 1986). One of the purposes of the institution is to furnish the US Administration with a 'tide aid war chest' in international trade.

1. What is the Commission's view of the Bank's activities hitherto?
2. Is it aware of instances in which the Bank's activities were directed against the Community's interests in relation to trade with third countries?
3. Can the Commission perceive any possible distortion of competition in the Bank's sphere of activities to date?
4. In the forthcoming Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations, does the Commission intend to raise the question of export financing and the activities of banks such as the Export-Import Bank with the negotiating body responsible for non-tariff barriers to trade or with any other competent body?
5. Would the Commission contemplate the possibility of drawing up models for establishing an equivalent Community institution or has this already been considered?

**Answer given by Mr De Clercq
on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 1987)**

1—3. Since the late 1970's, the Export-Import Bank of the United States (Exim) has emphasized its programmes to match interest rates in response to foreign competition. However, like its OECD partners (including Community Member States), the US has been bound to respect the minimum interest rate arrangements laid down in the so-called OECD Consensus on Export Credits, which apply to publicly-supported financing, so that OECD partners compete in this area on a broadly equal footing.

In contrast, the situation is not the same as regards tied-aid credits. Some countries including Community Member States use this form of financing much more extensively than others such as the US. In the OECD, the US has always

pleaded in favour of limiting the use of these credits. The 'war chest', which forms part of the new Exim legal framework and was initially introduced in late 1985, is intended to enable Eximbank to compete more effectively with other major exporting countries. However, its budget is still considerably lower than amounts available for tied-aid financing in other OECD countries.

So far, experience shows that for this reason the 'war chest' is used on a rather selective basis. It has been used in bids won by US companies against Community competition, but they are just as likely to be the result of other factors such as price, delivery or the decline in the value of the dollar. Generally, it cannot be asserted that Exim-bank, because of the 'war chest', has a competitive advantage over Community Member States.

As the Honourable Member may be aware, the Community, in the framework of ongoing discussions in the OECD, agrees with the US on the need to strengthen discipline in the field of tied-aid financing in order to minimize trade distortion. If measures can be taken to this effect, any inequalities in competitive conditions will be greatly reduced in this area.

4. The appropriate framework for discussions of the issues raised by the Honourable Member is the OECD. Nevertheless, in the light of the evolution of these negotiations, the Commission would not exclude also raising them in the context of the new GATT round, if appropriate.

5. The Commission is currently examining this question.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2002/86

by Mr Robert Battersby (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1986)

(87/C 133/107)

Subject: Commission fining policy in competition cases

Further to the answer to my Written Question No 2006/82 ⁽¹⁾ on plea bargaining in competition cases and in view of recent disturbing press reports of moves within the Commission to take a lenient attitude towards certain industrial cartels, can the Commission confirm that there is no truth whatsoever in these reports, and can the Commission further assure Parliament that its commendable new policy of strict enforcement and 'making the punishment fit the crime' in the field of cartel prosecution will be maintained?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 118, 3. 5. 1983, p. 21.

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

(3 February 1987)

The Commission confirms its reply to the Honourable Member's Written Question No 2006/82, and assures him of its continued effort to take appropriate action in all cases of serious infringement of the competition rules of the EEC Treaty which come to its attention.

With respect to its fining policy, the Commission understands that the Honourable Member refers to perceived variances in fines imposed on undertakings committing similar infringements of the competition rules by participating in horizontal cartels.

In accordance with Article 15 of Council Regulation 17 ⁽¹⁾ and the relevant case law of the Court of Justice, the Commission has a certain discretion in determining the amount of fines. It first considers the duration and gravity of the violation and the necessity of deterring other similar infringements. Alongside these it weighs up mitigating and aggravating factors which it may take into consideration to lower or increase the level of the fine which would otherwise be imposed. Mitigating factors may include either the behaviour of the undertaking itself or the state of the market in which it operates. The attitude of the companies involved in the particular proceeding in question is important in the assessment of fines.

The Commission can also take into consideration difficulties encountered by the relevant industry as a result of depressed markets in its assessment of the fine to be imposed on individual members of that industry. This attitude, which is inspired by the desire not to exacerbate the difficulties encountered by an industry will, however, not lead to a waiver of fines. The Commission remains convinced that restrictive practices are not an adequate solution to depressed market conditions and it continues to insist on enforcement of EEC competition rules and procedures in these circumstances.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 13, 21. 2. 1962, p. 204/62.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2003/86

by Mr Victor Arbeloa Muru (S—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1986)

(87/C 133/108)

Subject: Aid for the repair and restoration of historic town centres

As a Member of the European Parliament, I frequently receive requests from mayors of towns and villages in

Navarra concerning the repair and restoration of their historic town centres. Two such requests have concerned the Romanesque-Gothic medieval centre of Ujué and the Gothic Medieval centre of Viana, an important town from along the Camino de Santiago, the pilgrims' way.

What assistance does the Community provide in such cases and what are the main criteria for the granting of aid?

**Answer given by Mr Ripa di Meana
on behalf of the Commission
(23 January 1987)**

The Commission provides financial backing for pilot projects to conserve the Community's architectural heritage.

For details of the application procedure the Honourable Member is referred to the notice published for 1986 ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission intends to publish a similar notice for 1987 at the beginning of the year.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 97, 25. 4. 1986.

these channels and in accordance with the criteria and guidelines established between the Commission and its South African partners (see also Resolution of the European Parliament of 10 July 1986, point 20). No project has been presented to the Commission which does not fall within these guidelines.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2433/86
by Mr Kenneth Collins (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(23 January 1987)
(87/C 133/110)**

Subject: Staff vacancies in the Commission

Is the Commission aware of the questions I tabled on 22 May and 17 October concerning 'Vacancy for the post of Head of the Commission's London Office' and 'Staff vacancies in the Commission' ⁽¹⁾? Is the Commission now in a position to reply to these questions, and if not, is this because it is unsure of the procedure it has been using to fill vacancies?

⁽¹⁾ Written Questions Nos 696/86 and 1808/86.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2010/86
by Mr Otto von Habsburg (PPE—D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(24 November 1986)
(87/C 133/109)**

Subject: Aid for black people in South Africa

The EEC has set aside a certain amount of resources to support black organizations in South Africa. Would the Commission state what black organizations apart from the Church Council, the COSATU trade union and the Kagiso Trust have applied for aid from this fund, what has happened to these applications and how they are being treated?

**Answer given by Mr Natali
on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 1987)**

Assistance from the Community's special programme for victims of apartheid goes through four channels in South Africa, namely the South African Council of Churches, the South African Catholic Bishops' Conference, the Kagiso Trust and the trade unions. All requests for assistance from any organization in South Africa must be presented by one of

**Answer given by Mr Christophersen
on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 1987)**

The Commission answered the Honourable Member's Written Questions Nos 696/86 ⁽¹⁾ and 1808/86 ⁽²⁾ on 30 January 1987 and 20 January 1987 respectively.

⁽¹⁾ See page 3 of this Official Journal.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 100, 13. 4. 1987, p. 26.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2675/86
by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC—B)
to the Council of the European Communities
(19 February 1986)
(87/C 133/111)**

Subject: Development of new and renewable energy sources

On 26 November the Council of Energy Ministers adopted a draft resolution submitted by the Commission on a Community orientation to develop new and renewable energy sources. The Commission regrets that, in the

resolution adopted by the Council, no reference has been made to the Commission's proposal to set up a working party of experts on the development of these energy sources, comprising prominent members of the scientific and industrial community. Can the Council explain the reasons for this?

Answer
(10 April 1987)

1. The Council feels that it is for the Commission to provide itself with the expertise which it considers necessary.

2. At the Council meeting on energy on 26 November 1986 the Commission considered it appropriate to make a statement, which was noted by the Council.

According to that statement, the Commission will at the earliest opportunity organize a meeting of senior scientific advisers on new and renewable energy sources with a view to drawing up a description of programmes under way at national level in order to define the points of complementarity between Member States, identify and collect existing information on the long-term exploitable potential of these energy sources and establish a solid foundation for future work in this sector.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2843/86

by Mr Alfred Lomas (S—GB), Mr Giosuè Ligios (PPE—I), Mrs Carla Barbarella (COM—I), Mr Sylvester Barrett (RDE—IRL), Mr Pieter Dankert (S—NL), Mrs Rika De Backer-Van Ocken (PPE—B), Mr Guido Fanti (COM—I), Mr José Garcia Raya (S—E), Mrs Marlene Lenz (PPE—D), Mrs Marcelle Lentz-Cornette (PPE—L), Mr Paul Staes (ARC—B), Mr Frederick Tuckman (ED—GB) and Mr Francis Wurtz (COM—F)

to the Council of the European Communities

(10 March 1987)

(87/C 133/112)

Subject: The foreign debt of Third World countries

1. whereas the socio-economic situation in the developing countries has to a certain extent deteriorated and for some of them has been aggravated by the trend in the price of oil and other raw materials and the fall in the value of the dollar,

2. whereas the foreign debt of such countries cancels out the efforts made by some of them towards economic recovery,

3. concerned at the generic and incomplete nature of the guidelines laid down in this context by the Tokyo Summit on economic cooperation,

can the Council:

A. inform the European Parliament:

— whether the key question of reducing interest rates was tackled in Tokyo and, if so, how;

— what concrete undertakings were given at the Summit to implement and, possibly, extend the scope of the Baker initiative;

B. say what steps it intends to take in this sphere?

Answer
(3 April 1987)

1. The problem of reducing interest rates was discussed at the Tokyo Summit, which considered that the continuation of present policies, particularly structural adjustment policies and more international coordination, should help to create the requisite conditions.

2. In Tokyo, the Seven acknowledged the progress already made under the cooperative debt strategy based, in particular, on the initiative taken by Mr Baker at the IMF/World Bank annual assemblies in 1985. In this connection the Seven attached great importance to:

— an early and substantial eighth replenishment of IDA resources (an amount of 12,4 thousand million dollars has since been approved, in December 1986);

— a general increase in World Bank capital;

— the activation of the MIGA, which should help to improve the investment climate in the developing countries and, overall, increase the flow of direct private investment.

These conclusions are completely in accord with the approach adopted by the Council and the Commission.

3. At the meeting of the IMF Interim Committee in April 1986, the President of the Council expressed the Community's support for the Baker initiative. In this connection the Community took the view that the only valid basis for a lasting solution to the debt problem was to persevere with the 'case-by-case' approach, stressing that all the parties concerned (industrialized countries, international financial institutions and commercial banks) should participate in concerted efforts to assist the debtor countries

which adopted macroeconomic and overall structural adjustment policies. The Community further stated that it would be willing to help the multilateral financial institutions play their part and supported initiatives in progress, led by the IMF, particularly that concerning the use of the proceeds of repayments to the Trust Fund. This would make it possible to continue granting concessional loans to support the balance of payments of low-revenue developing countries, while facilitating the necessary structural adjustments.

At the recent annual meetings of the IMF and the World Bank, the President of the Council repeated the Community position on this matter and drew attention to the important opportunity, in terms of export revenue, offered to the developing countries by the new Uruguay Round; to which the Community has firmly committed itself.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2938/86

by Mr Enrique Sapena Granell (S—E)

to the Council of the European Communities

(18 March 1987)

(87/C 133/113)

Subject: Use of flags of convenience in place of flags of the Community fleet

The German shipping company, Rickmers Line of Hamburg, has sold the last two vessels of its fleet, the 'Renee Rickmers' and the 'Bertram Rickmers'. The company is to maintain its regular service to China, using chartered vessels flying third country flags.

The company Hapag-Lloyd is to charter vessels for its new service to South America. These will be manned by non-German crews. The English company Furness Withy is to replace the British flag with the flag of Hong Kong on six of its vessels.

There is reason to believe that practices such as these will continue in the future. With every day that passes, more and more vessels exchange their Community flags for flags of convenience and the size of the Community fleet is constantly diminished. Various proposals for Regulations and Directives — on which the European Parliament has given its opinion — were recently submitted by the Commission to the Council with a view to coping with the serious crisis affecting the sector in question.

Will the decisions so far taken suffice to solve this problem, which affects and is a matter for concern to so many Community citizens?

If, in the light of events, the recent proposals prove inadequate, will consideration be given to the preparation of fresh proposals which will tackle the crisis in a positive and effective way and can be implemented before the situation becomes irreversible?

What are the Council's views on this matter?

Answer

(3 April 1987)

At its meeting on 22 December 1986, the Council adopted four Regulations on maritime transport:

- a Regulation applying the principle of freedom to provide services to maritime transport between Member States and between Member States and third countries;
- a Regulation concerning coordinated action to safeguard free access to cargoes in ocean trades;
- a Regulation on unfair pricing practices in maritime transport;
- a Regulation laying down detailed rules for the application of Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty to maritime transport.

These four Regulations form the real beginnings of a common policy in this area. The aim of the policy is to maintain and develop a competitive and efficient Community shipping industry and to ensure the supply of competitive maritime transport services in the interests of Community trade.

The Council realizes, however, that if these aims are to be achieved further efforts will be needed to promote the development of the Community fleet and to reduce the disparities in operating conditions and costs between fleets in the Community as a whole and their foreign competitors. The Council has therefore asked the Commission to submit appropriate proposals to it as soon as possible.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 3080/86

by Mrs Martine Lehideux (DR—F)

to the Council of the European Communities

(2 April 1987)

(87/C 133/114)

Subject: AIDS threat

Whereas 15 new cases of AIDS come to light every week in France and, at this rate, the WHO predicts that in the coming years there will be 100 million carriers of the virus; whereas this new disease is therefore a threat to the future of mankind and no information designed to check this disease, even partially, is available in any Community country:

What steps does the Council intend to take to:

- implement a European information campaign,
- set up an AIDS research centre,
- help to establish a foundation for this disease,

- coordinate the health policy of the Twelve on this matter,
- set up health controls at Community frontiers to deny entry to persons infected by this contagious and extremely high-risk disease?

Answer
(10 April 1987)

The Council is extremely concerned about the AIDS threat. The European Council itself referred to this problem at its meeting in London on 5 and 6 December 1986. On that occasion it expressed — and I quote —

'its concern about the rising incidence of AIDS. They stressed the importance of coordinating national

campaigns to improve public awareness and information about the disease and prevent its spread.

The European Council expressed its support for the work of the World Health Organization. They asked the Council of Ministers and the Commission to ensure through the appropriate machinery the effective Community-wide exchange of information about the spread of the disease, prevention and treatment and to consider what further cooperative measures should be taken by all the Member States. They agreed to consider also the scope for further cooperation in research.'

All of these matters will be discussed by the Health Ministers at their meeting scheduled for 15 May 1987. Preparation for this meeting is under way.
