

Official Journal

of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6986

C 151

Volume 32

19 June 1989

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>	
89/C 151/01	No 644/87 by Mr Manuel Cantarero del Castillo to the Commission Subject: Promotion of rural tourism	1
89/C 151/02	No 1285/87 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Commission Subject: Animal protection and the 'minipet' fashion	2
89/C 151/03	No 2016/87 by Mr Thomas Raftery to the Commission Subject: Black market in hormones	2
89/C 151/04	No 2017/87 by Mr Thomas Raftery to the Commission Subject: Consumers and hormone-treated beef	2
89/C 151/05	No 2018/87 by Mr Thomas Raftery to the Commission Subject: Safety of hormone-treated beef from third countries	3
89/C 151/06	No 2019/87 by Mr Thomas Raftery to the Commission Subject: Health risk to consumers from hormone-treated beef	3
89/C 151/07	No 2020/87 by Mr Thomas Raftery to the Commission Subject: Residues from hormone-treated meat	3
89/C 151/08	No 2041/87 by Mr Thomas Raftery to the Commission Subject: Hormone ban	3
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 2016/87, 2017/87, 2018/87, 2019/87, 2020/87 and 2041/87	4
89/C 151/09	No 2383/87 by Mr Christopher Jackson to the Commission Subject: Use of hormones for fattening animals	5
89/C 151/10	No 2384/87 by Mr Christopher Jackson to the Commission Subject: Ban on use of hormones for beef animals	5

<u>Notice No</u>	<u>Contents (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
89/C 151/11	No 2441/87 by Mr Roberto Costanzo to the Commission Subject: Directive 85/649/EEC prohibiting the use of hormones in animal products in the Community	5
89/C 151/12	No 2532/87 by Mr José Happart to the Commission Subject: Use of hormones in cattle	5
89/C 151/13	No 2564/87 by Mr Pol Marck to the Commission Subject: Ban of hormones	6
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 2383/87, 2384/87, 2441/87, 2532/87 and 2564/87	6
89/C 151/14	No 2791/87 by Mr Thomas Raftery to the Commission Subject: Hormone ban — consumer choice	7
89/C 151/15	No 2795/87 by Mr Thomas Raftery to the Commission Subject: Hormone ban — plans to detect hormone-treated meat under transition measures	7
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 2791/87 and 2795/87	7
89/C 151/16	No 2792/87 by Mr Thomas Raftery to the Commission Subject: Hormone ban — reassessment on basis of scientific evidence	7
89/C 151/17	No 2794/87 by Mr Thomas Raftery to the Commission Subject: Hormone ban — Community preference	7
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 2792/87 and 2794/87	8
89/C 151/18	No 42/88 by Mr Lambert Croux to the Commission Subject: Training of national officials in European law and policy-making	8
89/C 151/19	No 181/88 by Mr Jean Besse to the Commission Subject: Recovery of State aids	9
89/C 151/20	No 296/88 by Mr José Vázquez Fouz to the Commission Subject: Effect of the agricultural stabilizers on employment	9
89/C 151/21	No 407/88 by Mr Roger Partrat to the Commission Subject: Definition of yoghurt	10
89/C 151/22	No 416/88 by Mr Georgios Saridakis to the Commission Subject: The direct broadcasting of programmes	11
89/C 151/23	No 486/88 by Mr Pol Marck to the Commission Subject: National subsidies in the pigment sector	11
89/C 151/24	No 508/88 by Mr Christopher Jackson to the Commission Subject: National aids for pigmeat	11
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 486/88 and 508/88	11
89/C 151/25	No 519/88 by Mr Carlos Bru Purón to the Commission Subject: A European statute or code for cooperatives	12
89/C 151/26	No 663/88 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins to the Commission Subject: Enquiry into monopoly and merger policy	12
89/C 151/27	No 686/88 by Mr Jean-Claude Pasty to the Commission Subject: Premiums paid to United Kingdom sheep-farmers	13

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
89/C 151/28	No 695/88 by Mr Kenneth Collins to the Commission Subject: Pesticide residue levels	13
89/C 151/29	No 781/88 by Mr Wolfgang von Nostitz to the Commission Subject: Toxic-waste exports from the Federal Republic of Germany to Turkey	14
89/C 151/30	No 868/88 by Mr Andrew Pearce to the Commission Subject: French breaches re grants in agricultural sector	14
89/C 151/31	No 904/88 by Mr Domènec Romera i Alcàzar to the Commission Subject: Safety in wild animal parks	15
89/C 151/32	No 928/88 by Mr Pedro Argüelles Salaverria to the Commission Subject: Consequences for the Community budget of the existence of a 'submerged economy' in certain Member States	15
89/C 151/33	No 1034/88 by Mr Francisco Sanz Fernandez, Mr Carlos Bru Purón and Mr José Bueno Vicente to the Commission Subject: Scientific and budgetary implications of the ITER programme (International Thermo-nuclear Experimental Reactor)	16
89/C 151/34	No 1049/88 by Mr Florus Wijsenbeek to the Commission Subject: Proposal for a directive on minced meat (COM(87) 658 final)	16
89/C 151/35	No 1179/88 by Mr David Morris to the Commission Subject: Closure of Rover factories at Llanelli and Cowley	17
89/C 151/36	No 1215/88 by Mr Lambert Croux to the Commission Subject: Eurotecnat	17
89/C 151/37	No 1260/88 by Mr Gerhard Schmid to the Commission Subject: German model 'smog regulation'	18
89/C 151/38	No 1266/88 by Mr William Newton-Dunn to the Commission Subject: Driver licensing	19
89/C 151/39	No 1590/88 by Mr Christopher Jackson to the Commission Subject: Second Driver Licensing Directive	19
89/C 151/40	No 1816/88 by Mrs Winifred Ewing to the Commission Subject: Community service minibuses	19
89/C 151/41	No 1868/88 by Mr James Ford to the Commission Subject: PSV licences for drivers of minibuses	19
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1266/88, 1590/88, 1816/88 and 1868/88	19
89/C 151/42	No 1291/88 by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission Subject: Standardization of service sector statistics in the national accounts of the Member States	20
89/C 151/43	No 1323/88 by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission Subject: Subsidies to conserve Europe's industrial heritage	21
89/C 151/44	No 1485/88 by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke to the Commission Subject: Preserving Europe's industrial and technological heritage	21
	Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1323/88 and 1485/88	21

(Continued overleaf)

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
89/C 151/45	No 1338/88 by Mrs Winifred Ewing to the Commission Subject: Boat grants	22
89/C 151/46	No 1398/88 by Mr José Álvarez de Eulate Peñaranda to the Commission Subject: Community scheme for early retirement for the farming community	22
89/C 151/47	No 1409/88 by Mr Dieter Rogalla to the Commission Subject: Road safety in the different Member States	23
89/C 151/48	No 1416/88 by Mr John McCartin, Mr Pol Marck, Mr Mark Clinton, Mr Christopher O'Malley and Mr Egon Klepsch to the Commission Subject: Imports of cereal substitutes	23
89/C 151/49	No 1460/88 by Mr Georgios Saridakis to the Commission Subject: Implementation in Greece of Regulation (EEC) No 1975/82: utilization of appropriations	24
89/C 151/50	No 1496/88 by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke to the Commission Subject: Consequences of the agreement between the EEC and Hungary	25
89/C 151/51	No 1510/88 by Mrs Anne André to the Commission Subject: Use of stimulants — dependence — addiction	25
89/C 151/52	No 1516/88 by Mr William Newton-Dunn to the Commission Subject: Lack of effective trademark legislation in Turkey	26
89/C 151/53	No 1519/88 by Mr Pol Marck to the Commission Subject: Co-responsibility levy for milk	26
89/C 151/54	No 1530/88 by Mr Georgios Saridakis to the Commission Subject: IMP disbursements for Crete and their percentage of total Community contributions	27
89/C 151/55	No 1546/88 by Mrs Raymonde Dury to the Commission Subject: Directive on freedom of movement for Community citizens	27
89/C 151/56	No 1600/88 by Mr Roberto Costanzo to the Commission Subject: Agricultural produce contaminated by radioactive fallout from Chernobyl	28
89/C 151/57	No 1601/88 by Mr Alexander Sherlock to the Commission Subject: European Parliament report on freshwater pearl mussels	28
89/C 151/58	No 1625/88 by Mrs Undine-Uta Bloch von Blottnitz to the Commission Subject: Programme to protect the monk seal	28
89/C 151/59	No 1632/88 by Mr José Lafuente Lopez to the Commission Subject: Measures against industrial accidents	29
89/C 151/60	No 1645/88 by Mr Mark Clinton to the Commission Subject: Beef calf imports	29
89/C 151/61	No 1653/88 by Mr Kenneth Collins to the Commission Subject: Radon levels in houses	30
89/C 151/62	No 1686/88 by Mr José Álvarez de Paz and Mr Jesús Cabezón Alonso to the Commission Subject: The latest report by Amnesty International (AI)	30

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
89/C 151/63	No 1689/88 by Mr Hans-Jürgen Zahorka to the Commission Subject: Commission recommendation to the national governments on new telematics services	31
89/C 151/64	No 1711/88 by Mrs Mary Banotti to the Commission Subject: Importation of certain toxic chemicals into the EC	31
89/C 151/65	No 1752/88 by Mrs Barbara Castle to the Commission Subject: Transport of live animals for slaughter	32
89/C 151/66	No 1760/88 by Mr Florus Wijsenbeek to the Commission Subject: Designation of Venlo as a logistics centre	32
89/C 151/67	No 1764/88 by Mr David Martin to the Commission Subject: Problems caused by eliminating customs controls	33
89/C 151/68	No 1779/88 by Mr Kenneth Collins to the Commission Subject: Directives on water quality	33
89/C 151/69	No 1780/88 by Mr Gijs de Vries to the Commission Subject: Information given in the <i>Official Journal of the European Communities</i> on State aids	34
89/C 151/70	No 1781/88 by Mr Gijs de Vries to the Commission Subject: Use of cable television networks for telecommunications	35
89/C 151/71	No 1784/88 by Mr Florus Wijsenbeek to the Commission Subject: Substitution by chemists of medicines specified on prescriptions	35
89/C 151/72	No 1791/88 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Commission Subject: Encouragement of research into nerve impulses in plant organisms	36
89/C 151/73	No 1792/88 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Commission Subject: European Community accession to the European Convention on Human Rights	36
89/C 151/74	No 1798/88 by Mr Hemmo Muntingh to the Commission Subject: The Corine programme as an aid to implementation of the EEC Birds Directive	37
89/C 151/75	No 1810/88 by Mrs Winifred Ewing to the Commission Subject: Myalgic encephalomyelitis disease	37
89/C 151/76	No 1811/88 by Mrs Winifred Ewing to the Commission Subject: Mackerel quotas	38
89/C 151/77	No 1813/88 by Mrs Winifred Ewing to the Commission Subject: Forestry action plan	38
89/C 151/78	No 1828/88 by Mr Thomas Megahy to the Commission Subject: Theft of cats for the continental fur market	39
89/C 151/79	No 1829/88 by Mr Kenneth Collins to the Commission Subject: Review of drinking water directive	39
89/C 151/80	No 1846/88 by Mr William Newton-Dunn to the Commission Subject: French subsidies to pig producers	39

(Continued overleaf)

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
89/C 151/81	No 1852/88 by Mr Virgilio Pereira to the Commission Subject: Requests for assistance from the EAGGF Guidance Section submitted by the Autonomous region of Madeira (Portugal)	40
89/C 151/82	No 1858/88 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Commission Subject: Protection of fauna and flora in the Antarctic	41
89/C 151/83	No 1860/88 by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke to the Council Subject: The right of nationals of the Member States of the Community to stand as candidates in the European Parliament elections in any Member State	41
89/C 151/84	No 1866/88 by Mr John Bird to the Commission Subject: The Internal Market and the 'new approach' to harmonizing technical standards	42
89/C 151/85	No 1874/88 by Mrs Winifred Ewing to the Commission Subject: Non-nuclear energies research institute	42
89/C 151/86	No 1882/88 by Mrs Winifred Ewing to the Commission Subject: Reference price for salmon	43
89/C 151/87	No 1904/88 by Mr John McCartin to the Commission Subject: Beef intervention price	43
89/C 151/88	No 1905/88 by Mr John McCartin to the Council Subject: Beef intervention price	44
89/C 151/89	No 1907/88 by Mr John McCartin to the Council Subject: Review of the beef market support scheme	44
89/C 151/90	No 1929/88 by Mr Kenneth Collins to the Commission Subject: Ehlass	45
89/C 151/91	No 1942/88 by Mr Jean-Pierre Abelin to the Commission Subject: Professional associations for members of the armed forces	45
89/C 151/92	No 1988/88 by Mr Llewellyn Smith to the Commission Subject: Environment	45
89/C 151/93	No 2001/88 by Mr Llewellyn Smith to the Commission Subject: Pentachlorophenol	46
89/C 151/94	No 2038/88 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins to the Commission Subject: Commercial use of the ecu	46
89/C 151/95	No 2039/88 by Mr Pieter Dankert and Mr Alman Metten to the Commission Subject: Contravention of Article 85 (1) of the EEC Treaty by the Netherlands pharmaceuticals industry's economy plan	47
89/C 151/96	No 2049/88 by Mr José Valverde Lopez to the Commission Subject: Financing and operation of Euro-windows	47
89/C 151/97	No 2071/88 by Mr Rafael Calvo Ortega to the Commission Subject: Report on the implementation of the 1988 budget (ERDF)	48
89/C 151/98	No 2089/88 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins to the Commission Subject: Electronic data interchange (EDI)	48

(Continued on inside back cover)

<u>Notice No</u>	Contents (continued)	Page
89/C 151/99	No 2096/88 by Mr Gijs de Vries to the Commission Subject: Article 115 of the EEC Treaty	49
89/C 151/100	No 2117/88 by Mrs Ursula Schleicher to the Commission Subject: Community legislation on environmental protection	50
89/C 151/101	No 2177/88 by Mrs Winifred Ewing to the Commission Subject: Financial contributions to political parties	50
89/C 151/102	No 2214/88 by Mr François Roelants du Vivier to the Commission Subject: Community aid to Wallonia	51
89/C 151/103	No 2229/88 by Mr François Roelants du Vivier to the Commission Subject: Energy and transport	51
89/C 151/104	No 2292/88 by Mr Richard Simmonds to the Commission Subject: Inheritance laws	51
89/C 151/105	No 2401/88 by Mr Francisco Lucas Pires and Mr Egon Klepsch to the Council Subject: EEC support for the consolidation of the peace process in southern Africa	51
89/C 151/106	No 2441/88 by Mr André Fourçans to the Council Subject: Recognition of specialist medical training in the Community	52
89/C 151/107	No 2465/88 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Council Subject: Electricity supplies to South Africa from Zaire	53
89/C 151/108	No 2467/88 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Council Subject: Questionable provision of equipment to Lesotho Airways	53
89/C 151/109	No 2469/88 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Council Subject: Opening of a new diamond mine by CDM in Namibia	54
89/C 151/110	No 2487/88 by Mr Ernest Glinne to the Council Subject: Setting up of the Soda Ash Botswana semi-public company	55

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

WRITTEN QUESTION No 644/87

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

*(24 June 1988)**(89/C 151/01)*

Subject: Promotion of rural tourism

The levels of development of rural tourism in the various countries of the European Economic Community are very uneven as between one country and another, and there are therefore wide variations in the economic impact it has had on people living in rural areas who wish to take advantage of visits by tourists to secure what is commonly known as 'diversified earnings'.

Whereas in some Community countries, such as Great Britain and Ireland, the economic structure of rural tourism is firmly incorporated into the pattern of income earned by those living in the countryside, such a structure barely exists in others, such as Spain, where the requests submitted to official bodies by private entrepreneurs for rural tourism to be promoted have so far gone unanswered, in spite of its being basically a tourist country.

Does the Commission consider that it would be worthwhile planning a campaign which would use the resources of the Community's structural funds to boost rural tourism at Community level, in order to increase incomes in the countryside and introduce tourists to the features of rural life?

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

(15 July 1988)

In its communication of 31 January 1986 on Community Action in the Field of Tourism ⁽¹⁾, the Commission

mentioned that rural tourism is a broad concept which covers not only farm tourism but all tourist activities in rural areas. This type of tourism is attractive to city dwellers in search of restful country holidays and, if better known, could expand and contribute to a better seasonal and geographical distribution of tourism (since it is less dependent on the weather than is mass tourism).

The Commission is currently carrying out, in collaboration with an independent consultant, a study on rural tourism in the Community in order to compile an inventory of existing rural tourism facilities in Member States and also to identify possible areas of its future development.

After the study is completed early next year, the Commission will be in a position to envisage Community action to promote this form of tourism if necessary.

It should be noted, however, that in the context of its socio-structural policy and in order to combine tourism and craft industries with agriculture, thus ensuring a complementary source of income to farmers, the Community already provides aids in less-favoured areas for investments of up to ECU 40 000 per holding in tourism or craft industry projects which are carried out as part of a farm improvement plan under Regulation (EEC) No 797/85 ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ COM(86) 32 final and Supplement 4/86 to the Bulletin of the European Communities.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 93, 30. 3. 1985.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1285/87**by Mr Ernest Glinne (S—B)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(23 September 1987)**(89/C 151/02)**Subject: Animal protection and the 'minipet' fashion*

In the United States it is now possible for pet lovers to obtain 'minipets', i.e. animals whose size has been greatly reduced by means of genetic manipulation, for example miniature horses (0,75 metres), miniature sheep or pygmy goats the size of cats, miniature hens, etc.

Such genetic manipulation is a highly controversial issue in the USA and the authorities in certain States — for example, Maryland — maintain that the animals concerned are not pets but farm animals which are not allowed indoors. It is offensive to see animals become the victims of fashion and commerce, with no regard for the respect to which all living beings are entitled.

However, the 'minipet' fashion will probably soon reach the Community.

What attitude will the Commission adopt in this eventuality?

Is it not reasonable to argue that such genetic manipulation may be equated with animal experiments and hence fall within the scope of the Council directive on the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes?

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

(10 November 1988)

The Commission fully shares the concerns expressed by the Honourable Member. However, the genetic manipulation of farm animals to produce miniature versions for the pet trade does not fall under the scope of Council Directive 86/609/EEC on the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes⁽¹⁾. The Directive applies only to the use of animals in experiments undertaken for:

- the development, manufacture, quality, effectiveness and safety-testing of drugs, foodstuffs and other substances or products;
- the protection of the environment in the interests of the health or welfare of man or animal.

The Commission will keep the issue raised by the Honourable Member under review.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 358, 18. 12. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2016/87**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE—IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(12 January 1988)**(89/C 151/03)**Subject: Black market in hormones*

Is the Commission aware that various international scientific experts have stated that:

- (a) there is no danger to public health from the five products banned by Directive 85/649/EEC⁽¹⁾,
- (b) that those experts have also stated that there is no economically viable test to discover residues of such products?

There are widespread fears that the consequence of the directive will be an increase in the black market use of untested substances whose effect on public safety is not known. Would it not be better to work with known experts to discuss amendments to Directive 85/649/EEC so as to permit the controlled use of nationally-registered and approved products and so forestall the development of a black market.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 382, 31. 12. 1985, p. 228.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2017/87**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE—IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(12 January 1988)**(89/C 151/04)**Subject: Consumers and hormone-treated beef*

The Commission has recently proposed (and the Council of Ministers has agreed) that beef from animals treated with hormone growth promoters may be legally traded in the Community and imported from third countries for a period of 18 months in spite of the ban on the use of such substances in livestock farming in the Community after 1 January 1988.

Can the Commission provide any objective criteria by which consumers may recognize such beef from hormone-treated cattle? Are there any adverse effects of the use of hormones on the quality of meat, which might permit consumers to discriminate between meat from treated versus untreated animals?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2018/87**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE—IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(12 January 1988)**(89/C 151/05)*

Subject: Safety of hormone-treated beef from third countries

The Commission has recently proposed (and the Council of Ministers has agreed) that beef from animals treated with hormone growth promoters may be legally treated in the Community and imported from third countries for a period of 18 months in spite of the ban on the use of such substances in livestock farming within the Community after 1 January 1988.

Can the Commission provide any assurance that such beef is safe for consumers?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2019/87**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE—IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(12 January 1988)**(89/C 151/06)*

Subject: Health risk to consumers from hormone-treated beef

In acknowledgement of the fact that the implementation of the hormone Directive (85/649/EEC) ⁽¹⁾ would result in major disruptions in international trade by excluding third country beef from importation into the Community, the Commission has recently proposed that the ban on the trade of beef from hormone-treated animals should be postponed, while the use of hormones by Member State farmers should be prohibited.

This means that there will have been a delay of three and a half years from the approval of the directive to its full implementation.

Does this mean that there is no real health risk for the consumer in eating meat from animals treated with the five licensed hormone products which have been banned from use in the Community from 1 January 1988?

If there is a health risk, why has the consumer been exposed to it for this additional period of time?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 382, 31. 12. 1985, p. 228.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2020/87**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE—IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(12 January 1988)**(89/C 151/07)*

Subject: Residues from hormone-treated meat

The Commission has recently proposed (and the Council of Ministers has agreed) that beef from animals treated with hormone growth promoters may be legally traded in the Community and imported from third countries for a period of 18 months in spite of the ban on the use of such substances in livestock farming in the Community after 1 January 1988.

Given that such beef must contain hormone residues, can the Commission please tell us:

- (a) What kinds of residues are likely to be present in beef from intervention stocks?
- (b) What kinds of residues are likely to be present in imported beef from third countries such as the US, Canada and Australia, where the use of certain hormonal substances is apparently authorized?
- (c) How could the Commission distinguish the meat of animals treated with hormones after 1 January 1988 from the meat of animals treated before 1 January 1988?
- (d) What levels of hormone residues in meat result from the treatment of cattle with those products licensed in third countries such as the US?
- (e) Does the Commission have the analytical capability to detect in meat those levels of residues of the substances referred to in (d)?
- (f) Has the Commission in fact ever detected in meat those levels of residues of the substances referred to in (d) resulting from their implants in livestock farming?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2041/87**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE—IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(12 January 1988)**(89/C 151/08)*

Subject: Hormone ban

Given that the stated intention of Council Directive 85/649/EEC is to protect the health of the consumer

from any possible danger from residues of hormones in meat, should not the ban be extended to the rearing of bull beef given that the natural concentration of hormones in meat from these animals is many thousands of times higher than in meat from steer beef treated with steroid hormone growth-promoters?

Would the Commission confirm on a country-by-country basis whether adequate facilities and sufficient resources are available in Member States to carry out tests for residues of hormonal growth-promoters in farm animals as required by Council Directives 85/358/EEC ⁽¹⁾ and 86/469/EEC ⁽²⁾?

If sufficient facilities are not available, what assurance can be given that the stringent requirements of the directives will be met?

Can the Commission indicate what tests, if any, are available to distinguish between hormones naturally produced within the animal's body and those growth-promoters licensed for use in many parts of the world?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 191, 23. 7. 1985, p. 46.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 275, 26. 9. 1986, p. 36.

**Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 2016/87, 2017/87, 2018/87, 2019/87, 2020/87 and 2041/87
given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 1988)**

Directive 85/649/EEC prohibits the use for fattening purposes of all substances having an oestrogenic, androgenic or gestrogenic action and thyrostatic substances.

The Commission is aware of the opinions of various international scientists as regards five substances which may be incorporated in commercial products. It cannot agree that for all of the substances concerned there is no viable test to discover residues. The Commission has never contended that checking for residues alone is a sufficient measure to ensure that the law is respected; the monitoring for the presence of residues serves as an additional check to support the general controls which must be made in application of Directive 85/358/EEC at the manufacturing, handling, storage, transport, distribution and sales stages for the presence of prohibited substances, together with controls of farm animals and the meat and meat products of such animals.

The Commission understands that the 'widespread fears of a black market' referred to by the Honourable Member may reflect the arguments of the European pharmaceutical industry which is calling on the

Commission to reassess the need for a total ban. Being the source of the products in question, the pharmaceutical industry must be aware of the entry into force of the ban on 1 January 1988 and of its responsibilities to respect the law. The Commission considers that the general system of controls which are now prescribed by Community law do provide a solid basis to enable Community decisions to be enforced.

The Directive referred to by the Honourable Member prohibits the use of hormones for fattening and for all types of animals. It does not prohibit, and does not have as an objective to prohibit slaughter of animals, including bulls, which are reared without the use of these substances. The Commission recognizes and accepts that natural physiological levels of hormones will be found in all species.

In relation to the recent Council decision on transitional measures concerning the prohibition on administration to farm animals of certain substances having a hormonal action (Directive 87/561/EEC) ⁽¹⁾, the Commission would point out that the decision obliges Member States in respect of intra-Community trade, importation from third countries and the placing on the market of domestic production, to maintain until 31 December 1988, in accordance with the general provisions of the Treaty, the arrangements resulting from the national provision in force on the date of the decision.

The treatment for fattening purposes is prohibited from 1 January 1988. This decision should not be understood as authorizing free movement of beef from treated animals throughout the Community. It aims to avoid any sudden termination of the possibility of disposing, on the internal market, of animals and of the meat thereof which has been legally treated in accordance with the national provisions of the Member States up until 1 January 1988. The transitional period is considered to be long enough to take account of rearing practices for the animals concerned. The national provisions may include measures in relation to the maximum residue levels for those substances which have been legally authorized in some Member States. It is expected that these levels will continue to apply in the case of stored, traded or imported meat during the transitional period.

The Member States have the responsibility for the analysis and detection of residues in accordance with Community rules and have indicated this capability in the control plans submitted to the Commission. The methods of analysis which may be used for the detection of residues are to be found in Commission Decision 87/410/EEC of 14 July 1987 ⁽²⁾.

The actual substances and levels found will depend upon the substances authorized, upon the respect of conditions laid down and upon the extent of illegal use both as regards production in the Community and as regards imports from third countries such as the United States. In general the Member States have presented plans to the Commission indicating that sufficient infrastructure

exists and sufficient resources will be made available to carry out the necessary checks. If this is not the case or if it becomes apparent that insufficiencies exist the Commission will take the necessary steps to ensure that the Member States fulfill their obligations.

During 1988 the Commission must rely on the full application of the Community controls laid down to ensure the enforcement of Community requirements so that illegally treated meat is identified and its origin investigated.

The Commission would not expect that the consumer would find it possible to judge by the appearance of meat at the retail outlet whether or not it derives from animals which have been treated with hormones.

In common with other chemicals which may be of concern in the food chain, reliance must be placed on the full application of all the controls and checks which are to be carried out prior to sale to ensure that the law is respected, and that meat from illegally treated animals is not placed on the market.

(¹) OJ No L 339, 1. 12. 1987, p. 70.

(²) OJ No L 223, 11. 8. 1987, p. 18.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2383/87

by Mr Christopher Jackson (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 February 1988)

(89/C 151/09)

Subject: Use of hormones for fattening animals

A ban on the use of hormones for fattening cattle is now in place in the European Community but hormone-treated meat may be imported for the remainder of this year.

So far as the Commission is aware, does the use for fattening purposes in animals of the following substances: oestrediol-17 beta, testosterone, progesterone, trenbolone and zeranol, present any harmful effect to health?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2384/87

by Mr Christopher Jackson (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 February 1988)

(89/C 151/10)

Subject: Ban on use of hormones for beef animals

The Council has recently taken the decision that the ban on the trade in beef from hormone-treated animals

should be postponed for one year, while the use of hormones by Member State farmers should be prohibited.

Does the Commission recognize that the adoption of this proposal would deny European farmers the cost-saving advantages of using hormone implants, while permitting third-country farmers to continue to enjoy the benefits of such products, thus giving our competitors a clear advantage in the form of lower production costs in comparison to those of European farmers who will be deprived of this technology?

How does the Commission reconcile this state of affairs with the principle of Community preference?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2441/87

by Mr Roberto Costanzo (PPE—I)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 February 1988)

(89/C 151/11)

Subject: Directive 85/649/EEC (¹) prohibiting the use of hormones in animal products in the Community

The directive referred to above entered into force in the 12 Community countries on 1 January 1988.

To take account of foreign trade relations, especially with the United States, the Council of Ministers has provided for derogations from the application of the directive, while intra-Community trade in hormonally produced animal products will be allowed to continue until 31 December 1988. Can the Commission therefore say:

1. what steps it will take to protect consumers, to ensure that, at the time of purchase, they can clearly distinguish between oestrogen-treated meat and meat not treated with hormones;
2. whether it has already issued or will issue common rules for the national inspectors responsible for supervising the proper implementation of the directive;
3. how it will solve the problem of oestrogen-treated meat delivered to the intervention agencies?

(¹) OJ No L 382, 31. 12. 1985, p. 228.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2532/87

by Mr José Happart (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(2 March 1988)

(89/C 151/12)

Subject: Use of hormones in cattle

Directive 85/358/EEC (¹) imposed a total ban on the use of growth hormones in the Community with effect from 1 January 1988.

Prior to that date several countries had already introduced national bans.

In its reply of 3 June 1987 to a previous question on the same subject (*Official Journal of the European Communities* No C 292, 2. 11. 1987, p. 12), the Commission had announced that a system of controls on imported products was required at Community frontiers.

However, on the grounds that the Community has large stocks of beef and veal which it cannot guarantee are free from residues, the Commission has authorized imports of beef and veal originating in third countries which have not imposed a ban on the use of hormones.

Community producers therefore wonder whether the Commission:

1. wishes to favour third country producers by allowing them terms which it denies Community producers;
2. has changed its mind and, in the absence of scientific proof, no longer considers certain growth hormones to be harmful; if so, which?
3. has set a final date for the banning of imports of meat from third countries which allow growth hormones of one type or another to be administered to animals?

(¹) OJ No L 191, 23. 7. 1985, p. 46.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2564/87
by Mr Pol Marck (PPE—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(9 March 1988)
(89/C 151/13)

Subject: Ban on hormones

What is the Commission's response to the claim by most scientists that it is impossible to determine whether or not natural hormones are used? In other words, if natural hormones are broken down, how can their use be monitored?

Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 2383/87, 2384/87, 2441/87, 2532/87 and 2564/87
given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission
(5 January 1989)

The Commission would draw the attention of the Honourable Members to its joint answer to Written

Questions Nos 2016/87, 2017/87, 2018/87, 2019/87, 2020/87 and 2041/87 (¹) by Mr Raftery.

The Commission remains of the opinion that the substances in question are potent sex hormones whose abusive use can have serious harmful effects on human health. It recognizes that some scientists consider that, subject to certain conditions, they could safely be used for fattening purposes in animals. The Commission is, however, of the opinion that these substances must properly be considered as medical substances which are only used for veterinary medical purposes, and only under strict conditions of supervision and control.

The Commission is aware that meat from untreated animals does contain natural physiological levels of hormones. The Commission does not consider that the natural physiological levels of hormones found in the meat of untreated bulls or castrated animals can be properly compared with results arising from the widespread use of hormone implants.

The Commission does not consider that the present transitional measures are contrary to the principle of Community preference. Whilst maintaining the ban of the use of hormones for fattening in the Community, they enable the present trading arrangements to continue, both for the Member States and third countries, subject to existing national provisions. At the end of this transitional period, all meat on the Community market must fulfil equivalent health guarantees that it is not derived from animals treated with hormones for fattening. Even though some farmers from third countries may continue to make use of these substances for fattening in their domestic markets, the Commission considers that Community producers should be proud of the quality of their meat produced without the aid of hormones and should do their utmost to support the maintenance of their market for the benefit of all.

The Commission will strive to ensure that, at the end of the transitional period, all meat reaching the consumer has been subject to controls which will give the best possible guarantees that it has not come from illegally treated animals.

It is drawn to the attention of the Honourable Members that, by its ruling of 23 February 1988, the Court of Justice declared void Directive 85/649/EEC, for reasons linked to the procedure followed by the Council. As a result of this ruling, the Council readopted its decision on 8 March 1988.

(¹) See page 3 of this Official Journal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2791/87**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE—IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(25 March 1988)**(89/C 151/14)**Subject: Hormone ban — consumer choice*

During 1988, two types of meat will be available on the market — meat from untreated animals and meat from treated animals (principally imported meat). If the consumer wishes to distinguish between the two, what objective criteria can he use? Will the meat be labelled, and if so, in what form? Will the consumer be informed of the choice available to him on the market? Is this not a good opportunity to do some market research on consumer preferences in this field?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2795/87**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE—IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(25 March 1988)**(89/C 151/15)**Subject: Hormone ban — plans to detect hormone-treated meat under transition measures*

In order to enforce the ban on the use of growth promoters, it will have to be possible to detect between meat from animals which have been treated before 1 January 1988, which will be allowed onto the market under the transition measures, from meat from animals which have been treated after 1 January 1988, which will be the product of a prohibited practice. How does the Commission plan to do this?

Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 2791/87 and 2795/87**given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission***(22 September 1988)*

By its Decision of 18 November 1987 ⁽¹⁾, the Council adopted transitional measures applicable to the matter raised by the Honourable Member. By virtue of the Decision the Member States are obliged to maintain until 31 December 1988 the arrangements resulting from the national provisions which were in force at that time for marketing meat. This Decision concerned intra-Community trade, importation from third countries and the placing on the market of domestic produce. This Decision also included practices and arrangements concerning the guarantees for the animals, the meat and the meat products. In consequence, the Commission would not envisage that during 1988 there will be any change in the Member States as regards the way in which meat is labelled.

In view of the objective of the recent Council Decision concerning the use of hormones in livestock production ⁽²⁾, the Commission can see no purpose in its proposing a special system of labelling which would be contrary to this objective, and contrary to the wishes which have been expressed in the past by the European Consumer Associations.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to the joint reply given to his Written Questions Nos 2016/87, 2017/87, 2018/87, 2019/87, 2020/87 and 2041/87 ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 339, 1. 12. 1987, p. 70.⁽²⁾ OJ No L 70, 16. 3. 1988, p. 16.⁽³⁾ See page 3 of this Official Journal.**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2792/87****by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE—IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(25 March 1988)**(89/C 151/16)**Subject: Hormone ban — reassessment on basis of scientific evidence*

Since agreement on the hormone directive in December 1985, further scientific evidence has been published which gives all five licensed products, including the xenobiotics, a clean bill of health. This is underlined by the recognition that the data now available justifies the abolition of the previously-required waiting/withdrawal periods. This evidence was published by the World Health Organization/Food and Agriculture Organization Joint Committee on Food Additives in June 1987. In October 1987, Professor Lamming published his Working Party's second report in the British Veterinary Association's publication 'The Veterinary Record'. This also clears the two xenobiotics.

Does this new evidence not justify a reassessment of the necessity for a total ban?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2794/87**by Mr Thomas Raftery (PPE—IRL)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(25 March 1988)**(89/C 151/17)**Subject: Hormone ban — Community preference*

By allowing the US continued access to the EEC markets for their meat from treated animals, the EEC is putting its

own farmers at a competitive disadvantage. US farmers can benefit from the cost-saving advantages of growth promoters for a further year during which time the EEC farmer is denied them by the implementation of the ban on their use. Does this not breach the principle of Community preference?

Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 2792/87 and 2794/87

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

(5 January 1989)

No.

The Commission would draw the attention of the Honourable Member to its joint answer to Written Questions Nos 2383/87 and 2384/87 by Mr Jackson, 2441/87 by Mr Costanzo, 2532/87 by Mr Happart and 2564/87 by Mr Marck ⁽¹⁾, in particular paragraphs 2 and 4 thereof concerning scientific evidence and the matter of Community preference.

⁽¹⁾ See page 6 of this Official Journal.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 42/88
by Mr Lambert Croux (PPE—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(22 April 1988)
(89/C 151/18)**

Subject: Training of national officials in European law and policy-making

The completion of the internal market will require a considerable process of adaptation by national administrative departments: preparations for the conversion of European directives into national legislation, application and/or implementation of European law and European measures in a positive spirit of integration.

It will thus be vitally important to secure the cooperation of well-informed national administrative departments.

1. Is the Commission aware of any measures that have been taken by the Member States themselves the better to inform and train their national officials in this connection?
2. If so, can it provide a concise summary of the situation in the different Member States?
3. Is the Commission already organizing any initiatives of its own in this connection?
4. Can the Commission take any new initiatives in this connection, e.g. by organizing seminars or by drawing up and distributing appropriate documents and providing information?

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

(6 March 1989)

1. The Commission does not know whether the approaching completion of the internal market has prompted Member States to improve the training and information available to their civil servants in order to enable them to transpose into national legislation a greater number of Community directives and apply the provisions of Community legislation in a positive spirit of integration.

2. Not relevant.

3. The training visits and courses section in the Commission's Secretariat-General organizes seminars for senior national officials at the request of the Member States.

As regards the needs referred to by the Honourable Member, the subjects concerned are dealt with at these seminars in collaboration with the Commission's Legal Service and Directorate-General for the Internal Market and Industrial Affairs.

The Commission actively supports public administration institutes within the Community in order to give them better access to information on the process of completing the internal market.

The Commission is also making an effort to disseminate as widely as possible information on all aspects of the completion of the internal market through publications detailing Community policy in a range of subject areas which are of importance to national administrations; as an example, a guide published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* in January 1988, which explained the present and future rules for the award of public contracts.

Officials from all the Commission departments involved in the completion of the internal market are often called upon to talk at the many information and training seminars organized in all the Member States on the internal market in general and on specific subjects (public procurement, taxation, technical harmonization, financial services, etc.). Although these seminars are rarely intended for civil servants alone, they are regularly attended by them. Recently there has been a marked rise in the number of events organized by the civil services of the Member States to look at the impact of the internal market on their procedures and roles: the Commission is always ready to provide whatever active support it can for such events if requested to do so.

4. For the time being the Commission does not intend to take any initiatives beyond those described above to organize such seminars for national officials.

Without an increase in its material resources the Commission could not contemplate regular training schemes for all the Member States along the lines suggested by the Honourable Member.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 181/88

by Mr Jean Besse (S—F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 May 1988)

(89/C 151/19)

Subject: Recovery of State aids

1. What is the amount in ecu of State aids considered by the Commission to be incompatible with the provisions of the Treaty and which the recipient undertakings were requested to reimburse in 1985, 1986 and 1987?

2. What is the amount in ecu of State aids which, according to the Commission's information, were actually reimbursed over the same period? Will the Commission specify which undertakings did reimburse and how much was reimbursed by each undertaking?

**Answer given by Sir Leon Brittan
on behalf of the Commission**

(30 January 1989)

1. The total amount of aids illegally granted by Member States, which the Commission required them to withdraw, and to recover the actual economic benefit conferred, was of the order of ECU 5 million in 1985, ECU 11 million in 1986 and ECU 747 million in 1987.

2. The Commission is able to inform the Honourable Member that, during the same period, the Belgian Government complied with Commission decisions by requesting the Boch and Tubemeuse companies to repay aid amounting to ECU 2 million and ECU 210 million respectively. These repayments are being made in the course of the winding up of the companies. A number of negative decisions by the Commission involving requests for repayment are contested by Member States and are the subject of litigation, either before the Court of Justice or before national courts. The Commission will examine, in the light of experience, what additional steps may be necessary to ensure implementation of its policy in this field.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 296/88

by Mr José Vázquez Fouz (S—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 May 1988)

(89/C 151/20)

Subject: Effect of the agricultural stabilizers on employment

What does the Commission consider are the effects on agricultural employment of the measures including the so-called agricultural stabilizers?

If their impact is a negative one, what additional measures to cushion their effects are envisaged?

Which types of production will have major adverse effects on employment?

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

(19 September 1988)

The impact on farm employment of the stabilization schemes organized under the CAP cannot be assessed. For one thing, changes in agricultural employment are due to many factors, some of which are related to the rationalization of farming, others to developments in the socio-economic background to farming. It is no easy matter to quantify the effects which the changes in such factors may have on employment over the next few years.

Secondly, the stabilizers form part and parcel of an interrelated group of instruments designed to achieve control of mounting farm production and to support the efforts farmers are having to make to adapt to new circumstances. As a result, any effect of the stabilizers cannot be isolated from the other factors that may influence agricultural employment, especially if the quantification refers only to one particular sector. Nor must it be forgotten that the rationalization of Community farming which the CAP is intended to encourage will not necessarily entail a reduction in the numbers of farmers or farm workers but may also be achieved by a more appropriate combination of the various factors of production, with a variable emphasis on labour-intensive methods.

The Commission is keenly aware of the possible implications of the CAP reform for farm employment: the

aim of the Community measures is not only to strengthen the effectiveness of the instruments introduced to cut back production and expenditure but also to cushion the socio-economic impact of the adjustments being made, especially as regards those farmers who are most vulnerable in structural and economic terms, and to enhance the role of agriculture in the protection of the environment and the development of rural society.

For this purpose, in addition to a batch of market measures designated to help small farmers, socio-structural policy has been strengthened and better adapted to new requirements and has been supplemented by new schemes more closely targeted on socio-economic objectives (aid schemes to promote 'extensification' and conversion, set-aside, 'pre-pension', etc.). Lastly, it should be borne in mind that the Commission has submitted practical proposals for the introduction of a farm income aid scheme.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 407/88

by Mr Roger Partrat (PPE—F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(13 June 1988)
(89/C 151/21)

Subject: Definition of yoghurt

The Commission asked France to explain the conditions it applies for the marketing of a product called 'yogho-yogho'. This product does not comply with the definition of yoghurt laid down by a large majority of the Member States, since it does not contain the specified live bacteria. The French Government recently replied to the Commission's reasoned opinion. This question is a test case for the completion of the internal market in foodstuffs. Are we progressing towards a market which will ensure consumers full access to information and hence freedom of choice, or will the large internal market be a jungle in which consumers will lose their way and/or quality products, whose names must be specifically protected, will be eliminated?

1. How will the Commission safeguard consumer information and the name 'yoghurt' in this particular case?
2. More generally, what action will the Commission take on the memorandum submitted by the French Government two months ago on the completion of the

internal market in foodstuffs? Does it not consider that some harmonization is needed in the defining of certain basic products, in order to protect their names? Will it draw up proposals for keeping consumers well-informed and adequately protecting quality food products?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(22 December 1988)

1. The case referred to by the Honourable Member does not relate to yoghurt as such but to a more complex product which is a drink made from several ingredients.

The Commission has not yet completed its study of this case.

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question No 1701/87 by Mr Marck ⁽¹⁾.

2. The Commission and representatives of France have held detailed discussions on the memorandum from the French Government. A broad measures of agreement has been reached.

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's view that the consumer must be properly informed but it considers that, for the time being, definitions of basic products are not necessary for this purpose. Council Directive 79/112/EEC on the labelling of foodstuffs ⁽²⁾ provides that the consumer must not be misled (Article 2) and requires very detailed information to be given on the label (Article 3 *et seq.*). The Commission is now considering what further provisions should be included in this Directive.

The Commission takes the view that standardization is likely to resolve any problems not otherwise covered by legislation. The Commission does not therefore feel that the name 'yoghurt' can be the subject of new provisions additional to those laid down in Council Regulation (EEC) No 1898/87 of 2 July 1987 on the protection of designations used in the marketing of milk and milk products ⁽³⁾.

The Commission would, however, draw attention to the fact that its Communication on 'The Future of Rural Society' ⁽⁴⁾ outlined a policy on product quality which would take the form of a package of measures on matters such as the description of goods.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 160, 20. 6. 1988, p. 12.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 33, 8. 2. 1979, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 182, 3. 7. 1987, p. 36.

⁽⁴⁾ COM(88) 501 final, 29. 7. 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 416/88**by Mr Giorgios Saridakis (PPE—GR)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(13 June 1988)**(89/C 151/22)*

Subject: The direct broadcasting of programmes

On page 2 of the publication entitled 'European File' issued by the Commission of the European Communities, there is a map showing the 'reception areas for the two channels from the European direct broadcasting satellite Olympus.'

Would the Commission state why according to this map Greece is outside the reception area of this direct broadcasting satellite?

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

(5 January 1989)

The Olympus project is an initiative by the European Space Agency, an intergovernmental organization of which Greece is not a member. To be more precise, the following countries are involved in the Olympus project: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Spain, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

Consequently, the reception area, or footprint, originally planned for programmes broadcast by Olympus left out Greece.

It should, however, be pointed out that since the share-out of footprints decided following the Geneva World Administrative Radio Conference in 1977 and shown in the brochure 'Towards a large European audio-visual market' ⁽¹⁾ mentioned by the Honourable Member, major progress has been made in reception antenna technology. As a result, the footprint for broadcasts via Olympus is much larger than appears in the above document.

It will therefore also be possible to pick up programmes rebroadcast by the satellite in Greece, by using slightly larger antennae than those used in other parts of Europe.

⁽¹⁾ No 4/88 of the 'European File' series.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 486/88**by Mr Pol Marck (PPE—B)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(17 June 1988)**(89/C 151/23)*

Subject: National subsidies in the pigmeat sector

Following the crisis in the pigmeat sector, several Member States have granted national subsidies.

1. Can the Commission provide a list of these support measures?
2. Are these measures compatible with Community rules?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 508/88**by Mr Christopher Jackson (ED—GB)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(20 June 1988)**(89/C 151/24)*

Subject: National aids for pigmeat

Pig producers are concerned that the crisis in the pigmeat sector may have led certain Member States to grant national aids which are not compatible with Community rules.

1. What action is the Commission taking to stamp out illegal national aids in the pigmeat sector?
2. In particular, what action has the Commission taken to investigate the workings of the Stabiporc system in France and a reported headage payment to Italian pig producers?

**Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 486/88 and 508/88
given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**

(22 December 1988)

The Commission is at present examining a number of national measures in the pigmeat sector.

France

Regarding the planned aid for the establishment and operation of a solidarity fund for the pigmeat sector (Stabiporc), the Honourable Member is requested to refer to the Commission's answer to Written Question No 2440/87 by Mr Früh and Mr Späth ⁽¹⁾.

In addition, the Commission requested the French authorities to provide information concerning aids, if any, in the form of the payment of interest charges on behalf of young farmers, support for the auction price in Brittany and export subsidies.

The answer received from the French authorities is now being studied by the Commission. The French authorities gave notice, furthermore, at the special Agricultural Conference in 1988, of two planned aids for the pigmeat sector. The purpose of these aids is, in one case, to assist pigmeat producers who are in difficulties and, in the other, to improve the quality of meat from pigs reared in mountain areas. These two planned aids are also being examined by the Commission.

Lastly, following the recent statements by the French Minister of Agriculture concerning his plan to grant a number of aids in the pigmeat sector, the Commission has sought further information from the French authorities.

Italy

In 1987 the Italian authorities sent the Commission a circular in which provision was made for a number of aids for the pigmeat sector in the form of a headage subsidy (Lit 50 000 per multiparous sow and Lit 10 000 to 20 000 per fattening pig according to weight) and a special aid for the maturing of hams produced by some cooperatives.

Following a preliminary examination, the Commission took the view that these measures were operating aids that could have no lasting effect on the improvement of structures in the sector in question. In addition they constitute an infringement of the pigmeat market organization.

The Commission decided, therefore, to initiate the procedure provided for in Article 93 (2) of the Treaty ⁽¹⁾. In their reply the Italian authorities informed the Commission that the measures have not been applied and that they intend to replace them with other measures, details of which are yet to be given.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 296, 21. 11. 1988.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 57, 1. 3. 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 519/88
by Mr Carlos Bru Purón (S—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(20 June 1988)
(89/C 151/25)

Subject: A European statute or code for cooperatives

The Commission's answers of 11 December 1975 (OJ No C 19, 28. 1. 1976) and 13 May 1981 (OJ No C 147, 17. 6.

1981) to two written questions from MEPs on the desirability of drafting a statute or code for cooperatives in the European Community were categorical — and negative — rather than evasive.

Subsequently, Parliament's resolution of 13 April 1983 (OJ No C 128, 16. 5. 1983) established the social value of achieving the Community's policy objectives — job creation, improving working conditions and implementation of a regional policy — and concluded by calling upon the Commission to conduct a study of cooperative structures.

The European Parliament's Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning also advocates a code for cooperatives (Doc. A 2-12/87).

In the light of this, does the Commission not believe that it is time to submit a draft Community statute or code for cooperatives which provides collectively owned businesses and associations thereof with a legal framework based on the shared principles governing the International Cooperative Alliance — an economically realistic framework geared to the single internal market?

Answer given by Lord Cockfield on behalf of the Commission

(5 January 1989)

The Commission is prepared to examine in due course, together with the representatives of the cooperative movement, the situation of cooperatives in the Community in the context of the establishment of a single market by the end of 1992, in order to assess whether there should be a code or statute for cooperatives in the European Community.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 663/88
by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(30 June 1988)
(89/C 151/26)

Subject: Enquiry into monopoly and merger policy

When does the Commission anticipate that its enquiry into monopoly and merger policy will be completed? Does it agree that in order to end uncertainty it is desirable that this should be completed as soon as possible?

**Answer given by Sir Leon Brittan
on behalf of the Commission**

(22 February 1989)

Like the Honourable Member, the Commission takes the view that, not least in the interests of legal certainty, it ought to have as soon as possible a suitable instrument which will give it systematic control of operations of concentration between undertakings which have a Community dimension. To this end, it transmitted an amended proposal for a Regulation to the Council on 25 April 1988 ⁽¹⁾. This was further amended ⁽²⁾ on 25 November 1988 pursuant to Article 149 (3) of the EEC Treaty, to take Parliament's wishes into account. Unfortunately, despite intensive discussions the Council has so far not been able to reach agreement on the central issues in the proposal. The Commission will continue to press for the speedy adoption of the projected Regulation.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 130, 19. 5. 1988, p. 4.

⁽²⁾ COM(88) 734 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 686/88

by Mr Jean-Claude Pasty (RDE—F)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 June 1988)

(89/C 151/27)

Subject: Premiums paid to United Kingdom sheep-farmers

(a) What was the total amount of premium (variable slaughter premium and the annual ewe premium) paid to United Kingdom sheep-farmers in the last financial year for which figures are available?

(b) How many farmers received premiums in that marketing year?

(c) What was the average amount paid to the 10 largest beneficiaries in that marketing year?

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

(21 November 1988)

For the 1986 marketing year, the corresponding expenditure for which in the United Kingdom is spread over the budget years 1986 and 1987, the Commission has the following figures:

— Overall amount of variable slaughter premiums: ECU 212 910 164 (A)

— Overall amount of annual ewe premiums: ECU 145 901 489 (A)

— Number of farmers receiving the definitive premium per ewe in the 1986 marketing year (1987 budget year): 81 111.

The Commission is not informed of the number of beneficiaries of the variable premium or of the amount received by each beneficiary.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 695/88

by Mr Kenneth Collins (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 June 1988)

(89/C 151/28)

Subject: Pesticide residue levels

Is the Commission aware that in the tables accompanying a recent consultative document on the Food and Environment Protection Act in the United Kingdom, derogations from the pesticide residue levels contained in Directive 76/895/EEC ⁽¹⁾ are allowed for lettuce and potatoes? Has the Commission been informed of these intended derogations and does it intend, given the possible danger to consumers, to take action against the United Kingdom to ensure that adequate and proper protection is maintained?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 340, 9. 12. 1976, p. 26.

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

(27 September 1988)

The Commission assumes that the Honourable Member is referring to the 'Second consultative document on pesticide residues' dated April 1988 and can confirm that this was notified by the United Kingdom authorities for comment in June 1988 to the Commission, which is presently studying it in relation to existing Community legislation.

With regard to the proposed maximum residue levels for lettuce and potatoes, the Community legislation in this field, and Directive 76/895/EEC in particular, does not yet cover potatoes and Article 3 (2) of this Directive

permits Member States, where they consider it justified, to authorize within their territories the circulation of fruit and vegetables falling within its scope which contain pesticide residues higher than those laid down in its Annexes.

In the Commission's view, such higher levels must be toxicologically acceptable and applied in a non-discriminatory manner.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 781/88
by Mr Wolfgang von Nostitz (ARC—D)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(22 July 1988)
(89/C 151/29)

Subject: Toxic-waste exports from the Federal Republic of Germany to Turkey

Has the Commission been informed of the export of highly toxic industrial residues by the firm of Weber Industrie- und Stadtreinigung (industrial and municipal refuse disposal) in Salach, Federal Republic of Germany, to the Goltas cement factory, Isparta, Turkey, for incineration?

What measures has the Commission taken, on the basis of existing relevant EEC directives, against the Federal Republic of Germany, which authorized these exports, and what possibilities are there of influencing the Turkish authorities on the strength of the Association Agreement or other bilateral or multilateral arrangements?

Are any other cases of exports of highly toxic industrial residues from Community Member States to Turkey known to the Commission?

Answer given by Mr Ripa di Meana
on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 1989)

The Commission would like to thank the Honourable Member for this information, which it had not received through official channels.

Directive 86/279/EEC⁽¹⁾ amending Directive 84/631/EEC on the supervision and control of the transfrontier shipment of hazardous waste⁽²⁾ lays down the conditions for the shipment of hazardous waste out of the Community. This Directive has been in force since 1 January 1987. The Federal Republic of Germany informed the Commission on 14 December 1988 of its national measures for implementing both Directives. Before then shipments of waste to non-member countries

were governed by temporary administrative provisions under German law. Directive 86/279/EEC permits the shipment of hazardous waste to third countries subject to the third country's prior agreement and provided that the destination of the waste is an installation capable of disposing of it 'under conditions presenting no danger to human health or the environment'.

In the case described by the Honourable Member, the waste was brought into Turkey wrongly labelled as low-quality combustible material. When the Turkish authorities stated that there was no plant in Turkey capable of disposing correctly of this type of waste, the Federal Ministry of the Environment said that it would take the waste back.

Following contacts between the Federal German and Turkish authorities, it was decided to set up a German-Turkish working party to ensure the correct disposal of this waste by seeing that it was returned to Germany or processed on the spot by a suitable mobile installation. At the same time the Turkish authorities also formally stated that there were no installations in Turkey for the disposal of hazardous waste and imports of hazardous waste into Turkey were therefore banned by the Turkish authorities.

The Commission has not been directly informed of any cases of exports of hazardous waste to Turkey from other Member States. There is no obligation under Directive 84/631/EEC for Member States to supply specific, detailed information on each shipment to third countries, in particular as regards the destination. The information which must be supplied is clearly stated in Article 13 (2) of Directive 84/631/EEC.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 181, 4. 7. 1986.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 326, 13. 12. 1984.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 868/88
by Mr Andrew Pearce (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(1 September 1988)
(89/C 151/30)

Subject: French breaches re grants in agricultural sector

Does the existence of Commission Decision 88/286/EEC⁽¹⁾ of 27 April 1988 imply that France is in breach of its obligations concerning grants of Community money in the agricultural sector?

If so, what breaches are suspected, what sums are involved and what action is being taken to rectify the position?

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 123, 17. 5. 1988, p. 32.

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(12 December 1988)

The sole purpose of the Decision mentioned by the Honourable Member was to specify the data which France was required to supply in order to obtain advances and reimbursements from the Guidance Section of the EAGGF.

Since that time, France has received a reimbursement of FF 9,0 million from the Guidance Section in respect of 1987 expenditure and an advance of FF 22,2 million for 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 904/88
by Mr Domènec Romera i Alcàzar (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(1 September 1988)
(89/C 151/31)

Subject: Safety in wild animal parks

Accidents in wild animal parks which are open to the public have been frequently reported by the media.

Although the regulations are not the same in all countries, there is no doubt that they have been drawn up with a view to ensuring that a visitor is able to enjoy in safety the spectacle of wild animals in freedom.

Does the Commission intend to draw up a Community regulation which by incorporating the most effective provisions of various national regulations, will ensure a greater degree of safety for visitors to wild animal parks?

**Answer given by Mr Clinton Davis
on behalf of the Commission**
(22 November 1988)

The Commission is currently investigating the possibility of introducing harmonized legislation on establishments exhibiting wild animals in order to ensure a high degree of public safety and an acceptable standard for animal welfare.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 928/88
by Mr Pedro Argüelles Salaverria (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 August 1988)
(89/C 151/32)

Subject: Consequences for the Community budget of the existence of a 'submerged economy' in certain Member States

In certain Member States, a high percentage of GDP corresponds to the income deriving from what has come to be known as the 'submerged economy', which functions outside the control of the legal measures regulating its official counterpart.

The European Community is partly funded by resources raised by the national economies on the basis of percentage deductions from tax receipts, and is, therefore, obviously one of the parties affected by the existence of the abovementioned 'submerged economy', which represents a costly dysfunction of the overall economic system on which the Community economy is based.

What measures does the Commission believe it could take to encourage the Member States to combat the 'submerged economy', within their respective national areas, in order to safeguard its legitimate right to the full percentage deductions which it should receive from national tax receipts?

**Answer given by Mr Schmidhuber
on behalf of the Commission**
(5 January 1989)

In assessing the impact of the underground economy, a distinction must be made between activities which are legal but which are not caught by national statistical procedures, and activities (such as tax evasion or 'moonlighting') which are intentionally hidden from the authorities. In the light of the information it has at present, the Commission does not consider that such activities undermine the reliability and comparability of the calculations of gross domestic product in the Member States, thereby impinging on the Community revenue based on them. With a view to further improving the comparability of macroeconomic aggregates in the Community, the Commission has transmitted to the Council a proposal for a Directive on the harmonization of definitions of gross national product and improvements to the basic statistics needed to estimate it in the Member States (1).

The fight against non-reported work is basically a matter for the Member States concerned. It is in their interests to

introduce appropriate rules and adequate checks and to measure activity in their national economies and their tax base correctly. The Commission supports every effort to combat or prevent organized undeclared work.

(¹) COM(88) 176 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1034/88
by **Mr Francisco Sanz Fernandez, Mr Carlos Bru Purón**
and **Mr José Bueno Vicente (S—E)**
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 August 1988)
(89/C 151/33)

Subject: Scientific and budgetary implications of the ITER programme (International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor)

In addition to the research into thermonuclear fusion currently being carried out in the European Community in the framework of the JET project and its extension under the NET project, the Commission has also announced that the Community is to take part in the international programme ITER.

Heading 5 of the current framework programme includes ECU 611 million (more than 10% of the total funds allocated to the framework programme) to finance the Community fusion programme, which is of great interest in terms of its possible implications for future energy supplies, and participation in the ITER programme will enable the Community to join forces with other world powers in this field, i.e. the USA, the USSR and Japan.

What, according to the Commission's estimates, will the Community's financial contribution to the new project be?

Will our participation in the ITER programme enable us to cut expenditure on the Community fusion programme or, on the contrary, will it lead to a further increase in the already substantial expenditure on fusion research from the funds used to finance research and development in the Community?

Answer given by Mr Narjes
on behalf of the Commission
(5 January 1989)

The 'Next Step' towards controlled thermonuclear fusion power is the design, construction and operation of an experimental reactor, in the current fusion programme of the Community, the 'NET' (Next European Torus) predesign activities are specifically directed to this goal.

There is considerable potential for mutually advantageous international cooperation on the 'Next Step'. This is recognized in the Community's Fusion Programme and has been emphasized by the Consultative Committee for the Fusion Programme. However, the line stated in the Programme is that the 'NET' activity should continue as planned until a possible international solution offering convincing guarantees is found for the 'Next Step'.

As regards the 'ITER' conceptual Design Activities, the Community succeeded in persuading its partners to accept, for 'ITER', the objectives and main parameters already defined for 'NET'.

Thus the Community is in a position to continue its 'NET' predesign activities as planned and, at the same time, make a contribution to the 'ITER' Conceptual Design Activities at no additional costs.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1049/88
by **Mr Florus Wijzenbeek (LDR—NL)**
to the Commission of the European Communities
(1 September 1988)
(89/C 151/34)

Subject: Proposal for a directive on minced meat (COM(87) 658 final)

Is the Commission aware that the proposal for a directive on minced meat (COM(87) 658 final) (¹):

1. excludes neck and belly meat, two basic components, from the preparation of minced meat, even though this cannot be justified on health grounds and will cause a considerable rise in prices;
2. contains a ban on trade in frozen minced meat, even though this is preferable in health terms and is common practice (hamburgers);
3. lays down bacteriological inspections for all undertakings, large and small, which will create serious problems for smaller retail undertakings?

Can the Commission state whether it is prepared to take account of the above problems and incorporate exemptions to the rules on the preparation of minced meat into the proposal for a directive?

(¹) OJ No C 18, 23. 1. 1988, p. 8.

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

(9 December 1988)

1. The Commission proposal does not exclude meat from neck and abdominal muscles as raw material for minced meat. The proposal forbids the preparation of minced meat from waste or trimmings due to the contamination arising from slaughter practices present on those parts.

2. It is not true that trade of frozen minced meat is forbidden; the proposal requires that frozen meat, after preparation is reduced to a temperature of -18°C .

3. The proposal does not apply to minced meat prepared on the spot for the consumers; thereafter the small enterprises directly preparing minced meat for the final consumer are excluded.

The Commission is ready to re-examine the proposal in the light of the discussion in the Parliament.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1179/88

by Mr David Morris (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 September 1988)

(89/C 151/35)

Subject: Closure of Rover factories at Llanelli and Cowley

On Monday, 18 July, the Rover Group announced that it was closing its Pressings plant at Llanelli and its Montego and Maestro car assembly plant at Cowley.

The Llanelli plant closure will mean the loss of 900 jobs in the area already suffering from high unemployment.

Does the Commission intend to take any action to mitigate the damage inflicted on Llanelli and Cowley by the BAe/Rover decision to close plants in these locations?

**Answer given by Miss Papandreou
on behalf of the Commission**

(8 February 1989)

The decision to close the Rover factories is part of the company's structuring plan, the purpose of which is to improve viability.

It is clear, however, that the decision may create local or regional difficulties. Such specific problems do not come directly within the Commission's purview. On the other

hand, where they occur within a restructuring context, assistance from the structural Funds may be considered under certain conditions.

The ERDF is currently active in the Llanelli district, in particular under a national programme of Community interest (NPCI). Cowley, however, which is not in a less-favoured region, is not eligible for ERDF assistance.

As regards the possibility of financial assistance from the ESF, this is governed by the current rules and, consequently, is limited to training operations. In particular, training for workers becoming redundant is a possibility under point 4.3 of the current ESF guidelines. Such operations are confined, however, to priority regions, which includes Llanelli in this instance, but not Cowley. Priority can be given, outside the priority regions, where the restructuring of a firm affects the vocational skills requirements of at least 25% of the workforce and is located in an area of particularly high unemployment or where the public authorities have introduced exceptional measures to support vocational training or job creation.

As part of the reform of the structural Funds, the Commission will shortly issue an initial list of the areas concerned by Objective 2 (conversion areas). In these areas, ERDF and ESF operations will be given priority.

Such areas will have to satisfy the criteria set out in Article 9 (2) of the Regulation on the tasks of the structural Funds (⁽¹⁾). Under the same head, areas which have recorded or are threatened with substantial job losses in sectors vital to their economic development, with a consequent serious worsening of unemployment, will also be eligible for assistance from the ERDF and the ESF.

(⁽¹⁾) Regulation (EEC) No 2052/88 of 24 June 1988, OJ No L 185, 15. 7. 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1215/88

by Mr Lambert Croux (PPE—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 October 1988)

(89/C 151/36)

Subject: Eurotecnet

The Eurotecnet 1985—1988 action programme was aimed at four groups: SMUs, young people with low

educational qualifications, adult skilled workers, and women who want to return to work.

Can the Commission say whether any (interim) reports on the programme are already available and if it plans to continue Eurotecnet activities after 1988?

Can the Commission also give details of the demonstration and research projects and study visits in Belgium under the 1985—1988 action programme?

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

(28 November 1988)

The 1985—1988 Eurotecnet programme (on the new information technologies and vocational training) was launched by the Commission in response to the adoption by the Council of the Resolution on measures relating to vocational training in the new information technologies on 2 June 1983 ⁽¹⁾.

The network of innovative demonstration projects in the field of vocational training (which forms the core of the programme) was set up mainly around the four target groups referred to by the Honourable Member on the basis of projects put forward by the Member States. Brochures describing the innovative features in the vocational training of these groups have been, or are being, published in French and English and will be sent to the Honourable Member and the Parliament Secretariat.

The Commission will also provide a list of the works published or planned, which will give details on the results of the programme, including the compendium of the 135 demonstration projects in the network, a summary of the research reports, accounts of round-table discussions with the two sides of industry, and the conclusions of specialized working parties and national dissemination conferences. The final report on the programme will be forwarded to Parliament and the Council before the end of 1988. The Commission intends to submit proposals for the continuation and development of Eurotecnet in 1989.

As regards specific activities in Belgium in respect of the demonstration projects, research activities, inter-project visits and national dissemination conferences, a summary will likewise be sent directly to the Honourable Member and the Secretariat General of the European Parliament.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 166, 25. 6. 1983.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1260/88

by Mr Gerhard Schmid (S—D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 October 1988)

(89/C 151/37)

Subject: German model 'smog regulation'

1. Is it true that the Commission has submitted a reasoned opinion to the German Federal Government opposing the model 'smog regulation' adopted by the Federal and Regional Ministers of the Environment at the end of 1987?

2. What EEC regulations are threatened here, given that this regulation imposes a general ban on driving and involves no national discrimination?

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

(1 February 1989)

1. On 16 December 1988 the Commission did in fact send a reasoned opinion to the Federal Republic of Germany on the basis of Article 169 of the EEC Treaty. This reasoned opinion concerns the anti-smog regulations adopted by some *Länder* on the basis of a model regulation adopted by the Conference of *Länder* Environment Ministers on 4 December 1987.

2. The implications of this reasoned opinion should be stated clearly. The Commission in no way contests the right of Member States to take measures to protect public health and the environment in the event of smog. Nor is the Commission opposed to the regulations in question providing for a ban on all traffic in the event of smog, with the exception of emergency services such as the police, the fire brigade and ambulances.

However, the Commission does take the view that by stipulating in the case of vehicles with a capacity of less than two litres or diesel-powered vehicles that in the event of smog only such vehicles may be used as are fitted with spark ignition and three-way catalytic converter systems, the regulations in question contravene Article 30 of the EEC Treaty. A measure of this kind is a barrier to the sale of vehicles which comply with the provisions of Directives 88/76/EEC ⁽¹⁾ and 88/77/EEC ⁽²⁾, and, while providing an equivalent degree of protection to the environment and public health, do not have to be fitted with a three-way catalytic converter.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 36, 9. 2. 1988, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 36, 9. 2. 1988, p. 33.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1266/88
by Mr William Newton Dunn (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 October 1988)

(89/C 151/38)

Subject: Driver licensing

What plans does the Commission have for promoting usage of 9—16-seat road passenger vehicles and 3,5—3,7-tonne goods vehicles by easing driver licensing restrictions in view of these vehicles' economic and social benefits and good safety record?

between 10- and 17-passenger capacity — will be required to hold a PSV Licence?

Would the Commission comment on the justification of such a requirement in terms of road safety, and also state whether it has considered the requirements of charities, schools and other such organizations, who comprise some 50 % of all users of such vehicles? Drivers from these organizations are invariably voluntary or lay drivers with normal driving licences, and as such these organizations would effectively be precluded from using these vehicles. Was this the Commission's intention?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1590/88
by Mr Christopher Jackson (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 November 1989)

(89/C 151/39)

Subject: Second Driver Licensing Directive

Can the Commission reassure me that its imminent proposals for a second driver licensing directive will not inhibit the current freedom of United Kingdom driving licence holders to drive non-commercial passenger vehicles without having recourse to special tests, as this would discriminate against volunteer drivers for schools and charities and severely curtail their activities?

Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1266/88, 1590/88, 1816/88 and 1868/88
given by Mr Van Miert
on behalf of the Commission

(8 February 1989)

Directive 80/1263/EEC⁽¹⁾ presently in force has provided, since 1980, for a set of standard vehicle categories based on the Vienna Convention of 1968. However, Article 9 of the same directive provides for category derogations, taking into account national particularities and pending introduction of the final system. For example, in the United Kingdom, the ordinary driving licence confers entitlement to drive goods vehicles up to 7,5 tonnes and minibuses up to 16 seats.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1816/88
by Mrs Winifred Ewing (RDE—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 January 1989)

(89/C 151/40)

Subject: Community service minibuses

When the new unified driver licensing system comes into operation, what action does the Commission propose to take to preserve the existing arrangements concerning the use of minibuses by voluntary and community service operators?

In conformity with Article 10 of Directive 80/1263/EEC, which states that 'The Council shall carry out as soon as possible a more detailed harmonization of the standards for driving tests and licensing with a view to improve road safety throughout the Community', the Commission has put forward a new directive proposal on driving licences⁽²⁾.

One of the basic principles of the new proposal is that practical tests have to be passed on the type and size of vehicle for which the licence is delivered. This provision is unanimously accepted by all experts. In that connection, attention should be drawn to the following facts:

- the width of a 9—16 seats minibus can be greater than the width of a private car by a factor of $\times 1,5$;
- the length of a minibus can be greater than the length of a private car by a factor of $\times 2$;
- the wheelbase of a minibus can be greater than the wheelbase of a private car by a factor of $\times 2$ which makes driving difficult.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1868/88
by Mr James Ford (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 January 1989)

(89/C 151/41)

Subject: PSV licences for drivers of minibuses

Will the Commission report on the veracity of reports that in future all drivers of minibuses — i.e. vehicles of

Under the Vienna system, goods vehicles of 3,5 up to 7,5 tonnes and 9—16 seats minibuses fall into the C and D categories.

To take into account the special situation of the United Kingdom, the new directive proposal provides for optional sub-categories, with limited C for 3,5 up to 7,5 tonnes and limited D for 9—16 seats minibuses, which will have the following advantages:

- practical tests appropriate for the type and size of vehicle, easier than for a full C or D category test (minimum weight of the test vehicle 4 000 kg instead of 11 000 kg) (length of vehicle may be shorter than 9 meters);
- minimum age is 18 for vehicles of 3,5 up to 7,5 tonnes instead of 21 which is the minimum age for heavy goods vehicles.

(¹) OJ No L 375, 31. 12. 1980, p. 1.

(²) COM(88) 705 final of 2. 12. 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1291/88
by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(10 October 1988)
(89/C 151/42)

Subject: Standardization of service sector statistics in the national accounts of the Member States

In 1986 the world trade in services grew by the same amount (13,5%) as the trade in goods. The relative share of European services on the world market increased by 2,5%. However, the national accounts of some Member States have not been modified to take account of the growing importance of the service sector. For example, BLEU figures for trade in services are sub-divided into four categories: transport, tourism, investments and 'other services'. In this last category — consisting mainly of marketable services such as data transfer, software, training and consultancy services — the BLEU made a surplus of ECU 2,2 billion. Given the increasing importance of services, the trade in the 'other services' category urgently needs to be broken down into specific industries.

What measures is the Commission considering, in the context of completion of the Internal Market, for standardizing service sector statistics in the national accounts of the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Christophersen
on behalf of the Commission

(7 March 1989)

The Commission is persuaded of the growing role of the international trade of services, and that availability of complete and viable statistics on the service sector is of great importance.

Facing these problems, Eurostat develops work in the two following fields (see Eurostat's Statistical Programme 1989—1992 and the Sectoral Programme on Service Statistics):

- I. International trade in services,
- II. The activity of the resident enterprises producing services.

In the first field, the two following actions are planned:

- (a) the proposal of a new collection system aimed to develop basic statistics in Member States and enhance its quality;
- (b) a statistical-economical analysis of international trade of services in the European Community based on available data.

In the second field, Eurostat works on a sectoral statistical programme on market services. To this end, the economic activities included in NACE sections 6 to 9 have been regrouped in the following 6 homogeneous sectors (vertical projects):

- A. Distributive trade activities, agents, recovery and repairs.
- B. Tourism, hotels and restaurants, travel agencies.
- C. Transport activities.
- D. Financial services, including insurance.
- E. Communication, information systems, business services.
- F. Recreational and cultural services, other market services.

A horizontal project on methodological aspects is also planned.

Three stages have been foreseen for each vertical project:

- collection of existing information in Member States;
- constitution of a statistical data base on services for each country;
- development of methodological work about economical concepts to be used in the analysis of each particular sector.

The final aim of this strategy is the constitution of a statistical data base on each of the aforesaid service sectors, harmonized at Community level (data base 'Mercure'), which should allow dissemination of structured information on service activities.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1323/88

by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(10 October 1988)
(89/C 151/43)

Subject: Subsidies to conserve Europe's industrial heritage

During the last two centuries society and everyday life have changed more quickly and more radically than at any other time in the history of the human race.

This development has left a variety of traces; monuments to industry, technology and science. These represent irreplaceable evidence of the way everyday and working life has evolved. Accordingly, I feel there is a particularly pressing need to invest in the preservation, presentation and exploitation of our industrial heritage.

Can the Commission state whether there are budget headings which could be used to fund the preservation of our industrial heritage?

Is so, could it provide:

- a survey of the funds available,
- a survey of the projects already being supported from those funds (if possible, broken down by country and budgetary year)?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1485/88

by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(28 October 1988)
(89/C 151/44)

Subject: Preserving Europe's industrial and technological heritage

Reference has been made at various Council of Europe colloquia (Lyon, 1985, Madrid 1987 and Bochum 1988) and at a colloquium organized by the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (Vienna 1987) to Europe's major contribution

in past and present industrial revolutions to the technological and scientific culture which determines the way of life in all advanced countries today. Europe has an incalculable wealth of industrial and technological monuments (buildings, plant and machinery), numerous important museums of technology and an abundance of industrial and technological archives. The changes currently taking place in the industrial, technological and socio-economic structure of society pose a very real threat to the survival of most of these important witnesses to Europe's vital contribution over the last two centuries.

Is the Commission aware of the resolutions adopted at the abovementioned colloquia? Was the Commission represented at them?

What programmes does it have for providing financial or other aid for preserving and enhancing the industrial and technological heritage of the Member States?

What aid is already being provided, and what projects and funds are involved? Does the Commission have plans for carrying out specific programmes to encourage the preservation and enhancement of the European industrial and technological heritage?

Joint answer to Written Questions Nos 1323/88
and 1485/88
given by Mr Ripa di Meana
on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 1988)

The Commission recognizes the need to invest in the preservation, presentation and exploitation of Europe's industrial heritage.

The European Monuments and Landscapes Fund set up in 1984 can provide assistance for the protection and conservation of the industrial and technological heritage.

The procedure for granting financial assistance is advertised every year by the information offices in the national press of the Member States and published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*. From this Fund the Commission has already backed 99 restoration projects involving a total of ECU 6 700 000. A panel of international experts gives advice on the selection of projects. Every year an effort is made to support the widest possible range of projects and industrial archaeology has featured prominently.

The following list illustrates the considerable interest shown for industrial archaeology.

Year	Project, country
1984	Firkin Crane Building, an industrial building Cork, Ireland (1850)
1985	The Fagus factory, an industrial complex designed by Walter Gropius, Alfeld, Federal Republic of Germany (1911—1914) Temple Meads station, one of the earliest railway stations, Bristol, United Kingdom (1838—1840)
1986	The naval arsenal dry dock Rochefort-sur-Mer, France (1669) Differdange iron-ore mine, an archaeological and industrial site, Differdange, Luxembourg (2nd century BC, 19th century) Italian canteen, reception centre for Italian migrant workers, Hourdeng Goegnies, Belgium (1946—1952)
1987	Royal saltworks of Chaux, designed by Ledoux, Arc-et-Senans, France (1775) The Salamander sawmill, Leidschendam, Netherlands (1775) Whitchurch Silk Mill, Whitchurch, United Kingdom (around 1800)
1988	Royal crystal workers, La Granja, Spain (1770—1785) Gunpowder factory and mills, Dimitsana, Greece (17th—20th centuries) Gasgebläse Maschinenhaus, an industrial complex with ancillary installations, Völklingen, Saar, Federal Republic of Germany (1900—1938) Mast House and Mould Loft, Royal Dockyards, Chatham, United Kingdom (1753) Jan Blanken drydock, Hellevoetsluis, Netherlands (1798—1825)

From 1989 the Commission will be taking a more subject-related approach, highlighting different aspects of conservation. As part of this thematic approach, special attention will be given to the heritage from our industrial past.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1338/88

by Mrs Winifred Ewing (RDE—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(10 October 1988)
(89/C 151/45)

Subject: Boat grants

Does the Commission recognize the principle of taking social considerations into account in decisions about where new boat grants are made?

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

(7 December 1988)

Council Regulation (EEC) No 4028/86 on Community measures to improve and adapt structures in the fisheries and aquaculture sector of 18 December 1986 ⁽¹⁾ states in the preamble that 'in line with the provisions of Article 39 (2) of the Treaty the structural policy must take broad account of the economic and social environment in the fishing industry and must be capable of adjustment where necessary in the light of the diversity or seriousness of certain structural problems at regional level'.

In accordance with this requirement, Annex II to the Regulation specifies certain regions within the Community where higher levels of Community aid are payable. In the case of these regions, maximum Community aid of 35 % is payable for vessels of which the length between perpendiculars does not exceed 33 metres in comparison to 20 % for other areas.

For vessels of which the length between perpendiculars does exceed 33 metres, the corresponding Community aid levels are 25 % for specified regions and 10 % for all other areas.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 376, 31. 12. 1986, p. 7.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1398/88

by Mr José Álvarez de Eulate Peñaranda (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(20 October 1988)
(89/C 151/46)

Subject: Community scheme for early retirement for the farming community

When the Community's Ministers of Agriculture approved the early retirement scheme, great expectations were raised in a number of farming areas in Spain, particularly in Castilla-Léon where the farming community is relatively old.

This scheme, which aims to encourage farmers over the age of 55 to stop working by making early retirement available, should now be in place in all of the Member States.

However, as the scheme is to be financed partly from Community funds and partly through the national budgets, there is a risk that it will not be applied in full owing to a lack of national budget resources, which would cause severe disappointment among the farming community.

In the Commission's view, what are the options for resolving this problem and prompting the Community to make a greater contribution?

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

(13 December 1988)

The Community scheme to encourage the cessation of farming, introduced by Council Regulation (EEC) No 1096/88 ⁽¹⁾, is based on the principle of co-financing of national aid schemes; this is a general rule for socio-structural measures of an individual nature.

There is no obligation on Member States to apply the scheme; it is for each individual Member State to establish its own priorities and to determine which measures it wishes to apply and, where appropriate, the regions in which they will be applied.

Proposed Community co-financing in Spain will cover 50% of the eligible expenditure, except for the expenditure set out in Article 10 of the abovementioned Regulation and incurred in the Basque Country, Rioja and the Balearic Islands, which is reimbursable at a rate of 25%. This represents a relatively high contribution in comparison with the rate usually applied to general socio-structural measures and to the regions of the other Member States.

The Commission considers that the early retirement scheme has taken full account of the situation in Spain, and no other specific provisions are planned at Community level.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 110, 29. 4. 1988, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1409/88

by Mr Dieter Rogalla (S—D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 October 1988)

(89/C 151/47)

Subject: Road safety in the different Member States

1. Does the Commission have statistics on road accidents, the number of dead and injured, etc., broken down by Member States?

2. Is the Commission prepared to obtain such data?

3. What predictions can be made on the basis of these comparisons for road safety and the future development of road traffic in the different Member States?

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

(20 December 1988)

1. The Commission is working in close collaboration with the Federal Institute for Roads (Bergisch Gladbach, Federal Republic of Germany) and the Federal Ministry of Transport with a view to establishing a Community road accident data base containing general overall statistics such as the number of accidents resulting in injuries or death.

2 and 3. However, these statistics are too general to provide a basis for a detailed assessment of road safety and traffic problems or a detailed review of new policy options in the various sectors.

There is therefore a clear need for a computerized data base containing detailed information so as to facilitate international comparisons, the regular updating and revision of data, reliable monitoring and immediate availability of reliable time series.

The completion of such a Community data base will make it easier to transfer information from one Member State to another and help the Commission to formulate a comprehensive road safety policy.

The data base will provide valuable information concerning accident frequency, the number of accidents per traffic unit, and traffic characteristics (drivers, vehicles and roads) for the purpose of identifying safety problems, devising effective road safety measures at local, regional, national and international level and evaluating road safety programmes and policies.

With the European Parliament's support (Seefeld Report — PE 111.42/fin — 1986 Road Safety Year: progress and prospects), the Commission is considering the feasibility of setting up a Community data bank, possibly starting at the end of 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1416/88

by Mr John McCartin (PPE—IRL), Mr Pol Marck (PPE—B), Mr Mark Clinton, Mr Christopher O'Malley (PPE—IRL) and Mr Egon Klepsch (PPE—D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 October 1988)

(89/C 151/48)

Subject: Imports of cereal substitutes

During 1987, export refunds for cereals cost the Community budget more than ECU 2 300 million. Part of

this burden arises from the Community's policy, based on trade and development considerations, of allowing almost unrestricted imports of cereal substitutes.

1. Is the Commission aware that producers of tapioca in Thailand receive only 20 % of the price paid for this commodity in the Community?
2. Is the Commission prepared to negotiate an end to imports of tapioca from Thailand on the basis of compensating Thai farmers in full for their loss of earnings (5 million tonnes at ECU 25 per tonne — ECU 125 million).
3. Is the Commission aware that such a proposal would result in a dramatic reduction in the cost of export refunds to the Community budget? About ECU 600 million is disbursed on export refunds on cereals displaced by tapioca imports from Thailand. It would cost the Community only ECU 125 million to compensate Thai farmers in full, i.e. a saving of ECU 475 million would be made.
4. Can the Commission justify the present system of import concessions on the one hand and subsidized exports on the other, which is of benefit only to international commodity traders and creates an expensive merry-go-round of artificial trade?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(22 December 1988)

Where imports are concerned, the Commission is obliged to comply with the commitments it has undertaken at international level.

Manioc is imported from Thailand under a cooperation agreement concluded between that country and the Community in 1982 and renewed in 1986. The Commission takes the view that, on the whole, this voluntary restraint agreement on exports, which will continue to apply until 31 December 1990, is operating satisfactorily for both parties, especially in so far as it restricts the quantity of manioc being exported by Thailand to the Community.

Price formation in the exporting countries, including the price paid to producers, is entirely a matter for each of those countries.

The Commission considers, therefore, that the type of financial aid measures recommended by the Honourable

Members would be out of keeping with a trade agreement and might interfere with the world market in manioc.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1460/88
by Mr Georgios Saridakis (PPE—GR)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(28 October 1988)
(89/C 151/49)

Subject: Implementation in Greece of Regulation (EEC) No 1975/82 (1): utilization of appropriations

1. In response to action taken by the New Democracy government, the Council adopted Regulation (EEC) No 1975/82 on the acceleration of agricultural development in certain regions of Greece (22 administrative regions). To achieve this, provision was made for a five-year Community action programme (July 1983—July 1988) to modernize agricultural structures and improve the country's potential for agricultural production. ECU 198,6 million were earmarked under the EAGGF-Guidance Section for the Community's funding (50 % of national expenditure) of measures relating to:

- (a) the improvement of rural infrastructure;
- (b) the modernization of the irrigation system;
- (c) land improvement;
- (d) the development of beef cattle, sheep and goat farming;
- (e) the promotion of agricultural training;
- (f) forestry improvement.

2. In its special report No 5/87 of 7 October 1987, the Court of Auditors was critical of many aspects of Greece's implementation of the Regulation, in particular:

- (a) the extent to which the Regulation in general had been implemented — at 31 December 1985 only 23,3 % of Community payments had been taken up — and certain development measures, in particular. For example, the take-up rates on Community payments for modernization of the irrigation system, the development of stockfarming and the promotion of agricultural training — at the same date — were only 7,6 %, 8,9 % and 1,4 % respectively.
- (b) inefficiency on the part of the civil service as well as the large number of obscure national implementing provisions and the government's failure to provide those concerned with essential information.

3. What steps have been taken to improve the situation and what progress has been made to date? In particular,

what proportion of the appropriations allocated had Greece taken up by July 1988 (when the Community programme was due to end)?

(¹) OJ No L 214, 22. 7. 1982, p. 1.

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

(5 January 1989)

Keeping within the overall ceiling of ECU 198,6 million and in order to improve the reimbursement of the actual expenditure incurred by Greece, the ceilings for the measures covered by Regulation (EEC) No 1975/82 were adjusted by the Commission Decision of 24 June 1988 (¹).

The uptake of the appropriations made available to Greece for the various measures under Regulation (EEC) No 1975/82 up to 31 December 1987 was as follows:

Scheme	Reimbursement of expenditure at 31. 12. 1987		Ceiling set (Million ECU)	Rate of uptake (%)
	Dr Million	Million ECU		
Agricultural structures	9 177,90	96,55	98	98,53
Irrigation	4 264,43	41,62	77	54,06
Land improvement	2 284,46	24,00	36	66,67
Stock farming	688,87	7,25	8,6	84,31
Training	165,30	1,56	4	39,00
Forestry	8 280,68	90,27	98	92,12

The figure set for the advance for the period 1 January to 31 July 1988 was Dr 1 969 730 426.

Regulation (EEC) No 1975/82 expired on 31 July 1988. A proposal is planned for a one-year extension, with a new adjustment of the ceilings aimed at achieving optimum use of the appropriations available by the end of the period of application of the Regulation.

(¹) OJ No L 208, 2. 8. 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1496/88

by Mr Luc Beyer de Ryke (LDR—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(28 October 1988)
(89/C 151/50)

Subject: Consequences of the agreement between the EEC and Hungary

The EEC and Hungary have recently concluded a trade and cooperation agreement and have decided to establish diplomatic relations.

This agreement, which was initialled in mid-July, has been hailed by observers as the most ambitious of all the agreements signed or under negotiation between the Community and an Eastern European country.

The agreement provides among other things for the abolition in three stages from now to the end of 1985 of all the present quotas on imports of Hungarian products into the Community.

Can the Commission provide details of the terms on which Hungary has undertaken to improve access to its market for Community firms and what sectoral restrictions (linked to the transfer of sensitive technologies — COCOM) does the Commission intend to propose under this agreement?

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

(19 December 1988)

Article 10 of the Agreement on trade and commercial and economic cooperation between the Community and Hungary covers the maintaining and improvement of access to the Hungarian market for Community enterprises. Details are given in the Annex relating to Article 10, and include the non-discriminatory application of Hungary's import licensing system and its global quota for consumer goods, non-discriminatory treatment of Community firms by Hungary in the awarding of international contracts and in business facilities such as the establishment of offices, recruiting of staff, access to the media and to retail distribution networks.

The agreement does not, on the other hand, provide for restrictions on exports from the Community for security reasons. Such restrictions linked with the transfer of militarily sensitive technology are at present a matter for legislation by the Member States.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1510/88

by Mrs Anne André ((LDR—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(28 October 1988)
(89/C 151/51)

Subject: Use of stimulants — dependence — addiction

Many athletes are tempted to take stimulants and seek all manner of substitute products having similar effects.

How does the Commission set the limits and draw the line between the use of stimulants and drug addiction?

**Answer given by Lord Cockfield
on behalf of the Commission**
(9 December 1988)

It is not possible to establish a distinction of the kind envisaged by the Honourable Member. Some of the substances whose use is prohibited by the International Olympic Committee are powerful and addictive narcotics, such as heroin and cocaine. On the other hand, the Commission would emphasize that many of the substances prohibited by the IOC do have perfectly legitimate therapeutic applications, such as the beta-blockers or diuretics.

For further information on its policy on this matter, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to Written Questions Nos 2511/87 by Mr Beyer de Ryke ⁽¹⁾, 2778/87 by Mr Duetoft ⁽²⁾ and Oral Question H-701/87 by Mr Delorozoy, given during question time at Parliament's part-session of December 1987 ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 332, 27. 12. 1988.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 1, 2. 1. 1989.

⁽³⁾ Debates of the European Parliament No 2-359 (December 1987).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1516/88
by Mr William Newton Dunn (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(28 October 1988)
(89/C 151/52)

Subject: Lack of effective trademark legislation in Turkey

Is the Commission aware of the major counterfeiting of well-known brand name textile products which currently goes on in Turkey?

Even though precise information is available (and it is) as to where and by whom near the Grand Bazaar in Istanbul these forgeries are made, is the Commission aware that there is no effective or enforceable legislation in Turkey which protects brand names?

Does the Commission agree that such legislation is one of the essential prerequisites before Turkey's application to join the Community could be considered favourably?

**Answer given by Mr Cheysson
on behalf of the Commission**
(22 December 1988)

The Commission is indeed aware of the problem that occurs in Turkey of widespread counterfeiting of well-known brand names for textiles. The Commission has been regularly briefed by the legal representatives for the main trademarks concerned on the development of this problem and actions taken to fight against it.

In these encounters the Commission has informed its interlocutors on its own discussions in both multilateral and bilateral fora.

The Commission considers such exchanges of information as an important factor in the search for effective solutions.

While legislation does exist in Turkey on this matter, as long as it is not vigorously enforced it will continue to be ineffective — as regrettably appears to be the situation up till now.

However, on its side the Community does have available legislation in the form of Regulation (EEC) No 3842/86 of 1 December 1986 ⁽¹⁾, which came into force on 1 January 1988, aimed at deterring international trade in counterfeit goods, which can also be brought into action against Turkish products. This measure allows customs clearance for entry into free circulation into a Member State to be suspended at the request of a trade mark holder in that Member State, when there is good reason to suspect that the goods in question are counterfeit.

These concerns have already been conveyed to the Turkish authorities at the highest level by Commissioner Cheysson. The Commission will not, however, let this matter rest there. The question of effective trade mark protection was one of the issues on the agenda for the first meeting on 7 November 1988 of a new Committee on Trade Questions made up of senior officials of the Commission and the Turkish Government.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 357, 18. 12. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1519/88
by Mr Pol Marck (PPE—B)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(28 October 1988)
(89/C 151/53)

Subject: Co-responsibility levy for milk

1. What was the revenue from the co-responsibility levy for milk in 1986, 1987 and 1988, broken down by Member State?

2. For what precise purposes was this revenue used (research, promotion, various intervention measures, etc.)?

**Answer given by Mr Andriessen
on behalf of the Commission**
(5 January 1989)

1. The revenue from the linear co-responsibility levy is shown in the table below:

Co-responsibility levy — milk products

(million ECU)

Member States	1986 budget	1987 budget	1988 budget (30. 9. 1988)
Belgium	21,495	18,506	18,2
Denmark	28,967	24,659	25,7
Germany	137,802	109,858	111,2
Greece	—	—	—
Spain	—	—	—
France	134,494	110,339	113,5
Ireland	31,082	25,511	26,4
Italy	36,573	29,780	38,6
Luxembourg	1,466	1,577	1,2
Netherlands	77,204	63,261	63,5
Portugal	—	—	—
United Kingdom	82,519	64,144	72,3
EEC total	551,603	447,635	470,6

2. A breakdown of the uses to which the revenue was put can be found in the annexes to the annual financial reports for the EAGGF, Guarantee Section. The most recent table has been sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1530/88

by Mr Georgios Saridakis (PPE—GR)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 October 1988)

(89/C 151/54)

Subject: IMP disbursements for Crete and their percentage of total Community contributions

Can the Commission say exactly what amounts have been disbursed to date for the implementation of the Integrated Mediterranean Programme in respect of Crete and for what specific projects? What is the exact

percentage of the budgeted total of Community contributions to the end of 1988 represented by the funds disbursed?

**Answer given by Mr Christophersen
on behalf of the Commission**
(13 March 1989)

As regards the instalments for the implementation of the Crete IMP for 1986 and 1987, more than 76 % of the commitments have been paid out. These payments correspond to the implementation of projects eligible under the Crete IMP and concern the following structural instruments: ERDF, ESF, EAGGF Guidance Section, Regulation 4028/86 (fisheries) ⁽¹⁾ and additional IMP budget heading. The payments are made, except for the payment of advances systems, on presentation of a summary of the expenditure by the Greek authorities under the Crete IMP. The Commission can make available to the Honourable Member a series of summaries of expenditure presented to it by the Greek authorities as part of the implementation of the Crete IMP. These documents make it possible to identify the progress of the implementation of the subprogrammes provided for in this IMP and of the various measures connected with it.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 376, 31. 12. 1986, p. 7.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1546/88

by Mrs Raymonde Dury (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 November 1988)

(89/C 151/55)

Subject: Directive on freedom of movement for Community citizens

On the assumption that the directive on freedom of movement for European citizens is revived, can the Commission say what proposals it has made or intends to make to facilitate the 'free movement' of individuals' social security benefits?

**Answer given by Miss Papandreou
on behalf of the Commission**

(8 February 1989)

As it pointed out in Annex 2 to its working paper of 14 September 1988 entitled 'The Social Dimension of the Internal Market' ⁽¹⁾, the Commission is drafting a proposal for a Regulation extending the regulations on

the social security of migrant workers ⁽¹⁾ to all insured persons. This extension should come into force on 1 January 1993.

⁽¹⁾ SEC(88) 1148 final.

⁽²⁾ Regulations (EEC) No 1408/71 and (EEC) No 574/72, OJ No L 230, 22. 8. 1983, as last amended by Regulation (EEC) No 3811/86 — OJ No L 355, 16. 12. 1986.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1600/88

by Mr Roberto Costanzo (PPE—I)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 November 1988)

(89/C 151/56)

Subject: Agricultural produce contaminated by radioactive fallout from Chernobyl

At the time of the Chernobyl disaster, the Community authorized contaminated agricultural produce to be withdrawn from the market. What guarantees can the Community now give consumers that this produce was not put onto the Community or international markets?

**Answer given by Mr Mac Sharry
on behalf of the Commission**

(15 February 1989)

At the time of the Chernobyl disaster the Community adopted measures, which are essentially still in force, to prevent the import of foodstuffs contaminated above certain limits into the Community from third countries. At the same time, Member States applied similar measures to foodstuffs produced within the Community.

Furthermore, the Community adopted rules prohibiting the buying into intervention or the granting of export refunds in respect of products not complying with Community limits.

Although the control of radioactivity in foodstuffs and subsequent measures are the responsibility of Member States, the Commission has no reason to believe, on the basis of the information it has from Member States, that foodstuffs contaminated above the levels which are currently applied to imports into the Community are being put on Community or international markets.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1601/88

by Mr Alexander Sherlock (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 November 1988)

(89/C 151/57)

Subject: European Parliament report on freshwater pearl mussels

Following the adoption of my report A 2-21/87 on freshwater pearl mussels, I would like to ask the Commission what progress has been made in calling for a working party to examine this matter, and, if no progress has been made, when does the Commission think that progress is likely to be able to get started?

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

(1 February 1989)

Since the adoption of the Honourable Member's report on freshwater pearl mussels in February 1988, the Commission has adopted a proposal for a directive on the protection of natural and semi-natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora ⁽¹⁾.

This aims to create a legislative framework for safeguarding threatened species in the Community through the protection of their habitats and the animals themselves.

The list of species to be assigned such protection is still under discussion but the pearl mussel will be given due consideration in view of its unfavourable conservation status.

⁽¹⁾ COM(88) 381 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1625/88

by Mrs Undine-Uta Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC—D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 November 1988)

(89/C 151/58)

Subject: Programme to protect the monk seal

The three-year programme to protect the monk seal expires in 1988. However, the population of this rare species is still declining rapidly.

1. Has the Commission drawn up a report on this programme analyzing its successes and failures and drawing conclusions from them?
2. If not, does it intend to do so?
3. What action does the Commission plan to take as a follow-up to the programme to protect the monk seal?
4. How will the plans for a new hotel on Cephalonia affect the monk seal population?

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

(14 February 1989)

1 and 2. The Commission has just received the report on the programme to protect the monk seal and will transmit it directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat-General.

3. The Commission intends to continue to take steps to protect the monk seal on the basis of Parliament's resolution of 16 September 1988 ⁽¹⁾.

4. The Commission has contacted the competent authorities in Greece to obtain comprehensive information on the situation.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 262, 10. 10. 1988, p. 200.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1632/88

by Mr José Lafuente López (ED—E)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 November 1988)

(89/C 151/59)

Subject: Measures against industrial accidents

In most of the Member States of the Community, there has been a considerable increase over the last year in the number of fatal industrial accidents in the construction sector, which reflects the boom in the sector in the wake of the current economic recovery.

As building operations are currently being carried out hastily and at great speed, the market increase in fatal accidents in the sector may be attributed to pressure on builders to complete as fast as possible, which has adverse consequences for working conditions and safety.

Given this situation, does the Commission not consider that it would be desirable to devise a Community legal instrument with a view to improving safety provisions in the construction sector, so as to protect workers' physical health and reduce the present high risk factors deriving from overhasty construction?

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

(5 January 1989)

The construction sector is a high-risk area and, as such, was given special consideration in the new Commission programme (1988—92) concerning safety, hygiene and health at work ⁽¹⁾. This programme provides in particular for the preparation of a directive which will stress the

need 'to incorporate safety requirements right from the initial design stage, to make health and safety aspects clearer in the tenders, to closely define responsibility on construction sites, and to establish safety-related qualification requirements for certain tasks'.

It should be pointed out, however, that legislation alone cannot ensure improved safety work, since accident statistics show that most accidents result from a failure to comply with the rules laid down. This is why the Commission, in addition to drawing up the necessary Directives, intends, as stated in the programme in question, to adopt measures to ensure a proper level of training and information for workers and managers with a view to increasing their awareness of safety and their knowledge of how to handle the risks involved.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 28, 3. 2. 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1645/88

by Mr Mark Clinton (PPE—IRL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(18 November 1988)

(89/C 151/60)

Subject: Beef calf imports

Can the Commission state actual beef calf imports for 1987 and 1988, stating the main country of origin of the imports?

**Answer given by Mr Mac Sharry
on behalf of the Commission**

(14 February 1989)

Imports into the Community in 1987, from non-member countries, of calves of less than 220 kg live weight for fattening amounted to 272 018 head.

The main supplier countries were:

- Poland: 219 102 head,
- Czechoslovakia: 27 376 head,
- Hungary: 20 686 head.

For 1988, as already indicated to the Honourable Member in the reply to his letter of 18 July 1988 to Mr Andriessen and in the answer to his Oral Question H-614/88 ⁽¹⁾, the introduction on 1 January 1988 of the harmonized system has delayed considerably the compilation of the official Community external trade figures. The Commission has therefore been unable to determine the precise volume of Community imports for 1988.

It would appear, however, from the partial information coming from the main importing countries (Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany) that the quantity imported

in the early months of 1988 is appreciably up on 1987. It is quite likely, therefore, that the total number of calves imported in 1988 will exceed the figure of 270 000 head imported in 1987.

(¹) Debates of the European Parliament No 2-371 (November 1988).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1653/88
by Mr Kenneth Collins (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 November 1988)
(89/C 151/61)

Subject: Radon levels in houses

Is the Commission aware of the recent survey carried out by the Institution of Environmental Health Officers in the United Kingdom which demonstrated that the number of houses with Radon is $2-2\frac{1}{2}$ times higher than any previous estimate? Is the Commission aware of levels in other Member States and do they intend to take any remedial action so as to reduce any possible threat to the population?

Answer given by Mr Ripa di Meana
on behalf of the Commission
(7 February 1989)

The Commission is aware of the survey of radon in 2 500 houses in the United Kingdom carried out by the Institution of Environmental Health Officers and of its results. It is further aware of surveys by other organizations in the United Kingdom and in other Member States, as indicated in the reply to Written Question No 1655/87 by Mr Roelants du Vivier (¹). Several of these have been carried out within the Commission's Radiation Protection Research Programme.

As regards remedial action to reduce radon in houses, guidance has already been issued by the authorities of several Member States on possible counter-measures in existing houses and on precautions to be taken during the construction of new housing. Remedial action and risk evaluation are presently being studied within the framework of the Radiation Protection Research Programme.

The Commission, for its part, is drawing up a proposal on the protection of the public against exposure to radon in dwellings.

(¹) OJ No C 140, 30. 5. 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1686/88
by Mr José Álvarez de Paz and Mr Jesús Cabezón Alonso
(S—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(18 November 1988)
(89/C 151/62)

Subject: The latest report by Amnesty International (AI)

In its latest report, Amnesty International draws attention to the deplorable state of affairs worldwide in the field of human rights, 40 years after the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In 1987, the death penalty was applied to over 760 people in 39 countries, with over 100 executions in South Africa, Iran and China.

Does the Commission intend to promote a wide-ranging debate to permit discussion of this disturbing state of affairs, with a view to action (within the framework of future political cooperation)?

Answer given by Mr Delors
on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 1989)

The Commission has taken note of the alarming report of Amnesty International referred to by the Honourable Members. As laid down in the joint declaration on human rights with the European Parliament and the Council of 5 April 1977, the Commission continues to attach prime importance to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Since 1983, it has taken an active part in the debates, plenary sessions, and in the annual reports of the European Parliament concerning the human rights situation in the world. The Commission will also participate in the next debate on the situation of human rights in the world planned for the first quarter of 1989.

The Commission, fully associated with the proceedings of European Political Cooperation, would like to point out that there is a regular substantive discussion on human rights issues at the various levels and within the relevant instances of Political Cooperation.

The question of the respect of human rights is dealt with in the annual report, consisting of Community and European Political Cooperation parts, to the European Parliament on European Union.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1689/88
by Mr Hans-Jürgen Zahorka (PPE—D)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 December 1988)
 (89/C 151/63)

Subject: Commission recommendation to the national governments on new telematics services

Is the Commission prepared to issue a recommendation to the national governments, and if necessary to all the services of the Community institutions, that, say, 50 000 terminals should be purchased without delay to permit the introduction of new telematics services?

Does the Commission not share my view that although European industry is in a position to offer such services, it lacks the necessary initial orders?

Answer given by Mr Pandolfi
on behalf of the Commission

(24 February 1989)

Against the background of the completion of the common market by the end of 1992, the Commission has presented a wide-ranging proposal on the political measures to be implemented in the field of telecommunications (cf. Green Paper on Telecommunications ⁽¹⁾). The measures described therein have been further defined and amplified in a follow-up document (cf. implementation of the Green Paper ⁽²⁾) after a broad consensus was achieved in the course of discussions on the subject.

The priority aims of this policy are to promote a Community-wide market in telecommunications services and terminal equipment. A number of proposed measures designed to achieve this objective have already been introduced or have completed their first stage, e.g., in the form of legal instruments.

Among the measures directly connected with the promotion of the telematics sector are the following:

1. Council Recommendation on the coordinated introduction of the ISDN ⁽³⁾ in the European Community (86/659/EEC);
2. Commission Directive on competition in the markets in telecommunications terminal equipment (88/301/EEC);
3. Directive on the mutual recognition of type approval for telecommunications terminal equipment (86/361/EEC);
4. Preparation of a Directive on a common market in services in the field of telecommunications.

These measures form the major cornerstones of a concerted set of instruments that represent an essential prerequisite for the creation of a common telematics market in Europe.

In essence, their aim is to remove all non-tariff barriers to trade within the Community and in this way to help to enhance the competitiveness of European industry.

Against the background of this far-reaching liberalization, it must be left largely to the market participants themselves to seize the opportunities opened up.

Since this type of market is largely determined, in the first instance, by technological innovation, a number of special measures designed to promote demand are indicated in the initial phase. In this, the Commission is in fundamental agreement with the view expressed in the Honourable Member's question. In the main, however, direct intervention in the market process, e.g., in the form of initial orders, is not regarded as reconcilable with the liberalization drive and the demands of competition.

Nevertheless, efforts are being made to devise additional suitable measures to support the market introduction of computerized telecommunications terminal equipment. The rapid introduction of the ISDN for the Commission departments could be an exemplary step in this direction.

The Commission's strategy is based on the premise that the measures outlined above are the proper way to stimulate the rapid development of this important market.

⁽¹⁾ COM(87) 290: Towards a dynamic European economy; Green Paper on the development of the common market for telecommunications services and equipment.

⁽²⁾ COM(88) 48: Towards a competitive Community-wide telecommunications market in 1992; Implementing the Green Paper on the development of the common market for telecommunications services and equipment.

⁽³⁾ Integrated Services Digital Network.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1711/88
by Mrs Mary Banotti (PPE—IRL)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 December 1988)
 (89/C 151/64)

Subject: Importation of certain toxic chemicals into the EC

1. Does the EC monitor the amounts of toxic chemicals imported and exported between Member States?

2. If so, can the EC give figures for the amounts of toxic chemicals, in particular strychnine, used on an annual basis in Member States?

3. In which EC Member States are there bans or severe restrictions on the use of strychnine?

4. Could the Commission name the major companies importing or manufacturing strychnine in the EC?

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

(8 February 1989)

1 and 2. Statistics of trade in chemicals and chemical products, including certain toxic chemicals, are established regularly by the Commission under tariff headings. Strychnine is one of a number of alkaloid chemicals grouped together under a single tariff heading without separate identification. Trade within the Community in 1987 for this group of chemicals amounted to 154 tonnes.

On 16 June 1988, the Council adopted Regulation (EEC) No 1734/88 ⁽¹⁾ concerning export from and import into the Community of certain dangerous chemicals. This regulation lays down a notification procedure for the export of dangerous chemicals to third countries, whereby the importing country is informed of the regulatory restrictions in force in the Community and the reasons for them. With regard to the import into the Community of such chemicals from third countries, the regulation lays down a procedure for the exchange of information between the Commission and the Member States. Once the regulation enters into force on 16 June 1989, it will guarantee a better protection of the population and the environment in third countries and in the Community.

3. Whilst strychnine is a substance subject to the provisions of Council Directive 78/631/EEC on the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances and preparations (pesticides) ⁽²⁾, it is not the subject of Community rules on restriction on marketing and use. The Commission has not been notified of any ban or severe restriction in individual Member States.

4. According to information available to the Commission, strychnine is manufactured by two companies in France; Etablissement Foudré, Paris, and Roques Chimie, Saint-Ouen.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 155, 22. 6. 1988, p. 2.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 144, 30. 5. 1984, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1752/88

by Mrs Barbara Castle (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 December 1988)

(89/C 151/65)

Subject: Transport of live animals for slaughter

Further to my Questions 980/87 ⁽¹⁾, 2667/87 ⁽²⁾ and 49/88 ⁽³⁾, there is still no sign of the long-awaited

research on animal transport which was supposed to have been completed by the end of 1987.

Will the Commission please (a) produce this report urgently and (b) in the light of the report, answer the point I raised in my question 980/87.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 42, 15. 2. 1988, p. 52.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 317, 12. 12. 1988, p. 30.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 317, 12. 12. 1988, p. 40.

**Answer given by Mr Mac Sharry
on behalf of the Commission**

(8 February 1989)

The report of the field study undertaken by the Dutch Veterinary Service into the application of the existing Community Directives on the subject has been translated, and a copy of the conclusions will be sent directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat General of the European Parliament.

The research being undertaken on behalf of the Commission into the long-distance transport of animals has been delayed and is not yet complete. When all of the results of the research are available they will be published along with the Dutch report.

The Commission is now completing work on a draft proposal which will be transmitted to the Council early in the year and which will take full account of the points raised in the Honourable Member's question.

In particular, proposals will be made for on-the-spot inspections by Commission veterinary experts and for an absolute limit of 24 hours transport without rest, food and water.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1760/88

by Mr Florus Wijsenbeek (LDR—NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 December 1988)

(89/C 151/66)

Subject: Designation of Venlo as a logistics centre

Has the Commission taken cognizance of the fourth Dutch Government memorandum on town and country planning?

Has the Commission noted that, although the memorandum was set in a European context and Venlo is of major importance as a communications and logistics centre for European goods haulage, this city has not been designated an 'urban centre' eligible for development aid?

Is the Commission prepared to support Venlo in its efforts to be designated an 'urban centre' in the memorandum — in view *inter alia* of this city's regional and European role — and, if so, is the Commission prepared to approach the Dutch authorities to this end following consultations with the municipal authority concerned?

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

(8 March 1989)

As the fourth Dutch Government memorandum on town and country planning has not been transmitted to it, the Commission is unable to comment on the content of that document.

However, the Commission would not dispute Venlo's importance as *inter alia* a logistics centre for European goods haulage. This was emphasized in the study concerning the formulation of a joint transfrontier development plan for the 'Rhine-Meuse-North' transfrontier region by the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany, which was transmitted to the Commission by the relevant authorities in the Member States concerned.

Against this background, and within the framework of the reform of the structural Funds, Venlo could, as part of the abovementioned transfrontier region, be eligible for application of the provisions of the last subparagraph of Article 3 (1) of Regulation (EEC) No 2052/88 ⁽¹⁾, under which the ERDF may provide support for studies or pilot schemes concerning regional development at Community level, especially where frontier regions are involved.

In addition, the Council adopted on 19 December 1988 a Regulation on the grant of financial support to transport infrastructure projects ⁽²⁾; those projects include the planned motorway between Boxmeer and the Federal Republic of Germany via Venlo.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 185, 15. 7. 1988, p. 9.

⁽²⁾ Regulation (EEC) No 4048/88 — OJ No L 356, 24. 12. 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1764/88

by Mr David Martin (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 December 1988)

(89/C 151/67)

Subject: Problems caused by eliminating customs controls

Although the ending of customs controls between Member States by the end of 1992 should in general be

welcomed, would the Commission not agree that there will be increased problems for the control of drug trafficking, terrorism and the spread of rabies. As the Commission may be aware, this is a particular concern in the United Kingdom where natural boundaries, in particular at sea ports, have provided effective points of control.

Could the Commission indicate whether or not it has considered any measures to tackle these problems and if so, what stage they have reached?

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

(20 February 1989)

In a recent communication to the Council ⁽¹⁾, the Commission analyzes the problems caused by the abolition of controls of persons at intra-Community borders in terms of terrorism and drug trafficking and gives its views on the measures needed to ensure that the abolition of controls does not undermine security.

Proposals on veterinary checks in intra-Community trade and the intensification of controls on the application of veterinary rules have been sent by the Commission to the Council ⁽²⁾. These were approved by the House on 18 November 1988.

⁽¹⁾ COM(88) 640 final.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 225, 31. 8. 1988, pp. 4 and 9.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1779/88

by Mr Kenneth Collins (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 December 1988)

(89/C 151/68)

Subject: Directives on water quality

On 22 February 1988, I tabled Written Question No 2378/87 to the Commission on 'Directives on water quality'. In its reply, which was not published until 19 October ⁽¹⁾, the Commission stated that, having studied the contents of the document produced by the United Kingdom Government, 'the Commission has sought clarification of a number of points from the United Kingdom Government and is awaiting a reply'. Will the Commission say what these points were, why they needed

clarification of them, whether or not they have received a reply and, if so, whether that reply was satisfactory?

(¹) OJ No C 111, 2. 5. 1989.

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

(14 February 1989)

The Commission has sought clarification from the United Kingdom on a number of points with regard to the compatibility of the UK's plans for the privatization of water authorities and EC Directives on water quality. The main items are:

a) Drinking water

i) The Commission is concerned that the UK may intend in certain circumstances to permit water undertakings to continue to supply drinking water which does not conform with the parameters laid down in Directive 80/778/EEC (¹).

ii) The Commission is also concerned that the UK may intend to make private water undertakings the responsible bodies for monitoring compliance of drinking water with EC directives.

b) Sewage sludge

The Commission has asked the UK whether any independent body will be monitoring the disposal of sewage sludge to agricultural land to ensure compliance with Directive 86/278/EEC (²).

c) National Rivers Authority (NRA)

The Commission has asked the UK which pollution control functions of the NRA they consider suitable for contracting out.

d) Municipal wastewater treatment works

The Commission understands the United Kingdom may be intending to relax the discharge consents of a number of municipal wastewater treatment works prior to the privatization of the water authorities. We have asked the UK whether this policy is consistent with Article 2 of Directive 76/464/EEC (³), that is to eliminate pollution by the dangerous substances in List I and reduce pollution by the dangerous substances in List II.

The Commission is awaiting further information from the UK on these points.

(¹) OJ No L 229, 30. 8. 1980.

(²) OJ No L 181, 4. 7. 1986.

(³) OJ No L 129, 18. 5. 1976.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1780/88

by Mr Gijs de Vries (LDR—NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 December 1988)

(89/C 151/69)

Subject: Information given in the Official Journal of the European Communities on State aids

Commissioner Sutherland has promised the European Parliament to increase the information given in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* when inviting third parties to comment on State aid procedures. As a first step, the Commission decided in 1987 to name the companies concerned in future publications.

Yet in *Official Journal of the European Communities* No C 286 of 24 October 1987 (p. 5), a notice appeared regarding aid planned by the Dutch Government in favour of an unidentified manufacturer of plant protective agents.

1. Which was the company concerned?
2. Did the Dutch Government modify its aid scheme and, if so, in what way?
3. Will the Commission see to it that, in future, information provided in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* is transparent?

**Answer given by Sir Leon Brittan
on behalf of the Commission**

(24 February 1989)

1. The aid project referred to in the Notice (¹) concerns the firm DUPHAR-CPD, a manufacturer of plant health products.

2. After the procedure laid down by Article 93 (2) of the EEC Treaty had been initiated with regard to the planned aid, negotiations took place to reduce the scale of the aid in view of its implications for competition. The Dutch Government agreed to reduce the amount of aid from Fl 14,175 million (ECU 6,05 million) to Fl 7,875 million (ECU 3,37 million), thus bringing the overall aid intensity down from 45% to 25% of the project's cost. Considering the applied nature of the research involved, that appeared acceptable under Community restrictions on State aid for R&D. In the light of this reduction and of further information demonstrating that the aid would stimulate additional research within the firm which it would not otherwise undertake, the Commission decided in May 1988 to terminate the procedure and to approve the aid.

3. The Commission shares the Honourable Member's view concerning the need for transparency in the area of

state aid. It has decided that the information published in the Official Journal in the context of Notices to third parties must contain the name of the firm receiving the aid. It would also inform the Honourable Member that all decisions taken on State aid are publicized in the Commission's monthly *Bulletin of the European Communities*. Details of the most important of them are also given in the Annual Report on Competition Policy.

(¹) OJ No C 286, 24. 10. 1987, p. 5.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1781/88
by Mr Gijs de Vries (LDR—NL)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(8 December 1988)
(89/C 151/70)

Subject: Use of cable television networks for telecommunications

1. In its comments on the Dutch Government's policy on the integration of local telecommunications infrastructure, the Dutch Media Council advocates a clear-cut distinction between the management of cable networks and provision of services (¹).

The Council maintains that the cabinet position that cable television networks may not be used or made available to carry services (telephone, telegraph, telex and data transfer services) assigned to the PTT (Post Office) means that the PTT is being given a monopoly of added-value services, which is in conflict with Community law.

2. The Media Council also thinks that it is competitively unfair to make greater demands on third parties (they have to obtain additional authorization) than on the PTT as regards the provision of interactive services.

What is the Commission's opinion on these two issues?

(¹) Media Council letter to the Minister of Transport and Public Works on the cabinet position on the Zegveld report, 1 June 1988 (No 368 III A-2).

Answer given by Sir Leon Brittan
on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 1989)

1. The Commission does not have a copy of the Media Council's comments and so is unable to express an

opinion on them. In any case, the preservation of a monopoly in services is not in itself contrary to Community law. Monopolies entrusted with the operation of a service of general economic importance are subject to the rules contained in the Treaty, except for those rules which would obstruct the performance of their tasks. It is therefore the Commission's responsibility to examine each of the services reserved to the telecommunications administration to see whether it is one of general economic importance and whether application of the competition rules would prevent that administration from performing its particular tasks.

Quite apart from the technical problem which could arise if cable networks were used for interactive services, the Commission is currently considering to what extent the cable network could at least temporarily remain covered by the exclusive rights relating to telecommunications which exist in the Member States.

As part of this work, the Commission recently approved the outlines of a division of services between those which are reserved and those open to free competition and a draft directive on harmonizing supplies and network utilization (Open Network Provision), which does not at present apply to the cable networks.

2. The compatibility with Community law of the arrangements requiring competitors with the telecommunications administration to obtain additional authorization for the supply of interactive services could be called into question only if the Dutch authorities did not use objective and non-discriminatory criteria in granting such authorizations or imposed conditions which were not justified by essential requirements.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1784/88
by Mr Florus Wijsenbeek (LDR—NL)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(8 December 1988)
(89/C 151/71)

Subject: Substitution by chemists of medicines specified on prescriptions

1. Is the Commission aware that legislation in all Member States requires chemists to abide by doctors' prescriptions when issuing medicines to patients, except in emergencies and with the doctor's express permission?

2. Does the Commission not consider this rule, which makes a clear distinction between the responsibilities of the doctor and those of the chemist to be of vital importance for the patient?

3. Does the Commission not think that this rule should be maintained, particularly in respect of medicines whose absorption characteristics, toxicity, bioavailability and therapeutic effect are identifiable and fundamentally important?

4. Does the Commission intend now or in the near future to introduce legislation that would undermine the principle of non-substitution of medicines, specified on prescriptions?

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

(28 February 1989)

1. The Commission is aware of the legislation in the Member States with regard to medical prescriptions.

2. The Commission is currently not competent to comment on the division of responsibilities, *vis-à-vis* the patient, between the doctor who prescribes a medicine and the chemist who supplies it.

3. The therapeutic indications, normal dosages, side effects and precautions for use are determined in accordance with Community directives when authorization is given for the medicine to be placed on the market. These rules are useful for the proper use of each medicine and are well known to doctors and chemists.

4. The Commission does not plan at the moment to take any action in this complex field.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1791/88

by Mr Ernest Glinne (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 December 1988)

(89/C 151/72)

Subject: Encouragement of research into nerve impulses in plant organisms

The FESPP Award, one of the most distinguished in Europe, has just been bestowed, at the international Plant Physiology Congress held in Split, Yugoslavia, in the presence of 700 scientific experts from 32 countries, on Mr F. Homblé, a young researcher at the Free University of Brussels.

This researcher has stated (*Libre Belgique*, 31 October 1988) that the research contract under which he operates is now under threat and will be terminated not later than two years hence. I should like clarification of the assistance the Commission is able to provide — and not only with reference to this particular individual — to those engaged in this type of scientific activity.

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

(24 February 1989)

Through his work, which won him the 1988 FESPP Award, Mr F. Homblé has made a valuable contribution to the study of ion transfers in plant cells. Mr Homblé discovered, in the cell membranes of plants, channels regulating the release of ions and thereby including transmission of an action potential similar to that of a nerve cell.

Mr Homblé's discoveries could be very important to our understanding of the nutrition mechanisms in plants.

This type of research, still at a very basic stage, is eligible for support under the Community Science Programme, provided that it is carried out on a firm basis of transnational cooperation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1792/88

by Mr Ernest Glinne (S—B)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 December 1988)

(89/C 151/73)

Subject: European Community accession to the European Convention on Human Rights

The need to make progress with the Europe of the citizen and the extent of the democratic deficit that remains to be cleared in this connection make it more appropriate than ever, even if only as a symbolic act, for the European Community as such to accede to the European Convention on Human Rights. An initiative on this matter would be all the more justified in that the Luxembourg Court of Justice ⁽¹⁾ has long asserted that the European Convention is one of the sources of the juridical system of the Community. Can the Community institutions give an up-to-date account of the reasons for failing to take this step, and of the action that would be necessary to reverse this situation promptly and by common accord?

⁽¹⁾ In its judgments on 'Internationale Handelsgesellschaft', 17 December 1970, and 'Lieselotte Hauer', 13 December 1979.

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

(7 February 1989)

In its Memorandum on the accession of the European Communities to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ⁽¹⁾, the Commission stated that it was in favour of the accession

desired by the Honourable Member. It reiterated its favourable stance in its Communication to the European Parliament of 24 June 1988 on a People's Europe ⁽¹⁾.

Although the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee expressed their support for accession and for a request for the opening of negotiations to amend the Convention so as to allow such accession, the Council has so far been unable to reach a decision on such an approach which can be set in motion as far as the Communities are concerned by an instrument based on Article 235 of the EEC Treaty and the corresponding provisions in the other Treaties.

⁽¹⁾ Supplement to the Bulletin of the European Communities 2/79.

⁽²⁾ COM(88) 331.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1798/88

by Mr Hemmo Muntingh (S—NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(8 December 1988)

(89/C 151/74)

Subject: The Corine programme as an aid to implementation of the EEC Birds Directive

The Commission has announced that under the Community Birds Directive the Member States have hitherto designated and notified some 400 areas as special bird sanctuaries.

The Community's Corine programme, which has been engaged for some years in compiling an inventory of data concerning nature and the environment, should also be enlisted in the task of designating and demarcating these special sanctuaries.

1. Can the Commission state whether the Corine programme is already capable of mapping out the special sanctuaries announced by the Member States?
2. Can the Commission state whether the Corine programme is already in a position, on the basis of the data compiled under the programme itself, to designate sanctuaries that have not yet been notified, and to map out their boundaries?
3. If Corine has these capabilities, will the Commission now compile and publish the relevant maps?
4. If Corine does not have that capability, will the Commission steer the programme in that direction as a means of enhancing its practical value to endeavours to conserve nature in the European Community?

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

(22 February 1989)

1. By the end of November 1988 Member States had notified 764 special protection areas under the Directive

on the Conservation of Wild Birds. Information supplied by Member States on these areas is still incomplete, however, particularly with regard to their locations; this has been supplied for only 459 areas so far. The information has been fed into Corine, enabling their positions in Community territory to be mapped.

2. In conjunction with scientists from the Member States, the Commission has identified and described 1 413 areas of major importance to bird conservation. Information on 1 100 of these has been fed into Corine, enabling their position in Community territory to be mapped.

3 and 4. The Commission is now completing a comparative analysis of the data files referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2. It intends to publish full information this year and keep it permanently updated thereafter. A preliminary version of the existing maps will be sent direct to the Honourable Member and the Secretariat of Parliament as soon as it is available.

Generally speaking, the information in the Corine Biotopes database, combined with other data from Corine such as land coverage, is beginning to be systematically used in developing Community nature conservation projects. Specifically, Corine and the networks of experts who gather and analyze the information will be particularly useful when the proposal for a directive on habitat conservation is under discussion.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1810/88

by Mrs Winifred Ewing (RDE—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 January 1989)

(89/C 151/75)

Subject: Myalgic encephalomyelitis disease

Will the Commission investigate the prevalence of this disease in the Community and provide any information it can on Member States' recognition of it and assistance to sufferers.

Answer given by Miss Papandreou
on behalf of the Commission

(8 February 1989)

The condition of myalgic encephalomyelitis is a benign disease but occasionally it can be seriously disabling thus causing social costs.

Current epidemiological and clinical studies are handicapped by the lack of a good diagnostic tool.

The Commission does not have any information available on the prevalence of this disease.

Will the Commission provide a breakdown of this figure indicating the location, species of tree and amount of grant aid involved in each project?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1811/88
by Mrs Winifred Ewing (RDE—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(9 January 1989)
(89/C 151/76)

Subject: Mackerel quotas

Because of changing migration patterns, North Sea mackerel are moving further away from traditional fishing grounds off the west coast of Scotland. Fishermen in the area are now unable to take their annual quota because present regulations stipulate that they cannot legally take the fish until they move west.

Will the Commission investigate the matter and prepare proposals to enable Scots fishermen to take some of their west coast mackerel quota while the fish are still in the northern North Sea?

Answer given by Mr Marin
on behalf of the Commission
(8 February 1989)

Due, in fact, to the problems mentioned by the Honourable Member during its meeting of 9 — 11 December 1988, the Council adopted, on a proposal from the Commission, a regulation allowing Member States having a quota of mackerel in ICES zone II (excluding EC zone), Vb (EC zone), VI, VII, VIIIa, b, d, e, XII, XIV to fish part of their quota in EC waters between latitude 59° N and 62° N and longitude 4° W and 1° E from 1 October to 31 December 1989.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1813/88
by Mrs Winifred Ewing (RDE—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(9 January 1989)
(89/C 151/77)

Subject: Forestry action plan

The forestry action plan approved by the Commission this summer envisages spending about £ 155 million a year on forestry over the next five years.

Answer given by Mr Mac Sharry
on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 1989)

The Commission would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the content and scope of the proposals it put forward in its communication of 23 September 1988 (¹). This document defines the forestry strategy which the Commission plans to follow in the years to come and sets out a plan of action for forestry for the period 1989 — 92. Under this programme, the Commission proposes seven regulations covering the following fields:

- improving the afforestation of agricultural land;
- development and optimal utilization of woodlands in rural areas;
- extension of Regulation (EEC) No 355/77 (²) on measures to improve the conditions under which agricultural products are processed and marketed to forest products and cork;
- setting up a Standing Forestry Committee;
- extension of the schemes for the protection of forests against atmospheric pollution;
- extension of the schemes for the protection of forests against fire;
- establishment of a European Forestry Information and Communication System.

These schemes will be applied largely under the rules deriving from the reform of the structural Funds, and in particular the provisions concerning partnership, the rate of contribution to be fixed and concentration on regions whose development is lagging behind or rural areas.

Against this background and in view of the nature and diversity of these proposals, it is difficult to give a full reply to the question, particularly as some of the details will be determined by the Member States themselves when they come to implement the forestry measures (e.g. location, species of tree used).

The level of aid has to be decided by the Council for some measures, and for others it will be determined by the Commission under the partnership arrangements within the range set by the provisions governing the reform of

the structural Funds; the rates are likely to vary widely from one scheme to another, from one Member State to another and even from one region to another.

(¹) COM(88) 255 final.

(²) OJ No L 51, 23. 2. 1977, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1828/88

by Mr Thomas Megahy (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 January 1989)

(89/C 151/78)

Subject: Theft of cats for the continental fur market

A recent report by the Independent Television news on its Oracle/Teletext service dealt with a large increase in the theft of cats for the continental fur market. Amongst other things it stated that in a rubbish skip in Manchester more than 800 amputated paws had been discovered. The report went on to say that the pelts of these unfortunate animals are exported to the Federal Republic of Germany where apparently there is a thriving trade in cat fur. Is the Commission aware of such a trade and if so what action is being taken at a European Community level to stamp it out?

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

(10 February 1989)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Question No 1194/87 by Mr John Bird (¹) and to Oral Question No H-260/87 by Mrs Crawley (²) on the same subject.

The Commission remains sensitive to this issue but can only reiterate at the moment the lack of substantive evidence available to support the allegations made.

(¹) OJ No C 108, 25. 4. 1988.

(²) Debates of the European Parliament No 2-354 (July 1987).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1829/88

by Mr Kenneth Collins (S—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 January 1989)

(89/C 151/79)

Subject: Review of drinking water directive

Will the Commission confirm that a committee has been set up to review the drinking water directive in the light of

objections to it raised at a recent Council of Ministers meeting? Will the Commission say what the composition of that committee is and whether and on what time scale its recommendations will be made public? Will they further indicate the extent to which the Commission has been under pressure to lower standards in the water industry so as to make the implementation cheaper in each Member State and the water industry thus more profitable?

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

(9 February 1989)

The Commission denies that any committee has been set up to review Council Directive 80/778/EEC (¹) in the light of objections raised to it.

Suggestions have been made to the Commission by certain Member States that the drinking water directive should be modified in such a way as to make it less stringent in some of its requirements. The Commission has made note of these suggestions but has taken no action to put them into effect.

The Commission has approved a proposal for a directive amending certain water directives, including the drinking water directive, in such a way as to allow the technical content of their annexes to be adapted to scientific and technical progress by means of the regulatory committee procedure. This procedure is one of those established under Council Decision 87/373/EEC (²) to assist the Commission in the exercise of its powers of implementation of acts adopted by the Council.

(¹) OJ No L 229, 30. 8. 1980, p. 11.

(²) OJ No L 197, 18. 7. 1987, p. 33.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1846/88

by Mr William Newton Dunn (ED—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 January 1989)

(89/C 151/80)

Subject: French subsidies to pig producers

Is the Commission satisfied that the national subsidies given by the French Government to their pig-producing industry are fully in accordance with the rules of the Community?

**Answer given by Mr Mac Sharry
on behalf of the Commission**

(23 February 1989)

The French authorities gave notice, at the Extraordinary Agricultural Conference held on 25 February 1988, of two aid schemes for the pig-producing industry. These consist of:

- a scheme to improve the quality of pigs in mountain areas to which the Commission has no objection;
- a scheme to assist producers experiencing difficulties which is being examined at the moment by the Commission.

The Commission asked the French authorities, in addition, for details of any other subsidies for the industry.

The reply received being less than complete, the Commission again questioned them about subsidies, if any, for young pig producers. The Honourable Member is requested to refer, in this context, to the answer given by the Commission to Written Questions Nos 486/88 by Mr Marck and 508/88 by Mr Christopher Jackson ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ See page 11 of this Official Journal.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1852/88
by Mr Virgilio Pereira (LDR—P)
to the Commission of the European Communities**
(10 January 1989)
(89/C 151/81)

Subject: Requests for assistance from the EAGGF Guidance Section submitted by the Autonomous region of Madeira (Portugal)

How many requests for assistance from the EAGGF Guidance Section have been submitted by the Autonomous Region of Madeira since 1 January 1986 and how many have been approved by the Commission of the European Communities?

Would the Commission list all the projects submitted under the following regulations:

- Regulation (EEC) No 3828/85 (PEDAP) ⁽¹⁾;
- Regulation (EEC) No 355/77 ⁽²⁾;
- Regulation (EEC) No 797/85 ⁽³⁾;

- Regulations (EEC) No 2908/83 ⁽⁴⁾ and (EEC) No 4028/86 ⁽⁵⁾;

stating the type of investment, the total amount thereof and, in the case of successful submissions, the extent of cofinancing by the EAGGF Guidance Section.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 372, 31. 12. 1985, p. 5.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 51, 23. 2. 1977, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 93, 30. 3. 1985, p. 1.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 290, 22. 10. 1983, p. 1.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ No L 376, 31. 12. 1986, p. 7.

**Answer given by Mr Mac Sharry
on behalf of the Commission**

(15 February 1989)

Under Regulation (EEC) No 355/77 on improving the conditions under which agricultural products are processed and marketed, the EAGGF Guidance Section has provided aid totalling Esc 133 361 810 for three projects, four projects involving aid of Esc 261 672 750 having been submitted. Those projects are:

- modernization of a tuna and mackerel canning factory at Funchal (Madeira):
aid granted: Esc 3 071 250,
planned investment: Esc 6 142 500.
- Construction of a central banana depot at Funchal (Madeira):
aid granted: Esc 94 750 000,
planned investment: Esc 227 000 000.
- provision of a banana canning unit at Funchal (Madeira):
aid granted: Esc 35 540 560,
planned investment: Esc 72 081 000.
- construction of a tuna canning factory at Funchal (Madeira):
planned investment: Esc 261 422 000.

In addition, the Guidance Section reimbursed a total of Esc 320 000 in 1988 for expenditure in 1987 pursuant to Article 15 (annual compensatory allowance to assist farming activities in less-favoured areas) of Regulation (EEC) No 797/85.

The Commission is sending the Honourable Member a list of the measures financed under Regulation (EEC) No 2908/83 and (EEC) No 4028/86.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1858/88**by Mr Ernest Glinne (S—B)****to the Commission of the European Communities***(10 January 1989)**(89/C 151/82)**Subject:* Protection of fauna and flora in the Antarctic

Can the Commission say:

1. whether all the Member States of the Community have laws similar to the Belgian law of 12 January 1978 and, if so, can it give references for each one?
2. whether the Community's executive institutions view favourably the suggestions put forward for safeguarding the ecological balance of the Antarctic more effectively by banning or strictly regulating the exploitation of mineral resources (e. g. proposal 448/1 by the Belgian Chamber of Representatives of 16 June 1988)?
3. what the Community's position is on this subject, as far as itself and third countries are concerned?

**Answer given by Mr Ripa di Meana
on behalf of the Commission***(22 February 1989)*

1. Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Spain, the United Kingdom and the European Community are contracting parties to the Canberra Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources. The chief objective of the Convention is to put in place an international strategy for the protection and rational use of the Antarctic marine ecosystem and its component parts.

Apart from the Convention the Commission has no precise information on national rules and regulations relating to the protection of Antarctic fauna and flora in force in the Member States.

2. The Commission warmly welcomes any step that may help to safeguard the environment in the Antarctic, where the ecological balance is particularly fragile and vulnerable, in view of its limited ability to absorb the changes that mankind's activities might cause there.

3. Negotiations aimed at the drafting of a convention on the Antarctic's mineral resources were completed at Wellington on 2 June 1988 when the text was initialled by the participating States' representatives. The Convention strictly regulates exploration for and development of

mineral resources in order to ensure that the Antarctic environment and ecosystems are not damaged thereby.

The Commission has examined the text and, in the light of explanations provided by the Member States, has reached the conclusion that some of the objectives of the Convention might fall within the jurisdiction of the Community but are too general to warrant participation by the Community at present. The Commission will consider, however, the desirability of obtaining observer status extended to cover all the bodies set up under the Convention, which would enable it to be directly associated with their work.

It is a matter for regret, however, that the Convention does not include a clause providing for the subsequent accession of the Community as the organization for regional economic integration, whose members include several contracting parties to the Antarctic Treaty. It is not out of the question that future developments in Community competence or in activities under this Convention may require the Community to participate directly.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1860/88**by Mr Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC—B)****to the Council of the European Communities***(10 January 1989)**(89/C 151/83)*

Subject: The right of nationals of the Member States of the Community to stand as candidates in the European Parliament elections in any Member State

On 16 September 1988 the European Parliament adopted a written declaration on the above subject. In it Parliament calls upon the Council to express its opinion on the objectives set out in it before 30 October 1988.

Can the Council say what its position is on this matter?

Answer*(25 April 1989)*

The Council would refer the Honourable Member to the reply it gave on 5 April 1989 to a letter from the President of the European Parliament on the same subject.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1866/88
by Mr John Bird (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(10 January 1989)
(89/C 151/84)

Subject: The Internal Market and the 'new approach' to harmonizing technical standards

In order to speed up the harmonization of technical standards, the Commission in 1985 adopted a new approach.

In view of the differing concepts of safety in Member States, what measures do the Commission intend taking to protect the consumer? In particular, how do they intend:

- (a) to ensure that there is established a general duty on manufacturers to trade safely;
- (b) to ensure that harmonization will not result in a reduction of standards to the lowest in the Community?

Answer given by Mr Bangemann
on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 1989)

In the Community directives or proposals for directives ⁽¹⁾ implementing the Council resolution of 7 May 1985 on a new approach to technical harmonization and standards ⁽²⁾, the level of protection — of consumers in particular — will be determined mainly by the essential requirements that are an integral part of the directives. In line with Article 100a (3) of the EEC Treaty, the basis of the proposals for directives in question will be a high level of protection. It follows that the European standards to be established by the European standards institutions CEN/Cenelec will also be geared towards a high level of protection. The Commission has taken every opportunity to reiterate this requirement in the standardization requests it has sent to CEN/Cenelec, especially with regard to machinery and personal protection equipment.

Moreover, the Commission feels that European standards should mirror the interests of both consumers and the other parties concerned. It shares the opinion of the Council, which, in its resolution of 4 November 1988 on the improvement of consumer involvement in standardization ⁽³⁾, called on the Member States to foster the representation of consumer interests in standardization bodies, and in national delegations involved in the work of CEN/Cenelec.

In addition, in its communication of 8 May 1987 ⁽⁴⁾, the Commission undertook to prepare a general Community

directive obliging manufacturers to market only products which are safe for consumers, as an essential complement to the new approach. Such a directive should also allow the Community to act when dangerous products are found to be on the market, and it would provide general protection applicable to all consumer products. The large number of technical and legal problems associated with a proposal of this kind have delayed its transmission.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 141, 30. 5. 1988, p. 14; OJ No C 322, 2. 12. 1987, p. 4; OJ No C 29, 3. 2. 1988, p. 1; OJ No C 214, 16. 8. 1988, p. 23; OJ No L 187, 16. 7. 1988, p. 1; OJ No L 344, 6. 12. 1986, p. 24.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 136, 4. 6. 1985.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 293, 17. 11. 1988.

⁽⁴⁾ COM(87) 209 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1874/88
by Mrs Winifred Ewing (RDE—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(10 January 1989)
(89/C 151/85)

Subject: Non-nuclear energies research institute

A nuclear power station has been closed down in Dounreay, Caithness, Scotland. Some 2 000 jobs have been lost as a result.

As a reflection of the trend away from nuclear energy, and to help relieve the unemployment situation in the area, will the Commission consider setting up a research institute into non-nuclear energies at Dounreay?

Answer given by Mr Pandolfi
on behalf of the Commission
(2 March 1989)

The Commission does not consider to propose setting up a research institute into non-nuclear energies.

The Commission's 'intra-muros' research activities are carried out by the Joint Research Centre in its scientific institutes situated in Ispra (Italy), Karlsruhe (Federal Republic of Germany), Geel (Belgium) and Petten (Netherlands). The Joint Research Centre implements the specific research programmes 1988 — 1991 as decided, in cooperation with the European Parliament, by Council on 14 October 1988 ⁽¹⁾. These include a programme on reference methods in non-nuclear energies.

Research into non-nuclear energies is to be carried out through costshared contracts under the specific research programme-‘JOULE’, on which the Council established, in cooperation with the European Parliament, a Common Position on 15 December 1988.

(¹) OJ No L 286, 20. 10. 1988.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1882/88

by Mrs Winifred Ewing (RDE—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 January 1989)

(89/C 151/86)

Subject: Reference price for salmon

Can the Commission explain why salmon is not covered by the EEC fishery regulations which permit the establishment of a reference price or sluice-gate price mechanism?

Will the Commission now review the position in the light of the present market forces which could bring about a sudden drastic price drop due to competition from Norway and other third countries?

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

(7 February 1989)

The Commission does not consider the establishment under present circumstances of a reference price for salmon or any other intervention mechanism to be justified. In fact:

- the development of salmon aquaculture is inserted within a context of international competition. Any substitution of imports into the EEC market by the increased community production should respect these conditions of competition;
- although the quantity of salmon offered for sale in the EEC market has increased considerably, prices remain at a very high level, ensuring a satisfactory income for the Community producer;
- production and quality of salmon, as a result of an industrial process, can be properly managed. This allows the Community producers to stabilize the prices and, possibly, to increase their market share.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1904/88

by Mr John McCartin (PPE—IRL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 January 1989)

(89/C 151/87)

Subject: Beef intervention price

Will the Commission agree that, given the particular situation on the Irish market, whereby the sale price of a marginal percentage of output determines the market price, the proposed intervention trigger of 84 % of the intervention price would reduce all Irish beef prices by almost 9p/kg from today's level and by substantially more should EEC beef production increase in the future?

Would the Commission not agree that the most effective means of ensuring stable prices combined with reduced purchases into intervention is to maintain the intervention triggers at their present level of 87 and 91 % of the intervention price (thereby maintaining farmers' confidence in the market) and the provision of adequate export refunds and aids to private storage schemes linked to export contracts?

**Answer given by Mr Mac Sharry
on behalf of the Commission**

(22 February 1989)

The Commission's proposals for the reform of the beef regime are designed to make production more market orientated, while at the same time protecting the interests of producers through the premium system and by providing essential support for the market should difficult market circumstances arise. The proposals involve setting a limit (200 000 tonnes) on the quantity of beef that may be taken into intervention in normal circumstances; actual intake would be determined following a tendering procedure. The adjustments proposed in the price levels for triggering intervention are an integral part of the proposed new system.

The Commission has also proposed the rationalization of the beef premium system, with the United Kingdom variable premium and the calf premium being withdrawn. The suckler cow premium and the special beef premium for male animals would be increased significantly.

The Commission does not share the view that, as a consequence of the reform of the regime, returns to beef producers in Ireland should be reduced as suggested. The Commission will bear in mind the importance of the beef sector in Ireland in the course of measures taken to

manage the market. Apart from intervention purchasing, it would be the Commission's intention to continue to support the market through aids to private storage and export refunds as appropriate.

supported the amended proposals submitted by the Commission, the Council finally decided, on 2 March 1989, on the reforms to be made in the common organization of the market in beef and veal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1905/88
by Mr John McCartin (PPE—IRL)
to the Council of the European Communities
(16 January 1989)
(89/C 151/88)

Subject: Beef intervention price

Will the Council agree that, given the particular situation on the Irish market, whereby the sale price of a marginal percentage of output determines the market price, the proposed intervention trigger of 84 % of the intervention price would reduce all Irish beef prices by almost 9p/kg from today's level and by substantially more should EEC beef production increase in the future?

Would the Council not agree that the most effective means of ensuring stable prices combined with reduced purchases into intervention is to maintain the intervention triggers at their present level of 87 and 91 % of the intervention price (thereby maintaining farmers' confidence in the market) and the provision of adequate refunds and aids to private storage schemes linked to export contracts?

Answer
(25 April 1989)

The Council is aware of the importance of beef and veal production to the economy of Irish agriculture. Since November 1988, the Council has discussed in detail proposals for the reform of the common organization of the market in beef and veal submitted by the Commission, in particular the alteration of the system of intervention buying. The Council is anxious to continue reducing the volume of intervention buying without at the same time jeopardizing stock farmers' incomes, and it has therefore concentrated on the problems posed by the fixing of the level and mechanism of intervention buying, the ceiling arrangements for such buying and the operation of the safety net with a view specifically to preventing any downward spiral in market prices.

After taking account of the Opinion delivered on 17 February by the European Parliament, which in the main

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1907/88
by Mr John McCartin (PPE—IRL)
to the Council of the European Communities
(16 January 1989)
(89/C 151/89)

Subject: Review of the beef market support scheme

Will the Council agree that the present negotiations on the review of the beef support scheme will have very significant implications for Irish producers, particularly in the medium and long term?

Will the Council agree that the proposed weakening of market support will have quite drastic implications, not only for farmers' incomes but also for employment in the industry as a whole and, in particular, that the proposal to set a predetermined ceiling on purchases into intervention could set a dangerous precedent and could result in the intervention quota being shared out between Member States?

Answer
(25 April 1989)

While the Council is aware of the importance that the reform of the common organization of meat markets will have in the medium and long term regarding the development of stock farmers' incomes in the Community, it considers that the restoration of market prices in most Member States should enable these prices to resume their essential role.

As regards intervention, it is precisely in order to preserve stock farmers' incomes that the Council provided for account to be taken of exceptional circumstances leading to the re-establishment of intervention purchasing even where the fixed maximum quantity would be exceeded.

In addition, in order to take account of the specific situation of Ireland, the Council has maintained the special financing arrangements for stock-farming in Ireland as regards the suckler-cow premium.

On 2 March 1989, after considering the European Parliament's Opinion delivered on 17 February 1989,

which essentially supported the modified proposals submitted by the Commission, the Council adopted the Regulations amending intervention and premium arrangements in the beef sector.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1929/88

by Mr Kenneth Collins (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(16 January 1989)
(89/C 151/90)

Subject: Ehlass

Will the Commission say whether or not it is now processing the statistical data from Member States on home and leisure accidents in accordance with the requirements of Ehlass (i. e. the European Home and Leisure Accident Surveillance System)?

Answer given by Mr Van Miert
on behalf of the Commission
(10 February 1989)

The Commission is receiving data from 58 hospitals spread over 11 Member States and has undertaken a preliminary analysis of 238 000 cases. The data at this stage is not representative of either the situation in the Community or the individual Member States. The Commission is readjusting its management of the demonstration project and will be involving Eurostat in the project to ensure that problems of representativity and analysis are overcome.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1942/88

by Mr Jean-Pierre Abelin (PPE—F)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(16 January 1989)
(89/C 151/91)

Subject: Professional associations for members of the armed forces

On 12 April 1984 the European Parliament adopted a resolution on the right of members of the armed forces to form professional associations to represent them in their dealings with government authorities.

Can the Commission say what the situation is with regard to such associations in the Member States and will it say what action has been taken towards harmonization in response to this resolution?

Answer given by Miss Papandreou
on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 1989)

Questions concerning the right of association of members of the armed forces do not come within the responsibility and competence of the Communities.

The resolution referred to by the Honourable Member was moreover addressed to the Member States.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 1988/88

by Mr Llewellyn Smith (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(19 January 1989)
(89/C 151/92)

Subject: Environment

What initiatives have been taken or promoted by the EC since June 1988 to clean up the pollution in the North Sea?

Answer given by Mr Ripa di Meana
on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 1989)

In Spring of last year we experienced some major ecological disasters — algae blooms and seal deaths.

In June these problems were discussed during 3 major political events: the European Council of 27 and 28 June in Hannover, the Council of the European Communities of 16 and 28 June and the Frankfurt Ministerial Seminar on future Community water policy of 27 and 28 June 1988. These meetings gave conclusions and resolutions which form the basis for a reinforced Community policy for the protection of waters including the North Sea.

In this context the Honourable Member is referred to the answer given by the Commission to Written Question No 1466/88 by Mr Beyer de Ryke ⁽¹⁾.

Since the answer was given the proposal for a directive on the use of nitrates in agriculture has been passed by the Commission and has just been presented to the

Council ⁽²⁾. Preparatory work on Community legislation covering municipal waste water is now at a stage where the Commission has invited representatives from the Member States for an expert meeting to discuss the framework for a directive, based on a working document from the Commission.

Finally it should be stressed that the Commission continues to play an active role in several international fora. Amongst these should be mentioned the preparatory work for the Third North Sea Conference which will take place in March 1990.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 132, 29. 5. 1989, p. 55.

⁽²⁾ COM(88) 708 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2001/88
by Mr Llewellyn Smith (S—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(25 January 1989)
(89/C 151/93)

Subject: Pentachlorophenol

What EC legislation covers the management of pentachlorophenol?

Answer given by Mr Bangemann
on behalf of the Commission
(24 February 1989)

On 20 April 1988 the Commission sent the Council a proposal for a Directive ⁽¹⁾ amending for the ninth time Directive 76/769/EEC relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations ⁽²⁾.

This proposal would prohibit the marketing of pentachlorophenol (PCP) and PCP compounds whether as such or in preparations containing concentrations of 0,1 % or more. Three exemptions from this ban have been proposed for products used in industrial installations:

- for treating wood;
- for the impregnation of heavy-duty textiles; or
- as a synthesizing agent.

The Economic and Social Committee endorsed the proposal by a large majority, with one abstention ⁽³⁾.

Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection first discussed the

proposal in December 1988. Parliament is expected to give its opinion in March 1989.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 117, 4. 5. 1988, p. 14.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 262, 27. 9. 1976, p. 201.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 208, 8. 8. 1988, p. 55.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2038/88
by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities
(25 January 1989)
(89/C 151/94)

Subject: Commercial use of the ecu

What is the Commission doing to encourage private companies to become commercial users of the ecu?

Answer given by Mr Delors
on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 1989)

The Commission endeavours to encourage the use of the ecu by private companies by all the means which are at its disposal.

One way of promoting the ecu is to use it more widely in the Community budget. However, present budgetary rules, which are set by the Council, hamper the use of the ecu in central areas. Most important, the ecu's role in the common agricultural policy is bound to remain very modest as long as special exchange rates are applied for agricultural products. Notwithstanding this difficulty, the Commission proposed in its draft Financial Regulation of December 1988 ⁽¹⁾ to confirm the principle — except where specific sectorial regulations demand otherwise — of generalized use of the ecu, not merely as a unit of account but as the denominator of the Community's financial claims and liabilities and as an instrument of settlement in the execution of the general budget.

Within the context of the European Coal and Steel Community, the Commission intends to use the ecu exclusively as the currency in which companies pay their levies. However, the Council's opinion on the Community's draft decision is pending. Expenditure under the ECSC Treaty is already executed at close to 100 per cent in ecu.

Apart from these initiatives for modifying budgetary rules, the Commission has further extended the use of the ecu in those transactions where it acts as a principal on its own authority. All contracts on studies, consultancies and services in general are denominated and settled in

ecus, and tenders must also be in ecus. In 1988, approximately 25 % of the non-agricultural expenditure in the general budget were executed in ecu, against around 15 % in the previous year.

The Commission is involved in a number of other activities to foster the ecu's commercial use. It follows closely the work of the Association for the Monetary Union of Europe, a group of leading European companies which has chosen as one of its objectives to promote the use of the ecu in and among companies through practical solutions. Likewise, the Commission takes strong interest in the activities of the ecu Banking Association and in the ecu clearing system set up with the support of the Commission by this Association. Furthermore, the Commission has contributed financially and by providing expertise to the survey on European enterprises and the ecu which was carried out by the Association for the Monetary Union of Europe in the Autumn of 1988 and which showed that a high majority (86 %) of companies want a common currency, and that the companies' familiarity with the ecu is not well developed. Finally the Commission has recently financed a study on the use of the ecu in transactions with Latin American countries, carried out by the University Bocconi of Milan.

At present, the majority of Member States require companies to draw up and publish their accounts in the national currency. In its proposal of 14 October 1988 for a Council Directive ⁽¹⁾ amending the Directives on annual accounts and on consolidated accounts, the Commission suggested that companies may draw up and publish their accounts in ecu if they so wish.

⁽¹⁾ COM(88) 838 final.

⁽²⁾ COM(88) 292 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2039/88

by Mr Pieter Dankert and Mr Alman Metten (S—NL)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 January 1989)

(89/C 151/95)

Subject: Contravention of Article 85 (1) of the EEC Treaty by the Netherlands pharmaceuticals industry's economy plan

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report in the *Volkscrant* of 5 October 1988 (page 8) entitled: 'Pharmaceuticals industry economy plan is built on ice'?

2. Does the Commission take the view that the so-called 'all-party agreement' of 18 August 1988

contravenes the prohibition contained in Article 85 (1) of the EEC Treaty?

3. Does the Commission take the view that an exemption from the said prohibition can be made in favour of the above agreement on the basis of Article 85 (3)?

**Answer given by Sir Leon Brittan
on behalf of the Commission**

(22 February 1989)

On 2 December 1988 the Commission received a complaint about the All-party Agreement from the Parallel Drug Importers Association, Prodifarma. The Agreement was notified to the Commission on 9 December 1988.

The All-party Agreement provides for a general reduction in the prices which pharmaceutical companies and wholesalers charge retail pharmacists for medicines in the Netherlands. The reduction in trade prices is conditional on acceptance by the pharmacists of changes in the margins they receive for dispensing medicines. The changes, which require government approval, include a cut in the special margins which the current scheme allows for dispensing generic and/or parallel imported drugs.

The Commission has begun an investigation into the Agreement under Regulation 17/62 ⁽¹⁾. It is considering in particular whether the Agreement fulfils the conditions for exemption under Article 85 (3).

On its own, a collectively agreed price reduction in this industry could, under certain conditions, qualify for exemption.

However, in the present case the price reduction is inextricably bound up with the other clauses of the Agreement, including those described above. It will therefore be necessary to assess the various parts of the Agreement and their effects on the Dutch pharmaceutical market as a whole.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No 13, 21. 2. 1962, p. 204/62.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2049/88

by Mr José Valverde Lopez (ED—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 January 1989)

(89/C 151/96)

Subject: Financing and operation of Euro-windows

The first 'Euro-windows' have been set up in Spain as part of the action programme for small and medium-sized

undertakings. How much financial support is being given to these Eurocounters in Spain and does private enterprise make any financial contribution to this service?

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

(10 March 1989)

During the first phase of the 'Euro Info Centre' project, 39 centres were set up throughout the Community, five of them in Spain.

The financial support given by the Commission was normally ECU 50 000 for the first year of operation and ECU 30 000 for the second year for each centre.

Two of the five Spanish centres have been accommodated in employers' organizations (CEA Seville and CEOE Madrid).

The total cost of each centre (investment and running costs) exceeds by far the assistance provided by the Commission. The difference is made up by the host structure, in this case, the employers' organizations.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2071/88
by Mr Rafael Calvo Ortega (NI—E)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(27 January 1989)

(89/C 151/97)

Subject: Report on the implementation of the 1988 budget (ERDF)

The report on the implementation of the 1988 budget shows that at 31 October 1988 only 58,3% of the commitment appropriations for the ERDF had been implemented, which is a low figure in view of the total appropriations available.

In the Commission's opinion, what are the reasons for this low level of implementation?

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

(7 March 1989)

The percentage of ERDF commitment appropriations utilized by 31 October 1988, as indicated by the Honourable Member, was virtually as forecast.

However, since these are annual appropriations, the rate at which they are used up cannot be assessed until the end of the period for which they were entered in the budget.

In this context, the Commission would point out that the ERDF commitment appropriations shown in the 1988 budget (Chapter 50 'European Regional Development Fund — Operations', and Chapter 51 'European Regional Development Fund — specific Community measures') have since been almost entirely utilized.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2089/88
by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(27 January 1989)

(89/C 151/98)

Subject: Electronic data interchange (EDI)

What is the Commission doing to encourage the growth of a strong EC presence in the rapid growing electronic data interchange (EDI) market? Does the Commission share my view that EDI will in the future become one of the most important of the new technologies?

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

(24 February 1989)

The Commission has recognized the need to encourage the growth of a strong Community presence in the growing EDI market and proposed in December 1986 a programme for this purpose⁽¹⁾. This proposal was approved by Parliament⁽²⁾ and the Economic and Social Committee⁽³⁾ and, following the Council Decision of 5 October 1987⁽⁴⁾, a communications network Community programme on Trade Electronic Data Interchange Systems (TEDIS) was launched at the beginning of 1988, with a budget of ECU 5,3 million over two years.

Although the start of the programme was delayed by budgetary uncertainties, the TEDIS programme has been very active in the field of standardization, coordination of existing work, raising public awareness, considering the measures which need to be taken in respect of commercial security and legal requirements, and of telecommunications.

It has supported the work of the Edifact⁽¹⁾ Board for Western Europe in developing standards for the necessary electronic messages, and provides the secretariat for that body, and its working groups on trade, transport, customs and administration, finance, construction and tourism. It has also encouraged and coordinated specific actions in various industry sectors; notably the Automotive, Chemical, Electronics, Insurance and Retail sectors.

The programme aims to make potential users and suppliers of EDI products and services aware of the benefits of electronic data interchange, and of the standards available. This is and will be done through trade exhibitions and conferences, and by launching projects amongst industry where EDI is not already happening.

The particular need for commercial security and the legal changes which may be required to enable EDI to be used with confidence within the Community are the subject of current research contracts.

The availability of an adequate telecommunications infrastructure, and of suitable hardware and software for EDI services is of great importance. The Directorate General for Telecommunications, Information Industries and Innovation is taking account of this in the planning of its ESPRIT (II) and RACE programmes as well as in its proposal for a Directive on Open Network Provision (ONP)⁽⁶⁾.

The Commission agrees that EDI will in the near future become one of the most important of the new technologies, and will be proposing a number of specific measures with the aim of promoting the emergence of European value-added services building on the foundation of the present TEDIS programme.

⁽¹⁾ COM(86) 662 final.

⁽²⁾ OJ No C 246, 14. 9. 1987, p. 92.

⁽³⁾ OJ No C 105, 21. 4. 1987, p. 1.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ No L 285, 8. 10. 1987, p. 35.

⁽⁵⁾ Electronic Data Interchange for Administration, Commerce and Transport.

⁽⁶⁾ COM(88) 825 final.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2096/88

by Mr Gijs de Vries (LDR—NL)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 January 1989)

(89/C 151/99)

Subject: Article 115 of the EEC Treaty

Will the Commission state, in respect of each of the 12 Member States,

- how often appeals have been made under Article 115 in 1986, 1987 and 1988, and
- how often the Commission has dismissed such appeals?

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

(14 March 1989)

The Honourable Member will find the requested information set out in the tables below.

1986

	No of appeals	Accepted	%	Dismissed	%
Germany	—	—	—	—	—
Benelux	—	—	—	—	—
Denmark	—	—	—	—	—
Spain	4	4	100	—	—
France	86	67	78	19	22
Greece	—	—	—	—	—
Ireland	66	45	68	21	32
Italy	22	20	91	2	9
Portugal	—	—	—	—	—
United Kingdom	6	5	83	1	17
Total	184	141	77	43	23

1987

	No of appeals	Accepted	%	Dismissed	%
Germany	—	—	—	—	—
Benelux	1	1	100	—	—
Denmark	2	2	100	—	—
Spain	17	13	76	4	24
France	72	62	86	10	14
Greece	—	—	—	—	—
Ireland	60	52	94	8	6
Italy	24	23	96	1	4
Portugal	1	1	100	—	—
United Kingdom	5	3	60	2	40
Total	182	157	86	25	14

1988

	No of appeals	Accepted	%	Dismissed	%
Germany	—	—	—	—	—
Benelux	3	2	67	1	33
Denmark	—	—	—	—	—
Spain	23	17	74	6	26
France	60	52	87	8	13
Greece	2	2	100	—	—
Ireland	38	33	87	5	13
Italy	25	20	80	5	20
Portugal	1	1	100	—	—
United Kingdom	1	1	100	—	—
Total	153	128	84	25	16

Accepted: Decisions to authorize protective measures.
Dismissed: Decisions rejecting recourse to Article 115.

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

(28 February 1989)

1 and 2. Classification of a Community legal instrument as 'environmental' is somewhat arbitrary, particularly in the fields of products standards, workplace protection, and legislation relating to agriculture, social affairs and energy; this makes it impossible to give a precise answer to the first two questions.

The Directorate-General responsible for the environment has compiled for its internal use an inventory of Community legal instruments relating to the environment, which lists chiefly — but not only — instruments administered by that Directorate-General. It is in French only and lists a total 166 instruments (regulations and directives, including amendments to them). It will be sent direct to the Honourable Member and the Secretariat of Parliament.

3. With regard to proposals for legislation not yet adopted by the Council, the Honourable Member is asked to refer to the list of proposals pending before the Council which the Commission sends to Parliament twice a year (the Broeks List).

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2117/88

by Mrs Ursula Schleicher (PPE—D)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 January 1989)

(89/C 151/100)

Subject: Community legislation on environmental protection

Although the Rome Treaties of 1957 contained no explicit legal base for legislation on environmental protection, it was not long before laws on environmental protection were adopted using Article 235 as the legal base (removal of barriers to trade and competition).

Since the entry into force of the Single European Act on 1 July 1987, there has been a legal base for Community legislation in the field of environmental protection.

1. How many laws (directives and regulations, including amending directives) have been drawn up on environmental protection since 1957?
2. How many of these laws has the Council of Ministers adopted so far?
3. How many directives and regulations are still pending in the Council?

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2177/88

by Mrs Winifred Ewing (RDE—GB)

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 February 1989)

(89/C 151/101)

Subject: Financial contributions to political parties

Will the Commission state which Member States have laws obliging companies to publicly disclose financial contributions to political parties?

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

(10 April 1989)

In the performance of its duties under the Treaties, the Commission does not acquire information of the kind requested by the Honourable Member.

It is therefore unable to answer her question.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2214/88

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

(14 February 1989)

(89/C 151/102)

Subject: Community aid to Wallonia

What contributions have been made since 1985 by the various Community financial instruments, funds and loan instruments to Wallonia?

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

(14 April 1989)

The Commission is sending directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of Parliament the information requested.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2229/88

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

(14 February 1989)

(89/C 151/103)

Subject: Energy and transport

In its resolution of 16 October 1987 (*Official Journal of the European Communities* No C 305, 16. 11. 1987, p. 161), the European Parliament recommended a series of measures on the rational use of energy in the field of transport.

Could the Community say what action it has taken on this resolution?

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

(12 April 1989)

The Commission is sending directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of Parliament the information requested.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2292/88

**by Mr Richard Simmonds (ED—GB)
to the Commission of the European Communities**

(17 February 1989)

(89/C 151/104)

Subject: Inheritance laws

From the recent experiences of two constituents, I understand that, under Italian legislation, if a man has

been married previously and if his current wife is not named in the deeds of the house, then his property will be inherited by the children of both his marriages and not by his widow, that is his second wife.

Children for previous marriages benefit in this situation, even if already provided for in divorce settlements.

Are there any plans for EC legislation which should safeguard the interests of the children and wives of second marriages?

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

(6 April 1989)

The Honourable Member's question does not come within the Commission's jurisdiction.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2401/88

by Mr Francisco Lucas Pires (PPE—P) and Mr Egon Klepsch (PPE—D)

to the Council of the European Communities

(6 March 1989)

(89/C 151/105)

Subject: EEC support for the consolidation of the peace process in southern Africa

Significant progress has been made by the peace process in southern Africa, since agreements were reached and quadripartite negotiations opened in Geneva on 8 August 1988 and continued when, with the United States acting as mediator, talks were held between Angola, South Africa and Cuba in Brazzaville. Therefore, there is every reason to hope for an early and successful outcome.

The importance of the current moves towards peace, democracy and development in southern Africa and the continent as a whole is such as to deserve not only the attention of the countries of Europe but also constructive and practical support and solidarity from the Community to help surmount what is still a very difficult problem.

Can the Council therefore say how it intends to contribute to a successful outcome of the current peace process and help consolidate the future peaceful development of the region:

- (a) politically,
- (b) economically?

Joint answer (1)
(25 April 1989)

The Twelve have always stood firm in their commitment to independence for Namibia in accordance with the United Nations planned settlement enshrined in Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). They will do everything in their power to facilitate its rapid application and to help restore conditions of peace, stability and dialogue throughout southern Africa.

The Twelve have always kept close track of the process of negotiations in southern Africa and they welcomed the important Protocol of Agreement which was signed in Brazzaville on 13 December 1988 by Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the United States acting as mediator, and which brings independence for Namibia on the basis of Security Council Resolution 435 (1978) closer than ever before. The Twelve also paid tribute to the constructive spirit which the parties brought to the negotiations and to the efforts of all those who helped bring about the remarkable progress which has been made, and expressed their appreciation of and support for the important role and significant efforts of the UN Secretary-General.

The Community has over the past few years supplied substantial assistance to southern Africa and it intends in future to continue its help for that region in order to promote the continuation and consolidation of the peace process.

Hard on the heels of the agreements on peace in Angola and independence for Namibia signed in New York on 22 December 1988, the Commission and the Member States approved an ECU 60 million programme of joint Community action for Angola in support of its reconstruction programme and agreed that discussions would continue between them on how bilateral aid from the Member States could best be deployed to finance and implement such a programme. From 1979 to 1988 the Community granted Angola some ECU 225 million to finance projects in the field of rural development, fisheries, infrastructure, food aid and emergency aid.

As regards Namibia, the Community and its Member States reiterate their willingness to continue and if necessary increase their aid to the people of Namibia in order to ensure a smooth transition to independence. They also reaffirm their intention of promoting the economic and social development of Namibia by granting it substantial economic aid once it has gained independence, and, in the same spirit, their willingness to accept a request from an independent Namibia to accede to the ACP-EEC Convention.

In addition, the Community and its Member States have already stepped up the programme of aid for the SADCC

and the Front Line States. Under the Lomé Convention, a total of some ECU 1 500 million is earmarked for the nine Member States of the SADCC over the period 1985 to 1990, which makes the Community one of the largest donors. What is more, in view of the importance of the region, its present problems and its development potential, the Commission has recently increased the regional funding made available to the SADCC under Lomé III from ECU 110 to 141 million. The extra money will be devoted chiefly to transport, for projects such as the Lobito corridor and the Limpopo railway, which are designed to reduce dependence on South African ports for the shipment of goods.

The Council would also mention here the special programme of assistance to the victims of apartheid in South Africa and Namibia, which covers some 220 projects in those two countries at a cost of almost ECU 56 million (situation as at the end of 1988), centred mainly on education and training, social and humanitarian aid and legal assistance. This special programme will continue, and ECU 25 million have been set aside for it in 1989.

(1) Because of the subject covered by the question, the answer has been given jointly by the Council and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs meeting in political cooperation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2441/88
by Mr André Fourçans (LDR—F)
to the Council of the European Communities
(13 March 1989)
(89/C 151/106)

Subject: Recognition of specialist medical training in the Community

In the context of the equivalence of diplomas and freedom of movement of persons within the European Community, is recognition granted to specialist medical training in cases such as the following:

If a French medical student who has not completed hospital training in France specializes in cardiology, for example, completing long periods of training in cardiology wards in other EEC Member States, is he entitled to work in France as a cardiologist on the same terms and with the same recognized stakes as a French house doctor?

Can the Council say whether, in such a case, mutual recognition of specialized medical diplomas exists?

Answer
(25 April 1989)

The mutual recognition of doctors' and specialist medical qualifications is the subject of Directive 75/362/EEC ⁽¹⁾, as amended by Directive 81/1057/EEC ⁽²⁾ and 82/76/EEC ⁽³⁾. The Commission recently proposed further amendments (see COM(87) 577 final 2), which are currently under examination at the Council.

The Council would point out that it is the Commission's responsibility to ensure that the Treaties and the measures taken under them are applied.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No L 167, 30. 6. 1975, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ No L 385, 31. 12. 1981, p. 25.

⁽³⁾ OJ No L 43, 15. 2. 1982, p. 21.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2465/88

by Mr Ernest Glinne (S—B)

to the Council of the European Communities

(13 March 1989)

(89/C 151/107)

Subject: Electricity supplies to South Africa from Zaire

Mr Ian McRae, head of the South African electricity company Eskom, recently went to Zaire to study the possibilities for cooperation between Eskom and the Zairean electricity company SNEL, whose directors are due to visit South Africa in February 1989. The avowed aims of the head of Eskom, who claims to be in contact with his opposite numbers in ten or twelve southern African countries, are to establish in the region an interdependent electricity grid and to meet the medium-term needs of South Africa. In the immediate future, Eskom would provide technical services, vocational training and electricity supplies.

However, according to the South African weekly 'Financial Mail' of 23 December 1988, Mr McRae is encountering some resistance from Zambia and Zimbabwe and stiffer opposition from the Southern African Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) which wishes to reduce and eventually end southern Africa's present dependence on South Africa.

What is the attitude of the Community's executive institutions and the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation towards Eskom's campaign (see 'Financial Mail' of 29 May 1988) to organize an energy policy structure in southern Africa around the future needs of

South Africa. Do such programmes not require prior approval by the SADCC and its contributors and above all, incontrovertible evidence of the definite phased dismantling of the apartheid regime in the Republic of South Africa?

Answer
(25 April 1989)

It is not for the Council to comment on the facts and press reports to which the Honourable Member refers.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2467/88

by Mr Ernest Glinne (S—B)

to the Council of the European Communities

(13 March 1989)

(89/C 151/108)

Subject: Questionable provision of equipment to Lesotho Airways

Lesotho Airways, that country's national airline, purchased an ageing Boeing 707 some months ago to fly South African tourists to the Seychelles, since South African Airways was refused landing rights and was therefore unable to provide such a service. This plane, having remained unused and unprofitable at King Moshoeshoe Airport near Maseru for a long time, makes the occasional flight with very few passengers to the Seychelles but putting it to alternative uses is practically impossible owing to the distance and the fuel required by this type of aircraft.

For international flights, Lesotho Airways also has a Dornier 228 and a Fokker F-27, the latter purchased through the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), a public body whose very laudable aim is to help to reduce Lesotho's dependence on South Africa. However, the Fokker is being used to ferry South African businessmen from Johannesburg to Maseru and back.

One year after entering into service, the Boeing 707 has lost \$ 2 million. Apparently, this is not Lesotho Airways' only loss.

In view of the foregoing:

1. what is the amount of indirect and direct aid supplied by the Community and its States for the development of Maseru Airport (a) before the coup which

overthrew the government of Mr Jonathan Swift with the backing of the South African Government and (b) since the coup;

2. what is the opinion of the Community's executive institutions on the Swiss—Israeli—South African backed purchase of the Boeing 707, which has proved to be a burden on Lesotho Airways with no other advantage than that of prestige;
3. has the European Community taken part in well-intentioned but ill-advised gestures such as that which the Swedish SIDA apparently now regrets;
4. should the training and recruitment of staff and the purchase and use of aircraft not receive the prior approval of the SADCC and be subject to feasibility studies before the Community gets involved, either within or outside the framework of the Lomé Convention?

Answer

(25 April 1989)

1. In 1984 the Community contributed to the construction of the new international airport at Maseru with a loan on special terms of ECU 3 million charged to the 4th EDF and intended to provide navigation aids, meteorological equipment, telecommunications equipment and a prefabricated control tower complete with instruments and air conditioning. In 1982 the Community also provided technical assistance worth ECU 2,1 million charged to the 5th EDF.

The Community contribution was intended to help Lesotho, which is landlocked, to improve its transport and communications. This was, moreover, in accordance with the Lomé II indicative programme for Lesotho which set aside certain amounts for the objective of 'improving Lesotho's external communications through the development of its air transport services, in particular communications with other ACP countries'.

The aforementioned financing decisions were taken in accordance with the relevant provisions of Lomé I and II on the procedures for implementing financial and technical aid.

2, 3 and 4. It is not for the Council to comment on the other points raised in the Honourable Member's question.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2469/88

by Mr Ernest Glinne (S—B)

to the Council of the European Communities

(13 March 1989)

(89/C 151/109)

Subject: Opening of a new diamond mine by CDM in Namibia

CDM, a subsidiary of De Beers, has announced the forthcoming opening of its fifth diamond mine north of the Orange River in Namibia, near the Atlantic Coast. The company's declared intention is, in so doing, to maintain its levels of production, reckoned to be approximately 1 million carats per year, which are being threatened by the drop in the quantity and quality of production from Namibian mines. These 1 million carats should be compared with the 8,6 million obtained by De Beers from its mines in South Africa proper and the 22,8 million actually produced or estimated to be produced by De Beers, including CDM and the Botswana deposits, for the period January 1988 — March 1989. CDM has stated that production at their fifth Namibian mine will in fact begin during the second half of 1992 and that reserves in the area in question will yield, over a ten-year period, an annual average of only 43 500 carats.

These figures indicate low-yield deposits: 3,6 carats for every 100 tonnes of ore compared with the average of 7,6 carats for every 100 tonnes produced by CDM for the same period and with the 8,3 carats produced the previous year.

Since, in my opinion, this seems to confirm the conclusions of the Thirion report on the unbalanced and excessive exploitation of Namibian diamond deposits and the relevance of Decree No 1 of the United Nations' Council on Namibia, what are the views of the Community's executive institutions on this matter given the need to assess the effort required to help Namibia, which is on the road to independence, against the profits made there in the past. The same is true of the debt with which Namibia will be burdened after independence.

Answer

(25 April 1989)

It is not for the Council to comment on the matters raised in the Honourable Member's question.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 2487/88**by Mr Ernest Glinne (S—B)****to the Council of the European Communities***(13 March 1989)**(89/C 151/110)*

Subject: Setting up of the Soda Ash Botswana semi-public company

The Botswana Government, whose Vice-President and Minister of Finance and Development Planning, Mr Peter Mmusi, is also President of the SADCC (Southern African Development Coordination Conference) Council of Ministers, has joined forces with the South African chemical giant, African Explosives and Chemical Industries (AECI), to set up the Soda Ash Botswana, a semi-public company. Together with Anglo-American and De Beers, AECI controls 52% of the fledgling company, with the Government of Botswana accepting a minority stake of 24% and the development of about 600 kilometres south of Gaborone of a non-mining industry providing at least 500 jobs. The project has received the support of the World Bank through the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the Commonwealth Development Corporation (CDC), each of which is contributing 5%. South Africa requires 300 000 tonnes of sodium sulphate annually, principally for its glass industry, which is being jeopardized by an anti-apartheid sanctions policy which could interrupt or reduce consignments from traditional suppliers such as Imperial Chemical Industries (ICI), Solvay and the North American consortium American Natural Soda Ash

Corporation (ANSAC). The possible participation in the project by Zimbabwe (through Sua Pan Zimbabwe Ltd) and Zambia (through the Meridien International Bank) would keep majority control in the hands of the South African AECI and its partners.

Can the Council confirm this information or provide further details? Since the SADCC, which is all too neatly 'sewn up', does not appear to have any objections to this operation, does the Council consider that this is a political move designed to reduce the dependence of southern Africa on South Africa or that, on the contrary, it is designed to ensure that the needs of the latter are covered in the name of interdependence, to which the governmental and regional authorities of southern African have attached little importance until now? Does this mean that avowed support for the sanctions policy should be regarded merely as rhetoric for the benefit of the Europeans and Americans, while in practice compromises are on occasion reached with South Africa which are profitable to the latter, in the form of measures which reflect a present-day lack of concern for the heritage of the likes of Rhodes and Kruger?

Answer*(25 April 1989)*

It is not for the Council to comment on the matters raised in the Honourable Member's question.

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

EUROPEAN CUSTOMS INVENTORY OF CHEMICALS

A guide to the tariff classification of chemicals in the combined nomenclature
(English version)

This work includes:

- 32 000 chemical names (internationally accepted common names, systematic names and synonyms).
- Nine languages: Danish, German, English, Greek, Spanish, French, Italian, Dutch and Portuguese.

Features of this publication are:

- The classification (heading and subheading) of a chemical in the new customs tariff of the European Communities can be ascertained immediately from its name in any one of the nine languages.
- The nomenclature in this new tariff (combined nomenclature) is based on the nomenclature of the 'harmonized commodity description and coding system' which entered into force on 1 January 1988.
- The equivalent names in all nine languages (multilingual glossary) obtainable by means of a common key-number (CUS No).
- A means of finding the CAS number (chemical abstracts registry number).

640 pp.

Published in: ES, DA, DE, GR, EN, FR, IT, NL, PT.

Catalogue number: CB-52-88-348-EN-C ISBN: 92-825-7919-0

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

per single-language volume:

ECU 33,75	BFR 1 450	DR 5 600	IRL 26,50	UKL 23,50	USD 42
-----------	-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	--------

per nine-volume set (nine languages):

ECU 232	BFR 10 000	DR 38 300	IRL 180	UKL 160	USD 285
---------	------------	-----------	---------	---------	---------



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